

Introduction: Right-dislocation (RD) in Japanese such as (1), where the right-dislocated phrase *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 *e* yubiwa-o watasi wasureta to] omoteiru yo, **sono kayku-ni**
 manger-Nom John-Nom ring-Acc give forgot C think Prt **that guest-Dat**
 '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* 'the ring-Acc' are right-dislocated. We argue that multiple RD is derived not by syntactic movement but by movement on the PF-side. Our analysis is supported by the fact that multiple RD neither obeys syntactic constraints nor has LF effects:

- (2) Tentyoo-ga [John-ga *e e* watasi wasureta to] omoteiru yo, **sono kayku-ni yubiwa-o**
 manger-Nom John-Nom give forgot C think Prt **that guest-Dat 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, being blind to syntactic constraints and lacking LF effects. First, RD obeys syntactic island constraints (3a, 4a), but multiple RD does not (3b, 4b):

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

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

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

Second, RD of a 'true adjunct' (ADJ) (5a) and RD of a nominative (NOM) phrase (6a) are deviant, but when an ADJ/NOM 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 ADJ/NOM + XP is acceptable (5b, 6b) while simply moving ADJ/NOM 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 ressyaga**
 John-Nom Tokyo-in arrive C think Prt **that train-Nom**
 b. John-ga [*e e* tuita to] omotteiru yo, **sono ressyaga 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), (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 (the subject QP > the object QP). When the object QP undergoes RD (9a), the result becomes ambiguous. When the object QP undergoes multiple RD together with another XP (9b), however, this ambiguity disappears (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 it disappears with multiple RD (11). In (11b), *kare* 'he' within the adjunct and *John* cannot be coreferential; the multiple RDed 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 [Mary-ga *e* osiete kurata to] itta yo, [**minna-no John₁-kara kakusieita 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* barasita to] itta yo, [**tomodati-ni**] [**minna-no John₁-no hihan-o**]
 he-Nom Mary-Nom disclosed C said Prt friend-Dat everyone-Gen John-Gen criticism-Acc
 'He₁ said that Mary disclosed everyone's criticism of John₁ to friends.'
 b.*?Kare₁-ga [Mary-ga *e e* barasita to] itta yo, [**ookuno tomodati-ni**]
 he-Nom Mary-Nom disclosed C said Prt **many friend-Dat**
 [**minna-no John₁-kara kakusieita hihan-o**]
everyone-Gen John-from was.hiding criticism-Acc

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

A Proposal: Kuno (1978) argues that RD changes Information Structure; the target of RD cannot be new information. This is supported by the fact that while (12B) is acceptable as an answer to (12A), its RD version (12B') is not. This is because *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 ...)_u (Phonology)

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 XP; VP, being predicative, is not eligible for RD. In RD (1), *sono kyakuni-ni* 'that guest-Dat', a single syntactic XP eligible for RD, is targeted for RD within syntax; it undergoes RD syntactically, obeying syntactic constraints and having LF effects.