

Introduction: Right-dislocation (RD) in Japanese (an SOV language) such as (1), where the right-dislocated argument *sono yubiwa-o* 'that ring-Acc' appears postverbally, has been extensively discussed in the generative literature (Kuno 1978, Tanaka 2001, Abe 2017, *inter alia*). Though details differ from theory to theory, those analyses all agree that RD involves syntactic movement:

- (1) Tentyoo-ga [John-ga kayku-ni *e* watasi wasureta to] omoteiru yo, **sono yubiwa-o**
 manger-Nom John-Nom guest-Dat give forgot C think Prt **that-ring-Acc**
 'The manger thinks that John forgot to give that ring to the guest.'

This paper deals with multiple RD, which has never been studied in detail. In multiple RD (2), *kyaku-ni* 'guest-Dat' and *sono yubiwa-o* 'that ring-Acc' are right-dislocated. We argue that multiple RD is derived not by syntactic movement but by movement on the PF-side (*prosodic* RD). Our analysis is supported by the fact that unlike RD, multiple RD neither obeys syntactic constraints nor has LF interpretive effects:

- (2) Tentyoo-ga [John-ga *e e* watasi wasureta to] omoteiru yo, **kayku-ni sono-yubiwa-o**
 manger-Nom John-Nom give forgot C think Prt **guest-Dat that-ring-Acc**
 'The manger thinks that John forgot to give that ring to the guest.'

Against a Syntactic Movement Analysis of Multiple RD: We present evidence to show that multiple RD is not derived by syntactic movement, thereby being blind to syntactic constraints and lacking LF interpretive effects. First, RD obeys syntactic island constraints (3a, 4a), but multiple RD does not (3b, 4b):

- (3)a.*?Tentyoo-ga [**ComplexNP** [John-ga kyaku-ni *e* watasiwasureta] nitizi]-o oboeteita yo, **sono-yubiwa-o**
 manger-Nom John-Nom guest-Dat give.forgot date-Acc remember Prt **that-ring-Acc**
 b. Tentyoo-ga [**ComplexNP** [John-ga *e e* watasiwasureta] nitizi]-o oboeteita yo,
 manger-Nom John-Nom give.forgot date-Acc remember Prt
kyaku-ni sono-yubiwa-o
guest-Dat that-ring-Acc

'The manger remember the date when John forgot to give that ring to the guest.'

- (4)a.*?Tentyoo-ga [**Adjunct** John-ga kyaku-ni *e* watasi wasureta kara] okotteiru yo, **sono-yubiwa-o**
 manger-Nom John-Nom guest-Dat gave forgot because be.angry Prt **that-ring-Acc**
 b. Tentyoo-ga [**Adjunct** John-ga *e e* watasi wasureta kara] okotteiru yo, **kyaku-ni sono-yubiwa-o**
 manger-Nom John-Nom gave forgot because be.angry Prt **guest-Dat that-ring-Acc**
 'The manger is angry because John forgot to give that ring to the guest.'

Second, RD of a 'true adjunct' (5a) and RD of a nominative phrase (6a) are deviant, but when an adjunct/nominative phrase undergoes multiple RD with another XP, the result is acceptable (5b, 6b). If the movement in multiple RD were syntactic, it is hard to explain why moving an adjunct/nominative phrase together with XP is acceptable (5b, 6b) while simply moving the adjunct/nominative phrase is not (5a, 6a):

- (5) a.*?John-ga [Mary-ga *e* sono riron-o sinziteiru to] omotteiru yo, **riyuu-mo-naku**
 John-Nom Mary-Nom that theory-Acc believe C think Prt **reason-even-without**
 b. John-ga [Mary-ga *e e* sinziteiru to] omotteiru yo, **riyuu-mo-naku sono riron-o**
 John-Nom Mary-Nom believe C think Prt **reason-even-without that theory-Acc**
 'John thinks that Mary believes in that theory without any reason.'

- (6) a.*?John-ga [*e* Tookyoo-ni tuita to] omotteiru yo, **sono ressyga-ga**
 John-Nom Tokyo-in arrive C think Prt **that train-Nom**
 b. John-ga [*e e* tuita to] omotteiru yo, **sono ressyga-ga Tookyoo-ni**
 John-Nom arrive C think Prt **that train-Nom Tokyo-in**
 'John thinks that that train has arrived in Tokyo.'

Third, RD of a *wh*-phrase is deviant (7a), but when a *wh*-phrase undergoes multiple RD with another *wh*-phrase, the result is acceptable (7b). Whatever LF interpretative constraint we adopt to rule out RD of a *wh*-phrase (7a), the acceptability of (7b) shows that multiple-right-dislocated phrases are interpreted *in-situ* at LF. This cannot be explained by a syntactic movement analysis of multiple RD:

- (7) a.*John-wa [Mary-ga Bill-ni *e* naisyode ageta ka] siritagatteiru yo, **nani-o**
 John-Top Mary-Nom Bill-Dat secretly gave Q want-to-know Prt **what-Acc**
 'John wants to know what Mary gave to Bill.'
 b. John-wa [Mary-ga *e e* naisyode ageta ka] siritagatteiru yo, **dare-ni nani-o**
 John-Top Mary-Nom secretly gave Q want-to-know Prt **who-Dat what-Acc**
 Lit. 'John wants to know to whom what Mary gave.'

Fourth, RD has an effect on quantifier scope while multiple RD does not. (8) is unambiguous; it has only the interpretation where the subject QP *mittu-no ginkoo-ga* 'three banks' has scope over the object QP *Toyota-dake-ni* 'only Toyota'. When the object QP undergoes RD (9a), the result becomes ambiguous due to a syntactic movement of the object QP; it has either *subject QP > object QP* or *object QP > subject QP*.

When the object QP undergoes multiple RD together with another XP (9b), however, this ambiguity disappears. (9b) has only *subject QP* > *object QP*; the object QP is interpreted *in-situ* at LF:

(8) Mittu-no ginkoo-ga Toyota-dake-ni monku-o itta (Unambiguous)
 three-Gen bank-Nom Toyota-only-Dat complaint-Acc said
 'Three banks complained only to Toyota.'

(9) a. Mittu-no ginkoo-ga *e* monku-o itta yo, **Toyota-dake-ni** (Ambiguous)
 three-Gen bank-Nom complaint-Acc said Prt **Toyota-only-Dat**
 b. Mittu-no ginkoo-ga *e e* itta yo, **Toyota-dake-ni monku-o** (Unambiguous)
 three-Gen bank-Nom said Prt **Toyota-only-Dat complaint-Acc**

Finally, there is an argument/adjunct asymmetry with reconstruction effects with Binding Condition C with RD (10), but the asymmetry disappears with multiple RD (11). The contrast in (10) can be explained by the late merge approach to adjuncts (Lebeaux 1988). In (10a), *John*, an argument, is merged with *hihan* 'criticism' when the latter first appears. The copy of *John* is visible in this position, which results in a Condition C violation. In (10b), *John* is within the adjunct modifying *hihan* 'criticism'; it may be late-merged after RD has taken place; there is no Condition C violation. In the case of multiple RD, however, the argument/adjunct asymmetry disappears. Especially, *John* and *kare* 'he' cannot be coreferential even when *John* is within an adjunct (11b); the multiple-right-dislocated phrases are interpreted *in-situ* at LF:

(10)a. *?Kare₁-ga [Mary-ga *e* osietekurata to] itta yo, [**minna-no John₁-no hihan-o**]
 he-Nom Mary-Nom told.him C said Prt **everyone-Gen John-Gen criticism-Acc**
 'He₁ said that Mary told him about everyone's criticism of John₁.'

b. Kare₁-ga [Hanako-ga *e* osiete kurata to] itta yo, [**minna-no John₁-kara kakusietita hihan-o**]
 he-Nom Mary-Nom told.him C said Prt **everyone-Gen John-from was.hiding criticism-Acc**
 'He₁ said that Mary told him about the criticism everyone was hiding from John₁.'

(11)a. *?Kare₁-ga [Mary-ga *e e* barasitato] itta yo, [**ooku-no tomodati-ni**] [**minna-no John₁-no hihan-o**]
 he-Nom Mary-Nom disclosedC said Prt **many friend-Dat everyone-Gen John-Gen criticism-Acc**
 'He₁ said that Mary disclosed everyone's criticism of John₁ to many friends.'

b. *?Kare₁-ga [Mary-ga *e e* barasita to] itta yo, [**ookuno tomodati-ni**]
 he-Nom Mary-Nom disclosedC said Prt **many friend-Dat**
 [**minna-no John₁-kara kakusietita hihan-o**]
everyone-Gen John-from was.hiding criticism-Acc

'He₁ said that Mary disclosed the criticism everyone was hiding from John₁ to many friends.'

A Proposal: It has been claimed that RD changes Information Structure. Kuno (1978) points out the contrast between (12B) and (12B'), arguing that the target of RD cannot be new information. While (12B) is acceptable as an answer to (12A), its RD version (12B') is not, since *in 1968* in (12) is new information:

(12) A: 1968-nen-ni umaremasita ka?

1968-year-in were.born Q 'Were you born in 1968?'

B: Hai, 1968-nen-ni umaremasita. B':*Hai, *e* umaremasita yo, **1968-nen-ni**.

yes 1968-year-in were.born yes were.born Prt **1968-year-in** 'Yes, I was born in 1968.'

We argue that the effects induced by Information Structure in (multiple) RD are not limited to syntax or phonology, but to both; material for (multiple) RD is targeted/marked within syntax, and is moved either in syntax or phonology. We then propose the following: (i) if target material can undergo RD syntactically, it does; (ii) if target material is not a *single syntactic XP eligible for RD*, then that material is packed into a *prosodic constituent* and undergoes *prosodic RD* to the right edge of an intonation phrase ι at PF. This naturally follows if syntax derivationally precedes phonology, and RD is subject to the derivational principle of Earliness (Pesetsky 1989). We argue that the target prosodic constituent is a major phrase, consisting of recursive phonological phrases Φ 's (Itô and Mester's 2007). Multiple RD (2) is analyzed as in (13). In (13), suppose that NP-Dat and NP-Acc are targeted/marked for RD within syntax. Since they do not form a single syntactic XP eligible for RD, they cannot undergo RD syntactically. Then, the two Φ 's are packed into a single Φ in terms of recursive Φ -formation, which undergoes *prosodic RD*. Since multiple RD is derived by *prosodic RD*, it is blind to syntactic constraints and lacks LF interpretive effects:

(13) a. ... X ... NP-Dat (*guest-Dat*) NP-Acc (*ring-Acc*) ... Y ... (Syntax)
 b. (ι ... X ... (Φ (Φ ) (Φ )) ... Y ...) ι (Phonology)

Our analysis also correctly predicts that there is a pause before the multiply-right-dislocated phrases because of an ι -boundary, though multiple RD has a mono-clausal structure. Note that although NP-Dat and NP-Acc form VP under the Larsonian analysis of double object, RD can only apply to a non-predicative (saturated) XP; VP, being predicative, is not eligible for RD. In RD (1), on the other hand, *sono yubiwa-o* 'that ring-Acc', which is a single syntactic XP eligible for RD, is targeted for RD within syntax; it undergoes RD syntactically, thereby obeying syntactic constraints and having LF interpretive effects.