

Ole Martin Stangen Lillevik

“He’s a great guy, him”

A Comparative Analysis of Pronominal Right-Dislocation in the Helgeland dialect of Norwegian and Scottish English

Master's thesis in Language Studies with Teacher Education
Supervisor: Andrew Weir

May 2024

Ole Martin Stangen Lillevik

“He’s a great guy, him”

A Comparative Analysis of Pronominal Right-Dislocation in the Helgeland dialect of Norwegian and Scottish English

Master’s thesis in Language Studies with Teacher Education
Supervisor: Andrew Weir
May 2024

Norwegian University of Science and Technology
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Language and Literature



Abstract

This paper looks at pronominal right-dislocation (PRD) in Scottish English and Norwegian. The pragmatics of PRD is used as a discourse marker, aiding the flow of discourse by functioning as a topicalizing element and making an utterance more expressive. These functions are largely, if not completely, shared by speakers of Scottish English and Norwegian. The syntax of PRD has not previously been the object of particular study. This paper compares PRD to fragments and analyzes their derivation along similar lines as Jason Merchant does fragments. Pronominal right-dislocation is assumed to be subject to ellipsis, but not to movement. The pronoun is the remnant of an elided clause, which has been elided below TP/IP, while the pronoun resided in the left periphery, being base generated in the specifier of TopicP.

Sammendrag

Formålet med denne masteroppgaven er å undersøke pronominal høyredislokasjon (PRD) i skotsk engelsk og helgelandsdialekten. Pragmatisk blir PRD brukt som en diskursmarkør som bidrar til flyt i samtale ved å virke som en form for tematiserende partikkel. PRD kan også gjøre en ytring mer uttrykksfull. Tidligere forskning på de pragmatiske funksjonene til PRD i engelsk og i norsk indikerer et stort samsvar mellom de to språkene. Til forskjell har det blitt gjort lite forskning på syntaksen til PRD konstruksjonen. Denne oppgaven sammenligner høyredislokerte pronomen med det Jason Merchant kaller fragmenter. Denne oppgaven analyserer høyredislokerte pronomen som at de gjennomgår ellipse, men ikke syntaktisk bevegelse. Pronomenet er derfor en etterlevning av en slettet leddsetning som har blitt slettet fra og med TP/IP, mens det gjenblivende pronomenet residerer i TopicP.

Acknowledgements

I want to offer my profound thanks to my advisor, Andrew Weir. From the beginning of this journey until its end, he has provided valuable feedback, and helped me write the best thesis I could. This thesis would not have been possible without him.

Many thanks to friends and strangers who have stood by me throughout my incessant questioning about acceptability judgements, or if I still am even speaking correct Norwegian at all. Your feedback has been a crucial support for this thesis.

I want to thank Sarah, for teaching me how to properly use Word, as well as how to use a Mac. I also want to thank Sarah, Rebekka, and the rest of Gang Gang for their continued check-ups, workshops and emotional support throughout this entire process.

Finally, I want to extend my deepest thanks to my family and my partner, Rosemari. You have been invaluable, and nothing but supportive and caring. Thank you for always being there for me.

Table of Contents

Tables.....	x
List of Abbreviations.....	x
1. Introduction	1
2. Theory.....	2
2.1 <i>Right- and Left-Dislocation.....</i>	<i>2</i>
2.2 <i>ProTags.....</i>	<i>8</i>
2.3 <i>Ellipsis and Fragments.....</i>	<i>12</i>
2.4 <i>Right-Dislocation in Norwegian.....</i>	<i>17</i>
2.5 <i>Grice's maxims and inferences.....</i>	<i>23</i>
2.6 <i>The left periphery.....</i>	<i>25</i>
3. Methodology.....	27
4. Analysis.....	27
4.1 <i>Pragmatics of Pronominal Right-Dislocation in English and Norwegian.....</i>	<i>27</i>
4.2 <i>Right-Dislocated Pronouns and Ellipsis.....</i>	<i>35</i>
4.3 <i>Moved or Base Generated Pronouns in Pronominal Right-Dislocation.....</i>	<i>37</i>
4.4 <i>Right-Dislocated Pronouns in the Left Periphery</i>	<i>41</i>
5. Conclusion.....	43
Bibliography	44
Appendix.....	47
<i>The Thesis' Relevance for Teaching Practice.....</i>	<i>47</i>

Tables

Table 1: Table of Norwegian pronouns.....	30
---	----

List of Abbreviations

NP	Noun Phrase
VP	Verb Phrase
CP	Complementizer Phrase
TP	Tense Phrase
IP	Inflectional Phrase
PRD	Pronominal Right-Dislocation
t	Trace
HT	Hanging Topics

“He’s a great guy, him”’: A Comparative Analysis of Pronominal Right-Dislocation in the Helgeland dialect of Norwegian and Scottish English

1. Introduction

Pronominal Right-Dislocation is a linguistic phenomenon in which a pronoun appears on the end of a sentence, while not fulfilling any apparent role. Pronominal right-dislocation, or PRD, is found in a majority of Norwegian dialects. This includes the dialect of the author, Helgelandsdialekt, which the discussion will center around. However, it is also relevant that it appears in other dialects, as different dialects sometimes show different forms for the same word. PRD is also found in certain Scottish dialects, as well as in dialects in the North of England. Pronominal right-dislocation in Norwegian is showcased in 1) and 2)

- 1) Kari er ei flott jente, hun
- 2) Kari is a great girl, her

This phenomenon has not been widely studied, although there in recent years has been research done on it (for research on PRD in English, Mycock 2019, in Norwegian, Borthen 2018, 2021). When confronted with such a phenomenon, quite a few questions do arise, such as what is going on syntactically? Normally, pronouns and/or NPs appear as arguments or compliments of some phrase, but in 1) and 2) this seems to not be the case. They are also not a part of a unit that is an argument or a compliment. They stand on their own, seemingly for no reason at all. Are there any syntactic processes that demand their being there? Is there a semantic/pragmatic reason to provide a pronoun at the end of the sentence? Do both languages showcase the same phenomenon, or are there different processes underlying the constructions?

This thesis looks at the phenomenon of pronominal right-dislocation and analyzes the pragmatics as well as the syntax of the construction in Scottish English and Norwegian. In the second chapter, I will be presenting the necessary theoretical framework for my analysis, starting with previous works on both the pragmatics of pronominal right-dislocation in both English and Norwegian. I will then be presenting ellipsis, and a comparative linguistic element,

fragments, as presented by Jason Merchant in his paper “Fragments and Ellipsis” (2004), before moving on to an overview of the left periphery of clauses. Chapter 3 lays out the methodology of the thesis. Chapter 4 is an analysis and a comparison of the pragmatics and syntax of pronominal right-dislocation, starting with the pragmatics, before moving on to the issue of how a PRD construction is derived syntactically. Towards the end of chapter 4, I will be looking at my findings and fitting them into a conclusion incorporating both the pragmatics and the syntax. Chapter 5 contains my conclusions, as well as an invitation for more research into the topic. Following the bibliography, you can find the appendix where I have written about the relevance of this thesis for my teaching degree.

2. Theory

2.1 Right- and Left-Dislocation

Right-dislocation is not an uncommon phenomenon in either English or Norwegian. Sentences like those in 3), where we have a NP in a sentence final position that refers back to a previous NP (they are coreferential), can be found in both spoken and written language.

- 3) a. He is here, Jim
- b. I don't like them at all, the cops

As we can see, the right-dislocated constituent can refer back to a NP in both subject and object position. English, as well as other certain other languages, also have a left-dislocation phenomenon.

- 4) The movies, we will go to.
- 5) My uncle Karl, he used to beat me every other week.

I will be providing a short account of how right-dislocation differs slightly from left-dislocation, found in Ziv (1994), as this distinction will be useful to keep in mind. Ziv argues that right - dislocation differs from left-dislocation with regards to some core characteristics. Ziv argues that left-dislocation is non-sentential, while right-dislocation is sentential. By sentential and non-sentential, Ziv is referring to what governs the phenomena. Left-dislocation does not, according to Ziv, display the bound variable anaphora (Ziv, 1994, p. 631). The bound variable anaphora refers to the idea that an anaphora is bound to its antecedent. Binding conditions on anaphora, which is based on H. Paul Grice's Maxims, a set of pragmatic maxims for communication, means that anaphora must be bound to a governing body, as that is what is communicatively optimal (Levinson, 1991, pp. 111-113). Ziv argues that left-dislocation

constructions do not show such a bound anaphora, and as such there must be something beyond pure grammar that governs the constructions (Ziv, 1994, p. 631). Following this, Ziv argues left-dislocation is not fit for analysis from a purely grammatical, or syntactic/sentential point of view (Ziv, 1994, p. 631). This makes left-dislocations non-sentential. On the other hand, Ziv argues that right-dislocation is sentential, meaning that it can be analyzed grammatically, and does not require a pragmatic analysis. (Ziv, 1994, p. 631). This analysis is based on several arguments, the first one being that there seems to be a lack of connection between a sentence's well-formedness and the left-dislocated item's anaphoricity (Ziv, 1994, p. 631). Ziv uses the examples in 6) and 7) to show how condition C of Chomsky's Government and Binding Theory functions, and how it might provide a problem for Ziv's analysis.

6) John said that John/John's mother is smart

7) John, I don't know anybody who likes John a whole lot

Given condition C, which states that any R-expression must be free, and not A-bound by any element, unlike pronominals and anaphors, the preferred interpretation of 8) is that of non-coreference. John was talking about a different John, and not himself, as that would be weird and redundant. Given Grice's maxim of quantity, and binding theory, for a coreferential reading to be preferred, there are other elements more suited, such as an anaphoric pronoun which refers to the John doing the speaking. (Levinson, 1991, p. 112) If the second John was referring back to the first John, it would violate condition C if the first John c-commands the second John. However, the preferred interpretation for sentence 7) is one of co-referentiality. This does not violate the C condition, if one assumes that left-dislocation structures are non-sentential discourse segments, and do not constitute sentences. Another argument for left-dislocation structures being non-sentential discourse segments is that when introducing a preposed adverbial, or if the sentence shows topicalization, the left-dislocated item is left on the outside in the left periphery, showcased in 8) and 9) (Ziv, 1994, p. 632).

8) a. *Last year, Rosa Berkoff, she lost 20 pounds

9) b. Rosa Berkoff, last year she lost 20 pounds.

10) showcases a topicalized sentence

10) a. *Movies, Rosa Berkoff, she can't stand, but books...

b. Rosa Berkoff, movies, she can't stand, but books...

The fixed position of the left-dislocated NP in combination with the coreferential nature of 10b) is enough to assume that left-dislocations are non-sentential. An analysis based purely on government and binding conditions will experience a crash in sentence 6) if it were to be meant as a co-referential element, and it fails to explain how sentence 7) is acceptable, given that if the left-dislocated element is a sentential element, it violates condition C. Ziv argues that government and binding theory cannot account for the anaphoric options available. A discourse-functional approach would have to be used instead (Ziv, 1994, p. 632).

Right-dislocation, however, does not, according to Ziv, display these same characteristics and must be analyzed as possessing some sentential characteristics. For example, right-dislocated NPs seems to pay heed to the “Right Roof Constraint”, a subjacency constraint on rightwards movement (Ziv, 1994, p. 640). The Right Roof Constraint, first formulated by John Robert Ross in his paper “Constraints on variables in syntax” from 1967, is a constraint on rightwards movement. That means there are elements that cannot be moved out of its place to the right, without making the sentence infelicitous. This is based on the idea of c-commanding. Ross wrote “In all rules whose structural index is of the form A Y, and whose structural change specifies that A is to be adjoined to the right of Y, A must command Y” (Ross, 1967, p. 185). This means that right-dislocation can occur while obeying the Right Roof Constraint as in 11), while something like 12) or 13) is infelicitous.

11) I don't like them, the students

12) *I don't like the students, them

13) *I received [...] last night in which topicalization was discussed, [a report];

Still, Ziv accounts for the anaphoricity of right-dislocations by use of a pragmatic approach. Ziv argues that the main function of right-dislocation is to topicalize something, by pointing out something new, or something that is already available in the greater context of the conversation, such as a picture on the wall, and marking it as a possible future referent. In example 14), speaker A brings a new piece of information about the new smartphone on the market, the Iphone

14) Speaker A: It has a brand new camera lens, the Iphone.

In example 15) Two people are at the Louvre discussing art, when speaker A refers to the Mona Lisa to make a point about muted colors.

15) It has muted colors to show sorrow, the Mona Lisa.

Ziv loans an example from Lambrecht (1981) to exemplify this. Lambrecht states that in some non-standard French variants, sentences like the one in 16) is acceptable when the picture in question is visible to the participants in the discourse, as it is used to evoke something situationally that could easily be evoked without causing troubles in communication.

16) Il est beau, ce tableau!

It is beautiful, the painting

Unless the painting in 16) is visible to the participants, it is clear that this would cause some issues. You might, for example, receive an answer like “Which painting are you talking about?”.

Ziv makes two points regarding the anaphoricity of right-dislocations. The first point is that if the main point of a right-dislocation is to (re-)introduce a potential topic, then it only makes sense for the right-dislocated NP to provide as much information as possible to ease the retrieving of the topic for the addressee, and to be a proper name or a definite description (Ziv, 1994, p. 642). However, some linguistic items that one would think could be right-dislocated, such as pronouns, cannot according to Ziv if they are unstressed (Ziv, 1994, p. 643). An example of this would be a sentence like 17)

17) #Rosa Berkhoff lost 20 pounds, she

This is due to their providing minimal information, and often requiring an antecedent in the very same clause, and it cannot be retrieved situationally in the same way a proper name can (Ziv, 1994, p. 643). If speaker A were to make a reference to a “he” or an “it” without a local antecedent, either in a previous utterance or in the same utterance, it becomes clear that it becomes almost impossible to understand to whom or what the pronoun is supposed to be referring to. However, infelicitous nature of 17) is quickly remedied by do-insertion, as in 18)

18) Rosa Berkhoff lost 20 pounds, she did

It sounds even more natural as a question.

19) Rosa Berkhoff lost 20 pounds, did she?

However, in 20) the do-insertion is necessary for the sentence to even be asked as a question. Leaving out the right-dislocated phrase, gives us 20)

20) Did Rosa Berkhoff lose 20 pounds?

Of course, some other sentence such as “is it true that ...” could also question the statement, the point is that it also changes the stress pattern of the right-dislocated entity, which lends itself to Ziv’s statement regarding the need for a right-dislocated pronoun to be stressed.

The second point Ziv makes is that if the point of right-dislocation is to reintroduce a topic, it would need to be restricted to “relatively distant discourse entities”. The right-dislocated pronoun is stressed to indicate this topicality, to bring attention to the fact that something is being evoked. If one were to right-dislocate an unstressed pronoun, there would be no discourse marker to signal the topic changing. This leads to the addressee looking for immediately accessible entities, such as in the previous utterance, where, according to Ziv, the topic is not to be found (1994, p. 643). The whole right-dislocated construction would then be redundant, and a barrier to processing, while the construction is supposed to ease processing. This why we can have right-dislocated sentences like those in 21) and 22), where the right-dislocated item is a proper name, or a definitive description, while those in 23) where the right-dislocated item is a pronoun are ill-formed.

21) He’s a great guy, Harry

22) I don’t like them, the cops

23) A. The picture is beautiful, it

B. He’s a great guy, him

In 23) A and B, according to the assumptions made in Ziv (1994), the right-dislocated pronouns are unstressed and are “attempting” to refer to some evoked topic, but not succeeding, because they do not carry enough information for a listener or reader to retrieve anything but what is in the preceding clause.

Interestingly, Ziv notes that the thing being evoked or topicalized by a right-dislocated phrase is not the closest, or most readily available topic. This is exemplified by Ziv in 24) and 25). # marks the sentence as infelicitous.

24) Speaker A: Did you see Jack yesterday?

Speaker B: #Yes. He is going to Europe, Jack

25) I asked you to read this book for today.

I know. I tried to very hard, but I was quite busy. Incidentally, it is much too difficult for me, this book.

The right-dislocated phrase “Jack” in 24) is infelicitous, states Ziv, because there is no need for Jack to be topicalized, as he is already the most likely referent. If sentence 24) left out the right-dislocated phrase, there would still be no doubt as to whether “he” referred to “Jack”. Any other referent would cause a crash in communication, leaving speaker A confused. The immediately available candidate will be chosen simply because it makes the most sense, without any structural or hints through discourse. By introducing the right-dislocated phrase “Jack” in 24), Speaker B is causing confusion, because why would “Jack” be specified as the referent for “he”, when that would be the natural interpretation? Ziv states that the immediately accessible entities such as “Jack” are “Naturally, candidates for future topicality” (Ziv, 1994, p. 641). This is just how most conversations tend to go. You usually assume that the information presented is following the flow of the conversation, and that no leap in topic or logic is being asked of you, without this being made either explicitly or through implication.

There are constructions, or linguistic entities, which look a lot like right-dislocated entities, but which are not. These are called Afterthoughts and are shown in 26).

26) I washed it. the car, I mean.

In sentence 26) the speaker realizes that the listener might not be able to understand what it is the speaker has washed, and as such provides the extra necessary information to remedy the situation, as an afterthought. Afterthoughts can also take the form of corrections, as in 27)

27) I danced with Jeff yesterday. Charlie, I mean.

One thing that must be noted about right-dislocations is that they are different from afterthoughts in two core aspects. Intonationally, there is a defining pause before introducing the referential NP associated with afterthoughts that is not found in cases of right-dislocation. In 28), there occurs a pause before the speaker interjects with the correction, that it was Charlie and not Jeff they danced with. This pause is very noticeable in conversation, and afterthoughts are easily marked in speaking. It is harder to decide whether something is a right-dislocated phrase or an afterthought in writing. However, the other key difference lies in their positioning within a clause. Right-dislocations must, by their very nature, be tagged on at the end of a clause, while afterthoughts occur in other positions, as in 30) (Ziv, 1994, p. 639).

28) I met him. Your brother, I mean. Two weeks ago.

After “I met him”, you would hear a pause, before “your brother, I mean” was interjected. Afterthoughts do not have to co-refer to an item in the same clause, while right-dislocations do, lest they be regarded as unacceptable.

2.2 ProTags

Mycock (2017) writes about tagging pronouns on the right end of a sentence, calling such pronouns ProTags. Tag questions such as “It’s raining outside, isn’t it?” have been studied and analyzed a lot in the literature, but Mycock wants to take a look at other form of tags at the end of the sentence. She shows that both personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns can be tagged at the end of sentences, while expletive “it” cannot and is switched out for either “this” or “that”. This is exemplified in sentences 29-32), with sentences 29-30) taken from Mycock (2017, p. 253)

29) I like things a bit offbeat me [...]

30) That was a big store that

31) *It is raining outside it

32) It is a good place that

As we can see from sentence 29), the right-dislocated pronoun appears in the accusative case. This seems to be the case for whenever a pronoun is right-dislocated like the one in 33).

33) He’s a great guy, him

34) She’s a nice girl, her

35) *He’s a great guy, he

Mycock notes that when a pronoun is right-dislocated, it appears in the accusative, or the objective case (Mycock, 2017, p.253). She states that this is the default case for pronouns, the obvious outlier being pronouns appearing in a subject position. A sentence like 35) is erroneous and sounds strange, even to those speakers of English who make frequent use of ProTags.

For her paper, Mycock used corpora as well as examples gathered from people she met, as well as what she gathered from TV and the internet, alongside examples from her own dialect. She has also used corpora with Tyneside English, a dialect where ProTags are relatively frequent. ProTags are always optional, there are no instances in which a right-dislocated pronoun is necessary to uphold the grammaticality of a sentence (Mycock, 2017, p. 253). As such, using

corpora to look at actual use of the construction, at varied use of the construction, is the most natural method for studying this phenomenon.

ProTags have much in common with right-dislocated NPs but do not carry a clarifying/specifying element (Mycock, 2017, p. 255). Right-dislocated NPs have a clarifying function in that they usually identify something already mentioned more specifically. This is exemplified by the right-dislocated NP “the record library” in 36).

36) It’s a good place that, the record library.

In 36), we can see that “the record library” is the place that is good, but now we know which specific place is meant by the speaker/writer. It clarifies the statement, making sure the listener or reader know which place is being mentioned.

ProTags on the other hand, do not seem to serve the same function. They are usually recursive, referring to an already mentioned entity, like right-dislocated NPs, but they do not specify anything about the antecedent. In 33), we already know it is “he” who is a great guy. Adding “him” at the end reinforces the target of the complement, but it is no more clear to a listener or a speaker whom “he” is. The difference is clear if we show 37) and 38) right next to each other.

37) He’s a smart fellow, him

38) He’s a smart fellow, our professor.

It is clear that the right-dislocated NP “Our professor” is specifying who it is that is a smart fellow, while “him” does no such thing.

ProTags can even occur with right-dislocated NPs as in 39):

39) It’s a good place that, isn’ it the record library

Here the ProTag occurs to the left of the right-dislocated NP, so although both elements are right-dislocated, the NP is the furthest to the right. A situation like 40) might be possible, in which the ProTag is further to the right than the NP.

40) It’s a good place that, the record library, isn’t it

While this sentence might be acceptable, the interpretation might change. Posing the ProTag at the end leaves a reader more likely to interpret the utterance as a question.

Mycock also states that ProTags differ from afterthoughts, most notably with regards to their being fully prosodically integrated with the main clause. An afterthought usually follows after

a pause, while ProTags do not. “A ProTag need not, except in cases of contrast, bear stress” (Mycock, 2017, p. 258). Mycock suggests that the fact that ProTags can carry stress, although they often do not have to, is the reason why “it” cannot function as a ProTag, as “this” or “that” is commonly used as substitutes when a 3SG pronoun needs to carry stress. The fact that ProTags need not carry stress, and in many cases do not and are reduced compared to their antecedents seems at odds with Mycock’s suggestion about the lack of “it” as a ProTag. In 41), here shown again for convenience, “it” is not accepted as a ProTag

41) It is raining outside it

In 41), the infelicity of the ProTag might have to do with the fact that its antecedent is semantically empty. “It” does not mean anything, or refer to anything, it is merely there to allow the speaker to make a note on the weather. The ProTag does not carry stress. However, in a case where one would assume an “it” ProTag to carry stress, for example in a more contrastive statement as in 42), where someone is contesting a statement about the leaves on the big tree in the garden, the result sounds strange.

42) It actually has shed its leaves it

Even though the subject “It” refers to the big tree in the garden, which we know from context, the ProTag is strange. Stress or no stress, “it” seems to not function as a ProTag.

ProTags can refer back to a non-overt referent (Mycock, 2017, p. 258)

43) A really unhealthy job **that** as well

Biber et al (1999), which Mycock refers to, do not mention personal pronouns as ProTags, but focus on “that”, which has a much higher frequency rate in the corpus than personal pronouns, or even “this” (Mycock, 2017, p. 258). Mycock points to how this/that have a wider variety of potential anchor points than personal pronouns. Mycock also suggests that “that” might have a higher frequency because it refers to a previous part of the discourse as in 43), while “this” is used to refer to a new or ongoing part of the discourse (Mycock, 2017, p. 258-259).

There is one interesting fact to note about ProTags, and that is related to mood. ProTags can occur in sentences in the declarative mood, the interrogative mood, and exclamative mood, but not imperative mood. Instances like 44) is not analyzed as ProTags.

44) Go home, you

The pronoun in 44) is analyzed as a vocative, and not a ProTag. Mycock contributes this to the fact that it is equivalent in meaning to the alternative “you go home!”, as well as the unacceptability of 45). 45) is taken from Mycock’s paper (2017, p. 260)

45) *Let’s get a drink, us.

Mycock concludes from this that there is no strong evidence for an imperative anchor or antecedent. As most ProTags have a clear referent in the preceding clause or phrase, it might be the case that imperative anchors seem impossible because they lack something for the ProTag to be referring back to. This might hold even in situations like the one in 45), where there is an implied contextual referent, namely the people being addressed.

ProTags can attach to anchors comprising a NP or AdjP. This seems to involve a kind of copula ellipsis as in 46) and 47)

46) NP: [Real thoroughbreds] them

47) AdjP: [not very modern] that

ProTags are concordant with their anchor points in terms of person, number, and gender features but this does not mean they are necessarily identical in form. As is visible in 33) where the anchor point is a pronoun in nominative case, while the ProTag is in the accusative case.

The anchor point (the antecedent) to a ProTag must be an entity that is old or assumed

48) A) Who married Tom?

a. Sue married him, didn’t she?/*her

B) Who did Sue marry?

b) She married Tom didn’t she?/her

This means that there are contextual or conversational limits to when a ProTag can appear.

Finally, the anchor point can bear a grammatical function other than subject

49) We’ve often seen her in the library, her

50) I couldn’t make them out them

51) I’ve done it loadsa times that

As for the functions of ProTags, they are mostly used for statements, but also sometimes for acknowledgment of a statement (Mycock, 2017, p. 270). ProTags can also be used for Barron et al (2015)’s other functions, like stating fact or an opinion, or challenging the addressee, and

even the function of GIVE, where you offer advice or suggestions, but they are less likely to appear, and they are more flimsy (Mycock, 2017, p. 267). ProTags are also used as pragmatic markers, although not prototypical. Mycock writes that they are often used in an intersubjective way. They are used to acknowledge an addressee's attitude or belief, or to be aggressive towards the addressee or the addressed, or maybe even to joke with the addressee, among other functions (Mycock, 2021)

2.3 Ellipsis and Fragments

In this section I aim to describe the phenomenon of ellipsis to the extent that it is relevant for this thesis. It is assumed that the right-dislocated pronoun is the remnant of an elided phrase or sentence that has been moved out of the sentence boundary. It is for this reason I here explain what ellipsis is.

Ellipsis is the deletion, or omission of, a string of words. This is typically done to aid in efficiency. If we look at a sentence like 52), something is thought to have been deleted.

52) Greg ate dinner yesterday, but Alex didn't

We know as speakers of English that what John didn't do is eat dinner yesterday. This indicates that the second clause is somehow "missing" the VP [ate dinner yesterday]. The idea behind ellipsis is that because the identity of the VP in the second clause matches the one in the first, it is redundant, and as such can be deleted (Carnie, 2013, p. 458). Generally, in computational systems we want them to be as efficient as possible while demanding the lowest amount of processing effort possible. As such, it is very useful for humans and the language computational system to be able to drop information that does not need to be produced.

The idea that some material is "left out" or deleted at some point during derivation is an accepted one in a generative framework. There are different types of ellipsis, in which different type of material is elided, and different languages will have access to different forms of ellipsis. The example above is what is called VP-ellipsis, in which a VP in a second clause is deleted because of shared identity with a VP in the preceding clause, as mentioned (Carnie, 2013, p. 458). Some forms of ellipsis will target VPs, but in different environments than VP-ellipsis, such as antecedent-contained deletion. Here a VP that is dominated by a higher VP is deleted, as in 53) (Carnie, 2013, p. 458).

53) Sarah played every game that Ronja did [~~play~~]

Other types of ellipsis only targets parts of phrases or other non-constituents like Gapping and Pseudogapping. In gapping, a modal or an auxiliary can be deleted while leaving the complement of the verb non-elided (Carnie, 2013, p. 459). This can look like 54)

54) I have learned more songs on the guitar than Sebastian [~~has (learned songs on the guitar)~~]

Pseudogapping will typically delete the verb and leave the complement of the verb stranded as in 55) (Carnie, 2013, pp. 458-459).

55) I have read more fantasy books than Marie has [~~read~~] science-fiction books

The last type of ellipsis I will mention is sluicing. It is the form of ellipsis most relevant for this thesis, as will become evident in this chapter, and the analysis. Sluicing sees the deletion of a clause, more specifically a TP after a wh-phrase has moved into the specifier of CP (Carnie, 2013, p. 459). This is exemplified in 56)

56) Javed ate dinner yesterday, but I don't know what_i [Javed ate for dinner t_i]

Ellipsis is used to explain a variety of phenomena in linguistics, but there are limits to the explanatory powers of ellipsis. One thing that the normal ellipsis approach struggles with, are examples like the following, taken from Jason Merchant's paper "Fragments and Ellipsis" (2004)

57) Abby and Ben are at a party. Abby asks Ben about who their mutual friend Beth is bringing as a date by uttering: "Who is Beth bringing?" Ben answers:
"Alex"

58) Abby and Ben are at a party. Abby sees an unfamiliar man with Beth, a mutual friend of theirs, and turns to Ben with a puzzled look on her face. Ben says:
"Some guy she met at the park"

59) Abby and Ben are arguing about the origin of products in a new store on their block, with Ben maintaining that the store carries only German products. To settle their debate, they walk into the store together. Ben picks up a lamp at random, upends it, examines the label (which reads Lampenwelt GmbH, Stuttgart), holds the lamp out towards Abby, and proudly proclaims to her:
"From Germany! See, I told you!"

In the first example, there is no need for Ben to make any other notes or to say anything else for Abby to understand that what Ben is saying is “Beth is bringing Alex”. In the next two examples, nothing is verbally being said. However, Abby still understands that when Ben says, “Some guy she met at the park”, he is referring to the guy Beth is walking with. In the last example, Abby understands that Ben is saying “this lamp is from Germany”. However, the utterances Ben has made, are not full sentences, but we, and Abby, can still gather the full sentence’s worth of information. The answers given drive the discourse forward in the same way more lexically full answers would. Merchant’s paper, “Fragments and Ellipsis” looks at how ellipsis can account for how items of a non-sentential nature, that is to say, items that are lexically less than full sentences, can still give a full syntactically sentential object’s worth of semantic information (Merchant, 2004, p. 662).

As I have established, there are multiple forms of ellipsis. We have Gapping, Pseudogapping, Sluicing and more, and most languages allow one or more form of ellipsis to occur. However, not all languages allow for the same type of elision processes to occur. Sluicing for example, a form of ellipsis in which the sentential element following a wh-phrase is elided, is available to both speakers of English and German. See 60) for an example.

60) Someone helped me to my flat yesterday, but I don’t remember who.

The idea here being that there is an elided IP, or TP, following the wh-phrase “who”, namely “who helped me to my flat”. The wh-phrase is analyzed as having been moved out of the IP, and it being deleted.

On the other hand, VP-ellipsis as it is licensed in English is not found in German (Merchant, 2004, p. 671). Merchant states that ellipsis is governed by the head of C, where the E feature as he calls it, resides (Merchant, 2004, p. 670). Different forms of ellipsis have different conditions that need to be fulfilled for ellipsis to occur. Phonetically and semantically, Merchant notes no differences with regards to at least a subset of elliptic processes across languages. The IP mentioned in 60) is not selected for pronunciation by the E feature (Merchant, 2004, p. 671). Semantically, as long as the information in the elided material is available already through an antecedent, then there is no issue with it being left out (Merchant, 2004, pp. 671-672).

Merchant argues that there is syntactic information in fragments (Merchant, 2004, p. 673). Fragments are non-sentential elements as the answers in 57-59) that still somehow seem to hold the same propositional element as a full sentential version of these same answers would give. There have traditionally been two ways of looking at this problem. One states that the full

syntax of a fragment is, for example in the case of 57), a DP [Alex], and that it is the categorical phrase projection of a fragment (Merchant, 2004, p. 673). The second is that there is a syntax reminiscent or identical to that of a normal declarative sentence, where parts of it is not pronounced (Merchant, 2004, p. 673). Both of these have problems. The first is at odds with the concept of propositions, as it then becomes necessary to explain that fragments like the DP in 57) can carry propositions. The second involves non-constituent deletion which is not possible in the current theories of ellipsis (Merchant, 2004, p. 674). Merchant's solution is "to assimilate fragment answers with sluicing [...]" (Merchant, 2004, p. 674). He posits that a phrasal element, like the wh-phrase in sluicing, can be moved out of the clausal boundary (Merchant, 2004, pp. 674-675). What is then deleted is the entire clause from which it has been moved. The fragment, let us just refer to the DP in 57) as a possible example for convenience, is then moved into the specifier position of some functional head, which he calls FP (Merchant, 2004, p. 675). One crucial difference from normal sluicing is that the non-pronunciation is not decided by the E feature residing in the head of C, but rather in the head of the FP (Merchant, 2004, p. 675). The strength of this idea is that it avoids the constraints on ellipsis that are problems for the previous solutions, while it relies on properties of movement that has been found independently in cases of leftward movement, as well as some forms of focus movements (Merchant, 2004, p. 675).

There are some features of fragments that speak to them being left out of ellipsis, while still adhering to a fuller syntactic structure. The first is that fragments show case matching effects with their fully sentential counterparts, as is showcased in 61) and 62), a German example taken from Merchant (2004)

61) Wem folgt Hans?

Who.DAT follows Hans

"Who is Hans following?"

A. Dem Lehrer

the.DAT teacher

B. *Den Lehrer

the.ACC teacher

62) Wen sucht Hans

who.ACC seeks Hans

"Who is Hans looking for?"

A. *Dem Lehrer

the.DAT leader
B. Den Lehrer
the.ACC leader

Merchant notes how this is natural given that the mechanism ruling case is bound to be the same for both the fragment and the full sentential version (Merchant, 2004, p. 683). Interestingly, in the elided element in 65), the deleted pronoun “him” referring back to Lars shares the accusative case with Lars. However, the pronoun holding the subject position also refers back to Lars, despite being in the nominative case. Merchant also notes how in a left-dislocation structure, a pronoun being left-dislocated must appear in the accusative case, and not the nominative. This is showcased in 63) and 64)

63) Me, I ate the pizza

64) *I, I ate the pizza

This suggest that there is no need for the pronoun to conform to the form of the antecedent.

65) The teacher failed Lars, but he didn't know why (the teacher failed him)

What is also evident from 65) is that the elided pronoun fails to violate Principle C of binding theory. Principle C in binding theory is that two expressions may not co-refer to the same entity if one of them c-commands the other.

Another argument for how fragments could be left out of ellipsis would be that they have moved. To explain how such movement can occur, Merchant references how with fragment answers, some languages that allow preposition stranding allow for “bare” DP answers to wh-questions. English allows for this, while German does not, as shown in 66) and 67), taken from Merchant (2004, p. 685-686)

66) Who was Peter talking with?

“Mary”

67) Mit wem hat Anna gesprochen?

Mit dem Hans

*Dem Hans

This is then taken to mean that a fragment answer DP can be moved alone, as parallelism is expected to be at play (Merchant, 2004, p. 687). Taking this further, fragment answers are shown to be sensitive to island effects, as shown by the acceptability of 68) and the unacceptability of a fragment answer in 69). 68) also highlights that this type of movement is

also possible across clausal boundaries. Words in cursive marks intonation rise to allow for implicate questions. Examples taken from Merchant (2004, p. 688)

68) Does Abby speak *Greek* fluently?

No, Albanian

No, she speaks *Albanian* fluently

69) Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that *Ben* speaks?

*No, *Charlie*

No, she speaks the same Balkan language that *Charlie* speaks

Merchant mentions many more examples that support this, but because of the scope of this paper, I will limit it to these few examples.

2.4 Right-Dislocation in Norwegian

Kaja Borthen and Elena Karagjosova present a different account of right-dislocation, using Norwegian, and focusing on right-dislocations with pronouns. It is the aim of their paper “Pronominal right-dislocation in Norwegian” (2021) to “propose a holistic analysis of the discourse properties and the interpretational effects of pronominal right-dislocation in Norwegian”. Borthen and Karagjosova do note that as their analysis relies on “assumptions about human cognition [...] the study makes cross-linguistic predictions despite its focus on one language” (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 1). Borthen and Karagjosova write that having a right-dislocated pronoun is fully acceptable in Norwegian. They provide an example from one of Borthen’s previous papers (Borthen, 2018, p. 434) 70) which shows a 3rd person singular masculine pronoun in the right periphery (my glossing).

70) Han er liksom ikke medregnet, han

He is like not included he

“He sort of doesn’t count”

Borthen and Karagjosova argue that because the sentence in 70) is well formed in Norwegian, the lack of acceptability of right-dislocated pronouns in standard English cannot be accounted for by the properties of pronouns or the right-dislocation construction in itself. There must rather be something licensing the construction in languages that allow the construction, that is missing in standard English (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 2).

Right-dislocation in general can have a variety of discourse related effects, and this is a fact that has been observed in a variety of other languages, and even varieties of English such as Irish or

certain dialect of Scottish English. Borthen and Karagjosova are interested in how the discourse properties affect interpretation and coherence.

Borthen and Karagjosova argue that pronominal right-dislocation is a marked topic construction. A topic is informally regarded as “what the sentence is about”, and the topic is usually encoded in an entry, typically the subject of a sentence. It is what “the sentence’s proposition is stored in memory, if accepted to be true” (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 4). The remaining part of the sentence is labelled *comment*. As such, the topic in 71) is encoded in the subject pronoun “he”

71) He is attending medical school

The sentence can be said to “be about” the man, whom we can call Max, who is attending medical school. We can ask a question to find out whether Max is the topic by turning 71) into a question as I have done in 72)

72) Who is attending medical school?

The answer to 72) is of course the “he” in 71). However, by changing what question we ask, the topic might change.

73) What kind of school does Max attend?

The answer to 73) would be that Max is attending medical school, and so it becomes apparent that the topic has changed from Max to the medical school. However, as a topic is related to discourse, a sentence by itself carries no “real” topic, but by questioning it we have topicalized either Max or the school. It is now the dominant entity under which we remember the extra information. However, as will be shown in the examples below in 74) and 75) (Reinhart, 1981), a conversation, or discourse has a topic. This is a simplified explanation of sentence topics found in a paper by Tanya Reinhart published in *Philosophica* vol. 27 in 1981, called “Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics*” Borthen and Karagjosova are aligned with Reinhart in their view of topic as a purely pragmatic notion (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021). Their argument for analyzing pronominal right-dislocation as a topic construction lies in the examples in 74) and 75), taken from the paper in question.

74) Speaker A: Nevn en lingvist.

“Mention a linguist”

Speaker B1: Chomsky er lingvist

Chomsky is linguist

“Chomsky is a linguist”

Speaker B2: #Chomsky er lingvist, han

Chomsky is linguist, he

“Chomsky is a linguist”

75) Speaker A: Hvilket yrke har Noam Chomsky? Er ikke han politiker?

“What occupation does Noam Chomsky have? Isn't he a politician?”

Speaker B: Nei. Chomsky er lingvist, han

No. Chomsky is linguist, he

“No. Chomsky is a linguist”

The well formedness of 75 as opposed to the ill-formedness of 74) is attributed to the fact that Chomsky has already been established as the topic by speaker A, while in 74) Chomsky first appears in the *comment*, resulting in an unnatural case of pronominal right-dislocation (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 4).

Borthen and Karagjosova also provide syntactic evidence to the topical nature of the construction by noting that non-fronted objects do not license pronominal right-dislocation, so that we cannot have a pronoun refer back to an object appearing in the canonical object position as in 76). (Example taken from Borthen & Karagjosova (2021, p. 5)

76) *Vi skal ha pizzaen til middag, den

We will have pizza.DEF for dinner it.M

“The pizza we will have for dinner”

However, if the object is fronted, as in 77), then right-dislocation is perfectly fine.

77) Pizzaen skal vi ha til middag, den

Pizza.DEF will we have for dinner it.M

“The pizza we will have for dinner”

These examples further support the pronominal right-dislocation as a topic construction argument.

When talking about markedness, Borthen and Karagjosova follow Givón's theory of markedness. Briefly explained, the more phonological, semantical, and/or morphological complexity a linguistic item has, the more unpredictable and “marked” the item is. This means that by calling pronominal right-dislocation a marked construction, they are referring to the fact that pronominal right-dislocation showcases some form of contrast or other type of change in

the conversation. The greater the degree of markedness, the greater the “surprise” when a linguistic form is introduced.

Borthen and Karagjosova state that there might be two different types of pronominal right-dislocation in Norwegian (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, pp. 5-6). One can be modified by a focus adverb, as seen in 78), while the other cannot, and it is this type I am interested in. However, to make matters clear I will briefly explain the modifiable type.

78) Jens trenger hjelp han også.

Jens need-S help he too

“John needs help to/ Also John needs help”

Here we see that a focus adverb modifies an accented right-dislocated pronoun, and therein lies the core difference between the two types. The construction of interest has unstressed pronouns, while this version has a stressed pronoun (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, pp. 5-6).

As a marked construction, pronominal right-dislocation is argued to aid coherence and ease processing when coming across new or unpredictable information in a discourse setting. By inserting a right-dislocated pronoun when interjecting with information in a conversation, the break is softened and not as “sharp”, and it allows the conversation to flow better. Such a break is called an eventive break. Example 79) has been constructed to showcase the difference in an exchange where speaker B interjects with information about Lars, with the right-dislocated pronoun.

79) Speaker A: Lars kommer ikke før i morgen.

Lars arrive-S not before tomorrow.

“Lars doesn’t arrive before tomorrow”

Speaker B: Han var gift med søsteren min, han.

He was marry-ED with sister mine he

“He was married to my sister”

In 79), speaker B’s interjection about Lars’ previous marriage to his sister would be quite jarring without the right-dislocated pronoun, and it would feel more like speaker B was properly intending to cut speaker A off, when what speaker B was intending was to provide information about Lars. The conversation could continue along the lines it was going before speaker B interjected, or the topic could move to talk about Lars, if Lars was not the topic of the greater

discourse, but rather the arrival time of multiple people (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, pp. 9-10, 16).

Another discourse related use of pronominal right-dislocation is a contrastive use. In the interaction between speaker A and B in 80), speaker B holds an opposing view to that presented by speaker A, and the insertion of the right-dislocated pronoun adds to the contrast of speaker B's views (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 10).

80) Speaker A: Jeg elsker å være gift

I love to be marry.ED

“I love being married”

Speaker B: Jeg foretrekker å være singel, jeg

I prefer to be single, I

“I prefer being single”

The insertion of “jeg” reaffirms the fact that speaker B prefers being single, as opposed to being married. However, this example showcases something that holds true for many uses of pronominal right-dislocation, namely that the sentence is still well formed when choosing not to insert a right-dislocated pronoun. Borthen and Karagjosova attribute this to the fact that the discourse properties that pronominal right-dislocation has, are not encoded in the pronouns or in the construction itself. The construction is rather something that more readily opens up for i.e. a contrastive interpretation and raises the acceptability of such an interpretation (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 11). This means that there is no information found “within” the right-dislocated pronoun, in the sense that the meaning of the pronoun is not what gives the construction its characteristics. Neither is it the construction itself that carries this information. That the construction opens up for a more contrastive interpretation is something that arrives from outside the construction, and is put upon it, perhaps through habitual use. This is also the case with other discourse properties such as the eventive breaks mentioned above. The addition of a right-dislocated pronoun raises the acceptability of the interjection by speaker B in 80).

Borthen has previously argued that another feature of pronominal right-dislocation borne out of the contrastive aspect that has been identified with the construction, is that it strengthens “the speaker’s epistemic or emotional attitude towards the proposition or a weakening of a potentially face-threatening speech act” (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 19). This has since been criticized as it does not properly account for how a construction can have such opposite

effects. Said in a more informal way, it allows the addressee to more easily interpret the speaker's attitude, either by the speaker's attitude being strengthened, and emphasis is given to the opposing viewpoint, or it might soften the blow for the addressee upon hearing that the speaker might not agree with them (Borthen, *Pronominal høyredislokering i norsk, det er et interessant fenomen, det*, 2018, pp. 433-438).

Borthen and Karagjosova use relevance theory to argue that the “emphasis” and “mitigation” effects mentioned above are in fact implicatures (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 19). In relevance theory, comprehension consists of three different subtasks (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 19). The first is making assumptions about what the explicit material of the coming utterance is, meaning, what is going to be audibly said and heard. The second is making assumptions about what the speaker considers to be the implicated premises of the utterance. This means that we take into account what we assume that the speaker assumes about the context of the utterance, so that we can understand where they are coming from. The third task is to make assumptions about the intended contextual implications, meaning, what is not being said aloud, but the listener is expected to retrieve (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 19). When Speaker A hears speaker B in 80) disagree with him, he might hear the right-dislocated pronoun and from that gather that there is an implicature to be interpreted. He might assume that since they have been friends for a long time, speaker B would not want to start a fight with speaker A and as such would want the disagreement to come of as less confrontational, or soft. What the actual implicature or the interpretation arises from is not clear. It might be from context, or it might be something that Borthen and Karagjosova read into it. In 70), the right-dislocated pronoun invites the addressee to feel even stronger for the person who is not being counted in the same way that his peers are. It is the contrastive aspect of the construction that raises the accessibility of the contrastive meaning, and that is what we feel. It is not so much the information being provided by “He doesn't count” that makes us want to interpret it this way, but rather the implicature that “other people do count”, and that makes the speaker seem more hurt (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 19). To be clear, in Norwegian, to “count” in this scenario refers to being a part of a group, about being regarded as a fully worthy and respected member of said group. To not be “counted” in this scenario refers to a great feeling of being left out, of not being regarded on equal terms with the subject's peers. To exemplify this feeling, imagine a situation where a class has a student with a physical impairment, meaning the student is not able to participate in all kinds of activities that the others are. If the school is consistently arranging for the students to partake in activities the impaired student cannot take part in, this

leads to multiple instances of the student in question to be set apart from the group, presumably left to do some other activity. It has to do with viewing people as people. Whether the implicature above is interpreted as “emphasis” or “mitigation”, depends not only on a right-dislocation structure, but also a wider discourse context and other clues given, i.e., through body language. Of course, sometimes there is no such effect present, and the speaker only wanted to change the topic and wanted to make it easier for the addressee to follow along. When writing about a speaker’s want in this way, please keep in mind that I am not referring to a conscious wish, but rather to the machinations at play and the general aim of want of any speaker to be understood.

2.5 Grice’s maxims and inferences

When people are speaking, we often manage to communicate effectively without being particularly direct and without saying what we intend to communicate. We are able to infer a variety of things from the information available to us. If two friends are sitting together at a restaurant, and one mentions how late it is getting, the other might take that to mean that they should be leaving, even though that meaning cannot be gleaned from the meanings of the words of the utterance itself. We are inferring things both from conversations and other signals every day so there is some surety to this system of inferences. This requires some goodwill from a hearer to play along with the game. H. Paul Grice investigated this phenomenon and he proposed what he called “the cooperative principle”

Make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged (Saeed, 2016, p. 210).

The idea is that if all speakers oblige by this principle, then that trust allows the system of inferences to work (Saeed, 2016, p. 211). If we can assume that whoever we are speaking to is attempting at communicating something worthwhile, and not simply breaking the flow of conversation, then we are able to communicate quite creatively. Of course, miscommunication does occur, and a lot of times people are drawing inferences from imaginary implicatures, or not picking up on implicatures put there by the speaker.

Grice also put forward four maxims of conversational cooperation. These maxims can be understood as assumptions made by participants in a conversation as to what constitutes good and successful communication. The first is “The Maxim of Quality” which is “try to make your contribution one that is true”. If we can assume that what someone says is true, then that aids communication because the hearer doesn’t spend a lot of processing power on deciding whether

something the speaker said is true or not. Conversely, if the speaker says something that the hearer knows to be false, then he might infer that the speaker is trying to communicate something else. Below you will see how breaking a maxim can give rise to implicatures.

81) Speaker A: Have you seen my car keys?

Speaker B: Yes, they were on the moon,

Given that the likelihood of speaker B's utterance being true is in fact quite low, speaker A might infer that what speaker B wants to communicate is that they don't know where Speaker A's car keys are.

The second maxim is "the Maxim of Quantity" and is about being informative. "Make your contribution as informative as is required, but not more informative than what is required" (Saeed, 2016, p. 211). This means that you should be providing enough information for communication to flow smoothly, and you should avoid being redundant by providing already established information. Breaking this maxim as in 82) could lead the hearer to infer that the speaker might be annoyed by the hearer's question.

82) Speaker A: Who won World War II?

Speaker B: The Second World War was won by the allied forces, of which the main nations were Great Britain, The US, China, The USSR and France. On the other side was the Axis Powers, where the main three nations were Germany[...]

If Speaker B were to lay out the entire course of the war as a response to speaker A's question, Speaker A might infer that speaker B found the question to be a stupid question.

The third maxim is "the Maxim of Relevance", and quite simply asks that a speaker's contribution be relevant to the situation at hand, and to not bring up the GDP of America when the conversation topic was which flavor of ice cream is best. Conversely, if the answer to "Can I borrow some money" is "My purse is in my coat", then the likely implicature is that it is okay for the person asking the question to borrow some money.

The fourth maxim and last maxim is the "maxim of Manner" which states that you should "be perspicuous, and specifically avoid ambiguity and obscurity, be brief and be orderly" (Saeed, 2016, p. 211). This means that you should not obfuscate your speech so that your listeners are able to properly understand what you are trying to communicate, or more informally, know your audience. It would do no good for a teacher teaching English to Norwegian students using

the most obscure words and expressions they could think of when the aim is to help the students learn.

As mentioned above, by having these assumptions when communicating, we are able to infer a lot, and this can lead to language and communication happening in clever ways. Both by obeying the maxim and by breaking them, we can give rise to implicatures, and we trust that the hearer understands that we are trying to communicate something (Saeed, 2016, p. 216). Different implicatures can come from obeying and breaking the same maxim, as shown in 83), or they can even give rise to the same implicature as in 84).

83) Speaker A: Can I borrow some money?

Speaker B1: My wallet is in my coat

Implicature: Speaker A can borrow money

Speaker B2: Fred never gave me back my copy of *Wuthering Heights*

Implicature: speaker B2 does not lend stuff after having a bad prior experience.

84) Speaker A: Have you seen my car keys?

Speaker B1: They're either in the hallway or in the living room

Speaker B2: They're on the moon

Implicature: Neither speaker knows where the car keys are.

Speaker A might pick up on the implicatures put forth by the others, or he might misunderstand or be confused. Despite this, we infer things every day and it holds as a functional way of communication.

2.6 The left periphery

For this thesis, it is necessary to consider alternative ways of conceptualizing the PRD construction. Therefore, I will present Luigi Rizzi's work about the structure of the left periphery. Rizzi presents an overview of a map of the left periphery in his paper "The fine structure of the Left Periphery". He assumes that all the parts of the complementizer system follow an X-bar structure, and notes that it is not important to the discussion whether the X-bar system is flawless or not (Rizzi, 1997, p. 286). He notes that among others, we can find a position for Focus and Topic in the complementizer system. He assumes that in a syntactic tree structure, these structures are built along the same X-bar lines as is, or was, typical. That means for a FocusP, that we have a head, Foc, or for a TopicP, a head Top. These project their own schemas, with a complement, YP, and a specifier, XP. In the case of a TopicP, the complement

is regarded as the comment, and the specifier as the topic (Rizzi, 1997, p. 286). The heads of these phrases are phonetically null in Rizzi's native Italian, as well as in English and Norwegian. Some languages will have pronunciations for these heads. Rizzi mentions Gungbe, which has a pronounced Focus head, argued to be realized as the particle "wè" (Rizzi, 1997, p. 287). The idea is that these functional heads all project their own X-bar schema and can be found in the complementizer system, however, as already shown above, not all languages will have pronunciations for all of its heads, and many of them might not even be in use at all in a given language. Rizzi argues that the topic-focus system is only present, if there is need for it. This means that it is only present if there is a construction that needs to have its focus or topic criteria checked, in which case it will be moved leftward (Rizzi, 1997, p. 287). Rizzi compares this form of feature checking to the Wh-criteria and the Neg-Criteria.

FocusP and TopicP is in the complementizer system, above IP and below C. According to Rizzi they are also framed by ForceP and FinP. Rizzi thinks of the C system as "the interface between a propositional content (expressed by the IP) and the superordinate structure (a higher clause or, possibly, the articulation of discourse, if we consider a root clause)" (Rizzi, 1997, p. 283). Complementizers says something about the sentence, and it informs the listener or reader about the nature of the sentence. A complementizer can tell us that a sentence is a question, or a relative, a declarative or a comparative etc. Rizzi adopts Chomsky's definition and calls this "the specification of Force" (Rizzi, 1997, p. 283). This is the closest to C as this information is extremely important for the interpretation of the entire sentence. The C system as an interface also conveys some sort of information to the IP, to the inside of the clause. This information is related to the verbal system of a clause. This is confirmed by the fact that there are agreement rules between C and I, for example that a "that" clause can have a tensed verb, while a "for" clause contains an infinitive (Rizzi, 1997, p. 283). Rizzi concludes that this information is not quite tense, but is related to tense, and also to other inflectional specifications, and calls this finiteness (Rizzi, 1997, p. 284). This is FinP. FinP is the closest to IP, because of the agreement rules mentioned, and normally, anything appearing in between the IP and FinP would stop the agreement from holding true (Rizzi, 1997, p. 301). This overview leaves us with Rizzi's map of the left periphery, or the complementizer system in 85)

85) ForceP → TopicP → FocusP → TopicP → FinP

The idea is that this will be the case for all languages. The map may not be complete, but for the purposes of this paper, this map is functional.

3. Methodology

This thesis relies partly on previously written material on the topic of right-dislocation and other related topics. Most of the examples used are either taken from previous literature or created based on the native speaker intuitions of myself and my supervisor, Andrew Weir. Some have also been taken from conversations with friends and family speaking either the same dialect as me (Helgelandisdialekt) or a closely related one unless stated otherwise. Few of the examples in Norwegian can be traced back to official sources due to lack of available material, as little to no research has been done on this dialect, especially regarding pronominal right-dislocation. However, for most of my examples I have confirmed in private with friends that their intuition also allows for the same examples to be made. I have not conducted interviews or made surveys to back up my claims, however. It felt redundant given the scope of the thesis, and I did not have the option to do the same with English speakers, so I opted not to conduct any interviews at all. Some examples have been taken from parts of the literature I apply in this thesis, and these examples have in large part been taken from either corpora, interviews or authentic written text. As such, this thesis is a part of the “armchair linguistics” tradition.

There is no standardized written Helgelandisk, so for my examples I will be writing them out as I would write them in a casual conversation on social media, and the examples will be glossed both with a translation into English, but how the sentence would be written in in Bokmål, the written standard I am accustomed to. This is done to avoid confusion and works as a disclaimer that other speakers of Helgelandisk might chose to write it slightly differently, mostly on a word level. However, this should not impact the analysis in any meaningful way.

4. Analysis

4.1 Pragmatics of Pronominal Right-Dislocation in English and Norwegian

Argues that PRD is a marked construction and a topic construction. Marked constructions are used in cases where continuity and predictability are not maximally maintained. Borthen assumes from this that marked constructions heighten the accessibility of contrastive interpretations. PRD then is used to shift the topic to whatever is being said

Holds a contrastive element, if the RDP represents a continuous topic, if there is no contrastive interpretation of the construction, then it is unacceptable. This means that it cannot represent non-topical information

An example that showcases this quite well is:

86) Speaker A: jeg liker hunder

“I like dogs”

Speaker B: Jeg liker Katter, jeg

I like cats, i

“I like cats, me”

This has the immediate effect of shifting the topic towards the cats speaker B likes. One might imagine speaker A would follow up with a question as to why they prefer cats to dogs.

You could also supplement this example with other contrastive elements such as “vel,” which is used in much the same way as “well, I like cats, me” although this does not seem to be a necessity.

Borthen mentions how liking cats might not be a very noticeable or controversial opinion; by providing an opposing opinion to liking dogs it shifts the focus towards speaker B and their love of cats. Context seems to hold clues for these constructions.

Borthen also argues that a PRD constructions’ contrastive nature can have effects on the implicatures in speaker B, by either “strengthening of the speaker’s epistemic stance or emotional attitude towards the proposition (i.e. “emphasis”) or a weakening of the speaker’s epistemic stance towards the proposition (i.e. “mitigation”). In the example above, one is unlikely to infer from speaker B that they are open to the addressee’s opinion but are rather digging a trench to secure their position, so to speak. For an example of mitigation see 87) (Borthen, 2021)

87) Speaker A: “Blir’u med på en tur, Kalle?”

Come you with on a walk, Kalle?

“Will you join me for a walk, Kalle?”

Speaker B: “Tror jeg mediterer litt, jeg”

Think I meditate a little, I

“I think I’ll meditate for a while, I”

In 87), as opposed to 86), we see speaker B declining speaker A’s invitation to go for a walk. Speaker B does not seem to want to strongly reject the idea, and by introducing an element of uncertainty through “I think”, the rejection is softened. This effect is reinforced by introducing

the right-dislocated pronoun. In Borthen's analysis, she mentions how it almost functions as an invitation to object, that you could be persuaded. In effect, it is a very soft rejection.

There is little to suggest that Borthen's analysis would not fit in most cases. For example, nothing seems wrong with a sentence like 88)

88) Speaker A: Would you like another portion Larry?

Speaker B: I think I'm full, me

Speaker B also attempts a soft rejection of speaker A's proposition, and the right-dislocated pronoun is seemingly inserted to lessen the punch of the rejection. When speaker A hears speaker B's reply, based on Grice's maxim of relation, he is likely to assume that speaker B is trying to respond to the question, and as such should infer that because speaker B is full, he would not like a second portion of food.

Could a right-dislocated pronoun also provide emphasis, and not only mitigation in Scottish-English? If we imagine an interaction as the one in 89)

89) Speaker A: I think syntax is the best linguistic discipline.

Speaker B: I like morphology better, me

If interaction 89) displays mitigation, a soft rejection, one would imagine that emphasis would seem more direct and perhaps less polite. Certainly, Speaker B would seem less scared of offending and less inviting speaker A to disagree.

Borthen and Karagjosova highlight that the pronominal right-dislocation construction has a contrastive aspect, which is an important part of why the construction has the effects put forward by them (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 10). Whether it is the straightforward "emphasis" or "mitigation" effects, or the softening effect it has in case of eventive breaks which aids with coherence, in most cases the analysis can be said to hold for most of my English examples.

With regards to Borthen and Karagjosova's analysis, Helgelandisk seems to differ slightly, but in interesting ways. The contrastive use is slightly preferred over the other uses. What I mean, is that I and fellow speakers are more likely to use PRD when we want to achieve a contrast effect. This does not mean that the other pragmatic functions are not in use, but based on my and friends' intuition, the frequency of use will vary depending on the type of effect sought, with the contrasting use being the most frequent. However, this is informally based on my, and a few friends' intuition and would need to be properly corroborated in a survey or a corpus

study to hold proper weight in a discussion about this topic. There is little evidence to suggest that there is much significant difference from a pragmatic point of view between Helgelandsk and Scottish due to cultural and linguistic overlap and similarities.

As we have established, pronominal right-dislocation is a phenomenon with some frequency in Norwegian, as well as other languages, including certain varieties of English. Mycock found it to be somewhat frequent in Modern Tyneside English, a dialect spoken in Tyneside around Newcastle (Mycock, 2017, p. 255-256). It is also found other parts of northern England, as well as in some Scottish English dialects. The first thing to note in a comparison is how in Scottish we see that the right-dislocated pronoun takes accusative case, as in 90)

90) Jim's a great guy, him

This does not result in an overt change for all pronouns. Second person, both singular and plural show no outward case, so when “you” appears as a subject, and as an object, all we see is “you”. In written standard Norwegian (Bokmål), all personal pronouns, except for in second person plural nominative and accusative, show case in their conjugated forms, as shown in the table below.

	Nominative	Accusative	Genitive
1 st person singular	jeg	Meg	Mi(n)e
2 nd person singular	du	Deg	Di(n)e
3 rd person singular	Han/hun/det	Ham/henne/det	Hans/hennes/dets
1 st person plural	Vi	Oss	Vår(e)
2 nd person plural	Dere	Dere	Deres
3 rd person plural	De	Dem	Deres

Table 1.

What should follow then is that if we translate 90) into Norwegian, we are left with 91). As an alternative we have 92).

91) Jim er en flott fyr, ham

Jim is a great guy, him

92) Jim er en flott fyr, han

Jim is a great guy, he

“Jim is a great guy, him”

The logical conclusion would be that 91) is a perfectly acceptable Norwegian sentence, where the right-dislocated pronoun shows accusative case. However, having informally asked a couple of younger speakers of Østlandsk from around the greater Oslo area, where they speak the

closest to the written standard, they found 91) to be weird. Keep in mind that Østlandsk is not one particular dialect, but rather a dialectal umbrella I use here to cover the varieties stereotypically regarded as being close to spoken Bokmål. There is variety there, but for brevity's sake I will not be documenting the dialectal differences of the different dialects in the geographical region Østlandet. The speakers I asked preferred the version in 92). The same people when asked if they used the accusative forms of third person singular at all, all of them responded that they did, but that they were firmer on the "hun/henne" distinction, than the "han/ham" distinction.

93) Jim er en flott fyr, han
Jim is a great guy, he
"Jim is a great guy him"

This reaction fit with my intuition about the matter as well. This might also be key to why, when I was first exposed to pronominal right-dislocation in English, I was very surprised to hear that it would result in a right-dislocated pronoun in the accusative case. That the right-dislocated pronoun would show case in this way surprised me quite a bit, as it did not fit with my intuition in Norwegian.

In Helgelandsk, the third person singular pronouns do not show case at all. The nominative form "han" is also the same form used in the accusative "han" as shown in 94)

94) A. Jim slo han
Jim hit he
"Jim hit him"
B. Han slo Jim
He hit Jim

All other personal pronouns do show case, such as first person singular, showcased in 95) and 96). The personal pronoun will be underlined or marked with bold font.

95) A. Eg slo **han**
I hit **him**
B. **Han** slo meg
He hit me
96) A. Du slo **dem**
I hit **them**

B. De slo **deg**

They hit **you**

This could make it difficult to determine whether the right-dislocated pronoun has received accusative case from somewhere. If we were to transpose my informal findings on the acceptability of the right-dislocated pronoun showing accusative case in Østlandsk, then we might be tempted to assume that right-dislocated pronouns in Norwegian, both in Østlandsk and in Helgelandsk. I am not convinced it is that simple. At a simple glance however, it might certainly be the case that while right-dislocated pronouns in English do show case, they do not in Norwegian/Helgelandsk for some yet unknown reason.

One possible reason I would like to propose is that Norwegian does not seem to have the same case-sensitivity as English. In English, it seems to be the case that when a personal pronoun appears in a non-subject position it appears in its accusative form. In some cases, even a pronoun functioning as a subject can appear in the accusative case, as is the case in 97) (Haegeman & Gueron, 1999, p. 132). Example 98) is provided for contrast.

97) He expects him to invite John

98) *He expects he to invite John

In the example above, the pronoun “him” functions as the subject of a XP, which functions as a complement to the verb “expect”. “him” is the subject of “him to invite John”, which when taken out of context sounds immediately strange, yet the same also happens if we were to take the XP in 98) out of context. However, 97) is a perfectly acceptable English sentence, while 98) is not. The fact that most speakers of English will naturally say 97), and not 98) is indicative of default case in English, this case being accusative. Nominative is generally associated with subjects, while accusative is usually associated with objects, and the fact that even pronouns that functions as a subject must take accusative case, aids this conclusion. However, default case is not an acknowledged rule, but rather an observation about this tendency of pronouns to prefer accusative case.

If English has a default case, and that case is accusative, it is important to consider whether the same tendency exists in Norwegian, as this could prove an interesting link for my analysis of pronominal right-dislocation. If Norwegian pronouns that appear in a non-subject position also prefer to take accusative case, then Norwegian might also have a default case tendency.

As previously mentioned, it is possible in written Norwegian to distinguish between an accusative form and a nominative form for almost all personal pronouns. This distinction is at the very least less important in spoken Østlandsk, and the forms are indistinguishable in Helgelandsk. However, given that the acceptability judgements about 91) and 92) were the same for speakers of Helgelandsk, and speakers of Østlandsk, and that the pragmatic effects of pronominal right-dislocation are the same, I will assume that Helgelandsk share central case features with Østlandsk. This means I will be assuming that my intuition regarding which case personal pronouns occur in is correct. When necessary, will I be reinforcing my examples with Østlandsk to show the different forms of personal pronouns.

I have already established one case in which a personal pronoun functioning as an object takes a nominative form in Norwegian, gauging by judgements of speakers of both Østlandsk and Helgelandsk. When introducing an indirect object, as in 99) and 100) below, it makes no difference in the acceptability judgements whether the pronouns functions as a direct object or an indirect object.

99) Eg ga brevet te ho

I gave the letter to she

“I gave the letter to her”

100) Eg ga ho brevet

I gave she the letter

“I gave her the letter”

Both sentences are perfectly acceptable in Helgelandsk. However, when writing it out in Østlandsk, it is harder to accept a nominative form, especially when presented with a 3rd person singular feminine pronoun, as in 101-104)

101) Jeg gav brevet til henne

I gave the letter to her

“I gave the letter to her”

102) Jeg gav henne brevet

I gave her the letter

“I gave her the letter”

103) *Jeg gav brevet til hun

*I gave the letter to she

“I gave the letter to her”

104) *Jeg gav hun brevet

*I gave she the letter

“I gave her the letter”

Examples 103) and 104) are both unacceptable in standard written Norwegian. They also elicit reactions both from myself and speakers of Østlandsk. The reactions are much stronger than if the feminine pronouns were exchanged with masculine ones. This is indicative of a development in spoken Østlandsk where the distinction between personal pronouns' nominative and accusative forms seems to be fading out as younger speakers continue to mix up the two forms, or even leaving the accusative form out of their speech entirely, as is the case in a lot of Norwegian dialects, including Helgelandsk (Eliassen & Yildiz, 2021). That a mixing of han/ham would elicit a weaker reaction than mixing up hun/henne might be due to the greater difference in form, both orthographically and phonetically in the female pronouns.

It is unlikely that there is a difference regarding preferred case for feminine and masculine personal pronouns. If Norwegian has a default case, no matter if that case is nominative or accusative, one must assume that it would affect all personal pronouns, and not a specific subset based on gender. There is no other case in which gendered nouns or pronouns behave differently, excepting conjugation. A different explanation lies in the evolution of spoken Norwegian. The lack of an insistence on a clear distinction between “han” and “ham” in spoken language led to early updates regarding written Norwegian, and it has been accepted for a long time to use “han” instead of the object form “ham”. The weakening distinction between “hun” and “henne” is a more recent phenomenon among younger speakers of Østlandsk. Using “hun” instead of “henne” for an object pronoun in written Norwegian makes the sentence unacceptable. As the phenomenon is a new one, and it is not yet reinforced in the grammar of written Norwegian, it makes sense that switching one out for the other would elicit stronger reactions among speakers than the equivalent for the masculine pronoun. It is also assumed that even in languages like Norwegian and English, which seldom shows case in form, nouns do need to check for case. This assumption makes sense based on the inflection of personal pronouns, given that we both in English have different forms for nominative and accusative pronouns. If all nouns, and all pronouns must be checked for case, whether the form shows case or not, then it makes more sense that the accusative form for the feminine personal pronoun “henne” is a remnant form, and that the distinction between “han/ham” is regarded as inconsequential, and there is no need for an accusative form, however the case for the masculine personal pronoun remains, like the feminine, in accusative.

4.2 Right-Dislocated Pronouns and Ellipsis

With regards to the RDP construction, it is tempting to analyze it in terms of ellipsis. In a deletion-based approach, like Vanden Wyngaerds, the remnant(s) move into a focalized projection called FocusP, which dominates the deleted verb phrase. This FocusP can then remain outside of the VP that is being deleted, and which might take with it other structural elements which it in turn dominates. This leaves us with a sentence like the one in 105)

105) Lars has read The Wheel of Time, and Sebastian [~~has~~] the Cosmere.

When saying this sentence out loud, one would naturally emphasize through a rising intonation “Sebastian” and would also intone on “the Cosmere”.

It has been posited that A-movement, moving phrases to another location which holds a fixed grammatical function, is not restricted by the Coordinate Structure Constraint (Winkler, 2005, p. 186). However, if gapping and other similar phenomena are the results of deletion, this is not relevant.

If we extrapolate the assumptions made above to the phenomenon of pronominal right-dislocation, then we are left with two possibilities. One possibility is that the phenomenon is a result of some form of deletion, leaving only the pronoun and no other remnants. This differs from most forms of ellipsis, as with the gapping examples above, we are usually left with more remnants. In 106) can be found a preliminary simple version of this analysis.

106) He’s a great guy, him is ~~a great guy~~.

In 44), the second conjunct has been almost entirely deleted, presumably at PF, leaving the pronoun behind. There are two curious elements to this analysis. As has been established, English pronouns appearing in a non-subject position tend to appear in the accusative case. This is not out of the ordinary. However, the pronoun must receive case from somewhere. Typically, an NP object receives accusative case from the verb, as NPs normally receive their case from the head of a projection of which it is a part. In the case of subjects, they will often receive their nominative case from the head of IP/TP. In the case of 106) however, a pronoun in the left field of the sentence, typically a subject position, appears in accusative case. It seems unlikely that it occupies the specifier of IP, as it would receive nominative case in that position. The fact of the matter is that it has received accusative case from somewhere.

There are cases where phrases receive case across clausal boundaries, such as cases of Exceptional Case Marking. Exceptional Case Marking, or ECM is a phenomenon in which the

subject NP of a clause appears in the accusative, having received its case not from the head of the IP, but rather from the preceding verb. This is showcased in 107)

107) I expect her to do great things

“her” is the subject of the non-finite clause “her to do great things”, but it does not receive nominative case from I, but rather accusative from the verb “expect” (Haegeman & Gueron, 1999, p. 135). This is because case assignment is governed by two interesting conditions, namely locality and government. NPs receive their case from the closest head possible, as well as the phrase by which it is governed. In the case of ECM, both the head of the IP and the head of the VP is close, but because the VP governs the NP, it takes precedence and gives accusative case to the subject of the governed clause (Haegeman & Gueron, 1999, p. 134).

It is not impossible for a pronoun in a subject position to receive accusative case from somewhere. Exceptional Case Marking is a clear example of this. However, in the case of pronominal right-dislocation, it is not clear where the pronoun can receive its case from.

The second problem is that elements need a reason to move. In a gapping construction, the VP might move because it is necessary for the construction to have a VP in the first conjunct, but not in the second conjunct. NPs can move for a variety of reasons, such as case checking or to create an interrogative sentence. For the pronoun NP in a RPD construction to receive accusative case, it could do so typically from a preposition or from a verb. It cannot, as mentioned above, receive accusative case from the head of an IP, while it occupies the specifier of IP. There is also nowhere in the first conjunct from which it can receive accusative case. Even if the case assignment could pass the clausal boundary between the two conjuncts, the closest element is the NP “A great guy” which cannot assign case.

The third problem is that the pronoun in the second conjunct does not move up into the first conjunct, given that both the object position and the subject position is already occupied by the NPs “a great guy” and “he” respectively. The pronoun then seemingly has to stay in its original clause. There is also the added question of what happened to the rest of the second conjunct. Even if the NP was able to move, making it appear as if deletion has happened, the remaining verb and its object would have had to move as well. As the pronoun cannot move out of its clause because there are no positions for it to take, nothing would be different for the object.

4.3 Moved or Base Generated Pronouns in Pronominal Right-Dislocation

At a first glance, the most likely syntactic operation that would leave us with a right-dislocated pronoun is one which involves both movement and ellipsis. However, how this could be possible has previously been a challenge to explain. The fact is that the right-dislocated pronoun is, whether analyzed as a DP or an NP, “bare” and should theoretically not be able to move out of an element that is deleted. In a typical ellipsis example, sluicing, we know that a wh-phrase can move out of its original position to the specifier of CP, with the TP from which the wh-phrase has moved is deleted at some point during derivation, presumably at PF, being marked for non-pronunciation (Merchant, 2004, pp. 664-665). With regards to possible problems about the nature of a right-dislocated pronoun; even if the right-dislocated pronoun has no apparent syntactic function in the sentence, it should still be regarded as a full constituent. I say this because pronouns are eligible for dislocation, both right-dislocation as in 108), and left-dislocation as in 109)

108) He’s a great guy, him

109) Me, I like them this way.

Given pronouns’ eligibility for movement, I do not expect any issues with regards to movement of non-constituents.

Interestingly, the same structure as in 109) in Norwegian seems strange to me. A sentence like 110) feels unnatural and completely unnecessary.

110) ?Meg/eg, eg lik dem sånn

Me/I, I like them that

“Me, I like them this way”

In 110), I would be more likely to accept the nominative pronoun than the accusative, but it still does not sound good. The only way to make it sound natural is if the first pronoun is a question, asking if someone is addressing you as in 111)

111) Speaker A: Kordan lik du dem?

How like you them?

“How do you like them?”

Speaker B: (m)eg? Eg lik dem sånn

I? I like them this way

This however changes the intonational patterns of the sentence, and it also separates the pronoun from the clause. It makes no difference to my ears whether you choose the nominative or accusative pronoun in 111)

Pronouns can move, and elements can move out of their clausal boundary. This is attested both by Ziv and Merchant, among others (Ziv, 1994) (Merchant, 2004). Ziv uses the example in 8 and 9), repeated here for convenience to show how a NP or a DP can be left outside of the left periphery.

- 112) *Last year, Rosa Berkoff, she lost 20 pounds.
 Rosa Berkoff, last year, she lost 20 pounds.

While Merchant notes how some elements can move out of a TP, into the C-system, where it may occupy a functional projection which he calls FP. He states that this FP could be the same as Rizzi's FocusP (Merchant, 2004, p. 675). Assuming that the general ideas here are correct, namely that elements can move out of the TP to some extent, to the left periphery, or the C-system, I posit that right-dislocated pronouns are remnants of an elided clause/TP. Following this, what we then call right-dislocated pronouns, or ProTags in Mycock's case, could actually be the result of left-dislocation, and not right-dislocation. However, for simplicity and continuity's sake, I will continue to refer to these pronouns as either right-dislocated pronouns or ProTags. This would hypothetically give us something like 113).

- 113) He's a great guy, [XP [him_i] [TP [~~he's a great guy~~ *t_i*]]

The pronoun "him" has moved out of its original TP and is the sole remnant of the elided TP "he's a great guy". The material is marked so as to not be pronounced at PF, seemingly because it is not effective processing to mark something out for pronunciation that is already understandable from context. This should provide no cause for concern, assuming Merchant's fragments analysis that fragment answers are derived along an almost identical process to sluicing (Merchant, 2004, p. 674).

There are multiple things to consider, the first being the issue of case. In sluicing, the moved wh-phrase is sensitive to case-matching. See 114-115) for two German examples

- 114) Sie will jemanden schlagen, aber er weißt nicht wen
 She wants someone.ACC strike, but he knows not who.CC
 "She wants to strike someone, but he doesn't know who"
- 115) Er will jemandem helfen, aber er weißt nicht wem

He wants someone.DAT help, but he knows not who.DAT
“He wants to help someone, but he doesn’t know who”

Merchant formulates it as “the wh-phrase must bear the case that its counterpart in a nonelided structure would bear” (Merchant, 2004, p. 665). This is true for fragment answers as well, and this feature seems to be uniform across case marking languages (Merchant, 2004, p. 666). Now, there is one important difference to note between fragments answers and ProTags. Merchant’s fragments, which are derived in a similar way as wh-questions, are argued to have a full syntactic structure, which explains how fragment answers seemingly provide propositional content (Merchant, 2004, pp. 665, 673, 676). For right-dislocated pronouns, or ProTags, I argue, there is an underlying structure from which the pronoun has moved out of. The difference lies in the content. The fact that right-dislocated pronouns show up in the accusative case with seemingly no way to receive it from anywhere in the main clause, suggests that it has received it from someplace else. This place is the elided clause. However, Merchant argues that pronouns in the accusative case can appear as fragment answers, but that they are island sensitive (Merchant, 2004, p. 704). Hanging topics, topicalized constructions consisting of an NP, on the other hand, are not island sensitive, and they can be accusative pronouns, as shown in 116), taken from Merchant (2004, p. 703) (Stark, 2022, p. 8)

116) Me, the FBI interviewed everyone I went to school with.

The potential issue with analyzing right-dislocated pronouns as hanging topics is that hanging topics are normally considered syntactically independent (Stark, 2022, p. 7). If the right-dislocated pronouns are moved out of an elided clause, then it they are naturally syntactically dependent. To attempt to solve this, I would like to suggest that right-dislocated pronouns, might not be dislocated at all. Merchant notes how there is a possibility that a pronoun like the one in 116) might not actually have been moved there, but that it is base generated in the SpecFP (which remember, may or may not be Rizzi’s FocusP, or some other functional projection in the c-system (Merchant, 2004, p. 703). Merchant also allows for the possibility that the head of F could leave case unchecked. This is of course relevant if the answer is that the pronouns has moved out of its clause, as the elision makes the lack of case-checking a non-problem (Merchant, 2004, p. 704). If we assume a structure like the one presented in 113), there is nowhere in the elided clause that the pronoun could receive case from either. Merchant writes how in an elided phrase like the one in 117), there is not a form-equivalent co-referent for Alex in the leftmost clause, but rather a pronoun.

117) The police arrested Alex₃, but he₃ didn't know why (the police arrested him).

Merchant mentions this as an example to how such constructions can avoid violating Principle C, but I am more interested in the case. Here, the pronoun in the elided clause shows in the accusative case, but it is of course functioning as an object, so that much is to be expected. If this could be extrapolated to 113), so that we get 118), this could be an explanation of how we get our pronoun. 118) then is a hypothetical of 113) analyzed along the lines of Merchant's discussion of 117)

118) He's a great guy [XP [him_i] [TP [~~he~~ is t_i]]

However, as might be evident to speakers of English, pronominalizing an indefinite NP, with a definite referent is strange. I would therefore like to discard the idea that this feature of fragments carry over into a right-dislocated pronoun structure.

The hypothetical in 118), then, looks like a bad analysis. However, 113) also has another problem, not just the issue of case. Technically, something like 113) is possible, but if the moved pronoun is assumed to have received its case from somewhere in the elided TP, then normally we would assume it to hold some function in the elided clause. I have already discarded the idea of it functioning as an object above, and without discovering the supposed function of "him" in the elided clause, there is no way for the pronoun to receive accusative case in its original clause.

The most feasible way a pronoun could end up in that position in the accusative case is for the pronoun to be generated in XP above TP, in the accusative case, according to the notion of default case. Given that Merchant is open for the possibility that fragment answers can be base generated in a functional phrase, in the form of DPs, and that pronouns are DPs, I find this to be the most salient conclusion to the facts and suppositions laid out here. This is however still in the realm of the second (elided) clause, which is marked for non-pronunciation at PF because of overlap, leaving it out of the surface structure. This combines Merchant's idea of fragment DP's having a full underlying syntactic structure, with the pragmatics of right-dislocated pronoun constructions, and allows for accusative case without needing a rework of how movement works. The idea of linguistic elements in the left periphery is also not controversial (Merchant, 2004) (Ziv, 1994) (Rizzi, 1997). However, Ziv argues that elements like Rosa Berkoff in 9) exists outside the left clausal boundary (Ziv, 1994). The fact that one can change the markedness of a right-dislocated pronoun through stress and that intonationally it is integrated into the preceding clause is also an argument for it being sentential and subject to

syntax, as opposed to hanging topics. Though elements can exist outside the clausal boundary, like hanging topics, a right-dislocated pronoun has not been moved out of C, and so is still within the clausal boundary, but is above TP, which allows it to survive ellipsis. In Given Merchant's findings on the linguistic universality across languages in fragments, and specific examples in Norwegian and English in his paper, I assume this to also be the case for Norwegian (Merchant, 2004, pp. 665-667).

There are two clarifications that need to be made. The first being: how is this different from Hanging Topics, and the second being, if the right-dislocated pronoun can be base generated in the left periphery, then why not also in the right periphery, or even outside the clause on the right periphery. To the first, I believe the clue lies in a difference between Norwegian and English. I have written above about how the Hanging Topic construction sounds strange in Norwegian, and, crucially, that the version with an accusative pronoun as a Hanging Topic is the version, I find to be the least acceptable. This judgment is shared by friends who speak both Helgelandsk and Østlandsk. The only natural version with a pronoun in that first position in (109) is one where it is a separate question, asking for confirmation that you were the speaker in question. What does exist in Norwegian, is pronominal right-dislocation. Following from my analysis, assuming that Merchant is correct in the cross-linguistic nature of fragment answers, pronominal right-dislocation has to be derived in some other way than Hanging Topics. As for whether it could have been base generated on or outside the right periphery, I do not believe it likely. Having just given my reasoning for why I believe PRD constructions are different from Hanging Topics, I am arguing that PRD constructions are, at the very least, subject to syntax. Hanging Topics, with their more syntax independent nature would allow them to simply come into existence on the left side of a clause, and then also hypothetically on the right side of a clause / at the end of an utterance. However, if PRD constructions are subject to at least some level of syntax, one would assume that it would have to hold some position in the system, meaning visually we could place it in a syntactical tree. Merchant's fragment answers will end up, or are base generated in FP, while I posit, due to the pragmatics of a PRD construction, that it will be base generated in TopicP, and not FP, if we accept that despite its myriad of uses, it is most efficiently thought of as a topicalizing element.

4.4 Right-Dislocated Pronouns in the Left Periphery

The right-dislocated pronoun is base generated in topicP, and not in FP. Both Mycock and Borthen & Karagjosova agree that ProTags or right-dislocated pronouns are to some extent topicalizing in the way that they are used (Mycock, 2017), (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021)

Mycock and Borthen & Karagjosova arrive at similar, but not identical points relating to the pragmatics of right-dislocated pronouns. They both agree that it is topicalizing, but they are not always in agreement with the wider functions, and where they diverge somewhat is around the contrastiveness of the construction. Mycock found that the most frequent use of ProTags was stating a fact or an opinion, but other functions such as acknowledging a response or challenging someone was also found used (Mycock, 2017). Borthen & Karagjosova found right-dislocated pronouns to be used as a discourse topic marking function, bringing attention to something, and making it clear that the intention is to continue to talk about whatever was marked (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 8). It is also used in eventive breaks, marking a new turn in the discourse (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, pp. 9-10). When it comes to contrast, Borthen notes that a right-dislocation construction is “particularly natural” (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 10). Borthen & Karagjosova also provide a scale which shows how right-dislocation can be used and to what extent it is marked by differentiating between an unstressed dislocated pronoun and a stressed dislocated pronoun, and also a lexicalized NP, such as a name. Mycock notes how the only time a ProTag needs to carry stress, is in cases of contrast, which is not something Borthen & Karagjosova makes any point of. However, it follows from their scale that a stressed pronoun might be more likely to be interpreted as contrastive. They all agree however, that the pronoun itself is not inherently contrastive, and that contrast is easily achievable without a ProTag (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, pp. 14-15)(Mycock, 2017, p. 262). The ProTag does however make the sentence more marked than it would be without it, and the existence of the pronoun is what is posited to open the listener to a contrastive interpretation. Thinking along the lines of Grice’s maxims, because the speaker decided to include the pronoun, they must be intending something, for example, to provide contrast (Saeed, 2016). This goes back to the “Jack” example in 24), where the sentence is unnecessarily marked, causing confusion, because “Jack” is marking the construction, is in fact already the most optimal referent. In a sentence where PRD is used to establish a future topic or evoke a past one, a listener might react to the marked construction and realize that there is intention behind it. Based on the degree of markedness, the pragmatic functions mentioned by Borthen & Karagjosova all seem to be available in English, and vice versa. ProTags are especially good for contrast, but can also be used to soften an utterance, or even harden it, making it more confrontational. One can also use it to mark a future topic, or to retrieve something, for example a previous topic, or a contextually retrievable element (Borthen, 2018, p. 444-445). If one were to assign a superordinate function, one could call this a coherence aiding function. Whether introducing something new, inviting the discourse in a new direction, or to clarify a position or opinion, these are all possible pragmatic

functions of a ProTag construction. Mycock provides ample evidence for this in English, while Borthen & Karagjosova provide for it in Norwegian. My judgements on the examples provided by Borthen & Karagjosova lead me to believe that there are no unique discourse functions related to ProTags in Helgelandsk, that are not also found for Østlandsk. Given the linguistic and cultural crossover between Norway and Scotland, as well as the examples Mycock providing, I find no reason to assume that there are discourse functions unique to ProTag constructions in Scottish English either.

5. Conclusion

Right-dislocated pronouns are discourse markers that, despite their seeming superfluous nature, do provide something in discourse. Louise Mycock has written multiple articles on what she calls ProTags in English and write about how they tend to appear in the accusative case, and they must have a relatively easily understood antecedent. This antecedent need not be verbal, which is one of many similarities with Jason Merchant's fragment answers but is a lot better for it with a verbal antecedent. In English ProTags can fulfill multiple functions, such as providing a marker for a new topic, or a return to an older topic, or to aid the listener to a contrastive interpretation, among many others (Mycock, 2017). The pronoun itself does not carry a great amount of meaning or information, but its appearance leads the listener to better follow along in the discourse due to its (lightly) marked nature. Kaja Borthen have written multiple papers on the topic of right-dislocation in Norwegian, most recently with Elena Karagjosova. They provide, in their own words "a holistic analysis of the discourse properties and interpretational effects of pronominal right-dislocation in Norwegian" (Borthen & Karagjosova, 2021, p. 1). Their findings are differently worded, but their findings greatly reflect those of Mycock in English. These similarities hold for Helgelandsk, a northern dialect of Norwegian, as well as for Scottish English.

The pragmatics of right-dislocated pronouns have been accounted for in English and Norwegian. What has not been accounted for was the syntactic structure of these constructions. Likening them to Jason Merchant's fragments, I have tried following his analysis where fragment answers are derived in the same way wh-questions are through sluicing, although these are not identical processes. Wh-phrases move out of a TP into specCP to create a question, while Merchant argues that fragments move into some functional head in the c-system, which he calls FP (Merchant, 2004, p. 675). He notes how this FP might be identified as Luigi Rizzi's FocusP, a functional head carrying information about the focus of the sentence (Merchant,

2004, p. 675). Given that fragment answers are DPs argued to hold propositional content through an elided full syntactical structure, I argued that pronoun DPs could move the same way, only into Rizzi's TopicP, more specifically specTP, (not to be confused with TP/IP) leaving its original clause which has been elided. The problem with this analysis is that right-dislocated pronouns tend to appear in the accusative case, which it cannot receive from anywhere. However, Hanging Topics, as laid out by Elisabeth Stark, can appear in the left periphery and are syntactically independent, and they also take accusative case. Merchant allows that fragment answers might be base generated in FP, and based on these observations, I argued that right-dislocated pronouns are discourse markers that are base generated in a TopicP, which does not check for case. I have previously in this paper provided examples with Norwegian right-dislocated pronouns in both the accusative case, and in the nominative case, while in English they always appear in the accusative case. If TopicP does not check for this, that also allows for this difference in what is otherwise a more or less identical structure. They are not syntactically independent Hanging Topics, because Hanging Topics, as in (109), are not judged to be acceptable by me, or the Norwegian speakers I have asked about the acceptability of sentences like (109). They are still in the left periphery of a duplicate clause, which is then elided, leaving the right-dislocated pronoun as the sole remnant. Both Rizzi's map of the c-system, as well as Merchant's findings in his analysis are argued to be cross lingual, subject to a principle and parameter system. This suggest that this analysis could hold for both the Norwegian and the English version.

Given the uncertain nature of the syntactic analysis, especially the case question, should tell us that there might be more to the English case system than we are currently aware of. A different conclusion could be reached if, for example, a way for right-dislocated pronouns to receive case was discovered. Or, if one could definitively prove that right-dislocated pronouns are syntactically independent and are not subject to the syntax in the way presented in this thesis. More research on the nature and workings of pronominal right-dislocation is therefore invited, particularly on the syntax.

Bibliography

- Borthen, K. (2018). Pronominal høyredislokering i norsk, det er et interessant fenomen, det. *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift Vol. 36*, 403-450.

- Borthen, K., & Karagjosova, E. (2021). Pronominal right-dislocation in Norwegian. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics Vol. 6 (1): 85, 1-25.*
- Carnie, A. (2013). *Syntax: A Generative Introduction, Third Edition.* John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Eliassen, H. Ø., & Yildiz, M. (2021, 03 18). *Er dette en språkfeil som er kommet for å bli?*
Hentet fra NRK: <https://www.nrk.no/kultur/folk-bruker-subjekts--og-objektsform-om-hverandre-1.15419948>
- Haegeman, L., & Gueron, J. (1999). *English Grammar: A Generative Perspective.* Blackwell Publishing.
- Levinson, S. C. (1991, 03). Pragmatic Reduction of the Binding Conditions Revisited. *Journal of Linguistics, Vol. 27, No 1, pp. 107-161.*
- Merchant, J. (2004, December). Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy, Vol 27. No. 6, pp. 661-738.*
- Mycock, L. (2017). Right-dislocated pronouns in British English: the form and functions of ProTag constructions. *English Language and Linguistics, 253-275.*
- Mycock, L., & Chi, L. P. (2021). Funny that isn't it ProTags in combination at the right periphery. *Journal of Pragmatics, 92-103.*
- Reinhart, T. (1981). Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica, ss. 53-93.*
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman, *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax* (pp. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7). Springer Science + Business Media, B. V.
- Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax.* Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Saeed, J. I. (2016). *Semantics: Fourth Edition.* Wiley Blackwell.
- Stark, E. (2022, 07 18). *Hanging Topics and Frames in the Romance Languages: Syntax, Discourse, Diachrony.* Retrieved from Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics: [https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-652.](https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-652)
- Winkler, S. (2005). *Ellipsis and Focus in Generative Grammar.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Ziv, Y. (1994). Left and right dislocations: Discourse functions and anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics* Vol. 22, 629-645.

Appendix

Appendix A

The Thesis' Relevance for Teaching Practice

This thesis is a pragmatic/syntactic work and is not rooted in pedagogy or didactics. Nevertheless, I believe it to be a great boon to my teaching competence, and that it will prove valuable to me as an English teacher. When learning a language in a school setting, you rarely start off with grammar. Instead, you start to learn simple words and common phrases in your target language. However, as you progress, it is natural to start to figure out “the system” of a language. Teaching grammar is the way we teach this system, and sometimes this can be quite frustrating. We try to lay out rules and explanations for why our target language works the way it does, but as you become increasingly proficient, you notice more and more apparent contradictions and exceptions to the rules. Many students are able to simply accept an answer like “it is just the way it is”, but for some this is not good enough. They want to understand why these things can happen, and how they can predict it. It is then crucial for a teacher to be able to explain beyond a simple “it is what it is”, to show the student that there oftentimes are explanations, and sometimes, we don't know, but people are trying to figure it out. It is frustrating to encounter a wall, and instead of stopping there, we should encourage students to climb that wall, and to foster an interest in learning. I have not been fond of mathematics since the 7th grade, but a teacher I had at high school managed to spark an interest in me. We were taught, when dividing fractions, you switch up the numerator and the denominator in one of the fractions, and then you multiply instead. Our math teacher, when asked why, decided to take the time to properly show us the mathematical reasoning behind this process and it was almost enchanting. It felt amazing to understand that it was not something random that worked, but that there was thought and reasoning behind it. I aspire to be able to provide one of my future students with such an experience when it comes to English grammar. I have learned things about English and languages that none of my students will ever need to know, but I want to be ready for the student that tells me they want to know. Given that my thesis is also a comparative one between my own dialect and Scottish English, I think that it will be a strength of mine as a teacher to be able to compare English to Norwegian. Comparisons are an excellent tool when teaching or learning grammar, as it compares something the students know (consciously or subconsciously) with something new and exciting. It is an example as to how you can use yourself and what you know to understand more. Lastly, I believe that having worked with a

text such as this for a longer time has made me into a better writer, and that is also something I will bring with me into the classroom, for when my students will be writing texts of their own.



 **NTNU**

Norwegian University of
Science and Technology