I. GOALS AND ORIENTATION

In this paper we discuss a set of verbal constructions found in spontaneous conversational discourse. These constructions have in common the following format: Referent + Proposition. That is, some referent is specified initially and is then followed by a proposition relevant in some way to this referent.

(1) 
K: They cleaned me out. And my father oh he's // he's fit to be tied.
R: Tell Daddy to buy you some more.

For example, in (1), "And my father oh he's-//he's fit to be tied." represents such a construction. Here the referent expressed by "my father" is semantically related to the subsequent proposition "he's-//he's fit to be tied."

Constructions of this type have been previously described as left-dislocations (Chafe 1975, Gruber 1967, Gundel 1975, Ross 1967 for example). Left-dislocation represents a transformation that moves an NP within the sentence. The term left-dislocation is not entirely appropriate to the constructions considered in the present analysis. First, although the proposition following the initial referent usually contains a coreferential pronoun, it sometimes does not. Example (2) illustrates such a case:

(2) 
B: ohh I g'ta tell ya one course, ((pause))
A: (incred-)
B: The mo-the modern art the twentieth century art, there's about eight books.

II. DATA BASE

Our analysis is based primarily on transcriptions made by G. Jefferson of five group therapy sessions (GTS) in which several adolescents took part (approximately 500 pages). Material on children's use of the constructions under study is drawn from transcriptions of the conversations of twins recorded over the period of a year. (33 mos. - 45 mos.) (Keenan 1974).
Dialogue (A) appears the most awkward, and in fact, we did not find any instances in the data in which as for X, concerning X, appeared following an immediately prior mention of X. (B) as well is odd. The most natural way to utter such a sequence is to utter the second "Tom" with a question intonation, indicating that perhaps he had not heard the speaker, e.g. "Tom? He left". We can imagine, however, that such a discourse is possible if a long pause separates the two utterances and/or if the addressee (B) repeats "Tom" in the course of searching for an adequate response.

Discourse (C) is by far the most natural of the three presented here. And in fact, constructions of the form "Referent + Proposition" appear most often in precisely this sort of discourse environment, namely, an environment in which the referent does not appear in the immediately prior discourse. Chafe (1974) discusses the fact that may or may not be presently in the consciousness of the hearer. If a referent is in the consciousness of the hearer, the referent is said to be "foregrounded". In English foregrounded information may be syntactically marked by the speaker by use of the definite article, anaphoric pronoun, relative clause and the like. We would like to claim here that in producing constructions of the form "Referent + Proposition" speakers are performing work of precisely the opposite sort: Rather than presenting information that is already in the foreground of the listener's consciousness, the speaker brings a referent into the foreground of the listener's consciousness (see also Sankoff & Brown 1975).

With respect to the interactional history of the interlocutors, the referent is usually not currently a "center of attention" i.e. not usually the current "topic" (in the sense described by Li and Thompson 1976). In producing constructions of this sort, the speaker makes the referent a "center of attention" (see also Payne 1974). Typically, the initial referent is some entity known to or knowable by the hearer from the non-verbal context of the utterance from some prior background experience. In other words, it is some entity that the hearer can identify or recognize. The referent may or may not have been discussed at some point in the current discourse participated in by the interlocutors:

1.) In many cases, the speaker uses the "Referent + Proposition" construction to INTRODUCE discourse-new referents. Examples (2) (3) & (4) exhibit this work:
B. FUNCTIONS OF FOREGROUNDING:

Once the global function of these constructions, i.e., to bring into the foreground or focus on some referent (c.f. Sankoff & Brown 1975), is understood; more particular functions of this phenomenon make sense.  

1) ALTERNATIVES: In many cases, the speaker uses this construction to bring in a different referent from one previously specified with respect to some particular predication. The speaker in these cases suggests an ALTERNATIVE to that produced in a prior utterance or turn. Example (4) illustrates this usage. We avoid the term "contrast" to describe this function, as "contrast" usually implies that the referent brought in in "contrast" is an alternative considered (with varying degrees of certitude) by both hearer and speaker (Chafe 1975, Kuno 1972). The way in which many of these "Referent + Proposition" constructions are used is much broader than this treatment of contrast. In the data at hand, the speaker may bring in a referent that the hearer has not yet entertained as a viable alternative. For example, in (4) the referent "all grownups" is not a set that was under consideration by those listening to L.  

2) PARTICULAR CASES: The "Referent + Proposition" construction is used to draw the listener's attention to a particular case of some general phenomenon under discussion or to some particular member of a previously specified set. For example, in (5) the speaker is isolating "my red sweater" from a previously mentioned list of items. Perhaps the most common use of this construction is to introduce referents that further illustrate the current topic of discussion. (Note that the referents in themselves do not constitute topics of discussion (discourse topics) but rather are important arguments in a proposition or set of propositions (discourse topic) under consideration in discourse. (c.f. Keenan and Schieffelin 1976)) For example, the discourse in (2) is preceded by a discussion about people who do not like one another. The introduction of "Pat McGee" initiates a case history relevant to the current topic or concern of the interlocutors. Similarly, in (6) below, the interlocutors have been talking about students falling asleep in class and K can't resist bringing in a relevant anecdote:  

(6) GTS5:35  

REF  
PROP  
K: Uh:: this guy, you could yell "Hey Jo:hn, hey Joh--" in you c'd go over an 'tap him on the shoulder  
R: So he's gotta/good imagination  
PROP  
K: That's the only way you c'd snap him out of it.  

It isn't always the case that the introduction of novel referents as particular cases involves speaker change. In many cases, a speaker may bring up a certain point and use the "Referent + Proposition" construction to illustrate his/her own point. For example in (7) below, there has been some discussion about how parents never treat their children as mature individuals (see also example (4)) and L. brings up the point that her parents are exceptions to this generalization. By way of illustration, L. describes an incident in which her mother plays a major role:  

(7) GTS3:63  
L: Well my parents are different. I-- it isn't my parents that do it to me, cause my [REF, mother, like my little sister, she had a party.  
PROP, So she says to the girls, "Just don't get pregnant"]  
(pause)  
D: heh heh heh  

Notice here that we have a case of a complex "Referent + Proposition" construction in which one Referent + Proposition is embedded in another. The "Referent + Proposition" construction "like my little sister, she had a party" is embedded in the "Referent + Proposition" construction "my mother,...so she says to the girls, 'Just don't get pregnant'".  

3) SPECIAL EMPHASIS: In some cases, the "Referent + Proposition" construction may be used neither to introduce nor re-introduce a referent but to mention again a referent currently in the foreground of the interlocutors' minds. We argue that this use is secondary rather than basic to such constructions. In these cases, the speaker is using the basic function of focussing the listener's attention on some referent to amplify the attention paid to some referent under discussion. In other words, the speaker uses the basic focus function to give SPECIAL EMPHASIS or importance to a particular entity. Example (8) illustrates this use:  

(8) GTS1-43  
(discussing younger siblings)  
L: T'know some of 'em are damn tall and goodlooking they could pass for (t)-nineteen.// A twelve year old guy comes over I say who's y'-older brother is he? He's not he's in the A7.  
R: But they don't-  
R: But they don't have a brain to go with it hehhh
These kids I don't believe it they're six foot.

This use of "Referent + Proposition" appears infrequently (6.6% of adult corpus, f=3) in the data under consideration.

C. FOREGROUNDING AND THE TOPICALIZATION HIERARCHY

If our suggestion is correct, that is, if the primary function of Referent + Proposition constructions is to bring into the discourse a referent that the speaker believes is not currently in the foreground of the listener's consciousness, then one would expect that frequently mentioned or discussed referents would appear infrequently in these constructions. That is, referents that are high on the sentence topic hierarchy (Li and Thompson 1976) should be low on the foregrounding referent hierarchy.

To a large extent, this is, in fact, precisely what occurs.

In this speech community co-conversationalists usually talk about themselves (Sacks 1968, Hawkinson and Hyman 1974). Overwhelmingly, conversations orient themselves to the speaker and/or the hearer. In terms of the sentence topic hierarchy, then, referents for "I" and "you" appear at the top. In the Referent + Proposition constructions collected, we found a number of cases of indirect reference to speaker or hearer, reference to others through the speaker or hearer, but direct reference to the speaker or hearer appeared only once (2% of adult data). Our data suggest that these referents are less likely to be foregrounded or "topicalized" through such constructions. We can explain their infrequent appearance as due to their near constant presence in the discourse history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENTENCE TOPIC</th>
<th>REF + PROP CONSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKER/HEARER</td>
<td>INDIVIDUALS OTHER THAN SPEAKER/HEARER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALS OTHER THAN SPEAKER/HEARER</td>
<td>SPEAKER/HEARER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This observation should be taken into account in comparing topic constructions across languages. Constructions of the Referent + Proposition format have been treated as comparable to topic constructions in other languages (Li & Thompson 1976). For example, they often appear as glosses for topic constructions in other languages. It is not clear at this point however, just how such constructions operate in the discourse of different languages. We need to examine the discourse of languages

We need to examine the discourse of languages such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Lahu and so on to assess the extent to which the informational status of the topicalized referent(s) is the same. In this way we can assure that constructions that appear similar on formal grounds are similar functionally as well.

IV. FOREGROUNDING, DEFINITENESS, AND SUBSEQUENT DISCOURSE

Thus far, we have discussed the initial Referent in Referent + Proposition constructions in terms of its status as piece of GIVEN information in the discourse (Chafe 1976) and as a sentence topic. We turn now to a discussion of its status as DEFINITE. We use the terms GIVEN and DEFINITE in the sense expressed by Chafe (1976). "GIVEN refers to referents that the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of the utterance." (Chafe 1976:7) DEFINITE refers to referents that the speaker believes the hearer knows you can identify. The hearer may know the referent through the discourse history or through the non-verbal context or through prior shared experience with the speaker, general knowledge of the world and so on. A piece of information, then, may be definite but not necessarily given. For example a referent may be mentioned in discourse for the first time but may be identifiable by the hearer from other sources.

We find that the initial referent in Referent + Proposition constructions normally is not given information, but it is normally definite. However, in looking over these constructions, we find that the distinctions between given/definite/new are still not sufficient for understanding the status of the initial referent and the form of the Referent + Proposition construction. We find that from the speaker's point of view, what is important is that the hearer know certain background information that is critical to assessing the subsequent proposition. That is, the hearer must not only recognize or know who the speaker is talking about. The hearer must know certain facts about the referent, facts that are relevant to the main predication the speaker wants.

We find that many of the constructions in the data perform just this task. We find that in many cases an initial referent will be expressed; it is then followed by one or more propositions that provide more information about the referent; and this in turn is followed by a major predication relevant to the referent. Examples (9), (10) and (11) illustrate such a construction: Referent + Background Proposition + Main Proposition.
developing further the role of Referent + Proposition constructions, we turn to this latter alternative, discourse, as a means of getting a referent known to an intended listener.

V. ALTERNATE FOREGROUNDING STRATEGIES

A. "ABOUT" QUESTIONS:

A speaker may draw the listener's attention to a particular referent in ways other than by the bald presentation of that referent as in "Referent + Proposition" constructions. For example, the speaker may introduce/re-introduce the referent through the use of an "about" question: "How about X?" "What about X?", where X represents some object, event, etc. (See also Sundel 1975). The response to this question provides a proposition relevant to X (the referent). Here, then, two or more separate utterances convey what is conveyed in "Referent + Proposition" utterances. For example, in (12) an individual named "Hogan" is introduced by J in an "about" question. He is identified in the subsequent three turns, at which point J is able to convey the relevant proposition ("he's a real bitchin' guy").

(12) GTS4:21
J: How about a guy named Hogan?
K: Bill Hogan?
K: Yeah I know him real well.
J: I do too he's a //real bitchin' guy.

In example (13), D asks his listeners to consider a particular type of person (rather than some specific individual):

(13) GTS5:37
D: Well what about the guy gets up on the dance floor, who feels that he can't dance.
R: -He's scared.

B. DIRECTIVES TO LOCATE REFERENT:

One extremely common strategy for bringing a referent into the discourse either as an Alternative or as Particular Case is for the speaker to request that the listener locate the referent in the non-verbal context. Here the speaker makes use of one or more LOCATING VERBS, for example "look at" "see" "consider" "turn to" "watch out for" "remember" "know" "return to"
"check out" "take a glance at". Certain of these verbs are used to locate referents in both memory and visible environment of the talk taking place. For example, one can ask a listener to "look at" some individual not present, using "look" in a metaphorical sense and of course one can ask the listener to "look" at some object present in the physical setting.

Locating Verbs appear in a number of sentence modalities. For example, they may appear in an interrogative sentence, as in example (14):

(14) GTS4:28

K: (Do you remember) Kouhalan?// (Fat kid two oh nine?)
J: Oh God, yeah, I know that guy.

(15) GTS1-73

L: Whaddya think of Paul
K: Paul the //quiet guy?
L: He was the quiet one who never said anything.

More widespread in conversational discourse is the use of a Locating Verb in the imperative mode. By far the most commonly used is the verb "look" or "look at".

(16) GTS4:12

T: ... Look, if I have - for example Picasso.
J: (Lookit) the guy who cut off his ear
R: That's another man
T: That was Van Gogh
J: Well, he was nuts, wasn't/he?

The Locating Verb "know" does not appear as such in the imperative, i.e. as "know X!". We find, however, that the texts are littered with the construction "you know" (y'know). We argue that "you know" sometimes operates as a directive to the listener to put himself in the state of knowing X, where X is some referent or proposition conveyed. That is, the speaker is directing the listener(s) to search in memory or in the immediate context for some known/knowable X. In example (17), we find this use of "you know" mingled with other locating verbs used to the same end.

(17) GTS1-73

(In discussion of picking fights in downtown Los Angeles)
A: I think-
R: Yeah that was much better man. You know an'

"Lookit these people come walkin down the street (Y'know they oughta be) Y' see dis executive, y'know wid his wife y'know

"you' come up t' him an ' chose'im off, he

PROP doesn't know what de hell's happened ....

Here we find the speaker making use of the Locating Verbs "know", "lookit", "see".

If the speaker feels that the listener may not know the information he wishes to convey, he may use "know" in either of two ways: He may ask if the listener knows the entity, proposition to be discussed. This does the work of making the listener aware that there is something that he does not in fact know and puts him in a state of readiness to receive the information (Heringer, personal communication). In many cases, the speaker does not expect that the listener does know the bit of information he will convey. Indeed often the speaker makes it impossible for the listener to know the information at the time of the "Do you know?" information request. The speaker may simply ask "Do you know what?" or "Know what?". Here the listener is being informed that there is something he does not know. He is obliged to respond with the request for information "What?" or "No, what?". This in turn obliges him to attend to the subsequent response (Sacks 1968). The question "You know what?", then, is a powerful tool for a speaker who wishes to control the direction of the listener's attention. The question operates in much the same manner as the use of the "summons-response" adjacency pair (Schegloff 1972). A summons or calling out of someone's name is usually responded to with some query such as "Yes?" "What is it?" "What do you want?". Having asked this question the party summoned is obliged to attend to its response. Given that "you know" questions are such effective attention-getters, it is not surprising that they are employed to shift to a novel topic or introduce an aside. Examples (15) and (16) illustrate such uses. Example (18) illustrates a not altogether successful use.
L: You know what a cute one is? You wanna hear what a cute one is? What's purple and goes bam bam bam bam. A four door plum.

K: Terrific.

L: You know what my father keeps down in the basement? Cases of champagne.

A: What?

(K): (I didn't hear.)

L: Cases of champagne.

A second alternative available to a speaker who feels the listener may not know what/who he is talking about is to assert that he, the speaker, knows this information, i.e. "I know X". Example (20) illustrates this strategy.

VI. LEFT - DISLOCATIONS OR DISCOURSES?

The strategies presented above represent discourse strategies for getting the listener to attend to and know a particular referent. The referent is introduced in one utterance, usually a directive. Subsequent utterances provide one or more predications concerning the referent. The major predication may or may not be preceded by background information relevant to the referent and its role in the predication.

A second group of communicators who employ Locating Verbs in imperative and interrogative utterances to this end are users of American Sign Language. Friedman (1976) mentions that the sign equivalent for "know" can be used to establish a referent as a "topic" (ibid: 28). The sign - equivalent for the sentence "There's a train that runs between San Jose and San Francisco" begins with the sequence YOU KNOW THAT/ TRAIN /. Similarly English sentences containing relative clauses may be glossed in sign by initially asking or telling the addressee to "remember" or "know" some referent and then predicating something of that referent, eg. "I saw the man who bought the dog" may be glossed in sign: REMEMBER MAN BOUGHT DOG? SAW HIM (INDEX). (Brandt, personal communication).

Further support for an underlying locating verb is seen in cases in which a pronoun appears as the initial referent.
The pronoun appears in the objective case in English in these contexts (e.g. me, my, us, etc.). In these cases as well, the construction could be paraphrased with a locating verb:

Me, I don't wear stockings = (Look at me) I don't wear stockings.

Him, he never studies. = (Look at him), he never studies.

That the Referent and Proposition function more like a discourse than a single construction is supported by formal characteristics as well.

1) PROSODIC BREAKS BETWEEN REFERENT AND PROPOSITION

We find that in most examples of Referent + Proposition that there is an intonational break between Referent and Proposition. In most cases, the referent is uttered with a slight rising intonation (represented by comma in transcript). This is then often followed by a pause or by a hesitation marker (e.g., uhh). In other cases the referent is expressed with a falling intonation followed by a brief pause.

2) INTERRUPTIONS

Another feature that supports the sequential nature of these constructions is the presence of interruptions between referent and subsequent propositions. We find interruptions of two sorts. First, there may be interruptions from a listener (Example (6)). Second, and more interesting, there may be self-interruptions. For example, we may consider the cases in which the speaker expresses the referent and then inserts background information about the referent before the main point as self-interruptions. (See examples (6), (7), (9), (10), and (11)).

3) LOOSE SYNTACTIC TIES

The initial Referent is not tightly tied to the subsequent proposition in the same way as sentential subjects are. (Keenan 1976). The initial referent does not control verb agreement for example. Further even the presence of a coreferential pronoun is not always manifest (example (2) (11)). We find several cases in which the initial referent is linked to the subsequent proposition simply by juxtaposition. For example:

(22) GTS3:62

(L has been talking about how her grandmother treats her father as small child)

L: Oy! my fa-my-/ my grandmother. My father comes in the house "OH MY SON MY SON"

In (22) the referent of "my grandmother" is linked to the subsequent proposition as utterances in a discourse are linked, i.e., by the maxim of relevance (Grice 1968).
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