

# On Multiple Right Dislocation in Japanese and the Uniqueness Parameter

Brian Agbayani and Toru Ishii

## 1. Introduction

Right Dislocation in Japanese such as (1), where the right-dislocated phrase *sono kyaku-ni* ‘that guest-Dat’ appears post-verbally, has received considerable attention (Haraguchi 1973, Kuno 1978, Simon 1989, Rosen 1996, Tanaka 2001, *inter alia*). Although details differ among these analyses, they generally agree that Right Dislocation involves syntactic movement. (1) gives an example of single constituent Right Dislocation.

- (1) Tentyoo-ga [John-ga *e* yubiwa-o watasi wasureta to] omotteiru yo, **sono kyaku-ni**  
manager-Nom John-Nom ring-Acc give forgot C think Prt **that guest-Dat**  
‘The manager thinks that John forgot to give the ring to that guest.’

We explore *multiple* Right Dislocation, which has previously received very little attention. We argue that multiple Right Dislocation, exemplified in (2), is derived not by syntactic movement but by *Prosodic Right Dislocation* in the phonological component, evidenced by multiple Right Dislocation’s insensitivity to syntactic constraints, its lack of LF interpretive effects, and its prosodic properties.

- (2) Tentyoo-ga [John-ga *e e* watasi wasureta to] omotteiru yo, **sono kyaku-ni yubiwa-o**  
manager-Nom John-Nom give forgot C think Prt **that guest-Dat ring-Acc**  
‘The manager thinks that John forgot to give the ring to that guest.’

We propose the Universal Uniqueness Principle, arguing that the *Prosodic Right Dislocation* analysis of multiple Right Dislocation straightforwardly follows from this principle. The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 presents evidence against a syntactic movement analysis of multiple Right Dislocation. Section 3 proposes a *Prosodic Right Dislocation* source for multiple Right Dislocation which, we argue, follows from the Universal Uniqueness Principle. Section 4 makes concluding remarks.

## 2. Against a Syntactic Movement Analysis of Multiple Right Dislocation

This section presents evidence against a syntactic movement analysis of multiple Right Dislocation. It is shown that unlike single Right Dislocation, multiple Right Dislocation neither obeys syntactic constraints nor exhibits LF interpretive effects.

### 2.1. Syntactic Island Constraints

The first evidence against a syntactic movement analysis of multiple Right Dislocation comes from syntactic island constraints. It has been pointed out by, among others, Simon (1989), Rosen (1996), and Tanaka (2001) that single Right Dislocation obeys syntactic island constraints as shown in (3):

---

\* Brian Agbayani, California State University, Fresno, bagbayan@mail.fresnostate.edu. Toru Ishii, Meiji University, tishii@meiji.ac.jp. We thank the audience of WCCFL 42 for helpful discussion, and we thank Tomoko Kozasa for assistance with the phonetic analysis.

- (3) a.\*?Tentyoo-ga [Complex NP [John-ga *e* yubiwa-o watasiwasureta] nitizi]-o oboeteita yo,  
 manager-Nom John-Nom ring-Acc give.forgot date-Acc remember Prt  
**sono kyaku-ni**  
**that guest-Dat**  
 ‘The manager remembers the date when John forgot to give that ring to the guest.’
- b.\*?Tentyoo-ga [Adjunct John-ga *e* yubiwa-o watasiwasureta kara] totemo okotteiru yo,  
 manager-Nom John-Nom ring-Acc gave.forgot because very be.angry Prt  
**sono kyaku-ni**  
**that guest-Dat**  
 ‘The manager is angry because John forgot to give that ring to the guest.’

In (3a), *sono kyaku-ni* ‘that guest-Dat’ is right-dislocated out of a complex NP. In (3b), *sono kyaku-ni* ‘that guest-Dat’ is right-dislocated out of an adjunct. Both (3a) and (3b) are unacceptable. Multiple Right Dislocation, on the other hand, does not obey syntactic island constraints as shown in (4):

- (4) a. Tentyoo-ga [Complex NP [ John-ga *e e* watasiwasureta] nitizi]-o oboeteita yo,  
 manager-Nom John-Nom give.forgot date-Acc remember Prt  
**sono kyaku-ni yubiwa-o**  
**that guest-Dat ring-Acc**  
 ‘The manager remembers the date when John forgot to give the ring to that guest.’
- b. Tentyoo-ga [Adjunct John-ga *e e* watasiwasureta kara] totemo okotteiru yo,  
 manager-Nom John-Nom gave.forgot because very be.angry Prt  
**sono kyaku-ni yubiwa-o**  
**that guest-Dat ring-Acc**  
 ‘The manager is very angry because John forgot to give the ring to that guest.’

In (4a), *sono kyaku-ni* ‘that guest-Dat’ and *yubiwa-o* ‘that ring-Acc’ undergo multiple Right Dislocation out of the complex NP. In (4b), they undergo multiple Right Dislocation out of the adjunct. Both (4a) and (4b) are acceptable. If multiple Right Dislocation were syntactic, (4) should be worse than, or at least just as bad as, (3), where only one constituent is right dislocated out of an opaque domain. The result, however, is the opposite of what any syntactic analysis of multiple right dislocation predicts.

## 2.2. Right Dislocation of a Nominative Phrase

Second, single Right Dislocation of a nominative phrase is generally deviant. In (5a), the nominative phrase *sono ressyu-ga* ‘that train-Nom’ undergoes single Right Dislocation, and the result is degraded. The result improves, however, when the nominative phrase *sono ressyu-ga* ‘that train-Nom’ undergoes multiple Right Dislocation with another phrase, such as the PP *Tookyoo-ni* ‘in Tokyo’, as shown in (5b):

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

Whatever syntactic constraint rules out single Right Dislocation of a nominative phrase, the acceptability of (5b) shows that multiple Right Dislocation is not subject to that syntactic constraint. If multiple Right Dislocation were syntactic movement, it would be hard to explain why moving a nominative phrase together with another XP is acceptable (5b), while simply moving a nominative phrase alone is not (5a).

## 2.3. Right Dislocation of an Adjunct

Third, single Right Dislocation of a ‘true adjunct’ is disallowed (see, among others, Tanaka 2001). In (5a), the ‘true adjunct’ *riyuu-mo-naku* ‘without any reason’ undergoes single Right Dislocation, and the result is deviant. However, when the ‘true adjunct’ *riyuu-mo-naku* ‘without any reason’ undergoes multiple Right Dislocation with *sono riron-o* ‘that theory-Acc’, the result is acceptable as shown in (6b).

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

Whatever LF interpretive constraint rules out single Right Dislocation of a ‘true adjunct’, the acceptability of (6b) indicates that multiple Right Dislocation is immune from that LF interpretive constraint. This fact straightforwardly follows if multiple Right Dislocation is not syntactic.

#### 2.4. An Argument/Adjunct Reconstruction Asymmetry

The final evidence against a syntactic movement analysis of multiple Right Dislocation comes from an argument/adjunct reconstruction asymmetry with Principle C of the Binding Theory. It has been pointed out by, among others, van Riemsdijk and Williams (1981), Lebeaux (1988), Chomsky (1995), and Ishii (1997) that there is an argument/adjunct asymmetry for reconstruction effects with Principle C in English *wh*-movement, as exemplified in (7):

- (7) a. \*?[Which pictures of **John<sub>1</sub>**] do you think that **he<sub>1</sub>** likes *t* best?  
 b. [Which pictures near **John<sub>1</sub>**] do you think that **he<sub>1</sub>** likes *t* best?

While the R-expression *John* and the pronoun *he* can be coreferential in (7b), they cannot be coreferential in (7a). The difference between (7a) and (7b) is due to the fact that while *John* is within the complement of the head noun in (7a), it is within an adjunct modifying the noun in (7b). Although there are various approaches to this argument/adjunct asymmetry with reconstruction effects, we assume a syntactic Late Merge approach to adjuncts advocated by, among others, Lebeaux (1988) and Ishii (1997). Under the Late Merge approach to adjuncts, (7a) is analyzed as follows. *John*, which is the argument of *pictures*, is merged when *pictures* first appears. The copy of *John* is visible in the base position of the *wh*-phrase, which results in a Principle C violation. In (7b), on the other hand, *John* is within the adjunct modifying *pictures*. *John* may be late merged after *wh*-movement has taken place, in which case there is no Principle C violation.

The argument/adjunct asymmetry with Principle C of the Binding Theory is also observed with single Right Dislocation in Japanese as shown in (8):

- (8) a. \*?**Kare<sub>1</sub>**-ga [Mary-ga *e* osietekurata to] itta yo, [**minna-no John<sub>1</sub>-no hihan-o**  
 he-Nom Mary-Nom told.him C said Prt **everyone-Gen John-Gen criticism-Acc**  
 ‘He<sub>1</sub> said that Mary told him about everyone’s criticism of John<sub>1</sub>.’  
 b. **Kare<sub>1</sub>**-ga [Mary-ga *e* osietekurata to] itta yo, [**minna-no John<sub>1</sub>-kara kakusieita**  
 he-Nom Mary-Nom told.him C said Prt **everyone-Gen John-from was.hiding**  
**hihan-o**  
**criticism-Acc**  
 ‘He<sub>1</sub> said that Mary told him about the criticism everyone was hiding from John<sub>1</sub>.’

In (8a), the R-expression *John*, which is the complement of *hihan* ‘criticism’, cannot be coreferential with the pronoun *kare* ‘he’. In (8b), on the other hand, *John*, which is within the adjunct, can be coreferential with *kare* ‘he’. Again, this is made available via a Late Merge approach to adjuncts.

This argument/adjunct asymmetry with Principle C, however, disappears with multiple Right Dislocation as shown in (9):

- (9) a. \*? **Kare<sub>1</sub>**-ga [Mary-ga *e e* barasita to] itta yo, [**tomodati-ni**] [**minna-no John<sub>1</sub>-no**  
 he-Nom Mary-Nom disclosed C said Prt **friend-Dat everyone-Gen John-Gen**  
**hihan-o]**  
**criticism-Acc**  
 ‘He<sub>1</sub> said that Mary disclosed everyone’s criticism of John<sub>1</sub> to friends.’

- b.\*?Kare<sub>1</sub>-ga [ Mary-ga ee barasita to] itta yo, [ ookuno tomodati-ni]  
 he-Nom Mary-Nom disclosed C said Prt many friend-Dat  
 [ minna-no John<sub>1</sub>-kara kakusieita hihan-o]  
 everyone-Gen John-from was.hiding criticism-Acc  
 ‘He<sub>1</sub> said that Mary disclosed the criticism everyone was hiding from John<sub>1</sub> to many friends.’

What is noteworthy is that although *John* is within the adjunct and thus may be late merged in (9a), *John* cannot be coreferential with *kare* ‘he’. This indicates that the multiple right dislocated phrases are interpreted *in-situ* at LF.

### 3. Proposal

The last section argued against a syntactic movement analysis of multiple Right Dislocation by showing that multiple Right Dislocation does not obey syntactic constraints or LF interpretive conditions. This section presents a *Prosodic Right Dislocation* analysis of multiple Right Dislocation, arguing that multiple Right Dislocation applies in the PF component. We argue that a Prosodic Right Dislocation analysis of multiple Right Dislocation naturally follows from what we call the Universal Uniqueness Principle.

#### 3.1. Information Structure with Right Dislocation

Kuno (1978) claims that Right Dislocation in Japanese changes Information Structure. Kuno observes the contrast between (10B) and (10B’), arguing that the target of Right Dislocation cannot be new information. While (10B) is acceptable as an answer to the question (10A), its right dislocated version (10B’), where *1968-nen-ni* ‘in 1968’ undergoes Right Dislocation, is not acceptable as an answer to (10A). This is because *1968-nen-ni* ‘in 1968’ is new information in (10) and cannot be the target of Right Dislocation.

- (10) A: 1968-nen-ni umaremasita ka?  
 1968-year-in were.born Q  
 ‘Were you born in 1968?’  
 B: Hai, 1968-nen-ni umaremasita.  
 yes 1968-year-in were.born  
 ‘Yes, I was born in 1968.’  
 B’:\*Hai, e umaremasita yo, 1968-nen-ni.  
 yes were.born Prt 1968-year-in  
 ‘Yes, I was born in 1968.’


This suggests that Right Dislocation may be induced by Information Structure requirements.

#### 3.2. A Prosodic Movement Analysis (Agbayani, Golston, and Ishii 2015)

Agbayani, Golston, and Ishii (2015) propose a *Prosodic Scrambling* analysis for multiple scrambling which makes use of conditions on *targeting*, arguing that multiple scrambling takes place in the phonological component. The Prosodic Scrambling analysis accounts for the lack of syntactic and LF interpretive constraint effects with multiple scrambling. Based on the Prosodic Scrambling analysis of multiple scrambling, multiple Right Dislocation would be analyzed as follows. Information Structure targets material to be right dislocated in the syntax, but the movement itself is induced in either syntax or phonology to ensure that only a single constituent is dislocated. If the targeted material is a single syntactic XP, it undergoes Right Dislocation in the syntax only. If the targeted material is not a single syntactic XP, then the multiple XPs, each mapped to a phonological phrase ( $\varphi$ ), are packed into a Major Phrase which undergoes *Prosodic Right Dislocation* to the right edge of an intonational phrase ( $t$ ) in the phonology. Let us consider the multiple Right Dislocation in (2) (repeated here as (11)) again:

- (11) Tentyoo-ga [John-ga *ee* watasi wasureta to] omotteiru yo, **sono kyaku-ni yubiwa-o**  
 manager-Nom John-Nom give forgot C think Prt **that guest-Dat ring-Acc**  
 ‘The manager thinks that John forgot to give the ring to that guest.’

The derivation of (11) is schematically represented in (12). In (12a), the dative NP *sono kyaku-ni* ‘that guest-Dat’ and the accusative NP *yubiwa-o* ‘ring-Acc’ are targeted for Right Dislocation. Since the targeted material is not a single syntactic XP, the dative NP and the accusative NP are packed into a Major Phrase as shown in (12b). The Major Phrase—which is an intonational phrase (i) incorporating multiple phonological phrases (φs) built from independent syntactic XPs (see Ishihara 2016 for this approach to Major Phrases)—then undergoes Prosodic Right Dislocation to the right edge of the superordinate intonational phrase (i) in the phonological component. Since multiple Right Dislocation applies in the phonological component, it straightforwardly follows that multiple Right Dislocation does not obey syntactic or LF interpretive constraints.

- (12) a. ... X ... NP-Dat NP-Acc ... Y ... (Syntax)  
 b. ( ... X ... (( ..... )<sub>φ</sub> ( ..... )<sub>φ</sub>)<sub>i</sub> ... Y ... )<sub>i</sub> (Phonology)
- 

It should be noted that although the dative NP and the accusative NP here form a VP under the Larsonian analysis of double objects, Right Dislocation can apply only to a non-predicative XP. VP, being predicative, is not eligible for Right Dislocation.

In a single Right Dislocation case like (1), a single syntactic XP is targeted for dislocation and undergoes syntactic Right Dislocation; it thereby obeys syntactic constraints and exhibits LF interpretive effects. It is crucial in this analysis that a single syntactic XP never undergoes Prosodic Right Dislocation. Agbayani, Golston, and Ishii (2015) argue (for multiple scrambling) that this naturally follows in a model where syntax feeds phonology, *i.e.*, syntax receives no feedback from phonology, and all operations are subject to the derivational principle of Earliness (13) (Pesetsky 1989):

(13) Earliness Principle


Satisfy principles as early as possible on the hierarchy of levels (DS) > SS > LF > LP.

It then follows that if the targeted material is a single syntactic XP, it will always undergo syntactic Right Dislocation following the Earliness Principle.

The Prosodic Right Dislocation analysis receives further support from the pitch contour associated with multiple Right Dislocation. Consider the multiple Right Dislocation case in (14).

- (14) John-ga [Mary-ga watasita to] itta yo, **Bill-ni sono mamé-o**  
 John-Nom Mary-Nom handed C said Prt **Bill-Dat that bean-Acc**  
 ‘John said that Mary handed that bean to Bill.’

The pitch track of (14), from a recording of an adult female speaker of Tokyo Japanese, is given in (15).



Prosodically, the right dislocated multiple XPs *Bill-ni* ‘Bill-Dat’ and *sono mamé-o* ‘that bean-Acc’ form a single constituent. *Bill-ni* ‘Bill-Dat’ and *sono mamé-o* ‘that bean-Acc’, preceded by a pause, both have H tones. The lexical H tone on *mamé-o* ‘that bean-Acc’ is lowered, however, as it is downstepped (!H\*L) in relation to the H boundary tone on *Bill-ni* ‘Bill-Dat’. This is indicated in the highlighted section of the

pitch track in (15). Here, we can see that the right dislocated elements are phrased together prosodically by the effects of tonal downstep: the right dislocated Major Phrase is the domain of tonal downstep in Japanese (Itô and Mester 2012, 2013; Ishihara 2016).

### 3.3. *The Universal Uniqueness Principle and Multiple Right Dislocation*

Although Agbayani, Golston, and Ishii's (2015) analysis for multiple scrambling in terms of Prosodic Scrambling can be extended to accommodate multiple Right Dislocation, the notion of *targeting* in their analysis remains obscure. In particular, it remains unclear why the targeted material must be a single constituent in syntax or phonology, and why the information about *targeting* is available in both syntax and phonology, though *targeting* applies in syntax. We therefore propose an analysis which does not rely on the notion of *targeting*. We seek to recast their analysis in more general terms and assume the Free Merge hypothesis advocated by Chomsky (2013, 2015, 2021), which claims that movement operations involve the free application of Merge. Furthermore, we propose the Universal Uniqueness Principle (16):

#### (16) Universal Uniqueness Principle

All applications of movement are unique in that the movement operation involves only a single application on a single constituent to a landing site at the edge of a domain.

The Universal Uniqueness Principle rules out multiple applications of a movement operation in a particular domain; a movement operation of a specific kind (*e.g.*, Scrambling, Right Dislocation) applies only once to a single constituent, *i.e.*, a single syntactic constituent in syntax and a single phonological constituent in phonology, displacing the constituent to the edge of the domain. We argue that the relevant domain where uniqueness is enforced is a CP phase in syntax and an intonational phrase (i) in phonology.

The notion of “uniqueness” in the comparative syntax of Japanese and English is also explored by Fukui (1999/2006), but the Universal Uniqueness Principle is a strong departure from Fukui's approach. Fukui claims that what he calls “the uniqueness effects” are observed in languages like English but not in languages like Japanese. Languages like Japanese lack the uniqueness effects, allowing relatively free word order, *i.e.* Multiple Scrambling, Multiple Cleft, Multiple Sluicing, multiple occurrences of Case like multiple nominative Case, and multiple headed relative clauses. Languages like English, on the other hand, show the uniqueness effects, disallowing such multiple phenomena. Fukui first assumes Chomsky's (1995) view of language as a generative procedure for providing a solution to legibility conditions (such as conditions at the interfaces) and argues that although UG assures the existence of a solution, it does not guarantee the “uniqueness” of a solution. In line with this reasoning, Fukui proposes the Uniqueness Parameter, a macro-parameter whose setting determines whether a language will enforce a unique solution or allow non-unique solutions to legibility conditions:

#### (17) Uniqueness Parameter

Languages like English guarantee a unique solution to legibility conditions while languages like Japanese do not. (adapted from Fukui 1999: 27 / 2006: 228)

Thus, the existence of Multiple Scrambling, Multiple Cleft and Multiple Sluicing, multiple occurrences of Case, multiple headed relative clauses in Japanese and their impossibility in English would fall out via variable settings for the Uniqueness Parameter. In contrast with Fukui's view, we argue that “universal uniqueness” applies to all movement operations in both syntax (applied to syntactic constituents) and phonology (applied to prosodic constituents) in all languages. This approach is a departure from Fukui's (1999/2006) conception of “uniqueness” in that it is not a parameterized property - uniqueness, in other words, is *exceptionless*.

We take the Universal Uniqueness Principle as ultimately a reflection of Chomsky's (2019, 2021) Resource Restriction, a general property of brain computation. Resource Restriction reduces resources available to computational operations, *i.e.*, the set of elements accessible to computational operations, to the minimum, thereby contributing to Optimal Computation. The Universal Uniqueness Principle forces unique application of a movement operation and excludes its multiple applications, thereby reducing the set of elements available to the movement operation. This means that for Right Dislocation, the operation applies only once to a single constituent within a CP phase in syntax or an intonational

phrase in phonology. This excludes multiple applications of Right Dislocation to separate XPs within a CP phase in syntax. Since movement occurs within phonology as well to affect a prosodic constituent, we argue that Resource Restriction regulates phonological movement too.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, prosodic movement, like syntactic movement (both conceived of as generalized Merge), is restricted by uniqueness as well, applicable to only one constituent—in this case a Major Phrase—within an intonational phrase. This forces the application of Prosodic Right Dislocation of a single Major Phrase to the right edge of an intonational phrase as illustrated in (18) (see also (11) - (12)):

- (18) a. ... X ...      WP                      ZP                      ... Y ...      (Syntax)  
 b. ( ... X ...      (( ..... )<sub>φ</sub> ( ..... )<sub>φ</sub> )<sub>t</sub>      ... Y ...      )<sub>t</sub>      (Phonology)
- 

This gives the appearance of multiple applications of syntactic Right Dislocation, and hence the appearance of non-uniqueness in Japanese (cf. Fukui 1999/2006), though in reality it is a single unique application of Prosodic Right Dislocation affecting a single Major Phrase, which may be composed of multiple (non-constituent) XPs and constitutes a domain for downstep (as shown in (15)).

In addition, the Earliness Principle (13) coupled with the grammatical model in which syntax feeds phonology and operates in only one direction, with no phonological influence on syntax (Zwicky and Pullum 1986a,b), yields the observed pattern that syntactic Right Dislocation “bleeds” Prosodic Right Dislocation: if Right Dislocation can apply to a single XP in the syntax, then the single application applies in syntax and not phonology (and consequently will be subject to syntactic islands and interpretive effects at LF). The universal uniqueness principle blocks Right Dislocation of multiple XPs in syntax, but these elements (or more accurately their phonological exponence) can be aggregated into a phonological Major Phrase in Japanese so that single application in accordance with the Universal Uniqueness Principle can apply in phonology (and consequently will be immune to syntactic islands and invisible to LF interpretive effects).<sup>2</sup>

If the construction of such a Major Phrase is generally available in the phonology of Japanese (Martin 1952; McCawley 1968; Poser 1984; Selkirk and Tateishi 1988; Itô and Mester 2013; Ishihara 2016), but not in English, we can account for the possibility of apparent “multiple movement” in Japanese, and its general impossibility in English. More than one syntactic XP can be packed into a Major Phrase in the phonology of Japanese, which creates the apparent non-uniqueness effect when this special prosodic constituent is moved in the phonology, *i.e.* what appears to be the result of multiple applications of movement. In languages like English, on the other hand, such phonological phrasing is not available: Selkirk (1984) shows that the existence of a level of prosodic phrasing equivalent to the Major Phrase is not motivated in English. If there is no prosodic parallel to the Japanese Major Phrase in English, then what appears to be a core syntactic distinction between English-type and Japanese-type languages boils down to differences in their prosodic structures. This view is compatible with Uniformity and the Externalization Parameter (Berwick and Chomsky 2011, 2016; Chomsky 2001, 2010), which claims that languages are uniform within the computational system and parameterization is restricted to the externalization process.

## 4. Conclusion

We have explored multiple Right Dislocation in Japanese, which has previously received very little attention, and argue that it is derived not by syntactic movement but by Prosodic Right Dislocation in

<sup>1</sup> We conjecture that Resource Restriction regulates any application of MERGE, whether it applies in the syntax over syntactically constructed objects or in the phonology over prosodic constituents; these are partially mapped from syntactic constituency but may also involve structural aggregations of elements which do not form syntactic constituents: for example, cases of prosodic words formed from functional elements and following lexical words which participate in ‘hyperbaton’ (Det + Adj or P (+ Det) + Adj which prosodically move in Latin and Classical Greek; see Agbayani and Golston 2010, 2016). The extension of MERGE to prosodic structure in the phonological component essentially recasts the phonological movement hypothesis of Agbayani and Golston (2010, 2016) and Agbayani, Golston, and Ishii (2015).

<sup>2</sup> The *Prosodic Scrambling* analysis of multiple scrambling proposed by Agbayani, Golston, and Ishii (2015) also follows from the Universal Uniqueness Principle without recourse to the notion of *targeting*.

the phonological component. Evidence comes from multiple Right Dislocation's insensitivity to syntactic constraints, its lack of LF interpretive effects, and its prosodic properties. We have proposed the Universal Uniqueness Principle, arguing that phonological movement (Agbayani, Golston, and Ishii 2015) derives multiple movement constructions in Japanese. The presence of the so-called "uniqueness effects" in some languages and their absence in others (Fukui 1999/2006) may fall out from differences in their prosodic structures.

## References

- Agbayani, Brian, and Chris Golston. 2010. Phonological movement in Classical Greek. *Language* 86(1): 133–167.
- Agbayani, Brian and Chris Golston. 2016. Phonological constituents and their movement in Latin. *Phonology* 33.1: 1-42.
- Agbayani, Brian, Chris Golston and Toru Ishii. 2015. Syntactic and prosodic scrambling in Japanese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33: 47-77.
- Berwick, Robert and Noam Chomsky. 2011. The biolinguistic program: The current state of its development, in Anna Maria Di Sciullo and Cedric Boeckx eds., *The biolinguistic enterprise: New perspectives on the evolution and nature of the human language faculty*, 19-41, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Berwick, Robert and Noam Chomsky. 2016. *Why only us: Language and evolution*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The minimalist program*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz ed., *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1-52, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2010. Some simple evo devo theses: How true might they be for language?, In Richard Larson, Viviane Déprez, and Hiroko Yamakido eds., *The evolution of human language: Biolinguistic perspectives*, 45-62, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130: 33-49.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2015. Problems of projection: Extensions. In *Structures, strategies and beyond: Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, ed. by Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann, and Simona Matteini, 3-16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2019b. UCLA lectures. 29-30 April and 1-2 May. Manuscript available with some changes and an introduction by Robert Freidin (<https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005485>).
- Chomsky, Noam. 2021. Minimalism: Where are we now, and where can we hope to go. *Gengo Kenkyu* 160: 1-41.
- Fukui, Naoki. 1999. The uniqueness parameter. *Glott International* 4, 9/10: 26-27 (Reprinted in Fukui, Naoki. 2006. *Theoretical comparative syntax: Studies in macroparameters*, Oxon: Routledge.
- Fukutomi, Yasuyuki. 2007. Japanese right dislocation: A preliminary study, paper presented at the On Linguistic Interfaces (OnLI) Conference, University of Ulster, Northern Ireland.
- Haraguchi, Shosuke. 1973. Remarks on right dislocation in Japanese, ms., MIT.
- Ishihara, Shinichiro. 2016. Japanese downstep revisited. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 34: 1389-1443.
- Ishii, Toru. 1997. *An asymmetry in the composition of phrase structure and its consequences*, doctoral diss., University of California, Irvine.
- Itô, Junko. and Armin Mester. 2013. Prosodic Subcategories in Japanese. *Lingua* 124 (1): 20-40.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1978. Japanese: A characteristic OV language. In Winfred P. Lehmann ed., *Syntactic typology: Studies in the phenomenology of language*, 57-138, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Lebeaux, David. 1988. *Language acquisition and the form of the grammar*, doctoral diss., U of Mass., Amherst.
- Martin, S. E. 1952. *Morphophonemics of standard colloquial Japanese*, Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.
- McCawley, James D. 1968. *The phonological component of a grammar of Japanese*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Pesetsky, David. 1989. Language-particular processes and the earliness principle. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Poser, William. 1984. *The phonetics and phonology of tone and intonation in Japanese*, doctoral diss., MIT.
- Rosen, Eric Robert. 1996. *The postposing construction in Japanese*, master thesis, UBC.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth and Koichi Tateishi. 1988. Constraints on minor phrase formation in Japanese, in *CLS* vol. 24 Part One: The General Session, ed. by Lynn MacLeod, Gary Larson, and Diane Brentari, pp. 316-336, Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Simon, Mutsuko Endo. 1989. *An analysis of the postposing construction in Japanese*, doctoral diss., U of Michigan.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2001. Right-dislocation as scrambling, *Journal of Linguistics* 37.3, 551-579.
- van Riemsdijk, Henk and Edwin Williams. 1981. NP structure, *The Linguistic Review* 1, 171-217.
- Zwicky, Arnold, and Geoffrey Pullum. 1986a. The principle of phonology-free syntax: introductory re- marks. *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 32: 63–91.
- Zwicky, Arnold, and Geoffrey Pullum. 1986b. Two spurious counterexamples to the principle of phonology-free syntax. *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 32: 92–99.

# Proceedings of the 42nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Shweta Akolkar,  
Amber Galvano, Akil Ismael,  
Kang Franco Liu, and Line Mikkelsen

Cascadilla Proceedings Project   Somerville, MA   2025

## Copyright information

Proceedings of the 42nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics  
© 2025 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-484-3 hardback

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.  
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

## Ordering information

Orders for the printed edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.  
To place an order, go to [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com) or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA  
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, [sales@cascadilla.com](mailto:sales@cascadilla.com)

## Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com). Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Agbayani, Brian and Toru Ishii. 2025. On Multiple Right Dislocation in Japanese and the Uniqueness Parameter. In *Proceedings of the 42nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Shweta Akolkar et al., 20-27. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. [www.lingref.com](http://www.lingref.com), document #3802.