

Discourse contribution of naming a referent

(or: “interactional re-analysis of Left Dislocation”):

comparative study of two languages

Pavel Ozerov

University of Münster

pozerov@uni-muenster.de

Goals and structure of the talk

- Explore the function of “lone” NPs...
- Analysis of “Left Detachment” (“Left Dislocation”) in two typologically different languages

The structure of the talk

1. Introduction
 - a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
 - b) Left Detachment
 - c) Online Syntax
 - d) The design of the study
2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew
3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga
4. Conclusions

The structure of the talk

1. Introduction
 - a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
 - b) Left Detachment
 - c) Online Syntax
 - d) The design of the study
2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew
3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga
4. Conclusions

Interactional Information Management

- “Traditional” Information Structure: Universal pragmatic categories
 - *Topic* – an entity at the centre of the interlocutors’ attention so that new information is stored as about it (cf. Gundel 1988, Lambrecht 1994, Lambrecht and Michaelis 1998)
- Proposed approach: Bottom up (Matić and Wedgwood 2013, Ozerov 2018)
 - *Interactional Information Management*
- A myriad of mostly yet unexplored, language-specific categories of interaction-management, attention-management, attitude-management, modality, evidentiality, subjectivity, epistemicity...
 - marked directly, trigger indirect IS-like effects
 - glossed over as “topic” and “focus”

The structure of the talk

1. Introduction
 - a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
 - b) Left Detachment**
 - c) Online Syntax
 - d) The design of the study
2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew
3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga
4. Conclusions

Introduction – LD?

- Left Dislocation/Detachment (LD) – topicalising syntactic construction (e.g. Lambrecht 2001)

John_i, I saw him_i.

- Related constructions:

- Hanging Topic (HT) *My work, I'm going crazy!*
- “Subject Marking-construction” (SM) *Dad, you know... did something like that.* (Netz and Kuzar 2010)

Introduction – LD?

- Clearly indicates/announces the TOPIC of the clause
 - Clear topic–comment partition
- PSRR (Principle of the Separation of Reference and Role):
“Do not introduce a referent and talk about it in the same clause” (Lambrecht 1994:178, Kuzar and Netz 2007, Kerr 2014 among many others)
- Interactional studies: Various specific discourse-managing functions
 - turn-taking (Ochs and Duranti 1979 for Italian)
 - turn-taking, assessment, overlap... (Pekarek Doehler et al. 2015)

LD?

- Apparent universal topicality effects with LD?

Hebrew:

DOʁ _ / lifa'mim o's-im l-o 'HAMbuxgev ||

PN sometimes do.PRES-PL to-3M hamburger

'Dor, sometimes we make a hamburger for him.' (C711_0_sp1_027-028)

Anal Naga:

mì.lá-to... / ból-k^he? p^hùl-lé:lo-hín-nú=nâ.e

pine-ABS stem-one cut-IDEO .openly-1PL-NFUT=ADDR

Lit: 'Pine, we cut one stem [there], eh?'

The structure of the talk

1. Introduction
 - a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
 - b) Left Detachment
 - c) **Online Syntax**
 - d) The design of the study
2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew
3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga
4. Conclusions

Online syntax

- *Projection* – “more to come” and the possibilities for this “more”; “the individual part foreshadows another” (Auer 2005)

The... → *NP*

Here comes... → *DP*

The sun...

NP – the moon, and the stars

VP – has disappeared...

cop + adj – is red

...

- Online syntax – “Speakers improvise at each point as the discourse unfolds” (Hopper 2011:31)

The structure of the talk

1. Introduction
 - a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
 - b) Left Detachment
 - c) Online Syntax
 - d) The design of the study
2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew
3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga
4. Conclusions

The study

- Analysis of “lone NPs” – NPs that are:
 - Not projected by previous material
 - Form a separate Intonation Unit
- Information status (new, given, inferable), function (updating, elaborating, re-instantiation, stance, contrast)
- turn management (overlap, starting TCU...), back-channeling, prosody, hesitation
- form (NP, pronoun), larger structure (stand-alone, sentence, LD/HT...)

The study

- Detached NPs and their functions
 - Some tokens develop into LD-like structures
- Are LD cases and alike constructions with a dedicated function? (NO!)
 - Or are these ad-hoc continuation choices for the detached noun? (YES!)
 - The regular local reason for the detached NP

Main findings

- Detached NPs are a product of different (commonly known) strategies of interactional discourse management
 - Routinised/secure starting points
 - Attention alignment wrt referent
- LD-like outcomes are not fixed constructions used for IS (or other purposes)
 - But are occasional by-products of the strategies above
 - LD (NP+Clause): Cherry-picked examples of much broader phenomena
- Different language-specific strategies
 - Syntactic differences (V-final language → dominance of heavy starting points)
 - Cultural differences

The structure of the talk

1. Introduction

- a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
- b) Left Detachment
- c) Online Syntax
- d) The design of the study

2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew

3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga

4. Conclusions

Detached NPs in Israeli Hebrew

- Israeli Hebrew (Semitic)
 - Free constituent order – but tendency for (A) VP
 - NOM-ACC
- 2.5 hours of natural speech (CoSIH)
 - 528 examples
- 3 major reasons for detached NPs
 - online re-planning
 - online recycling
 - attention-alignment

Online trajectory re-planning

- Initiating move
 - with an NP
 - a pronoun
 -
 - continuing tone/
hesitation
- Bare NP's/pronouns – underspecified projection
- Highly routinised starting points
 - Very secure attempt to start when the rest is not planned
- Re-adjustment of the trajectory
 - Retrospectively leaves a stranded NP behind: 149 examples (28% of total 528)
 - if continued with a clause: “LD”-like (48% of all LD-like)

Resonance/recycling

- Repeating a part of the preceding utterance or echoing its structure (Du Bois 2014)
- Interactional/discourse-structuring effects
- Both re-planning and recycling are found in turn-taking, argumentative discourse, competition for turn, sequence opening, lengthy monologues

Re-planning and recycling

A was telling about his bus trip in Mongolia. After a 4 sec long pause, the interlocutor takes the turn.

rega | *ve=ha-otobus* | *kmo=ma* *nir'e?*
hold.on and=**DEF-bus** | like=what looks?
'Just a second, and **the bus**, what does it looks like?' ...1.5...
ha-otobu:s | *kmo:s* | ...2.5... *kmo=ma* *je=haja* *be=fnot* *ha-arba'im*
DEF-bus **like** **like=what** that=was in=year.PL DEF-40's
kaze //
that.one
'The bus... like... ... like what there was in the 40's.
One of these.'

Trajectory re-planning

<i>ima</i>	<i>feli</i>	...	<i>ani</i>	<i>m- --</i>	<i>ma</i>	<i>je=ani</i>	<i>jaxol</i>	<i>lehagid</i>
mother	my		1SG	(cut)	what	that=1SG	can	to.tell
<i>l-exa</i>	<i>ze</i>	<i>je=ima</i>			<i>feli</i>	<i>bemefex</i> ..	<i>kol</i>	<i>fnot</i>
to-2SG.M	it	that=mother			my	during	all	years.of
<i>xaj-eha</i>	<i>ani</i>	<i>xofev</i>	<i>haja</i>	<i>l-a</i>		<i>ha-ze</i>	<i>fel=SEB</i>	
life-3SG.F	1SG	think	was	to-her		DEF-this	of=SEB	

My mother | ... | wh- what I can tell you | is that my mother_ | during
| ... all her life | I think | **she** had this one of SEB'



Detached NP – re-planning+recycling

- Not “introduce a referent – say something about it”
- But: “begin with the likeliest starting point... and improvise from there”
 - 25% of detached NPs; 48% of LD-like
- “begin by echoing preceding talk... and improvise from there”
 - 30% of detached NPs, 49% of LD-like
- The combination of the two: 32% of LD-like

Hebrew detached NPs – Summary

role	% of total (out of 528)	% of LD-like (out of 196)
updating	42	13
recycled	30	49
re-planning	25	48
planned ref. intr.	6	17

66%

- Begin with the likeliest constituent – improvise from there
 - depart from the more obvious, expected...
- Recycle/resonate – continue the talk
 - recycled/resonated is given/accessible
- Align attention – use it later (not necessarily propositionally/*about* it)

Detached NP – re-planning+recycling

- Language properties prompt starting with accessible NP
 - Free constituent order – but tendency for **(A) VP** aka (S)VO
- A-argument (typically given, recycled...) as a routinised starting point

The structure of the talk

1. Introduction
 - a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
 - b) Left Detachment
 - c) Online Syntax
 - d) The design of the study
2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew
3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga
4. Conclusions

Detached NPs in Anal Naga

- Israeli Hebrew (Semitic); 2.5 hours of natural speech (CoSIH)
 - NOM-ACC
 - free constituent order
 - 528 examples
- Anal Naga (Kuki-Chin, Tibeto-Burman; Manipur, India; 20,000 speakers); 1 hour of natural interaction
 - ERG-ABS NP, hierarchical V-indexation
 - V-final
 - 196 examples



Detached NP in Hebrew vs. Anal Naga

	Hebrew		Anal Naga	
	% of total (out of 528)	% of LD-like (out of 196)	% of total (out of 196)	% of LD-like (out of 150)
develop into LD-like	37		77	
updating	42	13	1	0.5
planned ref. intr.	6	17	25	33
recycled	27	49	12	12
re-planning	25	48	57	63
new referent	19	26	58	60

- Major reasons for detached NPs
 - online re-planning
 - (online recycling)
 - attention-alignment
- Different weight for these factors
 - due to the syntax-related nature of the likely start

Syntax of Anal Naga

- Verb final

tendency for (A)PV

k^hi.k^hi-pá tɕam^hù háŋ-t^hé-nú

PN-father cow UP.TEMP-accompany-NFUT

‘Khikhi’s father took the cows up.’



Detached NPs in Anal Naga

- 196 detached NPs
 - 150 (77%) continued into LD-like

Warsun asà:n *va-na-ká:=te=nâ |*

PN earlier 3-REL-shoot=DISC.SHFT=ADDR

va-t^hal=so *t^hà-pá:-já:-nú=vê*

3-gallbladder=ADD good-AUG-JUST-NFUT=ADDR

'The one that Warsung shot earlier, its gallbladder was also very good.'

Reasons for detached NPs

- Re-planning – the primary reason for NP separation: 113 cases (57%), 95 develop into LD (63% of LD)
 - Not a LD-construction
 - but unplanned move: start with X – improvise from there (50 LD + 44 regular)
- Attention-alignment: 25% of total, 33% of LD-like
 - external referent – 17 cases (10 LD + 7 regular)
 - negotiated – 32 cases (14 LD + 7 regular)

Starting points

- (A)PV order

- highly frequent PV

→ Starting points are heavy!

- e.g. a new P-argument (typically regarded as focal, highly newsworthy)

aro: va-tò:m-ká-hín-to *a-hún-η-hòl-jè-nú*

EXCL 3-bear-shoot-PL-ABS CIS-UP.HOME

‘Oh, they brought here **a bear that they shot.**’



Starting points

- Detached NP
 - “heavy, new, newsworthy” information
 - but the following talk can relate back to it (cf. focal LD in Japanese, Yamaizumi 2011)



(A mentions a place in the forest, B takes turn)

mì.lá-to... | bó!-k^he? p^hùl-lé:lo-hín-nú=nâ.e

pine-ABS | stem-one cut-IDEO.openly-1PL-NFUT=ADDR

‘We cut a pine tree there.’

Lit: ‘Pine, we cut one stem there, eh?’

Starting points

- Starting points as reflected by detached NPs:
 - 1) 60% - new, “focal” P
 - start with the likeliest constituent =
 - “name the primarily introduced/newsworthy referent!”
 - 2) Recycling/shifting to given: 23%

Alleviating “heavy” starting points

- Large set of adnominal markers that foreshadow the intended goal
 - *-te* – discourse shift (“Contrastive Topic”)
 - Direct negotiation regarding the referent
 - Highly frequent final marker =*nê/nâ/nô* and/or special contour
 - Calls for alignment, identification; requests **back-channelling**
 - 23% of LD-examples
- “ALIGN ATTENTION ON A REFERENT – USE IT LATER”
- Introduction → repetition
 - 11% examples

Alleviating starting points

➤ “*There is*” referent introduction:

- typicallythetic
- no topic
 - let alone no topic status for the newly introduced referent
- But what about languages with NV-clause structure?

Alleviating “heavy” starts

As we were cutting wood...

k^hupasa-he-tô |... k^hupasa-e=nâ |

bee-1DEM-ABS bee-2DEM=ADDR

at^he e-k^hè-lem.lom-e

like.that NMLZ-hang-IDEO.openly-2DEM

e-ám-vá=ve

NMLZ-be-COP=EXCL

(Lit: ‘This bee? This bee, eh? There was one hanging like that.’)

‘There was a bee hanging openly like that.’



The structure of the talk

1. Introduction
 - a) Information Structure vs. Interactional Information Management
 - b) Left Detachment
 - c) Online Syntax
 - d) The design of the study
2. Left Detachment in Israeli Hebrew
3. Left Detachment in Anal Naga
4. Summary

Summary

	Hebrew		Anal Naga	
	% of total (out of 528)	% of LD-like (out of 196)	% of total (out of 196)	% of LD-like (out of 150)
develop into LD-like	37		77	
updating	42	13	1	0.5
planned ref. intr.	6	17	25	33
recycled	27	49	12	12
re-planning	25	48	57	63
new referent	19	26	58	60

1) On-line trajectory re-planning

- Start with the likeliest constituent – improvise from there
- ~ half of cases develop into a syntactically regular clause

2) Align-attention on a referent – act in this regard

Summary

	Hebrew		Anal Naga	
	% of total (out of 528)	% of LD-like (out of 196)	% of total (out of 196)	% of LD-like (out of 150)
develop into LD-like	37		77	
updating	42	13	1	0.5
planned ref. intr.	6	17	25	33
recycled	27	49	12	12
re-planning	25	48	57	63
new referent	19	26	58	60

1) On-line trajectory re-planning

- Start with the likeliest constituent – improvise from there
- ~ half of cases develop into a syntactically regular clause

2) Align-attention on a referent – act in this regard

Summary

	Hebrew		Anal Naga	
	% of total (out of 528)	% of LD-like (out of 196)	% of total (out of 196)	% of LD-like (out of 150)
develop into LD-like	37		77	
updating	42	13	1	0.5
planned ref. intr.	6	17	25	33
recycled	27	49	12	12
re-planning	25	48	57	63
new referent	19	26	58	60

1) On-line trajectory re-planning

- Start with the likeliest constituent – improvise from there
- ~ half of cases develop into a syntactically regular clause

2) Align-attention on a referent – act in this regard

Conclusions

	Hebrew		Anal Naga	
	% of total (out of 528)	% of LD-like (out of 196)	% of total (out of 196)	% of LD-like (out of 150)
develop into LD-like	37		77	
updating	42	13	1	0.5
planned ref. intr.	6	17	25	33
recycled	27	49	12	12
re-planning	25	48	57	63
new referent	19	26	58	60

1) On-line trajectory re-planning

- Start with the likeliest constituent – improvise from there
- Hebrew: accessible, recycled
- Anal Naga: (i) new, newsworthy (ii) accessible

Conclusions

	Hebrew		Anal Naga	
	% of total (out of 528)	% of LD-like (out of 196)	% of total (out of 196)	% of LD-like (out of 150)
develop into LD-like	37		77	
updating	42	13	1	0.5
planned ref. intr.	6	17	25	33
recycled	27	49	12	12
disfluency	25	48	57	63
new referent	19	26	58	60

2) Align-attention – act in this regard

- Hebrew: negotiated sequence-openings/exophoric pointing
- Anal Naga: negotiated referent introduction/activation

Conclusions

- Detached NPs are a product of different (commonly known) strategies of interactional discourse management
 - Starting points
 - Attention alignment
 - Recycling
- Some are continued immediately with apparent LD-like outcomes

Conclusions

- Different language-specific strategies
 - Syntactic differences (V-final → heavy starting points)
 - Cultural differences (frequency of direct negotiation)
- LD – Universality of Topic-Comment?
 - LD? By-product of static examination of the collocation “NP + clause”
 - Cherry-picked examples of much broader phenomena
 - Speakers do not orient themselves on “topicality”
 - No need in pre-empirical universalist extra-machinery

Thank you ! תודה רבה

e-m^hàn

NMLZ-happy

a'm-pá:-kà

be-AUG-NFUT