

統語論と談話構造における話題化と左方転移

Tolicalization and Left Dislocation in Syntax and Discourse

奥野忠徳*

Tadanori OKUNO

論文要旨

We will be concerned in this paper with Topicalization (TOP) and Left Dislocation (LD) in syntax and discourse. Syntactically, the sentence-initial NP in LD is arguably more detached from the S which follows than that in TOP. Viewed from the discourse angle, TOP has two distinct functions, whereas LD has only one basic function, which, however, takes on different nuances depending on the contexts in which it appears.

Topicalization and Left Dislocation in Syntax and Discourse

0. Introduction

In this paper, I will be concerned with a clarification of the structures and functions of Topicalization and Left Dislocation (henceforth, TOP and LD, respectively). These two rules form part of the set of processes called root transformations by Emonds(1976), main clause phenomena by Green(1976), or discourse-conditioned rules by Hankamer(1974). In section 1, an analysis is given of TOP and LD, which share the property of having what looks like a topic in sentence-initial position. Since these constructions are inextricably related to various discourse factors, they are analyzed in terms of discourse structure in section 2.

1. TOP and LD in Syntax

TOP is exemplified by the sentences in (1), and LD, by (2) :

- (1) a. These steps I used to sweep with a broom.
b. Each part John examined carefully.
c. Our daughter we are proud of.
d. Poetry we try not to memorize.
- (2) a. This room, it really depresses me.
b. John's sister, she won't do anything rash.
c. This movie, I told you you wouldn't like much.
d. Jane, she visits this park every weekend.

*弘前大学教育学部 英語・英文学科教室

Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Hirosaki University

First, we will give an analysis of these constructions in terms of sentence structure. Since it is apparent that the sentences in (1) and those in (2) are formally quite similar, Ross (1967), among others, proposed to derive them by applying the following almost similar transformations :

(3) a. Topicalization

$$X \text{ -- NP -- } Y$$

$$1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \implies 2 \# [1, 0, 3]$$

b. Left Dislocation

$$X \text{ -- NP -- } Y$$

$$1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \implies 2 \# [1, 2, 3]$$

$$+ \text{Pro}$$

In addition, Emonds(1976) claims that both are root transformations because they do not apply in embedded clauses :

(4) a. * Have I shown you the broom (that) these steps I used to sweep with?

b. * I fear (that) each part John examined carefully.

c. * We are going to the school play because our daughter we are proud of.

d. * Are you aware (of the fact) that poetry we try not to memorize?

e. * Do you think socialist theory many Czechs would deny?

(5) a. * I told you that this movie, you wouldn't like it much.

b. * Bill hopes that John's sister, she won't do anything rash.

c. * They put so much furniture in here that this room, it really depresses me.

d. * The fact that these clams, I buy them right at the store means that they are sure to be fresh.

e. * He doesn't like the park that Jane, she visits every weekend.

These are some of the properties common to both. On careful investigation, however, we notice some important differences. First, whereas interrogative sentences are immune to TOP, they are susceptible to LD, as is observed by Rodman(1974), Reinhart (1976), and Schachter(1976), among others. Contrast (6) with (7) :

(6) a. * Those petunias what did Joanne do with?

b. * Those petunias did Joanne plant?

c. * Those petunias when did Joanne plant?

d. * Rosa when did you last see?

(7) a. Those petunias, what did Joanne do with them?

b. Those petunias, did Joanne plant them?

c. Those petunias, when did Joanne plant them?

d. (As for) Rosa, when did you last see her?

Second, LD is possible with imperative sentences while TOP is not, as is observed by Rodman(ibid.) :

(8) * These carrot squares eat up!

(9) These carrot squares, eat them up!

Third, there is the fact that LD does not necessarily ‘move’ a single NP, which would pose a serious problem to Ross’s formulation :

(10) Bill, Sue, and that damn snake, he told her to get it out of their sleeping bag.

As Rodman observes, in (10) it is possible to interpret ‘he’, ‘her’, and ‘it’ as coreferential with ‘Bill’, ‘Sue’, and ‘that damn snake’, respectively. Fourth, contra Ross, there are LD-sentences in which movement does not seem to be involved :

(11) a. (As for) the flat tire, John explained that there had been nails on the ground.

b. Lee’s outrageous appearances, we wondered whether he could possibly be a CIA agent.

c. Restaurants, the situation’s helpless in Chapel Hill.

The reasonable conclusion to draw from (10)–(11) seems to be that LD-sentences are not derived by a rule of the form (3b). Examples like (11) suggest in addition that LD-construction implies that the sentence/proposition following the NP in sentence-initial position predicates something of that NP. In this connection, it is interesting to consider (12) :

(12) As far as John is concerned, I will never believe the claim that have been made about him.

Chomsky (1977), regarding (12) as a variety of LD-construction, observes that LD, unlike TOP, does not belong to the core grammar, because it would violate the Complex NP Constraint. Contrast this with TOP, which is subject to whatever constraints movement transformations in general are subject to :

(13) a. * This book I accept the argument that John should read.

b. * This book I wonder who read.

Various possibilities suggest themselves for the analysis of LD, but one thing which is clear about it is that the sentence-initial NP is not as closely related to the remaining sentence in LD as in TOP. This fact seems related to the following phenomenon noted by Jackendoff (1972) :

(14) a. I believe of Holland that the tulips are beautiful.

b. I believe of Holland that Amsterdam is a swinging place.

c. * I believe of Holland that New York is a drag.

Jackendoff observes that for the sentence containing ‘believe of NP that S’ to be acceptable, a very weak relation like direct relevance between S and NP is sufficient. Chomsky’s theory is one attempt to make precise the difference in the closeness of relation between LD and TOP.

Reinhart (1976) posits the structure (15a) for TOP, where the initial NP is dominated by S’, and the structure (15b) for LD, where it is dominated by S” :

(15) a. [S’ [NP]_{COMP} [S ...]]

b. [S” NP [S’ ...]]

These two structures capture the difference in the relationship between the initial NP and the rest of the sentence in the two constructions. From the proposal (15) follows automati-

cally the fact that when TOP and LD both happen to show up in the same clause, we end up with a pattern such as (16a) :

- (16) a. (As for) Rosa, my next book I will dedicate to her.
 b. * My next book, Rosa, I will dedicate to her.

The proposal also makes it possible to explain coreference data like those in (17) on the basis of the general condition (18) :

- (17) a. * Sonya_j, she_j denies that Hirshel admires.
 b. (As for) Sonya_j, she_j denies that Hirshel admires her.
 (18) Two NPs must be interpreted as non-coreferential if one is in the domain of the other and is not a pronoun. (Reinhart(1979))

2. TOP and LD in Discourse

Hooper and Thompson(1973) note that TOP and LD have the semantic effect of putting an emphasis on the initial NP. The problem with their statement, however, is that the concept 'emphasis' is too vague to be truly explanatory. As a matter of fact, almost all rhetorical constructions put an 'emphasis' on some constituent(s) in some way or other. But this way of putting it does not go a very long way toward explaining the relevant phenomena in any satisfactory way. What should really be addressed is the question of what kind of emphasis it is, and in many cases, it cannot be solved without any consideration of discourse structure.

Let's get started with (19) and (20), quoted from Rodman(1974) :

- (19) What can you tell me about John?
 a : John Mary kissed.
 b : * John, Mary kissed him.
 (20) What can you tell me about John?
 a : * Nothing. But Bill Mary kissed.
 b : Nothing. But Bill, Mary kissed him.

The initial question in (19) and (20) is about 'John', which means that 'John' is the topic of the discourse. From the fact that the question can be appropriately answered by (19a) and cannot be answered by (20a), we could infer that the initial NP in TOP embodies the established discourse topic. In contrast, the initial NP in LD could be said to have the function of introducing a new topic into the discourse.

However, the facts are not so simple. Let us consider TOP first. Gundel(1974) observes that TOP comes in two varieties : Topic Topicalization(TTOP), in which the initial NP represents a discourse topic, as in (19) and (21), and Focus Topicalization(FTOP), in which the initial NP is the focus of the sentence, as in (22) below :

- (21) John she CALLED.
 (22) JOHN she called.

Note that the sentence (21) can be an answer to the question 'What about John?' and that the sentence (22) can be an answer to 'Who did she call?' and can be paraphrased as 'It was

John who she called.’ That the focus can be topicalized is also pointed out by Fukuchi (1985) and Prince(1981) :

- (23) a. Joe his name is.
 b. An utter fool I felt too.
 c. Relaxation you call it.

(24) They just bought a dog. Fido they named it.

There are, therefore, two kinds of topicalization construction; one which puts a discourse topic (hence, old information) in front, and the other which has a focus (hence, old information) preposed. Both are, however, natural in the sense that the former is in accord with the natural flow of information (i.e., from old to new information) whereas the latter mentions first and foremost just what the speaker really wants to say.

Next, we will attempt to locate the left dislocation construction in discourse structure. We have seen Rodman’s claim that LD has the function of introducing a new topic into the discourse. However, this observation appears to be contradicted by the following claim made by Gundel (1974) :

- (25) A left-dislocated sentence which is not itself a question always answers some implicit or explicit question: What about it?

Furthermore, Kantor(1976) suggests that the initial NP in LD can be either new information or old information, as shown by the sentences in (26) and (27) :

- (26) Who did what for Mary?
 --- John_i, when he_j went to Boston, he_j took her out to dinner.
 (27) How do you feel about gin?
 --- Gin_i, whenever it’s_j offered, I’ll always drink it_j.

In (26), ‘John’ represents new information, which accords with Rodman’s claim, whereas in (27), ‘gin’ is already the topic of the discourse and therefore old information. What should we make of this?

In this context, it is interesting to see what Keenan and Schieffelin(1976 : henceforth, K&S) have to say about the matter. They derive (28) from data consisting of natural conversations :

- (28) The function of LD is to introduce the referent of the initial NP into the consciousness of the hearer.

Clearly, (28) is in accord with Rodman’s claim. A typical example of (28) cited by K&S is the following :

- (29) (Adolescents discussing how parents treat them.)
 K : Yeah // Yeah! No matter how // old you are.
 L : Yeah. Mh hm.
 L : Parents don’t understand. But all grownups w-they do it to kids. Whether they’re your own or not.

In (29), ‘all grownups’ is introduced into the discourse as a new topic. K&S observe that the general function described in (28) takes a variety of different forms depending on

different specific contexts in which it shows up, one of them being (30) :

- (30) K : I got a red sweater, an' a white one, an' a couple of other sweaters, you know. And uh my sister loves borrowing my sweaters because they're pull-overs, you know, an' she c'n wear a blouse under 'em an' she thinks "Well this is great."

(pause)

K : An' so my red sweater, I haven't seen it since I got it.

In (30), although the underlined left-dislocated NP has already been introduced in the preceding discourse, it is nevertheless reintroduced into the discourse as if it were a new topic, because the speaker felt that it has gone out of the hearer's consciousness.

K&S also make the observation that LD can even be used to mention something that is currently in the hearer's consciousness, rather than to introduce a new topic or reintroduce what has gone out of the hearer's mind into the discourse. (31) is one such instance :

- (31) (discussing younger siblings)

L : Y'know some of 'em are daramn tall and goodlooking they could pass for(t)-nineteen. // A twelve year old guy came over. I say who's y'-older brother is he? He's not he's is the A7.

R : But they don't ---

R : But they don't have a brain to go with it hehhh.

L : These kids I don't believe it they're six foot.

In (31), the speaker gives special emphasis and importance to the underlined initial NP by placing it in the topic-introducing position and making it look as if it were a new topic of the discourse. These observations will suffice to resolve the apparent incongruence between Rodman's and Gundel-Kantor's claims.

To summarize :

- (32) TOP has two functions; one is to inherit the discourse topic (Topic Topicalization), and the other is to set the focus of the sentence in relief by preposing it (Focus Topicalization).
- (33) LD has one basic function, which is to introduce a new topic into the consciousness of the hearer. The new topic thus introduced must have some relation to the preceding discourse.

The condition expressed by the latter sentence in (33) has been met by all the instances of LD we have seen thus far. It plays a role in explaining why we cannot start a discourse with an LD-sentence, as witnessed by Hankamer(1974) :

- (34) # Left-dislocation, you just don't find many examples of it except in papers about syntax.

A TOP-sentence cannot start a discourse, either :

- (35) # Your car, we're going to have to repossess.

Note that this follows from (32), because in discourse-initial position, 'your car' cannot have been the discourse topic, and it cannot be the focus of the sentence, either, there being no reason to take 'we're going to have to repossess' as representing the presupposition of

the sentence. In short, (35) receives no legitimate interpretation at all.

References

- Chomsky, N.(1977) "On WH-Movement," in Culicover,P.W., T.Wasow and A.Akmajian (eds.) *Formal Syntax*, Academic Press, New York, 71-132.
- Emonds,J.E.(1976) *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax*, Academic Press, New York.
- Fukuchi,H.(1985) *Dan'wa no Kozo*, Taishukan, Tokyo.
- Green,G.(1976) "Main Clause Phenomena in Subordinate Clauses," *Language* 52,297-382.
- Gundel,J.M.(1974) *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*, Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Hankamer,J.(1974) "On the Non-Cyclic Nature of WH-Clefting," *CLS* 10,221-233.
- Hooper,J.B. and S.A.Thompson(1973) "On the Applicability of Root Transformations," *Linguistic Inquiry* 4,465-497.
- Jackendoff,R.S.(1972) *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, MIT Press,Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Kantor,R.N.(1976) "Discourse Phenomena and Linguistic Theory," *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 21,161-188.
- Keenan,E.O. and B.Schieffelin(1976) "Foregrounding Referents: a Reconsideration of Left Dislocation in Discourse," *BLS* 2
- Prince,E.(1981) "Topicalization, Focus Movement, and Yiddish Movement: a Pragmatic Differentiation," *BLS* 7,249-264.
- Reinhart,T.(1976) *The Syntactic Domain of Anaphora*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Reinhart,T.(1979) "Syntactic Domains for Semantic Rules," in F.Guenther and S.J. Schmidt (eds.) *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Language*, 107-130.
- Rodman,R.(1974) "On Left Dislocation," *Papers in Linguistics* 7,437-466.

Ross, J.R. (1967) *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Schachter, P. (1976) "A Nontransformational Account of Gerundive Nominals in English,"
Linguistic Inquiry 7, 205-241.

(1992.7.20 受理)