

1 Discourse-Pragmatic Functions for Applications to Shared and 2 Thematic Information Structures

3 Eri Kondo

4 *Received: 31 December 2021 Accepted: 25 January 2022 Published: 9 February 2022*

5

6 **Abstract**

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

16

17 **Index terms**— discourse structures, conversation analysis, marked word order, pragmatics.

18 **1 Introduction**

19 We have to give a grammatical explanation of the term, left-dislocation. Left-dislocation is a marked word order,
20 which derives from the canonical SVO word order of English (Ross, 1967). Traditionally, leftdislocation has been
21 characterized in terms of the preposing a noun phrase from a proposition into the initial sentence position that
22 is external to it, which contains a coreferential pronominal reference with the left-dislocated noun phrase (Ross,
23 1967). Examples are here:

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

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

29 **2 Theoretical Background**

30 In general, many types of research on leftdislocation have shown that the function is to topicalize a referent
31 (Halliday, 1967;Reinhart, 1981). However, these studies focus on the function of left-dislocation in one sentence
32 rather than in a discourse context. Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin (1976), who have examined the discourse function
33 of left-dislocation, regard the usage of left-dislocation in discourse as a speaker's strategy in the communicative
34 work. They propose that the speaker brings a referent into the foreground of the listener's consciousness by
35 leftdislocation; then, the referent is usually not currently a center of attention; that is, it is not the current topic
36 in the discourse context (p. 242). They indicate three discourse functions of left-dislocation: (i) to introduce
37 a discourse-new referent, (ii) to reintroduce a referent into n this paper, we describe the discourse-pragmatic
38 functions of left-dislocation in American English discourse and descriptively observe how the particular word
39 order relates with the discourse context or the discourse unit; moreover, with a speaker's communicative intention.
40 As for the term discoursepragmatics, in this paper, we follow the definition by Lambrecht (1994), in the state
41 that "since discourse involves the use of sentences in communicative settings, such research is associated with the
42 general area of pragmatics (p. 2)". In addition, in this paper, we put forward two terms, which are discourse-
43 pragmatic function and discourse function. In this thesis, the analyses argue the discourse-pragmatic functions

44 through the usages of left-dislocations as a speaker's intention, assistance, and goal in the communicative discourse
45 context. On the other hand, the discourse function draws upon the phenomena of the work in the discourse
46 context.

47 3 I

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

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

63 3) 1. K: Yeah// Yeah! No matter how old// you are 2. L: Yeah. Mh hm 3. Parents don't understand. ??.
64 But all grownups w-they do it to kids. ???. Whether they're your own or not.

65 (Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 243) 4) 1. K: An' I got a red sweater, an' a white one, an' other 2.
66 sweaters, you know, ???. And uh my sister loves borrowing ???. my sweaters because they're pullovers, you know,
67 ???. she c'n wear a blouse under'em ???. an' she thinks "Well this is great" 7. An' so my red sweater, I haven't
68 seen it ???. Since I got it.

69 (Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 243) 5) 1. L: T'know some of 'em are darmn tall and goodlooking 2.
70 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.
71 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 hehh 8. L: These
72 kids I don't believe it they're six foot.

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

74 In example (3), the left-dislocation at line 4 introduces a discourse-new referent, 'all grownups.' The precious
75 topic is about the speaker's parents (Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976, p. 243). In example (4), the left-dislocation
76 at line 7 reintroduces a referent, 'my red sweater,' into the discourse. The referent appeared at line 1; however,
77 it is not a topic lines 3 to 6. The main is 'my sister' in the discourse context (Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin, 1976,
78 p. 243). The left-dislocations in these two examples function to foreground a referent; but the left-dislocation at
79 8 in example ??5) does not. The left-dislocated referent, 'these kids', is in the foreground of the speaker's and
80 hearer's minds in the preceding discourse context. Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin (1976, p. 245) state that "the
81 speaker is using the basic function of focusing the listener's attention on some referent to amplify the attention
82 paid to some referent under discussion." They report this type is a minor focus function of left-dislocation, and
83 it occupies 6.6 percent of the total left-dislocations in their data. From a similar perspective, Ono & Thompson
84 (1994) suggest that the discourse function of left-dislocation is particular for establishing or tracking a referent
85 in the discourse context.

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

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

101 Next, we investigate the definiteness of the leftdislocated referents in our data that are identifiable for the
102 hearer in the discourse context.

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

105 **4 III.**

106 **5 Data and Methodology**

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

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

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

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

140 **6 IV.**

141 **7 Analysis and Results**

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

147 **8 a) Discourse Function**

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

154 We divide the discourse functions of the lefdislocations in our data into four types: (1) to reintroduce a referent
155 (hereafter Type 1), (2) to rephrase a referent (hereafter Type 2), (3) to characterize a referent (hereafter Type
156 3), and (4) to introduce a referent (hereafter Type 4). Type 1 is the discourse function of the left-dislocations in
157 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
158 percent.

159 Then, the left-dislocations in Type 2 do not have a clausal gap between a referent and a left-dislocated referent
160 which refers to a referent. The left-dislocated referent refers to the immediate previous referent. In other words,
161 a topic in the discourse context is not particular by the left-dislocation in contrast with the lefdislocations in
162 Type 1, which sets it apart as changing a theme in the discourse context. In Type 2, the topic As for each
163 characteristic of the referential distances, the topic persistence, the forms, and the stress of the left-dislocations,

164 the left-dislocations in Type 1 have clausal gaps in the first introduction of referent into the discourse by the left-
165 dislocation. In Type 1, the topic persistence is continuous in the left dislocations succeeding discourse context.
166 Further, the forms of the left-dislocated noun phrases in Type 1 are proper nouns or nouns with the genitive
167 modifiers. A lot of the left-dislocated noun phrases have the stress.

168 discourse context, and this feature is also as opposed to that of Type 1. And the forms of the left-dislocated
169 noun phrases in Type 2 are characterized by the following: the nouns with a demonstrative pronoun, 'that,' or
170 with a definite article, 'the.' In addition, most of the left-dislocated noun phrases have the stress.

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

180 9 i. Type 1: Function to reintroduce a referent

181 Here, we examine Type 1. The left-dislocation occurs to reintroduce a referent into the discourse context, where
182 the speaker introduced the referent at the previous discourse; however, there is only one reference that refers
183 to the referent at the context. The referent has not been a topic, but another referent has been a focus as a
184 topic. Left-dislocations occur to focus on the referent as the topic in the discourse context. The speaker brings
185 a referent into the foreground of the listener's consciousness by the left-dislocation. The following example (6)
186 shows the case where the leftdislocation appears for the reintroduction of referent, which is not a central topic
187 in the previous discourse context. Finally, the left-dislocations in Type 4, of course, do not have a clausal gap
188 between a referent and the left-dislocated referent because the discourse function is to introduce a discourse-new
189 referent. The topic persistence in the following discourse context is continuous, while it may not mean a topic
190 persistence but rather a thematic structure. The difference between topic persistence and thematic persistence
191 would be significant in the number of referential markings in the succeeding discourse context, described by the
192 examples in the later section. As for the forms of the left-dislocated noun phrases, they are indefinite. And they
193 have weak stress. We exemplify each type of the left-dislocations from our data in the following subsections. In
194 this context, the speaker has told a story about which her acquaintance, 'Mike,' is the person who stole Hector's
195 radio (line 11-12). 'Mike' and 'Hector's radio' are new in the discourse context. We can find the left-dislocation
196 at 42-43: 'Hector's radio, it was broken.' The referent is reintroduced into the discourse because it has not been
197 the center of the topic. The speaker has talked about 'Mike' from the line 11 to 38: 'he (=Mike) was a cocaine
198 addict' at line 17, 'he (=Mike)'s talking about' at line 18, 'he (=Mike)'s gonna show us' at line 22, 'he (=Mike)'s
199 actually pretty intelligent' at line 36, and 'he (=Mike) just uneducated' at line 37-38. The referent, 'Mike' is the
200 main topic there; 'Hector's radio' is not. Accordingly, there is no an identified referent, 'Hector's radio' at line
201 13 to 41. After the interruptions such as 'so', 'um', and 'yeah' at line 39 to 41, the speaker has started talking
202 about the referent, 'Hector's radio' at line 42. We can say that the function of leftdislocation is to reintroduce
203 the referent into the discourse context. In this example, there are clausal gaps between the previous utterance
204 at line 12 and the current one at line 42, where it contains nine clauses.

205 10 Volume XXII Issue II Version I

206 11 take it

207 The left-dislocation is used to foreground the referent in the background of the hearer's consciousness and to
208 make the topic-marking. The speaker has talked about 'Hector's radio' in the succeeding contexts at line 42 to
209 68: for example, 'we were gonna take it (=Hector's radio) out and send it (=Hector's radio) back to the factory'
210 at line 44 to 45, 'he (=Hector) never got his radio' at line 58, and 'he (=Hector)'s having bad luck with that car'
211 at line 68. There are ten pronominal or nominal referents that refer to or presuppose 'Hector's radio' after the
212 leftdislocation at line 42-43. It is represented: 'it, radio, he, his radio, that, and we (because Hector is Alina's
213 husband)'. There are 15 pronominal and nominal references which refer to the left-dislocated referent among 12
214 clauses. Thus, we see that the function can maintain the topic persistence.

215 12 ii. Type 2: Function to rephrase a referent

216 The left-dislocations in Type 2 occur to rephrase a previous topical referent, and it is in the foreground of the
217 listener's consciousness. The discourse function gives the speaker special emphasis or comment upon a particular
218 entity mentioned in the prior utterance. Moreover, the topic persistence is not particular in the succeeding
219 discourse context. Characteristically, the speakers use the left-dislocation when they finish talking a story about
220 the referent. We found 7 cases or 35 percent of this type. 37 In this context, the speakers, Alina and Lenore,
221 have talked about one girl who has been at a party to which she has gone at line 1 to 43. The first mention

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

232 iii. Type 3: Function to characterize a referent 8) 1. ALINA: Well I didn't get along with !Dennis at all, 2.
233 he was a jerk. ?? ??4. and he was real bright, In this context, the speaker, Alina, is talking about the event
234 at a party she visited. There are many persons in this discourse context: 'Dennis' at line 1, 'Spargo' at lines
235 5 and 21-22, and 'two paddlers' at line ???. The topic changes one after another in the discourse context. The
236 left-dislocated referent at line 10-11 refers to the immediate previous utterance at line ???. In this example, the
237 speaker characterized the referent by the left-dislocation.

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

242 13 iv. Type 4: Function to introduce a referent

243 In this section, finally, we demonstrate the discourse function of the left-dislocations in Type 4. The left-dislocated
244 referent occurs in the discourse context. In other words, the left-dislocations are significant to introduce a referent.
245 We found 2 cases or 10 percent in this type of total. 9) 1. MARILYN: ? Mhm. 2. ? Yeah. ???. ? little lemons
246 from the tree, 4. they're still kinda yucky. 5. .. <@ You know @>, 6. (H) we came back from a, 7. ? we had to
247 go to ? the Ritz Carlton, 8. <X out in X> <VOX Laguna VOX>, 9. .. for a .. event.

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

253 14 10.

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

257 15 b) Result

258 We have examined the discourse functions of the left-dislocations in our data in the preceding section, and
259 proposed four discourse functions: (1) to reintroduce a referent (50%), (2) to rephrase a referent (35%), (3)
260 to characterize a referent (5%), and (4) to introduce a referent (10%). Each characteristic has been mainly
261 significant by two measurements of referential distances and topic persistence. Table 1 indicates each average of
262 the referential distance in four discourse functions of the leftdislocations; on the other hand, Table 2 shows each
263 of the topic persistence in four discourse functions of the left-dislocations. Referential distances show the clausal
264 gap between the previous occurrence of a referent or a topic in the discourse and the left-dislocated referent. In
265 addition, we have analyzed the number of references.

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

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

270 We can descriptively analyze the functions in our data by the measurements which show referential V.

271 16 Discussion

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

275 In this chapter, we will, first of all, examine the identifiability, that is, the definiteness of the leftdislocated
276 referents in the discourse context. Next, we will point out that the four discourse functions which we have shown
277 can be further generalized down to the two discourse-pragmatic ones in using the left-dislocations. The two
278 discourse-pragmatic applications interact with the speaker's goal, which s/he attempts to achieve by using the
279 left-dislocation in the discourse context. Of course, they are particular by basing on the results of the referential

280 distance and the topic persistence of leftdislocation, which we have clarified in the preceding chapter. Then, we
281 here will focus on the characteristic of the left-dislocations in the thematic paragraph rather distances and the
282 topic persistence. Next, we focus on the speaker's intention in the usages of the functions; we also investigate the
283 roles of the left-dislocations in the discourse or thematic unit. Each result concerning forms and stress of them
284 is finally visible in Tables 3 and 4.

285 17 Average in clauses Average in reference

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

289 18 a) Definiteness

290 We, thus, try to descriptively explain the correlation between the form and the discourse functions of the left-
291 dislocations in our data and to give an explanation of which all the left-dislocated referents in our data are
292 familiar and identifiable for the speaker and the hearer in the discourse context even though they are introduced
293 in the discourse context, as it is certain in the usages of left-dislocated referents in Type 4. The leftdislocated
294 noun phrases at Type 4 were indefinite; on the other hand, the other left-dislocated noun phrases, particular in
295 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
296 identifiable referents for the speakers and the hearers; however, that in Type 4 does not seem to be.

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

307 19 Shibata

308 (1975), who observes lexical concreteness, refers to several examinations on proper nouns. He explores that a
309 proper noun is limitedly a reference that refers to a particular person among friends. However, it is essentially
310 able to apply to or refer to any person. On the contrary, in the case of semantic generalization of proper nouns,
311 the proper nouns refer to a characteristic of a famous person by using a famous person's name (p. 48). For
312 example, it is expressed as 'he is (like) Bill Gates.' We all notice that Bill Gates is identifiable as a rich man.

313 Next, we observe the correlation between the left-dislocated nouns with the determiner, 'that' or the definite
314 article, 'the' and the discourse function to rephrase a referent (Type 2). The left-dislocations occurred to
315 emphasize a topical referent in the immediate previous discourse context. Shibata (1975) notes that demonstrative
316 or personal pronouns cannot be correctly understood by a hearer until they appear in a context (p. 41). In that
317 sense, the left-dislocated referents seem to be anaphoric usages in the discourse context. As for anaphoric usages,
318 ??ivón (2001, p. 196-199) explains that an anaphoric referent has to refer to a topical referent in the previous
319 discourse context. An anaphoric reference requires "functional transparency" (p. 196). If an anaphoric reference
320 refers to a non-topical referent in the discourse, it is difficult for the hearer to identify the referent to which the
321 anaphoric referent refers.

322 As for definite/indefinite referents in discourse, Givón (1983) also addresses that a hearer has to open a new
323 file in their mind when a topic is particular by an indefinite noun phrase, it may be difficult for a hearer to
324 identify the referent in such case as that there are clausal gaps between the definite referent and the First, we
325 examine the relationship between the left-dislocated proper nouns and the discourse function to reintroduce a
326 referent (Type 1); and it is the most frequently used in our data. All the forms were judgeable as proper nouns.
327 The characteristic of the discourse function was characteristical that there were clausal gaps between the first
328 mention of a referent and the second mention by the left-dislocation (see Table 1). It was 30 clauses on average.
329 We may say that the speaker assumes that the hearer can correctly identify or pick up the left-dislocated referent
330 even if the speaker reintroduces into the discourse context after 30 clauses from the first mention.

331 In this section, we examine the definiteness of the forms of the left-dislocated referents which we have seen,
332 as we have introduced, Keenan-Ochs & Schieffelin (1976), Ono & Thompson (1994), Gundel (1985), and Prince
333 (1985Prince (, 1997)) note about the form of a left-dislocated noun phrase or the characteristic of a leftdislocated
334 referent. For example, they are proper nouns, nouns with determiners such as 'this' or genitive modifiers (Ono &
335 Thompson, 1994). Besides, it is a familiar or identifiable referent for the speaker and hearer (Gundel, 1985;Prince,
336 1985Prince, , 1997). However, they do not clarify the relation between a left-dislocated noun phrase and the
337 discourse function. They only say that the discourse function of left-dislocation is distinguishable as establishing
338 or tracking an identifiable referent for the speaker and the hearer in the discourse.

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

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

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

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

357 Gundel, Hedberg, and Zacharski (1993) mention that the noun phrase with the demonstrative determiner
358 'this' has to be "speaker-activated, by virtue of having been introduced by the speaker or otherwise included in
359 the speaker's context space (p. 279)". Observe the following examples: 11) B: My neighbor has a dog.

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

366 The left-dislocated noun phrase with the demonstrative determiner, 'this' in our data, referred to a referent
367 introduced by the speaker in the immediate previous utterance.

368 It shows the anaphoric characteristic of 'this.' In addition, the speaker characterized the referent which the
369 speaker introduced into the discourse by the left-dislocation; that is, it is clear as the speaker-activated referent.
370 Thus, we can notice that the feature of the demonstrative determiner, 'this,' interacts with the discourse function
371 of the leftdislocation.

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

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

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

392 The fact reveals that all left-dislocated referents in our data are familiar or identifiable for the hearer in
393 the discourse context, even if they are indefinite. We have given more descriptive explanations regarding the
394 familiarity and the identifiability of the left-dislocated referent than the simple observation suggested by Keenan-
395 Ochs & Schieffelin (1976), Gundel (1985), Prince (1985Prince (, 1997)), and Ono & Thompson (1994). In the
396 following section, we shall examine that the degree Year 2022 G Discourse-Pragmatic Functions for Applications
397 to Shared and Thematic Information Structures 10) A: Have you seen the neighbor's dog? ??Gundel, Hedberg,
398 and Zacharski, 1993, p. 279) B: Yes, and ? this dog kept me awake last night.

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

402 20 b) Discourse pragmatic functions

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

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

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

425 Let us discuss the relationship between the thematic paragraph and the discourse-pragmatic functions of
426 the left-dislocations. Later we shall try to give an account of the correlation of the predictability of the left-
427 dislocated referents and the discoursepragmatic applications. Givón (1983) demonstrates that a topic-marking
428 device is related with the construction of thematic paragraphs in the discourse unit (p. 6). Moreover, it is coded
429 to a grammar syntax (p. 9). To begin with, regarding a thematic paragraph and discourse unit, he explains that
430 a thematic paragraph is a focus by chains of clauses; further, the thematic paragraph is composite into larger
431 discourse units such as sections, chapters, parts, or stories (p. 7). The thematic paragraph and discourse unit
432 are strongly distinguishable as macro organizations in discourse; on the other hand, a clause chain is completely
433 particular as a micro organization.

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

437 (1) Characteristically a newly-introduced, newlychanged or newly-returned topic; thus (2) Characteristically
438 a discontinuous topic in terms of the preceding discourse context; but (3) Potentially -if an important topic -a
439 rather persistent topic in terms of the succeeding discourse context.

440 b) Chain medial topic:

441 (1) Characteristically a continuing/continuous topic in terms of the preceding discourse context; and also (2)
442 Characteristically persistent -but not maximally so -in terms of the succeeding discourse context, even when an
443 important topic.

444 c) Chain final topic:

445 (1) Characteristically a continuing/continuous topic in terms of the preceding discourse context; but (2)
446 Characteristically non-persistent topic in terms of the succeeding discourse context, even if an important topic
447 ??Givón, 1983, p. 9) Volume XXII Issue II Version I Here, we regard two of three types, (a) and (c), as the
448 discourse-pragmatic functions of the leftdislocations in our data: the initial chain topic seems to be coded to
449 the left-dislocation which functions as topicalizing a referent in the discourse context; on the other hand, the
450 final chain topic seems to be coded to the left-dislocation, which is distinguishable as giving an emphasis upon
451 a topical referent. In addition, we assume that the chain medial topic is connected to the pronominal references
452 in subjects' or objects' positions. Then, we now attempt to observe the chain medial topic device of the subject
453 and the object in our data before turning to the closer examination of the two functions of the left-dislocations
454 in the thematic paragraph. It would be helpful to describe our main task. We here provided the referential forms
455 of the subject and the object constituents in our data (1753 clauses): 1690 noun phrases and pronouns in the
456 subject positions, in addition, 866 noun phrases and pronouns in the object positions are examined. Tables 5 and
457 6 show each result. In both Table 5 and 6, the main point to note is to set out the percentage of each pronominal
458 reference. Table 5 tells us that the pronominal ones account for 88 percent of the total of the subject constituents
459 in our data; moreover, Table 6 shows that the pronominal references account for 26 percent of total of the object
460 constituents in our data. Surely, the pronominal ones in the subject positions command an absolute majority in
461 the subject constituents.

462 In general, pronominal referents refer to given information or active information in the discourse context in
463 English (Chafe, 1987(Chafe, , 1994)). Although the fuller study of the problems about subjects and objects, or
464 given and new information lies outside the scope of this paper, in short, we regard each pronominal reference in

465 the subjects and the objects as a continuing topic in the discourse context. That is, they code the medial chain
466 topic. Let us now look at the problem of the leftdislocations and the thematic paragraph.

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

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

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

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

481 (b) Thematic information: information in an expression is thematic to the extent the speaker assumes the
482 hearer attends to the referent of the expression. ??Tomlin, 1986, p. 39) Before explaining the overt reasons for
483 our hypothesis, we here provide the remarks on the predictability of a referent in discourse contexts, which is
484 weighty by Givón (1992).

485 Givón (1992, p. 12) highlights that "any information transacted in discourse has a certain level of predictability,
486 coherence, or accessibility vis-à-vis its context." In addition, he points out "generic ("cultural") permanent
487 memory" and "textural ("discourse") episodic memory" regarding the predictability or the accessibility of
488 information in discourse, namely, regarding the shared contexts in the searches of information in the speaker's
489 and hearer's present memory. Based on Givón's and Tomlin's ideas, we may regard that most of the notices
490 of the left-dislocated referents coded to the clausal initial topics exist in the generic permanent memory of the
491 speaker and the hearer; on the other hand, most of the information of the left-dislocated referents coded to the
492 clausal final topics exist in the textual (discourse) episodic memory in the discourse context. As we investigated
493 in the previous section, for example, the left-dislocated referents, which function as reintroducing a referent, are
494 shed light on the proper nouns as the direct label to a particular person, such as the speaker's family. The
495 searches depend on the shared concrete information between the speaker and the hearer rather than on the
496 discourse context. That is, it exists in permanent memory. Therefore, when the referent has a topicality by the
497 left-dislocation in the chain initial position, the hearer can easily understand the beginning of the referent which
498 the speaker refers to and does not have many surprises because it is the certainly shared information. On the
499 other hand, the left-dislocated referents which occur in Types are to set anaphoric referents. For example, it is
500 made upon of such noun phrases as 'that boy.' They overtly exist in the textual episodic memory of the speaker
501 and the hearer. Actually, the referents are introduced as the leftdislocated referent in the final of the story-telling
502 discourse context; that is, it is cleared up the chain final topic. If a referent is introduced as a left-dislocated
503 referent as the chain first topic in thematic paragraphs, the speaker cannot understand the referent which the
504 speaker refers to. In this sense, we can summarize that the left-dislocation as the chain initial topic device
505 follows the constraint of which the referent is identifiable and shared information in the discourse context; in
506 contrast, the left-dislocation as the chain final topic device follows the constraint of which the referent is thematic
507 information in the discourse context. In fact, the speakers use the two different discourse-pragmatic functions of
508 the left-dislocations in our data. The choice is a base on the speaker's communicative intention and the feature
509 of the information in the discourse context.

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

513 12) Mary washed and dried the dishes. 13) John left yesterday. ??Harlig & Bordovi-Harlig, 1988, p. 133)
514 Left-dislocated referents are in a sentence-initial position; nevertheless, most of the left-dislocated referents in our
515 data have stress. On the other hand, most of the pronominal or nominal references in the subject position in our
516 data do not have stress. The fact might show the left-dislocated referents pragmatically have the marked stress.
517 From this viewpoint, one may say that the speaker achieves their goal in the discourse, which the goal means
518 that s/he topicalizes the shared information or emphasizes the thematic information, by not only the marked
519 syntactic order but also the marked stress. Moreover, we can see that the speaker calls the hearer's attention
520 to the thematic information by the stress. The left-dislocation causes a surprise for the hearer in the discourse
521 context.

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

527 about the discourse function as identifiability of the left-dislocated referents have more specified Keenan-Ochs
528 and Schieffelin's study.

529 **21 VI.**

530 **22 Conclusion**

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

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

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

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

Figure 1:

Figure 2:

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,
 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.
 ... and these guys—,
 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.

Figure 3:

1

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

Figure 4: Table 1 :

22 CONCLUSION

2

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

Figure 5: Table 2 :

3

Type 1	Proper Noun Noun with Genitive modifier	9 1	10 50%
Type 2	Noun with Demonstrative 'that'	5	7 35%
	Noun with Definite article 'the'		2
Type 3	Noun with Demonstrative 'that'	1	1 5%
Type 4	Indefinite Noun	2	2 10%
Total			20

Figure 6: Table 3 :

4

	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

Figure 7: Table 4 :

5

$\%$

Figure 8: Table 5 :

6

$\%$

Figure 9: Table 6 :

547 [Lenore:] , Lenore: .

548 [Halliday and Hasan ()][Halliday and Hasan ()] , Michael & Halliday , R Hasan . *Cohesion in English* 1976. Longman.

550 [Alina] <X sitting there= and X>VOX>, 12. (H) he said, 13. I would have been here, 14. but <VOX she was so late, Alina . (3And she's like3)

552 [? (H) uneducated, 39. so, 40. .. u=m, 41. .. (TSK) yeah=. 42. Hector's radio=, 43. it was bro=ken, 44. we were gonna s] ? (H) uneducated, 39. so, 40. .. u=m, 41. .. (TSK) yeah=. 42. ~Hector's radio=, 43. it was bro=ken, 44. we were gonna s, pp. -.

555 [Harlig and Bardovi-Harlig ()] 'Accentuation typology, word order and themerheme structure'. Jeffrey & Kathleen Harlig , Bardovi-Harlig . *Studies in syntactic typology*, (Amsterdam) 1988. John Benjamins. p. .

557 [ALINA: (H) .. Yeah, 10. her ex-boyfriend][ALINA: (H) .. Yeah, 10. her ex-boyfriend] ALINA: ALINA: (H) .. Yeah, 10. her ex-boyfriend,

559 [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' ! Mike 13. LENORE: ? How do you know? 14, (23. .. you know, 24. how X not X, 25. LENORE: (THROAT)

563 [ALINA: ? <VOX And she was like a real pill] ALINA: ? <VOX And she was like a real pill, (5. you know, 6. LENORE: [@@@@@@@])

565 [ALINA: [she's sitting there, 8. with <X this X> hair=] pulled back, 9]b14 ALINA: [she's sitting there, 8. with <X this X> hair=] pulled back, 9, (in <X a X> little pony [2tail=2)

567 [ALINA: remember !Tyke?] ALINA: remember !Tyke?,

568 [ALINA: to protect your car] ALINA: to protect your car, 27. (not to get it, 28. you know, 29. ripped off man)

569 [Bois and Cumming Danae Paolino (ed.) ()] *An outline of discourse transcription*, Du Bois , JohnW , Susanna Cumming & Danae Paolino . J. Edwards & M. Lampert. (ed.) 1993. p. .

571 [And getting her any place on time VOX>, 16. she's going, 17. (H) <VOX well, 18. I had to get rea=dy= VOX> And getting her any place on time VOX>, 16. she's going, 17. (H) <VOX well, 18. I had to get rea=dy= VOX>,

574 [Tomlin ()] *Basic word order: functional principles*, Russell S Tomlin . 1986. London: Croom Helm.

575 [Chafe ()] 'Cognitive constraints on information flow'. Wallace Chafe . *Coherence and Grounding in discourse*, Russell Tomlin (ed.) (Amsterdam) 1987. John Benjamins. p. .

577 [Gundel and Hedberg Ron Zacharski ()] 'Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse'. J Nancy Gundel , Hedberg & Ron Zacharski . *Language* 1993. 69 (2) p. .

579 [Ross ()] *Constrains on variables in syntax. The doctoral dissertation*, J R Ross . 1967. (at MIT)

580 [Chafe ()] *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*, Wallace Chafe . 1994. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

582 [Prince ()] 'Fancy syntax and shared knowledge'. Ellen F Prince . *Journal of pragmatics* 1985. 9 p. .

583 [Tomlin ()] 'Focal attention, voice, and word order: an experimental, cross-linguistic study'. Russell S Tomlin . *Word order in discourse*, 1995. p. .

585 [Keenan-Ochs and Schieffelin ()] *Foregrounding referents: a reconsideration of leftdislocation in discourse*, E B Keenan-Ochs , Schieffelin . 1976. 2 p. .

587 [Fox ()] Barbara A Fox . *Discourse structure and anaphora: written and conversational English*, (Cambridge) 1993. Cambridge University Press.

589 [Chafe ()] 'Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view'. Wallace Chafe . *Subject and topic*, N Charles, Li (ed.) (NY) 1976. Academic Press. p. .

591 [Shibata ()] *Goiron*, Shozo Shibata . 1975. Taishukan Publishing Company.

592 [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 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, 32. (Cause, 31. you know)

595 [Lambrecht ()] *Information structure and sentence form*, Knud Lambrecht . 1994. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

597 [Duranti and Elinor Ochs ()] 'Leftdislocation in Italian conversation'. Alessandro Duranti , Elinor Ochs . *Syntax and semantics*, Taly Givón (ed.) (NY) 1979. Academic Press. 12 p. . (discourse and syntax)

599 [LENORE: (H)] LENORE: (H),

22 CONCLUSION

600 [LENORE: [(H) She's probably like] twenty-six References Références Referencias]b19 'LENORE: [(H) She's
601 probably like] twenty-six'. *References Références Referencias*,

602 [Lived next door to Mom?] *Lived next door to Mom?*,

603 [Halliday ()] 'Notes on transitivity and theme in English, part 2'. Michael A K Halliday . *Journal of linguistics*
604 1967. 3 p. .

605 [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
606 man, 27. and, (he's taking care of me VOX>)
607 *Nothing was gonna help her. 23. (H) No make up, 24. no nothing, 25. Cause she's the little <VOX gir=l,
608 26. and he's the older man, 27. and, (he's taking care of me VOX>*

609 [Prince ()] 'On the functions of leftdislocation in English discourse'. Ellen F Prince . *Directions in functional
610 linguistics*, A Kamio, Amsterdam: John, Benjamins (ed.) 1997. p. .

611 [Reinhart ()] 'Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics'. Tanya Reinhart . *Philosophica* 1981. 27
612 p. .

613 [Bois and Stephan Schuetze-Coburn ()] 'Representing hierarchy: constituent structure for discourse databases'.
614 Du Bois , John W Stephan Schuetze-Coburn . *Talking data: transcription and coding in discourse research*,
615 J Edwards, M Lampert Eds, Hillsdale, Erlbaum (ed.) 1993. p. .

616 [Gundel ()] 'Shared knowledge and topicality'. Jeanette Gundel . *Journal of pragmatics* 1985. 9 p. .

617 [Givón ()] *Syntax: an introduction*, Talmy Givón . 2001. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1.

618 [Givón ()] *The grammar of referential coherence as mental processing instructions*. *Linguistics*, Talmy Givón .
619 1992. 30 p. .

620 [Givón ()] 'Topic continuity in discourse: an introduction'. Talmy Givón . *Topic continuity in discourse: a
621 quantitative cross-language study*, Talmy Givón (ed.) (Amsterdam) 1983. John Benjamins. p. .

622 [Prince ()] 'Toward a taxonomy of given-new information'. Ellen F Prince . *Radical pragmatics*, Peter, Cole (ed.)
623 (NY) 1981. Academic Press. p. .

624 [(h)] *Two weeks ago I'm watching TV*, 6, (h) . (and David Horowitz is going to have, 7. this former car .. radio
thief on? 8. LENORE: ? It's her boyfriend)

625 [Ono et al. ()] 'Unattached NPs in English conversation'. Ono , A Sandra , Thompson . *BLS* 1994. 20 p. .

626 [Kim ()] 'Wh-clefts and left-dislocation in English conversation: cases of topicalization'. Kyu-Hyun Kim . *Word
627 order in discourse*, P Dowling & M. Nooman Eds, : John Amsterdam, Benjamins (ed.) 1995. p. .

628 [You know he just] *You know he just*,

629 [Lenore:] *you know, some, 33. .. (H) <Q you know, 34. .. (Hx) she's so vulnerable Q>*, Lenore: . (35. ALINA:
630 [(DRINK)])