Meinunger, André. 2004. Verb position, verbal mood and the anchoring (potential) of sentences. In *Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, H. Lohnstein & S. Trissler (eds), 313–341. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Netter, Klaus. 1998. Functional Categories in an HPSG for German. PhD dissertation, German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence (DFKI) & University of Saarland.

Oppenrieder, Wolfgang. 1991. *Von Subjekten, Sätzen und Subjektsätzen. Untersuchungen zur Syntax des Deutschen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Pasch, Renate. 1997. *Weil* mit Hauptsatz – Kuckucksei im *denn*-Nest. *Deutsche Sprache* 25(3): 252–271.

Pasch, Renate, Brauße, Ursula, Breindl, Eva & Waßner, Ulrich H. 2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Verknüpfer (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln)*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Peyer, Ann. 1997. *Satzverknüpfung: syntaktische und textpragmatische Aspekte*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Pollard, Carl & Sag, Ivan. 1994. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Stanford: CA CSLI.

Reis, Marga. 1997. Zum syntaktischen Status unselbständiger Verbzweit-Sätze. In *Syntax im Fokus. Festschrift für Heinz Vater*, C. Dürscheid, K.H. Ramers & M. Schwarz (eds), 121–144. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Safir, Ken. 1986. Relative clauses in a theory of binding and levels. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(4): 663–689.

Santorini, Beatrice. 1992. Variation and change in Yiddish subordinate clause word order. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10: 595–640.

Shaer, Ben & Frey, Werner. 2004. Integrated and non-integrated leftperipheral elements in German and English. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 35(2), 465–502.

Steinbach, Markus. 2007. Integrated parentheticals and assertional complements. In parentheticals, N. Dehé & Y. Kavalova (eds), 53–87. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: CUP.

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 2006. On the semantic motivation of syntactic verb movement to C in German. *Theoretical Linguistics* 32–3: 257–306.

Uhmann, Susanne. 1998. Verbstellungsvariation in weil-Sätzen. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 17(1): 92–139.

Uszkoreit, Hans. 1987. *Word Order and Constituent Structure in German*. Chicago IL: Chicago University Press.

Van Valin, Robert. 1984. A typology of syntactic relations in clause linkage. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, C. Brugman et al. (eds), 542–558. Berkley CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Vikner, Sten. 1995. Verb-Movement and Expletive Subject in the Germanic Languages. New york: Oxford University Press.

Wechsler, Stephen. 1991. Verb second and illocutionary Force. In *Views on Phrase Structure*, K. Leffel & D. Bouchard (eds), 177–191. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Wegener, Heide. 1993. Weil – das hat schon seinen Grund. Zur Verbstellung in Kausalsätzen mit weil im gegenwärtigen Deutsch. *Deutsche Sprache* 21: 289–305.

To the right of the clause

Right dislocation vs. afterthought*

Maria Averintseva-Klisch
University of Tübingen

In my paper I will introduce two different, although apparently similar constructions at the right sentential edge in German: right dislocation (RD) and afterthought (AT). I show that RD is a discourse-structuring device: it marks the topic for the following discourse segment. AT, on the contrary, is a local repair strategy. I assume that a syntactically independent repair like AT and a syntactically adjoined discourse-structuring device like RD are cross-linguistically two options of the right sentential edge, and test this assumption for French and Russian.

Keywords: Right dislocation, discourse topic, afterthought, discourse relation

1. Introduction

'German right dislocation' is since Altmann (1981) a term for a construction consisting of an NP[1] at the right edge of the clause (i.e., after the formal completion of the clause) and a coreferent intraclausal pro-form, as in (1):

(1)   *Hast Du   ihn   schon   gesehen,   (ich meine)   den   Karl?*
      have you   him$_i$ already seen,   (I   mean)   the   Karl$_i$

(Schindler 1995: 44)

1.   Altmann (1981) also mentions PP- and CP-right dislocations; these are not considered in this paper. See, however, Averintseva-Klisch & Salfner (2007) for PP-RD.

Traditional analyses of the German right dislocation assume that this is a construction of spoken German that serves to resolve a potentially unclear pronominal reference (Altmann 1981; Auer 1991; Schindler 1995; Selting 1994; Uhmann 1993; 1997). The speaker of (1) notices that the use of the pronoun *ihn* ('him') is unclear in the context (it might be that there are either several referents that are equally suitable as an antecedent, or no referent is activated highly enough for the reference of the pronoun to be resolved effortlessly by the addressee). This observation causes the speaker to provide as an "afterthought" information that should make it easier to identify the intended referent.

However, there are abundant cases where a right dislocation cannot serve the reference clarification, as the reference is pretty clear, cf. (2):

(2) a. (*"Der Taifun!"*   *rief*   *Lukas*   *dem*   *Kapitän*   *zu.*
      The   typhoon.MASK called Lukas   the   captain   to
      "Da   *ist*   *er!"*)   *Ja,*   *da*   *war*   *er,*   *der*   *Taifun.*
      There   is   he   Yes   there   was   he$_i$ the   typhoon$_i$
                               (Michael Ende, *Jim Knopf und die Wilde* 13: 190)

    b. (*Den*   *Tag,*   *den*   *vergess'*   *ich*   *nicht,*)
      (That   day,   D-PRON   forget   I   not)
      der   *war*   *viel*   *zu*   *schön,*   *der*   *Tag.*
      D-PRON$_i$ was   much   too   wonderful   the   day$_i$.
                                     (Altmann 1981:129)

Here the right dislocation marks the referent of the NP (the typhoon in (2a) and the day in (2b)) as being especially important for the discourse. To be more exact, the referent is marked as the discourse topic in the sense of aboutness (see section 2.2.). I argue that (1) and (2) are instances of two functionally and formally different constructions that have been subsumed under the label of right dislocation. I name these constructions 'right dislocation proper' (RD), cf. (2), and 'afterthought' (AT), cf. (1), following the distinction made for other languages, e.g., in Ziv (1994) and Ward & Birner (1996) for English and Fretheim (1995) for Norwegian.

In this paper, I will first dwell upon the functional and formal differences between RD and AT in German. In section 2, I will briefly introduce prosodic and syntactic features of RD and AT (section 2.1.), and then turn to their respective discourse functions (section 2.2.). I will propose that AT is a syntactically independent 'orphan' (Haegeman 1991), that gets introduced into the discourse via a discourse relation *Afterthought* formulated for this case (section 2.3.). As for RD, it is syntactically integrated into its host sentence, and serves to mark the discourse topic for the following discourse segment. In section 3, I will address the general issue of the use of the right clausal edge.[2] I will

argue with data from German, Russian and French that RD (i.e., a syntactically integrated global discourse-structuring device) and AT (i.e., a syntactically non-integrated local repair) are two cross-linguistically possible options of the use of the right clausal edge. Finally, in section 4, I will sum up and draw some conclusions.

2. RD vs. AT: Form and function

In this section, I introduce the prosodic and syntactic differences between RD and AT. Many of the facts presented here have been already pointed out in the previous research, e.g., in Altmann (1981), but have mostly been done up with as exceptions from a certain pattern of a so-called "right dislocation". However, distinguishing between RD and AT allows to dispence with most exceptions, and to describe distinct patterns for RD and AT instead. The formal differences between RD and AT suggest that RD is prosodically and syntactically part of its host sentence, while AT is not. After describing these differences I will specify the discourse functions of RD and AT which have been mentioned above.

2.1. RD vs. AT: Prosodic and syntactic differences

RD is prosodically integrated into its host sentence (3a), i.e., it continues the tone movement of the host sentence and thus does not build a prosodic unit (an intonational phrase in terms of Selkirk (1978)) of its own, whereas AT builds an intonational phrase (optionally divided from the clause by a pause) with a tone movement and a clause-like accent of its own (cf. Uhmann 1997), (3b)[3]:

(3) a. [*Ich*   *MAG*   *sie$_i$*   *nicht,*   *die*   *Brigitte$_i$*].   RD
    b. [*Ich*   *MAG*   *sie$_i$*   *nicht*], | [*die*   *BriGITte$_i$*].   AT
      Ilike   her   not,   the   Brigitte.
      'I don't like her, Brigitte.'
      (|: pause; [ ]: intonational phrase; CAPITALS: primary accent)

Crucially, prosody is only one of several criteria for distinguishing between RD and AT. Prosodic differences go along with syntactic differences, which are briefly listed

---

2.   I use the expression "right clausal edge" here and later to refer to constructions coming after the syntactic completion of the clause irrespectively of the fact whether they really pertain syn-

tactically to the clause (being base-generated or moved right IP-adjuncts) or whether they are syntactically autonomous. That is why I do not use the term "right periphery" here, as this term implies that a right-peripheral construction belongs syntactically to its host sentence. "Right clausal edge" in this sense covers right peripheral items as well as autonomous afterthought additions, which are syntactically not part of the host sentence, as I argue below.

3.   See Fretheim (1995) for a similar analysis for Norwegian: he shows that in Norwegian, as in German, prosodically integrated structures are RDs, and prosodically non-integrated ones ATs.

below; they all suggest that RD belongs in a much more straightforward way to its host sentence than AT.

I. Strict morphological agreement (in case, gender and number) between the clause-internal pro-form and the NP is necessary for RD, while at least gender agreement is only optional for AT, cf. (4) vs. (5):

(4) *(Ach ja, mein Nachbar! Er hat gestern wieder einen Wutanfall*
     bekommen, nur weil die Kinder im Garten gespielt haben.)
     '(Oh yes, my neighbour! He went completely berserk yesterday, only
     because the children were playing in the garden.')
     Ich   kann   ihn   nur bedauern, den Mann /   RD
     I   can   him$_{AKK.MASK}$ only regret   the man$_{AKK.MASK}$ /
     *die Giftspritze$_i$ / *der Mann$_i$.
     *the spitfire$_{AKK.FEM}$ / *the man$_{NOM.MASK}$

(5) a. *Es$_i$ ist ein bisschen gleichförmig, | deine Melodie$_i$.[4]*
         it.NEUTR   is a   bit   homogeneous   your melody.FEM   AT
                                                            (Attested oral data)

     b. *Und dann passierte das Unglück$_p$ (ich meine)*
         And then happened [the misfortune]$_{NEUTR}$ (I mean)   AT
         dieser schreckliche Autounfall$_i$,   / ich meine
         [this terrible   traffic.accident]$_{MASK.NOM}$ / I mean
         diesen schrecklichen Autounfall$_i$.[5]
         [this   terrible   traffic.accident]
                                                        MASK.AKK

II. A subordinate clause between the clause-internal pro-form and the NP is not possible for RD and possible for AT, cf. (6):

(6) *Ach, diese Münchner Stadtväter!*
     a. *Es könnte ihnen$_i$ ja wirklich aufgefallen sein,*   RD
         it could them$_i$ yes really   standing.out be

---

4. It is not quite clear, whether *es* and the AT-NP *deine Melodie* really corefer, or whether the neutral weak personal pronoun *es* here is a so-called "anticipatory *es*", which refers in a very abstract way (Smith 2002: 95). In the latter case coreference in the strict sense of the word does not take place. For RD in any case coreference between the RD-NP and the pro-form is required. Thus, irrespective of the fact whether grammatical incongruence corresponds to non-coreference here or not, (5a) is only possible as AT, and not as RD.

5. If an AT is introduced with the addition *ich meine* ('I mean'), the case of the AT-NP can vary between nominative and accusative. Altmann (1981) argues against the assumption that the verb *meinen* ('to mean') constituting the part of the addition is really able to govern the accusative case, so that the case variation cannot be explained with the case marking through the verb.

     daß dazu das Geld   fehlt, *den Münchner Stadtvätern$_i$.
     that for.it the money lacks *the of.Munich city.fathers$_i$

     b. *Es könnte ihnen$_i$ ja   wirklich aufgefallen   sein, daß dazu*
         it could them$_i$ yes really   standing.out be   that for.it
         das Geld   fehlt,| ich meine (damit) die M.   Stadtv.$_i$.   AT
         the money lacks I   mean (with.it) the of.M. city.fathers$_i$
                                                    (Altmann 1981: 115)

'Oh, these city fathers of Munich! They$_i$ really could have noticed, that the money for this purpose is lacking, (I mean) these city fathers of Munich / *these city fathers of Munich$_i$!'

Furthermore, optional additions (*ich meine* ('I mean'), *also* ('that is'), *tatsächlich* ('really') etc.) between the clause-internal pro-form and the NP are possible for AT and not for RD, cf. (7) vs. (8):[6]

(7) *("Der Taifun!" rief Lukas dem Kapitän zu. „Da ist er!")*
     '"The typhoon!" Lukas called to the captain. "Here it comes!"'   RD
     Ja, da   war er, (*ich meine /*also/*tatsächlich) der Taifun.
     yes, there was it$_i$ (*I   mean /*that.is/*really)   the typhoon$_i$

(8) *(Lisa und Melanie haben sich gestritten.)*
     'Lisa and Melanie quarrelled.'
     Dann ist sie weggelaufen, | (ich   meine / also)   LISA.   AT
     then is she$_i$ run.away   (I   mean / that.is) Lisa$_i$

III. The NP is not tied to the right-peripheral position in the case of AT, but can have a fairly free position in its host sentence, while RD is only possible at the right periphery, cf. (9) vs. (10):

(9) a. *Ich habe ihn gestern   nur mit Mühe wiedererkannt, | ich*
         I have him yesterday only with effort recognized,   I
         meine den PETER.   AT
         mean the Peter

     b. *Ich habe ihn, | ich meine den PETER. | gestern nur mit Mühe wiedererkannt.*

     c. *Ich habe ihn gestern | ich meine den PETER, | nur mit Mühe   wiedererkannt.*
         'I hardly recognized him yesterday, I mean Peter.'

---

6. As the examples show, the (im)possibility of additions with RD and AT is not due to the meaning and function of the addition, as one might be tempted to believe in the case of *ich meine / also* ('I mean' / 'that is'), which are additions explicitly assisting the reference-clarifying function of AT. Also such additions like *natürlich* ('of course'), *tatsächlich* ('really') etc., which are insensitive to the functional difference between RD and AT, are bad with RD and perfectly acceptable with AT. Thus, this difference seems to be a syntactic one.

(10)　Den Tag, den　verges'　ich　　nicht,
　　　 the day$_i$　D-PRON$_i$　forget　I　　not
　　a.　der$_i$　　war　viel　zu　schön,　der　Tag$_i$.
　　　　 D-PRON$_i$　was　much　too　beautiful　the　day$_i$
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Altmann 1981: 129)
　　b.　*der$_i$　　der Tag$_i$　war viel　zu　schön.　　　RD
　　　　 *D-PRON$_i$　the　day$_i$　was　much　too　beautiful
　　　　 'That day, I will never forget it, it was so beautiful, the day.'

To summarize: there is ample evidence that RD belongs prosodically and syntactically in a much more straightforward way to its host sentence than AT. Prosodically, RD is a part of its host sentence's tone contour. Considered syntactically, morphological agreement of the RD-NP with the clause-internal pro-form suggests that NP is part of the clause, as morphological agreement is a sentence-bound phenomenon.[7] Moreover, RD occupies a fixed position in the host sentence (at its right periphery), and does not allow insertions (neither subordinate clause insertion nor optional additions of any kind) between the host sentence and the RD-NP. The former constraint, i.e., not allowing subordinate clause insertion, is since Ross (1967) known in the literature as "Right Roof Constraint": Ross assumes rightward movement to be possible, but never across a sentence boundary. For reasons of length and thematic contiguity of this paper I am not going to discuss the issue whether RD is a product of syntactic movement or base-generated at the right periphery.[8] I use the term 'right dislocation' without implying any syntactic analysis, but rather as it is the term generally accepted in the literature for this construction, cf. e.g., Ziv (1994), Fretheim (1995), Ward & Birner (1996), Lambrecht (2001).

However, RD in German seems to be island-sensitive, cf. (11), which might be considered an argument for the movement analysis:

(11)　Über Meyer$_1$ werden öfters Gerüchte verbreitet. Mal soll er$_1$ Beziehungen zur Regierung haben, mal werden seine$_1$ Erfolge mit Kontakten zur Mafia erklärt. 'There are lots of rumours about Meyer. One hears that he is bound to have connections to the government, or even that his success is due to his contacts to the mafia.'

7.　Consten (2004: 91) shows that intersentential anaphoric resumption is generally possible without gender agreement, whereas it is impossible for intrasentential anaphora.

8.　I am not aware of any detailed syntactic analysis of German RD, but see Ross (1986/1967), Kayne (1994), and Culicover / Jackendoff (2005), to name but a few, for different possibilities of syntactic analysis of RD in general. Ross assumes that RD is a result of a rightward movement, whereas for Kayne RD emerges through the movement of the remaining clause to the left of the RD-NP. Villalba (2000) modifies this analysis for RD in Catalan slightly, still assuming that RD involves the leftward movement of its host clause. In contrast, Culicover / Jackendoff (2005) advocate the base generation of the RD to the right of its host sentence.

　　a.　*Ich habe schon　oft　[$_{NP}$　das Gerücht, dass ihm$_1$　die Mafia
　　　　 I　have already often　[$_{NP}$　the rumour that him$_1$　the mafia
　　　　 geholfen hat]　gehört,　dem　Meyer$_1$.
　　　　 helped　has]　heard　the　Meyer$_1$
　　b.　Ich habe schon　oft　[$_{NP}$　das Gerücht t$_a$] gehört, [dass ihm$_1$
　　　　 I　have already often　[$_{NP}$　the rumour t$_a$] heard　[that him$_1$
　　　　 die Mafia geholfen hat]$_a$, dem　Meyer$_1$.
　　　　 the mafia helped　has]$_a$　the　Meyer$_1$
　　　　 'I have already often heard the rumour, that the mafia has assisted him, this Meyer.'

Complex NPs being movement islands in German might explain the ill-formedness of (11a) as opposed to (11b). In this paper, I solely assume that RD is syntactically part of its host sentence, i.e., it belongs to the 'Nachfeld' ("afterfield") in terms of Zifonun, Hoffmann & Stecker (1997). For the purposes of this paper I assume that RD is a right IP-adjunct.[9] As far as the structural position of the clause-internal pro-form is concerned, RD does not impose any additional placement constraints on it (to the structural position of unstressed personal pronouns in general see Abraham 2007: 185 ff.)[10]

AT, on the contrary, 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. Besides, AT is not island-sensitive, cf. (12):

(12)　Alles spricht jetzt nur noch über die Freilassung von Meyer$_1$ und Müller$_2$, und es gibt die wildesten Gerüchte. 'Everybody is talking about the discharge of Meyer$_1$ and Müller$_2$, and the strangest rumours go around.'
　　　 Ich habe schon　oft　[$_{NP}$　das Gerücht, dass ihm$_1$　die Mafia
　　　 I　have already often　[$_{NP}$　the rumour that him$_1$　the mafia
　　　 geholfen hat] gehört, | ich　meine dem Meyer$_1$.
　　　 helped　has]　heard　| I　mean the Meyer$_1$

All in all, AT appears to be syntactically fairly independent of its host sentence. That is why I propose to analyse AT as an 'orphan' in terms of Haegeman (1991), Shaer (2003) and Shaer & Frey (2004). 'Orphans' are linguistic units that are syntactically totally

9.　As for rightward adjunction there are no syntactic tests allowing to discern the exact functional layer that serves as the adjunction site, I keep the notation "IP" to refer to the functional domain above VP. This does not mean that I theoretically disagree with the split IP assumption, but solely that there is virtually no possibility to account for the adjunction site of the RD-NP in a more precise way.

10.　In this respect German RD is expected to differ from clitic RD like in Catalan, Italian or Greek, where clitics are subject to structural constraints different from those on full pronouns.

independent from their host sentence and get integrated into it only at the level of the discourse, as other utterances do. One illustration: according to Shaer (2003), certain adverbials like *with his X-ray vision* in (13) are 'orphans' in this sense:

(13)   *With his X-ray vision, John located the files.*

(Shaer 2003: 458)

Shaer shows that the PP *with his X-ray vision* in (13) is syntactically independent. For instance, it does not show any effects that a syntactic movement would produce (e.g., it violates island constraint), so that a movement-based analysis of such adverbials fails. Furthermore, this PP can occur parenthetically at different positions in the clause, as in (14), which is expected if it does not have any syntactically determined position in its host sentence:

(14)   a.   *With his X-ray vision, John located the files.*
       b.   *John, with his X-ray vision, located the files.*
       c.   *John located the files, with his X-ray vision.*   etc.

Besides, an 'orphan' has to build a prosodic unit of its own. As I have argued above, the same characteristics apply to AT: it does not show any features typical for elements syntactically dependent on its host sentence. Thus, AT allows morphological non-agreement, and does not obey the island constraint. Prosodically, it also has to build a unit of its own. In other words, AT appears to be a syntactic 'orphan'. In terms of Zifonun, Hoffmann & Stecker (1997) AT is a construction of the 'rechtes Außenfeld' ("right outer field") that embraces syntactically independent additions to the clause.

The assumption that AT is syntactically non-integrated can directly account for its appearance after an explicit marking of the sentence boundary, the latter being either marked graphically with an appropriate punctuation mark, e.g., a full stop, in the case of written language, cf. (15a), or, in spoken language, by an intervention of another speaker (so-called 'alien-initiated repairs' in terms of Uhmann (1993)), like in (15b):

(15)   a.   (*Der Koch war schon an Bord, der Matrose ebenfalls.*)
            'The cook was already on board, the sailor too.'
            Er aß die Fliegen. Der Koch, nicht der Matrose.
            He ate the flies.   The cook   not   the sailor
            (Martel Yann, Schiffbruch mit Tiger: 364)

       b.   A: *Ich weiß nicht, wann sie kommt. B: wer?*
            A: I   know not   when she$_i$ comes. B: who?
            A: *na   die Anna.*
            A: INTERJ the Anna$_i$.   (Attested oral data)

After showing how the formal differences between RD and AT correspond to functional differences, I will turn to the issue of how the discourse integration of AT takes place.

2.2   RD vs. AT: Functional differences

My proposal is that RD is used to mark the discourse topic. I understand discourse topic informally as the discourse referent that is stably activated in the discourse representation during the reception of a particular discourse segment,[11] or, in other words, the referent about which the current discourse segment is, cf. (16), where the old shoemaker is the discourse topic:[12]

(16)   *A broad ray of light fell into the garret, and showed the workman with an unfinished shoe upon his lap, pausing in his labour. [...] He had put up a hand between his eyes and the light, and the very bones of it seemed transparent. So he sat, with a steadfastly vacant gaze, pausing in his work. [...]*
       (Charles Dickens, *The Tale of Two Cities*, Ch. 6)

Each particular language has preferred options of referring to discourse topics. Thus, personal pronouns are generally considered to be the cross-linguistically preferred anaphorical means of reference to discourse topics (see e.g., Bosch et al. 2003). Also in (16) the discourse topic referent is constantly referred to with the personal pronoun *he*. Besides, the so-called Left Dislocation in English, the construction consisting of an NP to the left of a clause and a coreferent pro-form inside it as in (17), has been argued to set the current discourse topic (e.g., Frey 2004):[13]

---

11.   I understand discourse segment intuitively as a relatively small span of a discourse (minimally one utterance) that is characterized through a fairly tight thematic contiguity. In written language a discourse segment mostly corresponds to a paragraph.

12.   The problem of the status of discourse topic has been extensively and controversely discussed in literature (see Büring (2003); Asher (2004a) and (2004b); Kehler (2004); Oberlander (2004); Stede (2004) and Zeevat (2004), to name just a few). However, in spite of theoretical controversies and unclarities concerning the exact definition of the discourse topic, the existence of some kind of entity that is most salient at a given stage of the discourse and that is relevant for establishing coherence seems to be uncontroversial. This is the intuition shared by the papers in the recent issue of *Theoretical Linguistics* dedicated to discourse topics, although the authors use different terms for the same intuition of "the thing" that "chunks of text are about" (Asher 2004b: 255). My understanding of the discourse topic as being valid on the local level of a discourse segment corresponds more or less to the concept of 'local topic within discourse segments' in Kehler (2004).

13.   Generally a comparison of the left and right dislocation seems promising, even if it is out of reasons of space impossible in this paper. In short, both dislocation constructions are topic-related devices, although there are differences. In general, LD seems cross-linguistically to be functionally more tightly connected with its host sentence than RD. Due to the linear order of the discourse, LD is bound to set the topic for the discourse segment including its host sentence, whereas RD is more important for the segment following its host sentence. In German, a special variant of left dislocation, the so-called 'Hanging topic' like in (a), has been argued to be a discourse-topic-marking device, cf. Frey (2004):

(17)   *Anna$_p$, I like her$_i$ a lot. She$_i$ [...]*

Similarly, RD in German serves to mark the discourse topic, but is has the peculiarity that the topic is marked not only to be the current one, but also as the topic for the discourse segment following the RD. In (18), Madame Dutitre is set as "what is being talked about" for the segment following the host sentence of the RD:

(18)   *Und als der König seine Frau verloren hatte, bedauerte ihn die Dutitre: "Ach ja, für Ihnen is et ooch nich so leicht [...]."*
       'And when the king lost his wife, Dutitre pitied him: "Dear me, I should say, for you things aren't that easy either [...]"'
       Sie$_i$ war   ein   Original,   die   Madame   Dutitre$_i$.
       she$_i$ was   an   original   the   Madame   Dutitre$_i$
       Sie verstand nie, warum man über ihre Aussprüche lachte. Sie war eben echt und lebte, wie alle wirklich originalen Menschen, aus dem Unbewussten. Kein falscher Ton kam deshalb bei ihr auf.
       'She$_i$ never understood why everybody always laughed at her$_i$ remarks. She$_i$ was genuine and lived unconsciously, as all unique people do. She$_i$ never came across as being artificial.'
       (Siegfried Fischer-Fabian, *Berlin-Evergreen*: 125)

Thus, RD in German is a global discourse strategy in the sense that it helps to structure a whole discourse segment by marking its topic. More specifically, RD can either promote a discourse-old referent to the discourse topic, or to signal maintenance of the old discourse topic (especially after a change of the narration perspective).[14] Importantly, it is a forward-looking strategy, as it structures the segment following the host sentence. RD being situated at the right periphery of the sentence predestines it to influence the subsequent segment. This means that in the default case the referent of the RD-NP is the discourse topic for the following segment, as in (19a). Interestingly, RD is also possible at the very end of a discourse like in (19b). This only seems to contradict my claim: the crucial point is that no other discourse referent is available as topic as long as the discourse continues, cf. (19c), which is a pragmatically unsuitable continuation in the context of

---

(a)   *Peter,   I   like   him   a   lot.*

See also Zybatow & Junghanns (1997) for Russian and Lambrecht (1981) for French counterparts to Hanging topic, as well as Averintseva-Klisch (2006) for similarities and differences between Hanging topic and RD.

14.   Thus in (18) the discourse topic is maintained over the change of the perspective introduced by the quotation; as this maintenance cannot be taken for granted, it is explicitly signalled through the RD.

the RD (marked with "#"). This means that even in (19b) the referent of the RD-NP remains the only discourse topic that is hypothetically possible:

(19)   a.   *Sie$_i$ war   ein   Original,   die   Madame   Dutitre$_i$.*
            she$_i$ was   an   original   the   Madame   Dutitre$_i$
            Sie verstand nie, warum man über ihre Aussprüche lachte.
            'She$_i$ never understood why everybody laughed at her$_i$ remarks.'
       b.   *Ja,   sie$_i$ war   ein   Original,   die   Madame   Dutitre$_i$.*
            yes   she$_i$ was   an   original   the   Madame   Dutitre$_i$
            'Yes, she was unique, that Madame Dutitre.' (*context*: e.g., as the last sentence of the chapter about Madame Dutitre.)
       c.   *Monsieur und Madame Dutitre waren damals ziemlich berühmt, er für seine Pferde, sie für ihre Sprüche. Sie war ein Original, die Madame Dutitre. #Er hatte die besten Pferde Berlins in seinen Ställen.*
            'Monsieur$_1$ and Madame$_2$ Dutitre were rather famous at that time, she$_2$ in particular for her$_2$ bon-mots, and he$_1$ for his$_1$ race horses. She$_2$ was unique, that Madame D.$_2$. #He$_1$ had the best race horses of Berlin in his stables.'

As for AT, it is a repair strategy used to resolve a potentially unclear reference in the host sentence, as in (20):

(20)   *(Sie [Die Mutter] hat den Wohnzimmerschrank aber auch nicht leiden können,[...], aber mein Vater hat sich auf keine billigen Sachen mehr eingelassen,)*
       'Mother hated the wardrobeMASK, [...], but my father didn't want to have any more cheap things around.'
       er   ist   ihr   auch   zu   dunkel   gewesen,   der   Wohnzimmerschrank [...]
       he$_i$ is   for.her   also   too   dark   been   the   wardrobe$_i$
       (Birgit Vanderbeke, *Das Muschelessen*)

Contrary to RD, AT is a local strategy, as it is used to repair its host sentence and does not have any impact on the global discourse structure. In this sense it is backward-looking, as it refers back to its host sentence and does not influence the following discourse segment. In the next section, I will introduce my proposal for the integration of syntactically independent AT into its host sentence.

2.3   Syntax-discourse asymmetry with AT

Being detached syntactically, an orphan gets attached to its host sentence at the level of the discourse (cf. Haegeman 1991). This attachment occurs for orphans in a regular way used for discourse units (cf. Shaer 2003). I assume with Asher & Lascarides (2003) that discourse units get attached to each other via discourse relations. In Averintseva-Klisch (forthc.), I have argued that a special discourse relation *Afterthought* has to be formulated for the attachment of ATs. What is relevant for the present issue is that

Afterthought is argued to be a subordinating discourse relation in terms of Asher & Vieu (2005). Asher and Vieu put forward four tests to distinguish between subordinating and coordinating discourse relations, cf. (21):

(21) Given are two constituents, α and β, a relation R (α, β), and a possible extension with a constituent γ; the nature of R is to be tested:

1. *Attachment Test*: If it is possible to attach γ to α, then R is subordinating; if attachment is possible only to β, then R is coordinating.
2. *Continuation Test*: if γ continues β in its relation to α, then R is subordinating; if it is impossible, then R is coordinating.
3. *Anaphora Test*: if for any γ attached to β no pronominal element in γ can be bound by referents in α, then R is coordinating; if some can, then R is subordinating.
4. *'Prototype' Test*: if R can co-occur with *Narration* (as prototypical coordinating relation), then R is coordinating; if R can co-occur with *Elaboration* (prototypical subordinating relation), then R is subordinating.
(Summed up from Asher & Vieu 2005)

Test 4 is not applicable to *Afterthought*, as the semantics of *Afterthought* is not compatible with *Elaboration*. In short: firstly, *Afterthought* differs crucially from *Elaboration* in its impact on the truth conditions of the whole sentence: AT first makes the establishing of the truth conditions for an utterance possible; due to the lack of referential clarity, it is not possible before the adding of the AT takes place. Secondly, *Elaboration* and *Afterthought* are different kinds of discourse relations. Asher & Lascarides (2003) distinguish between 'content-level' discourse relations and 'cognitive-level' discourse relations. For the former, it is only the content of the utterances building up a discourse that matters; this is the case with *Elaboration*. For the latter not only the content of the utterances, but also the intentions of the speaker and the addressee are important for defining their semantics. This seems for me to be the case with *Afterthought* (see also Averintseva-Klisch (forthc.)). Because of these differences between *Elaboration* and *Afterthought* Test 4 cannot be applied to *Afterthought*. The applicable tests all yield the same results: *Afterthought* is subordinating, cf. (22)-(24):

(22) Attachment Test:
   a. *Dann ist sie weggelaufen,*   (α) α
   b. *(ich meine) die Serena.*   (β) ↓ Explanation
   c. *Das macht sie immer wenn sie wütend ist.* (γ) γ
       'Then she ran away (α), (I mean) Serena (β). That's what she always does when she is angry (γ).'

According to the Attachment-Test, the relation R (α, β) is bound to be subordinating, because γ gets attached to α (and not to β) via discourse relation *Explanation*: the last constituent explains the first one.

(23) Continuation Test
   a. *Dann ist sie weggelaufen,*   (α) α
                                          ↓
   b. *(ich meine) die Serena.*   (β) β Afterthought
                                          ↓
   c. *Also die Kleine mit blonden Zöpfchen.* (γ) γ
       'Then she ran away (α), (I mean) Serena (β). That is the little one with blonde pigtails (γ).'

Here, it is possible to proceed with a constituent that continues β in its *Afterthought* relation to α; thus, R again fulfils the conditions for subordination.

(24) Anaphora Test
   a. *Dann ist sie weggelaufen* (α) attachment site
   b. *(ich meine) die Serena.* (β)
   c. <u>*Das*</u> *war nicht besonders schlau.*   (γ)... das ...
   c'. <u>*Das*</u> *macht sie immer wenn sie wütend ist.* (γ)... das ...

   'Then she ran away $(\alpha)_1$, (I mean) Serena (β). That$_1$ was not very clever (γ). / That$_1$'s what she always does when she is angry (γ).'

It is possible to resume the event token (24c) as well as the event type (cf. Asher 1993) of the constituent α (24c') with the pronoun *das* ('that') in γ. To sum up: the tests 1–3 all show that *Afterthought* is a subordinating discourse relation.

According to the analysis presented here, corrections like (25) are a subtype of afterthoughts:

(25) A: *John failed his exams. B: No, he didn't, he got 60%. A: I meant John SMITH.*
(Asher & Lascarides 2003:305)

Asher and Lascarides (2003) do not consider in detail cases like (25), but they seem tacitly to handle them in a similar way as the instances of the discourse relation *Correction*, cf. (26):

(26) A: *John distributed the copies. B: No, it was Sue who distributed the copies.*
(Asher & Lascarides 2003: 470)

However, for *Correction* the constituents involved are per definition required to be inconsistent with each other (Asher & Lascarides 2003: 469). This is not the case in (25), where the constituent *With "John" I mean John Smith* is in no way inconsistent with the constituent *John failed his exams*. Besides, with respect to their function corrections like (25) are exactly like 'alien-initiated repairs' (Uhmann 1993), where the hearer explicitly signals his inability to resolve the pro-form, like in (27) (cf. also example (15b)):

(27)   A: *I don't like her at all. B: Whom? A: Anna I mean.*

That is why I propose to subsume corrections like (25) under afterthoughts. Reflecting the character of AT as described above, the discourse relation *Afterthought* can be informally stated as in (28):

(28)   *Afterthought* is a subordinating discourse relation, which holds whenever the speaker of the host sentence and the AT supplies the AT with the intention of clearing the reference of a discourse referent x that has been introduced in the host sentence by establishing a relation x=z, where z is a discourse referent introduced in the AT, and the reference of z in the discourse representation is assumed to be unambiguous.

A point that I would like to make here is the following: syntax and discourse attachment do not mirror each other in the case of AT: syntactically, AT is an orphan, i.e., not attached at all. At the level of the discourse structure, however, it gets attached via a subordinating discourse relation. This supports the widely assumed hypothesis that generally the symmetry of syntactic relations and discourse relations between two discourse units is not necessarily required (see e.g., Blühdorn in this volume and Holler in this volume), although in some cases syntactic and discourse relations might go hand in hand.

As for RD, I assume that it does not constitute a separate discourse unit, but is a part of the unit containing the host sentence. In Averintseva-Klisch (2006) I show how exactly RD contributes to the semantics of its host sentence.

Summing up this section one might say that the right clausal edge in German holds two options: it is either used for syntactically integrated RD, or for syntactically non-integrated AT repairing some intraclausal reference.[15] The former is a global discourse-structuring device, in particular concerning the immediately following discourse segment. The latter, on the contrary, is a local (i.e., related to the host sentence) repair strategy. In the next section I will argue that these are cross-linguistically two options the right clausal edge might have.

3.   Right periphery in the discourse: an outlook

The issue of interest now is whether the usage of the right clausal edge for backward-looking local repairs and for forward-looking discourse topic marking is a peculiarity of German or whether these two options (local repair and global discourse structuring) are used cross-linguistically. The following is to be understood as an outlook for further research. My hypothesis is that local repair and discourse topic marking are cross-linguistically available due to the general properties of the right clausal edge. This position is on the one hand the last possibility to add locally to the clause or to comment on some information within it. On the other hand, by virtue of its placement it relates the clause to the following discourse. As the first step to test this hypothesis I will in this paper very briefly compare German to French and Russian with respect to the use of RD and AT. I will begin with AT.

3.1   Afterthought in Russian and French

AT is expected to be cross-linguistically generally available (primarily as an option of the spoken language). Not being syntactically attached at all, ATs do not depend on the syntactic characteristics of a language, and in fact nothing should prevent the possibility of adding repairs after the actual end of the clause. As expected, ATs are possible in Russian, cf. (29), as well as in French, cf. (30):

(29)   *Ego žena revnujet ego k Tereze Lido.*
       'His wife is jealous of Teresa Lido.'
       Ona   puskajetsja za nim   v   pogonju, | *ego žeNA.*
       She_i starts   for him in pursuit   his $wife_i$
       'She_i pursues him, his $wife_i$.'   (Attested oral data)

Here, the speaker retells the contents of a movie, and the sentence preceding the clause with the pronominal reference *ona* ('she') introduces two female referents, "his wife" and "Teresa Lido". The speaker uses a personal pronoun to refer to the wife, but then believes it might be unclear to the hearer whom she actually means, and she adds an explicit reference resolution device. Similarly in (30), where the reference of the pronoun *il* ('he') is unclear in the context, it is resolved explicitly with an afterthought NP:

(30)   (*context*: Jean and Jacques are eating.)
       Il   a   déjà   mangé la soupe, | *JEAN.*
       he   has already eaten the soup   Jean

As in German, the AT-NPs in Russian are those constructions involving NPs to the right of the clause that have been investigated most often.[16] Now, I will turn to the less clear and more interesting issue of RD proper in Russian and French.

3.2   Right dislocation in Russian and French

RDs in Russian have to my knowledge barely been considered in the literature. The only analysis I am aware of distinguishing between a repair and another kind of

---

15.   Strictly speaking, RD and AT hold two different positions: while I assume that RD being part of the sentence is located at its right periphery, AT comes after the sentence boundary; being syntactically fully independent, it cannot be analysed as a right-peripheral construction. Zifonun, Hoffmann & Stecker (1997) introduced the term *rechtes Außenfeld* ('right outer field') for non-integrated phrases as the right edge of the clause (as compared to *Nachfeld* ('afterfield') for syntactically integrated ones).

---

16.   Lapteva (1976) assumes that adding a NP having a coreferent pro-form inside the clause after a syntactically complete clause has a function of "explanation". Cf. also Zemskaja (1973) and Švedova et al. (1982) who are talking about the function of "specification of the pronoun" for the added NP.

right-peripheral NP is given in Lapteva (1976). She assumes that besides AT there is another kind of added NPs with a coreferent pro-form, which seems "not to have any function at all" (Lapteva 1976: 267). In (31), however, one could hardly assume that the right-peripheral NP does not have any function; it is clearly used to enhance the intended meaning of the passage in that the wall is marked as the discourse topic:

(31) *Meier Wolf vsju žizn' kopil den'gi, čtoby uvidet' Stenu Plača.*
      'MW saved money his whole life long to see the Wailing Wall'
      On videl ejë teper', ėty stenu.
      he saw her$_i$ now this wall.FEM$_i$
      Ona naxoditsja za linijej železnoj dorogi [...]. Ėto prostaja požarnaja stena [...]
      'Now he has seen it$_i$, this wall$_i$. It$_i$ is situated behind the railways [...]. It$_i$ is a simple fire protection wall [...]'

                    (Aleksandr Galič, *Matrosskaja Tišina*)

Characteristically, the reference of the pronoun in RD is often quite clear in the context, as in (31) and (32). That is why I argue that both are cases of RD proper.

(32) A: *A Petrova ušla čto-li?*
      A: and Petrova$_i$ is.gone INTERR.PRON
      B: *Net, ona po-mojemu ne byla Petrova*
      B: no she$_i$ I.believe not was Petrova$_i$
      'A: Is Petrova already gone? B: No, I believe she has not been here at all, Petrova.'
                                    (Lapteva 1976: 267)

In (32) the referent of Petrova is clearly the discourse topic, so that (31) and (32) are similar and in both the right-peripheral NP is an RD in the sense of a right-peripheral discourse topic marking construction.[17]

    RD is also attested for French (Lambrecht 1981, 1987), e.g., (33):[18]

(33) a. *Il a mangé la soupe, Jean.*
          he$_i$ has eaten the soup Jean$_i$
      b. *Il est beau, ce tableau!*
          he$_i$ is beautiful, this picture.MASK$_i$ (Lambrecht 1981: 80)

Formally, RD is prosodically and syntactically integrated in Russian as well as in French, (see Lapteva (1976) resp. Lambrecht (1981)). For example, morphological agreement is required for Russian RD (Zemskaja 1973), cf. (34) as well as for French RD (35):

---

17. In (32) the discourse topic is similarly to (18) marked as maintained over the change of a perspective (here the change of the speaker).

18. The French data presented in section 3 are taken from Lambrecht (1981), (1987) and Ashby (1988); the glosses are mine.

(34) *Mne eje podarili nedavno, ėtu knigu /*
      To-me her.ACC presented.3.PS.PLUR recently this.ACC book.ACC /
      *ėta kniga.
      *this.NOM book.NOM
      'I recently got it as a present, this book.'   (Zemskaja 1973: 166)

(35) *Il-faut y aller quand il-fait chaud à la plage / *la*
      one.should there$_i$ go when it.is warm to the beach$_i$ / *the
      plage.
      beach.nom$_i$ (Lambrecht 1981: 78)

In (34), the default nominative case is not available for the RD-NP if the intraclausal pro-form is in the accusative. In (35) RD-phrase has to preserve the morphological marking which an argument phrase would have in its canonical position (Lambrecht 1981: 79).[19] This suggests that RD in Russian and French is syntactically integrated in the same way as RD in German.

    As for the function of RD, I argue for Russian as well as for French that in these languages RD serves in a way similar to German RD to mark the discourse topic. Observations made in the previous research on French RD are compatible with my analysis of RD as a discourse topic marking device. Lambrecht argues that RD is used to refer to the "previously established topic" (Lambrecht 1987: 237). Ashby (1988) claims that at least sometimes the referent of the RD "continue[s] to be talked about in succeeding sentences" (Ashby 1988: 216),[20] which would correspond to its being the discourse topic for the following segment, cf. (36):

(36) *Et puis ils étaient méchants, les Allemands. A la fin, quand*
      and then they$_i$ were angry the Germans$_i$ at the end when
      ils ont vu que la situation était perdue [...]
      they$_i$ have seen that the situation was lost [...]
                                    (Ashby 1988: 214)

Here the speaker tells about the end of World War II in France and introduces the new discourse topic, the Germans, with the help of the RD. Generally, Ashby (1988) differentiates between 6 pragmatic functions of French RD: turn closing, filler,

---

19. In (35) the dislocated constituent is a PP and not an NP. However, Averintseva-Klisch & Salfner (2007) argue that PPs like in (35) that are prepositional objects behave in a RD exactly like NPs as far as their function is concerned. Here it is only due to the subcategorization frame of the verb *aller* that requires a PP, that a PP instead of an NP is dislocated.

20. It is slightly surprising, that Ashby does not explicitly state referring to the discourse topic as a function of RD, although he observes that 93% of RDs in his corpus refer to discourse topics (Ashby 1988: 216, Table 4).

clarification, topic shift, contrast and epithet. However, these, with possible exception of clarification, appear to me to be secondary functions accompanying the discourse topic marking. Thus, turn closing, which Ashby claims to be the most important function of RD, seems to me to be a special case of the discourse topic marking: the discourse topic gets "passed on" to the next speaker, so to speak: the first speaker wants to get sure that his communication partner continues to talk about the same entity as he did. So, in (37) "his son" is the discourse topic for both speakers:

(37) A: Il   est en dernière année, son   fils.
      A: he   is   in   last   year   his   son.
      B: Ah mais, oui, c'est en dernière année.
      B: Ah but   yes   it.is in   last   year.

(Ashby 1988: 222)

As for the cases analysed as clarification in Ashby, these cases I expect to be ATs. This is however, an issue I cannot decide upon, as Ashby introduces only one example of clarification, and it does not have enough context for me to be able to decide on this issue.

In other words, an informal cross-linguistic comparison supports the claim that RD marks the discourse topic. An important additional evidence for this claim coming from French are the pronominal RDs like in (38a), cf. Ashby (1988); these also occur in Norwegian (Fretheim 1995, 2001), cf. (38b):[21]

(38) a. Madame X, elle est née   ici, elle.
          Mrs. X_i she_i is born here she_i

(Ashby 1988: 204)

      b. Scott   heter   Glenn til etternavn, han.
          $Scott_i$ is.named   Glenn as   surname he_i

(Fretheim 2001: 62)

Pronominal RDs seem to me to be the clearest case of a discourse topic marking function of the RD. Firstly, adding a pronominal reference definitely cannot be a reference clarification. Secondly, personal pronouns are traditionally assumed to be the preferred means for referring to discourse topics (e.g., Zifonun, Hoffmann & Stecker (1997), Bosch et al. (2003), Consten & Schwarz-Friesel (forthc.)), so it is to expect that also right dislocated personal pronouns refer to discourse topics.

This cross-linguistic affinity of the discourse topics to the right periphery might seem unexpected, as especially in the conversation analysis the right clausal edge is usually seen as the position used for turn taking or for delaying of turn taking (cf. e.g., Auer (1991)). In accordance with this analysis information coming at the right periphery is not important, so that its potential loss through a turn-taking is not problematic. However,

---

21. Note that my analysis with respect to the function of RD differs from the actual proposals in Ashby (1988) and Fretheim (2001).

it seems to me that the repetition of information that is already given and is thus seemingly "unnecessary" must be something more than just a strategy to retain turn-taking. Rather with this repetition the importance of the corresponding referent for the discourse is made clear, i.e., the referent is explicitly set as the current discourse topic.

3.3 Discussion: RD vs. AT cross-linguistically

A comparison of German, Russian and French with respect to their use of RD and AT shows that these languages have AT and RD as the options of the use of the right clausal edge. These two uses of the right clausal edge are due to its twofold character. On the one hand, for reasons of linearity the right periphery constitutes a point of intersection with the following discourse. As such it is predestined to host NPs referring to the discourse topics that pertain in the following discourse segment. On the other hand, the position immediately after a clause is the last possibility to add something locally to this clause; that is why afterthought NPs are possible. Moreover, in all three languages observed RD is syntactically integrated. A similar observation was made in Lambrecht (2001: 1068), who stated that RD is cross-linguistically "more tightly connected with the predicate-argument structure of the clause" than left-dislocated elements. In the languages under discussion AT is syntactically non-integrated. That is to be expected, as a speaker adds AT as a repair device when he has already completed the clause and only after that notices that the clause might be unclear. The question that remains is: Why is RD cross-linguistically prosodically and syntactically integrated? Why a forward-looking discourse topic marking prefers a realization through a syntactically integrated NP at the right periphery is a challenging question for further research. It would be especially interesting to compare in a systematic way RD in languages featuring clitic RD (like e.g., Catalan or Greek) with RD in languages having only full pronouns like German. It seems that clitic RD differs from non-clitic RD in that multiple dislocation is non-restrictedly allowed (Vallduví 1992: 85 for Catalan). As for *Left dislocation*, Grohmann (2003) proposes different syntactic analyses for non-clitic and clitic left dislocation. For Romance languages it is often assumed that RD is either derived from left dislocation (e.g., Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007) for Italian) or that both constructions are symmetrical (Beninca & Poletto (2003) for Italian and Vallduví (1992) for Catalan), which would imply also different analyses for clitic and non-clitic RD. If the syntax of the clitic and non-clitic RD also differs, then one would expect functional differences, too. Still, it seems that also clitic RD is a topic-marking construction, cf. Villalba (2000: 20), Lambrecht (2001: 1072), so that the generalization made above, viz. that the right periphery is a position designated for hosting expressions referring to discourse topics, still holds.

4. Summing up and conclusions

In my paper, I first introduced two prima facie similar, but formally and functionally different constructions of German, right dislocation and afterthought. I argued that

whilst AT is a local reference repair strategy, RD is an important discourse-structuring device used to mark the discourse topic for the segment following RD. At the level of syntax, RD is part of its host sentence, presumably a right IP-adjunct. AT, on the contrary, is syntactically independent from its host sentence, and gets integrated into it only at the level of the discourse via a special discourse relation. Thus, AT might be seen as an illustration of the general asymmetry of syntactic and discourse relations: AT is added via a subordinating discourse relation, although there is no subordination on the level of syntax, AT being syntactically not attached at all.

I assume that local repair and global discourse-structuring devices are cross-linguistically two options of the use of the right clausal edge, and put forward the question whether AT is always syntactically detached, whereas RD is always syntactically integrated. To follow up this point, I compared German to Russian and French with respect to the use and characteristics of RD and AT.

I found that all three languages feature AT as an 'orphan' and RD as a syntactically integrated construction used to mark the discourse topic for the following segment. The former is due to the character of AT as a local repair.

As for RD, this discourse-topic marking device at the right clausal periphery seems to be available cross-linguistically in a similar way. Discourse topic, contrary to sentence topic, is not a sentence-bound notion and thus also not a syntactic, but a pragmatic category. Accordingly, there cannot be a prototypical position for discourse topic inside the clause. However, it seems that right periphery, being a syntactically unnecessary and thus entirely pragmatically ruled position, is cross-linguistically preferred for the placement of NPs referring to discourse topics. This leads to the hypothesis that there is a cross-linguistic interdependence of the discourse function and the syntax. I assume that RD is cross-linguistically part of its host sentence, situated at the right periphery. Respectively, AT and other kinds of repair constructions are cross-linguistically 'orphans', i.e., syntactically independent units generated after a sentence is completed. Testing of this assumption for more languages with different syntactic character would be a challenging task for further research.

References

Abraham, Werner. 2007. Topic, focus and default vs. contrastive accent. In *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form: Generalizations across Languages*, Kerstin Schwabe & Susanne Winkler (eds), 183–203. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Altmann, Hans. 1981. *Formen der "Herausstellung" im Deutschen: Rechtsversetzung, Linksversetzung, Freies Thema und verwandte Konstruktionen* [Linguistische Arbeiten 106]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Ashby, William J. 1988. The syntax, pragmatics and sociolinguistics of left- and right-dislocations in French. *Lingua* 75: 203–229.

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

Asher, Nicholas. 2004a. Discourse topic. *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 163–201.

Asher, Nicholas. 2004b. Troubles with topics: Comments on Kehler, Oberlander, Stede and Zeevat. *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 255–262.

Asher, Nicholas & Lascarides, Alex. 2003. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge: CUP.

Asher, Nicholas & Vieu, Laure. 2005. Subordinating and coordinating discourse relations. *Lingua* 115: 591–610.

Auer, Peter. 1991. Vom Ende deutscher Sätze. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 19: 139-157.

Averintseva-Klisch, Maria. 2006. 'Separate performative' account of German right dislocation. In *Proceedings of the Sinn und Bedeutung 10* [ZAS Papers in Linguistics 44]. Christian Ebert & Cornelia Endriss (eds), 15–28. URL: http://www.zas.gwz-berlin.de/papers/zaspil/articles/zp44/Averintseva.pdf.

Averintseva-Klisch, Maria. Forthcoming. German right dislocation and afterthought in discourse. In *Constraints in Discourse*, Anton Benz & Peter Kühnlein (eds). 213–235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Averintseva-Klisch, Maria & Salfner, Fabienne. 2007. German PP-dislocations to the left and to the right: against a symmetric approach. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, Estela Puig-Waldmüller (ed.), 46–62. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra. URL: http://mutis.upf.es/glif/pub/sub11.

Beninca, Paola & Poletto, Cecilia. 2003. Topic, focus and V2: Defining the CP sublayers. In *The Structure of CP and IP*, Luigi Rizzi (ed), 52–75. Oxford: OUP.

Bosch, Peter, et al. 2003. Demonstrative pronouns and personal pronouns. German *der* vs. *er*, *Proceedings of the EACL2003, Workshop on The Computational Treatment of Anaphora*. Budapest.

Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(5): 511–545.

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

Consten, Manfred & Schwarz-Friesel, Monika. 2007. Anapher. In *Wortarten des Deutschen*, Ludger Hoffmann (ed.). 265–292. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Culicover, Peter & Jackendoff, Ray. 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: OUP.

Frascarelli, Mara & Hinterhölzl, Roland. 2007. Types of topic in German and Italian. In *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form: Generalizations across Languages*, Kerstin Schwabe & Susanne Winkler (eds), 87–116. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fretheim, Thorstein. 1995. Why Norwegian right-dislocated phrases are not afterthoughts. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 18: 31–54.

Fretheim, Thorstein. 2001. The interaction of right-dislocated pronominals and intonational phrasing in Norwegian. In *Nordic Prosody*, Wim A. van Dommelen & Thorstein Fretheim (eds), 61–75. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Frey, Werner. 2004. Notes on the syntax and pragmatics of the German left dislocation. In *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, Horst Lohnstein & Susanne Trissler (eds), 203–233. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2003. *Prolific Domains. On the Anti-Locality of Movement Dependencies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haegeman, Liliane. 1991. Parenthetical adverbials: The radical orphanage approach. In *Aspects of modern English linguistics: Papers presented to Masatomo Ukaji on his 60th birthday*, S. Chiba et al. (eds), 232–254. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.

Kehler, Andrew. 2004. Discourse topics, sentence topics, and coherence. *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 227–240.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1981. *Topic, Antitopic and Verb Agreement in Non-Standard French* [Pragmatics and Beyond II-6]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1987. On the status of SVO sentences in French discourse. In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, Russel S. Tomlin (ed.), 217–262. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Lapteva, Ol'ga A. 1976. *Russkij razgovornyj sintaksis*. Moskva: Nauka.

Oberlander, Jon. 2004. On the reduction of discourse topic. *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 213–225.

Ross, John R. 1986. *Infinite Syntax!* Norwood: Ablex. [= Ross, John R. 1967. Constraints on Variables in Syntax. PhD dissertation, MIT].

Schindler, Wolfgang. 1995. Zur Topologie von Herausstellungen und Zusätzen am rechten Satzrand. *Sprache & Sprachen* 16: 44–56.

Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1978. On prosodic structure and its relation to syntactic structure. In *Nordic prosody II*, Thorstein Fretheim (ed.), 111–140. Trondheim 1981: TAPIR.

Selting, Margret. 1994. Konstruktionen am Satzrand als interaktive Ressource in natürlichen Gesprächen. In *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation?*, Brigitta Haftka (ed.), 299-318. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Shaer, Benjamin. 2003. An 'orphan' analysis of long and short adjunct movement in English. In *WCCFL 22 Proceedings*, G. Garding, G. & M. Tsujimira (eds), 450–463. Sommerville MA: Cascadilla Press.

Shaer, Benjamin & Frey, Werner. 2004. 'Integrated' and 'non-integrated' left-peripheral elements in German and English. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 35(2): 465–502.

Smith, Michael. 2002. The polysemy of German *es*, iconicity, and the notion of conceptual distance. *Cognitive Linguistics* 13(1): 67–112.

Stede, Manfred. 2004. Does discourse processing need discourse topics? *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 241–253.

Švedova, Natalija et al. (eds). 1982. *Russkaja Grammatika*. Moskva: Nauka.

Uhmann, Susanne. 1993. Das Mittelfeld im Gespräch. In *Wortstellung und Informationsstruktur*, Marga Reis (ed.), 313–354. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Uhmann, Susanne. 1997. *Grammatische Regeln und konversationelle Strategien. Fallstudien aus Syntax und Phonologie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Vallduvi, Enric. 1992. *The Informational Component*. New York NY: Garland.

Villalba, Xavier. 1999. Symmetry and antisymmetry in syntax. *Syntaxis* 2: 1–25.

Ward, Gregory & Birner, Betty J. 1996. On the discourse function of rightward movement in English. In *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*, Adele Goldberg (ed.), 463–479. Stanford CA: CSLI.

Zeevat, Henk. 2004. Asher on discourse topic. *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 203–211.

Zemskaja, Elena A. (ed.). 1973. *Russkaja razgovornaja reč*. Moskva: Nauka.

Zifonun, Gisela, Hoffmann, Ludger & Stecker, Bruno. (eds). 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Vol. 1 & 2. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Ziv, Yael. 1994. Left and right dislocations. Discourse functions and anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics* 22: 1–17.

Zybatow, Gerhild & Junghanns, Uwe. 1998. *Topiks im Russischen* [Sprache und Pragmatik 47]. Lund: University of Lund.