The limits between Extraposition and Right-Discocation

Laetitia Leonarduzzi, Sophie Herment

THE LIMITS BETWEEN EXTRAPOSITIONS
AND RIGHT-DISLOCATIONS

LAETITIA LEONARDUZZI AND SOPHIE HERMENT

Aix Marseille Université, Laboratoire Parole et Langage, UMR 7309, 13100 Aix-en-Provence

It is often said that, like NPs, clauses which are phrasal cannot (or can rarely) undergo extraposition. It is especially the case for instance of nominal *–ing* clauses. Except when introduced by such embedding predicates as *be no use*, *be worth*, these clauses are not considered as extraposable[1]. Quirk et al. (1985) for example think that the sentence *It's fun(,) being a hostess* is unlikely to contain an extraposition (even though this is one possible interpretation). Rather, they consider the *–ing* clause here as a noun-phrase tag (or right-dislocation). Huddleston (1984) gives the following extraposed example as ungrammatical or doubtful: *?It has caused many of us great distress seeing him treat her like that* (whereas it would be fine with an infinitive clause). The author deems the extraposition of *–ing* clauses to be nevertheless possible in short sentences (*It's been nice meeting you; it was useful having her with us*). Smolka (2005) and Kaltenböck (2004), for their part, show that with *–ing* clauses, contrary to what happens with the other nominal clauses (that, infinitive), extraposition is the marked structure. Non-extraposition is more frequent than extraposition. So it seems that extraposition is indeed rather rare, and found mainly with certain embedding predicates.

---

[1] Note that in the written part of the corpus we investigated (ICE-GB), almost all the occurrences of *it* followed by an *–ing* clause are found with the predicate *be worth(while)*, which tends to show that the contexts in which an *–ing* clause appears with *it* are really limited in writing.

Now if we take such examples as *It's quite hard hitting reports in some way*, the presence of *in some way* at the end of the sentence gives the impression that *hitting reports* is integrated into the sentence, so can't we say here that the *-ing* clause is extraposed rather than right-dislocated, even though it is not introduced by one of the classical predicates used with *-ing* extraposition?

Another aspect of the problem is prosody. Some linguists who point out the differences between extraposition and clausal right-dislocation take prosody into account to disambiguate the two structures. They take it for granted that each structure corresponds to a specific phonological pattern, explaining the differences in terms of the number of tone units or the tone [Quirk *et al.* 1985; Huddleston & Pullum 2002].

The questions we will be addressing in this paper are the following: is it possible to disambiguate such examples as *It's quite hard hitting reports in some way* above? What criteria can be used? Is there a clear-cut distinction between clausal extraposition and clausal right-dislocation? And lastly: does one prosodic pattern correspond to one syntactic structure?

Our study bears mainly on (the disambiguation of) *-ing* clauses, but we will take into account other types of clauses as well.

Corpus and method

The study is based on a corpus of spontaneous or semi-spontaneous speech taken from the ICE-GB and Aix-Marsec [Auran *et al.* 2004] corpora as well as from a few radio or television programmes.

We have first conducted two separate analyses: a discourse analysis and a prosodic analysis, which were then combined.

Our study is divided into two main parts. From a theoretical point of view first, we shall examine the syntactic, discourse-pragmatic and prosodic common points and differences between the two structures. Then we shall proceed with the corpus analysis, which will be analysed mainly from a prosodic point of view: unambiguous extrapositions, unambiguous right-dislocations, (ambiguous) *-ing* clauses, and (other) ambiguous examples.

1. Background

1.1. Preliminary remarks and definitions

We should note first of all that the term *right-dislocation* is usually used to refer to noun phrases, whereas the term *extraposition* applies mainly to clauses. Indeed, very few noun phrases can be extraposed [Michaëlis & Lambrecht 1996; Simonin & Leonarduzzi 2009]. The right-dislocation of

clauses is rarely mentioned as well (although we do not think this to be a very rare phenomenon). Our terminology will distinguish clausal right dislocation (CRD) from noun phrase right-dislocation (NPRD). Extraposition will be considered mainly as clausal extraposition (CE), and noun phrase extraposition (NPE) will be mentioned only briefly.

We shall distinguish the main clause (MC) from the rightmost constituent (RC: extraposed or dislocated clause or NP). For instance, in *It'sfun(,) being a hostess*, *It's fun* will be called the MC and *being a hostess* is the RC.

To start with simple definitions, we will take up Birner & Ward's definition of (C)E and Crystal's definition of (NP)RD. Birner & Ward's definition of extraposition is as follows:

> "In extraposition, a subordinate clause is postposed from subject position[2], while its canonical position is filled by non-referential *it*." [Birner & Ward 2004: 166]

As for (noun-phrase) right-dislocation, this is how Crystal defines it:

> "A type of sentence in which one of the constituents appears in final position and its canonical position is filled by a pronoun with the same reference, e. g. *I know her, Julie; He's always late, that chap*." [Crystal 2003: 401]

This definition can be applied to clauses as well as noun phrases. The only difference is that there is a restriction in the use of the anticipatory pronoun for a clause: it can only be a neutral pronoun (generally *it*).

1.2 Distinguishing criteria

We shall here start with syntactic and discourse-pragmatic parameters before turning to the prosodic point of view.

1.2.1 Syntactic and discourse-pragmatic criteria

1.2.1.1 Common points

If ambiguity exists between two structures, it means first of all that they share common features. So let us see first the analogies between CEs and CRDs.

As we mentioned in the preceding paragraph, CRD generally starts with the pronoun *it*. It is also the case for CE. And in both structures, this pronoun is cataphoric and refers forward to the clause on the right:

1)It's important to meet people. (CE)

---

[2] It can also be postposed from object position.

2) <u>It</u>'s interesting, what you are saying. (CRD)

In both cases, from a purely syntactic point of view, the anticipatory pronoun can be replaced by the clause on the right. The sentence remains grammatical:

1b) To meet people is important.

2b) What you are saying is interesting.

But there seem to be more differences than common points.

1.2.1.2 Differences: syntactic analysis

The syntactic analysis of RD and (C)E is quite different. Huddleston (1984) indicates that (NP)RD is not a reorganisation of a canonical sentence. Thus, we cannot say that *They are excellent company, the Smiths* is derived from *The Smiths are excellent company*. Huddleston regards *the Smiths* as "an amplification of *They are excellent company*" [Huddleston: 452]. Indeed, the right-dislocated NP *the Smiths* "could never provide the sole or primary indication of what *they* refers to" [Huddleston: 451] (this is linked to the fact that in RD the pronoun has to be anaphoric: see following paragraphs). Radford (1988) also shows that a right-dislocation cannot be handled in terms of a movement rule.

On the contrary, extraposition has been classically analysed as proceeding from a movement rule: such an example as *It is annoying that he should be so late* can be considered to derive by movement from *That he should be so late is annoying* (even though such an analysis is now questioned). Huddleston (1984), for instance, describes extraposition as a transformation which "moves the embedded clause to the right and puts *it* in its place" [Huddleston: 17].

1.2.1.3 Differences: the reference of *it*

The second difference concerns the reference of *it*. Several authors consider that in extraposition *it* is non-referential whereas in RD the pronoun is anaphoric, referring to an already-mentioned item [*cf.* Birner & Ward 2004; Huddleston & Pullum 2005; Miller 2001]. This difference is linked to the syntactic analysis of extraposed constituents as derived by a movement rule. Indeed, if the extraposed clause is moved to the end of the sentence, it means that there is no prior existence of a referring pronoun. The *it* is inserted in subject (or object) position to fill an empty syntactic slot and to refer to the clause at the right of the sentence. The inserted element is semantically empty. Birner & Ward (2004) explain that preposing as well as postposing

"involve the non-canonical placement of one or more constituents whose canonical position is not filled by a referential element (such as an anaphoric pronoun)." This contrasts with RD, which "places a coreferential pronoun in the right-dislocated NP's canonical position". In RD, the pronoun is (already) referential.

Such a difference leads to two consequences.

a) Replacement of *it* by *this/that*

First of all, in (C)E, the pronoun cannot be replaced by anaphoric *this/that*, whereas it is possible to do so with (C)RD. This fact is pointed out by Miller (2001), who opposes right-dislocation and extraposition in sentences starting with the phrase *the fact that* (hence with noun phrases, which cannot be extraposed) [Miller: 2/ 684]. He gives the ungrammatical (extraposed) example

This was a shock to me [the fact that a bloodthirsty, cruel capitalist should be such a graceful fellow]

 as opposed to the grammatical RD

This was a shock to me, [the fact that a bloodthirsty, cruel capitalist should be such a graceful fellow].

Let us take other examples. The following extraposed clause could not be introduced by *that*:

*They asked how they could buy the corpus and it's been / *that has been suggested that they could make a PO first.*

On the contrary, with a dislocated clause, *it* can be replaced by *that* :

I have many, many friends there. It's / That is true, what I'm telling you. I know almost everyone[3].

b) Removal of the rightmost clause

The second, correlated consequence is that the clause on the right should be removable if it is right-dislocated, but not if it is extraposed. If we take up the preceding examples, we can say:

I have many, many friends there. It's true. I know almost everyone.

---

[3] This example has been borrowed from C. Delmas (*Faits de langue, faits de discours en anglais − initiation méthodologique à l'explication grammaticale,* Éditions de l'Espace Européen, collection Anglophonia, 1992).

But not:

They asked how they could buy the corpus and it's been suggested.

We can refer here to Michaëlis & Lambrecht (1996), who explain "in the case of RD, an instance missing the dislocated constituent is always a syntactically well formed and potentially complete sentence" [Michaëlis & Lambrecht: 222].

Here is another example:

A : Nice to meet you

*B : Yes, nice meeting you as well / *Nice as well.*

1.2.1.4 Differences: discourse status of the extraposed or dislocated clause

The discourse status of the rightmost constituent is different in CE and CRD.

Let us start with CE. Both Birner & Ward (2004) and Kaltenböck (2004) show that the content of extraposed clauses can be either new or given. In their corpus, Birner & Ward find that 56.1% of extraposed structures in spoken English are discourse-new (this rate goes up to 83.2% in written English). For Birner & Ward (2004), Kaltenböck (2004), and Miller (2001), if the content of the subordinate clause is discourse-new, extraposition is mandatory.

On the contrary, in CRD, the pronoun is analysed as anaphoric, which means that it has to refer to discourse-old information. Hence, the content of the right-dislocated clause will be discourse-old as well. Birner & Ward (2004) show thanks to the following example that in (NP)RD the right-dislocated element has to be discourse-old (or given):

> "(34) Before the waterfall (and this was the most astonishing sight of all), a whole mass of enormous glass pipes were dangling down into the river from somewhere high up in the ceiling! # They really were ENORMOUS, some of the boulders in the river" (OK: *they really were ENORMOUS, those pipes*) [Birner & Ward 2004: 169]

Huddleston (1984) also considers that the referent of a right-dislocated noun-phrase has to be already mentioned or "sufficiently salient in the context of discourse" to be referred to with a pronoun [Huddleston: 451].

1.2.1.5 Conclusion

In spite of these syntactic and discourse-pragmatic differences, it is not always easy to know whether a sentence is extraposed or right-dislocated. Indeed, from a discourse-pragmatic point of view, the content of an

extraposed as well as of a right-dislocated clause can be given. Only when the content of the clause is new can we be sure that we are faced with extraposition. Moreover, it is not always easy to determine whether a pronoun is referential or not (especially as we are dealing with clauses and not noun phrases), hence it is difficult to know whether the clause can be removed or not. Replacement by *this/that* is also questionable. It largely depends on the preceding context and how far the content of the right-dislocated clause has already been mentioned.

Consider the following example (a conversation between two people):

A- So you 're not coming in

B- No it 's booked up with the wordprocessing thing from half past nine till five **So r it 's a complete waste of time me coming in.** *Xepe 's coming in anyway because he's got to do some teaching on Monday (ICE-GB:s1a-008F164-171)*

Me coming in is already given. It has actually been an (incomplete) question asked by A further up in the conversation (*Are you going to…*) and which is taken up in *So you're not coming in.* The subordinate clause *me coming in* could be removed or not. You could say *That's a complete waste of time*, but it might also not meet the speaker's purpose. In other words it is not clear whether *it* is referential or not. While removable, it seems that the *-ing* clause is yet necessary to make the speaker's speech clearer.

1.2.2 Prosodic criteria

To our knowledge, not much has been said about the prosody of right-dislocations *vs.* extrapositions and only a few authors point out some differences. In the literature, various authors mention the number of tone units or the tones, and the placement of nuclei, but very few combine the three.

As far as the number of tone units (TUs) is concerned, the authors seem to contradict each other.

For Michaëlis & Lambrecht (1996), who oppose NPRD to NPE, the extraposed NP is necessarily accented, whereas in (NP)RD "the postpredicate NP has a low and flat intonation contour, indicating that it follows the right boundary of the VP focus domain" [Michaëlis & Lambrecht: 223]. This would support the view that "the postpredicate NP in NE [NPE] is indispensable" [*ibid.*]. In NPE, the referent of the extraposed constituent is nonrecoverable. On the contrary, the NP in NPRD is topical,

and hence can lack prosodic prominence. This is how they represent the (prosodic) differences between the two structures:

a. It's AMAZING the things children SAY. (NPE)

b. It's AMAZING, the things children say. (NPRD)

On the contrary, Huddleston & Pullum (2005), considering CRD as opposed to CE, explain that "unlike the extraposed constituent, the dislocated constituent almost invariably constitutes a distinct intonational phrase and is separated from the nucleus of the clause by an intonational boundary" [Huddleston & Pullum: 1414]. They link this prosodic difference to a difference in information status: right-dislocation is discourse-old whereas extraposition may be discourse-new. Smolka (2005), who points out the prosodic treatment in the distinction between extraposition and right-dislocation with *–ing* clauses, is at one with Huddleston & Pullum: one single unit of intonation for extraposition, and two for right-dislocation.

Wells and Aijmer talk about the prosody of NPRDs. Wells [2006: 81] explains that displaced subjects at the end of the sentence (that is right-dislocations) form a "separate IP". He thus also considers that RDs are uttered with 2 tone units.

Aijmer (1989) has a slightly different view. She underlines that, contrary to a theme (*i.e.* a left-dislocation), what she calls a tail (*i.e.* a right-dislocation) is not always marked off by a tone unit boundary from predication (there is no tone unit boundary in 34% of her examples).

Concerning the place of nuclei and the tones, very different opinions also coexist in the literature. The tone in extraposition has rarely been spoken of. In NPRD, it has been mentioned by a few authors.

Associating the tone of the tail (*i.e.* NPRD) to its function in discourse, Aijmer (1989) mentions two possibilities: a rising intonation (for most of the tails), which indicates intimacy and personal "rapport" in the interaction [Aijmer: 148], and a falling intonation, which is used for afterthoughts [Aijmer: 152]. In the example

/ \ AGO'NIZING TH/AT,

she explains that the tail is part of a tone unit with two nuclei : a rising-falling intonation in the predication and a rising intonation in the tail. Aijmer also acknowledges the possibility of a tail lacking prominence and being pronounced indistinctly (*sotto voce*), for instance in:

'Cos it's so F\UNNY that book

This is close to what Simonin & Leonarduzzi (2009) refer to when they say that right-dislocations can have the intonation of parenthetical groups.

Similarly, Miller (2001) explains that if a clause is right-dislocated, it will be pronounced "with a sentence-final intonation contour" on the first part, a pause, and a deaccented dislocated constituent, whereas if it is an extraposition, such a pattern will be inappropriate.

Quirk *et al.* (1994) give the following prosodic patterns for the two possible interpretations of *It's fun being a hostess*:

a. It's / fun being a HÒSTESS /

b. It's FÙN being a HÓSTESS [Quirk *et al.*: 1393]

Sentence a. (with a fall and main information focus on *hostess*) represents extraposition, and sentence b. (with a fall and main focus on *fun*, and a rise on *hostess*) corresponds to a noun-phrase tag (or right-dislocation). It is not clear here whether they consider one or two units. The same ambiguity exists in Huddleston's (1984) example *They are nice company, the Smiths*, for which the author gives a fall on *company* and a rise on *the Smiths.* So there are two possible interpretations here:

- In the case of one TU, the tone is a fall-rise with the nucleus on *fun* or on *company.*

- If there are two TUs, we have a fall followed by a rise. This is what Wells (2006) gives: a "fall-plus-rise pattern" in the case of the displacement of the subject to the end of the sentence:

"the main fall tone stays on its normal place. […] The displaced subject, in a separate IP, has a dependent rise (or less commonly fall-rise):

She's \bri̲lliant, | /Bre̲nda." [Wells, 1996: 81-2]

To sum up, three different tones have been mentioned by the authors for (NP)RD: a rise or a fall on the dislocated constituent, or a fall-rise (with the nucleus before the dislocated constituent). To these three tones we can add the absence of intonation contour on the right-dislocated constituent.

So we can see that the opinions differ a lot and Smolka (2005), who touches on the problem of the ambiguity between extraposition and right-dislocation with *–ing* clauses, concludes after analysing his examples that "intonation is by no means a reliable criterion" [Smolka: 139].

But is it not (a reliable criterion)? This is what we shall consider in the following section.

2. Corpus analysis: prosody

2.1 Method and theoretical background

We have selected a certain number of unambiguous (clausal) extrapositions on the basis of the syntactic and discourse-pragmatic criteria put forward in the above paragraphs, and proceeded to examine their prosody to see what their prosodic pattern was. We did so too for noun phrase right-dislocations. Then we studied *-ing* clauses and tried to see whether we could associate one type of clause with one (or several) prosodic patterns.

Due to the poor oral quality of many examples (in the ICE-GB corpus), the prosodic analysis was performed aurally.

Following phonologists like Crystal (1969) or Cruttenden (1986), we consider in this study that a tone unit is a segment of speech which occurs with a coherent prosodic contour (pitch and rhythm). Phonetic clues enable us to segment the discourse into TUs, such as the presence of pauses (silent or not), an anacrusis at the beginning of the TU, the lengthening of the final syllable of the TU and pitch reset [Cruttenden 1986: 36 *ff*; Couper-Kuhlen 1986: 75; Deschamps *et al.* 2000: 185). We also adopt the principle that there is only one nuclear syllable in a TU, which is the most prominent one, that bearing the tone (the distinctive pitch movement) of the TU [for example Tench 1996: 12-13 or Halliday & Greaves 2008: 42-44]. We therefore based our prosodic analysis on Halliday's 3 Ts: tonality (the segmentation into tone units), tonicity (the place of nuclear syllables) and tones (the distinctive pitch movements) [Halliday 1967].

We coded our examples as follows:

1)   the number of tone units (TUs) (the tone unit boundaries are marked by slashes):

> - we coded 1 TU when there was no boundary between the two elements of the extraposition or dislocation: *It's fun being a hostess.* If a tone unit boundary occurred in the second part of the structure (the extraposed or dislocated constituent), the coding was still 1TU : *It's fun being a hostess / or a steward /*

> - we coded 2 TUs (or more) if there was a boundary after the first element of the structure (the main clause, MC): *It's fun / being a hostess or a steward /.* There can be several TUs in the first part of the structure: *It's fun / but also very tiring / being a hostess or a steward /*; or several in the second part of the structure: *It's fun / being a hostess / or a steward / when you are young;* or both.

2) the place of the tonic syllable, the nucleus (N): this syllable is underlined in the examples;

3) the tone: we coded F for a falling tone, R for a rising tone, FR for a fall-rise movement and HF for a high fall tone.

Let us take an example: if we have an F/F pattern for a sentence, that means we have 2 TUs, with a falling tone in the first one (on the MC) followed by another falling tone in the second TU (on the rightmost constituent, RC).

2.2 Unambiguous (clausal) extrapositions

We have studied 86 examples of CEs. Most of these examples contain a *that* clause or an infinitive clauses, but we also have a few indirect questions. We divided the examples first according to the number of TUs.

55% of our examples (47 examples in total) contain only one TU. In this case, the nucleus is on the second part of the sentence (the rightmost, or extraposed, constituent):

I mean it'd been left to me to <u>or</u>ganise it F (<u>s1a-s1a-005F220</u>)

The tone can be neutral (F or R) or non-neutral (emphatic or contrastive: HF or FR) and in this case, the emphasis or contrast logically bears on the extraposed constituent (9 such examples):

if you're working honestly with your body and with your weight uhm / then it doesn't matter <u>who</u>'s involved HF (<u>s1a-002F147</u>)

Uhm it 's nice for <u>me</u> to do something FR/ where I 'm <u>moving</u> F <,> because I <u>teach</u> now F (<u>S1A-002 F006</u>)

45% of our examples (39 examples) contain two TUs. These examples can be divided into three categories.

First, the examples containing an HF or FR pattern somewhere in the MC or the RC, or both. There are 23 of them. These are either contrastive or emphatic.

It is up to the people of Ku<u>wait</u> F / to decide what kind of government they <u>want</u> HF (<u>s1b-027F131</u>) (there is emphasis on *want* and *Kuwait* is opposed to *us* earlier in the discussion)

Second, the examples pronounced with R/F (6 occurrences):

You know I think it's not going to be possible <u>actually</u> R / to to do that next term un<u>for</u>tunately F(<u>s1b-015F018</u>)

The rising tone can be considered to announce what follows [Wells 2006: 73].

Third, the pattern F/F is found in 10 examples. It is associated with a contrast or an emphasis in 5 occurrences, and 5 examples are taken from a special type of discourse, either parliamentary or journalistic:

and uh I know it's not best practice F / to start from the general F/and then move on to the particular F /(s2a-021F005)

Is it honourable F/ for a member who's been on his feet F/ speaking for five minutes F / to quite cynically after it's been pointed out to him F/that he was in breach of the rules of the House R/ to suddenly say (s1b-051F088)

So if a sentence is found with the F/F pattern and is not contrastive or emphatic, or part of a special type of discourse, it is unlikely to be an extraposition.

| | | Place of nucleus | | Contrast/ | Nb of | |
	Tone	on MC	on RC	emphasis	exs	%age
One TU	F or R		X		38	44
	HF or FR		X	X	9	10.5
Total					*47*	*54.5*
Two TUs	HF or FR			X	23	27
	R/F				6	7
	F/F			X (5 ex)	10	11.5
Total					*39*	*45.5*
Total					**86**	**100**

Chart 1: the prosody of clausal extrapositions

3.3 Noun phrase right-dislocations

Taking up the corpus of Simonin & Leonarduzzi (2009), which is based on ICE-GB, we treated 66 examples of NPRD and found that 69.5% (46 examples) of the occurrences were uttered with only one TU. The nucleus is then most often on the first part of the sentence (the MC), the dislocated constituent being unaccented. This pattern corresponds to 43 examples out of the 46:

It looks swollen that foot FR (s1a_047F262)

The tone is F (33 examples) or FR (12 examples), and in a great part of the examples (16 in total) the dislocated constituent is *this* or *that*:

It's a bit <u>scary</u> this F (<u>s1a-037F236</u>)

In three cases only, the nucleus is on the rightmost (dislocated) constituent, because the RC is emphatic. In two cases the nucleus is in a marked position, that is not on the last lexical word, and the tone is F:

It escaped on the <u>underground</u> F / and it got out this <u>poor</u> wasp F / so far from <u>home</u> F (<u>s1a-067F048</u>)

Two TUs were found in 30.5% of the examples (20 occurrences). These can be divided into two categories. First, the F/F[4] pattern is found with the examples in which the RD functions as an afterthought (15 examples). The speaker seems to add an element to make sure the co-speaker understands the reference of the (co-referential) pronoun in the MC. The right-dislocation may also play the part of a "filler", when the speaker does not know what he is going to say next. There is often a pause between the MC and the RC. The F/F pattern corresponds to what Wells [2006: 85-86] calls concord tone between two intonation phrases to show some kind of parallelism, concordance between the two elements here:

That's a Tefl or teaching in English in Ja<u>pan</u> F / [uhm] the <u>JET</u> scheme F (<u>s1a-035F014</u>)

The second category concerns the examples in which an element in the MC and/or the RC is contrastive or emphatic (5 examples), with the FR or HF pattern:

Indeed it may be because they are <u>ideals</u> HF/ and not <u>truths</u> F/ that they are so deeply <u>attached</u> to them F (<u>s2b-032F063</u>)

Is that something you <u>saw</u> FR / this piece of jagged <u>metal</u> R/ or something you assumed must be <u>there</u>? FR (<u>s1b-066F190</u>)

---

[4] The pattern can also be terminal R: in questions and in the regional use of R as a terminal tone (also called HRT for High Rising Terminal or upspeak).

	Tone	Place of nucleus		Contrast/ emphasis	Nb of exs	%age
		on MC	on RC			
One TU	F or FR	X			43	65
	F or HF		X	X	3	5.5
Total					*46*	*69.5*
Two TUs	F /F (+pause)				15	23
	FR or HF			X	5	7.5
Total					*20*	*30.5*
Total					**66**	**100**

Chart 2: The prosody of noun phrase right dislocations

2.3 –*ing* clauses

We shall now broach the question of -*ing* clauses. Can the above prosodic patterns for CE and NPRD apply to -*ing* clauses in order to disambiguate the clause and say whether it is extraposed or right-dislocated?

Among our 36 occurrences, 27 are taken from ICE-GB, and 9 from various radio programs or films[5].

We will consider first the cases in which there is only one TU. To come back on the above analyses of CE and NPRD, we can conclude that the two structures work differently: in CE, the nucleus is on the rightmost constituent whereas it is on the first part of the sentence (the main clause) in NPRD. When there is one TU, then, the examples are not ambiguous. Among the 19 examples of -*ing* clauses containing only one TU, 14 can be said to be extraposed (nucleus on the RC):

It's wonderful meeting you F / just at this point after ten years is it when you were just leaving St Albans (s1b-041F049)

and 5 are dislocated (nucleus on the MC):

But has it had an effect on your work winning the prize F / ii in the sense that you know you can write a best-selling prize-winning novel F (s1b-046F010)

The pattern can then be F or FR in both structures.

---

[5] Special thanks to Pierre Busuttil and Paul Larreya, who kindly let us use some of their examples.

The case is trickier when there are two or more TUs. We have 17 examples of those (47%). We have found no R/F pattern (which would have been unambiguously extraposed). If the pattern is F/F, and the structure functions as an afterthought, then we can speak of dislocations. We have found the F/F pattern in 9 examples, and 4 of them are clear instances of afterthoughts (with characteristic pauses) and can then be considered to be dislocated:

Has it been a new experience F /working with disabled people F ([s1a-002F120](s1a-002F120))

But it also takes up far too much room F / doing it here doesn't it F ([s1a-057F010](s1a-057F010)) (there is a long pause before the second TU)

The other occurrences are more ambiguous, prosodically speaking. They are neither emphatic nor contrastive.

There remain 8 examples in which there is a contrast or an emphasis somewhere in the sentence (with an HF or FR tone), and this makes it impossible to say, from a prosodic point of view, whether the *–ing* clause is extraposed or dislocated. The important point here is probably not so much the distinction between extraposition and dislocation as the contrast or the emphasis:

it's no longer any good HF / offering cars that can only perform off-road F ([s2a-055F083](s2a-055F083))

For me as a visually impaired person R / I don't think it's any harder than a sighted person FR / looking for this sort of job F/ because it's just tough for anyone really (BBCInTouch240603)

Our conclusions on *–ing* clauses are summed up in the chart below.

	TUs	Tone	Place of N		Contrast/ emph	Nb of exs	%age
			On MC	On RC			
Extraposed	1	F or FR		X	No	14	39
Total						*14*	*39*
Dislocated	1	F or FR	X		No	5	14
	2	F / F			No	4	11
Total						*9*	*25*
Ambiguous	2	F/ F			No	5	14
	2	HF or FR			Yes	8	22
Total						*13*	*36*
Total						**36**	**100**

Chart 3 : The prosody of -ing clauses

2.4. Ambiguous examples

2.4.1 Examples that can be disambiguated

To the syntactic and discourse-pragmatic criteria mentioned in § 2, we can now add a prosodic criterion. A clause will be right-dislocated if it corresponds to the following pattern: 1 TU and a falling tone or FR tone on the first part of the structure, or two TUs with the F/F pattern and a pause indicating an afterthought. On the contrary, if the sentence has one TU with the nuclear syllable in the rightmost constituent, the *–ing* clause will be extraposed.

Let us come back on the example mentioned above, which was considered to be ambiguous from a syntactic and discourse-pragmatic point of view:

it was a complete waste of time me <u>coming</u> in F (<u>s1a-008F167</u>)

If we consider prosody, we can say that this example is extraposed, and not dislocated, since the nucleus falls on the RC. In the same way, the example mentioned in the introduction can be said to be extraposed because of the prosodic pattern:

It was quite hard hitting <u>reports</u> in some way F

Conversely, some examples remain ambiguous from a prosodic point of view but can be disambiguated thanks to the syntactic and discourse-pragmatic features described above. In the example below, the prosody does

not help to disambiguate, but we can say that this is an extraposition because the RC cannot be removed (it has not been mentioned yet):

in a very r restricted field / it may be worth <u>while</u> F/ letting them <u>have</u> a C.V. F/ and letting them know you know you are av<u>ai</u>lable F ([s1a-066F078](s1a-066F078))

2.4.2 Examples that remain ambiguous

In spite of all the criteria presented in this paper, there are still examples which remain ambiguous (that is, for which no disambiguating criterion works).

In the following example, the speaker explains what a "quadrat" is and how they do it (and then why they do it): they use pieces of rope that they put down on the ground.

We had <,> so we had five quadrats And uhm the the reason for carrying <laugh> carrying this out **It really sounds <u>strange</u> you know HF / just pinning pieces of uhm rope down on the <u>ground</u> F / uh to make a a rectangle or a square** *Uhm <,> the reason for doing that is that the five of us spread out over a little distance in the wood and we each took a patch <,> And then you mark down you write down on a list exactly what plants are in (ICE-BG: S1A-036F198 to 201)*

From a prosodic point of view, the example contains two TUs and an HF tone in the first part of the structure, so it is ambiguous (it is more likely to be an extraposition in terms of the frequency of use of a non-neutral tone in CE and CRD). Now, from a discourse-pragmatic point of view, it is not clear whether the *it* is referential or not, and hence whether the *–ing* clause can be removed or not. The pronoun *it* seems to refer back to the preceding sentence (*carrying THIS out*), so that it seems that the *–ing* clause could be removed. But it is not certain that the speaker did not have in mind the end of the sentence when he started it, and it may be the case that the clause cannot be removed. Replacement by *this* (or *that*) is also unlikely, even though it would make sense. What is important here is certainly the emphasis on *strange*.

Conclusion

We can now answer the questions raised in the introduction.

1) Is it possible to disambiguate examples such as *It's quite hard hitting reports in some way*? Yes. This possibility is based on a combination of criteria, which can be syntactic, discourse-pragmatic or prosodic.

We feel though that we have not explored all the criteria which can be taken into account in order to disambiguate between CE and CRD. For instance,

the type of embedding predicate and the discourse function of the clause certainly play a part as well.

2) Is there a clear-cut distinction between clausal extraposition and clausal right-dislocation? The distinction is not always clear-cut and some examples remain ambiguous.

3) Does one prosodic pattern correspond to one syntactic structure?

There is no one-to-one correspondence between one syntactic structure and one prosodic pattern. Both CE and CRD can be pronounced with one or two TUs, with a variety of tones. This explains why authors should have contradictory intuitions when they consider the prosodic differences between (C)RD and (C)E. Nevertheless, general tendencies stand out: when there is just one TU, CRD is pronounced with the nucleus on the main clause (the dislocated constituent being a tail) and the tones are F or FR. CE is on the contrary found with a nucleus on the rightmost (extraposed) constituent, generally with the tone F. When there are two TUs, CRD can be characterized by an F/F pattern, whereas CE is more frequent with an HF or FR tone somewhere in the main clause or the rightmost constituent. CE can also display the pattern R/F.

If we consider only the unambiguous examples (which amount to 64% of our occurrences), it seems that *-ing* clauses are more frequently extraposed than right-dislocated (even if we do not include the classical *it is no use, it is worth…*). So the structures with *-ing* clauses would be, by order of frequency: non-extraposed; extraposed; right-dislocated.

References

AIJMER, Karin. "Themes and Tails : the discourse functions of dislocated elements", *Nordic Journal of Linguistics 12(2)* (1989): 137-154.

BIBER, Douglas, JOHANSON, Stig & LEECH, Geoffrey. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*, Harlow: Longman, 1999.

BIRNER, Betty J. & WARD, Gregory. *Information Status and Noncanonical Word Order in English*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1998.

BIRNER, Betty J. & WARD, Gregory. "Discourse and Information Structure", in SCHIFFRIN, D., TANNEN, D. & HAMILTON H. (eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2001: 119-137.

BIRNER, Betty J. & WARD, Gregory. "Information Structure and Non-canonical Syntax", in HORN, L.R. & WARD, G. (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2004: 153-174.

BOLINGER, Dwight. *Intonation and its parts: melody in spoken English*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986.

BOLINGER, Dwight. *Intonation and its Uses, Melody in Grammar and Discourse*, London: Arnold, 1989.

BUSUTTIL, Pierre & LARREYA, Paul. « le sujet "réel" dans les constructions extraposées *it's V-ING / TO+V* : sémantique, syntaxe, prosodie, » communication pour les journées de l'ALAES (ENS-LSH Lyon), 2004.

CALUDE, Andreea S. "Clefting and extraposition in English" in *ICAME Journal n°32*, 2008: 7-33.

http://calude.net/andreea/Clefting.pdf

COLLINS, Peter. "Extraposition in English", *Functions of Language 1*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995: 7-24.

COUPER-KUHLEN, Elizabeth. *An Introduction to English Prosody*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1986.

CRUTTENDEN, Alan. *Intonation*, 2nd edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

CRYSTAL, David. *Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

CRYSTAL, David. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, Blackwell Publishing, 5th edition 2003 (1980).

DESCHAMPS Alain, DUCHET, Jean-Louis, FOURNIER, Jean-Michel & O'NEIL, Michael. *English Phonology and Graphophonemics*, Gap-Paris: Ophrys, 2004.

HALLIDAY, Michael A.K. *Intonation and Grammar in British English*, The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1967.

HALLIDAY, Michael A.K. & GREAVES William S. *Intonation in the Grammar of English*, London-Oakville: Equinox, 2008.

HERRIMAN, Jennifer. "The functions of extraposition in English texts", *Functions of Language* 7.2, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2000: 203-230.

HERMENT-DUJARDIN, Sophie. « Prédication et emphase en anglais : le rôle de la prosodie », in J-M. MERLE (ed.), *La Prédication*, Bibliothèque de faits de langue, vol. 30 & 31, 2009: 243-252.

HUDDLESTON, Rodney. *Introduction to the Grammar of English*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1984.

HUDDLESTON, Rodney, & PULLUM, Geoffrey. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, 3rd edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

KALTENBÖCK, Gunter. "Using non-extraposition in spoken and written texts: A functional perspective", in AIJMER, K. & STENSTRÖM, A-B. (eds.), *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004: 219-242.

KHALIFA, Jean-Charles. *La syntaxe anglaise aux concours. Théorie et pratique de l'énoncé complexe,* Paris: Armand Colin, 1999.

LARREYA, PAUL. "Deixis, anaphore et cataphore dans les constructions extraposées" in *l'ordre des mots II, domaine anglais, C.I.E.R.E.C*, Saint-Etienne, 1993: 253-279.

LAMBRECHT, Knud. *Information Structure*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

LEONARDUZZI, Laetitia & HERRY, Nadine. « Les dislocations à droite : entre détachement et intégration : quelques aspects syntaxiques et prosodiques », Actes du 13ème colloque d'anglais oral de Villetaneuse, 31 mars-1 avril 2006, to appear.

LEONARDUZZI, Laetitia. *La subordonnée interrogative en anglais contemporain*, Aix-en-Provence: Presses de l'Université de Provence, 2004.

MCCAWLEY, James D. *The Syntactic Phenomena of English*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, second edition 1998 [1988].

MICHAELIS, Laura A. & LAMBRECHT, Knud. "Toward a construction-based theory of language function: the case of nominal extraposition", *Language 76 (2)*, 1996: 219-245.

MILLER, Jim & WEINERT, Regina. *Spontaneous Spoken Language, Syntax and Discourse*, Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1998.

MILLER, Philip. "Discourse constraints on extraposition from subject in English" in *Linguistics: an interdisciplinary journal of the language sciences*, vol. 39, n°4, de Gruyter, Berlin, 2001: 683-701 (found on http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_hb195/is_4_39/ai_n28861810/).

OHLANDER, S. "Question-orientation versus answer-orientation in English interrogative clauses," in D. Kastovsky et A. Szwedek (eds.), *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries : in Honour of Jacek Fisiak on*

the occasion of his 50ᵗʰ birthday, Vol. 2, Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter, 1986: 963-982.

PRINCE, Ellen. "Toward a taxonomy of given-new information", in COLE P. (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*, New York: Academic Press, 1981: 223-255.

QUIRK, Randolph, GREENBAUM, Sidney, LEECH, Geoffrey & SVARTVIK, Jan. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language,* London: Longman, 12ᵗʰ edition 1994 [1985].

RADFORD, Andrew. *Transformational Grammar. A First Course,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

SMOLKA, Vladislav. "Non-extraposed Subject Clauses", in *Theory and Practice in English Studies 3: Proceedings from the Eighth Conference of British, American and Canadian Studies.* Brno: MasarykovaUniverzita. 2005: 137-143.

SIMONIN, Olivier & LEONARDUZZI, Laetitia. « Dislocations à droite et extrapositions nominales : syntaxe et réalisation(s) » in *Grammaire et prosodie 2*, travaux du CerLiCO, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2009: 129-149.

TENCH, Paul. *The Intonation Systems of English,* London: Cassell, 1996.

WELLS, John C. *English Intonation, an Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

ICE-GB (University College London): http:// ice-corpora.net/ice/icegb.htm