

*Right Dislocation in Cantonese as a focus-marking device**

ANN LAW

Abstract

This paper considers some aspects of Right Dislocation in Cantonese and argues that, despite its name, it is different from Right Dislocation in Romance and Germanic languages, with respect to its linguistic properties, function and structure. Right Dislocation in Cantonese is a device to mark identificational focus. Adopting Cheung's (1997) leftward-movement analysis, I argue that the focused constituent is moved to the Focus field (Rizzi 1997) rather than adjoined to some projection. This analysis captures the facts about the phenomenon better.

1 Introduction

Unlike languages such as Hungarian, Cantonese is not known to have any syntactic position designated for expressing identificational (or contrastive) focus.¹ (Cf. Xu 2002, in press, on Mandarin) Nevertheless, Cantonese does make use of a syntactic process resulting in identificational focus marking. I shall argue below that Right Dislocation (RD) is one such process.

In Germanic and Romance languages, e.g. Italian (Cecchetto 1999, Cardinaletti 2002), Dutch (Zwart 2001, 2002), English (Ross 1967, Kayne 1994), and French (De Cat 2002), the term Right Dislocation is generally used to refer to constructions like the following:

- (1) They spoke to the janitor about that robbery yesterday, the cops (Ross 1967)

* I wish to thank Neil Smith for encouragement and commenting on the previous drafts; Hans van de Koot for advice; and Dirk Bury, Keith Chau and Romina Vegro for data and judgements. All errors are mine.

¹ I distinguish information focus from identificational (often contrastive) focus in the spirit of É. Kiss (1998).

- (2) ... dat ik hem niet ken, die jonger (Zwart 2001)
 that I him not know that guy
 'I don't know him, that guy.'
- (3) Io lo odio, Gianni (Cecchetto 1999)
 I him hate Gianni
 'I hate him, Gianni.'
- (4) Ils poussent bien, mes pois de senteur (De Cat 2002)
 they grow well my sweet peas
 'My sweet peas are growing well.'

The Right-dislocated phrase is typically associated with a resumptive pronoun or clitic in the main clause. An intonational break is obligatorily required before the Right-dislocated phrase which often has a low and level pitch intonation. With respect to meaning, the Right-dislocated phrase is said to be either topic (e.g. Cardinaletti 2002, De Cat 2002) or background (e.g. Zwart 2001).

Various accounts have been proposed for Right Dislocation in these languages: e.g. rightward movement of the dislocated phrase; double topicalisation, which involves leftward movement of the dislocated phrase followed by leftward remnant movement; and base-generated adjunction of the dislocated phrase, followed by remnant movement, etc., and its apparent counterpart Left Dislocation has been shown not to be treated as its mirror image (see, e.g. Cecchetto 1999). A comprehensive survey of all accounts of Right Dislocation in these languages is beyond the scope of the present work. Right Dislocation is said to be attested in Cantonese as well, but I shall argue in section 2 that so-called Right Dislocation in Cantonese is in fact a phenomenon different from that in Germanic and Romance languages, with respect both to its function and derivation. It is probably more aptly compared with leftward fronting of focused constituents in other languages, such as focalisation in Italian (cf. Rizzi 1997). In section 3, I outline my proposal for Cantonese Right Dislocation. Sections 4 - 6 discuss some properties of RD in Cantonese. In section 7, I claim from the evidence of focus-sensitive operators and questions that RD is a focus-marking device. Section 8 concerns the issue of ordering of fronted phrases with respect to other elements such as sentential adverbs and topics, and Section 9 gives some speculation on the status of sentence-final particles. Section 10 concludes the paper.

2 ‘Right Dislocation’ in Cantonese is different from Right Dislocation in Romance and Germanic languages

So-called Right Dislocation in Cantonese is a widespread phenomenon in the language and typically refers to the structure illustrated below.

- (5) a. zukkau lo1 Billy zinghai zungji tai _
 football SFP² Billy only like watch
 ‘It is obvious that Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).’
- b. zukkau zaa3 Billy zungji tai _
 football SFP Billy like watch
 ‘Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).’

In these structures, one or more constituents are superficially dislocated to the right (hence the name) of the sentence-final particle (SFP) (*lo1* and *zaa3* in these cases), which otherwise always ends up in the final position of a sentence. However, one difference between Cantonese RD and Right Dislocation in Romance and Germanic languages, as exemplified in (1) – (4), is that the right-dislocated string in the former is very often a non-constituent. In (5a), the superficially right-dislocated string *Billy zinghai zungji tai* (‘Billy only likes to watch’) is not a constituent. On the other hand, in English, for example, it is impossible to dislocate a non-constituent to the right.

- (6) *They did to the janitor about that robbery yesterday, the cops speak?

In Cantonese RD, however, what is always a constituent is actually the string on the left-hand side of the sentence-final particle, e.g. *zukkau* (‘football’) in (5a). (7) is bad when it is not.

- (7) *Billy zinghai zungji tai lo1 zukkau
 Billy only like watch SFP football

² The following abbreviations are used in this paper: ASP = aspect marker; CL = classifier; EXP = experiential marker; GE = genitive marker; LE = Mandarin verbal particle *le*; PRT = post-verbal particle; SFP = sentence-final particle; TOP = topic marker. The number following a sentence-final particle indicates its tone: Tone 1 = high level; Tone 2 = high rising; Tone 3 = mid level; Tone 4 = low falling; Tone 5 = low rising; Tone 6 = low level.

In Germanic and Romance languages, the Right-dislocated phrase is typically associated with a co-referential resumptive pronoun. In Cantonese, however, this is not obligatory. In fact, as shown in the survey in Cheung (1997), RDs with a gap are much more prevalent in the language than gapless RDs.³

Interestingly, Cantonese RD resembles focus movement in these languages, by which a focused element is preposed to the left periphery, more than their Right Dislocation structures. For example, in Italian, *il tuo libro* ('your book') can be preposed to receive a contrastive focus interpretation.

- (8) IL TUO LIBRO ho letto (, non il suo) (from Rizzi 1997)
 your book I read not his
 'Your book I read (not his).'

Here, a clitic is not required. The presence of the clitic, on the other hand, results in topicalisation rather than focalisation.

- (9) Il tuo libro, lo ho letto
 your book it I read
 'Your book, I have read it.'

Apart from the absence of clitics or resumptive pronouns, Cantonese RD is reminiscent of Italian focus movement to the left periphery in the sense that the string on the left of the sentence-final particle is obligatorily interpreted as the focus. This will be further elaborated in a later section. The Right-Dislocated phrase in Romance and Germanic languages, on the other hand, is generally thought to be background or topic, as mentioned earlier, and this construction has not been analysed as having a focusing effect. So there is reason to believe that RD in Cantonese is not quite the same phenomenon as RD in Germanic and Romance languages. Analysing Cantonese RD along those lines may miss its true properties. However, I shall continue to use the term 'Right Dislocation' to refer to structures like (5) for the sake of convention.

³ In his (1997) survey, Cheung classifies three types of RDs: *Pronominal RD (PN RD)* which contains a resumptive pronoun, *Repeated Copy RD (RC RD)* which contains two identical copies of a string (not necessarily NPs) on either side of the sentence-final particle, and *Gap RD (GP RD)* which contains a gap corresponding to the dislocated string. He has found that in the corpus, *Gap RD (GP RD)* outnumbers the other two types with an overwhelming majority, 91.6% of all cases.

3 Proposal

Cheung's (1997) thesis on Cantonese Right Dislocation, to the best of my knowledge, provides the most in-depth analysis of this construction in the language. Despite the name, he convincingly argues that the syntactic operation responsible for the phenomenon is actually leftward movement of a constituent preceding the sentence-final particle (together with the sentence-final particle), rather than rightward movement of the apparent right-dislocated phrase. He proposes a Generalised Dislocation Adjunction (GDA) Rule, which is an instance of Move- α that adjoins a YP (a phrasal constituent immediately preceding the SFP) to any XP (IP, VP or a fragment) so that the moved YP can bind the trace at the base position. Hence, for instance, in (5a), repeated below, the constituent *zukkau* ('football') is adjoined to IP (together with the SFP *lo1*).

- (5a) [IP [NP *zukkau lo1*] [IP Billy *zinghai zungji tai _*]]
 footballSFP Billy only like watch
 'It is obvious that Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).'

I agree with Cheung's (1997) argumentation for leftward movement as the superficially right-dislocated string stranded on the right is often not a constituent. I shall maintain the spirit of his proposal, but propose that the moved constituent is uniformly moved to the FocusP of the split-CP system in the sense of Rizzi (1997), rather than adjoined to a choice of maximal projections. The motivation for moving the constituent to the FocusP is that the leftward fronted constituent is obligatorily interpreted as the focus and this should better capture the interpretive effect of Right Dislocation. I suggest that the fronted constituent undergoes movement to [Spec,FocusP]. The Left Periphery of Cantonese contains the following projections:

- (10) Force Top₁ **Foc** Top₂ ...

(5a) now has the structure in (11).

- (11) [ForceP [TopP [FocP *zukkau lo1*] [TopP [IP Billy *zinghai zungji tai _*]]]]
 footballSFP Billy only like watch
 'It is obvious that Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).'

In fact, Cheung (1997) also observes that there is such a focusing ability of Right Dislocation, and 'focus' to him is not to be confused with 'newness', with which I agree. He states that 'dislocation specifies the α -string [the string preceding the

sentence-final particle] as the domain for focus' and 'whenever there is a focus in the dislocated sentence, it must fall in the α -string and focus in the β -string [the string following the sentence-final particle] is denied'. (98) While the observation is largely correct, I would like to push it further to state that Right Dislocation in Cantonese is actually one of the focusing devices to mark identificational focus. The fronted phrase preceding the SFP must be interpreted as the focus.

4 Island constraints and reconstruction

This section provides supplementary evidence for leftward movement of the fronted phrase, as observed by Cheung (1997).

4.1 Island constraints

Although Cheung (1997) argues that movement of the fronted phrase should be sensitive to island constraints, due to his postulation of the D(islocation)-Adjacency Constraint (to be refuted in Section 5), he only gives examples showing that the fronted constituent cannot be extracted out of a conjunct. I provide more examples below showing that it is indeed impossible to extract phrases out of a strong island (complex NP, adjunct island and subject island).

[Complex NP]

- (12) *cin lo1 Billy mou zeonsau keoi jiu zeonsi waan _ ge singnok
 money SFP Billy not obey s/he muston-time return GE promise
 'Billy broke the promise that he would return the money on time.'

[Adjunct island]

- (13) *hokfai lo1 keoi zou loeng fan gung janwai jiu bong sailou gaau _
 fee SFP s/he do two CL work because have-to helpbrother pay
 'S/he has two jobs because s/he has to pay the tuition fees for his/her brother.'

[Subject island]

- (14) *jisang laa3 keoi waa m soeng zou _ zanhaigiksei keoi aamaa
 doctor SFP s/he say not want do really irritate her/his mother
 'That s/he says s/he doesn't want to be a doctor really irritates his/her mother.'

4.2 Reconstruction

Cheung (1997) briefly notes that Right Dislocation displays reconstruction effects. Below is a survey of RD structures involving binding and scope interactions, all of which substantiate the claim for reconstruction in Right Dislocation.

4.2.1 Anaphoric binding. RD structures that involve dislocated anaphors are grammatical and have identical dependencies as in their counterparts in the canonical word order, though apparently the anaphor has moved to a position where its antecedent cannot c-command it. This is shown in the following examples.

- (15) a. Billy_i hou gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3
 Billy very care-about self CL student SFP
 ‘Billy_i cares about his_i students.’
- b. hou gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 Billy_i
 very care-about self CL student SFP Billy_i
 ‘Billy_i cares about his_i students.’
- c. zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 Billy_i hou gwaansam
 self CL student SFP Billy very care-about
 ‘Billy_i cares about his_i students.’
- (16) a. Mary_i waa Jenny_j hou zungji zigei_{i/j} aa3
 Mary say Jenny very like self SFP
 ‘Mary_i said Jenny_j liked herself_{i/j}.’
- b. zigei_{i/j} aa3 Mary_i waa Jenny_j hou zungji
 self SFP Mary say Jenny very like
 ‘Mary_i said Jenny_j liked herself_{i/j}.’
- c. hou zungji zigei_{i/j} aa3 Mary_i waa Jenny_j
 very like self SFP Mary say Jenny
 ‘Mary_i said Jenny_j liked herself_{i/j}.’

In all the examples above, Right Dislocation makes no difference to binding dependencies: the dislocated structure has the same interpretation as the one in normal order. As *zigei* (‘self’) is a long-distance anaphor or logophor (see Cole, Hermon and Huang 2001 for a survey), one might argue that it can be made co-

referent to the antecedent by some other means. However, if we examine the local polymorphemic anaphor *keoizigei* ('him/herself'), which cannot be bound by an antecedent outside the clause which contains it, the dependency is also preserved, as evidenced by the following examples.

- (17) a. $Mary_i$ waa $Jenny_j$ hou zungji $keoizigei_{*i/j}$ aa3
 Mary say Jenny very like him/herself SFP
 'Mary_i said Jenny_j liked herself_{*i/j}.'
- b. hou zungji $keoizigei_{*i/j}$ aa3 $Mary_i$ waa $Jenny_j$
 very like him/herself SFP Mary say Jenny
 'Mary_i said Jenny_j liked herself_{*i/j}.'
- c. $keoizigei_{*i/j}$ aa3 $Mary_i$ waa $Jenny_j$ hou zungji
 him/herself SFP Mary say Jenny very like
 'Mary_i said Jenny_j liked herself_{*i/j}.'

One should take note that this does not hold true for topicalisation. When the anaphor occurs as the topic, it cannot be bound by any NP in the IP clause. Below is a minimal pair of (17c).

- (18) * $keoizigei$ le1 Mary waa Jenny hou zungji
 him/herself TOP Mary say Jenny very like

4.2.2 Bound pronoun binding. Generally, Right Dislocation does not affect the grammaticality or dependencies of sentences with bound pronoun binding. The bound pronoun can be realised as the pronoun *keoi* ('s/he'), the long-distance reflexive *zigei* ('self') or the local anaphor *keoizigei* ('him/herself'). In cases of bound pronoun binding, the three entities do not display any difference in locality restrictions. There is, however, some interpretation difference among the three. The use of *keoi* is best translated as 'his', while the meaning of *zigei* and *keoizigei* is closer to 'his own'. All possibilities of the three are presented below, in addition to sentences containing *zinghai* ('only'). It is found that all RD sentences are grammatical and the bound pronoun in the dislocated constituent can be bound by the quantified noun phrase, except where only the bound pronominal phrase is fronted (19d and 22e) which are relatively deviant. No explanation can be provided for this decreased acceptability for the time being.

[Pronoun *keoi*]

- (19) a. *muigo sinsaang_i dou hou gwaansam keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3*
 every teacher all very care-about his CL student SFP
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i students.’
- b. *dou hou gwaansam keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i*
 all very care-about his CL student SFP every teacher
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i students.’
- c. *hou gwaansam keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou*
 very care-about his CL student SFP every teacher all
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i students.’
- d. *??keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou hou gwaansam*
 his CL student SFP every teacher all very care-about
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i students.’

[Long-distance reflexive *zigei*]

- (20) a. *muigo sinsaang_i dou gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3*
 every teacher all care-about self CL student SFP
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.’
- b. *dou gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i*
 all care-about self CL student SFP every teacher
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.’
- c. *gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou*
 care-about self CL student SFP every teacher all
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.’
- d. *zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou gwaansam*
 self CL student SFP every teacher all care-about
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.’

[Polymorphemic reflexive *keoizigei*]

- (21) a. *muigo sinsaang_i dou gwaansam keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3*
 every teacher all care-about him/herself CL student SFP
 ‘Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.’

- b. dou gwaansam keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i
all care-about him/herself CL student SFP every teacher
'Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.'
- c. gwaansam keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou
care-about him/herself CL student SFP every teacher all
'Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.'
- d. keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou gwaansam
him/herself CL student SFP every teacher all care-about
'Every teacher_i cares about his_i own students.'

[Pronoun *keoi* with *zinghai* 'only']

- (22) a. muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai gwaansam keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3
every teacher all only care-about his CL student SFP
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i students.'
- b. ?dou zinghai gwaansam keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i
all only care-about his CL student SFP every teacher
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i students.'
- c. zinghai gwaansam keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou
only care-about his CL student SFP every teacher all
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i students.'
- d. ?gwaansam keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai
care-about his CL student SFP every teacher all only
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i students.'
- e. ??keoi_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai gwaansam
his CL student SFP every teacher all only care-about
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i students.'

[Long-distance reflexive *zigei* with *zinghai* 'only']

- (23) a. muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3
every teacher all only care-about self CL student SFP
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'

- b. dou zinghai gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i
all only care-about self CL student SFP every teacher
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'
- c. zinghai gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou
only care-about self CL student SFP every teacher all
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'
- d. gwaansam zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai
care-about self CL student SFP every teacher all only
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'
- e. zigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai gwaansam
self CL student SFP every teacher all only care-about
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'

[Polymorphemic reflexive *keoizigei* with *zinghai* 'only']

- (24) a. muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai gwaansam keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3
every teacher all only care-about him/herself CL student SFP
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'
- b. dou zinghai gwaansam keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i
all only care-about him/herself CL student SFP every teacher
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'
- c. zinghai gwaansam keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou
only care-about him/herself CL student SFP every teacher all
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'
- d. gwaansam keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai
care-about him/herself CL student SFP every teacher all only
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'
- e. keoizigei_i di hoksaang gaa3 muigo sinsaang_i dou zinghai gwaansam
him/herself CL student SFP every teacher all only care-about
'Every teacher_i cares only about his_i own students.'

4.2.3 Scope interaction. Cheung (1997) briefly discusses scopal dependency in RD structures. His examples (given below) seem to suggest that there is scope reconstruction (though he does not explicitly make this claim).

- (25) a. fung singkeijat jau gei go pangjau lei taam Wong taai gaa3 (=80a)
 every Sunday have few CL friend come visit Wong Mrs. SFP
 ‘Every Sunday, some friends come to visit Mrs. Wong.’
 [every > some : unambiguous]
- b. jau gei go pangjau fung singkeijat lei taam Wong taai gaa3(=80b)
 have few CL friend every Sunday come visit Wong Mrs. SFP
 ‘Several friends come to visit Mrs. Wong every Sunday.’
 [some > every : unambiguous]

RD structures apparently preserve the scopal dependency in the canonical order and no ambiguity arises. As noted in Cheung, the correspondence of linear and scopal ordering of quantifiers cannot explain the scopal dependencies in RD structures. This is shown in the following RD counterparts of (25).

- (26) a. jau gei go pangjau lei taam Wong taai gaa3 fung singkeijat(=81a)
 have few CLfriend come visit Wong Mrs. SFP every Sunday
 ‘Every Sunday, some friends come to visit Mrs. Wong.’
 [every > some : unambiguous]
- b. fung singkeijat lei taam Wong taai gaa3 jau gei go pangjau (=81b)
 every Sunday come visit Wong Mrs. SFP have few CL friend
 ‘Several friends come to visit Mrs. Wong every Sunday.’
 [some > every : unambiguous]

In both cases, the scopal order in the RD structure is the same as in the canonical word order. Moreover, the two sentences remain unambiguous.

For ambiguous sentences, Right Dislocation does not seem to impose any effect either. Passive sentences in Chinese containing two quantifiers are known to be ambiguous. (Cf. Aoun and Li 1993, etc.) Here is an example.

- (27) a. muigo hoksaang dou bei jat go sinsaang gaau gwo gaa3
 every student all by one CL teacher teach EXP SFP
 ‘Every student is taught by a teacher.’
 [$\forall > \exists$ or $\exists > \forall$]

- b. bei jat go sinsaang gaau gwo gaa3 muigo hoksaang dou
 by one CL teacher teach EXP SFP every student all
 ‘Every student is taught by a teacher.’
 [$\forall > \exists$ or $\exists > \forall$]

(27a) is ambiguous. *Muigo hoksaang* (‘every student’) can have scope over *jatgo sinsaang* (‘a teacher’) or vice versa. The corresponding Right Dislocation structure in (27b) shows the same ambiguity. Whichever mechanism one employs to explain such scope ambiguity, Right Dislocation does not seem to have any logical effect on it.

5 D(islocation)-adjacency constraint

Cheung (1997) proposes the D(islocation)-Adjacency Constraint to account for the observation that the moved constituent must immediately precede the sentence-final particle. In other words, a constituent which is not adjacent to the SFP cannot undergo movement. Some of Cheung’s examples are given below (the judgements are his).

- (28) a. keoi zinghai heoi faantong wan Aaming lo4/zaa3
 s/he only go canteen find Aaming SFP
 ‘S/he only went to the canteen to find Aaming.’
 b. *faantong lo4/zaa3 keoi zinghai heoi _ wan Aaming (=5)
 canteen SFP s/he only go find Aaming
- (29) a. keoi ze cin maailau aa1maa3
 s/he borrow money buy flat SFP
 ‘S/he borrowed money to buy a flat.’
 b. *ze cin aa1maa3 keoi _ maai lau (=16)
 borrow money SFP s/he buy flat
- (30) a. ngo zinghai sung zo loeng gin saam bei keoi lo4
 I only give ASP two CL clothes to him/her SFP
 ‘I only gave two clothes to him/her.’
 b. *loeng gin saam lo4 ngo zinghai sung zo _ bei keoi (=6)
 two CL clothes SFP I only give ASP to him/her

- (31) a. Aaming sik dak Aafan wo3
 Aaming know PRT Aafan SFP
 'Aaming knows Aafan.'
- b. ??Aamingwo3 _ sik dak Aafan (=7)
 Aaming SFP _ know PRT Aafan
- (32) a. Aafan jau Baalai heoi zo Saibaanngaa lo3wo3
 Aafan fromParis go ASP Spain SFP
 'Aafan went to Spain from Paris.'
- b. *jau Baalai lo3wo3Aafan _ heoi zo Saibaanngaa(=10)
 fromParis SFP Aafan go ASP Spain
- (33) a. ngodei hai ukkei tai syu zi1maa3
 we at home read book SFP
 'We were only reading books at home.'
- b. *hai ukkei zi1maa3 ngodei _ tai syu (=11)
 at home SFP we read book
- (34) a. keoi siusamgam se go fung seon wo3
 s/he carefully writethat CL letter SFP
 'S/he carefully wrote the letter.'
- b. *siusamgam wo3 keoi _ se go fung seon (=12)
 carefully SFP s/he writethat CL letter

As shown above, it appears that movement of non-adjacent constituents, such as the complement of the first VP or the first VP in a Serial Verb Construction (SVC) ((28) and (29)), the direct object of a double object construction (30), a subject NP (31), or a preverbal PP ((32), (33) and (34)), is prohibited. These examples thus motivate the postulation of the D-Adjacency Constraint for RD structures. However, this ad hoc constraint actually does no more than give a generalised description of ill-formed RD structures such as the above. While I agree with most of Cheung's judgements, I shall show below that the D-Adjacency Constraint is not really well motivated.

First, the SVC examples above seem to be compelling cases for the D-Adjacency Constraint. However, it is not true that these are without exceptions. Consider the following example.

- (35) a. Billy sung zo loeng go daangou lai aa3
 Billy send ASP two CL cake come SFP
 ‘Billy sent two cakes here.’
- b. loeng go daangou aa3 Billy sung zo _ lai
 two CL cakes SFP Billy send ASP come
 ‘Billy sent two cakes here.’

(35) is also an SVC; however, the extraction of the object *loeng go daangou* (‘two cakes’) in the first VP, which is not adjacent to the sentence-final particle, is legitimate but would have violated the D-Adjacency Constraint. Similar examples where one verb is transitive and the other is ergative are fine, such as (36) below.

- (36) a. Billy daai zo loeng bun syu zau aa3
 Billy take ASP two CL book go SFP
 ‘Billy took away two books.’
- b. loeng bun syu aa3 Billy daai zo _ zau
 two CL book SFP Billy take ASP go
 ‘Billy took away two books.’

Nevertheless, extraction of constituents that are not adjacent to the SFP in other types of SVC is indeed more restricted, such as those that take a purpose clause.

- (37) a. keoi heoi Baalai tai zinlaam aa3
 s/he go Paris see exhibition SFP
 ‘S/he went to Paris to see the exhibition.’
- b. tai zinlaam aa3 keoi heoi Baalai _
 see exhibition SFP s/he go Paris
 ‘S/he went to Paris to see the exhibition.’
- c. *heoi Baalai aa3 keoi _ tai zinlaam
 go Paris SFP s/he see exhibition
- d. *Baalai aa3 keoi heoi _ tai zinlaam
 Paris SFP s/he go see exhibition

In (37), movement of neither the first VP (c) nor the object in the first VP (d) is possible. This seems to support the D-Adjacency Constraint. However, note that topicalisation is not possible either, as shown in the following.

- (38) a. *heoi Baalai le1, keoi _ tai zinlaam
 go Paris TOP s/he see exhibition
- b. *Baalai le1, keoi heoi _ tai zinlaam
 Paris TOP s/he go see exhibition

So it seems that the impossibility of fronting the first VP or part thereof out of a purpose SVC is not idiosyncratic to Right Dislocation. For topicalisation, no such adjacency constraint has been proposed; in fact, topicalising constituents that are non-adjacent to the sentence-final particle is widespread. Hence, there is reason to believe that the phenomenon may not be due to the ad hoc D-Adjacency Constraint specifically proposed for RD structures.

Moreover, extraction in the English counterparts of (37) (not SVC) is fine, as illustrated in the following wh-questions.

(39) What did he do to see the exhibition?

(40) Where did he go to see the exhibition?

So it seems that the ungrammaticality of (37c) and (37d) in Cantonese could be due to the structure of SVC, rather than the moved constituent being non-adjacent to the SFP. The following contrasts provide support for this contention.

- (41) a. ngo maai zo bou dinnou lai sungbei keoi lo1
 I buy ASP CL computer to give to s/he SFP
 ‘I bought a computer for him/her.’
- b. bou dinnou le1, ngo maai zo _ lai sungbei keoi lo1
 CL computer TOP I buy ASP to give to s/he SFP
 ‘The computer, I bought it for him/her.’
- c. bou dinnou lo1 ngo maai zo _ lai sung bei keoi
 CL computer SFP I buy ASP to give to s/he
 ‘The computer, I bought it for him/her.’

As shown in (41) above, extraction of the object *bou dinnou* ‘the computer’ in both topicalisation (41b) and Right Dislocation (41c) is actually possible in a non-SVC,⁴ even if it is not adjacent to the SFP. The RD utterance could be a natural response to the question: *What is it? (pointing at a carton)* This is, in fact, also a counterexample to the D-Adjacency Constraint, as the object *bou dinnou* (‘the computer’) does not originate in the position immediately preceding the SFP. The following is an SVC version of the sentences above, which shows a striking contrast with (41). Extraction of *bou dinnou* (‘the computer’) in (42) is bad, no matter whether it is topicalisation (42b) or RD (42c).

- (42) a. ngo maai zo bou dinnou sung bei keoi lo1
 I buy ASP CL computer give to s/he SFP
 ‘I bought a computer for him/her.’
- b. *bou dinnou le1, ngo maai zo sung bei keoi lo1
 CL computer TOPI buy ASP give to s/he SFP
- c. *bou dinnou lo1 ngo maai zo sung bei keoi
 CL computer SFP I buy ASP give to s/he

So, the D-Adjacency Constraint cannot really explain the ban on extracting the first VP or part thereof of some SVCs in an RD construction. If it were necessary, it would have to be invoked to explain topicalisation as well, which has never been independently claimed to be subject to a constraint of this kind. Such ill-formedness should probably be better explained by some independent reasons (unknown at the moment).

As for examples (32), (33) and (34), in which preverbal adjuncts are prohibited from being dislocated, I suspect that the ungrammaticality (or unacceptability rather) is due to unsatisfactory choices of either the sentence-final particles or some lexical items. Consider (32). If we change the sentence-final particle to *aa1maa3*, the sentence sounds much better, in fact grammatical, according to an informant’s and my judgement. This could be a natural answer to the question ‘From where did Aafan go to Spain?’.

⁴ *lai* in the example (41) is, according to Chao (1968), a ‘particle of purpose’ (340). Although *lai4* can also be a verb which means ‘come’, Chao notes that in these cases ‘it is practically a particle like English ‘to’ in the infinitive verb, which expresses the purpose.’ (340) He explicitly states that the particle is inserted between two verbal expressions. Hence, *lai* should not be analysed as a verb, and therefore (41) is not a Serial Verb Construction.

- (43) *jau Baalai aa1maa3 Aafan _ heoi zo Saibaanngaa*
 from Paris SFP Aafan go ASP Spain
 ‘Aafan went to Spain from Paris. (Didn’t you know?)’

For (33), if we try another complement such as *daa maazook* (‘play mahjong’), again the sentence becomes acceptable (and presumably grammatical).

- (44) *hai ukkei zilmaa3 ngodei _ daa maazook*
 at home SFP we hit mahjong
 ‘We only play mahjong **at home**.’

(44) could be a response from a wife to her husband’s accusation that she has been playing mahjong in some dodgy mahjong clubs; so it is only **at home** that she plays the game but not in those places. (34) probably also suffers from some pragmatic oddity. The following is better, at least in our judgement.

- (45) *tautaudeigam aa3 keoi _ zaujap go cyufong tau je sik*
 secretly SFP s/he enter CL kitchen steal thingeat
 ‘S/he sneaked into the kitchen to steal food.’

My judgement for (30) is different from Cheung’s, so extraction of the direct object from a double object construction is actually fine for me. The subject extraction in (31) is indeed bad, but if the subject is made heavy by using a complex NP, for instance, grammaticality improves. This is shown in the following example.

- (46) *?zoek jyulau go go naamjan aa1maa3 _ laudai zo go peigip haidou*
 wear raincoat that CL man SFP leave ASPCL suitcase here
 ‘The man who wore a raincoat left a suitcase here.’

It has been shown that Cheung’s D-Adjacency Constraint is not well motivated because of its ad hoc nature and numerous counterexamples which suggest that constituents non-adjacent to the SFP can also be fronted. The ungrammaticality of some remaining cases, such as in the SVC, is better explained by some independent principle(s). Hence, I suggest that such a constraint is not necessary.

6 The size of the dislocated string

It has been assumed that in Right Dislocation structures, the fronted string has to be a maximal projection, ranging from a DP to something as big as the whole VP. However, there seems to exist certain cases where the dislocated string can be smaller than a DP, in fact a head noun (apparently).

It is well-known that some languages allow movement of some constituents out of a DP, e.g. Russian (Gouskova 2001), German (van Riemsdijk 1989), Modern Greek (Androutsopoulou 1997), Mandarin Chinese (Pan and Hu 2000) and Cantonese, under a variety of terminology such as split scrambling, split DP, split topicalisation and head noun movement. Some examples are given below.

- (47) Gorillu my videli vcera bol'shuju _ [Russian, from Gouskova 2001]
gorilla we saw yesterday big
'As for gorillas, yesterday we saw a big one.'
- (48) Bücher hat John viele _ gelesen [German]
books has John many read
'John has read many books (not magazines).' [Focus reading]
'As for books, John has read many.' [Topic: but only with a big pause after *Bücher*]
- (49) to kokkino idha forema [Modern Greek, from Androutsopoulou 1997]
the red saw-1s dress
'It is the RED dress that I saw.'
- (50) shu, wo mai le yi ben [Mandarin]
book I buy LE one CL
'I bought a book.'
- (51) syu, Billy tai zo loeng bunlaa3 [Cantonese]
book Billy read ASP two CL SFP
'Billy read two books.'

In these examples, the moved fragment of a DP is usually the topic or focus. However, in languages like English, such movement is disallowed.

(52) *Books, I have read two

(53) *Apples, John ate two

(54) *Tie, John bought the

This kind of split-DP phenomenon can also be found in Cantonese Right Dislocation. As Cantonese is a classifier language, a noun phrase can contain a demonstrative, numeral, classifier and noun in the order Dem-Num-CL-N. The occurrence of the functional categories depends on definiteness, specificity and genericity, etc. (For various proposals of Mandarin Chinese and Cantonese noun phrases, see Tang 1990, Li 1998, Cheng and Sybesma 1999 and Chan 1999.) It is interesting to see in what way a Cantonese noun phrase can be ‘split’ in an RD structure. Below is a list of the (im)possibilities.

[Num-CL-N]

- (55) a. syu aa3 Billy tai zo loeng bun _
 bookSFP Billy read ASP two CL
 ‘Billy read two books.’
- b. *bun syu aa3 Billy tai zo loeng _
 CL book SFP Billy readASP two
- c. loeng bun syu aa3 Billy tai zo _
 two CL book SFP Billy readASP

In a noun phrase which contains Num-CL-N, the noun can be extracted, but [CL-N] cannot. The whole NP ([Num-CL-N]) can of course be moved.

[Dem-CL-N]

- (56) a. syu aa3 Billy tai zo ni bun _
 book SFP Billy readASP this CL
 ‘Billy read this book.’
- b. *bun syu aa3 Billy tai zo ni _
 CL bookSFP Billy read ASP this
- c. ni bun syu aa3 Billy tai zo _
 this CL book SFP Billy read ASP
 ‘Billy read this book.’

Similarly, in a noun phrase containing [Dem-CL-N], the demonstrative and classifier cannot be separated.

[Dem-Num-CL-N]

- (57) a. syu aa3 Billy tai zo ni loeng bun _
 book SFP Billy read ASP this two CL
 ‘Billy read these two books.’
- b. *bun syu aa3 Billy tai zo ni loeng _
 CL book SFP Billy read ASP this two
- c. *loeng bun syu aa3 Billy tai zo ni _
 two CL book SFP Billy read ASP this
- d. ni loeng bun syu aa3 Billy tai zo _
 this two CL book SFP Billy read ASP
 ‘Billy read these two books.’

In the case of [Dem-Num-CL-N], it seems that the three functional categories Dem, Num and Cl cannot be split.

[CL-N] is also a legitimate string in Cantonese. Movement of just the noun is fine in Right Dislocation, as shown in the following.

- (58) a. bun syu lo1 Billy maai zo _
 CL book SFP Billy buy ASP
 ‘Billy bought the book.’
- b. syu lo1 Billy maai zo bun _
 book SFP Billy buy ASP CL
 ‘Billy bought the book.’

So, from this survey, whenever part of an NP is extracted, this can only be the head noun. This is also true even in NPs that take a relative clause. Note that in (59c) below, the relative clause *Mary maai* (‘Mary bought’) cannot be stranded, even if the functional categories Dem, Num and CL are not separated in the moved string.

- (59) a. Billy tai zo Mary maai go bun syu lo1
 Billy read ASP Mary buy that CL book SFP
 ‘Billy read the book that Mary bought.’

- b. syu lo1 Billy tai zo Mary maai go bun _
 book SFP Billy read ASP Mary buy that CL
 ‘Billy read the book that Mary bought.’
- c. *go bun syu lo1 Billy tai zo Mary maai _
 that CL bookSFP Billy read ASP Mary buy

However, moving the head noun out of an NP that takes a complement clause does not seem to be permitted.

- (60) a. Billy mou zeonsau keoijiu zeonsi waan cin ge singnok aa3
 Billy not obey s/he must on-time return money GE promise SFP
 ‘Billy broke the promise that he would return the money on time.’
- b. *singnok aa3 Billy mou zeonsau keoi jiu zeonsi waan cin ge _
 promise SFP Billy not obey s/he must on-time return money GE

But if a demonstrative and classifier are inserted, grammaticality improves. This is also observed in Mandarin topicalisation (Pan and Hu 2000).

- (61) a. Billy mou zeonsau go go keoi jiu zeonsi waan cin ge singnok
 Billy not obey that CL s/he must on-time return money GE promise
 ‘Billy broke the promise that he would return the money on time.’
- b. ?singnok aa3 Billy mou zeonsau go go keoijiu zeonsi waan cin ge _
 promise SFP Billy not obey that CL s/he must on-time return money GE
 ‘Billy broke the promise that he would return the money on time.’

It remains unclear why extraction of the head noun from a complement complex NP results in ungrammaticality. Pan and Hu (2000) suggest that the predication relation between the topicalised NP and the XP predicate can be established only when they are adjacent. Hence, if we adopt their idea, (60b) is bad because *singnok* (‘promise’) and the predicate *keoi jiu zeonsi waan cin* (‘s/he must return the money on time’) are not adjacent. Mandarin topicalisation counterparts of (61) are also found to be better and the explanation provided by Pan and Hu (2000) is that the demonstrative and classifier set the relevant NP (*go go keoi jiu zeonsi waan cin ge singnok* ‘the promise that he would return the money on time’) in focus. They argue that this NP with an empty head noun is assigned the [+Focus] feature and undergoes LF movement to [Spec,FocusP], which is immediately below the Topic

Phrase whose specifier hosts the moved head noun. The head noun and the predicate are now adjacent and so grammaticality improves.

Nevertheless, Pan and Hu's (2000) idea is not immediately transferable to Cantonese Right Dislocation structures because, firstly, the moved head noun in RD is not the topic but focus. As argued in the current discussion, the head noun is moved to the FocusP in my proposal. If LF movement of the phrase with an empty head noun were to take place, it could not move to [Spec,FocusP] because the position would have been occupied by the head noun. Secondly, my framework does not postulate any [Focus] feature, so there doesn't seem to be any motivation for such LF movement. Thirdly, with respect to interpretation, what is really in focus in the RD structure is the moved head noun rather than the complement clause or the whole complex NP. So, to say that the complex NP is in focus would miss this fact.

To summarise, the split-DP phenomenon is attested in Cantonese Right Dislocation; however, only the head noun can be dislocated whereas the DP-internal functional categories and/or relative/complement clauses, if any, have to be stranded together. The question now is whether the fronted noun is just the head noun or something larger (an NP). I suggest that, adopting any of the current proposals of Chinese/Cantonese noun phrases (e.g. Li 1998, Cheng & Sybesma 1999, Chan 1999), the apparent head noun is in fact an NP selected by the classifier. I shall tentatively assume that what is being moved is an NP rather than just the N, though more evidence is perhaps needed.

7 Cantonese RD as a focus-marking device

As mentioned earlier, I suggest that the fronted phrase in RD is moved to the Focus field and must be interpreted as focus. We have three pieces of evidence to support this.

7.1 Focus operators 'only'

First, as mentioned in Cheung (1997) as well, the focus operator *zinghai* ('only') or the focus SFP *zaa3* ('only') must associate with the fronted phrase. So in both (62) and (63), the only reading available is (a) where the fronted phrase *zukkau* ('football') is associated with *zinghai* ('only') and *zaa3* ('only') respectively. The (b) reading where the verb *tai* ('watch') is in focus is unavailable, even though the verb is in the scope of *zinghai* ('only') and *zaa3* ('only'), whereas in the canonical order when RD does not take place, this interpretation is possible.

- (62) *zukkau lo1 Billy zinghai zungji tai _*
 football SFP Billy only like watch
 a. ‘Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).’
 b. # ‘Billy only likes to watch football (not play football)’
- (63) *zukkau zaa3 Billy zungji tai _*
 football SFP Billy like watch
 a. ‘Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).’
 b. # ‘Billy only likes to watch football (not play football)’

We can see that Right Dislocation serves as a disambiguation device in the sense that it identifies the intended focus among all the possible foci. Functionally, it is on a par with contrastive stress placement. So, for instance, if we put stress on *zukkau* (‘football’) in (64) which is in the canonical word order, again the (b) reading is unavailable due to the fact that the intended focused element (*zukkau* ‘football’) has been identified by contrastive stress.

- (64) *Billy zungji tai ZUKKAU zaa3*
 Billy like watch football SFP
 a. ‘Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).’
 b. # ‘Billy only likes to watch football (not play football)’

The fact that the alternative readings involving other possible foci is unavailable shows that RD picks out the focus which is to be associated with the focus operator. This is reminiscent of focalisation in Italian. The example below can only have the reading ‘John only likes to eat sushi (not pasta)’. Again, focalisation picks out the intended focused element (*sushi*) which is associated with the focus operator *solo* (‘only’).

- (65) *Sushi, a Giovanni piace solo mangiare*
 sushi to John like only eat
 ‘John only likes to eat sushi (not pasta).’

For a focus operator to associate with a constituent, the set of possible foci has to be in its c-command domain. The Right Dislocation structures (62) and (63) fulfil this requirement since it has been shown in section 4.2 that reconstruction takes place in RD structures. The constituent *zukkau* (‘football’) originates in a position in the c-command domain of *zinghai* (‘only’) in (62) and *zaa3* (‘only’) in (63). If we compare RD with topicalisation, we can see a difference. In (66) and (67) where the fronted *zukkau* (‘football’) is the topic, this c-command requirement is

not fulfilled because topics occur in a position higher than the VP adverb *zinghai* ('only') and the sentence-final particle *zaa3* ('only').⁵ So it is not c-commanded by either of the focus operators. Moreover, reconstruction does not seem to take place.

- (66) *zukkau le1, Billy zinghai zungji tai _*
 football TOP Billy only like watch
 a. # 'Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).'
 b. 'Billy only likes to watch football (not play football).'
- (67) *zukkau le1, Billy zungji tai _ zaa3*
 football TOP Billy like watch SFP
 a. # 'Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket).'
 b. 'Billy only likes to watch football (not play football).'

(66) is acceptable when *zungji tai* ('likes to watch') or *tai* ('watch') is associated with the focus operator *zinghai* ('only'). Hence, reading (b) 'Billy only likes to watch football (not play football)' is available. However, associating *zinghai* ('only') with *zukkau* ('football') is not possible, so (66) cannot mean 'Billy only likes to watch football (not cricket)' (reading a). This also holds true for the case in (67) where the sentence-final particle *zaa3* cannot focus *zukkau* ('football').

This shows that Right Dislocation and topicalisation in Cantonese involve different mechanisms and functions and that the dislocated phrase and topicalised phrase probably occupy different positions in the syntactic structure, despite their superficial similarity.

7.2 Negation

Another piece of evidence for the focus-marking function of RD comes from negation. Consider the following example.

- (68) *sausi lo1 keoi m zungji zing*
 sushi SFP s/he not like make
 a. 'S/he doesn't like to make SUSHI (as opposed to dumplings).'
 b. # 'S/he doesn't like to MAKE sushi (but s/he likes to EAT sushi).'

⁵ The focus sentence-final particle *zaa3* ('only') occupies a position lower than the higher Topic. See Law (2002) for details.

Assuming that negation is focus-sensitive and associates with focus (cf. Lee & Pan 2001), the unavailability of reading (b) can be accounted for by the fact that RD identifies the focus (*sausī* ‘sushi’) and negation obligatorily associates with it. Reading (b) is otherwise possible when the sentence is in the normal word order. So (69) in the canonical word order is actually ambiguous.

- (69) keoi m zungji zing sausī lo1
 s/he not like make sushi SFP
 a. ‘S/he doesn’t like to make SUSHI (as opposed to dumplings).’
 b. ‘S/he doesn’t like to MAKE sushi (but s/he likes to EAT sushi).’

7.3 Questions

Right Dislocation is also compatible with questions. Cheung (1997) observes that a wh-word cannot occur after the sentence-final particle, i.e. when a wh-word is present, it must be part of the fronted phrase. Here is one of his examples.

- (70) *Aaming zek1 bingo sik dak? (=95b)
 Aaming SFP who know PRT
 ‘Aaming, who knows him?’

Having wh-words occurring in the fronted phrase is permitted.

- (71) A: nei geisi heoi gwo Holaan?
 you when go ASP Holland
 ‘When did you go to Holland?’
 B1: soeng-go-jyut aa1maa3 _ heoi Holaan
 last-month SFP go Holland
 ‘I went to Holland last month.’
 B2: #heoi Holaan aa1maa3 soeng-go-jyut _
 go Holland SFP last-month
 ‘I went to Holland last month.’

As it is well known that in a wh-question the information that is being sought is the focus, this observation provides further support for the focusing function of RD. Here in example (71), *geisi* (‘when’) is the focus and in B1’s answer the fronted phrase gives the information *soeng-go-jyut* (‘last month’) which coincides with the focus. B2’s answer, on the other hand, is infelicitous, though grammatical, because

the fronted phrase *heoi Holoan* ('went to Holland') is not the focus but the presupposition. If the fronted phrase is moved to the Focus field, then the unacceptability of B2's answer is expected owing to a mismatch of focus and presupposition.

It appears that Right Dislocation can be exploited freely in all types of questions in Cantonese. (72) is a wh-question, (73) an A-not-A question and (74) a particle question. Both the latter are used to express a yes-no type question.

(72) *zou matje aa3 nei heoi Baalai _?*
do what SFP you go Paris
'What are you going to Paris for?'

(73) *Baalai aa3 nei heoi-m-heoi _?*
Paris SFP you go-not-go
'Are you going to Paris?'

(74) *Baalai me1 nei heoi _?*
Paris SFP you go
'Are you going to Paris?'

The current proposal should be compatible with A-not-A questions (73) and particle questions as well (74). In both cases, *Baalai* ('Paris') is being focused, so the questions roughly have the meaning 'Is it Paris that you are going to?'. The wh-question case in (72) is interesting in that at first glance it looks like wh-movement has taken place in a wh-in-situ language. If it were true, the moved element should have been moved to [Spec,CP] as standardly assumed. However, if we look more closely, there is reason to believe that this is not a case of wh-movement. Note that in (72), the moved constituent is the VP *zou matje* ('do what') rather than just the wh-element *matje* ('what'). Interestingly, it is actually ungrammatical if the verb *zou* ('do') is stranded.

(75) **matje aa3 nei heoi Baalai zou _?*
what SFP you go Paris do

However, in a statement the object complement alone can be dislocated while the verb is left behind.

(76) *zinlaam aa3 ngo heoi Baalai tai _*
exhibition SFP I go Paris see
'I went to Paris to see an exhibition.'

So, at least it can be established that the ungrammaticality of (75) is not due to the fact that the object complement of the second verb in an SVC cannot be fronted. Nevertheless, it is not entirely impossible to front a *wh*-phrase. Consider the following examples.

(77) ??/**matje aa3 nei sik zo _ ?*
 what SFP you eat ASP
 ‘What did you eat?’

(78) ??*bindou aa3 nei heoi zo _ ?*
 where SFP you go ASP
 ‘Where did you go?’

These questions are marginal when they are uttered in a neutral context or out of the blue but are significantly better when used as repetitions of the same question which carry a coercive force. For instance, (78) is fine in the context where a wife repeatedly asks her evasive husband where he went the previous night but does not get any satisfactory answer. But (78) is very odd if uttered in the first instance, i.e. no coercion is intended. One should take note that the sentence-final particle, *aa3* in this case, is obligatory: omitting it would result in ungrammaticality, even in the coercive context.

(79) **bindou nei heoi zo _ ?*
 where you go ASP

It appears that these examples should not be analysed as cases of *wh*-movement (to [Spec,CP]) because they are not really comparable with *wh*-questions with genuine *wh*-movement, e.g. their English counterparts. I shall maintain that, as in other non-question RD structures, the landing site of these *wh*-phrases is [Spec,FocusP]. In fact, the coercive context which licenses these *wh*-questions with RD may serve as evidence that the *wh*-phrase is being brought in focus, in the sense that it is intended to be interpreted as the most prominent element in the utterance.

8 Ordering

The present proposal predicts that it is possible to have both topicalisation and Right Dislocation at the same time and that the topic and the fronted phrase are in a fixed linear order. An example is given here.

- (80) *dungmat* *le1*, *cungsyu* *aa3* *keoi zeoi zungji* _
 animal TOP squirrel SFP s/he best like
 ‘As for animals, s/he likes squirrels best.’

Dungmat (‘animal’) is the topic (Top₁), marked by the topic marker *le1* while *cungsyu* (‘squirrel’) cannot be the second topic because it is followed by a sentence-final particle *aa3* and sentence-final particles do not mark topics. The different markers used serve as a good indicator of whether one is a case of topicalisation or Right Dislocation. Furthermore, as Focus is lower than the higher Topic as shown in (10), the dislocated constituent should not be able to cross the Topic. So, it predicts that the topic *dungmat* (‘animal’) must precede the focused element *cungsyu* (‘squirrel’) and this is indeed true. (81) is impossible.

- (81) **cungsyu* *aa3* *dungmat* *le1* *keoi zeoi zungji* _
 squirrel SFP animal TOP s/he best like

This is also true in cases where the topic is associated with a gap in the sentence.

- (82) a. [*go zaat faa*]_i *le1* [*sung t_i bei Cindy gaa3*]_j *Mary t_j*
 that CL flower TOP give to Cindy SFP Mary
 ‘As for that bunch of flowers, Mary gave it to Cindy.’
- b. **[sung t_i bei Cindy gaa3]*_j [*go zaat faa*]_i *le1* *Mary t_j*
 give to Cindy SFP that CL flower TOP Mary

While Cheung (1997) also contrasts Right Dislocation with topicalisation with respect to their (lack of) focusing properties, his Generalised Dislocation Adjunction Rule makes no prediction with regard to the ordering of the topic and the fronted focused phrase.⁶

⁶ Actually, Cheung (1997) does allow the fronted phrase to be adjoined to a topic. For example, in the following RD structure, the NP *loeng gaa baasi* (‘the two buses’) is assumed to be the topic, for it can only have a definite reading.

- (i) *ngo gin dou lo3 loeng gaa baasi* (=16b))
 I see PRT SFP two CL bus
 ‘I can see the two buses.’

However, he also takes note of the difference in grammaticality between sentences similar to (80) and (81), i.e. when the topic marker *le1* is present, the topic phrase cannot follow the fronted phrase and the SFP. This seems to be in conflict with the observation of (i). His speculation is that ‘with the use of topic markers, the topic is normally stressed and is followed by a slight

My proposal predicts that the dislocated string cannot precede sentential adverbs which express speech acts or speaker-oriented evaluation which occupy the position of the highest Force projection. (Cf. Cinque 1999, Mui & Chao 1999, Chao & Mui 2000) The following examples illustrate the fact that the sentential adverbs *loulousatsat* ('honestly') and *houcoi* ('luckily') cannot occur after the SFP, which shows that the fronted phrase cannot cross the adverbs.

- (83) a. *loulousatsat jiging ding zo gaa3laa3 go zyuzik wai _*
 honestly already fix ASP SFP CL president post
 'Honestly, the presidential post has been assigned already.'
- b. **jiging ding zo gaa3laa3 loulousatsat go zyuzik wai _*
 already fix ASP SFP honestly CL president post
- (84) a. *houcoi bei zo Billy go sailou zaa3 go zyuzik wai _*
 luckily give ASP Billy CL younger-brother SFP CL president post
 'Luckily, Billy's younger brother has been elected president.'
- b. **bei zo Billy go sailou zaa3 houcoi go zyuzik wai _*
 give ASP Billy CL younger-brother SFP luckily CL presidentpost

Consider the following examples which pose problems for Cheung's (1997) analysis.

- (85) *jaudi jan mou tai saai jisap bun syu aa1maa3*
 some person not read all 20 CL bookSFP
 'Some people didn't read all the twenty books.'

pause' which 'conflicts with the general tendency to unstress the β -string in dislocation and the absence of pause between α -string and β -string'. (fn. 23) First, I disagree with his observation that topics are stressed. Second, his reasoning implies that there can never be a pause in the string following the sentence-final particle. While it is true that this part of an RD structure normally has a low and level intonation and pauses are seldom attested, if we impose a pause at a legitimate position, say, the edge of a phonological phrase, the result only sounds unnatural rather than totally ungrammatical. With respect to (i), I would hesitate to analyse the NP *loeng gaa baasi* ('the two buses') as the topic. Its definite reading is likely to be forced by the fact that the NP is in the non-focus position (or background) and the indefinite reading is hard to get.

(86) jisap bun syu aa1maa3 jaudi jan mou tai saai
 20 CL bookSFP some person not read all
 ‘Some people didn’t read all the twenty books.’

(87) ??/*jaudi jan jisap bun syu aa1maa3 mou tai saai
 some person 20 CL book SFP not read all

(85) is the normal word order and (86) is a legitimate RD structure. However, (87) is marginal. According to Cheung’s (1997) GDA Rule, (87) should have been fine because the GDA Rule allows the fronted phrase to be adjoined to a VP. The subject NP *jaudi jan* (‘some people’) is indefinite and is guaranteed to be within IP, i.e. it cannot be a topic. The present proposal, however, rules (87) out on the ground that the fronted phrase *jisap bun syu* (‘20 books’) fails to move to the focus position, which is located higher than the subject, and correctly predicts that (86) is grammatical where the fronted phrase is now higher than the subject.

Allowing the fronted phrase to be adjoined to a VP also wrongly renders sentences like (88) grammatical where the fronted phrase *jisap bun syu* (‘20 books’) is adjoined to the VP *tai saai* (‘read all’) while the negation *mou* remains in a higher position than the fronted phrase.

(88) *jaudi jan mou jisap bun syu aa1maa3 tai saai
 some person not 20 CL book SFP read all

This problem is avoided if we posit that the fronted phrase is moved to the Focus position, since Focus is structurally higher than Negation.

9 The status of the SFP

Cheung (1997) does not propose any mechanism by which the sentence-final particle gets into the sentence-medial position in an RD structure. He has resort to the stipulation that ‘in dislocation, the SP [SFP] immediately follows the fronted XP which is D-Adjacent to the SP in the underlying sentence’. (94) He also observes that a second sentence-final particle (cluster) is not allowed at the end of an RD sentence. Hence, the following sentence with two sentence-final particles is ungrammatical, unless construed as two separate utterances, of course.

(89) *cungsyu aa1maa3 keoi zeoi zungji lo1
 squirrel SFP s/he best like SFP
 ‘S/he likes squirrels best.’

So, it doesn't look as if a sentence-medial particle is generated to act as some kind of focus marker for the fronted phrase. Moreover, it is possible to have virtually any sentence-final particle following the dislocated constituent, irrespective of its semantics. I do not have a fully satisfactory explanation for this mystery, but offer the following speculation. The occurrence of the SFP in that particular position is perhaps due to a phonological reason (apart from its semantic and pragmatic contribution). A sentence-final particle typically occurs at the final position which coincides with the right edge of an intonational phrase. Its occurrence in a sentence-medial position may serve the function of marking the edge of an intonational phrase so that the string following the SFP constitutes a separate intonational phrase. This at least correctly describes the fact that the string after the SFP has a low and level intonation, which is also characteristic of Right-dislocated phrases in Germanic and Romance languages. Whether this speculation is plausible or not is subject to further investigation. I shall leave it open here.

10 Conclusion

In this paper, I have given facts, some previously unobserved, about Right Dislocation in Cantonese and argued that the derivation of RD involves leftward movement of a constituent to the Focus field (Rizzi 1997). RD displays reconstruction effects and is subject to island constraints. Focus-sensitive elements such as restrictive focus operators and negation in RD structures provide evidence that the moved constituent is obligatorily interpreted as identificational focus, thus making Right Dislocation in Cantonese a focus-marking device. This also suggests that, in addition to contrastive stress, Cantonese does make use of word order to identify focus. The precise status of sentence-final particles in RD structures is unresolved though, partly because the syntax of sentence-final particles is still subject to debate. Further research on both RD and SFPs is much needed.

References

- Androutsopoulou, Antonia (1997). Split DPs, Focus, and Scrambling in Modern Greek. *WCCFL* 16, 1-16.
- Aoun, Joseph & Yen-Hui Audrey Li (1993). *Wh*-Elements in Situ: Syntax or LF? *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:2, 199-238.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2002). Against Optional and null clitics. Right dislocation vs. marginalization. *Studia Linguistica*, 56:1, 29-57.
- Cecchetto, Carlo (1999). A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica*, 53:1, 40-67.

- Chan, Brian Hok-Shing (1999). *Aspects of the Syntax, Production and Pragmatics of Code-Switching, with special reference to Cantonese*. PhD thesis, UCL.
- Chao, Wynn and Evelynne Mui (2000). Clausal adverbs and clausal structure in Cantonese. *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale* 29(1): 3-39.
- Chao, Yuen-Ren (1968). *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Cheng, Lisa Lai-Shen & Rint Sybesma (1999). Bare and Not-So-Bare Nouns and the Structure of NP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:4, 509-542.
- Cheung, Yam Leung (1997). *A Study of Right Dislocation in Cantonese*. M.Phil. thesis, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon & James G-T. Huang (2001). Long Distance Reflexives: the State of the Art. In P. Cole, G. Hermon & J. Huang (eds.), *Long Distance Reflexives*, Academic Press, Syntax and Semantics Series, vol. 33.
- De Cat, Cécile (2002). *French Dislocation*. PhD thesis, University of York.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (1998). Identificational Focus vs. Information Focus. *Language* 74(2), 245-273.
- Gouskova, Maria (2001). Split Scrambling: Barriers as Violable Constraints. *WCCFL*, 220-233.
- Kayne, Richard (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Law, Ann (2002). Cantonese sentence-final particles and the CP domain. *UCLWPL* 14, 375-398.
- Lee, Peppina Po-Lun & Haihua Pan (2001). The Chinese negation marker *bu* and its association with focus. *Linguistics* 39:4, 703-731.
- Li, Yen-Hui Audrey (1998). Argument determiner phrases and number phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29, 693-702.
- Mui, Evelynne and Wynn Chao (1999). Adverbs in Cantonese and the Universal Base Hypothesis. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 9: 489-508.
- Pan, Haihua & Jianhua Hu (2000). Head Noun Movement, Focus, and Topicalization in Mandarin Chinese. Ms.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk (1989). Movement and Regeneration. In P. Benincà (ed.), *Dialectal Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp.281-337.
- Ross, John Robert (1967). *Constraints on variables in syntax*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Tang, C.-C. Jane (1990). *Chinese phrase structure and the extended X'-theory*. PhD dissertation, Cornell University.
- Xu, Liejiong (2002). Is Mandarin Chinese a discourse configurational language? ('*Hanyu shi huayu gainian jiegouhua yuyan ma?*') *Zhongguo Yuwen* 5, 400-410.
- Xu, Liejiong (in press). Manifestation of informational focus. *Lingua*.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2001). Backgrounding ('right dislocation') in Dutch. Ms.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2002). Right-dislocation vs. extraposition in Dutch. Abstract for *Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop 17*, Reykjavik, Iceland, Aug 2002.