ON PERIPHERAL DOUBLING IN SCANDINAVIAN[*]

Øystein Alexander Vangsnes, NORMS & CASTL, University of Tromsø, Norway

1. INTRODUCTION

In colloquial Norwegian and Swedish various constituents of the middle or pre-field (i.e. IP and CP) can appear with a correlate in the sentential right periphery. This rightward correlate can be either a proform or a fuller XP. In the latter case the fuller XP is always coreferential with a proform inside the clause proper, whereas proforms in the right periphery can be coreferential with both proforms and full XPs. Consider the Norwegian examples in (1).

(1) a.   Jon   har   mye   penger,   han!
          Jon   has   a-lot-of   money   he
     b.   Han   har   mye   penger,   han!
          he   has   a-lot-of   money   he
     c.   Han   har   mye   penger,   han Jon!
          he   has   a-lot-of   money   that Jon
     d.   *Han Jon   har   mye   penger,   han Jon!
           he   Jon   has   a-lot-of   money   that Jon

In the first two examples a pronoun in the right periphery doubles the subject, which is a full noun phrase in the first case and another pronoun in the second case. In the third example the situation is reversed in the sense that a full noun phrase appears in the right periphery whereas a pronoun occupies the sentence internal subject position. In the fourth example, which is ungrammatical, the (intended) co-referential phrase for the sentence final noun phrase is itself a full noun phrase.[1]

---

[1] Notice that the instance of *han* right before the proper name in the (1c) and (1d) is a proprial demonstrative, and thus part of the full noun phrase, rather than a pronominal copy. To my ear the presence of

Askedal (1987) uses the term 'correlative right dislocation' to cover both the case where a proform appears in the right periphery and the one where an XP does. In this paper I will argue that one should make a distinction between the two, and I will henceforth refer to the former as *right peripheral doubling* (RPD) and the latter as *right dislocation* (RD). In short the main arguments for distinguishing RD from RPD are the following: (i) RPD can involve doubling of both a proform and a full phrase whereas RD can only double a proform (cf. above), (ii) RPD and RD can appear in one and the same sentence, but then in a fixed order (the right peripheral proform preceding the right dislocated phrase) and with clause typing particles intervening (if present), (iii) RPD is also compatible with *left dislocation* (LD), but RD is not.

Whereas both RD and LD appear to be quite wide-spread across languages and language areas, the RPD construction appears to be a somewhat more exotic phenomenon. I will therefore next present some further details concerning the RPD construction. In the subsequent sections I will then return to the differences between the constructions mentioned above in more detail. Eventually, I will end up suggesting that all three constructions are, despite appearance, related to the left periphery of the clausal structure, but that shifting processes render some constituents to the right.

All examples will be taken from colloquial Norwegian unless otherwise indicated.

2. RIGHT PERIPHERAL DOUBLING (RPD)

2.1. The nature of the proform
RPD is not restricted to subjects and in fact not to nominal expressions either. The following examples from Faarlund et al. (1997:908f) show that various kinds of constituents may enter into a RPD relation.

(2) a. Dem er   det   synd på,   dem!   (oblique argument)
        them is   it   pity on   them
        'They can be pitied (indeed)!'
    b. Nå   skal det bli   koselig,   nå!   (temporal adverb)
        now shall it   become   cosy   now
        'Now we're going to have pleasant time!'
    c. Du   har jo   glømt   meg, jo!   (epistemic particle)
        you have yes forgotten me   yes
        'Hey, you forgot about me!'
    d. Det var   så   kjedelig, så!   (measure adverb)
        It   was so   boring   so
        'It was so boring!'

The present study will focus on the doubling of arguments and leave studies of non-argument doubling to future research.

---

this proprial demonstrative on the right peripheral full noun phrase makes them sound more natural (but crucially does not save the example in (1d)).

As shown by the very first pair of examples the antecedent for a pronominal doublee can be either a pronoun or a full noun phrase. A further refinement concerning pronominal antecedents is that they may appear in either a full (strong) form (e.g. *han* 'he') or, provided that the syntactic environment allows cliticization, a maximally reduced (weak) form (e.g. *'n* 'he'). The doublee must however always have the non-reduced form. These facts are illustrated in (3).

(3) a. Har han   vært i Tromsø, han?
         has   he   been in Tromsø   he
         'Has *he* been to Tromsø?'
     b. Har'n   vært i Tromsø, han/*'n?
         has'he.W   been in Tromsø he.S/he.W
         'Has *he* been to Tromsø?'
     c. Han/*'n   har   vært i Tromsø, han, ikke sant?
         he/he.W   has   been in Tromsø   he   not true
         'He has been to Tromsø, right?'
     d. Var   det   i Tromsø'n   hadde   vært?
         was   it   in Tromsø he.W   had   been
         'Was it in Tromsø that he had been?'

A crucial piece of information here is that the illegitimate cliticization in (3b), i.e. of the reduced pronoun to *Tromsø*, is not impossible *per se*, as witnessed by (3d). In line with a suggestion made by a reviewer I believe that this restriction is intimately tied to prosodic factors. I will therefore continue with some notes on prosody.

2.2. Stressed right peripheral pronouns and notes on prosody

Although a clause initial maximally destressed pronoun is not possible in (3c), it would be if it only were preceded by some phonological material of the right sort: the example would indeed be fine if the reduced pronoun were preceded by for instance the conjunction *og* 'and', pronounced /o/ (i.e. without the final consonant in the spelling), as in (3c').

(3) c'. ... og 'n   har   vært i Tromsø, han, ikke sant?
          and   he.W has   been in Tromsø   he   not true
          '... and he has been to Tromsø, right?'

This tells us is that a maximally reduced pronoun cannot occur on the left edge of an intonation phrase, and it *may* tell us that the restriction on maximally reduced pronouns in RPD, witnessed in (3b), is due to the fact that the RPD pronoun occurs on the left edge of a separate intonation phrase. In this respect, it should be pointed out that the RPD pronoun does not have to carry any contrastive or emphatic stress.

However, prosodically the RPD pronoun seems to interact with the clausal intonation in interesting ways. It will lead too far here to go into this in detail, but the following discussion will seek to lay out some of the basic facts. The discussion is to a large extent inspired by a series of comments made by one of the reviewers, a native speaker of Norwegian.

In Eastern Norwegian questions are prosodically marked with a rising tone on the last prosodic phrase of the clause. Thus, for the examples in (3ab) above to be naturally interpreted as questions, the doublee will be stressed and realized with a rising tone, as indicated in (4a). If not stressed the sentence has a marked pragmatic reading where the speaker is conveying that she couldn't care less (or something along those lines), as indicated by the translation in (4b), and this would correspond to the prosodic pattern of a declarative sentence. However, if the doublee is followed by the clausal particle *da* 'then' as in (4c), the doublee and the particle will form a prosodic unit, assigned the so-called 'tone/accent 1' pattern (LH in Eastern Norwegian): the rising tone will then be realized on the particle rather than on the pronoun, and the sentence as such will have to be interpreted as a question.

(4) a.　Har han　(noensinne)　vært i Tromsø, HAN?
　　　　has　he　　ever　　　been in Tromsø　he
　　　　'Has *he* been to Tromsø?'

　　b.　Har han　(*noensinne)　vært i Tromsø, han.
　　　　has　he　　ever　　　been in Tromsø　he
　　　　'Oh yeah, he's been to Tromsø, has he now?'

　　c.　Har han　(noensinne)　vært i Tromsø, HAN DA/?*da?
　　　　has　he　　ever　　　been in Tromsø　he　　then/then
　　　　'Has *he* been to Tromsø?'

These considerations are furthermore confirmed by the observation that a polarity item like *noensinne* 'ever' is only licensed in the examples that have interrogative illocutionary force but not in example (4b) with the "carelessness" reading.

The same facts can be observed in *wh*-questions with the clear difference that it is not even possible to have a declarative prosodic pattern (compare (4b) and (5b)), i.e. there has to be stress and a rising tone at the end of the clause. These facts are illustrated in (5) and square with the observation made by the reviewer that *wh*-questions are only compatible with what he terms 'stressed right peripheral pronouns'.

(5) a.　Hvor　　bor　du　hen, DU?
　　　　where　　live　you　LOC　you
　　　　'Where do you live?'

　　b.　*Hvor　　bor　du　hen, du.
　　　　where　　live　you　LOC　you

　　c.　Hvor　　bor　du　hen, du　DA?
　　　　where　　live　you　LOC　you　then

Given that the proform constitutes the first part of this prosodic unit, and given that maximally reduced pronouns need a host to its left—in other words, are enclitic—we now have a prosodic account of why maximally reduced pronouns cannot appear as doublees in RPD constructions (cf. the previous section).

In the review that inspired these comments on prosody the reviewer suggests that the instances of stressed right peripheral pronouns represent a special type of RPD pronouns (SRPP) that should be treated separately from the non-stressed instances. The reviewer gives a series of arguments for this, one being the fact that in

wh-questions clause final RPD must carry stress. I believe that the discussion of prosody above serves to show that this requirement can be seen as an effect of the interaction between interrogative intonation and the material present at the right edge of the clause. Nevertheless, the reviewer points out several other structural differences between stressed and non-stressed RPD pronouns that need to be addressed, and we will return to these issues in sections 3.3. and 4.3. below when more background information has been provided.

In the following capital letters will, in line with the discussion above, indicate that there is stress on pronnouns and particles in the right periphery.

2.3. Clause types and illocutionary force

The examples provided so far show that RPD can be found in both declaratives and interrogatives. It can also appear in imperatives and exclamatives as illustrated in (6)–(7).

(6)   Bare dra   til Tromsø, du!
         only go   to Tromsø you
         'Just you go to Tromsø!'

(7)   a.   Så   snill du   er,   DU   ?*(DA)!
           so   kind you   are   you   then
           'How kind you are!'
      b.   For   noen unger han har, HAN ?*(DA)!
           for   some kids   he   has   he   then
           'What kids he has!
      c.   Som dere skriker,   DERE   ?*(DA)!
           as   you.PL screem   you.PL   then
           'You are really screaming!"

We may thus conclude that RPD is not a clause typing process.[2]

At the same time, as pointed out by Øystein Nilsen (p.c.), it seems that RPD proforms are always associated with the periphery of matrix clauses. RPD may have an antecedent in an embedded clause, but the doublee will nevertheless not be a part of the embedded clause as such. This becomes evident when we take into consideration for instance the interaction between an RPD pronoun and a matrix focus particle. Consider first the example in (8a) which shows a well-formed case of RPD of an

---

[2] RPD in exclamatives appears to be subject to some interesting restrictions. On the one hand, there is the obligatoriness of the clausal particle *da* 'then' after the RPD pronoun as indicated in (i). On the other hand, the antecedent for the doublee has to be a pronoun itself.

(i)   a.   *Så   snill Jens   er,   HAN DA!
            so   kind Jens   are   he   then
            'How kind you are!'
      b.   *For   noen unger Petter har,   HAN DA!
            for   some kids   Petter has   he   then
            'What nice kids he has!
      c.   *Som ungene   skriker,   DE   DA!
             as   kids-DEF   screem   they then

Crucially, the clausal particle *da* is not obligatory in exclamatives *per se*. I will leave it to future research to unravel the basis for the interplay between RPD and the clausal particle in exclamatives.

embedded subject pronoun. Consider next (8b) which shows that the matrix particle *engang* 'even' can appear either before or after the embedded clause and (8c) which shows that *engang* is not licensed in the embedded clause in question. The example in (8d) then finally shows that *engang* must precede rather than follow the RPD pronoun.

(8) a. Jeg   veit ikke hvor han bor hen, HAN.
        I   know not   where he lives LOC *he*
        'I don't know where he lives.'

    b. Jeg   veit ikke (engang)   hvor   han bor hen (engang).
        I   know not   even   where   he   lives LOC   *even*
        'I don't even know where he lives.'

    c. Hvor   bor   han   hen (*engang)?
        where lives   he   LOC   even
        'Where does he (*even) live?'

    d. Jeg   veit ikke hvor han bor hen (engang),   HAN (*engang)!
        I   know not   where he   lives LOC   *even*   *he   even*
        'I don't even know where he lives.'

The most natural conclusion to draw on the basis of these facts is that the RPD pronoun appears at the right periphery of the matrix clause rather than at the periphery of the embedded clause. In turn that means that the relationship between the doublee and the antecedent is long distance. On the conjecture entertained below that the RPD pronouns occupy a position in the (matrix) left periphery, and furthermore the idea that illocutionary force is a property of root clauses, what we have just seen indicates that the RPD proforms are markers of illocutionary force.

    This squares with findings in Askedal (op.cit.:102f). In a corpus study of a particular children's book series, written in quite a colloquial style and with abundant examples of RPD, Askedal found only four examples where the RPD relation pertained to an embedded antecedent. The four examples are the following.

(9) a. plutselig så han at marken den var jo et stykke nede den, jo!
        suddenly saw he that worm.DEF it was PRT a part   down it PRT
        'All of a sudden I saw that the worm had reached a little bit in.'

    b. "og så   skal du se   at jeg blir   nok tykk jeg også," sa mor og smilte.
        and then shall you see that I become PRT thick I too said mum and smiled
        '"And then you'll see that I'll be thick as well," said Mum and smiled.'

    c. "Ja, du vet jeg går på skolen nå, jeg," sa Ole Aleksander, [...]
        yes, you know I go on school-DEF now I said Ole Aleksander
        '"Yes, you know: I go to school now", said Ole Aleksander.'

    d. "Jeg tror nok vi skal få det hyggelig her også, vi."
        I think PRT we shall get it nice here also we
        '"I think we will make it nice for us here too."'

All of the examples involve *that*-clauses, and the two first ones moreover have embedded Verb Second as witnessed by the placement of the modal particles *jo* and *nok*. This is in line with the general observation (see e.g. Wechsler 1991 and references

cited there) that embedded V2 in Mainland Scandinavian is licit when the embedded clause can be argued to carry illocutionary force of its own. Notice incidentally that the first example also has an embedded left dislocated subject (*marken, den*): left dislocation is arguably also a root phenomenon (see below).

In other words, the contention is that whereas some embedded clauses can be argued to have root properties (cf. e.g. Hooper and Thompson 1973, Haegeman 2006) and therefore should readily allow RPD at their own right edge, an RPD relation can also be established across a clause boundary. In both cases the RPD proform serves to mark and perhaps emphasize the illocutionary force of the clause: according to Askedal (op.cit: 105) RPD (and on his view correlative right dislocation more generally) does not alter the truth conditions of the sentence. Rather, adding a double in the right periphery seems merely to have a pragmatic effect, and Askedal concludes that the construction is used either (i) "to rhematize non-rhematic material by placing it at the end of the sentence; or (ii) [...] as a means of repetition of non-rhematic material, without any rhematization being involved."

2.4. Dialect geography

In terms of dialect geography Askedal (op. cit.:107) notes that within Scandinavian RPD appears to be a Norwegian and Swedish phenomenon, and one that is not found in Danish, Faroese, and Icelandic. Icelandic and Danish speakers that I have consulted, have confirmed the ungrammaticality of (10a) and (10b), respectively.

(10) a. *Jón er   ríkur,   hann.   *Icelandic*
          Jón is   rich   he
      b. *Jesper   er   rig, han/ham.   *Danish*
          Jesper   is   rich he/him

However, although RPD appears not to be a part of standard colloquial Danish, Jørgensen (2000: 163f) points out that RPD data can be found at least in the traditional dialects of Zealand. He gives among other the following two examples collected from the dialect archives of the Institute for Danish dialectology at the University of Copenhagen. The orthography has been standardized.

(11) a. Sådan én, hun skulle jo ikke have så   meget at   æde, hun.
          such one   she   should PRT *not   have so   much   to   eat   she*
          'Such a one, she didn't need so much to eat.'
      b. Det var   nogle slemme   marker   de.
          it   was   some difficult   fields   they
          'Those were difficult fields.'

In a wider Germanic context RPD appears to be absent in the German and Dutch language areas, again according to Askedal (op.cit.). This then suggests a dialect boundary within Germanic that sets Norwegian, Swedish, and presumably some Danish dialects, apart from the rest of the Scandinavian area as well as Germanic more generally.

It should furthermore be pointed out that also within Norwegian and Swedish there may be variation as to what kind of constituents allow RPD. Finland Swedish,

and possibly other Swedish dialects, does for instance allow RPD of negation as well as the modal particle *nog* (literally speaking 'enough'), whereas this sounds quite exotic to a Norwegian ear. Consider the examples in (12) and (13) provided by Jan-Ola Östman (p.c.).

(12) a.   Har   du   en   penna?   *Finland Swedish*
          have you   a   pen
          'Do you have a pen?'

     b.   Inte   har   du   en   penna,   inte?
          not   have you   a   pen   not
          'You haven't got a pen, have you?'

     c.   Inte   har   du   en   penna?
          not   have you   a   pen
          'Do you have a pen?'

     d.   *Har du   en   penna   int?
          have you a   pen   not

(13)   No   är   det   så,   no   *Finland Swedish*
          well is   it   so   well
          'That's probably the way it is.'

Doubling of adverbs and modal particles is not out *per se* in Norwegian, cf. the examples in (2) above. But there are some indications that these Finland-Swedish cases of RPD are dependent on fronting of the antecedent (Østbø 2007, Lisa Söder-gård p.c.), and the crucial dividing line with respect to dialects that allow and disallow such cases, may in fact be to what extent negation and modal particles may be fronted. Negation and the particle *nok* are indeed not felicitous in initial position in Norwegian in the corresponding cases.

(14) a.   *Ikke har du   en   penn, VEL?   *Norwegian*
          not have you   a   pen   PRT

     b.   Du   har   ikke en penn,   VEL?
          you have not   a pen   PRT
          'You don't have a pen, do you?'

(15) a.   *Nok er det sånn.
          well is it so

     b.   Det er nok sånn.
          it is well so

Further investigations of the range of possible RPDs within different dialects of Nor-wegian and Swedish (and Danish too) are warranted—further details are not available (to me) at the present stage.

At this point we may return to comparisons between right peripheral doubling and right dislocation as well as left dislocation.

3. RIGHT PERIPHERAL DOUBLING VERSUS DISLOCATION

3.1. Distinguishing peripheral doubling from dislocation

The pragmatic difference between RPD and RD appears rather subtle, but there is a sense in which RPD is more emphatic than RD. From a communicative point of view that seems reasonable in that the RD constituent provides more information about the referent in question whereas the pronominal double does not. This subtle difference concerning emphaticness is not necessarily an argument for treating them as distinct syntactic phenomena, but there are additional structural reasons to believe so.

The first argument for treating RPD as a different phenomenon than RD is that a right periheral pronoun can double both a pronoun and full noun phrase whereas a full noun phrase in the right periphery can be correlative only with a pronoun. This was shown already by the first set of examples in the introduction, repeated here.

(1) a. Jon   har   mye   penger,   han!
         Jon   has   a-lot-of   money   he
     b. Han   har   mye   penger,   han!
         he   has   a-lot-of   money   he
     c. Han   har   mye   penger,   han Jon!
         he   has   a-lot-of   money   that Jon
     d. *Han Jon   har   mye   penger,   han Jon!
          he   Jon   has   a-lot-of   money   that Jon

It is not immediately clear what to make of this difference in structural terms. The puzzling fact, if anything, is that the doubling pronoun can be correlative with another pronoun: as already said, from the point of view of information structure the RPD pronoun does not add any referential content.

A second structural argument for keeping RPD and RD apart is that the two types of correlative elements in question may cooccur, and when they do, the order is fixed with the RPD pronoun preceding the right dislocated DP. Clause typing particles like *da* 'then' will furthermore intervene between the two. These facts are illustrated by the examples in (16): (16a) shows that a right dislocated DP can follow an RPD pronoun and that the clause typing particle *da* may intervene between the two, (16b) shows that the reverse order of RPD and RD is not possible, and(16c)–(16f) complete the picture and show that the two cannot both occur either before or after the particle *da* no matter what the relative order is.

(16) a. Hvor mye penger   har   han   egentlig   HAN (DA),   han Jon?
         how much money   has   he   actually   he   then   that Jon
         'How much money does he actually have, then, that Jon
     b. *Hvor mye penger har han egentlig han Jon (da), HAN?
     c. *Hvor mye penger har han egentlig, HAN han Jon DA?
     d. *Hvor mye penger har han egentlig da han Jon HAN?
     e. *Hvor mye penger har han egentlig da HAN han Jon?
     f. *Hvor mye penger har han egentlig han Jon HAN DA?

At first sight these facts suggest that RPD and RD relate to distinct syntactic positions, but the facts are more complicated. First of all, when a right dislocated DP appears on its own, it may precede the clause final particle. This is shown by the example in (17a) which should be compared to (16c). Second, it is also possible to have a pronoun in the position after the clause final particle as in (17b)—in a *wh-*question like this stress (and rising tone) is required, a fact which we will address below.

(17) a.   Hvor mye penger   har   han   egentlig,   han Jon   DA?
          how   much money   has   he   actually   that Jon   then
          'How much money does he actually have then, this Jon?'
     b.   Hvor mye penger   har   han   egentlig,   da   HAN/*han?
          how   much money   has   he   actually   then he / he

In other words, if we want to capture this merely in terms of linear positions we must assume two positions—one before and one after clause final particles—which both can be filled by either a pronoun or a DP: when both a pronoun and a DP occur in the right periphery, however, the pronoun must precede the DP. This obviously precludes the argumentation for keeping RPD and RD apart, but we will return to a solution shortly.

     The third argument for distinguishing between RPD and RD is the fact that whereas LD is clearly compatible with RPD it seems to be incompatible with RD. This is shown by the examples in (18), this time using, for the sake of variation, a declarative clause and the clause final declarative particle *ass* (derived from *altså* 'also').

(18) a.   Han Per, han har   mye penger,   han (ass)!
          that Jon he   has   a-lot-of money   he   PRT
          'That Per sure has a lot of money!'
     b.   *Han Per, han har   mye   penger   (ass),   han Per!
          that Per he   has a-lot-of   money   PRT   that Per

One may argue that the LD/RD incompatibility is a reflex of the same restriction that makes (the non-LD structure) (1d) ungrammatical, namely that a dislocated DP cannot be coreferential with another referring expression. This is corroborated by the fact, pointed out by Kirsti Koch Christensen (p.c.), that a left dislocated pronoun is compatible with a right dislocated DP as in the example in (19).

(19)   Han, han har   mye   penger   (ass),   han Per!
          he   he   has a-lot-of   money   PRT   that Per
          'Now he, he sure has a lot money, has John!'

In other words, the restriction in question seems to be a Principle C effect: a referring expression cannot be bound.

3.2. Intermediate summary
Summing up so far, in purely linear terms it seems that we have are dealing with three peripheral positions for correlative constituents, one preceding the clause proper and

two following it, the latter two being separated by clause final particles. In other words, we have the following scheme.

(20)   1   [CORE CLAUSE]   2   PARTICLE   3

All positions can be filled by either a DP or a pronoun, it seems, but there can be only one coreferential DP present in a single sentence. Furthermore, a right peripheral pronoun must precede a right peripheral DP, in effect meaning that the DP must follow the particle if the pre-particle position is filled (by a pronoun).

The example in (21), which is an expansion of (19), shows that a (RPD) pronoun is possible in position 2 even if the left dislocate is also a pronoun.

(21)   Han, han   har   mye   penger,   han   (ass),   han Per!
            he   he   has   a-lot-of   money   han   PRT   that Per
            'Now he, he sure has a lot money, has John!'

Hence, all three positions can be filled simultaneously. However, this is only possible if position 3 is filled by a DP: the examples in (22) show that position 3 cannot be filled by a pronoun regardless of whether position 1 is filled by a DP or a pronoun.

(22) a.   Han Per,   han   har   mye penger,   han   ass   (*han)!
            that Jon   he   has   much money   he   PRT   he
            'That Per has a lof of money!'
    b.   Han, han   har   mye   penger,   han   ass,   (*han)!
            he   he   has   a-lot-of   money   han   PRT   he
            'He has a lot of money, has he!'

But if we remove the RPD pronoun in (22) we get a grammatical sentence: the sentence in (23) replicates the observation made above that a pronoun can follow a clause final particle, only in this declarative case, the pronoun cannot be stressed.

(23)   Han   Per   har   mye penger,   ass   han/*HAN!
            he   Per   has   much money   PRT   he / he
            'That Per sure has a lot of money!'

Hence, position 2 and 3 cannot be filled by a pronoun at the same time.

At this point it seems appropriate to return to the issue of stressed right peripheral pronouns (SRPP) pointed out by one of the reviewers and briefly discussed in section 2.2.

3.3. Further notes on Stressed Right Periheral Pronouns (SRPP)
The native Norwegian reviewer reports that stressed right peripheral pronouns are incompatible with RD for him, and gives the following example: **Har'n vært i Tromsø HAN, han Jens?*, literally "Has he been in Tromsø HE, he Jens?". Notice that this judgment is in disagreement with my claim that (16a) is grammatical. In fact, I also find the example provided by the reviewer grammatical, but only on the following condition:

there must be a rising tone, i.e. interrogative prosody, on both the pronoun/particle *and* on the right dislocated DP. A corresponding rising tone is crucially not present on the RD noun phrase in (17a) which precedes the clause final particle: in this case there is only one rising tone, realized on the particle. The examples are repeated here for the sake of convenience.

(16) a.   Hvor mye penger   har   han   egentlig   HAN (DA),   han Jon?
          how much money   has   he   actually   he   then   that Jon
          'How much money does he actually have, then, that Jon

(17) a.   Hvor mye penger   har   han   egentlig,   han Jon   DA?
          how   much money   has   he   actually   that Jon   then
          'How much money does he actually have then, this Jon?'

      b.   Hvor mye penger   har   han   egentlig,   da   HAN/*han?
              how   much money   has   he   actually   then   he / he

Notice furthermore the opposite stress patterns on the post-particle pronoun in (22) and in (17b), the former a declarative, the latter an interrogative clause: again there is a requirement that the post-particle pronoun be stressed in the interrogative case, but unstressed in the declarative case.

      The obligatory stress on the clause final pronoun in (17b) can in my opinion be seen as an effect of the interrogative stress pattern which requires stress and rising tone on the clause final intonation phrase. In this case the particle *da* and the following pronoun do not form a prosodic unit: it is quite clear that the string *da han* cannot be assigned a common tone unlike what we remarked in section 2.2. when the order was reversed. In (17b) stress must fall on the pronoun which in turn carries the rising tone required by the interrogative prosody, i.e. /da 'han/ is allowed but not */'da han/.

      Conversely, in the declarative sentence in (23) there is no requirement for a rising tone at the end of the clause since this is not a part of the declarative prosodic pattern. Accordingly, the pronoun can be left unstressed. A right dislocated DP in the same position would on the other hand receive stress since its internal structure requires the realization of a tone.

      So far, then, we have established that in interrogatives there is a requirement for a rising tone on the constituent in position 3. If position 2 is filled (by an RPD pronoun), position 3 can only be filled by a DP and in such cases the post-particle DP will double the rising tone otherwise found on the prounoun in position 2 (or on the particle with which it forms a tonal unit). If position 3 is filled by a pronoun position 2 must be left unfilled and there will be a single rising tone, realized on the pronoun.

3.3. Left dislocation replicates the right periphery

Above we also established the insight that the only way that all three positions can be filled simultaneously is when position 1 and 2 are filled by a pronoun and position 3 by a DP. The examples that show this are repeated here for convenience.

(21)   Han, han har   mye   penger,   han   (ass),   han Per!
            he   he   has   a-lot-of   money   han   PRT   that Per
            'Now he, he sure has a lot money, has Per!'

(22) a.   Han   Jon,   han   har   mye   penger,   han   ass   (*han)!
            that   Jon   he   has   much money   he   PRT   he
            'That Jon has a lof of money!'
      b.   Han, han   har   mye   penger,   han   ass,   (*han)!
            he   he   has   a-lot-of   money   han   PRT   he
            'He has a lot of money, has he!'

The clause final particle was used above to distinguish between position 2 and 3. Interestingly, such particles can also appear on the left edge of the clause, in fact even if they co–occur with instances of the same particle on the right edge. Consider the examples in (24).

(24) a.   Han Per ass,   han   har   mye   penger,   han (ass) (*han /*han Per).
            that   Per PRT   he   has   much money   he PRT   he   that Per
      b.   Han Per   da,   har'n   mye penger,   HAN (da) (*han/*han Per)?
            that Per   then   has-he much money   he   then   he /that Per

Recall that pronouns cannot fill positions 2 and 3 simultaneously and that there can be only one correlative DP inside one sentence. However, if the left dislocate is a pronoun, a DP can occur on the right edge.

(25) a.   Han ass,   han   har   mye   penger,   han (ass) (han Per/*han).
            he   PRT   he   has   much money   he   PRT   that Per/he
      b.   HAN da,   har'n mye penger,   HAN (da) (han Per/*han)?
            he   then   has-he much money   he   then   that Per/he

One way of interpreting the facts in (24) is that left dislocated DPs replicate the right peripheral structure, but in the reverse order, i.e. that "position 1 + particle" is the mirror image of "particle + position 3". But at the same time there is a sense in which LD doubles part of the right peripheral structure: interrogative left dislocates will be realized with the same rising, interrogative intonation as we have described for the right periphery above, i.e. either on the LD constituent or, if present, on the particle that immediately follows.

       In the analysis to be developed next I will exploit this observation in a particular way.

4. RIGHT IS LEFT AND LEFT IS TOO

4.1. Getting the orders right
What should now be evident from the discussion above is that there is a multitude of ways to combine what I have described as right peripheral doubling and right and left dislocation. There are a few combinations which are not possible, however, making it a bit of a challenge to develop an appropriate analysis: it must be powerful enough to

allow many different surface orders, yet impose some specific restrictions. In addition to this, we should ideally be able to relate prosody to syntactic structure.

In the following two subsections I will first present a way of analyzing the word order facts and then briefly discuss how the account can be related to prosody. For the sake of clarity, I will mostly use versions of declarative main clauses based on a single core sentence. It is nevertheless my firm belief that the main facts pertaining to peripheral correlative elements will be more or less the same also for interrogative clauses.

Given that previous studies of correlative dislocation in Scandinavian, as far as I know, have not focussed on exhausting the combination possibilties, the analysis that I will present in the following does not purport to give a conclusive account of the matter(s), but should rather be viewed as a first attempt to approach the field from a contemporary generative point of view.

In addition to standard assumptions about phrase structure and movement the approach will be based on the following set of assumptions:

(30) (i)   In the left periphery of matrix clauses there are altogether three hierarchically ordered positions for peripheral correlative elements, intermitted by positions for clausal particles, the latter in effect functional heads related to illocutionary force.

(ii)   The peripheral constituents are first merged in the three positions, not moved there from the core clause, and the (single) peripheral DP is always (first) merged in the lowest of the three left peripheral positions, and

(iii) The lower particle head is an operator which needs to bind a clausal variable.

(iv)   The higher particle head needs to c-command the core clause.

The three positions will not correspond directly to the three surface positions that we discussed above, so in order to avoid confusion I will label the new set of positions with capital letters. The base structure that I am assuming can then be sketched as in (31), where I take the 'core clause' to correspond to TopP.[3]

(31)   X   PRT1   Y   PRT2   Z   [TopP
            pronoun   *pronoun*   *DP/pronoun*   *core clause*

The effect of assumption (iii) is that the head hosting the lower clausal particle triggers obligatory movement of a constituent containing the core clause, either Z or TopP itself, to a position not c-commanded by the PRT2 head: the trace thus created will be an appropriate variable for the head to bind. The effect of (iv) is that a constituent containing the core clause cannot move past the PART1 head. In other words, the two particle heads will in effect embrace the core clause.

---

[3] It will lead to far here to assess the assumption that the so-called core clause corresponds to TopP, but the most important entailment of the assumption is that regular topicalization will be to the left edge of the constituent in question. That entailment is necessary given that the antecedent for RPD, and dislocation too, very often is a fronted constituent.

It should furthermore be noted that assumption (iii) entails that many sentences must involve vacuous movement: the movement will be visible only if there is either a right peripheral particle or a right dislocated DP, or both, present.

In other words, the leading idea for the analysis is that LD, RD, and RPD alike all pertain to the left periphery of the clausal structure and that various shifting processes make some left peripheral material end up to the right. Let us now go through a series of cases to see how the system will work.

Consider first an example with RD where the dislocate follows a clause final particle.

(32) a.   Han har mye penger, ass, han Per.
      b.   [$_{PRT2}$ ass [$_Z$ han Per [$_{TOPP}$ han har mye penger]]]
      c.   [$_{PRT2}$ [$_{TOPP}$ han har mye penger] ass [$_Z$ han Per [t]]]

Given the base structure in (32b) the correct surface order will be derived by moving TopP into PRT2.

In a case of an RPD pronoun and RD combined, with a clausal particle intervening, we can assume that TopP will move into Y rather than PRT2: that will give the correct surface order.

(33) a.   Han har   mye penger, han ass, han Per.
            he   has   much money he PRT that Per
      b.   [$_Y$ han   [$_{PRT2}$ ass [$_Z$ han Per   [$_{TOPP}$ han har mye penger]]]]
      c.   [$_Y$ [$_{TOPP}$ han har mye penger] han [$_{PRT2}$ ass [$_Z$ han Per] [t]]]]

If in this latter case, the TopP were to move into PRT2 rather than Y we would also get a licit surface order, namely the following.

(34) a.   Han, han har   mye penger,   ass, han Per.
            he   he   has   much money   PRT   that Per
      b.   [$_Y$ han   [$_{PRT2}$ ass [$_Z$ han Per   [$_{TOPP}$ han har mye penger]]]]
      c.   [$_Y$ han   [$_{PRT2}$ [$_{TOPP}$ han har mye penger] ass[$_Z$ han Per] [t]]]]

A problem here is that if we assume this, we should, on the basis of the core assumptions made above, expect an additional pronoun in X and a PRT1 to be able precede the string in (34), i.e. as in (35), which is ungrammatical.

(35)   *Han, ass, han, han har   mye penger, ass, han Per.
            he   PRT he   he   has   much money PRT that Per

What we could argue for instead is that the left dislocated pronoun in (34) is merged in X whereas (PRT1 and) Y are empty, and that TopP moves into PRT2 which hosts the particle, i.e. giving the structure in (36).

(36)   [$_X$ han [$_{PRT1}$ __ [$_Y$ __ [$_{PRT2}$ [$_{TOPP}$ han har mye penger] ass [$_Z$ han Per] [t]]]]]

Notice, that on this account we can also derive a surface structure containing a RPD pronoun in addition to the constituents we have in (34): a higher particle is in fact licit as shown in (37).

(37) a.   Han (ass), han har   mye penger,   han ass,   han Per.
           he   PRT he has much money   he PRT   that Per
     b.   [$_X$ han [$_{PRT1}$ (ass) [$_Y$ han [$_{PRT2}$ ass   [$_Z$ han Per [$_{TopP}$ han har mye penger]]]]]]
     c.   [$_X$ han [$_{PRT1}$ (ass) [$_Y$ han [$_{PRT2}$ [$_{TopP}$ han har mye penger] han ass [$_Z$ han Per]
          [t]]]]]]

What then about cases where we have a left dislocated DP? We have seen above that such an LD noun phrase can be immediately followed by a clausal particle, as in (24a), repeated here.

(24) a.   Han Per   ass, han har   mye penger,   han (ass) (*han/*han Per).
           that Per   PRT he has much money   he PRT   he /that Per

Given assumption (30ii) this means that we must allow for the DP to move from Z to X. To otherwise derive (24a), we can assume as before that TopP has moved to Y. The derivation is shown in (38).

(38) a.   Han Per ass,   han har   mye penger,   han ass.
           that Per PRT   he has much money   he PRT
     b.   [$_X$ [$_{PRT1}$ ass [$_Y$ han [$_{PRT2}$ ass [$_Z$ han Per [$_{TopP}$ han har mye penger]]]]]]
     c.   [$_X$ [$_{PRT1}$ ass [$_Y$ [$_{TopP}$ han har mye penger]$_i$ han [$_{PRT2}$ ass [$_Z$ han Per
          [$_{TopP}$ t$_i$]]]]]]
     d.   [$_X$ [han Per]$_j$ [$_{PRT1}$ ass [$_Y$ [$_{TopP}$ han har mye penger]$_i$ han [$_{PRT2}$ ass [$_Z$ t$_j$
          [$_{TopP}$ t$_i$]]]]]]

Notice that the restriction against a post-particle RPD pronoun with left dislocated DP will follow straightforwardly on this analysis: such a constituent cannot occcupy Z since that is the base position for the left dislocated DP. It is less clear whether a correlative pronoun can be merged in X before the DP moves into this position. The following sentences are, according to my intuitions, at best very awkward: in the a.-example it is as if the second LD pronoun introduces a hesitation or a long pause, whereas in the b.-example one gets the feeling that the second LD DP is introduced for clarification.

(39) a.   ??Han Per, han ass,   han har   mye penger,   han ass.
             that Per he PRT   he has much money   he PRT
     b.   ??Han, han Per ass, han har   mye penger,   han ass.
             he   that Per PRT he has much money   he PRT

Notice furthermore that adding a particle to the first LD constituent supports the view that we are here dealing with true appositions: the same repair strategy can be applied in the right periphery.

(40) a. Han Per ass – han ass – han har mye penger,   han ass.
          that Per PRT he PRT he has much money   *he PRT*
      b. Han ass – han Per ass – han har mye penger,   han ass.
          he PRT   that Per PRT he has much money   *he PRT*
      c. Han, ass, han har mye penger,   han ass – han Per, ass.
          he   PRT he has much money   *he PRT*   *that Per PRT*

Assumption (iv) has so far not been addressed explicitly, but we are now in a position to see its relevance more clearly. The ungrammaticality of the following two surface orders can be directly related to this stipulation in addition to the others, which have been demonstrated above.

(41) a. *Han Per, han har mye penger,   han ass,   han ass.
          that Per he has much money   *he PRT*   *he PRT*
      b. *(Han Per), han, han har mye penger,   ass, han ass.
          that Per he he has much money   *PRT* *he PRT*

Given that the base order must be as prescribed by (ii), (41) could have been derived by moving Z (*han Per, han har mye penger*) into X (i.e. the pronoun immediately preceding the first *ass*). (41), which is bad both with and without the LD noun phrase, could have been derived by moving TopP into PRT1.

4.2. Post-particle pronouns and pre-particle DPs
Consider now the pair of examples in (17) which show that a DP may precede a particle in the right periphery whereas a pronoun can follow. These may at first sight seem difficult to derive along the lines drawn up so far.

(17) a. Hvor mye penger   har han egentlig, han Jon   DA?
          how much money   has he   actually   that Jon   then
          'How much money does he actually have then, this Jon?'
      b. Hvor mye penger   har han egentlig, da   HAN/*han?
          how much money   has he   actually   then he / he

Let us take the last example first, and let us start by noting that this example becomes very awkward if the core clause contains a DP antecedent rather than a pronoun.

(42)   ??Hvor mye   penger   har han Jon   egentlig, da   HAN?
          how much   money   has that Jon   actually   then he

One way of accounting for this is to say that such post-particle pronouns project full DPs and are merged in Z. Z would then be a position reserved for DPs and that this position can only be filled if the core clause antecedent is itself a pronoun. In other words, we would treat the post-particle pronoun as a "true" RD, not an RPD. How this can be alligned with an account in terms of a Principle C violation requires some further theorizing which will not be undertaken here.

The case in (17a) must be approached differently. Let us exchange it with the following declarative clause to make the connection with the other analyses clearer.

(43)   (Han ass,) Han har   mye penger, (*han) han Per (*han) ass (*han).
          he PRT   he   has   much money   he   that Per he   PRT   he

Such a pre-particle RD noun phrase is compatible with an LD pronoun plus LD particle, but not with a pronoun in the right periphery, no matter where we try to place such a pronoun. Given the assumptions made, the analysis then comes quite straight-forwardly: the DP is merged in Z as required but raises to PRT2. TopP on the other hand moves into Y. The derivation of this nested structure is shown in (44).

(44) a. $[_Y [_{PRT2}$ ass $[_Z$ han Per $[_{TopP}$ han har mye penger$]]]]$
      b. $[_Y [_{PRT2} [$han Per$]_i$ ass $[_Z t_i [_{TopP}$ han har mye penger$]]]]$
      c. $[_Y [_{TopP}$ han har mye penger$]_i [_{PRT2} [$han Per$]_i$ ass $[_Z t_i [_{TopP} t_i]]]$

If this analysis is on the right track it means that in cases of RD without either RPD or a right peripheral particle, there are two possible derivations, one where the DP moves one notch up and one were it stays in its base position. (In both cases TopP of course shifts across the DP.)

I will not claim that this discussion of the proposed analytical machinery and various word orders has exhausted all conceivable combinations and permutations of LD, RD, and RPD. Nevertheless, the general approach appears to possess a consider-able degree of consistency and thus seems to provide a meaningful basis for further investigations. One further challenge, which I will only briefly address next, is how the various derivations can be related to prosody.

4.3. Getting at prosody

There is one striking observation about the prosody of examples like (43) with a pre-particle RD noun phrase: unlike in many of the other cases of both RD and LD there is, in intuitive terms, no intonation break – the pronunciation of the sentence is quite "smooth", as it were.

This contrasts with cases the particle precedes the RD noun phrase, and I would like to propose a relatively non-complicated explanation for this, namely that Y+PRT2 and Z correspond to different intonation phrases. In turn, X+PRT1 is also a separate intonation phrase, and so is TopP.

It seems that a lot would fall in place on this simple approach. LD seems always to be accompanied with an intonation break, and that should fall out no matter whether LD is a product of raising of Z (pied-piping) or movement of a DP to X. RPD pronouns are normally not preceded by any intonation break, but as we saw in section 2.2. there are other clear indications that they introduce a separate intonation phrase: (i) cliticization to the preceding constituent is not allowed and (ii) they will carry the rising interrogative tone of the clause, either alone or in combination with, if present, a particle. Furthermore, as just mentioned above, RD involves an intonation break when it follows a right peripheral particle, but not when it precedes it, which it may in the absence of an RPD pronoun.

All in all, I believe that, in the advent of more sophisticated studies of intonation patterns in this domain, the current approach to the syntax of correlative elements in Scandinavian tackles the basic facts quite successfully.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper has studied peripheral doubling in Scandinavian introducing the new concept of Right Peripheral Doubling in addition the better known phenomena of Left and Right Dislocation: varieties of colloquial Mainland Scandinavian possesses a construction whereby a correlative proform appears in the right periphery of sentences, doubling either another proform or an XP inside the core clause. The phenomenon has been investigated from a mainly Norwegian perspective, focusing on argumental doubling, and the central claim of the paper has been that both right peripheral proforms and RD in fact pertain to the *left* periphery of the clausal structure but that movement processes shifts the core clause around them and renders them on the right in overt syntax.

I believe to have shown that such an approach to peripheral Scandinavian syntax proves successful in accounting for a number of the many combinations of RPD, RD, and LD that we find. Furthermore, prosodic facts seem to fall out quite nicely from the syntactic proposal.

Further and more detailed studies of the interaction between syntax and prosody are nevertheless warranted. Another issue which should be addressed in follow-up studies, is how the proposed peripheral clause structure can be more explicitly related to pragmatic and semantic notions such as illocutionary force and emphasis. A third obvious question is why other languages do not have the RPD construction and whether the general approach is tenable when confronted with data from other languages.

The present study has hopefully paved some ground which can be exploited in future investigations of peripheral syntax in Scandinavian as well as other languages.

REFERENCES

Askedal, J. O. (1987). On the morphosyntactic properties and pragmatic functions of correlative right dislocation (right copying) in modern colloquial Norwegian. In: *The Nordic languages and modern linguistics* 6 (P. Lilius and M. Saari, eds.), 93-110. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Faarlund, J. T., S. Lie, and K. I. Vannebo. (1997). *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Haegeman, L. (2006). Argument fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the Left Periphery. In *Negation, tense and clausal architecture: Cross-linguistic investigations* (R. Zanuttini, H. Campos, E. Herburger, and P. Portner, eds.), 27–52. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Hooper, J. and S. Thompson (1973). On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* **4**, 465–497.

Jørgensen, H. (2000). *Studien zur Morphologie und Syntax der festlandskandinavisch-en Personalpronomina: mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Dänischen*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Copenhagen, Acta Jutlandica **75**.

Østbø, C. B. (2007). Negation in Northern Ostrobothnian. Ms., University of Tromsø, to appear in *Nordlyd*.

Wechsler, Stephen. (1991). Verb Second and Illocutionary Force. In: *Views on Phrase Structure* (K. Leffel and D. Bouchard, eds.), 177-191. Dordrecht: Kluwer.