French does not readily mark (non-corrective) focus intonationally (Vander Klok, Goad & Wagner, submitted). Right dislocation (RD), which involves a clause followed by one or more deaccented constituents, is a standard way to realize verum focus, by aligning prominence with the predicate.

(1)  
\[ J Sur en \text{ mange, du poisson.} \]
\[ \text{I indef eat, indef fish.} \]
‘I do eat fish.’

(1) can be used to convey contrariness or insistence. However, on closer inspection, RD has an additional pragmatic import. For (1) to be felicitous as a direct answer to a polar question, explicit contrast with a stronger claim needs to be established. This is shown in (2).

(2) a.  Do you eat fish?
   b.  \[ J Sur en \text{ mange, du poisson. #(...)mais pas à tous les jours.} \]
       \[ \text{I indef eat, indef fish. #(...) but not every single day.} \]

I couch my analysis in the Question Under Discussion (QUD) framework (Roberts 1996), and show that RD requires the QUD to remain unresolved post-contextual update. In the case of (2), this effectively enforces a shift of the QUD to something stronger (‘Do you eat fish?’ \[ \rightarrow \] ‘Do you eat fish every day?’). In general, however, all that is required is non-resolution of the QUD.

As such, the pragmatic licensing conditions of RD and the English Rise-Fall-Rise intonational contour (RFR) intersect. The French data closely match Constant (2012)’s analysis of RFR, and do so in unforeseen ways. I show of many of RD’s functions fall out from the framework: (i) to invite the listener to draw their own conclusions, (ii) to indicate a desire to move on with the conversation, (iii) to deny or question presuppositions, and (iv) to mark contrastive topics.