Volume 22 Issue 7
Originally issued as G2



Global Journal of human-social science: G
Linguistics & Education
Volume 22 Issue 2 Version 1.0 Year 2022
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Discourse-Pragmatic Functions for Applications to Shared and Thematic Information Structures

By Eri Kondo
Japan Women's University in Tokyo

Abstract- This paper investigates that brief connections between usages of left-dislocations in American discourse and discourse functions for developing conversation statuses based on conversation analyses in pragmatics. It also reveals that speakers' intentions are shown in a conversation for maintaining topic continuity as a tool of discourse function. It is hard to account that word order is manipulative; however, hypotheses that we can bear out discourse functions technically are demonstrated. As the point, the aspect proves that the conversation analyses are correlated with a discourse speakers talk unconsciously to construct good relationships between friends and new classmates. It may be difficult to find theories of discourse structures and information statues; however, we must try to appeal and reach new analyses.

Keywords: *discourse structures, conversation analysis, marked word order, pragmatics.*

GJHSS-G Classification: *FOR Code: 339999p*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



© 2022. Eri Kondo. This research/review article is distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). You must give appropriate credit to authors and reference this article if parts of the article are reproduced in any manner. Applicable licensing terms are at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Discourse-Pragmatic Functions for Applications to Shared and Thematic Information Structures

Eri Kondo

Abstract- This paper investigates that brief connections between usages of left-dislocations in American discourse and discourse functions for developing conversation statuses based on conversation analyses in pragmatics. It also reveals that speakers' intentions are shown in a conversation for maintaining topic continuity as a tool of discourse function. It is hard to account that word order is manipulative; however, hypotheses that we can bear out discourse functions technically are demonstrated. As the point, the aspect proves that the conversation analyses are correlated with a discourse speakers talk unconsciously to construct good relationships between friends and new classmates. It may be difficult to find theories of discourse structures and information statues; however, we must try to appeal and reach new analyses.

Keywords: discourse structures, conversation analysis, marked word order, pragmatics.

I. Introduction

In this paper, we describe the discourse-pragmatic functions of left-dislocation in American English discourse and descriptively observe how the particular word order relates with the discourse context or the discourse unit; moreover, with a speaker's communicative intention. As for the term discourse-pragmatics, in this paper, we follow the definition by Lambrecht (1994), in the state that "since discourse involves the use of sentences in communicative settings, such research is associated with the general area of pragmatics (p. 2)". In addition, in this paper, we put forward two terms, which are discourse-pragmatic function and discourse function. In this thesis, the analyses argue the discourse-pragmatic functions through the usages of left-dislocations as a speaker's intention, assistance, and goal in the communicative discourse context. On the other hand, the discourse function draws upon the phenomena of the work in the discourse context.

We have to give a grammatical explanation of the term, left-dislocation. Left-dislocation is a marked word order, which derives from the canonical SVO word order of English (Ross, 1967). Traditionally, left-dislocation has been characterized in terms of the preposing a noun phrase from a proposition into the initial sentence position that is external to it, which contains a coreferential pronominal reference with the left-dislocated noun phrase (Ross, 1967). Examples are here:

1) Cathy, she is not a good friend herself.
2) That boy, he's supposed to be awe some.

In (1) and (2), each initial noun phrase, 'Cathy' and 'that boy' is supposed from each proposition: the canonical word order of (1) is 'Cathy is not a good friend herself' and that of (2) is 'That boy's supposed to be awe some.'

Given the non-canonical structure of left-dislocation, this paper aims to investigate how this marked word order construction is used for the speaker's aim to achieve some goals which would not be achievable by using the unmarked counterparts in the discourse context. It is significant to clarify that we are not trying to analyze the grammatical derivation of left-dislocation but to examine why some noun phrases are preposed in the discourse context. To this end, we rely on the functional linguistic perspective approach and attempt to describe the use of left-dislocation in discourse has particular roles in the discourse construction or the discourse unit. Some recent studies which analyze linguistic forms in discourse contexts (Fox, 1993) show that discourse data is saliently distinguishable from monologic data. In this respect, this paper is based on the insights of functional and interactional-oriented studies that look at the functions of left-dislocation in the discourse. In the next section, we will introduce studies focused on discourse functions of left-dislocation (Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976; Ono & Thompson, 1994; Gundel, 1985; Prince, 1985, 1997).

II. Theoretical Background

In general, many types of research on left-dislocation have shown that the function is to topicalize a referent (Halliday, 1967; Reinhart, 1981). However, these studies focus on the function of left-dislocation in one sentence rather than in a discourse context. Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin (1976), who have examined the discourse function of left-dislocation, regard the usage of left-dislocation in discourse as a speaker's strategy in the communicative work. They propose that the speaker brings a referent into the foreground of the listener's consciousness by left-dislocation; then, the referent is usually not currently a center of attention; that is, it is not the current topic in the discourse context (p. 242). They indicate three discourse functions of left-dislocation: (i) to introduce a discourse-new referent, (ii) to reintroduce a referent into

Author: Master's Degree in Linguistics. This paper is original on the Master Thesis that was approved by Yoko Fujii at Japan Women's University in Tokyo. e-mail: butterflyofbuttertree@gmail.com

© 2022 Global Journals

the discourse when the referent is not in the foreground of the speaker's and hearer's minds, and (iii) to give an emphasis upon a referent. They note that the former two functions, (i) and (ii), are functions in the use of left-dislocations; on the contrary, the latter function, (iii), is a minor. Each discourse function is shown in the following examples;

3)

1. K: Yeah// Yeah! No matter how old// you are
2. L: Yeah. Mh hm
3. Parents don't understand.
4. *But all grownups w-they do it to kids.*
5. Whether they're your own or not.

(Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 243)

4)

1. K: An' I got a red sweater, an' a white one, an' other
2. sweaters, you know,
3. And uh my sister loves borrowing
4. my sweaters because they're pullovers, you know,
5. she c'n wear a blouse under'em
6. an' she thinks "Well this is great"
7. *An' so my red sweater, I haven't seen it*
8. *Since I got it.*

(Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 243)

5)

1. L: T'know some of 'em are darmn tall and goodlooking
2. they could pass for (t)- nineteen.//
3. A twelve year old guy comes over
4. I say who's y-older brother is he?
5. He's not he's in the A7.
6. R: But they don't-
7. But they don't have a brain to go with it hehhh
8. L: *These kids I don't believe it they're six foot.*

(Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 245-6)

In example (3), the left-dislocation at line 4 introduces a discourse-new referent, 'all grownups.' The precious topic is about the speaker's parents (Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 243). In example (4), the left-dislocation at line 7 reintroduces a referent, 'my red sweater,' into the discourse. The referent appeared at line 1; however, it is not a topic lines 3 to 6. The main is 'my sister' in the discourse context (Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 243). The left-dislocations in these two examples function to foreground a referent; but the left-dislocation at 8 in example (5) does not. The left-dislocated referent, 'these kids', is in the foreground of the speaker's and hearer's minds in the preceding discourse context. Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin (1976, p. 245) state that "the speaker is using the basic function of focusing the listener's attention on some referent to amplify the attention paid to some referent under discussion." They report this type is a minor focus function of left-dislocation, and it occupies 6.6 percent of the total left-dislocations in their data. From a similar perspective, Ono & Thompson (1994) suggest that the discourse function of left-dislocation is particular for establishing or tracking a referent in the discourse context.

The characteristic of the left-dislocated referent or noun phrase is belonging to Keenan and Schieffelin (1976), Ono & Thompson (1994), Gundel (1985), and Prince (1985, 1997). According to Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin, the left-dislocated referent typically seems to be an entity known to or knowable by the hearer from a non-verbal context or from prior background experiences; and it is an entity that the hearer can identify or recognize a referent of representation (p. 242). Similarly, Gundel (1985) and Prince (1985, 1997) also point out that the possibility of an appearance of left-dislocation depends on a speaker's familiarity with a referent in the discourse. In other words, a referent which a speaker refers to by left-dislocation has a unique referent that the hearer can identify from previous utterances or extra-linguistic contexts, as for the formal features of left-dislocated noun phrases, Ono & Thompson (1994) note that they are defined as 100 percent fully specified noun phrases such as proper nouns or noun phrases with determiners or genitive modifiers (p. 410).

In this study, we mainly reexamine the discourse functions of left-dislocation suggested by Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin (1976) and Ono & Thompson (1994), and descriptively demonstrate it. As for the descriptive approach, we use a measurement proposed by Givón (1983). Therefore, it is accountable for in the next chapter. We then demonstrate how the left-dislocations in our data work in the discourse context and the discourse unit, based on the calculation.

Next, we investigate the definiteness of the left-dislocated referents in our data that are identifiable for the hearer in the discourse context.

Finally, we characterize the discourse-pragmatic functions of the left-dislocations. Then, we attempt to simplify the speaker's communicative intention in the usages of left-dislocation in the discourse context.

III. Data and Methodology

The data for this study consists of three corpora of the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English. All of them are face-to-face conversations: one corpus is that over dinner in a private home among four male speakers, and they are friends. They mainly talk about the dance called the lambada and about a party. Another corpus is the face-to-face conversation with cooking dinner in the kitchen among three speakers. One of the three speakers is female, and the two are male; and they are friends. They mainly talk about the decay of nature or their personal stories. Another

© 2022 Global Journals

corpus is a face-to-face conversation at the living room among two speakers, and they are female friends. They mainly talk about their personal stories or a party to which the host invited one speaker.

My database consists of 77 minutes of conversation transcribed into intonation units, of which there are 4633 (cf. Du Bois, Schuetze-Coburn, Cumming, & Paolino, 1993; Du Bois & Schuetze-Coburn, 1993). An intonation unit refers to a spurt of talk produced under a coherent intonation contour, often is connected to a pause.

For the present study, we apply two calculations proposed by Givón (1983): one calculation is a "referential distance (look back)," and the other one is a "topic persistence." The calculation of referential distance shows the gap between the previous occurrence of a referent or a topic in the discourse and its current occurrence in a clause, significant for a particular grammatical coding device. The gap is obvious in the number of clauses to the left of the present occurrence of the grammatical coding device in the discourse context (p. 13). The test of referential distance will clarify whether the left-dislocated noun phrase in our data appears to introduce or reintroduce a referent in the discourse context. It also shows whether the left-dislocated referent is topical in the previous discourse context. Givón (1983) explains that the calculation of topic persistence, on the other hand, looks at the subsequent discourse. It shows the reflection of a topic's importance in the discourse context and the speaker's topical intention (p. 15). He says that "more important discourse topics appear more frequently in the following discourse (p. 15)." The persistence is measured in terms of the number of clauses to the right from a referent's present occurrence (p. 15). The test will clarify the topicality of the left-dislocated noun phrase in our data in the succeeding discourse context. For this study thus, the unit of analysis is a clause. Our database consists of 1753 clauses; these clauses are analytical. Moreover, we will measure not only the number of clauses but also the number of pronominal references which are coreferential with a left-dislocated noun phrase, and nominal references which refer to the same referent with a left-dislocated noun phrase because the measurement more clearly shows the referential distance and the topic persistence of left-dislocation in our data.

As for the definition of left-dislocation in our data, we draw upon that by Ono & Thompson (1994): (a) the left-dislocated noun phrase has continuing intonation contours which signaled by a comma, not by a period in the transcription, (b) the left-dislocation causes to turn-taking by a speaker or a hearer between the left-dislocated noun phrase and the proposition, and (c) the left-dislocated noun phrase does not appear as a backchannel in the discourse context. Moreover, of course, we do not regard vocative as a left-dislocated noun phrase.

IV. Analysis and Results

In our data, the appearance of left-dislocation is 20 cases in the total. The total percentage of the total number of clauses (1753 clauses) is 1 %. We might say these are the limited ones. In this chapter, we analyze the discourse functions of the left-dislocations in the following sections, based on Givón's (1983) calculations. And we show the results of the referential distance and the topic persistence in the discourse context, in addition, to the forms and the stress of the left-dislocated referents.

a) Discourse Function

Left-dislocations occur to introduce or reintroduce a referent on story-telling discourse contexts. In other words, the speakers use them to foreground a referent or establish a referent as a topic in a discourse context; however, in fact, some left-dislocations in discourse contexts seem to work in different ways in respect of foregrounding a referent or managing a discourse. It is for this reason that left-dislocations in our data have various characteristics in the referential distance in the preceding discourse context and the topic persistence in the succeeding discourse context. Each also interacts with the discourse functions of the left-dislocations.

We divide the discourse functions of the left-dislocations in our data into four types: (1) to reintroduce a referent (hereafter Type 1), (2) to rephrase a referent (hereafter Type 2), (3) to characterize a referent (hereafter Type 3), and (4) to introduce a referent (hereafter Type 4). Type 1 is the discourse function of the left-dislocations in our data because it occupies 50 percent of the total; Type 2 is 35 percent, Type 3 is 5 percent, and Type 4 is 10 percent.

As for each characteristic of the referential distances, the topic persistence, the forms, and the stress of the left-dislocations, the left-dislocations in Type 1 have clausal gaps in the first introduction of referent into the discourse by the left-dislocation. In Type 1, the topic persistence is continuous in the left dislocations succeeding discourse context. Further, the forms of the left-dislocated noun phrases in Type 1 are proper nouns or nouns with the genitive modifiers. A lot of the left-dislocated noun phrases have the stress.

Then, the left-dislocations in Type 2 do not have a clausal gap between a referent and a left-dislocated referent which refers to a referent. The left-dislocated referent refers to the immediate previous referent. In other words, a topic in the discourse context is not particular by the left-dislocation in contrast with the left-dislocations in Type 1, which sets it apart as changing a theme in the discourse context. In Type 2, the topic

© 2022 Global Journals

persistence is not continuous in the succeeding discourse context, and this feature is also as opposed to that of Type 1. And the forms of the left-dislocated noun phrases in Type 2 are characterized by the following: the nouns with a demonstrative pronoun, 'that,' or with a definite article, 'the.' In addition, most of the left-dislocated noun phrases have the stress.

Next, the left-dislocation in Type 3 does not have a clausal gap between a referent and the left-dislocated referent, which refers to the referent; and the characteristic of the referential distance seems to be similar to that in Type 2. However, they differ in the topicality of the referent referred to by the left-dislocation in the previous discourse context. The left-dislocation in Type 2 refers to a referent that has a high topicality in the previous stage, and the referent referred to by the left-dislocation does not continue as a topic in the succeeding discourse context. The left-dislocation in Type 3, on the other hand, refers to a referent that is not a topic in the previous discourse context, and the referent referred to by the left-dislocation continues as a topic persistence is lower than of in Type 1. As for the form of the left-dislocated noun phrase in Type 3, it is the noun with a demonstrative pronoun, 'this.' The left-dislocated referent has weak stress.

Finally, the left-dislocations in Type 4, of course, do not have a clausal gap between a referent and the left-dislocated referent because the discourse function is to introduce a discourse-new referent. The topic persistence in the following discourse context is continuous, while it may not mean a topic persistence but rather a thematic structure. The difference between topic persistence and thematic persistence would be significant in the number of referential markings in the succeeding discourse context, described by the examples in the later section. As for the forms of the left-dislocated noun phrases, they are indefinite. And they have weak stress. We exemplify each type of the left-dislocations from our data in the following sub-sections.

i. *Type 1: Function to reintroduce a referent*

Here, we examine Type 1. The left-dislocation occurs to reintroduce a referent into the discourse context, where the speaker introduced the referent at the previous discourse; however, there is only one reference that refers to the referent at the context. The referent has not been a topic, but another referent has been a focus as a topic. Left-dislocations occur to focus on the referent as the topic in the discourse context. The speaker brings a referent into the foreground of the listener's consciousness by the left-dislocation. The following example (6) shows the case where the left-dislocation appears for the reintroduction of referent, which is not a central topic in the previous discourse context.

6)

1. ALINA: remember !Tyke?
2. .. Lived next door to Mom?
3. LENORE: .. % … Yeah=
4. ALINA: … Okay.
5. (H) .. Two weeks ago I'm watching TV,
6. .. and David Horowitz is going to have,
7. this former car .. radio thief on?
8. LENORE: … It's her boyfriend?
9. ALINA: (H) .. Yeah,
10. her ex-boyfriend.
11. .. ! Mike
12. … He's the one that stole ~Hector's radio.
13. LENORE: … How do you know?
14. ALINA: (H) Well,
15. … cause well,
16. .. he –
17. .. he was a cocaine addict.
18. So he's talking about,
19. <X he –
20. <X you know X> he's,
21. yeah, man,
22. he's gonna show us,
23. .. you know,
24. how X not X,
25. LENORE: (THROAT)
26. ALINA: to protect your car,
27. not to get it,
28. you know,
29. ripped off man.
30. Cause,
31. you know,
32. I –
33. .. yeah,
34. I was into it,
35. uh let me show you how easy it was VOX>.
36. (H) He's actually pretty intelligent.
37. .. You know he just –
38. … (H) uneducated,
39. so,
40. .. u=m,
41. .. (TSK) yeah=.
42. *~Hector's radio=,*
43. *it was bro=ken,*
44. we were gonna s- --
45. take *it* out and send *it* back to the factory,
46. to get a new factory,
47. .. (H) radio,
48. We never got a chance,
49. because,
50. the back window was broken,
51. and they stole it.

© 2022 Global Journals

52. … *The radio.*
53. … And you can't send something back to the
54. factory,
55. that isn't there any [more],
56. LENORE: [<WH @@@ WH>]
57. ALINA: right?
58. .. So *he* never got *his [radio.*
59. LENORE: [It's really hard.
60. ALINA: (H) =]
61. LENORE: <WH Oh.
62. Shit WH>].
63. ALINA: So *he* got another radi[2o this2] summer,
64. LENORE: [2 (H)=2]
65. ALINA: but of course that got ripped off also.
66. <VOX But never mind VOX>.
67. (Hx [=])
68. LENORE: [*He's* <X having X>] bad luck with that car.
69. What i- what i- what is this.
70. ALINA: .. (TSK) I don't know.

In this context, the speaker has told a story about which her acquaintance, 'Mike,' is the person who stole Hector's radio (line 11-12). 'Mike' and 'Hector's radio' are new in the discourse context. We can find the left-dislocation at 42-43: 'Hector's radio, it was broken.' The referent is reintroduced into the discourse because it has not been the center of the topic. The speaker has talked about 'Mike' from the line 11 to 38: 'he (=Mike) was a cocaine addict' at line 17, 'he (=Mike)'s talking about' at line 18, 'he (=Mike)'s gonna show us' at line 22, 'he (=Mike)'s actually pretty intelligent' at line 36, and 'he (=Mike) just uneducated' at line 37-38. The referent, 'Mike' is the main topic there; 'Hector's radio' is not. Accordingly, there is no an identified referent, 'Hector's radio' at line 13 to 41. After the interruptions such as 'so', 'um', and 'yeah' at line 39 to 41, the speaker has started talking about the referent, 'Hector's radio' at line 42. We can say that the function of left-dislocation is to reintroduce the referent into the discourse context. In this example, there are clausal gaps between the previous utterance at line 12 and the current one at line 42, where it contains nine clauses.

The left-dislocation is used to foreground the referent in the background of the hearer's consciousness and to make the topic-marking. The speaker has talked about 'Hector's radio' in the succeeding contexts at line 42 to 68: for example, 'we were gonna take it (=Hector's radio) out and send it (=Hector's radio) back to the factory' at line 44 to 45, 'he (=Hector) never got his radio' at line 58, and 'he (=Hector)'s having bad luck with that car' at line 68. There are ten pronominal or nominal referents that refer to or presuppose 'Hector's radio' after the left-dislocation at line 42-43. It is represented: 'it, radio, he, his radio, that, and we (because Hector is Alina's husband)'. There are 15 pronominal and nominal references which refer to the left-dislocated referent among 12 clauses. Thus, we see that the function can maintain the topic persistence.

ii. *Type 2: Function to rephrase a referent*

The left-dislocations in Type 2 occur to rephrase a previous topical referent, and it is in the foreground of the listener's consciousness. The discourse function gives the speaker special emphasis or comment upon a particular entity mentioned in the prior utterance. Moreover, the topic persistence is not particular in the succeeding discourse context. Characteristically, the speakers use the left-dislocation when they finish talking a story about the referent. We found 7 cases or 35 percent of this type.

7)

1. ALINA: %Th- .. the friend that was there with them,
2. is this older guy with *this young chick.*
3. LENORE: (H)
4. ALINA: … <VOX And *she* was like a real pill,
5. you know,
6. LENORE: [@@@@@@@@]
7. ALINA: [she's sitting there,
8. with <X this X> hair=] pulled back,
9. in <X a X> little pony [2tail=2].
10. LENORE: [2@2] [3 (H) 3]
11. ALINA: [3And she's like3] <X sitting there= and X>VOX>,
12. (H) he said,
13. I would have been here,
14. but <VOX she was so late.
15. And getting her any place on time VOX>,
16. she's going,
17. (H) <VOX well,
18. I had to get rea=dy= VOX>.
19. .. [I don't know why=.
20. LENORE: [@@@@@@@@ @@]@@@
21. ALINA: <@ (SNORT) @> @@]
22. (H) Nothing was gonna help her.
23. (H) No make up,
24. no nothing,
25. Cause she's the little <VOX gir=l,
26. and he's the older man,
27. and [he's taking care of me VOX>].
28. LENORE: [(H)=]
29. ALINA: (SNIFF)
30. LENORE: … G[od],
31. ALINA: [(TSK)]
32. LENORE: .. you know, some,
33. .. (H) <Q you know,
34. .. (Hx) she's so vulnerable Q>.
35. ALINA: [(DRINK)]
36. LENORE: [(H) She's probably like] twenty-six,

© 2022 Global Journals

37. .. <Q and she looks thirteen,
38. and it ['s just so],
39. [@@@]
40. ALINA: *[That] stupid little b=itch,*
41. *She just married [2d=addy to take care of her.*
42. LENORE: [2 (H) (SWALLOW) (Hx)2]
43. ALINA: (H)2] .. They all live down like in Del Mar.

In this context, the speakers, Alina and Lenore, have talked about one girl who has been at a party to which she has gone at line 1 to 43. The first mention occurs as 'this young chick' in line 2. The left-dislocation is at lines 40 to 41: 'that stupid little bitch, she just married daddy to take care of her.' The left-dislocated referent refers to the referent, 'this young chick.' The left-dislocated referent is argued as the topical thing when the speaker uses the left-dislocation. There are 11 pronominal references in the succeeding discourse context of the nominal reference at line 2. The speaker gives a comment on the girl. In addition, in line 43, the speaker starts talking about another topic. Here, of course, it should be sure that the pronominal reference, 'they,' refers to the girl in line 43. However, the center topic or story in the following discourse is not focused on only the girl, but rather on the lifestyle of the older guy and the girl of line 1-2. In this sense, the topic change is noticeable in the discourse context. In summary, we can say that the left-dislocation is used to rephrase the previous referent, that is, to give a final comment on a story and to give an emphasis upon the referent.

iii. *Type 3: Function to characterize a referent*

In this section, we examine the left-dislocation in Type 3. The left-dislocated referent refers to an immediate previous referent; however, the referent is not topical in the discourse context. The speaker uses the left-dislocation to characterize the utterance by themselves.

8)

1. ALINA: Well I didn't get along with !Dennis at all,
2. he was a jerk.
3. .. I did not like him.
4. .. Period.
5. (H) And !Spargo was okay.
6. .. (H) And we go out,
7. … and,
8. so, I walk in,
9. .. I see two paddlers.
10. .. and *these guys- --,*
11. *they were at each other's throats,*
12. <MRC the whole= … ni=ght … lo=ng.
13. … Competition .. galore MRC>
14. LENORE: … Really.
15. ALINA: .. Oh, yeah.
16. .. Each one was fighting for our affection [s].
17. LENORE: [%]
18. ALINA: … That was very apparent.
19. I knew that was gonna happen.
20. (H) Plus they didn't like each other.
21. (H) !Spar- --
22. Well !Spargo was ol=der,
23. … you know,
24. and he was real bright,

In this context, the speaker, Alina, is talking about the event at a party she visited. There are many persons in this discourse context: 'Dennis' at line 1, 'Spargo' at lines 5 and 21-22, and 'two paddlers' at line 9. The topic changes one after another in the discourse context. The left-dislocated referent at line 10-11 refers to the immediate previous utterance at line 9. In this example, the speaker characterized the referent by the left-dislocation.

As for the topic persistence, the left-dislocated referent, 'these guys,' is referred to by pronominal references in the following context: 'each one' at line 16 and 'they' at line 20. We can say that the topic persistence is lower than that of referent in Type 1. Moreover, the left-dislocated noun phrase occurs with the demonstrative 'this.' The noun phrase has weak stress.

iv. *Type 4: Function to introduce a referent*

In this section, finally, we demonstrate the discourse function of the left-dislocations in Type 4. The left-dislocated referent occurs in the discourse context. In other words, the left-dislocations are significant to introduce a referent. We found 2 cases or 10 percent in this type of total.

9)

1. MARILYN: … Mhm.
2. … Yeah.
3. *… little lemons from the tree,*
4. *they're still kinda yucky.*
5. .. <@ You know @>,
6. (H) we came back from a,
7. … we had to go to … the Ritz Carlton,
8. <X out in X> <VOX Laguna VOX>,
9. .. for a .. event.

In the context, Marilyn has talked about other topics. In this example, the left-dislocated referent at line 3, 'little lemons from the tree' appears into the discourse context. The left-dislocated referent, 'little lemons,' is not directly referred to by the speaker in the following discourse. There is not a nominal or pronominal reference. The left-dislocated referent is marked as the theme in the succeeding discourse. We might say that the speakers use the function to establish or track a referent. It is a discourse-new referent.

© 2022 Global Journals

b) Result

We have examined the discourse functions of the left-dislocations in our data in the preceding section, and proposed four discourse functions: (1) to reintroduce a referent (50%), (2) to rephrase a referent (35%), (3) to characterize a referent (5%), and (4) to introduce a referent (10%). Each characteristic has been mainly significant by two measurements of referential distances and topic persistence.

Table 1: Average of referential distance

	Average in clauses Average in reference		
Type 1	30 44% 30 <70 22% 20 <25 33% 10<15	1 100%	10 50%
Type 2	12 29% 16 <30 71% 5<15	8 29% 11<15 71% 5<10	7 35%
Type 3	1 100%	1 100%	1 5%
Type 4	1 100%	1 100%	2 10%
Total			20

Table 2: Average of topic persistence

	Average in clauses Average in reference		
Type 1	23 55% 16 <25 44% 10 <15	10 33% 11<15 66% 5<10	10 50%
Type 2	0	0	7 35%
Type 3	4 100%	2 100%	1 5%
Type 4	-	-	2 10%
Total			20

Table 1 indicates each average of the referential distance in four discourse functions of the left-dislocations; on the other hand, Table 2 shows each of the topic persistence in four discourse functions of the left-dislocations. Referential distances show the clausal gap between the previous occurrence of a referent or a topic in the discourse and the left-dislocated referent. In addition, we have analyzed the number of references.

The result in Table 1 manifests that the left-dislocated referents which have the function of reintroducing a referent (Type 1) has clausal gaps on average, which marks 30 clauses.

Table 2 shows each persistence of the left-dislocated referents in the left dislocations following discourse context, which was measurable by the number of the clauses and references.

We can descriptively analyze the functions in our data by the measurements which show referential distances and the topic persistence. Next, we focus on the speaker's intention in the usages of the functions; we also investigate the roles of the left-dislocations in the discourse or thematic unit. Each result concerning forms and stress of them is finally visible in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Forms

	Forms No. of instances		
Type 1	Proper Noun Noun with Genitive modifier	9 1	10 50%
Type 2	Noun with Demonstrative 'that' Noun with Definite article 'the'	5 2	7 35%
Type 3	Noun with Demonstrative 'that'	1	1 5%
Type 4	Indefinite Noun	2	2 10%
Total			20

Table 4: Stress

	Strong	Weak	
Type 1	8 80%	2 20%	10 50%
Type 2	6 86%	1 14%	7 35%
Type 3	0 100%	1	1 5%
Type 4	0 100%	2	2 10%
Total			20

V. Discussion

In the preceding chapter, we have analyzed the discourse functions of the left-dislocation in our data. Then, they have been divided into the following four types: (Type 1) to reintroduce a referent; (Type 2) to rephrase a referent; (Type 3) to characterize a referent; and (Type 4) to introduce a referent.

In this chapter, we will, first of all, examine the identifiability, that is, the definiteness of the left-dislocated referents in the discourse context. Next, we will point out that the four discourse functions which we have shown can be further generalized down to the two discourse-pragmatic ones in using the left-dislocations. The two discourse-pragmatic applications interact with the speaker's goal, which s/he attempts to achieve by using the left-dislocation in the discourse context. Of course, they are particular by basing on the results of the referential distance and the topic persistence of left-dislocation, which we have clarified in the preceding chapter. Then, we here will focus on the characteristic of the left-dislocations in the thematic paragraph rather

© 2022 Global Journals

than the discourse context which we have analyzed. In addition, we show the stress pragmatically has the markedness and clearly indicates the boundary of the thematic paragraph in the discourse unit.

a) Definiteness

In this section, we examine the definiteness of the forms of the left-dislocated referents which we have seen, as we have introduced, Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin (1976), Ono & Thompson (1994), Gundel (1985), and Prince (1985, 1997) note about the form of a left-dislocated noun phrase or the characteristic of a left-dislocated referent. For example, they are proper nouns, nouns with determiners such as 'this' or genitive modifiers (Ono & Thompson, 1994). Besides, it is a familiar or identifiable referent for the speaker and hearer (Gundel, 1985; Prince, 1985, 1997). However, they do not clarify the relation between a left-dislocated noun phrase and the discourse function. They only say that the discourse function of left-dislocation is distinguishable as establishing or tracking an identifiable referent for the speaker and the hearer in the discourse.

We, thus, try to descriptively explain the correlation between the form and the discourse functions of the left-dislocations in our data and to give an explanation of which all the left-dislocated referents in our data are familiar and identifiable for the speaker and the hearer in the discourse context even though they are introduced in the discourse context, as it is certain in the usages of left-dislocated referents in Type 4. The left-dislocated noun phrases at Type 4 were indefinite; on the other hand, the other left-dislocated noun phrases, particular in Type 1, 2, and 3 were definite. That is to say, the left-dislocated referents in Type 1, 2, 3 seem to be familiar or identifiable referents for the speakers and the hearers; however, that in Type 4 does not seem to be.

We shall now focus on the definition of definiteness. Chafe (1976) defines definiteness as a speaker's assumption if the hearer knows or can identify a referent the speaker refers to or has in mind in communicative situations. In other words, it means that the hearer correctly picks up the referent that the speaker refers to, which is identifiability (p. 39). Similarly, Givón (1983) says that definiteness shows that a hearer can uniquely identify a referent referred to by the speaker. The speaker can assume that the referent is familiar to the hearer (p. 10). Chafe (1976) points out that the identifiable referent is figured out such nouns as proper nouns, common nouns, generic nouns, and nouns with the determiners like 'this' or 'that.' Moreover he clears that nouns are distinguishable as direct labels to particular referents; and the way to construct definiteness is a base on a speaker's prior mention in the discourse context. Thus, contexts or scenes are special for definiteness (p. 39). Let us now expand these arguments into the left-dislocated referents in our data.

First, we examine the relationship between the left-dislocated proper nouns and the discourse function to reintroduce a referent (Type 1); and it is the most frequently used in our data. All the forms were judgeable as proper nouns. The characteristic of the discourse function was characteristical that there were clausal gaps between the first mention of a referent and the second mention by the left-dislocation (see Table 1). It was 30 clauses on average. We may say that the speaker assumes that the hearer can correctly identify or pick up the left-dislocated referent even if the speaker reintroduces into the discourse context after 30 clauses from the first mention.

Shibata (1975), who observes lexical concreteness, refers to several examinations on proper nouns. He explores that a proper noun is limitedly a reference that refers to a particular person among friends. However, it is essentially able to apply to or refer to any person. On the contrary, in the case of semantic generalization of proper nouns, the proper nouns refer to a characteristic of a famous person by using a famous person's name (p. 48). For example, it is expressed as 'he is (like) Bill Gates.' We all notice that Bill Gates is identifiable as a rich man.

The left-dislocated proper nouns used in our data refer to a particular person among friends, so it is identified as direct labels. We now can say that concrete proper nouns seem appropriate for the left dislocations discourse functions to reintroduce a referent because the hearer can identify the referent, that is, the familiar name.

Next, we observe the correlation between the left-dislocated nouns with the determiner, 'that' or the definite article, 'the' and the discourse function to rephrase a referent (Type 2). The left-dislocations occurred to emphasize a topical referent in the immediate previous discourse context.

Shibata (1975) notes that demonstrative or personal pronouns cannot be correctly understood by a hearer until they appear in a context (p. 41). In that sense, the left-dislocated referents seem to be anaphoric usages in the discourse context. As for anaphoric usages, Givón (2001, p. 196-199) explains that an anaphoric referent has to refer to a topical referent in the previous discourse context. An anaphoric reference requires "functional transparency" (p. 196). If an anaphoric reference refers to a non-topical referent in the discourse, it is difficult for the hearer to identify the referent to which the anaphoric referent refers.

As for definite/indefinite referents in discourse, Givón (1983) also addresses that a hearer has to open a new file in their mind when a topic is particular by an indefinite noun phrase, it may be difficult for a hearer to identify the referent in such case as that there are clausal gaps between the definite referent and the

© 2022 Global Journals

previous mention to which the referent refers. A hearer can identify a topic in such case as a short clausal gap between them (p. 11).

Each left-dislocated anaphoric or definite referent with the demonstrative, 'that' or the definite article, 'the,' which is particular to give a special emphasis, referred to a topical referent in the preceding discourse context. If it was significant to reintroduce a referent, as seen in Type 1, it would be difficult for the hearer to correctly identify the referent, which the speaker refers to by the left-dislocation. Therefore, we may say that the anaphoric or definite characteristics of the left-dislocated referents related with the left-dislocated discourse function to give an emphasis or comment upon the immediate previous referent.

Thirdly, we examine the correlation between the noun phrase with the demonstrative, 'this' and the left dislocations discourse function to characterize a referent (Type 3). This discourse function was distinguishable as follows: the left-dislocated referent referred to a referent in the immediately preceding utterance. And the left-dislocated referent, 'these guys,' was used to characterize the immediate previous referent, 'two paddlers.' We can see that this case is also defined as an anaphoric usage which seems to be similar to the left-dislocated noun phrases with the demonstrative, 'that' and the definite article, 'the,' as we have seen. However, there is one significant difference in the demonstrative, 'that' and 'this'.

Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski (1993) mention that the noun phrase with the demonstrative determiner 'this' has to be "speaker-activated, by virtue of having been introduced by the speaker or otherwise included in the speaker's context space (p. 279)". Observe the following examples:

10) A: Have you seen the neighbor's dog?
B: Yes, and ? this dog kept me awake last night.
that dog
(Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski, 1993, p. 279)

11) B: My neighbor has a dog.
This/that dog kept me awake last night.
(Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski, 1993, p. 279)

In these examples, the referent, 'the neighbor's dog,' which is referred to by 'this dog' in (10), is uttered by the speaker A; on the other hand, in (11) speaker B introduces the referent, 'a dog' which is clear as 'this dog' or 'that dog.' Gundel, Hedberg, & Zacharski (1993, p. 279) draw attention to the usage of demonstrative determiner, 'this' in (10), is not appropriate. Thus, we can recognize that the noun phrase with 'this' is characterized by the speaker-oriented usage and anaphoric usage.

The left-dislocated noun phrase with the demonstrative determiner, 'this' in our data, referred to a referent introduced by the speaker in the immediate previous utterance. It shows the anaphoric characteristic of 'this.' In addition, the speaker characterized the referent which the speaker introduced into the discourse by the left-dislocation; that is, it is clear as the speaker-activated referent. Thus, we can notice that the feature of the demonstrative determiner, 'this,' interacts with the discourse function of the left-dislocation.

Finally, we explain the relationship between the left-dislocated indefinite noun phrase and the discourse function to introduce a referent (Type 4). These left-dislocations occurred to introduce a referent into the discourse for the first time, and all the forms of the left-dislocated noun phrases were indefinite. It seems to be a natural correlation between the discourse function and the form because it is new information in the discourse; however, it contradicts the examination proposed by Gundel (1985) and Prince (1985, 1997). They say that a left-dislocated referent is familiar or identifiable for a hearer. Is each indefinite referent of left-dislocated in our data non-identifiable for each hearer in the discourse context?

We regard the indefinite noun phrases of left-dislocated as identifiable referents for the hearer in the discourse context because they are knowable by the hearer from the non-verbal context of the utterance, or "inferable" from the previous one (Prince, 1981). As for the inferable information in discourse contexts, Prince puts forward that the information status in discourse does not depend on the only binary distinction of whether it is given or new information. In addition, she proposes that new information is not always new information for a hearer (p. 236). The new information is distinguishable into two types; whether it is inferable or not from the previous utterance or the discourse situation.

We here point out that the left-dislocated indefinite referents, which introduce a referent, are inferable. The one is inferable from the discourse situation; for example, the left-dislocated referent, 'little lemons from the tree,' is defined as the inferable referent from such extra-linguistic context as dinner time. The other inferable referent from the previous utterance may be focused on the inferable referent from the topic about an event. Thus, we can say that the left-dislocated indefinite referents which function as introducing a new referent are not identifiable as discourse-new referents but rather identifiable referents.

The fact reveals that all left-dislocated referents in our data are familiar or identifiable for the hearer in the discourse context, even if they are indefinite. We have given more descriptive explanations regarding the familiarity and the identifiability of the left-dislocated referent than the simple observation suggested by Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin (1976), Gundel (1985), Prince (1985, 1997), and Ono & Thompson (1994). In the following section, we shall examine that the degree

© 2022 Global Journals

of the identifiability of the left-dislocated referents closely links with the discourse-pragmatic functions. In other words, it sets out the problem "referential accessibility" or "predictability" of the referent in the discourse context, which is noticeable by Givón (1992).

b) Discourse pragmatic functions

In this section, we suggest that the four discourse functions of the left-dislocations we have analyzed seem to be further generalized down to the two discourse-pragmatic functions. The one discourse-pragmatic function shows the function to topicalize a non-topical referent in the discourse context; on the other hand, the other discourse-pragmatic function shows the function to give an emphasis upon a topical referent. The former function indicates Type 1, 3, and 4, which we have seen, and the latter function indicates Type 2, which we have seen. The two discourse-pragmatic functions of the left-dislocations are different.

Each discourse-pragmatic function is particular by not only the differences in the referential distance and the topic persistence but also the differences in the anaphoric feature, which we have examined in the preceding section. In other words, the predictability of the left-dislocated referent in the discourse context relates with the discourse-pragmatic functions. Of course, all left-dislocated referents in our data are identifiable for the hearer, as we have observed; however, the degree of identifiability seems to be different in respect of the predictability of a referent.

First, as for the topic persistence, the left-dislocations in Type 1, 3, and 4 have the topic persistence in the following discourse context; on the contrary, the left-dislocations in Type 2 do not have it. Moreover, each left-dislocation in Type 2 refers to the previous topical referent. That is, the referential distance is nothing. We can be fairly certain that the two kinds of the left-dislocations differ in the goal which the speaker attempts to achieve in the discourse context: in some cases, the speaker tries to foreground a non-topical referent in the discourse context to topicalize the referent in the succeeding discourse context; in other cases, the speaker would give an emphasis on a topical referent. In the former case, the speaker uses the left-dislocation in the opening of the story-telling discourse context; on the other hand, in the latter case, the speaker uses the left-dislocation in the last of the story-telling discourse context. The fact seems to relate to the thematic paragraph in each discourse unit.

Let us discuss the relationship between the thematic paragraph and the discourse-pragmatic functions of the lest-dislocations. Later we shall try to give an account of the correlation of the predictability of the left-dislocated referents and the discourse-pragmatic applications.

Givón (1983) demonstrates that a topic-marking device is related with the construction of thematic paragraphs in the discourse unit (p. 6). Moreover, it is coded to a grammar syntax (p. 9). To begin with, regarding a thematic paragraph and discourse unit, he explains that a thematic paragraph is a focus by chains of clauses; further, the thematic paragraph is composite into larger discourse units such as sections, chapters, parts, or stories (p. 7). The thematic paragraph and discourse unit are strongly distinguishable as macro organizations in discourse; on the other hand, a clause chain is completely particular as a micro organization.

As for the chains of clauses, Givón (1983, p. 9) suggests that there are three major types of the topic-marking device within thematic paragraphs: (a) chain initial topic, (b) chain medial topic, and (c) chain final topic. The characteristics of the three types are noteworthy below:

a) Chain initial topic:
   (1) Characteristically a newly-introduced, newly-changed or newly-returned topic; thus
   (2) Characteristically a discontinuous topic in terms of the preceding discourse context; but
   (3) Potentially – if an important topic – a rather persistent topic in terms of the succeeding discourse context.

b) Chain medial topic:
   (1) Characteristically a continuing/continuous topic in terms of the preceding discourse context; and also
   (2) Characteristically persistent – but not maximally so – in terms of the succeeding discourse context, even when an important topic.

c) Chain final topic:
   (1) Characteristically a continuing/continuous topic in terms of the preceding discourse context; but
   (2) Characteristically non-persistent topic in terms of the succeeding discourse context, even if an important topic (Givón, 1983, p. 9)

Here, we regard two of three types, (a) and (c), as the discourse-pragmatic functions of the left-dislocations in our data: the initial chain topic seems to be coded to the left-dislocation which functions as topicalizing a referent in the discourse context; on the other hand, the final chain topic seems to be coded to the left-dislocation, which is distinguishable as giving an emphasis upon a topical referent. In addition, we assume that the chain medial topic is connected to the pronominal references in subjects' or objects' positions. Then, we now attempt to observe the chain medial topic device of the subject and the object in our data before turning to the closer examination of the two functions of the left-dislocations in the thematic paragraph. It would be helpful to describe our main task.

© 2022 Global Journals

Table 5: Subject constituents

		%
Pronoun	1494	88
Proper noun	80	5
Noun with article 'the'	55	3
Noun with genitive modifier	18	1
Noun with demonstrative pronoun 'this'	15	0.9
Noun with demonstrative pronoun 'that'	8	0.5
Indefinite noun phrase	20	1
	1690	99.40

Table 6: Object constituents

		%
Pronoun	224	26
Proper noun	57	6.5
Noun with article 'the'	102	12
Noun with genitive modifier	53	6
Noun with demonstrative pronoun 'this'	40	5
Noun with demonstrative pronoun 'that'	21	2
Indefinite noun phrase	369	43
	866	99.50

We here provided the referential forms of the subject and the object constituents in our data (1753 clauses): 1690 noun phrases and pronouns in the subject positions, in addition, 866 noun phrases and pronouns in the object positions are examined. Tables 5 and 6 show each result. In both Table 5 and 6, the main point to note is to set out the percentage of each pronominal reference. Table 5 tells us that the pronominal ones account for 88 percent of the total of the subject constituents in our data; moreover, Table 6 shows that the pronominal references account for 26 percent of total of the object constituents in our data. Surely, the pronominal ones in the subject positions command an absolute majority in the subject constituents.

In general, pronominal referents refer to given information or active information in the discourse context in English (Chafe, 1987, 1994). Although the fuller study of the problems about subjects and objects, or given and new information lies outside the scope of this paper, in short, we regard each pronominal reference in the subjects and the objects as a continuing topic in the discourse context. That is, they code the medial chain topic. Let us now look at the problem of the left-dislocations and the thematic paragraph.

As mentioned above, the left-dislocations code to the chain initial topic or the chain final topic of the thematic paragraph. And the pronominal references in the subjects and the objects code the chain medial topic.

We are now able to see that the left-dislocated referent which codes the chain initial topic causes the referential and the thematic "disruption"; on the other hand, the left-dislocated referent that codes the chain final topic maintains the referential and the thematic "continuity" in the discourse, but not in the succeeding discourse context. Then, we have one question: can the speaker use left-dislocated referents as the topic-marking devices if they are identifiable for the hearer?

We here that the left-dislocations which mark the chain initial topic and function as topicalizing a non-topical referent have an engagement in the shared information for the speaker and the hearer; on the contrary, the left-dislocations which mark the chain final topic of giving a special emphasis upon a topical referent have an argument on the textually thematic information in the discourse context. Tomlin (1986) notes the difference between shared information and thematic information:

(a) *Shared information:* information in an expression is shared to the extent the speaker assumes the hearer is able to identify the referent of the expression.

(b) *Thematic information:* information in an expression is thematic to the extent the speaker assumes the hearer attends to the referent of the expression.

(Tomlin, 1986, p. 39)

Before explaining the overt reasons for our hypothesis, we here provide the remarks on the predictability of a referent in discourse contexts, which is weighty by Givón (1992).

Givón (1992, p. 12) highlights that "any information transacted in discourse has a certain level of predictability, coherence, or accessibility vis-à-vis its context." In addition, he points out "generic ("cultural") permanent memory" and "textural ("discourse") episodic memory" regarding the predictability or the accessibility of information in discourse, namely, regarding the shared contexts in the searches of information in the speaker's and hearer's present memory. Based on Givón's and Tomlin's ideas, we may regard that most of the notices of the left-dislocated referents coded to the clausal initial topics exist in the generic permanent memory of the speaker and the hearer; on the other hand, most of the information of the left-dislocated referents coded to the clausal final topics exist in the textual (discourse) episodic memory in the discourse context.

As we investigated in the previous section, for example, the left-dislocated referents, which function as reintroducing a referent, are shed light on the proper nouns as the direct label to a particular person, such as the speaker's family. The searches depend on the shared concrete information between the speaker and the hearer rather than on the discourse context. That is, it exists in permanent memory. Therefore, when the referent has a topicality by the left-dislocation in the chain initial position, the hearer can easily understand the beginning of the referent which the speaker refers to and does not have many surprises because it is the certainly shared information. On the other hand, the left-

© 2022 Global Journals

dislocated referents which occur in Types are to set anaphoric referents. For example, it is made upon of such noun phrases as 'that boy.' They overtly exist in the textual episodic memory of the speaker and the hearer. Actually, the referents are introduced as the left-dislocated referent in the final of the story-telling discourse context; that is, it is cleared up the chain final topic. If a referent is introduced as a left-dislocated referent as the chain first topic in thematic paragraphs, the speaker cannot understand the referent which the speaker refers to. In this sense, we can summarize that the left-dislocation as the chain initial topic device follows the constraint of which the referent is identifiable and shared information in the discourse context; in contrast, the left-dislocation as the chain final topic device follows the constraint of which the referent is thematic information in the discourse context. In fact, the speakers use the two different discourse-pragmatic functions of the left-dislocations in our data. The choice is a base on the speaker's communicative intention and the feature of the information in the discourse context.

Finally, we note the characteristic of the stress of the left-dislocations. As we have analyzed, many left-dislocated referents have stress. In general, English has a normal postverbal stress either on a direct object or on some other elements (Harlig & Bordovi-Harlig, 1988. P. 133), which is exemplified as follows:

12) Mary washed and dried the *dishes.*
13) John left *yesterday.*

(Harlig & Bordovi-Harlig, 1988, p. 133)

Left-dislocated referents are in a sentence-initial position; nevertheless, most of the left-dislocated referents in our data have stress. On the other hand, most of the pronominal or nominal references in the subject position in our data do not have stress. The fact might show the left-dislocated referents pragmatically have the marked stress. From this viewpoint, one may say that the speaker achieves their goal in the discourse, which the goal means that s/he topicalizes the shared information or emphasizes the thematic information, by not only the marked syntactic order but also the marked stress. Moreover, we can see that the speaker calls the hearer's attention to the thematic information by the stress. The left-dislocation causes a surprise for the hearer in the discourse context.

In conclusion, this research on the discourse functions based on the referential distance and the topic persistence of the left-dislocations, and the discourse-pragmatic functions based on the speaker's communicative intention in the usages of the left-dislocations, then we have descriptively seen that the applications of the left-dislocations could not be generalized down to one function. The fact agrees with the function of left-dislocation as the speaker's communicative strategy considered by Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin (1976). However, our analysis and discussion about the discourse function as identifiability of the left-dislocated referents have more specified Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin's study.

VI. Conclusion

The present study has attempted to descriptively examine the discourse-pragmatic functions of left-dislocation in American English discourse. The database for this study has consisted of three corpora of the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English, which has consisted of 77 minutes and 1753 clauses. The total percentage of left-dislocation out of the total number of clauses was 1% of the corpus. It was not high against our expectations.

This paper analyzed the referential distance in the preceding discourse context and the topic persistence in the succeeding discourse context of the left-dislocations. Then, it divided the discourse functions of the left-dislocations into four types.

We have clarified all left-dislocated referents in our data were identifiable for the hearer in the discourse context. Next, we have noted that the four discourse functions of the left-dislocations we analyzed were generalized down to the two different discourse-pragmatic functions. We have suggested that the speaker tried to achieve their goal in the interactional discourse by using each discourse-pragmatic application of left-dislocation.

To conclude, this study claims how marked syntactic structures interact with a particular discourse function, in addition, with a speaker's communicative goal in discourse context. Further studies are needed to examine this function and interaction-oriented grammatical aspects. In the future, we would like to investigate operations of left-dislocations in a larger database, and investigate other grammatical devices such as topicalization or thematization in discourse.

References Références Referencias

1. Chafe, Wallace. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In *Subject and topic* (pp. 25-55), by Charles N. Li.. NY: Academic Press.
2. Chafe, Wallace. (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. In *Coherence and Grounding in discourse* (pp. 21-52), by Russell Tomlin. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
3. Chafe, Wallace. (1994). *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Du Bois, John W. & Stephan Schuetze-Coburn. (1993). Representing hierarchy: constituent structure for discourse databases. In *Talking data: transcription and coding in discourse research*

© 2022 Global Journals

(pp. 221-61), by J. Edwards and M. Lampert eds. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
5. Du Bois, John W., Susanna Cumming & Danae Paolino. (1993). An outline of discourse transcription. In J. Edwards & M. Lampert. (pp. 45-89).
6. Duranti, Alessandro. & Elinor Ochs. (1979). Left-dislocation in Italian conversation. In *Syntax and semantics., vol. 12: discourse and syntax* (pp. 377-416), by Talmy Givón ed. NY: Academic Press.
7. Fox, Barbara A. (1993). *Discourse structure and anaphora: written and conversational English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Givón, Talmy. (1983). Topic continuity in discourse: an introduction. In *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study* (pp. 1-41), by Talmy Givón. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
9. Givón, Talmy. (1992). The grammar of referential coherence as mental processing instructions. *Linguistics* 30, pp. 5-55.
10. Givón, Talmy. (2001). *Syntax: an introduction. Vol. 1.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
11. Gundel, Jeanette. (1985). Shared knowledge and topicality. *Journal of pragmatics* 9, pp. 83-107.
12. Gundel, J. Nancy Hedberg & Ron Zacharski. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69 (2), pp. 274-307.
13. Halliday, Michael A. K. (1967). Notes on transitivity and theme in English, part 2. *Journal of linguistics* 3, pp. 199-244.
14. Halliday, Michael & R. Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
15. Harlig, Jeffrey & Kathleen Bardovi-Harlig. (1988). Accentuation typology, word order and theme-rheme structure. In *Studies in syntactic typology*, (pp. 125-46), by Michael Hammond eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
16. Keenan-Ochs, E. & B.B. Schieffelin. (1976). Foregrounding referents: a reconsideration of left-dislocation in discourse. *BLS* 2, pp. 240-57.
17. Kim, Kyu-hyun. (1995). Wh-clefts and left-dislocation in English conversation: cases of topicalization. In *Word order in discourse*, (pp. 245-96) by P. Dowing & M. Nooman eds. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
18. Lambrecht, Knud. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Ono, Tsuyoshi & Sandra A. Thompson. (1994). Unattached NPs in English conversation. *BLS* 20, pp. 402-19.
20. Prince, Ellen F. (1981). Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In *Radical pragmatics* (pp. 223-55), by Peter. Cole. NY: Academic Press.
21. Prince, Ellen F. (1985). Fancy syntax and shared knowledge. *Journal of pragmatics* 9, pp. 65-81.
22. Prince, Ellen F. (1997). On the functions of left-dislocation in English discourse, In *Directions in functional linguistics*, (pp. 117-43), by A. Kamio. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
23. Reinhart, Tanya. (1981). Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27, pp. 300-13.
24. Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constrains on variables in syntax.* The doctorical dissertation, at MIT.
25. Shibata, Shozo. (1975). *Goiron*. [Lexicology.] Tokyo: Taishukan Publishing Company.
26. Tomlin, Russell S. (1986). *Basic word order: functional principles*. London: Croom Helm.
27. Tomlin, Russell S. (1995). Focal attention, voice, and word order: an experimental, cross-linguistic study. In *Word order in discourse*, (pp. 517-54).

© 2022 Global Journals