国立国語研究所学術情報リポジトリ

Left-Dislocation in Japanese and Information Structure Theory

Left-Dislocation in Japanese and Information Structure Theory

YAMAIZUMI Minoru

Adjunct Researcher, Department of Crosslinguistic Studies,
National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics [–2011.03]

Abstract

The present paper has put forward three arguments pertaining to left-dislocation in Japanese and information structure theory (Lambrecht 1994). (i) The function of left-dislocation is not limited to announcing the topic of the following clause. It can announce not only topic but also focus, for in Japanese, Korean, and English, left-dislocation can be employed in answering a *wh*-question. (ii) Since indirect question clauses including an interrogative can be left-dislocated, open propositions represented by such clauses are eligible as a topic, not to speak of a discourse referent. (iii) The function and features of left-dislocated elements are quite similar to those of Japanese bare topical NPs which have been pointed out in previous studies, and the structure of left-dislocation is consistent with that of topical bare NPs. Japanese topical bare NPs can be considered left-dislocated elements with their coreferential pronoun elided.*

Key words: left-dislocation, information structure, open proposition, bare NP

1. Introduction

According to Lambrecht (2001: 1051), left-dislocation[1] can be found in most languages. Left-dislocation in Japanese, however, has been little discussed at least in the tradition of functionalism. In this paper, I will make three statements pertaining to left-dislocation and information structure as a component of sentence grammar, but they are not directly interrelated themselves. The first statement is on a crosslinguistic function of the left-dislocation construction, the second one is on the status of open propositions (i.e., propositions including a variable) in information structure theory, and the third on the grammatical status of topical bare NPs in Japanese.

This paper is organized in the following way. In the rest of Section 1, we will define left-dislocation and illustrate its variety. In Section 2, we will briefly introduce the information structure theory adopted here, i.e., Lambrecht's (1994, 2001) information structure theory. In the succeeding three sections from 3 to 5, I will put forth each of the three main points. Section 5 will conclude this paper.

1.1 Definition and Variety of Left-Dislocation

First, we will define left-dislocation in structural terms. We adopt the definition by Lambrecht (2001), a survey of left (and right) dislocation constructions in various languages from a func-

[1] I will refer to the construction primarily discussed in this paper as "left-dislocation" for convenience, and any leftward movement or derivation from a so-called base structure is not assumed.

tional and typological perspective. We thereafter will review the pattern that is most commonly found in the world's languages and the other non-central patterns in this order. Note that the non-central patterns are genuine subtypes of left-dislocation, no less than the central ones.

Definition

Lambrecht (2001) defines left-dislocation as "a sentence structure in which a referential constituent which could function as an argument or adjunct within a predicate-argument structure occurs instead outside the boundaries of the clause containing the predicate" to its left (p. 1050), and typically, "the role of the denotatum of the dislocated constituent as an argument or adjunct of the predicate is represented within the clause by a pronominal element which is construed as coreferential with the dislocated phrase" (p. 1050). Therefore, the structure of typical left-dislocation can be schematically illustrated as follows (based on Lambrecht 2001: 1051):

(1) LDE_{i} $_{\text{cl}}$ $[... \text{pro}_{i} ...]^{2}$

Before the matrix clause indicated by the square brackets, there comes a left-dislocated element (most typically NP, but also PP, AP, infinitive VP, etc.) that would appear inside the matrix clause canonically (i.e., in non-dislocated sentences). In the matrix clause, 'pro', or what is called 'pronominal' in this paper, occurs in the canonical position of the LDE. The 'pronominal' designates the same referent as the LDE represents. In this paper, the parts of examples that correspond to LDE and 'pro' are indicated by underscores and subscripts as $_{\text{LDE}}$ and $_{\text{pro}}$, respectively.

Lambrecht (2001: 1050) lists the following four criteria for identifying left-dislocation (the phrases within brackets are supplemented by the author for the ease of understanding):

(i)   Extra-clausal position of a constituent [occupied by the left-dislocated element].
(ii) Possible alternative intra-clausal position [where the 'pronominal' occurs].
(iii) Pronominal coindexation [between the left-dislocated element and the 'pronominal'].
(iv) Special prosody [specifically, the left-dislocated element is necessarily prosodically prominent to some extent, and typically followed by a pause].

Lambrecht considers only (i) to be a necessary condition, and adds that "there are many instances in which one or more of them fail to apply" (p. 1050).

It is noteworthy that left-dislocated elements do not participate in the argument-predicate relation in the succeeding clause (Lambrecht 2001: 1065) even if they are coreferential with an argument, and thus they have no semantic roles and cases. Probably for this reason, in all of the Japanese examples below the left-dislocated elements bear no case. It is the 'pronominal' that instead participates in the argument-predicate relation and has a semantic role and case-marker. However, the absence of case-marking is not a crosslinguistically applicable criterion, so we will not consider it one of the defining features of Japanese left-dislocation.

The type of left-dislocation most commonly found in the world's languages

NPs are "by far the most commonly found category" of left-dislocated elements in the world's languages (Lambrecht 2001: 1061). The following are examples of left-dislocation of NP, cited

---

2 In Lambrecht (2001: 1051), "LDE" (Left-Dislocated Element) and "cl" (clause) in this formula was labeled "XP" and "s" (i.e., sentence) respectively.

from the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese (NIJLA, CRL, and TITech 2004):

(2) ... *taimu-sukezyûru*_{LDE}, *kore*_{pro}*=o* *sakusei* *itas–i–mas–u*
     time-schedule   this=ACC   make   do.PLT-LINK-PLT-NPST

     tokuni   *genkô=no*   *simekiri-bi*_{LDE} *kore*_{pro}*=o*
     especially manuscript=GEN deadline-day this=ACC

     gensyu   *tosite*   *kettei–su–ru=toiu*
     strict.observance   as   determination-do-NPST-QT

     koto=des–u...   (the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese)
     NMLZ=COP.PLT-NPST

     '... our time schedule, we make this; especially the deadline of manuscripts, this is set so as to be strictly kept ...'

(3) *Motiron* *kore=o*   *kangae-ru* *toki=ni=mo*   *sakihodo=no*
     of.course this=ACC think-NPST occasion=DAT=also former=GEN

     mittu=no   *zyôken*_{LDE}, *kore*_{pro}*=wa* *tune=ni*   *atama=ni*
     three=GEN condition this=TOP always=DAT head=DAT

     oi-te   *kentô-si-te*   *ik–i–mas–u*   (the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese)
     put-NF consider-do-NF go-LINK-PLT-NPST

     'Of course, when we think about this, the former three conditions, these we will always bear in mind and take into consideration.'

It is safe to say that these examples fulfill all the four criteria. Normal prosody for these as spoken utterances would also fulfill criterion (iv). As for the criterion (iii), the 'pronominal' is realized as a pronoun, *kore* ('this'). We will see other cases below.

Non-central types

Besides the common type above, there is a startling variety of left-dislocation in languages of the world. Here, we will take a glimpse at only a small part of this variation that is relevant to our argument below (see Lambrecht (2001) for the array of variation found in left-dislocation).

    Regarding the left-dislocated element, "LDE" in (1), though it was originally labeled "XP" in Lambrecht (2001), it is not necessarily a subsentential phrase. What can be left-dislocated varies depending on the language. In addition to various subsentential phrases (NP, PP, AP, infinitive VP), clausal units such as finite complement clauses may be left-dislocated, e.g.,:

(4)   That you're not coming tonight_{LDE}, I can't BELIEVE[3] it_{pro}.   (Lambrecht 2001: 1063)

In Japanese, indirect question clauses are also allowed to be left-dislocated, as we will see in Sections 2 and 3.

    Crosslinguistically, 'pronominals' can be realized in various forms: syntactically free personal pronouns, clitics, inflectional affixes, or possessive pronouns (or affixes). In Japanese, it is possible for a noun following an adnominal pronoun, such as *kono*, *sono*, and *ano* to serve as a part of a 'pronominal', e.g.,:

(5) *Kessoku-sei=ga*   *seiritu-su-ru*   *tame=ni*
     cohesion-nature=NOM   establishment-do-NPST   purpose=DAT

---

[3] Small capitals indicate a main sentence-stress on the word in English examples.

hituyô-na	*imi=no*	*hokyû*LDE,	*kono*	*koto*pro*=ni*
need-ADNOM	meaning=GEN	supplement	this	thing=DAT

tuite=wa	*ato=no*	*setu=de*	*ronzi-ru*	*koto=ni*
about=TOP	later=GEN	section=LOC	discuss-NPST	thing=DAT

su-ru	*ga* ...			(Ono 2005: 160)
do-NPST	CORD ...			

'The extra provision of meaning required for establishing meaning, we will discuss this in a later section ...'

In Japanese, adnominal forms of demonstrative pronouns (such as *kono* in this example) have different forms from pronouns used by themselves (such as *kore* in (2) and (3)), while both of them are glossed as *this* in English. In the example (5), the NP consisting of the adnominal pronoun *kono* and the noun *koto* 'thing' corefers with the left-dislocated NP.

More noteworthy is that the 'pronominal' can be omitted (or realized as zero) in so-called pro-drop languages, like Japanese. This would not be surprising, considering that zero in pro-drop languages roughly corresponds to unaccented pronouns in other languages. Additionally, while the adnominal pronoun *kono* in (5) cannot be ellipted, such adnominal pronouns of the 'pronominal' NP can be omitted in some environments, as determiners are not obligatory for NPs in Japanese. We will see examples where adnominal pronouns can be ellipted in Sections 2 and 3 (e.g., (21)). In such cases, as a result of omitting an adnominal pronoun, the nouns alone serve as a 'pronominal' by themselves.

Last but not the least, it should be noted that the requirement of referentiality in the definition of left-dislocation means no more than having some semantic value. One of the clearest cases of a non-referential expression is impersonal pronouns (as *it* in *It is easy for you to go there*). Therefore, the term *referential* is used here in the broader sense than that of Nishiyama (2003), where being referential means referring to some entity in the (real or unreal) world. In order to clarify the difference in the definition of being referential, consider the following examples.

(6)   MeLDE worryLDE, thatpro's ridiculous!   (Lambrecht 2001: 1061)
(7)   JohnLDE a doctorLDE, I don't believe itpro!   (Lambrecht 2001: 1061)
(8)   A: Our listeners correct you never never.
      B: MeLDE wrongLDE, what, thatpro's impossible!
                              (Lee & Cannata (Hosts). (2011, February 11).
                              Weekend Confirmed [audio podcast]. Episode 47, 28′ 01″,
                              http://www.podtrac.com/pts/redirect.mp3/cdn2.shacknews.com/
                              public/extras/podcast/wknd_confirmed_021111_47.mp3)

Note that these left-dislocated predicates (*worry*, *a doctor*, and *wrong*) are referential in the broader sense, but non-referential in the narrower sense. In these examples, two constituents are left-dislocated and together express a proposition, and the pronouns (*that*, *it*, and *that*, in (6), (7), and (8) respectively) in the matrix clauses refer to the proposition. When a speaker utters an instance of this construction (what Lambrecht (2001: 1061) calls Mad-Magazine sentence), s/he is always incredulous of the proposition (Lambrecht 2001: 1061). The matrix clause as a whole can be ellipted because what the matrix clause expresses is recoverable. Lambrecht classifies even the resultant sentences (i.e., *Me worry?* and *John a doctor?*) as a variety of left-dislocation. This

view would be worth reconsidering, but we do not go further into this construction here. Later, we will examine another case where an expression which is referential in the broader sense but non-referential in the narrower sense is left-dislocated.

1.2 Two Superficially Similar Constructions: Topicalization and Focus-Movement

There are at least two constructions which are superficially similar to but crucially different from left-dislocation. One is the Topicalization construction, exemplified by (9), and the other is the Focus-Movement construction, exemplified by (10).

(9)　　[This movie], I saw __ when I was a kid.　　　　　　　　　(Lambrecht 2001: 1052)
(10)　[Fifty six hundred dollars] we raised __ yesterday.　　　　　(Lambrecht 2001: 1053)

In these constructions, unlike left-dislocation, the preposed element serves as a syntactic and semantic argument. This is why a pronoun as the object of the verbs does not (and cannot) occur in the underscored position in the English examples above. This feature differentiates these constructions from left-dislocation. In pro-drop languages, such as Japanese, however, it is difficult to distinguish instances of these constructions from ones of left-dislocation where the 'pronominal' in the matrix clause is omitted. We then propose the following criterion:

> If, in the matrix clause, it is possible to insert a 'pronominal' corresponding to a preposed element, then such a pattern as a whole is recognized as an instance of left-dislocation.

It may be worth mentioning in passing that according to this criterion, Japanese NPs which are marked by *wa* and serve as an argument of the predicate are not considered to be a left-dislocated element (pace Shimojo 1995) because it is almost impossible in contemporary Japanese to insert a pronoun which is coreferential with the preposed *wa*-marked argument NP. This point is illustrated in the following example:

(11)　a.　*Ringo=wa*　　*Hanako=ga*　　　*tabe-ta.*
　　　　　apple=TOP　Hanako=NOM　eat-PST
　　　　　'Hanako ate the apple.'
　　　b. ?***Ringo**=wa*　　*Hanako=ga*　　　***kore**=o*　　　*tabe-ta.*
　　　　　apple=TOP　Hanako=NOM　this=ACC　　eat-PST

The pattern exemplified by (11a) can be observed, but is restricted to special genres such as archaic texts, word-by-word translation of Chinese classics, or provisions of law, such as (12).

(12)　<u>*Kenri=no*　　　*ran'yô*</u>$_{\text{LDE}}$*=wa*　<u>*kore*</u>$_{\text{pro}}$*=o*　　*yurusa-zu.*
　　　right=GEN　　abuse=TOP　　this=ACC　　permit-NEG
　　　'The abuse of rights, this is not permitted.'　　　　　　　　(the Civil Code 1889)

The fact that this pattern is employed only in these genres indicates that it belongs to the inventory of contemporary Japanese at most only marginally. We will not concern ourselves further with the pattern exemplified by (11b) and (12), and with those two similar constructions, Topicalization and Focus-Movement.

1.3 Information Structure Theory Adopted in the Present Paper

Let us here delineate the realm of information structure theory. As noted above, this paper adopts

Lambrecht's (1994, 2001) information structure theory. He proposes the following definition of information structure:

> That component of sentence grammar in which propositions as conceptual representations of states of affairs are paired with lexicogrammatical structures in accordance with the mental states of interlocutors who use and interpret these structures as units of information in given discourse contexts (Lambrecht 1994: 5)

This framework assumes that at least some grammatical constructions and lexical items involve the combination of propositions (semantics) with lexicogrammatical structures (morphosyntax) depending on the mental states of interlocutors. And as a component of sentence grammar, the information structure of such constructions (or instances thereof) is described in parallel with its semantics and morphosyntax. In other words, unlike some other theories, this theory does not incorporate information structure into syntax, so syntactic nodes such as Topic Phrase or Focus Phrase are not postulated. Nor does this theory try to account for linguistic phenomena reflecting the mental states of interlocutors, such as structural variation of semantically equivalent sentences, exclusively in terms of discourse beyond sentence grammar, although the mental states of interlocutors are undoubtedly affected by discourse. In the same vein, we will examine information-structural aspects of the left-dislocation construction within sentence grammar.

Two important information-structural concepts—topic and focus—should be defined here. Note that the topic currently under discussion is different from discourse topic, or the subject of a discourse. Unlike discourse topic, the scope of the topic under discussion is at most a sentence, and defined relative to a proposition including the topic as a discourse referent that the proposition is understood to concern. Focus is also defined relative to a proposition including a focus as the part of a proposition that is not predictable and makes the proposition a piece of new information. For example, that part of the answer which the questioner of a *wh*-question wants to know must be a focus, and by the definition of focus above, the comment about the topic is also understood as a focus. Even a proposition as a whole can be interpreted as a focus when the situation corresponding to the proposition is assumed to be totally unknown to the hearer.

Now that we have introduced the object and framework of analysis, we will turn to our three main arguments.

2. Information-Structural Function of Left-Dislocation

First, we shall focus on the information-structural function of left-dislocation. Semantically speaking, an instance of left-dislocation and its canonical word-order counterpart express the same proposition. An instance of left-dislocation, however, differs from its canonical word-order counterpart in respect of information structure. Previous studies (Lambrecht 1994, 2001; Prince 1984, 1997; Gregory and Michaelis 2001, to name but a few) argue that left-dislocation has some specific information-structural functions. According to Lambrecht (2001: 1075), the speaker, in employing left-dislocation, announces a new topic represented by the left-dislocated element. S/he then comments on it in the clause, referring to the topic by means of the coreferential 'pronominal'. Technically speaking, it is not the left-dislocated constituent itself but the coreferential 'pronominal' that directly designates the topic. This is because the topic is defined relative to the proposition it contains. To quote Lambrecht, "Since a detached lexical topic constituent does not occupy an argument position in a clause, it is strictly speaking not with the [left-dislocated; YM]

lexical topic NP but with the anaphoric 'pronominal' topic expression that the pragmatic about-ness relation between the referent and the proposition is expressed" (1994: 188).

Although we have adopted the structural definition of left-dislocation due to Lambrecht (2001: 1050), we will offer a different view on its function. Regarding the information-structural function of left-dislocation, Lambrecht remarked that there is a general agreement among researchers on dislocation that left-dislocation and right-dislocation "are topic marking constructions, i.e., grammatical constructions which serve to mark a constituent as denoting the topic (or theme) with respect to which a given sentence expresses a relevant comment" (Lambrecht 2001: 1072). He has also asserted that left-dislocated constituents are "necessarily **non-focal** sentence elements" (Lambrecht 2001: 1072, emphasis original).

However, we can employ left-dislocation in Japanese to announce the focus of the answer to a *wh*-question, which asks the value of the variable in a presupposed open proposition. The following example illustrates this fact:

(13) A: *Dare=ga   Itirô=no   haha=des-u=ka?*
          who=NOM Itirô=GEN mother=COP.PLT-NPST=Q
          'Who is Ichiro's mother?'

      B: *Yamada Hanako*_{LDE}, *kanozyo*_{pro}*=ga   haha=des-u.*
          Yamada Hanako   3sgf=NOM   mother=COP.PLT-NPST
          'Yamada Hanako, SHE is his mother.'

      B′: ? *Yamada   Hanako*_{LDE}, *kanozyo*_{pro}*=wa haha=des-u.*
          Yamada   Hanako   3sgf=TOP   mother=COP.PLT-NPST

      B″: ? *Yamada   Hanako*_{LDE}, *haha=des-u.*
          Yamada   Hanako   mother=COP.PLT-NPST

In (13), Speaker A asks the value of the variable in the open proposition [x is Ichiro's mother], and Speaker B provides the answer, Hanako. Therefore, *kanozyo*, which refers to Hanako in the clause representing the proposition, has to be a focal NP, and yet (13B) must be an instance of left-dislocation from the viewpoint of its form. Thus, Yamada Hanako in (13B) is proved to be a "focus-announcing NP," not a topic-announcing NP. This is corroborated by the fact that (13B′) and (13B″) are much less acceptable than (13B). Speaker B cannot mark the focal NP *kanozyo* by *wa* as a topic, as illustrated in (13B′). It should also be noted that an NP cannot be both focal and topical at the same time. Nor can the speaker omit the focal NP *kanozyo*, as shown in (13B″), presumably because the focus is an unrecoverable part of the information. The sentence (13B″) is particularly intriguing in that it is unacceptable even though the referent corresponding to the answer is expressed by the left-dislocated element. Its unacceptability presumably suggests the validity of the aforementioned assumption that a left-dislocated element itself is not a topic (or focus in this case) expression for the reason that topic as well as focus is relative to a proposition. It is the 'pronominal' in the matrix clause that is a topic or focus expression, and a left-dislocated element just announces a topic or focus of the proposition represented in the matrix clause.

All that we have just seen in the Japanese examples (13) is true of Korean (Hanae Yukimatsu and Moon Chan Hak, p.c.).

(14) A: *nwu-ka   Ichilo   emeni-yey-yo?*
          who-NOM Itirô   mother-COP-PLT
          'Who is Ichiro's mother?'

    B: *Yamata Hanakho*_{LDE},   *kunye*_{pro}*-ka*   *emeni-yey-yo.*
       Yamada Hanako   3sgf-NOM   mother-COP-PLT
       'Yamada Hanako, she is his mother.'

  B′: ? *Yamata Hanakho*_{LDE},   *kunye*_{pro}*-nun*   *emeni-yey-yo.*
       Yamada Hanako   3sgf-TOP   mother-COP-PLT

  B″:? *Yamata Hanakho*_{LDE}, *emeni-yey-yo.*
       Yamada Hanako   mother-COP-PLT

The same is in fact true even of English, in which Lambrecht (2001) was written.

(15) A: Who is Ichiro's mother?
      B: Yamada Hanako_{LDE}, sʜᴇ_{pro} is his mother.   (John Whitman, p.c.)

It seems to be impossible to devise a well-formed English example corresponding to (13B′) or (13B″).

    Additionally, at least in Japanese, left-dislocated elements can announce a part of the focus of the proposition represented by the matrix clause. Consider an example of left-dislocation (16B), where an indirect question clause is left-dislocated and coindexed with a full NP in the matrix clause.

(16) A: *Nanka*   *nayan-de*   *i-ru*   *mita-i=da=ne.*
        somehow be.troubled-NF be-NPST   seem-NPST=COP=SEP
        Dô-si-ta=no?
        how-do-PST=NMLZ
        'You look troubled somehow. What's wrong?'
      B: *Dare=ga*   *Itirô=o*   *koros-i-ta=no=ka*_{LDE},
        who=NOM   Itirô=ACC   kill-LINK-PST=NMLZ=Q
        *hannin*_{pro}*=ga*   *wakar-a-na-i=n=da.*   (Mariko Aihara, p.c.)
        culprit=NOM know-LINK-NEG-NPST=NMLZ=COP
        lit. 'Who killed Ichiro, (I) don't know the culprit.'
        'I don't know the culprit who killed Ichiro.'

It might be difficult to recognize (16B) as an instance of left-dislocation because the preposed element is an indirect question clause. However, it is safe to say that this is an instance of a sub-type of left-dislocation for the following reason (see Section 3 for more details on the subtype). The indirect question clause is left-dislocated, and after the clause, the concealed question NP *hannin*, which is semantically equivalent to the clause, serves as a 'pronominal' in the matrix clause. To return to the point, the focus of (16B) is the entire proposition that I do know the culprit who killed Ichiro, since this is what A did not know and wanted to know, and the 'pro-nominal' NP *hannin* expresses only part of it, the culprit who killed Ichiro. Given that this is an instance of left-dislocation, whether we consider that such an instance serves a focus-announcing function, despite of the fact that what is represented by the left-dislocated element is only a part of the focus, is a matter of the definition of focus-announcing left-dislocation.

    Taking the facts presented above into consideration, we are compelled to reconsider a cross-linguistically valid information-structural function of left-dislocation. It seems that the left-dislocated position does not determine whether the announced discourse referent represented

there turns topic, focus, or some other information structural category in the succeeding clause. It may be the case that what left-dislocation does is only to make the announced referent activated, and that the information structural role (i.e., topic or focus) of the referent depends on whether the 'pronominal' is a topic or focus. There is room for further investigation, but it has become clear that what left-dislocation can announce is not limited to the topic, in contrast to the above-mentioned general agreement among researchers on the function of the construction that left-dislocation is a topic-marking construction (Lambrecht 2001: 1072).

3. Open Propositions in Information Structure Theory

In this section, we will argue that it is possible that open propositions function as a discourse referent, and furthermore as a topic, although Lambrecht (1994) and Nishiyama (2003) expressly deny this possibility.

An open proposition can be represented, among other possibilities, by an indirect question clause including an interrogative, e.g.,:

(17) a. [*Dare=ga   Itirô=o   koros-i-ta=no=ka*]=*ga*
          who=NOM   Itirô =ACC   kill-LINK-PST=NMLZ=Q=NOM
          wakar-a-na-i.
          know-LINK-NEG-NPST
          '(I) do not know who killed Ichiro.' or 'It is unclear who killed Ichiro.'
      b. [x=ga Itirô=o koros-i-ta]
          '[x killed Ichiro]'

In (17a), the indirect question clause enclosed in the brackets represents the open proposition (17b). Note that the interrogative *dare* corresponds to the variable *x* in the open proposition. Thus, an indirect question clause including an interrogative iconically encodes an open proposition. Not only such indirect question clauses but also NPs can designate open propositions. An NP which represents an open proposition is called a concealed question NP. For instance, the subject NP *Itirô=o koros-i-ta hannin* in the following example is a concealed question NP.

(18) a. [*Itirô=o   koros-i-ta   hannin*]=*ga   wakar-a-na-i.*
          Itirô=ACC   kill-LINK-PST   culprit=NOM   know-LINK-NEG-NPST
          '(I) do not know (the identity of) the culprit who killed Ichiro.' or
          'The (identity of the) culprit who killed Ichiro is unknown.'
      b. [x=ga Itirô=o koros-i-ta hannin=da]
          '[x is the culprit who killed Ichiro]'

The sentence (18a) is semantically equivalent to (17a), since the noun *hannin*, composing a concealed question NP with the adnominal clause *Itirô=o koros-i-ta* concealingly represents the open proposition (18b), which is semantically equivalent with (17b). Concealed question NPs thus can very often substitute indirect question clauses; the difference between them consists in how open propositions are represented: concealingly or iconically.

Opinions are divided among researchers as to whether an open proposition can be a topic, or, as a precondition of topichood, a discourse referent. As noted earlier, Nishiyama (2003: chapter 8) and Lambrecht (1994: 122) do not accept that open propositions are eligible to be topics, no matter how they are expressed. Both of them make that argument on the following ground

among others: open propositions are semantically incomplete, so they cannot be referential in the narrower sense mentioned above (i.e., they do not refer to some entity in the world); therefore, it is impossible to comment on what such non-referential expressions designate. The examples Lambrecht and Nishiyama have used to support this argument are similar in that an open proposition (represented by the underscored parts in the following examples) is pragmatically presupposed and the value of the variable is asserted:

(19) *Syopan-konkûru=no*   *yûsyôsya=wa*   *ano*   *otoko=da.*   (Nishiyama 2003: 386)
        Chopin competition=GEN winner=TOP that man=COP
        'The winner of the Chopin Piano Competition is that man.'
        Presupposed open proposition: [x is the winner of the Chopin Piano Competition].
        Assertion: the value of *x* is that man.

(20) (Answering the question "Who went to school?")
        The CHILDREN went to school.   (Lambrecht 1994: 122)
        Presupposed open proposition: [x went to school].
        Assertion: the value of *x* is the children.

It was in discussing whether such presupposed parts can be regarded as a topic expression that Nishiyama and Lambrecht argue that open propositions are not eligible to be topics[4]. Note that their argument applies to open propositions in general, regardless of the focus structure of a sentence, or of the way that an open proposition is represented (e.g., a subject NP as in (19), a VP as in (20), an indirect question clause as in (17a), or a concealed question NP as in (18a)). This is because their argument is based on semantic considerations.

   I do not concur with Nishiyama (2003) or Lambrecht (1994) in the opinion introduced above because there is concrete evidence against their argument, a kind of left-dislocation[5]. As I showed with example (16) in section 2, indirect question clauses including an interrogative can be left-dislocated in Japanese. In such sentences, either a concealed question NP or pronoun can be a 'pronominal' in the matrix clause, as shown in the following examples:

(21) *Dare=ga*   *Itirô=o*   *koros-i-ta=no=ka*$_{\text{LDE}}$,
        who=NOM   Itirô=ACC kill-LINK-PST=NMLZ=Q
        {*(sono)   hannin/sore*}$_{\text{pro}}$=ga   *wakar-a-na-i.*
        the   culprit/that=NOM know-LINK-NEG-NPST
        lit. 'Who killed Ichiro, (I) don't know the culprit/that.'

(22) ...*firipin*   *nanka=de=wa*   *yasi=no*   *sen'i=de*
        the.Philipines   and.the.like=LOC=TOP   coconut=GEN   fiber=INST
        nan-te   *iu=no=ka*$_{\text{LDE}}$ *watasi*   *namae*$_{\text{pro}}$=wa
        what-QT   call=NMLZ=Q 1sg   name=TOP
        sir-a-na-i=n=des-u   *ga* ...
        know-LINK-NEG-NPST=NMLZ=COP.PLT-NPST   CORD
                                                              (the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese)
        '... in the Philippines and others, with palm fiber, I don't know its name ...'

---

[4] I leave open the question of whether the underscored parts in these particular examples are topic expressions or not.
[5] For more detail of this construction, see Yamaizumi (2008, 2010: chapter 5).

(23)　*Boku=ga*　　*naze*　　*Tôkyô=e*　　　*ik-u=no=ka*_{LDE},　　　*riyû*_{pro}*=wa*　　*kantan.*
　　　1sg=NOM　why　　Tokyo=ALL　go-NPST=NMLZ=Q　reason=TOP　simple.
　　　　　　　　　(http://blog.goo.ne.jp/86taka2002/e/4ae17060af0422016cb9a3cc56477a3e)
　　　lit. 'Why I go to Tokyo, the reason is simple.'
　　　'The reason I go to Tokyo is simple.'

In each of these examples, the left-dislocated indirect question clause represents an open proposition such as [x killed Ichiro], and the pronoun or full NP functioning as a concealed question NP represents an open proposition which is semantically equivalent to that of the preceding indirect question clause. Thus, these concealed question NPs serve as 'pronominal' in the matrix clause as a pronoun does, and these sentences count as instances of left-dislocation.

　　Let us consider in passing how an open proposition is functionally expressed when we announce it. In comparison with a concealed question NP, an indirect question clause is obviously more suitable for announcing an open proposition, since it iconically represents an open proposition. On the other hand, a concealed question NP is more suitable for designating the role of the open proposition as an argument of the predicate in the matrix clause, since it is an NP, a highly common form as an argument. Viewed in this light, the structure represented by examples (21), (22), and (23) can be regarded as a functionally well-motivated pattern of left-dislocation involving an open proposition.

　　As we have seen, at least one of the functions of left-dislocation is to announce a topic before a clause and to comment on it in the clause. When the type of left-dislocation under discussion serves this function, the open proposition designated by the concealed question NP is a topic[6]. In such cases, the open proposition must be eligible to be a discourse referent, since, as noted in the definition of topic, a topic must be a discourse referent. This is most clearly illustrated, among the examples above, in (23), where the matrix clause is a predication sentence. This is because a predication sentence[7] is a construction conveying a proposition in such a way as to ascribe the property designated by the predicate to the referent of the subject; in other words, what the predicate represents is presented as a property about what the subject represents. Therefore, the subject NP of a predication sentence is necessarily topical and referential in the narrower sense.

　　In Korean as well as Japanese, it is possible for indirect question clauses including an interrogative to be left-dislocated and for a concealed question NP as a 'pronominal' to occur in the matrix clause. For example, (21) can be translated as (24).

(24)　*nwu-ka*　　*ichilo-lul*　　*cwuky-ess-nun-ci*_{LDE}
　　　who-NOM　　Itirô-ACC　　kill-PST-NMLZ-Q
　　　*pemin*_{pro}*-ul*　　*molu-keyss-ta.*
　　　culprit-ACC　not.know-MOD-DECL
　　　lit. 'Who killed Ichiro, (I) don't know the culprit.'

---

[6]　In connection with Section 2, the open proposition of (21) can be a focus too, when, for example, it is used as an answer to the question (i).

　(i)　*Sono*　*ziken=ni-tuite*　　*nani=ga*　　*mada*
　　　the　　case=DAT-about　　what=NOM　still
　　　wak-at-te　　　*i-nai=no=des-u=ka?*
　　　know-LINK-NF　　be-NEG=NMLZ=COP.PLT-NPST=Q
　　　'What is still unclear about the case?'

[7]　See Nishiyama (2003: 3.2) for more details on predication sentences.

Obviously, this is very close to the Japanese counterpart both structurally and semantically.

All these considerations make it clear that an open proposition is eligible to be a topic, not to speak of a discourse referent. This conclusion is, however, clearly incompatible with the view that concealed question NPs are non-referential (Nishiyama 2003) in the narrower sense, since, as noted, a topic is a discourse referent by definition; that is to say, a topic expression is necessarily referential in the narrower sense. If the view that concealed question NPs are non-referential but can be topic expressions is accepted, then it follows that referentiality in this sense is not a necessary condition to be a topic expression. We would have to either accept this corollary, or modify the view on the non-referentiality of concealed question NPs.

4. Some Bare NPs in Japanese as Left-Dislocated Elements

In this section, we will deal with a Japanese NP which is not marked by any particle following it. One instance of such an NP is *aru hito=no susume=de sit-ta kono hon* in the following example:

(25) *Aru*   *hito=no*   *susume=de*   *sit-ta*   *kono*   *hon*,
    certain   man=GEN   recommendation=INST   know-PST   this   book
    yatto   *yomi-owat-ta.*
    finally   read-finish-PST

                                 (http://hoshi6.blog99.fc2.com/blog-date-20101123.html)

    'This book that I got to know from a certain man's recommendation, I finally finished reading (it).'

This NP could be marked by the topic marker *wa* or accusative case marker *o*, but at least in some context, it is more natural for the NP not to be marked at all. This type of NP has often been called *mu-zyosi meisi-ku* 'no-particle noun-phrase' in the field of Japanese grammar; in this paper, we will refer to such NPs as bare NPs, regardless of the presence or absence of modifiers preceding the noun.

There is a large amount of literature on bare NPs (e.g., Niwa (1989)). The fact that they are not marked by any particles has been accounted for in many ways: (i) a case marker is ellipted, (ii) the topic marker *wa* is ellipted, (iii) the zero (i.e., with no phonological realization) particle with some function should be posited, (iv) the semantically-neutral zero case should be posited, and (v) there is originally no particle. Irrespective of different accounts, many researchers recognize two kinds of bare NPs: one is an NP with some topic function, and the other is one without any topic function; the latter type is usually assumed to result from the omission of its marker (mainly a case marker). Nevertheless, it is not always easy to distinguish these two types of bare NPs, as Mikami (1960: 174) remarked as early as more than half a century ago. This is mainly because the difference among the available options for marking (some case marker, the topic marker *wa*, or no particle) is often so subtle that it is difficult to judge which option is most natural to an NP in a given context[8]. This has presumably motivated researchers to posit a continuum ranging from one of the two types of bare NP to the other. Furthermore, among researchers who posit the two types, opinions are divided as to the relation between them. Some argue that some bare NPs assume the nature of both to some extent; others argue that they are distinct categories in

---

[8] In addition, there seems to be considerable differences between individuals in the preference to these options in a given context, for the author's judgment sometimes differs from that of previous studies.

theory, and that each instance can form a continuum according to how easily an instance is interpreted as belonging to one category (and not the other). I concur with the latter view, and we will focus on topical bare NPs in what follows because only topical bare NPs have something to do with left-dislocation and non-topical ones are irrelevant to our concern.

Previous research has clarified a great deal about the context suitable for bare NPs and on the functional and pragmatic differences between topical bare NPs and *wa*-marked NPs. However, few attempts have been made to characterize such NPs in a crosslinguistically applicable framework. I here propose the following hypothesis on the grammatical status of topical bare NPs: they are left-dislocated elements whose 'pronominal' is omitted. Given this hypothesis, most importantly, we can naturally account for properties of topical bare NPs, because the function and features of bare topical NPs which have been pointed out in previous studies (Maruyama 1995: 378, Onoe 1996, Saegusa 2005: 20, to name but a few) are quite similar to those of topic-announcing left-dislocation. The structure of left-dislocation is, of course, consistent with that of topical bare NPs. Note that instances of focus-announcing left-dislocation are clearly differentiated from ones of left-dislocation of topical bare NPs whose 'pronominal' is elipted, because the 'pronominal' of focus-announcing left-dislocated elements cannot be omitted, as we have seen in Section 2 ((13B″) and (14B″)). We shall now survey the similarities.

The first point of the similarity concerns syntax, especially, constituent order. Noda (1996: 268) has pointed out that the topicality of bare NPs positively correlates with the sentence initial position. Maruyama (1996: 75) also remarks that the more detached a bare NP is from the verb and the nearer to the sentence initial position it occurs, the more it assumes topicality. Compare her examples:

(26) a. *Kono   tebukuro,   dare=ga   kat-te   kure-ta=no?*   (Maruyama 1996: 74)
          these   mittens   who=NOM   buy-NF give-PST=SEP
          'Who bought these mittens for you?'

cf.   b. *Kono   tebukuro,   dare=ga   **sore=o** kat-te   kure-ta=no?*
          these   mittens   who=NOM   **it=ACC** buy-NF give-PST=SEP

(27) a. *Hakodate=de   "ika-sômen"   tabe-ru=no*
          Hakodate=LOC   squid-noodle   eat-NPST=NMLZ
          wasure-ta-desyo.   (Maruyama 1996: 74)
          forget-PST-POL.CONJEC
          'You forgot to eat "squid noodles" in Hakodate, didn't you?'

cf.   b. *Hakodate=de   "ika-sômen"=**o**   tabe-ru=no*
          Hakodate=LOC   squid-noodle**=ACC**   eat-NPST=NMLZ
          wasure-ta-desyo.
          forget-PST-POL.CONJEC

Kono tebukuro in (26a) is a topical bare NP, while it is more natural to regard *ika-sômen* in (27a) as a non-topical bare NP, an instance of simple case-marker deletion, according to Maruyama (1996) and my judgement. Since the 'pronominal' in (26a) and the case-marker of the bare NP in (27a) are omitted, they can be restored as in (26b) and (27b)[9].

---

[9] When we restore an omitted 'pronominal' to a sentence with a topical bare NP, the resulting sentence may be less acceptable in the original context than the original sentence. However, this is not necessarily be

More researchers have pointed out functions of a bare NP which are remarkably similar to those of topic-announcing left-dislocated elements. For example, taking the sentence (28a) as an example, where the bare NP is more natural than NPs marked by a case marker or *wa* (28b), Onoe (1996) writes that sentences with no particle convey the impression that the topic (referred by the bare NP) is first cut out from the scene and set up as a topic at the time of utterance. Consider (28a) (cited from Onoe 1996), which would be used in the situation where, for example, the speaker is struggling with a bag of candies that s/he cannot manually open.

(28) a. *Hasami,   ar-u?*   (Onoe 1996)
         scissors   exist-NPST
         'Do you have scissors?'
     b. *Hasami   ?=ga /(?)=wa   ar-u?*
         scissors   NOM/ TOP   exist-NPST

Onoe's view can be interpreted as essentially the same as what is said regarding the topic-announcing function of left-dislocation; that is, the referent of a left-dislocated element has not yet been established as a topic until it is announced by means of a left-dislocation and the matrix clause comments on it. In the same vein, Maruyama (1996: 78) describes the "take-out" function of bare NPs as taking out the referent and setting it out as a topic at the time of utterance, unlike the *wa*-marked topic, which is said to have been established beforehand. We can find similar views in many other studies such as Saegusa (2005: 20) and Kurosaki (2007: 76).

As these structural and functional commonalities have indicated, it is obvious that topical bare NPs are a kind of left-dislocated element with their coreferential pronoun elided. This view has not been proposed before as far as I know. According to Saegusa (2005: 17), researchers have treated topical bare NPs largely in two ways. Some researchers (Kuno 1973: 223[10], for example) regarded bare NPs as a result of the ellipsis of its particle; other researchers, including Saegusa, argued that the zero-marking represents a distinct case. Both views seem not to be free from their respective problems (although they are not too serious). The former particle-ellipsis analysis would have to explain why a sentence with an NP whose marker is omitted carries out the aforementioned discourse pragmatic function that is different from that of a sentence with a case-marked or *wa*-marked NP in place of a topical bare NP. The latter zero-case analysis is extremely uneconomical from a theoretical viewpoint for the following reason. Given that the primary function of cases is to differentiate the arguments of a predicate and to make it clear what semantic and grammatical roles each of them has, this analysis means positing that kind of case[11] which would be always used to mark the arguments that could otherwise be marked by one of the other case-markers without ambiguity. Our view that the case is not assigned to topical bare NPs is, needless to say, free from these problems and economical.

---

problematic, for, given one of the basic assumptions in linguistics, "different forms have different functions," the resultant sentence in a different form from the original may well be suitable for a different context, and unsuitable for the original context.

[10] See also Kuno (1973: 218, note 7), where he mentions the difference between *wa*-marked NPs and bare NPs.

[11] I do not argue that Japanese does not have zero-case at all. See Suzuki (1972: 217–222) for other types of zero-case.

5. Summary and Conclusion

To sum up, the three arguments that have been presented in this paper are the following: (i) the function of left-dislocation is not limited to announcing the topic of the following clause. It can announce not only a topic but also focus. (ii) Since indirect question clauses including an interrogative can be left-dislocated, open propositions represented by such clauses are eligible as a topic, let alone a discourse referent. (iii) Topical bare NPs can be considered left-dislocated elements with their coreferential 'pronominal' ellipted.

In conclusion, I would like to mention that the collaborative relationship between crosslinguistic studies like Lambrecht (2001) and studies of individual languages such as the present paper on Japanese is highly fruitful. As we have seen, findings of crosslinguistic studies on left-dislocation have shed new light on topical bare NPs in Japanese. In the opposite direction, some findings on Japanese left-dislocation, I hope, urge us to reconsider the crosslinguistically valid characterization of the function of left-dislocation, topic, and discourse referents.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations used for glosses in this paper are as follows. 1sg first person singular, 3sgf third person singular female, ACC accusative, ADNOM adnominal, ALL allative, CONJEC conjecture, COP copula, CORD coordinator, DAT dative, DECL declarative, GEN genitive, INST instrumental, LOC locative, MOD modality, NEG negation, NF non-finite, NMLZ nominalizer, NOM nominative, NPST non-past, PLT polite, PST past, Q question, QT quotation, SEP sentence-ending particle, TOP topic.

Sources

Lee, Garnett and Jeff Cannata (hosts) (2011, February 11) *Weekend Confirmed* [audio podcast].
The National Institute for Japanese Language (NIJLA), the Communications Research Laboratory (CRL), and the Tokyo Institute of Technology (TITech) (2004) *The corpus of spontaneous Japanese*.
Ono, Naoyuki (2005) *Seisei goi-imiron* [The generative lexicon]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

References

Gregory, Michelle L. and Laura A. Michaelis (2001) Topicalization and left-dislocation: A functional opposition revisited. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1665–1706.
Kuno, Susumu (1973) *Nihon-bunpô kenkyû* [*Studies in Japanese grammar*]. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
Kurosaki, Satoko (2007) Wadai teizi ni mirareru muzyosi bun no zyôken: Nyûsu midasi o tyûsin to site [The functions of the zero particle in the presentation of subject matters: According to analysis of news headlines]. *Waseda Journal of Japanese Applied Linguistics* 1: 67–80.
Lambrecht, Knud (1994) *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lambrecht, Knud (2001) Dislocation. In: Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterricher and Wolfgang Raible (eds.) *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook*, Vol. 2, 1050–1078. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
Maruyama, Naoko (1995) Hanasi kotoba niokeru muzyosi kakuseibun no kaku [Function of case particle ellipsis]. *Mathematical Linguistics* 19: 365–380.
Maruyama, Naoko (1996) Zyosi no daturaku gensyô [The phenomenon of missing particles]. *Gengo* 25(1): 74–80. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten.
Mikami, Akira (1960) *Zô wa hana ga nagai: Nihon bunpô nyûmon* [*Elephants, their trunk is long: An introduction to Japanese grammar*]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.
Nishiyama, Yuji (2003) *Nihongo meisiku no imiron to goyôron: Sizitekimeisiku to hisizitekimeisiku* [*Semantics and pragmatics of Japanese noun phrases: Referential and non-referential noun phrases*]. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Niwa, Tetsuya (1989) Muzyosi kaku no kinô: Syudai to kaku to gozyun [The function of the particleless case: Topic, case, and word order]. *Kokugo Kokubun* 58(10): 38–57. Kyoto University.

Noda, Hisashi (1996) *"Wa" to "ga"* [*"Wa" and "ga"*]. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Onoe, Keisuke (1996) Syugo ni *wa* mo *ga* mo tukaenai bun ni tuite [On the sentence whose subject can be marked neither *wa* nor *ga*]. Paper presented at the 13th annual meeting of the Japanese Cognitive Science Society Workshop: Nihongo ni okeru zyosi no daturaku o megutte [Concerning the missing of particles in Japanese], Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International, Kyoto, Japan.

Prince, Ellen F. (1984) Topicalization and left-dislocation: A functional analysis. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 433: 213–225.

Prince, Ellen F. (1997) On the functions of left-dislocation in English discourse. In: Akio Kamio (ed.) *Directions in functional linguistics*, 117–143. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Saegusa, Reiko (2005) Muzyosikaku: Sono yôken [Conditions for grammatical case without particles]. *Center for Student Exchange Journal* 8: 17–28. Hitotsubashi University.

Shimojo, Mitsuaki (1995) Focus structure and morphosyntax in Japanese: *Wa* and *ga*, and word order flexibility. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Suzuki, Shigeyuki (1972) *Nihongobunpô: Keitairon* [*Japanese grammar: Morphology*]. Tokyo: Mugi Shobo.

Yamaizumi, Minoru (2008) Kansetu gimon to senpuku gimon ga kyôki suru kôbun: Sono imiron, danwa goyôron, kinôteki tôgoron [A Japanese construction where indirect and concealed questions co-occur: Its semantics, discourse pragmatics and functional syntax]. In: Yuichi Mori, Yoshiki Nishimura, Susumu Yamada and Mitsuaki Yoneyama (eds.) *Kotoba no dainamizumu* [*The dynamism of language*], 223–239. Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Yamaizumi, Minoru (2010) Setu niyoru hihôwa meisi (ku) no paramêta no hozyû [Unsaturated nouns in Japanese: How clauses fill their parameters]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Tokyo.

情報構造理論と日本語の左方転位

山泉　　実

国立国語研究所 言語対照研究系 非常勤研究員 ［–2011.03］

要旨

　　日本語の左方転位構文（文頭への移動などの派生は想定しない）を検討し，3つの主張をした。（I）左方転位構文の通言語的な機能：従来，左方転位句は文の題目をアナウンスすると言われてきたが，日本語・韓国語・英語では焦点をアナウンスすることもできる。（例（誰が一朗を殺した犯人でしたか？）山田次朗，彼［＝焦点］が犯人でした。）（II）情報構造理論：日本語・韓国語では変項を含んだ命題を表す間接疑問節が左方転位され，文の題目をアナウンスできる（例　なぜ帰ったのか，理由は簡単だ。）。従って，それが表わす変項を含んだ命題も題目や discourse referent になれると言える。（III）日本語の題目的な無助詞名詞句と言われているものは指摘されている機能が左方転位句のものと酷似しており，左方転位名詞句で主節内にそれを受ける代名詞がないものだと考えられる。

キーワード：左方転位，情報構造，変項を含む命題，無助詞名詞句