MARRI AMON

Initial and final detachments
in spoken Estonian: a study
in the framework
of Information Structuring

TARTU ÜLIKOOL · UNIVERSITAS TARTUENSIS
1632

MARRI AMON

Initial and final detachments in spoken Estonian: a study in the framework of Information Structuring

University of Tartu, Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics

Dissertation accepted for the commencement of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy on May 13rd, 2015 by the Committee of the Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Tartu

Supervisors: M.M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest, Professor Emerita,
CNRS&Université Paris 3 La Sorbonne Nouvelle

Senior Researcher PhD Liina Lindström, University of Tartu

Opponent: Professor Marja-Liisa Helasvuo, University of Turku, Finland

Commencement: Jakobi 2-438, Tartu, on 26 August 2015 at 11.15.

European Union
European Social Fund

Investing in your future

University of Tartu Press
www.tyk.ee

PREFACE

As my thesis took quite a long time to prepare, with a few interruptions along the way, I would like to express my gratitude to all the people whom my life has brought me in contact with during this period, both in academia and in other spheres of life, and who have supported and encouraged me in various ways, if even simply by showing interest in how my work was progressing.

To begin with, I'd like to thank my thesis supervisors. Professor M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest was readily willing to help me when my work adopted a different perspective and I needed an alternate viewpoint in order to find a clearer path by which to approach my thesis topic. As my first specialty is French philology, this gave me an opportunity to deepen my knowledge of French linguistics, in which M.M.J. Fernandez-Vest's assistance was inestimable. I am also thankful for the opportunity to participate in her doctoral seminar at the University of Paris III: Sorbonne Nouvelle and in several international colloquia which she organized. Her clear ideas and capacity for work have served as a great example for me. My other supervisor was PhD Liina Lindström of the University of Tartu, who helped me tremendously with questions related to Estonian and who always found time to discuss my problems and provide thorough comments and suggestions. My heartfelt thanks to them both.

In addition to my supervisors, I have received great support from the researchers at the Department of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics at the University of Tartu, primarily from professor emeritus Ago Künnap, with whom this whole adventure began. I would also like to thank professors Renate and Karl Pajusalu for their constant good-hearted support, as well as professor Helle Metslang, who gave me an excellent idea at a most appropriate time and who has continually supported and encouraged me, and docent Külli Habicht, who has provided friendly support.

In working with the University of Tartu's corpus of spoken language, I received valuable assistance from researcher Olga Gerassimenko and PhD Tiit Hennoste; researcher Pärtel Lippus aided me in using the phonetic corpus, and senior researcher Eva-Liina Asu-Garcia helped to clarify a number of complicated phonetics-related questions for me. My correspondence with researcher Nele Salveste also helped me to put my thoughts in order.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the participants in the morphosyntax working team seminar organised by Helle Metslang for their thorough and extraordinarily supportive examination of certain parts of my thesis, which was a great help to me.

Various exchanges of ideas with the French-Estonian working team in the G.F. Parrot joint programme have helped me to improve the focus of my work. I am grateful to my colleagues from the Department of Romance Studies, Anu Treikelder and Marge Käsper, for the inspiring discussions we have had on a number of other problematic linguistic topics.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations used in interlinear glossing

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ADE	adessive
ADV	adverb
ALL	allative
APP	active past participle
COM	comitative
COMP	comparative
COND	conditional
DEM	demonstrative
INF	infinitive
ELA	elative
ESS	essive
GEN	genitive
ILL	illative
IMP	imperative
IMPS	impersonal voice
INE	inessive
INF2	supine
NEG	negative form
NOM	nominative
PART	partitive
pl	plural
PPP	passive past participle
PREP	preposition
PRTCL	particle
PST	past simple
Q	question marker/particle
sg	singular
SUP	superlative
TERM	terminative
TRL	translative

1. INTRODUCTION

The object of the present thesis is to analyse from the point of view of Information Structuring (IS), based on data of spoken Estonian and from a textual (discourse) perspective, two types of constructions, initial and final detachments, which are argued as being universal constructions in spontaneous oral language.

Depending on the approach, these constructions are generally known as left or initial /right or final detachments or dislocations.

Example of initial detachment:

(1)
My wife, I think I'll keep **her**.
(commercial for a food supplement)

Example of final detachment:

(2)
Ils sont fous, **ces Romains**.
'**They** are crazy, **these Romans**.'
(Sempé & Goscinny)

The investigation takes as point of departure the fact that these above-mentioned, quite well delimited structures that occur mostly in oral language, have often been related to notions described at the level of Information Structuring in discourse: Theme (Topic) and Post-Rheme (Tail, Mneme). Another fact that triggered the current investigation is that first of all, the IS as a separate level of analysis has not received much attention in Estonian linguistics until now and second, detached constructions as such have not generated any interest in researchers who work with Estonian data.

This level of analysis (Information Structuring) is considered as being distinct from morphosyntactic and semantic analysis, following the principles proposed by the Prague school researchers and also later in other studies (Enkvist, Fernandez-Vest, Combettes). The examples come mostly from spoken Estonian, but since the studied phenomena have been described as constant in spontaneous oral speech, some examples from other Finno-Ugric or Indo-European languages have also been included in this study. However, the other language groups are left outside the scope of this study.

This particular background (Information Structuring framework) has been chosen for the following reasons: firstly, at the Information Structuring level it is possible to observe and explain many phenomena that are not discussed in academic grammars and in accounts of written language, i.e. some of the main features of oral language can be best analysed at this level which is anyway present in all linguistic activities and language use, but presents a special

challenge in relation to oral language; in written texts the information packaging mechanisms are relatively more simple to track, compared to spontaneous oral ones. The investigation of detachment constructions as mostly oral structures in Estonian could increase our knowledge about different phenomena observable in real communication, such as the introduction and persistence of referents in discourse and the means that are used for this purpose, the devices of Information Structuring at discourse level (beyond one utterance), the role of discourse particles etc. These constructions are relatively frequent in oral speech in Estonian and can be thus described by their different functions, but until now they have not been discussed in detail in syntactic accounts about Estonian, probably because they are considered as still being marginal or not yet 'grammaticalized'. Secondly, on the basis of methodological and theoretical considerations it seemed inevitable to give priority to a textual or discourse-based approach, i.e. not to study isolated utterances. Oral communication is always linked to a co-text and to a context and this aspect has been taken into account as much as possible. As IS is considered as being prior to the morphosyntactic level (but the sense is built up in the combination of the two), it seems plausible to opt for an approach which takes into consideration the discourse as it occurs: I consider that when the study of Information Structuring phenomena is only limited to the sentence (which is still the case in many works), it does not show the complexity and the functioning of natural speech. And thirdly, since the studies about oral Estonian are more often linked to the tradition of Conversation Analysis, it seemed challenging to adopt a different approach which has not yet been applied as such to Estonian discourse data. However, as IS does not consist of a research method, the analysis takes place in a more loose framework compared, for example, to CA. This consideration is complemented by the fact that the domain of Information Structuring is very complex and somewhat overexploited, so that some researchers have asked me: what exactly is Theme? Or is it really possible to study Information Structuring and what is the value added of such an approach compared to other levels of investigation? One of the objectives of this study is also to look for an answer to these questions. Nevertheless, it should be underlined that Information Structuring cannot be investigated in a totally isolated way: in communication, syntactical, pragmatic and informational levels are intertwined; consequently, although most of the attention is given to the analysis of detachment constructions using the notions and principles from the Information Structuring framework, adapted for the needs of the present analysis, other relevant approaches will not be completely left aside. Where appropriate, we also refer to some studies of Conversation Analysis, which itself also makes use of informational criteria and depending on different approaches tends to consider these two levels as complementary, and other studies such as sentence-based analyses etc.

The main investigation questions of this thesis are the following:

- Which are the main formal and functional properties of typical detachment constructions (initial and final detachments) in spoken Estonian?
- How do they participate in the Information Structuring process at the discourse level?
- Is it possible to identify linguistic markers that typically occur between different informational constituents (i.e. on the boundaries of detachment constructions and main clauses)?
- How can the informational status of the referent of detachment constructions (introduction of a Theme, re-introduction of a referent, the persistence of this constituent in following utterances, its role on discourse level as a device assuring coherence in discourse) be described?
- As a universal structure in spoken language, can the detachment construction in Estonian be compared in its functions and characteristics to corresponding constructions in Indo-European languages such as French or English?
- Finally and more generally, what do detachment constructions do in spoken Estonian, what is their role in discourse? To what extent can they be described as conventionalized constructions in Estonian?

1.1. Overview of the thesis

This study is structured in the following way: chapter 1 presents the structure of the thesis, the corpus used for the analysis and its transcription symbols.

Chapter 2 proposes a short introduction into the Information Structuring framework and deals with terminological questions and the level of investigation chosen for the present study; the questions associated to categories of the Information Structuring framework within some general approaches are also addressed in this chapter.

Chapter 3 gives a brief historical overview, mentioning the most influential authors and schools, especially those whose works led to the precursors of the modern approach to Information Structuring. After this insight this chapter deals more in detail with Information Structuring approaches inspired by the Prague school and discusses some central problems and notions regarding the studies at discourse level: text (discourse) level versus sentence-based approaches, special features of oral language compared to written texts (first of all, IS was studied in written texts, whereas today oral corpuses are widely used), questions linked to word order and prosody.

In chapter 4 the works of Estonian linguists who have used IS notions are presented; these studies are not to be associated with the approach chosen in the present thesis, which is different. However, it was considered that this overview is necessary in order to show different approaches that can be developed regarding the same set of notions and the problems this can possibly generate when it comes to trying to make a synthesis of them.

In chapter 5 the categories of Theme and Mneme (Post-Rheme, Tail) are presented in the framework of Information Structuring: these are the informational constituents which are generally associated with initial and final detachments in language.

Chapter 6 delineates the general properties of detached constructions: their formal properties, semantic, rhetorical and stylistic effects and their frequency. Some examples found in written texts in Estonian are also discussed.

Chapter 7 is dedicated to initial detachments constructions, based on the examples of corpus. The examples are divided into three groups: initial detachments introducing a complex element (mostly detached constituents modified by relative clauses), management of the referents in the immediate discourse environment and management of the referents in larger discoursive environment. Some other aspects revealed by the analysis are also discussed, such as the persistence of the referents in discourse, the nature of anaphoric pronouns used, and the marking of the boundaries between informational constituents.

Chapters 8 deals with final detachments. At first, aside from the general properties, some specific questions linked to this construction are addressed, such as the distinction of afterthoughts and the different viewpoints concerning their functions in discourse.

Chapter 9 brings forward the main conclusions of the current thesis and draws some perspectives for future research.

1.2. Description of the corpus

The corpus used in this thesis is constituted of three main sources: firstly, the transcriptions and recordings of the corpus of oral language of Tartu University and secondly, two interviews stored at the Estonian Literary Museum, of 45 minutes each, transcribed by the author and the phonetic corpus of Tartu University. With the permission of the authors of the Tartu University corpus, I have to some extent modified their transcription, in order to make the text more easily accessible (the marking of word stress has been unified and some paralinguistic markers have been left out) and I have also used the same transcription principles and symbols for the other two resources. The transcription symbols are given at the end of this chapter.

In this chapter I give a short overview of my corpus.

1. The linguistic corpus of Tartu University (corpus of oral language)
This corpus was initiated in 1997 and is the main corpus of oral Estonian. The corpus is collected under the direction of Tiit Hennoste (for details of the corpus see Hennoste 2000, 2003); the collection work is done in the oral speech work group (http://www.cl.ut.ee/suuline/), but also students have participated in recording and transcription. Today it contains about 1,7 mln transcribed words. It has been created as a universal open corpus, i.e. there are no limits concerning

the volume or the text types included. These cover variable situations from spontaneous conversations to institutional dialogues. It is possible to research word forms and variants using a special software. The corpus items are classified and coded according to the following criteria: everyday/institutional communication; dialogues and monologues; direct / phone / media communication. Due to its open nature, the corpus is not totally balanced with regards to the speakers and their background: the persons recorded are mostly inhabitants of Tartu, Tallinn or Pärnu and there are more female, educated and younger speakers.

The transcription is based on G. Jefferson's transcription principles. Over time, some symbols used by the Tartu work group have changed (for example, the marking of word stress); regardless of these differences, I used a unified and somewhat simplified transcription (see symbols and principles below) which does not use all of the symbols used in the original transcriptions.

From the Tartu University corpus I have mainly used everyday conversations and institutional dialogues (mostly information requests by phone, but also dialogues between a client and a service provider or salesperson).

The text types range from conversations with longer turns and developments to dialogues with quite rapid exchanges of questions and answers. Information requests in institutional dialogues, where the conversation takes place in a certain thematic framework with many derived themes, constitute a specific subtype.

The total number of words in texts used for analysis is 20 200.

The length of the transcribed corpus texts ranges from 20 words to 2000 (2500) words, the average being around 630 words.

2. Two recordings from the Estonian Literary Museum

The second item in my corpus comes from the Estonian Literary Museum and it contains two different recordings of 45 minutes each. These are two clearly limited communication situations, but quite different from each other.

The first recording is a directed interview with an eminent Estonian journalist, Juhan Peegel. The person who conducts the interview is familiar to him, they originate from the same county (island of Saaremaa) and are from the same generation (they were young adults when WWII broke out). A third person is also present, but she does not intervene much. They speak mostly about past events (before and during WWII), about their common acquaintances and about some universal philosophical or humanist problems. The communication seems relatively spontaneous, but one of the speakers at least is used to performing in public in an academic context; also, probably due to the choice of topics, the language used is somewhat literary and formal.

The second interview is conducted by Rutt Hinrikus with a former inmate of a famous prison in Tallinn, the Patarei prison, and the discussion is about that prison and the period of WWII and shortly after when the interviewee had to find a residence, an occupation and at the same time conceal his past in order to

avoid persecution. The text is rather of a monologic type; the interviewer needs to ask only a few directive questions. The language use is quite specific: the speaker speaks very rapidly, has many truncated constructions, repairs, but very few pauses. He seems to have a South Estonian background (his mother living in Tartu), but he does not have specific dialectal features in his speech, besides the use of distal demonstrative *too*.

3. Phonetic Corpus of Estonian Spontaneous Speech
(http://www.keel.ut.ee/et/foneetikakorpus)
The phonetic corpus of Estonian Spontaneous Speech is an ongoing project composed of high-quality recordings of non-guided discussions and semi-institutional monologues which are segmented phonetically on different levels. It has a web-based search engine.

The recordings are done mostly in studio. In order to add spontaneity to the situation, the speakers recorded are familiar with each other and the duration of each recording is usually 30 minutes, so that the speakers have time to get used to the situation. Each speaker is recorded on a different channel. There is one person who directs the conversation, but also participates to it. The participants are of different ages, gender balance is been observed and the objective was to find speakers from different regional and social backgrounds.

The corpus contains 67 hours of segmented recordings (17.09.2014). This corpus, however, does not include conversations that can be considered spontaneous *impromptu* speech.

The segmentation and annotation are done with Praat (www.praat.org). In segmentation the following tiers are used:
- phonetic and linguistic tiers: words (in orthographic spelling), speech sounds, sound structures, syllables (short – long, open – closed), feet, utterances;
- dialogue units: turns and pauses;
- fillers;
- changes in voice quality (e.g. creaky breathy voice, whisper);
- paralinguistic phenomena (e.g. expiration and inspiration, sighing, yawning, sneezing, coughing etc.);
- emotional states (e.g. laugher, weeping, whimper);
- other tiers (e.g. smacking with lips or tongue).

The transcription of examples according to the same principles used in the aforementioned corpora has been done by the author.

Besides these corpuses a few written sources are also used: web resources, newspapers, some fictional novels etc. The references to the published books are given at the end of the thesis, the reference to the newspaper citation is given in the text.

In the text, the examples of different corpuses bear the following coding:
OCTU – Tartu University corpus of spontaneous oral speech
PCTU – Tartu University phonetic corpus

LM1 – Literary Museum, interview with Juhan Peegel
LM2 – Literary Museum, interview with a former prisoner

The examples are glossed and translated; morphology-based glossing rules of Leipzig are used for interlinear glossing (http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/ resources/glossing-rules.php). The glossing is used for utterances that contain an example of the detachment construction under investigation; if a longer sequence is provided for a better readability, the remaining utterances are only translated.

1.2.1. Criteria used for compiling the examples

Due to the limits of the present study and with the aim of thoroughly analysing an adequate amount of examples, I had to select which constructions to include in the analysis: the preliminary analysis was done on 230 examples (115 representing initial detachments and 115 representing final detachments), from which a number of examples were extracted for the discussion. As will be explained below in two following subchapters, the final number of examples discussed and the principles used in classifying them are somewhat unequal for the two categories, but this difference was ultimately considered acceptable in a qualitative study such as the present thesis. Notwithstanding the differences in the distribution of examples in both categories (initial and final detachments), the discussion will be structured in a way that allows for general conclusions to be drawn, based on the research questions formulated at the beginning of the thesis. The process of selection remains nevertheless subjective, but the examples were selected to be as representative as possible: first of all, a general (typical) pattern was identified that allowed the creation of subcategories of initial and final detachments respectively. The examples were also intended to demonstrate the observed variability in all examples: in all categories, the most frequent types (from a formal point of view) are most represented and some less frequent examples are included on the condition that they are not unique occurrences, but seem to represent a less frequent type.

In addition to the examples from the oral corpus, 13 examples from different written sources are discussed in the study, mostly representing initial detachments.

1.2.1.1. Examples of initial detachments

Compared to final detachments, initial detachments form a more homogeneous category in the sense that there are fewer difficulties in identifying these constructions as such: the examples are easier to define and delimit using formal criteria; however, the classification inside the category remains controversial as the criteria to be taken into account have in all cases some

problematic aspects and the internal complexity of detached elements seems to be greater than in final detachments.

The choice of examples to discuss was made on the basis of 115 examples, from which 35 were selected and divided into 3 groups.

The classification principles can vary according to the perspective adopted, but in the case of initial detachments it seemed justified to first create a category of examples with a relative clause modifying the detached element (or more generally, the complex detached element), secondly to separately analyse a category of examples where the detached element seems to play a clear role in the structuring of the discourse, and thirdly, analyse the examples where typically the detached element serves to extract an item from a set or occurs as a contrast in a situation of competing referents; this also includes examples where the whole construction contributes to a specification of a referent, by repairs or other means.

Examples have been included in this analysis of initial detachments which contain a lexical element, pronoun or proper noun as a detached element, followed by the main clause, but the biggest group is formed by utterances containing a detached full NP.

At this stage, I tried to find the proper balance by excluding examples whose most important characteristics in the light of my investigation occurred only once or twice in the corpus. Of course, with a larger corpus and a quantitative analysis this distribution could be somewhat modified, but some general principles should remain (in similar types of corpora), for example the fact that lexical elements are far more frequent in a detached position as pronouns or names and that certain grammatical cases (nominative, partitive) occur more often in main clauses.

The following table shows some characteristics and statistics of the examples of initial detachments discussed in the present thesis:

Table 1

Initial detachments	Total occurrences in corpus	Occurrences discussed in detail
Complex detached element (relative clause)	45, of which 12 are detached pronouns (39%)	13
Extraction of a referent (adjustment, contrast)	58 (50%)	18
Resumption of a sequence, other textual functions	12 (11%)	7
Total	115 (100%)	38

We considered that the so-called 'accessibility' or the status of the referent in the discourse cannot be used as a general criterion in order to classify the examples in a systematic way due to the variable interpretation of this

property – there is a continuum rather than clear-cut limits between different cases. Therefore, it was decided to use one formal criterion (the complexity of the detached element, relative clause) and textual criteria related to the reference (extraction of one element from a set or contrast between several items and resumption of a sequence by using a detachment construction).
Of the 36 examples, 11 occur in interrogative utterances.

1.2.1.2. Examples of final detachments

The choice of examples to discuss was made on the basis of 115 examples, from which 29 were selected and divided into 3 groups for a more detailed analysis.

Table 2

Final detachments	Total occurrences in corpus	Occurrences analysed in detail
Generalisation, resumption of a sequence	22 (19%)	7
Referent present in discourse framework	59 (51%)	14
Discourse in elaboration	34 (30%)	8
Total	115 (100%)	29

The question of representativity is somewhat different in the case of final detachments: as the interpretation of the "right periphery" is more complicated due to the "openness" of this construction (the detached element does not necessarily mark the end of the utterance), it was decided to discuss these more ambiguous examples in one group ("discourse in elaboration") where most of the examples represent cases of different repair constructions. The total number of examples discussed is slightly smaller than in the case of initial detachments, firstly because of recurrent patterns in many unambiguous examples (i.e. the most typical examples do not show great variability, which is why the biggest category is represented with a smaller proportion of examples discussed in detail) and secondly due to a number of examples that are not in the focus of the present study. This mostly concerns examples that merit a separate analysis, with different types of borderline cases where prosodic criteria likely play a more important role; that is why the cases of "discourse in elaboration" are less represented relative to their overall number in the corpus.
    Of the 29 examples, 7 occur in interrogative utterances.

1.3. Transcription symbols

The transcription is somewhat simplified for better readability as described in previous section; most of the transcribed material from the Tartu corpus is annotated according to the Jefferson transcription rules. With the permission of the administrators of the corpus, this transcription has been adapted for the needs of the present thesis: since quite long extracts need to be presented in the text, some symbols and information have been deleted from the transcriptions in order to offer better lisibility.

bold	the elements under investigation
[ ]	overlapping talk
'	stress or emphasis
=	latching between words/utterances
(0.5)	pause length in tenth of second
(.)	micropause
(( ))	transcriber's comments
-	truncation, cut-off of a word
< …>	slower delivery
> … <	more rapid delivery
AHA	louder speech
te:re	lengthening of the sound
@ ... @	change of voice quality
$ ... $	laughing intonation
.hh	audible exhalation
{-}	unclear word
{---}	unclear paragraph

2. INFORMATION STRUCTURING: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

As detachment constructions are closely linked to the IS categories, it will be necessary to make an overview about the main problems of this level of description of language for the following reasons: 1. IS is considered here as a separate level of analysis; as such, it has not been applied to Estonian data; 2. IS as a framework, level of analysis or simply a tool for explaining various phenomena at the syntactic as well as discourse level, has been used in so many approaches that a summarising review is necessary in order to make more explicit the approach chosen here and the advantages and possible limitations of such an approach.

This chapter will introduce the general problematics of the IS framework as it will be approached in the present study: first will be given an overview of some relevant questions concerning the level of analysis, the terminology and methodology used in different frameworks, followed by a brief insight into some generalizing studies concerning this domain. The need for such a preliminary view becomes even more obvious when one looks at the different notions and oppositions that are used and defined in relation to the terms of IS: theme/rheme, topic/comment, topic/focus, presupposition/focus, antitopic or mneme as a third constituent, to mention the most frequent ones, that have also being combined with each other by researchers who sometimes feel the need to suggest new definitions because the problems and confusion related to previous ones have not been dissipated. Due to the absence of a direct link with any formal linguistic category, the definitions of all these notions have often been critizised as being too intuitive, circular and not univocal. Different approaches have indeed related these notions to virtually all levels of linguistic description, as argued by Gómez-González (2001: 9–10):

1. Phonology: the intonation patterns of a tone group have been cited as criterial for thematic/topical status;
2. Morphology: thematic/topical status has been said to be demarcated by inflections or particles;
3. Syntax: clause organization has been described as affected by thematic/topical factors;
4. Lexicon: it has been hypothesised that thematic/topicality relations influence the organization of and access to entries in a lexicon;
5. Semantics: the categories of Theme and Topic invoke some meaning, or function/purpose;
6. Pragmatics, or the textual level: the labels 'Theme' and 'Topic' have been related to the discourse co(n)text.

The term Information Structuring has not been used as long as some of the above-mentioned oppositions: in the present framework, it should be understood as a set of notions that is used to describe how, in a dynamic process

of communication, the distribution of information is performed. Having said that, the term 'information' can also have different interpretations: here, information refers to the way by which the entities that the message is about – the core of the message and possible adjunctions to it – are introduced, assuming that the speaker needs to convey this information in a certain way that makes the processing and interpreting of the message possible in a most unambiguous manner. The second part of this term, 'structuring' also needs some clarification; more often, the term 'information structure' has been used, but, according to Fernandez-Vest 2009: 198, the term 'structuring' underlines better the dynamic nature of the process in question: it is not a fixed structure, like the abstractions of structuralists, but a dynamic process where the terms are defined one in relation to another, subject to a re-evaluation during the process, and not in absolute terms. That is why the approach in this study is a discourse-based (or textual[1]) approach: it is considered that the phenomena of IS should be observed on a larger scale than within a sentence in order to describe it functioning in the discourse dynamics. Moreover, in authentic oral speech, it is very difficult to define in advance the relevant unit that is taken as the basis of the analysis, as the sentence as defined in written language can not be analysed as such in oral corpuses, where numerous constructions that are typical to oral language do not allow a traditional morphosyntactic analysis to be applied to the discourse units. The differences between text and sentence-based approaches as well as between written and oral language will be discussed further. However, the sentence-based analyses have given an important contribution to the field of IS; we could mention, for example, the works of Lambrecht (1994), who limits his analysis to the sentence within its context.

The methodological approach chosen in this study is thus the following: after a preliminary analysis on a larger corpus, a detailed analysis is done on examples extracted according to the principles laid out in chapter 1.2.1, taking into account the textual dimension, i.e. by looking at the management of the referents of the detached construction in a textual framework, with the aim of identifying different factors that may influence the use of this construction. To that end, special attention is paid to the status of the referent and its relations with other referents in the ongoing discourse, the complexity of the detachment construction and more generally, by what means it contributes to the process of discourse construction in oral communication.

The notions that are used to describe IS have been developed in very different frameworks, which is why each researcher has to set a backround very carefully before presenting the study itself; aside from the fact that the terms and notions

---

[1]   The disdvantage of the term 'textual' is that it refers essentially to a written text; even if the examples are mainly in written form (transcription), the oral speech is considered here as being primary, so that the term 'textual' can be used only with some reservations. On the other hand, the term 'discourse' can be easily associated to a narrower framework of Discourse Analysis, which is not the approach adopted here and thus is not perfect either.

have been used to describe elements that are not linked to IS studies *sensu stricto*, in many studies IS is regarded as a different level of linguistic analysis.

2.1. The state of the issue: problems and criticisms

The following sub-chapters will give a short and not exhaustive overview of some crucial problems linked to IS, i.e. the terminological questions, the link between form and function and the level of analysis. The first set of problems, related to the terms and their scope, has been deliberately reduced: there exists quite an important literature on this subject and it would not give any added value if one compiles once again all the contradictions and gaps in existing studies. As observed by A. Grobet (2002), who makes a distinction between two types of methodological approaches (on the one hand, discussion and criticisms of existing terms, and on the other, concepts and discussions of examples on the background of different models), the second approach can lead to a more constructive analysis with a discussion about the possible application of the models and allows the advantages of each model to be brought about (Grobet 2002: 17–19). It goes without saying that critical assessment can also prove useful in some stages, but we consider here that pure criticism without any discussion of examples does not further the problems in this field.

By the same token, it will also be suggested that any critical evaluation should lead to a more positive approach by adopting a more rigorous framework and by defining the scope of the used terms.

2.1.1. Terminological questions

The notions used in relation to this problematics have been used or are still being used in so many different studies and frameworks that they seem to be familiar to almost everyone, but different researchers fail to reach a consensus about the real scope of these notions. However this very general 'recognition' of these terms also causes many problems of understanding between researchers who, for a very long time, have been deploring the confusion about the notions that are referred to by different researchers who give them sometimes completely opposite interpretations. As pointed out by Mondada (1994: 27), one of the difficulties in this domain comes from the evolution of the observation of linguistic data: firstly, the notions of Topic (Theme) has been developed in the framework of a linguistics that dealt with sentence, then with utterance, and following that it became clear that analysing these phenomena in natural oral speech, especially in longer excerpts, is much more complicated than dealing with sentences.

I have extracted some information from a general synthetic table by Gómez-González (2001: 6–7) in order to demonstrate that the scope and the repartition of the terms that have been used by different researchers do not coincide in

most cases (the choice was made in order to make reference mainly to the authors that are mentioned in the current thesis); the definitional criteria and oppositions are divergent as well. I have not inserted more recent references to this table, as it is given for demonstration purpose only, and is not provided as exhaustive information about recent works in the domain.

Table 3

Types of terms	Terms used	References
Gradient terms	Given/Known/Salient Vs New/Unknown Non-salient information	Chafe (1976, 1987, 1994), Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), Givón (1988, 1992), Gundel et al. (1993)
	Bound vs Free (information)	Firbas (1964, 1974, 1992)
Bipolar terms	Dynamic vs less Dynamic Theme (vs Rheme, Focus, Tail)	Travniček (1937, 1961, 1962), Mathesius (1939, 1961), Firbas (1964), Dik (1978, 1997), Lutz (1981)
	Topic (vs Comment/Focus)	Hockett (1958), Gundel (1985, 1988b), Li & Thompson (1976), Keenan & Schieffelin (1976)
Bi-functional terms	Ground/Links/Centre(ing) vs Figure/Focus Theme/Topic/Ground (Rheme/Comment/Figure) vs Focus/Emphasis	Kuno (1969, 1976), Halliday (1967a, b), Gundel (1985, 1988b), Dik (1997), Lambrecht (1987a, 1994)
Related (psycho)logical terms	Presupposition vs Focus/assertion	Fillmore (1968), Kuno (1976), Dik (1978, 1997), Ulrich (1985), Sasse (1987)

When moving from one linguistic area or tradition to another, the problems of transposition and translation of terms cannot be neglected. In the present study, as well as works published in English, studies in French will also be taken into account. However, the focus will not be on translation problems, but rather on the respective contributions of complementary studies or innovative approaches that are useful in the present framework. In the French-speaking tradition, even if the study of H. Weil (1844) did not meet a great response in his con-temporaries' works, the same cannot be said about Ch. Bally (1944), whose syntactical account had important repercussions and made the respective terms (*thème, propos*) familiar to a larger circle of (mostly) French-speaking scholars before the works of the Prague school were made available in English. The Prague school linguists took over the terms *Theme* and *Rheme* coined by Ammann in 1928 (Thema/Rhema), whereas the distinction used later mainly by American linguists *topic/comment* comes from Hockett (1958: 201). After that,

from the 1960s, the English-speaking community (which does not, of course, claim univocally their descendence from the Prague school) developed multiple approaches, as did the French-speaking tradition by maintaining the previous terms (Weil, Bally), sometimes by combining them with the terms which are mostly used in the English-speaking community. That is one of the reasons why one part of the studies published in French have been dedicated to the terminological questions, for example Galmiche 1992, Prévost 1998, Kleiber 1992, Fradin & Cadiot 1988 – which are useful for attempting a general overview.

An important distinction that will be clarified later is to be made at the outset of the present study: it concerns the distinction made between two main approaches of IS problematics: firstly, the textualist approach developed by Daneš, Firbas, Enkvist, Fernandez-Vest, Combettes, Grobet etc, and approaches that are more or less dealing with clause and sentence level (Lambrecht). In some cases these approaches can be complementary.

In the present study the accent is on the discourse-based approach that allows, in my view, to better encompass different phenomena that characterize the oral speech. The oral language can not be investigated as a linear process with a left side, a medium and a right side – rather, it is a dynamic network of references which are linked together in a communication process which takes into account previous exchanges, i.e. looks back and forward at the same time, as the discourse is constructed in a real-time exchange.

Not all constituents of IS have received equal attention: the most controversial is the notion of Theme or Topic, which has been most frequently evoked and has also the most divergent definitions. This interest has been explained already by Daneš (1974: 13):

> It is obviously not by chance that the studies of FSP [Functional Sentence Perspective] predominantly concern the problems of theme (and not those of rheme – cf. the frequent term 'thematization' and the rarely used term 'rhematization'), in spite of the fact that it is just the rheme that represents the core of the utterance (the message proper) and 'pushes the communication forward' (Firbas): from the point of view of text organization, it is the theme that plays an important constructional role.

One set of problems that are evoked often when dealing with IS and its components, is quite well résuméd by Maslova & Bernini (2006: 69):

> The genuine problem with identification of topic-encoding constructions – and more generally, with the hypothesis of existence of topic in general – is /.../ that there are obviously no topics in the 'real world'. The topic status – assuming it indeed exists – is a language-internal, or, in slightly more cautious wording, mind-internal phenomenon without obvious counterparts in the perceived reality.

They give the example of the category of time, which is part of our experience of the world and therefore does not pose problems when even language-internal

or cross-linguistic variation is very important. If we consider the category of definiteness/indefiniteness, for example, some similarities can be found: definiteness does not have a direct link to our perception of the world, but rather it can be described as a category of structuring the objects by our experience of the world (if not grammaticalized). In some languages, definiteness is grammaticalized. The same can be argued about topichood: in some languages, so called topic-prominent languages, this category has dedicated markers.

Another set of studies focuses on criticisms about a particular characteristic of this domain: different needs and approaches have generated an exceptionally large number of terms and oppositions between them, so that it is quite difficult to find another domain where the proliferation of different notions is as big as here. In consequence, it is not surprising that many analysts deplore this situation where the notions used seem to be extremely polysemic, whereas it is the contrary that should be attempted in scientific reasearches.

2.1.2. The level and the scope of the analysis

The distinction of different levels in linguistics has become more widespread following the works of the Prague school, since then it is generally admitted that information packaging (Functional Sentence Perspective in their terminology) is a set of phenomena that should be analysed independently of other levels (grammar/syntax and semantics), as states Firbas (1971: 241):

> Following F. Daneš, we maintain that the function of the sentence in the act of communication can be successfully interpreted if three levels are kept separate: those of semantic and the grammatical structure of the sentence and that of FSP. As we see it, the theory of FSP makes it possible to understand how the semantic and the grammatical structure of the sentence function in the very act of communication, i.e. at the moment they are called upon to convey some extra-lingual reality reflected by thought and are to appear in an adequate kind of perspective.

However, Prague school researchers are not the first ones to have introduced this distinction. Back in the 1940s, Ch. Morris, influenced by the theory of the sign by Ch.S.Peirce, distinguished in his theory of semiotics three fundamental levels: syntax, semantics and pragmatics, where syntax is defined as the study of "the formal relations of signs to one another", semantics as the study of "the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable", and pragmatics as the study of "the relation of signs to interpreters" (Morris 1938: 6).

This principle is followed inexplicitly in a great number of works. One example is C. Hagège, who maintains in the same vein that utterances produced in language are structured on three points of view (*point de vue*): morpho-syntactic, semantic-referential and enunciative-hierarchic (1984: 349–351), the latter configures the structuring of information in language (he uses the notions of *theme* and *rheme*). The author underlines the complementarity of these two

terms when they are applied to linguistic phenomena: they can only be defined with reference to one another and he describes this process in language as a dynamic one where, for example, the structure theme-rheme can become a theme for the next rheme (*ibidem*: 376).

The fact that this distinction has not been used consistently is related to the development of different frameworks that use the same IS notions and it is often admitted that IS cannot be reduced to one formal characteristic but is to be searched on several levels. This approach characterizes, for example, the studies concerning Estonian language where IS has not been considered as an independent level of analysis.

This can be linked to a more general problem of correlations between linguistic forms and their functions. Mondada, who opposes on the one hand functionalists (conceptual approach) and on the other, formalists, suggests that these two approaches should be complementary, but they very rarely are:

> *…les tenants de l'approche conceptuelle constatent qu'un grand nombre de formes est susceptible de marquer la nouveauté ou l'ancienneté, etc., alors que les tenants de l'approche formelle constatent que les marques qu'ils observent peuvent avoir un grand nombre de fonctions et significations différentes, parfois même contradictoires. S'il y a consensus quant à la non correspondance biunivoque entre les formes et les fonctions, tout le reste est sujet à dissension.* (Mondada 1994: 31) [2]

Beyond the fact that Mondada suggests abandoning completely the term 'topic' (see her critics in Mondada 1994), one can follow her argumentation by admitting that this point needs to be clarified in every research that deals with a category that cannot be easily matched with only a few formal markers.

Lambrecht, for example, puts forward a definition that deliberately leaves some flexibility, in a domain that he calls 'syntax', though:

> I see my own research as located somewhere in between the 'formal' and the 'functional' approaches to syntax. I do not believe that linguistic form can be exhaustively accounted for in terms of its communicative function in discourse. /.../ As I said before, this book is based on the assumption that there are aspects of grammatical form which require pragmatic explanations. (Lambrecht 1994:11)

To explain different phenomena, the studies which deal with communicative categories in general almost always use some kind of functionalist approach

---

[2]   'the backers of the conceptual approach note that an important amount of forms can mark the newness or the oldness etc, whereas the backers of the formal approach note that the markers they observe can have many different, sometimes even contradictory functions and significations. If there is a consensus regarding the non-biunivocal correspondence between forms and functions, all the remaining is subject for discussion.' (here and below, the citation translated from French into English by the author)

which can be quite different in its scope depending on the theoretical background of the researcher. The term 'function' should be understood in the context of textual categories of discourse organization and includes functional accounts of such questions as narrative structure, cohesion and other markers of textuality.

The functionalist approach does not imply that the formal/grammatical aspect is to be totally neglected; different researchers have linked, for example, Theme or Topic to different grammatical devices such as Zero anaphora, clitic pronouns, unstressed pronouns, left/initial detachment, definite NP etc. According to Gómez González (2001), the difference comes from the perspective adopted: the form-to-function approach presumes the existence of a formal expression in any cases where these categories are looked for, whereas the function-to-form approach consider Theme/Topic as being universal communicative categories, which means that any message is construed from this perspective, having no regard to its formal realization (*ibidem*: 13).

In this framework the present work is located more closely to the moderate 'functional' approach, however bearing in mind that if the pragmatical level has a priority over the morphosyntactical level, both of them are important in the construction of discourse. Pragmatic level has also been postulated as being universal, whereas the morphosyntactic level determines restrictions that are language-specific, but the sense is produced as a result of the interaction of these two levels (Fernandez-Vest 1994: 197).

The difficulties of definition and conciliation of different approaches have been pointed out by almost all authors who deal with these problematics; quite often, in order to avoid worsening the confusion in terminology, researchers explicitly limit themselves to one narrow definition or to one authors' study when setting the framework of their study.

It is also possible to make a less usual distinction between, on the one hand researches that are based on a work on a specific corpus, and on the other hand works that are more centred on a theoretical approach, which try to explain, for example, the relations between different sets of notions and different theories, but do not use many examples of corpora, or if the do, they only serve the purposes of demonstration. As for the Estonian data, we consider that spoken Estonian has not yet been studied from so many different perspectives, so that investigating phenomena from oral corpora as a basis for the study is an appropriate methodological choice and does not exclude drawing more general conclusions that can be linked to previous theoretical positions.

If one assumes the principle that IS is an inherent level in human language and certain constructions like detachments are widely used in languages at least in informal communication, it is somewhat surprising that there are not more works written from a perspective of general linguistics or typological researches. For example, Fernandez-Vest has systematically tried to develop a typological approach, by using examples from Finno-Ugric (Sami, Finnish) and Indo-European languages (French, English) and different subtypes of language

use. In contrast, many analyses that deal with the above-mentioned problems (IS constituents, detachment constructions) in spontaneous oral in Indo-European languages (mostly French, English or Italian) limit themselves to only these languages without looking beyond. This is certainly due also to the competences of the researchers who are rarely able to work on the authentic data of languages from different linguistic families.

With regards to the Estonian data, I am aware of the fact that some bases are first necessary before reaching conclusive generalizations; therefore, in the present thesis, a clearly limited construction will be analysed, but at the same time, reference is made to different works related to this subject from a language-specific as well as a cross-linguistic viewpoint, mostly about Indo-European languages, and thus some openness is preserved in order to leave open the possibility for future work to be conducted specifically from a typological perspective or to add a contrastive point of view on the basis of the results of the present work.

2.2. Different interpretations of IS categories in some generalizing approaches

As has been described previously, the prolific literature on Information Structuring and its multiple notions associated with different approaches has given raise also to some attempts of generalization and synthetization. Some of these approaches that should merit more attention are chosen here.

These approaches have mainly two ways of considering the problem: firstly, one can take as the point of departure the terms that are used and then try to link them to different approaches; secondly, it is possible to try to work out the definition of different articulations and propose a classification for them, without even considering the terminological questions.

Usually, the distinction is made by opposing two different definitions of Theme/Topic: one widely accepted definition is Theme as 'what is being spoken about', Kuno 1972, Dik 1978, Reinhart 1982, Lambrecht 1994; quite often, Theme as the 'point of departure' can also be associated with this approach.

The second approach tries to characterize the Theme by considering its 'informational charge' (Firbas 1964, Prince 1981, Chafe 1987,): Theme as the 'known' element or the less informative element.

B. Combettes has made a distinction between two main approaches to information partition that are not, according to him, completely incompatible and the choice of terms that are used for describing these phenomena (Theme and Topic) refers to the aforementioned distinction between two essential theoretical approaches (1998: 56–57 and 134–135). When the term 'topic' is used, the accent is laid especially on the 'point of departure' of the utterance that sets the scene for forthcoming information. He considers that the definition of theme/topic as something 'about what one is talking' is quite close to a

previous approach, as well as the approaches that consider this element as always the first element of an utterance. To avoid confusion, Combettes suggests distinguishing a second approach, which should refer to these notions by using the terms 'theme' and 'rheme' and which would take into consideration the information charge of clause units and define the thematic element as a group that carries the least information in an utterance, referring also to the Prague school scale of communicative dynamism.

There are quite a number of examples of such propositions which aim to clarify the terminology by assigning a certain term to a definition, for example Östman & Virtanen (1999) suggest that Theme and Rheme should be defined in positional terms, the notions of topic and comment should be used in an interactional framework and the new/old information in a cognitive one.

And Moeschler & Reboul whose somewhat reductive approach to discourse has been criticized, suggest in a more normative vein that

> *L'opposition sujet/prédicat est à la fois une distinction linguistique et logique; le couple topique/commentaire est de nature syntaxique, alors que la relation thème propos est fonctionnelle; enfin, [la différence] entre information donnée et information nouvelle est psychologique, alors que la distinction foyer/ présupposition est sémantique.*[3] (Moeschler & Reboul 1994: 456)

Another example of such generalization is proposed by Gómez-González (2001: 9) who does not set out to relate certain terms to certain categories, but reaches a more abstract approach and describes three main interpretations of communicative categories: informational, semantic and syntactic. The first one invokes the notions such as 'aboutness' and 'relevance', Theme being 'what the message is about'. The semantic approach is related to the distinction of 'old' and 'new' information and the syntactic approach assumes that Theme is to be linked to the initial position.

---

[3] The subject/predicate opposition is at the same time a linguistic and logic distinction; the couple topic/comment is of a syntactic nature, whereas the relation *thème propos* is functional; finally, the difference between the given information and new information is psychological, whereas the distinction focus/presupposition is semantic.

3. INFORMATION STRUCTURING: FROM THE FIRST STUDIES AND THE PRAGUE SCHOOL TO THE INVESTIGATION OF SPOKEN LANGUAGE

In this chapter we will give a brief overview of the most influential and pertinent works in the domain of Information Structuring that can be related to the approach adopted here. As the Prague school has made such an important contribution to the development of this domain, it will be in focus in the first parts of this chapter. Then there will be brief (and not exhaustive) mention of some studies that are inspired by the Prague school and which have a particular interest regarding the present study.

The second section of this chapter deals with some sets of questions that were raised after the Prague school: the transition from sentence to text/ discourse, text linguistics, spoken and written languages as two different codes, problems linked to reference, word order and prosody. Since all these problems merit a thorough investigation, which is not possible given the limits of the present study, only certain relevant aspects within these domains will be selected.

It could also have been possible to choose a chronological approach, or a conceptual approach, i.e. to present the different studies according to the way they distinguish the constituents of Information Structuring and their content. However, this type of synthesis has been attempted and some of these attempts give quite an appreciable account of these phenomena (Gómez González 2001, Grobet 2002). That is why the attention will be focused on approaches that deal with larger units of discourse in order to give a background to the approach that is adopted in the present study.

3.1. Some preliminary sets of notions leading to the problematics of the Prague school: from H. Weil to V. Mathesius.

In this section some sets of notions will be introduced that were elaborated in a syntactic framework by two researchers who can be considered as the pre-cursors of modern studies of information structuring, namely H. Weil and Ch. Bally.

Henri Weil (1844) is generally considered as one of the forerunners of studies about Information Structuring in modern times: already, in the 19th century, he was the author of a very innovative investigation about word order and information structure (without using this concept) – it is also worth noting that his thesis was totally neglected by his contemporary researchers. He claims that a distinction should be made between syntactic features and discourse level: according to him, a phrase is organized according to a 'march of ideas', i.e. there can be different languages with different syntactic constraints, but there is

always something that governs that organization. He also makes some very interesting remarks about the pre-eminence of *oral* language in the study of word order (*ibidem*: 7, 73), shows the importance of accentuation (*ibidem*: 76), the use of discourse particles (*ibidem*: 95) and thus can be considered as a precursor of modern linguistic studies in pragmatics and even in construction grammar (*ibidem*: VII).

When analysing examples from Latin, he uses the concepts of 'point of departure' and 'the goal of the discourse' as two central points of his theory. He claims that the objective movement in a phrase is expressed by syntactic relations and the subjective movement by the word order, which is why he considers the moment of enunciation as the most important (*ibidem*: 21). He formulates the basic rules of communication that are used in studies about Information Structuring: what has been later expressed by 'given-before-new' principle. When comparing the ancient and modern languages, especially French, he notes that both of them follow a certain course of ideas and a certain word order, but in modern languages word order is more subordinated to the syntax while in ancient languages these two levels are more independent thanks to the declensions (*ibidem*: 28). He also compares the order of complements that are typical to certain languages like German, French, ancient Greek etc (51–59) and comes to the conclusion (at the same time innovative and expressed in the spirit of his time) that the most perfect languages are those whose constructions are maximally free of constraints, i.e. Latin and Greek (*ibidem:* 64).

The terms *Theme* and *Rheme* (*Thema* and *Rhema*) were used for the first time by the German linguist H. Ammann (1928: 3).

Charles Bally, the best-known scholar of the Geneva school of Linguistics, instigated the use of two important notions that are still used in linguistics today: in his extensive description of French, Bally makes use of the distinction *thème-propos*, which he defines in these terms:

> *La pensée qu'on veut faire connaître est - /.../ le but, la fin de l'énoncé, ce qu'on se propose, en un mot: le* propos; *on l'énonce à l'occasion d'une autre chose qui en forme la base, le substrat, le motif: c'est le* thème.[4] (Bally 1944: 53)

He claims that in natural speech the *propos* can occur alone (*ibidem*). Bally also mentions the role of prosody when distinguishing *thème* and *propos*, which cannot be easily interpreted in written phrases, but whose intonation allows the distinction between the two.

He describes two types of sentences: the first, where the theme is given first : '*le thème produit un effet de tension; il fait désirer le propos, qui prend toute sa*

---

[4]   'The idea that we want to express is /…/ the aim, the end of the utterance, that we intend, in one word: the *propos*; we utter it about another thing that constitutes its basis, its substrate, its motive: this is the *thème*.'

valeur par cette préparation',[5] and the second type where the *propos* arrives as an explosion and the theme follows as an echo: '*le propos éclate par surprise, et le thème est comme l'écho de cette explosion*'[6] (*ibidem*: 69).

3.1.1. (Psycho)logical Subject and Predicate and the word order

This section delineates some principles elaborated by different linguists who attempted back in the nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century to distinguish from a psychological perspective constituents that differ from the grammatical Subject and Predicate, but that contribute at the same time to conveying information in a sentence. Some assumptions about the sentence word order will also be mentioned in relation to the informational charge and the strategy of communication.

The two terms that were already used back in classic Greek philosophy (the subject of human judgement, i.e. first mention of an entity, and the predicate of human judgement, i.e. the statement that is made about it) were taken up by linguistics in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and distinguished from the grammatical Subject and Predicate.

(Psycho)logical Subject and Predicate have been described as two language universals and unlike grammatical Subject and Predicate, which were described by using morphosyntactic means, they were regarded as having particular characteristics in relation to the information conveyed and the status of that information. Three criteria in particular can be pointed out, as shown by Gómez-González (2001: 8): contextual relevance, informational status and linearity. The first has been formulated by von der Gabelenz as 'what the message is about' or 'the object of speech' (1869: 378), the second has been expounded by Høffding (1910: 88) as the difference between the logical predicate, the accent it bears and the grammatical 'point of view'. The linearity of the language has been examined by Paul (1880) and within his theory, he describes the psychological Subject as 'the idea which appears first in the mind of the speaker' (Paul 1975 [1880]: 124).

As will be shown below, these three ideas about (psycho)logical Subject and Predicate were taken up by Mathesius, who first formulated the problems that the Prague school dealt with later on, and this synthesis can thus also be viewed as the source of most of the confusions and later developments that these questions have undergone.

The constituent order has been often related to the informational charge and communicational strategy of the speaker; already the first studies did not overlook this aspect, for example von der Gabelenz (1891: 357) and Wundt (1900, 2: 363–4) argued that important entities tend to be more stressed and

---

[5]   'the theme creates an effect of tension; it makes desire the *propos* which takes all its value from this preparation.'
[6]   'the *propos* explodes with surprise and the *theme* is like the echo of this explosion.'

move towards the beginning of the sentence, while Paul (1975 [1880]) suggested the opposite, i.e. the more important the idea is, the more it should move towards the end.

Without using the terminology of the IS framework, Bolinger, 1952, when dealing with the position of adjectives in English, stresses the importance of the first elements of a clause from the point of view of 'information structuring'. He refers to Poutsma's argument about word order:

> The first words of the sentence, like the cautionary words of a command, put the listener on the alert. As the discourse proceeds, he is kept in suspense, so that his mind is prepared to receive that part of the communication on which his attention should chiefly be centered. (Bolinger 1952: 1122, note 9)

However, in his approach, the important idea tends to come towards the end, when the content of the sentence is progressively revealed: he explains the ordering of the information in a clause by pointing out (deliberately simplifying) the dynamism of the information as the constituents follow each other in the communication:

> Before the speaker begins, the possibilities of what he will communicate are practically infinite, or, if his utterance is bound within a discourse, they are at least enormously large. When the first word appears, the possibilities are vastly reduced, but that first word has, in communicative value for the hearer, its fullest semantic range. The second word follows, narrowing the range, the third comes to narrow it still further, and finally the end is reached at which point the sentence presumably focuses on an event – usually aided by a gesture, a physical context in which only one of several possibilities can be elected, /.../. (Bolinger 1952: 1118)

In this section were described some principles pointed out by researchers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries about conveying information in the sentence and about the word order in the communication dynamics within one sentence. These were some works, among others, that led to the formulation by the Prague school linguists of the principles of Functional Sentence Perspective.

3.1.2. The point of departure for the problematics of Theme-Rheme: Vilém Mathesius

Mathesius (1939) defines the 'starting point of the utterance (východisko)' as 'that which is known or at least obvious in the given situation and from which the speaker proceeds', whereas 'the core of the utterance (jádro)' is 'what the speaker states about, or in regard to, the starting point of the utterance'. The same author defines, in 1942, 'the foundation (or the theme) of the utterance (základ, téma)' as something 'that is being spoken about in the sentence', and

'the core (jádro)' as what the speaker says about this theme (cited by Daneš 1974: 106).

Following this and the propositions of the Prague school, the main problematics of Theme-Rheme and informational status have remained inside three crucial domains of interpretation (Gómez-González 2001):
1. semantic, i.e. 'what the message is about'
2. informational 'given/new information'
3. syntactic, linked to positional criteria in the sentence (initial position for Theme).

With a rough generalization, one could argue that most of the problems in this domain are due to the distribution of these three categories between different domains of description of the language. Clearly it is difficult to avoid mis-understandings when these three criteria are used together, separately or combined with each other and by using some additional subcategories, within a rather intuitive approach, regardless of the scope of the units under investigation (sentence, textual approach; natural discourse/forged examples). Following the idea that these categories are to be defined by using a rather functional approach (as it is more a functional than a formal category) and that the formal criteria are not primary, it is also clear why the so-called 'intuitive' approach has been criticized so often: in linguistics, the preference is still given to formal, 'measurable' characteristics and that is what one tends to look for in a well-founded study. Some researchers have even suggested abandoning the idea of informational organization and replacing it with different domains where the formal characteristics appear. This type of choice can also be justified in some cases and the informational aspect can thus be overlooked, but here I support the idea that it is undeniably a cross-linguistic category; maybe the definitions lack precision, but it can set an appropriate frame for the investigation of different linguistic phenomena.

3.2. The Prague school and the Functional Sentence Perspective

The Prague school is generally considered as the precursor of the modern conception of Information Structuring. However, their model, based on the description of written language, may seem somewhat outdated today and it has not often been applied as such to the oral language. On the other hand, if one presumes that the written language should not have a separate status and that the underlying principles can be applied to any linguistic activity, whether it is written or oral or oralised, then their model is still relevant today. They have also underlined the importance of prosody when it comes to the analysis of real examples:

> Inquiries into the degree of congruence of non-prosodic and prosodic means are of primary importance. A special aspect of such inquiries is the question of congruence of the gamut of degrees of CD [communicative dynamism] and the gamut of functional weight carried by the prosodic features. (Firbas 1974: 32)

Although their model is not directly applicable to a spoken corpus (its main shortcomings are that it is too schematic and takes as a starting point the regularities that can be observed above all in written language and especially in certain types of texts (scientific, descriptive), these authors have nevertheless pointed to some phenomena that are still today under investigation and continue to raise questions among linguists.

The first distinctions in this framework belong to Mathesius (Theme-Rheme), whereas the notion of communicative dynamism was introduced by Firbas: 'the extent to which the sentence element contributes to the development of the communication' (Firbas 1964: 270), and by the same token the terms of Theme and Rheme are also developed in more detail: Theme is constituted 'by the sentence element(s) carrying the lowest degree(s) of CD within the sentence' (*ibidem*: 272).

The Praguan researchers (Daneš 1964, 1974, Firbas 1962, 1974) have developed a model of thematic progression (Functional Sentence Perspective) that has a particular interest in the light of this study. Although the detached constructions were not investigated specifically in the framework of their theory, the principles elaborated by Praguan researchers present an adequate background to the investigation of Information Structuring in general and also to the present work.

According to Firbas (1962: 136) the functional perspective is the principle according to which elements of an utterance 'follow each other according to the amount (degree) of communicative dynamism they convey, starting with the lowest and gradually passing on to the highest'.

They also made some assumptions from the typological perspective about the preferential devices in languages:

> The functional perspective employs different devices in different languages; e.g. in Slavic languages it is mainly the word order and intonation. (Daneš 1964: 228)

The property of being new has, according to them, two independent aspects: new in a sense of 'not mentioned in the preceding context' and new in the sense of 'related as a Theme to a Rheme to which it has not yet been related' (Daneš 1974: 111). In the former case, the property 'new' is assigned to the expression itself, while in the latter it is the T-R nexus that appears as new.

The text connexity is represented, inter alia, by thematic progression (TP) which is one of the central notions of their theory (Daneš 1974: 114, 118–119).
1) Simple linear TP (or TP with linear thematization of Rhemes)
2) TP with a continous (constant) Theme
3) TP with derived Themes.

This description can apply to written texts, especially some types of texts; it is possible that it corresponds to the general functioning of cognitive processes: we need to present something, establish a consensus about the information we share, or to point out divergencies, using our knowledge about the listener's presuppositions, before we say anything about the topic under discussion. This assertion seems to be largely supported by researchers of different domains. As far as spoken language is concerned, the question arises about the coding of these mechanisms in spoken language: supposing that the human brain functions globally in the same way, independently of genre, how should the specificities of spoken spontaneous language, like formulation difficulties, dialogue handling mechanisms, hesitations etc., be treated in this context?

The studies of the Praguan researchers have inspired a large number of scholars; some of them have tried to apply their model almost directly or with some adjustments to a spoken corpus (Maynard 1986), but most of them take these authors as instigators of a certain tradition that has developed the problematics of IS on a larger scale. It is not easy to decide how much a theory owes to the Praguan scholars: it has certainly also helped to formulate critics against it, for example in Chafe 1976. It would not be correct to bring everything back to them just because of the mentioning of the information structure or its elements, even if it is almost impossible to overestimate their contribution to the development of this field. That is why the theories presented in the next sections of this study, although undoubtedly inspired by the Prague school to a certain extent, are not discussed according to their more or less close links to this theory, but rather according to the principles they used in their approach to the linguistic material and to the relevant unit of investigation (text/discourse or sentence).

3.3. After the Prague school: sentence, text, discourse

In this section an overview will be given of some other relevant studies in modern linguistics that deal with the Theme-Rheme interface and the problems of Information Structuring. It could have been possible to choose a chronological approach, or a conceptual approach, i.e. to present the different studies according to their manner of distinguishing the constituents of IS and their content. However, this type of synthesis has been attempted and some studies have given quite an appreciable account of these phenomena (Grobet 2002, Gómez González 2001) and there is thus no need to résumé these studies. That is why the attention will be focused on approaches that deal with larger units of discourse in order to give a background to the approach that is adopted in the present study.

3.3.1. Text and discourse. Textual linguistics

As the approach which is chosen in the present study is a *textual* approach, it will also be necessary to situate it with regard to studies that claim themselves as *discourse-* or *text-* oriented and those which are *sentence*-oriented and more generally related to *text linguistics*. As the word *text* itself is polysemic and text-centred approaches can be encountered in linguistics as well as in literary or anthropological studies, it should be made clear what exactly is referred to when we claim it to be a textual approach.

Text or discourse? Quite often these two terms are used as synonyms, especially when comparing a sentence-based approach to approaches which take into account longer segments of discourse, but several researchers have pointed out that in many cases a differentiation between the two might be useful. This distinction makes clearer the links with theoretical background, as pointed out, for example, by Maingueneau (1996: 82):

> *En parlant du discours, on articule l'énoncé sur une situation d'énonciation singulière; en parlant de texte, on met l'accent sur ce qui lui donne son unité, qui en fait une totalité et non une simple suite de phrases.*[7]

Text is generally considered as a linguistic unit, whereas discourse is not a unit, but refers to a certain type of approach. Texts can encompass different kinds of discourses, but discourse analyses can also be very diverse, as attested by the use of the general label 'discourse analysis' for different types of approaches.

The use of the term 'text' and 'textual' in modern linguistics comes from several important sources: German *Textlinguistik* and textual grammars by American or Czech researchers in the 60s and 70s.

The first textual studies were dedicated to written text, e.g. *Cohesion in English* by Halliday and Hasan (1976), which has inspired many researchers who deal with textual phenomena, but also today the notion of 'text' is in general mostly associated to written code. Among other important studies should be mentioned those of T. A. van Dijk (1977), W. Dressler (1972), R. A. Beaugrande & W. U. Dressler (1981), H. Weinrich (1989), B. Combettes (1983), J.-M. Adam (1990, 2004).

Information Structuring has received unequal attention in text-centred approaches: generally, it has been claimed that English-speaking researchers concentrate on cohesive devices and connexity of the texts, on the features that differentiate the text from arbitrarily chosen sentences, whereas during the 60s and 70s in the French tradition the most influent theory was elaborated by E. Benveniste (*énonciation*), leading to studies that deal more with the subject

---

[7]   'When speaking about disourse, we link the utterance to a specific situation of enunciation; when speaking about text, we put the accent on what makes its unity, what makes an ensemble of it, not just a simple series of sentences.'

of *énonciation* and the traces of *énonciation*, but this trend has not received much attention in other countries (Charolles & Combettes 1999: 83).

Some of the main questions related to text linguistics and the theme/rheme interface of texts have already been developed in N. E. Enkvist's overview of different aspects of text analysis from the perspective of text linguistics (Enkvist 1974: 56–79).

As a precursor of this domain in Scandinavian linguistics, this author also points to the question of textual dimensions of thematic and rhematic constituents in the structuring process of a text: he assumes that although these phenomena are mostly described within one sentence or utterance, there should be regularities concerning the whole process of text construction, where the thematic structure as well as the semantics play an important role (*ibid.*: 68–69). He gives examples of nominalization and different clause order when discussing the respective roles of semantics and thematic structuring of the text.

He points out that detached constructions (dislocations) as especially oral phenomena are to be linked to the "thematization" and "rhematization" processes (*ibid.*: 64–65).

More recent works have complemented the traditional problematics with questions regarding, for example, the computational use of larger text corpuses, the applications in translation studies or foreign language learning.

Information Structuring (or Functional Sentence Perspective) or some of its applications (thematic continuity etc) have been dealt with as one of these textual phenomena and has received more or less attention depending on the school in question. For example, Beaugrande et Dressler, in their *Introduction to text linguistics* refer to FSP in a quite schematic way while discussing the syntactical devices of maintaining cohesion in text, so that the FSP does not receive much attention (1981: 75–76).

Some other researchers go explicitly beyond the syntax and argue that textual linguistics cannot operate with the morphosyntactic notions and categories that are used in traditional grammar, i.e. in sentence-centred approaches.

According to M. Charolles (1993: 305, 311), textual approaches cannot refer to the same type of connexions as sentence-based approaches, because of the special characteristics of these connexions: they are not structural and are capable of signalling the connexity of elements that can be more or less distant from each other. Textual linguistics deal with the categories of these connexions, but they cannot be identified and described in traditional grammar terms, so that both disciplines have sometimes their proper terminology: for example, coordinating conjunctions are described as 'connectors' in textual linguistics. B. Combettes claims in the same vein that 'the coherence of text is not the result of the facts of grammaticality' (1992: 113).

M. Charolles (1993, 1995) and B. Combettes (1992) both proposed defining certain relevant classifications of units and textual connexion types. M. Charolles describes four types of non-structural connexions which act as markers – connectors, anaphoras or referential chains, expressions that introduce the

discourse frames and configurational markers of segmentation, for example indentations or metadiscursive organizers, used by the speaker in order to mark the boundaries of textual units. B. Combettes proposes five textual categories that coincide partly with the classification of M. Charolles: connectors (that have their counterparts among morphosyntactical terms like subordinating or coordinating conjunctions), anaphorical substitutes (third-person pronouns etc. in morphosyntactical terms), the position of Theme and Rheme, deictics and modalizers. As can also be seen from these approaches, Information Structuring is again considered as one type of textual connexity device, but does not receive the same treatment by different researchers. B. Combettes, as will be seen below, has written a study which deals exclusively with the segmentation of text in thematic and rhematic parts, according to the principles laid down by the Prague school (Combettes 1983).

In conclusion and in order to point to some connexions with the present thesis it can be said that certain approaches in text linguistics deal with some problematics that are also present here and some underlying principles in text linguistics are also valid in the framework of the present thesis, such as the distinction of the level of Information Structuring, the necessity to go beyond the level of one linguistic unit (sentence/utterance) and to explore segmentation and connexion devices.

3.3.2. Spoken and written language

Oral and written language have had very different statuses regarding their use and usability in studies that deal with Information Structuring. The first studies that have been made reference to in this thesis deal with written language, but as oral language becomes more salient as an object of investigation by itself, the attention turns to oral language and to the possibilities it offers to linguistic investigation. When it became clear that the traditional morphosyntactic approaches are not always convenient to study the phenomena of orality, then the question arises of opposing these two codes by assigning to them different investigation methods: should these two domains be kept separetely because of their admittedly different objects?

Among others, French syntacticians C. Blanche-Benveniste & C. Jeanjean (1987) have deplored the fact that these two variants of the language have been placed in opposition as two completely different codes, with the idea that one of them is the ideal form and the other one is necessarily incorrect. P. Linell could also be mentioned, having elaborated quite an extensive critique called *The written language bias in linguistics*, in which he proposes alternative views on all the problems that come from the formalistic, objectivising approach to language (Linell 2005). Ayres-Bennett & Carruthers (2001: 4) observe that both codes contain a large variety of subtypes and registers which do not necessarily correspond to the general idea of oral language being more informal and written code being more formal (there can be very formal uses of oral language and,

similarly, completely informal uses of written language), so that the general opposition between the two is not justified.

In the present study the problem of opposing or separating oral language from written language is not a central one: the main analysis is carried out on examples of oral language, which I consider as primary when investigating real language use, and secondly also takes as a point of departure the assumption that detached constructions are above all a construction typical to oral speech. I agree rather with J.-M. Adam (2004: 38), who considers these two objects (oral and written language) as two aspects of the same language and where the huge differences come, on the one hand from the difference between the genres, and on the other hand from the differences between the conditions of interaction in these two cases.

When spoken and written languages have been compared, there are several specificities that have been pointed out: the constructions used in spoken and in written language are in some measure different. However, it is not correct to argue that spoken language uses systematically more simple constructions, or that it is a sort of simplified written language due to the fact that speakers want always to make only minimal effort. The main linguistic characteristics of spoken language can be summed up as follows (Miller & Fernandez-Vest 2006: 13):

- information is carefully staged, a small quantity of information being assigned to each phrase and clause;
- spontaneous spoken language typically has far less grammatical subordination than written language and much more coordination or simple parataxis;
- the syntax of spontaneous spoken language is, in general, fragmented and unintegrated; phrases are less complex than phrases of written language; the clausal constructions are less complex;
- the range of vocabulary in spontaneous language is not as large as in written language;
- a number of constructions occur in spontaneous spoken language but not in written language, and vice versa.

These properties are in a large proportion made possible by the special conditions in which spoken language occurs and by its intrinsic properties: availability of context and extra-linguistic information in the situation, the use of gestures and other non-verbal means and the use of pitch, amplitude, rhythm etc., which help to disambiguate and guide the information flow in the right direction.

There are also approaches that underline some other aspects typical to spontaneous oral language, for example Chafe 1982 distinguishes between contextualized speech with strong interpersonal involvement (spontaneous speech) and decontextualized speech (more formal uses) which shows the opposite features. The contextualized language is characterized by the following properties:
- concreteness and imageability (use of details)

- use of 1st- and 2nd-person pronouns
- people and their relations highlighted
- actions and agents more emphasized than states and objects
- feelings and thoughts (evaluation) reported
- hedged signals used
- feedback signals and repairs used when needed

Information Structuring as an inherent property of any sensed production can consequently be analysed equally in written language as well as in oral productions by exploring to some extent different markers, for example referring to the prosody in oral language.

Different approaches can be found in this domain: there are studies which rely mostly on the evidence of written language, by using terms and definitions that have been worked out on the basis of written language data and by using traditional morphosyntactic categories (these are, for the most part of the studies, dealing with the sentence level), but seem not to exclude the study of e oral language, by just adding some typical features to it. An example of such an investigation is the recent collection *The expression of information structure* (Krifka & Musan 2012) which unfortunately does not go further in this direction: the examples are in most cases created by the authors and there are not many new ideas in the light of recent analysis of the spoken language.

The question arises as to whether it is possible to use the terms and relevant phenomena which have been described, first in relation to written language, for example as concerns frames etc. and to try to apply them to oral language bearing in mind that these two language uses have certain divergent features. Many influential studies still deal mainly with written language or self-created examples or just very short oral sentences, because it becomes very complicated to take into consideration full oral paragraphs, which means that there are necessarily more unclear and questionable sequences. However it was considered here that although the textual/discursive approach has in this context some weaknesses, it should be attempted to find a way to first get to the data of the oral language only and to consider what it is possible to find out by working on this type of corpus. Of course, as the linguistic material (oral or written) shares a certain amount of common features and is undoubtedly organized following universal underlying principles, it is not necessary to oppose them on all levels, but to try in some way to push into the background the evidences that we already have concerning the written language.

M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest (1994: 144–158, 2009: 194–198) has shown in which manner the features of oral language are modified when an oral communication (given based on written notes, though) is to be 'translated' into a normative written text. As for the frequency of detached constructions, the comparison given in Fernandez-Vest 2009: 196 as an example of the occurrence of detached constructions in interviews and their written and published transcriptions speaks for itself: in the written version, no final detachments remained and only 5% of Themes are detached.

It is generally admitted that the choices concerning transcription and editing principles depend on the objectives of the research: the transcription should be on the one hand as informative as possible and at the same time usable by the researcher in his or her particular field of study (the principles that have been followed in the present research are delineated in sections 1.2 and 1.3). Sometimes, the features of oral language are to some extent also preserved in transcriptions used in more normative registers of language; in these cases one can question the particular effects this creates.

Such an interrogation could be raised about the next example, which shows that the principle of economy is not always followed in transcriptions of oral language; the excerpt comes from a partial transcription of a video broadcast on the public TV channel during the main news programme. The person interviewed is Estonian cross-country skier Andrus Veerpalu after his discharge at the Court of Arbitration for Sport. It should be noted that this affair was highly controversial and generated passionate debates over two years in Estonian society. The interview itself is somewhat longer, the interviewer asks about ten questions, but for illustration a short excerpt has been selected.

(3)

Q : Kas olete kahe aasta jooksul endale selgeks teinud, kust kohast [tuli] siis see tõdemus, et Andrus Veerpalu on dopingupatune?

V : No... seda on nagu raske öelda, kust see... See on piiripealne, kui see test ei ole veel oma õigeid piire kätte saanud, siis sportlased ongi suht sellised... teistsugused ja kui neid asju pole nii täpselt uuritud, ega sealt võibki mingi viga sisse tulla.

/---/

Q : Andrus Veerpalusse mitteuskujad on kogu aeg öelnud, et vaidlustatakse ju testi, seda, kas test on pädev, mitte seda, kas on tarvitatud dopingut või mitte. Kuidas nendele vastate?

V : No... eks igaüks sai nagu... ise mõelda ja olla, mis ta tahtis, ega mina saanud kellelegi mõtteid pähe panna.

Q: 'Have you been able to understand after the last two years, where the conclusion that Andrus Veerpalu has used drugs came from?'

V: 'Well, it is, like, difficult to say, from where it… It is a borderline, when this test has not yet reached its limits, sportsmen are indeed, like, … different and when these things have not been investigated so thoroughly, then some mistakes can indeed be made.'

Q: 'Those who didn't believe in Andrus Veerpalu have said all the time that it is the test that's being contested, in order to find out whether the test is efficient, not the fact of whether drugs have been used or not. How would you respond to those?'

V: 'Well, then everyone could, like, ... think and believe, whatever they wanted, I could not put ideas into anyone's heads.'
(sport.postimees.ee)

What is the role of this type of short written summary? Should it give an overview to those who do not (cannot) watch the video? Should it generate the reader's interest towards the online video?

When we compare the summary with the original interview, we find naturally that many features typical to oral language are edited (word order, repetitions, repairs etc), which is predictable, but the question is to what purpose are the numerous incoherencies proper to spontaneous language use preserved? This sportsman is known as someone who is not at ease with public appearances, so it could be another illustration of this weakness, corresponding also to the expectations of the public or intentionally presented as such. The original interview shows that the answer to the second question is more developed after this hesitant take-off, however the editor chose not to transcribe the whole response, so that it seems here that the oral language devices used in sensitive matters can act as rather discrediting means.

In her analysis about the initial detachments in French, B. Barnes (1985: 114) put forward the hypothesis, based on the distinction of foreground and background in speech and on the suggestions of Lambrecht (1984), that detachments are a feature of foregrounded parts of the discourse – the back-grounded parts display the characteristics of spontaneous or unplanned use of language less. The definitions of 'foregrounded' and 'backgrounded' portions come from Hopper and Thompson's (1980: 280) analysis of narratives (written language): foregrounded parts represent the main storyline, while background portions assist, comment or amplify the foregrounded parts.[8]

The detachment constructions are almost constantly characterized as primarily oral devices and this is presented in different works as a cross-linguistic universal, so that as a rule this assumption seems not to be questioned by researchers working on different languages. However, McLaughlin (2011) proposes a more subtle approach to detachment constructions in French and tries to find out whether the general idea, according to which the detachment constructions in written texts are used primarily in order to give an effect of orality, can be supported by the evidence found in the corpus. She explores the occurrences of detachments in three types of language use: spoken, journalistic and literary (fiction novels) and comes to the conclusion that detached constructions are used in written texts to create different effects, not only to represent orality: on the one hand, they certainly can be used in order to imitate orality (with other 'mimetic features' present such as discourse particles etc.), but on the other hand, in many cases the surrounding features typical to written

---

[8]   Lambrecht makes use of them in order to distinguish between the uses of lexical subject NPs and detached NPs.

code without any characteristics of oral speech suggest that the detached element also has other functions, related to the inner structuring of the text (stylistic effects), simple establishment of the topic and others (McLaughlin 2011: 225–226). However, the author does not explore more specifically the other possible functions of detachments in her article.

In this chapter an insight was proposed into the complex problematics of relations between oral and written language uses in connexion with detached constructions and we saw that the claim about the orality of these constructions in all uses should not always be taken as an immutable principle, although a consensus seems to be established about their primarily oral nature.

3.3.3. Mental processes linked to the treatment of the referents

In this chapter I will present a short overview of the pragmatic categories elaborated by Lambrecht in relation to Information Structuring and draw some links with other works that try to define the cognitive categories determining the status of the referent in discourse.

Different authors have pointed out (Givón 1992, Combettes 1999a) that grammar or the language system should not be directly linked to the text or the discourse, but that it is the mental process of the language users that produce or interpret the texts in question. According to Combettes (1999a: 94), rather than noticing the existence of different structures in oral and written language it is more interesting to discuss the different treatment of the relationship between these structures and cognitive processes. Different authors have discussed these questions in relation to the identification, introduction and the treatment of referents in discourse. These problems of 'known', 'identifiable', 'inferable', 'recoverable', 'old' etc. referents have necessarily interested all researchers that have to work on the packaging of information in the discourse. Following Chafe and Lambrecht, one has to make a clear distinction between the fact of identifying a referent and referring to it in the discourse. Another important distinction concerns the entities which are present in the discourse: these are the representations of the referents and not the referents themselves, even if quite often, in linguistic texts, this distinction is not observed. It is worth noticing that many questions in this field are linked to these representations: speakers make choices according to the idea that they have about the knowledge of the listener, but they can also, by using specific linguistic means, act as if the referent should be known by the listener, even if that is not the case.

As we have seen in previous chapters, sentence-based approaches have greatly contributed to the development of different problematics linked to IS. However, this thesis deals mainly with phenomena on a discourse level, so that we have to draw a certain limit when considering the contribution of all these analyses. Here we present only the principles described by K. Lambrecht who has a sentence-based approach to IS, but his arguments have been widely used

by many researchers and also by those who take into account longer excerpts of discourse.

Lambrecht defines pragmatic categories that help to describe the grammatical structure of utterances and its relation to the communicative function of the discourse. The speaker has a certain number of presuppositions about the cognitive status of the *signifiés* of the utterance that the conversation partner is able to use. He can also make presuppositions about the relations of these *signifiés* with the utterances at the informational level. When describing the composition of an utterance in informational terms Lambrecht uses the notions of presupposition, assertion and focus: they correspond to cognitive categories that have formal correlates in the structure of the sentence.

He defines these categories as follows:

1. Pragmatic presupposition:
    'The set of propositions lexicogrammatically evoked in a sentence, which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered' (*ibidem*: 52).

2. Pragmatic assertion:
    'The proposition expressed by a sentence which the hearer is expected to know or take for granted as a result of hearing the sentence uttered' (*ibidem*).

3. Focus:
    'The semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition' (*ibidem*: 213).

Lambrecht completes the first, knowledge presupposition, with three other types of presupposition: firstly, the ability of the listener to identify the referents of the given discourse (identifiability presupposition); secondly, the supposition about the state of activation of the entities or situations mentioned in the utterance (activation presupposition); and thirdly, the supposition about the interest of the listener for a given entity or utterance (relevance presupposition) (*ibidem*: 32). According to Lambrecht, the knowledge and identifiability presuppositions can be compared with Prince's cognitive category of *hearer-old* and the activation presupposition corresponds to her category of *discourse-old*. Prince does not mention the relevance presupposition (*ibidem*: 34). An activated entity can be in the spirit of the listener either completely active or accessible through cognitive means. Thus his categories of 'active' and 'accessible' information correspond to 'discourse-old' and 'inferable' by Prince and also to the distinction made by Gundel, Hedberg and Zacharski 1993 between 'in focus' and 'activated'. Here again it can be noted that the use of the notion 'focus' can be a source of misunderstandings, because it is used in a completely opposite sense (discourse-old *vs* in focus). Lambrecht adds to these categories the relevance presupposition that has been taken up by other studies, for example in the definition of 'Theme' by Grobet 2002.

Gundel 1988b makes a fundamental distinction between the two characteristics of givenness: relational givenness and referential givenness. Relational givenness has to do with the relational character of topic (theme) and comment (rheme), whereas referential givenness has to do with the cognitive status of discourse entities. She claims that topic, defined as a relationally given category, also has to be to some extent referentially given. She has developed her approach in many subsequent works (i.a. Gundel 1999, Gundel and Fretheim 2004, Gundel 2012). According to her, the topic typically has to be familiar/identifiable in order to be related to a comment in the same sentence.

With regards to the present analysis and the corpus that has been used, we should bear in mind that an oral (and transcribed) corpus also has its limits in this regard: it is not always justified to make assumptions about the state of knowledge of the discourse participants, we do not have access to their previous exchanges, and the notion of 'general knowledge' or 'shared knowledge' can be quite controversial, etc. Besides these considerations, we are mainly interested in referents that appear in detachment constructions and their persistence in the ongoing discourse, so we will mostly rely on the linguistic clues appearing in the discourse.

3.3.4. Transition from sentence to text and related terminological questions

When the units under investigation exceed the limits of a morphosyntactically defined sentence, the question arises about the need to oppose sentence-based and other approaches, and secondly, about determining minimal/maximal units.

Different opinions have been expressed about the possible transition from a sentence-based approach to a text-based approach: this has been invoked as one reason for the confusion that has been found in the terminology of the IS framework (Mondada 1994: 27).

The notion of 'discourse topic' in relation to 'sentence topic' can also give rise to questions: to illustrate the relations between these notions, we refer to T. A. van Dijk who has attempted a rapprochement between the notions of discourse topic and sentence topic, taking as a basis the FSP framework and referring to semantic and cognitive aspects to interpret the possible distribution of information components. With regards to the sentence, he argues that the assignment of topic and comment (Theme-Rheme) depends on the functional structure of the whole sequence of which the sentence is only one part – this applies to the semantic level, and on the other hand, it depends on the cognitive aspects of the sequence on the pragmatic level (previous knowledge, assumptions, interest focus, etc.). The discourse topic according to him summarizes, reduces, organizes and categorizes the semantic information of discourse in the form of a proposition: it is formulated as a summary and is based on the macro-structure of the discourse, which expresses the 'global' meaning of a discourse (Van Dijk 1977: 57). He comes to the conclusion that

both of them 'answer the questions "about what/whom" at the macro- and the micro-level of discourse semantics' (*ibidem*: 61).

However, the questions about the assignment of 'discourse topic' are not the centre of interest here: our aim is not to determine one general 'topic' of the discourse, but to analyse the functioning of detachment constructions in the framework of IS, i.e. the status of the referents, their introduction and persistence in discourse; the central notion is 'utterance' and the interpretation of utterances can be made only if one looks also to the surrounding context, its semantic and pragmatic implications.

Some remarks should also be made about some central notions that have already been mentioned in relation to the description and segmentation of discourse material.

There are two types of terms (sentence/utterance (*phrase*/*énoncé*); text/ discourse) that are sometimes considered as opposed to each other, but sometimes their relations are not very clearly defined and thus remain problematic through different approaches.

The concept of discourse can be linked to the French *énonciation* (Benveniste): the speaker, using his speaking abililty, creates by his speech act an utterance which is to be considered in its context and conditions of production. The utterance (*énoncé*), taken separately as an object of investigation, has been defined as a speech act, limited by pauses, but it has also been, in a more abstract sense, related to discourse, e.g. Maingueneau (1976: 11):

> *Le discours [...] [est] considéré comme un unité linguistique de dimension supérieure à la phrase, un* message pris globalement, un énoncé.[9]

Enoncé seems nevertheless to be considered as a relatively short unit, a sort of discourse counterpart for 'sentence'. The notion of *text* is more complex, as we have seen in section 3.3.1., because of its polysemy. But in a narrower perspective, for example in textual linguistics, *text* is not very far from *discourse* and Dressler (1972) has already argued in the 70s that text is the fundamental element of language and that in communication speakers do not use sentences but texts. In this thesis, by using *text* or *discourse* I do not refer to some special theoretical distinctions, but after having explained the problematics of their use, it is assumed that in some cases it might be necessary to make a distinction between them, as argued by J-M. Adam 2004: 39–40 who considers that text, studied together with its context and conditions of production, enters into the domain of discursive practices and thus discourse is a larger notion than *text*, but if one leaves aside the idea of a written, finished form of the discourse, then both the notions can be used as referring to the same type of entity (through opposition to other entities).

---

[9]   Discourse [...] [is] considered as a linguistic unit superior by its dimension to the sentence, a *message taken globally, an utterance*.

On the other hand, *sentence* does not enter into the same theoretical model and we should never claim that a discourse is made of sentences: a typographical sentence is a product of many constraints (interaction, discourse genres, syntax) and is not an invariable level of textual composition (Adam 2004: 38–39). The same idea was also expressed in the first textual grammars, which dealt with connexion mechanisms, for example Halliday & Hasan who claim that we will not find the same type of integration between the parts of a text and those of a sentence or proposition (Halliday&Hasan 1976: 2).

So the question arises: do we need specific terms and approaches for the discourse level or can we make use of notions developed in the framework of sentence grammar? Generally, the notions have been extended using appropriate definitions or additional terms.

For example, in different works, the notions of 'sentence topic' and 'discourse topic' have been used for appropriate categories, but it is not always clear what the scope is of these terms.

Similarly, clause, sentence and utterance can be considered at different levels and in different frameworks and can therefore remain vague. In the current thesis, in order to avoid confusion we use the syntactic term *clause* in its most ordinary sense (smallest grammatical unit), the term *utterance* is used for communicative units in discourse without any rigid criteria for delimiting them, as it is not necessary in most cases, *sentence* refers to the representation of an utterance in written form. When speaking about detachment constructions, the terms *construction, constituent, element*, etc. are used. *Construction* in this context refers to a certain recurrent form in language use.

The French linguist A. Culioli 1984: 10 has marked the difference between the two sets of concepts in the following terms:

> *Le texte écrit nous force, de façon exemplaire, à comprendre que l'on ne peut pas passer de la phrase (hors prosodie, hors contexte, hors situation) à l'énoncé, par une procédure d'extension. Il s'agit en fait d'une rupture théorique, aux conséquences incontournables.* [10]

In consequence, a large number of researchers from different theoretical backgrounds have claimed that *sentence* is not adapted for the analysis of oral discourse (Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1990: 39, Berrendonner 1990: 25 etc.)

Others have partly taken over definitions that have been applied in sentence-based approaches, and used them in analysis dealing with discourse, e.g. A. Grobet (2002) who refers to Lambrecht's definition of 'topic' and makes an analysis of dialogues in a modular approach, i.e. analysing long excerpts of discourse. Here could also be mentioned an article by Charolles & Combettes (1999) in which they argue that the relations between different units in a

---

[10]   The written text obliges us, in an excellent way, to understand that we cannot pass from the sentence (without prosody, without context, without situation) to the utterance, through an extension procedure. This is in fact a theoretical break with inevitable consequences.

semantic and pragmatic perspective (proposition, sentence, discourse) should not be viewed as belonging to completely different levels, but as forming a part of a continuum (Charolles & Combettes 1999: 112–113).

3.4. Text- (discourse-) based approaches

In this subchapter, some approaches will be presented that take the discourse level as the main level of investigation, the majority of them elaborated by French-speaking researchers.

3.4.1. Textual-typological approach of M.M.J. Fernandez-Vest

M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest has applied the principles defined by the Prague school in different domains of textual research in relation to discourse organization from the point of view of Information Structuring, underlining the role of discourse particles and other devices of impromptu oral language in a typological perspective. Her most recent publication "Detachments for cohesion" presents a valuable summary of this approach (Fernandez-Vest 2015).

Her approach was initially developed in the 1970s for the analysis of Finnish as spoken by Sami people (characterized as "interlanguage"), and was then applied to Northern Sami, which was at that time (in the 1980s) still a typical language of pure oral tradition. Later she expanded her analysis to include several European languages with a written tradition. According to her, the terms initial and final detachment should be reserved for talking about operations (of detachment) and the terms Theme and Mneme (*Mnémème* in French) should be used for constituents present in these operations: she underlines that the constituents as such cannot be detached and only in the case of final detachment is there direct and exclusive correspondence between the operation and constituent, as Mneme=final detachment (Fernandez-Vest 2006: 175).

One of the phenomena identified by Fernandez-Vest is characterized as "circular cohesion": it refers to two successive predications where after the first predication the order of constituents is reversed and presented in the second one, thus allowing changes in enunciative strategy (Fernandez-Vest 2006: 182). This phenomenon should be distinguished from iconic cohesion, which refers to the simple repetition of the constituents or a sequence.

She supports the idea of three informational components at the pragmatic level (Theme, Rheme, Mneme) which combine in oral language (dialogues) typically in two main strategies: binary strategy 1 (Theme-Rheme) and binary strategy 2 (Rheme-Mneme) (Fernandez-Vest 2009: 252).

She considers that a Rheme can constitute a minimal communication unit, without Theme being necessarily present.

Example of a simple Rheme (order to tidy up the tablecloth):

(4)
La nappe!
'The tablecloth!'

Example of binary strategy 1:
    (5)
    Moi, l'air en conserve, j'aime pas ça!
    'Me, canned air, I don't like it!'
        Theme   Rheme

Example of binary strategy 2:
    (6)
    Ça n'arrive qu'à moi, des choses pareilles!
    'Such things only happen to me!'[11] (Hergé 1976)
        Rheme   Mneme

Her studies have largely inspired the reflections on IS in the current thesis.

3.4.2. Modular approach (Geneva school)

The modular approach developed in Geneva and some other research centres (works of Nølke 1994, Roulet 1999, 2001) takes as a point of departure the fact that linguistic studies in general, having regard to the immense diversity of languages, should consider different problems in a framework that allows specific phenomena to be analysed without losing sight of the more general aim. The modular approach uses a theoretic model that is composed of subsystems called 'modules'. A module has to account for a more specific question, whereas the whole system is built with global rules that link the modules with each other. This approach has different applications, in generative framework or in functional grammar one. Some general principles should be mentioned here that are relevant to the present study and to a more specific study (Grobet 2002) inspired by this approach that also accounts for some of the questions that this study is dealing with.

    The modular approach examines first the information structure of dialogues and second the so-called 'topical structure' of a text, which accounts for the different statuses of discourse referents and their hierarchy. Like Daneš did for written texts, this approach studies the informational progression for all types of texts, by defining topics that are not only textual elements, but information stocked in discourse memory that can be activated by the text. In his first version in 1991, Roulet takes as the point of departure the theory of Daneš with regards to the IS; in his later developments he extends the theory to several discourse types, using different linkages with other discourse structures, especially hierarchic and referential ones. The discourse memory is defined by

---

[11]   Literal translation: 'It happens only to me, such things!'

Berrendonner as knowledge shared by discourse participants, modified constantly by new events and ongoing discourse (Berrendonner 1983: 230–231). Roulet then, supported by Chafe's distinction between inactive, semi-active and active information (Chafe 1994: 53–56), proposes considering that every speech act introduces an activated information and this activation requires at least one anchoring point in discourse 1996: 18). By each act, a so-called 'discourse-object' is activated. The Prague school's notion of 'Theme' can be found in the 'anchoring point' and secondly in the 'track of the anchoring point', that is the concrete realization of this information called 'discourse object', for example by an anaphoric expression. There can also be different anchoring points that can be found on different levels of discourse memory: a distinction is made between immediate anchoring points, called 'topics' and background anchoring points. The same idea of distinguishing between a topic and its track can already be found in Auchlin 1986 and Lambrecht 1994 (topic and topic expression Lambrecht 1994: 131).

Having established the topical organization of the discourse, the modular approach accounts for different hierarchical and referential structures of discourse (cf. for example Grobet 2002: 67–68, 301–341). Here this aspect will not be described in more depth.

Another example of a specific application of this model is A. Grobet who refers to the 'modular approach' in her analysis dealing with the 'identification of topics' in the dialogues.

Grobet (2002) has also adopted a view according to which Information Structuring should be treated in 'modular' terms, drawing inspiration from the ideas elaborated by the Geneva scholars (Roulet). This approach has certain advantages, especially the ambition to encompass very different discourse types (oral, literary, non-literary etc.) and the fact that it tries to associate IS with other discourse structures, especially hierarchic and referential ones. A. Grobet (2002) takes as a point of departure the modular approach, but after having presented some critiques about it, tries to solve some important problems that are related to the notion of topic. The theory of the Geneva school is original in the fact that it makes a distinction between an anchoring point (the implicit constituent of Information Structuring) and its linguistic coding and it allows several topics in the same clause to be considered, including implicit ones. It still has some problematic aspects, especially in defining different elements that are implied in the analysis, such as the topic and discourse object. There are however some crucial questions that are not resolved by this approach, as have also been pointed out by A. Grobet: among others, the problem of defining the topic and discourse object, as well as the distinction between an immediate anchoring point and a background anchoring point (Grobet 2002: 69), and more generally the problem of identifying topics of each act due to the fact that a topic must not be explicit, there can be more than one topic in one act and the definition of topic is rather intuitive etc. (*ibidem*: 70). This aspect makes the usability of the findings and the applicability of this model somewhat

problematic, because there are numerous functions to be identified for each sequence and the criteria used for demonstration can turn out to be ambiguous when applying them to a larger selection of examples.

3.4.3. Some other approaches

S. Maynard (1986) has made an attempt to apply the model of the Prague school to spoken language in an interactional perspective, combining the latter with Conversational Analysis. She explores the patterns of thematic progression elaborated by Daneš by applying them to interactional discourse and making some necessary adjustments of his model.

B. Combettes (1983) has applied the principles laid down by the Prague school regarding the thematic progression to the textual domain; he has also associated the types of thematic progression and the levels of text organization (background and first plane). He is also known by his diachronic studies and his works on detached constructions from a broader perspective (1993, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2005).

N. E. Enkvist (1974, 1982, 1984,1987) is one of the precursors and introducers of text linguistics in Nordic countries. He has spread the ideas of the Prague school and has worked on several sub-domains linked to text linguistics problems (stylistics, contrastive linguistics etc), cf. section 3.3.1.

As the Conversation Analysis framework is not the theoretical background I have chosen to apply in the present analysis, some works will be briefly mentioned here, and furthermore, in the analysis of detachment constructions some findings will be associated to the current analysis; it is worth mentioning that some of these studies have been concerned about the problems linked to Information Structuring and more specifically detachment constructions, so that some of their results may also be of interest when we investigate more specifically detachment constructions in discourse.

Among others, the following studies should be mentioned: Mondada 1994, 2003, Pekarek Doehler 2001, Horlacher & Müller 2005, Horlacher 2012. One specific study about initial detachments in English (Geluykens 1992), which uses the background of interactional linguistics, should also be mentioned.

3.5. Word order

Researchers in different fields of linguistics have pointed out that languages differ from each other by the degree of constraints that the syntax imposes on other levels. It has been argued that some Finno-Ugric languages such as Finnish or Estonian have a relatively free constituent order (Vilkuna 1989), which means that the word order is discourse-conditioned or in other words mostly influenced by pragmatic needs, in comparison with some Indo-European languages where the position of the constituents determines their syntactic

function. These types of observations were made, for example, in the first studies of the Prague school researchers who compared some Indo-European languages and Slavic languages and made clear that the word order plays an important role at a pragmatic level in Slavic languages, whereas in languages like English or French the word order is mostly determined by syntactic constraints.

Issues concerning the relationship of word order to the processes of thematization have been discussed by Enkvist 1975: 69–73. He points to the well-established fact that word order variation takes place within certain limits allowed by syntax and discusses some more restrictions such as the syntactic island rule and avoiding the thematization of heavy and long constituents, among others.

From a textual perspective, this author stresses the role of Information Structuring (seen as a means of presenting of old and new information) in relation to the word order:

> The sentence /.../must be provided with devices that plug it into the preceding text and make possible a contact with that which comes after. Textual fit is largely a matter of that information structure which signals what in the sentence is old and what is new information. (Enkvist 1984: 53)

A. Hakulinen 2001 (1976): 133–135 discusses the flexibility of word order in Finnish, analysing several constraints related to grammatical structures, and also proposes an overview of different modifications to neutral word order caused by thematic considerations. Among other phenomena, detached constructions are described. The need for final detachment is explained by two factors: first of all, the need for the speaker to clarify the referent, and secondly, the fact that the nominal constituent is too heavy to be placed at the beginning of the utterance, but nevertheless some support is needed there in order to be able to use, for example, a particle (*han/hän*) (*ibid.*: 133). In the case of initial detachments the author also invokes the possible difficulties of integrating the nominal element in certain grammatical structures of the main clause, for example due to the heaviness of the nominal constituent or the presence of several modifiers (*määrite*). This points to the fact that this construction is especially suitable for use with relative clauses that determine the detached nominal constituent (*ibid.*: 135). This author also draws attention to the fact that the investigation of non-Indo-European languages like Finnish still bears the influence of studies of SVO-languages with grammatically triggered word order such as English. The category of subject in Finnish is clearly less pervasive and is not assigned a position at the beginning of the sentence, as a consequence of which it is less plausible to look for the theme being expressed in this position (Hakulinen 2001: 222, 226).

Generally, in most (syntactic) studies it has become clear that the word order is greatly influenced by different parameters, such as Information Structuring

and different rules commanding the presentation of the information (heavier constituents moving to the end etc.).

These questions have also been of great interest for language typologists, especially after the publication of an article by Li & Thompson where they proposed a new typological approach according to the degree of marking the topic in languages (Li & Thompson 1976).

Ehala 2006 observes, for instance, that Estonian has a rare and marked word order SIOV (I stands for auxiliary verb) which seems to have been stable already for some centuries. From the perspective of universal language, the author suggests that instead of grammatical word order principles, the rules of coding given and new information are universal.

In Finnish linguistics, the questions of word order and the information packaging have been treated from different viewpoints. As one example can be mentioned the study of Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979 which deals with syntax from a transformational and textual perspective, using examples from written language. Different word order patterns are presented and the changes of word order are linked to the information packaging, among others: first, the basic word order can be modified in order to fill certain positions determined by the syntactic structure. The second principle described in this context is the one of giving the 'lighter' constituents first and leaving the 'heavier' constituent at the end. And thirdly are mentioned the textual connexions, such as the informational status of the constituents (known/unknown), different connexions between the constituents, semantic relations, focusing (*ibidem*: 497–499). The Theme is defined in positional terms: it is the nominal constituent that precedes the verb. Other nominal preverbal constituents that can not be interpreted as themes, are presented as Topics (adverbials, framing constituents).

A special study is also devoted to the 'free' word order in Finnish: M. Vilkuna's study from 1989 analyses from a syntactic perspective discourse factors that impose constraints on word order in Finnish (word order being understood as constituent order at clause level).

In languages where the word order is more subordinated to grammatical constraints, the questions of the role of IS have been discussed, especially in relation to different constructions that are difficult to describe in terms of traditional syntax, such as detachment constructions etc. A well-known example comes from K. Lambrecht who defines from the perspective of IS the pragmatical word order constraint and, resulting from that, the generalized use of detachment constructions in French: since French spoken language avoids new referents as subjects, detachments and cleft constructions (*il y a … qui*) are frequently used in order to introduce new referents in discourse. More generally, this observation has been extended cross-linguistically in many works to oral speech in general: for example, Lambrecht (1987a: 218) has suggested that the canonical SVO order is not a predominant pattern in any language; a similar idea has been proposed by Du Bois (1987) on the basis of data from English and other languages.

This phenomenon has been linked to the principle of Separation of Reference and Role (Lambrecht 1994: 185) according to which one has to first introduce a referent and after that formulate a predication about it. This pragmatic principle is linked to the processing of information in communication:

> From the hearer's point of view, it is easier to decode a message about a topic if the task of assessing the topic referent can be performed independently of the task of interpreting the proposition in which the topic is an argument. (Lambrecht: *ibidem*)

In a related area, Lambrecht (1988: 143), has analysed the presentational or *avoir* cleft (*il y a le telephone qui sonne* / ***J'ai** les yeux qui me font mal*, literally 'there *is* the telephone ringing'/ '*I have* my eyes that are hurting me') in French, arguing that French, as compared to English and Italian, has developed a 'mixed strategy'. He compares 'event-reporting' sentences in the three languages, positing that, in English, the constraints of syntax win out over those of pragmatics while, in Italian, the reverse is the case. French, however, according to Lambrecht, manages a compromise, preserving a syntactically controlled basic word order while at the same time avoiding violation of constraints originating in pragmatic concerns (see Lambrecht 1988 for examples and discussion).

Similarly, it can be argued that the use of dislocated sequences for various pragmatic purposes (e.g. Barnes, 1985; Lambrecht, 1987a) achieves a similar compromise between the rigidity of a so-called word order language and the flexibility of languages with rich morphological components, such as Italian (Heilenman & McDonald 1993:185).

As will be shown in chapter 4, in Estonian linguistics, the informational aspect in linguistic studies has also mostly been used in studies about the constituent order, or more precisely, the constituent order has sometimes received an informational explanation.

Mention should also be made here of the studies of J. Perrot who began his theorization in this field back in the 1970s (1978, 1994a, 1994b) where he also adopts a more general perspective by underlining the fact that in a sentence, two main structurations make up the essential part of linguistic communications: firstly, syntactical structuration and secondly, informational structuration. Perrot distinguishes three components: possible preliminary information (*thème*, 'support' in his terminology), new information (*rhème*, 'apport' by Perrot) and sometimes a third element ('report') that recalls a known information that is not specified in the rhematic part or that serves to disambiguate the previous message (Perrot 1994a: 16–17, 1994b: 37). In relation to the word order 'liberty', he claims that the coexistence of these two structures creates constraints that impose certain limits to this 'liberty' (1994a: 17). According to him, because of the communicational objective of human discourse, the informational structure of the message has priority over the syntactic structure of the sentence, but the informational aspect has to adapt itself to the syntactic constraints (*ibidem*: 30).

In this chapter some sets of problems that deal with the interaction between the level of Information Structuring and word order were briefly addressed; the researches about Estonian language that make reference to this association will be presented in chapter 4.

3.6. Prosody and Information Structuring: a problem not yet resolved

The role and functions of intonation have been discussed thoroughly in different frameworks, therefore it is not necessary to refer to all of them; only some very general and classic studies will be mentioned here, along with all those which mention the relations between Information Structuring and intonation/prosody.

The first question is, of course, can prosodical features be correlated with a significant value, or more precisely, as put by Lacheret-Dujour & Beaugendre (1999: 95), can minimal prosodical features be attributed a functional pertinence?

Often, it seems that the phoneticians and 'other' linguists do not manage to find a lot of common points of interest and possible ground for consensus.

The biggest controversy seems to be the extent to which prosodical units can be put into a relationship with units on other levels of description, as assumed by Simon (2004: 3):

> *En effet, l'obstacle majeur à une meilleure compréhension du fonctionnement de la prosodie en discours réside actuellement dans l'absence d'unités définies de manière systématique et cohérente avec lesquelles mettre la structure prosodique en relation.*[12]

Some French linguists who work on spoken language (Blanche-Benveniste, Morel, Danon-Boileau) take as their point of departure the fact, recognized for a long time (but with different judgements and consequences) that French spoken spontaneous discourse has so many differences in comparison to written language that one could ask the question as to whether they are two poles of the same language or two completely different codes. Besides very important differences on a lexical level that we won't investigate here, spoken French is characterized by a 'decondensation of markers' (Morel, Danon-Boileau 1998: 8), detached constructions etc.

The 'grammar' or 'syntax' of oral spontaneous French has been studied as such in different frameworks: for example, the works of C. Blanche-Benveniste (GARS), where the data are presented on 'syntactic grids' that allow distinction to be made between the syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations of the clause (Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1979, Blanche-Benveniste 2000, Tiainen-Duvallon

---

[12] Indeed, the major obstacle to a better understanding of the functioning of the prosody in discourse resides in the absence of systematically and coherently defined units to put into relation with the prosodic structure.'

2002). This approach focuses on syntax which is described as starting from its nucleus, the verbal element, and is presented as a progressive creation in 'syntactic moulds' which allow the oral text to be constructed (especially Tiainen-Duvallon 2002: 9–10). Prosody is not studied in this framework.

Another approach to spoken French is proposed by Morel & Danon-Boileau (1998) in *Grammaire de l'intonation* where both levels, prosody and syntax, have been taken into account.

According to the authors it is not possible to speak about the functions of intonation globally without any other precision, because intonation, taken separately, does not carry any substantive meaning: it corresponds to different cues and only the variations of different features constitute an interpretable data set.

They distinguish between 'iconic' and 'conventional' values: every cue (pitch, intensity, duration, silent pause) has a basic iconic value and then it can be assigned a conventional value. For example, they claim that the iconic value of a silent pause is to indicate a turning point in an existing framework; a silent pause, when it is longer than 40 cs, has a conventional value and indicates that the previous information has to be taken as a unified thematic set and thus introduces the rhematic part of the paragraph; these authors determine also the functions of pitch range variations, intensity and the possible combinations of these cues etc.

This approach has been criticized on several points: firstly, the suprasegmental nature that they attribute to the intonation has been opposed by phonological approaches to the prosody. Secondly, as pointed out by Simon 2004, several methodological and theoretical problems are not solved in their approach, such as their coupling of different features that lacks substantiation, the division of pitch range into four levels with an absolute level for each speaker (Simon 2004: 29), and more generally, the presumably universal nature of prosodic features (*ibidem*: 53). In conclusion to her research on prosody in French discourse, Simon pleads in favour of a *relative* independence of prosody:

> *La propriété première de la prosodie est de n'être parfaitement congruente avec aucun plan d'organisation du discours, mais de l'être potentiellement avec tous.*[13] (*ibidem*: 346)

Another view is put forward by the researchers of the framework of contextualization theory (Auer & di Luzio 1992, Couper-Kuhlen & Selting 1996): according to them, the 'sense' of prosodic features has an indexical nature and must thus be considered together with other signs, like syntax, interactional clues etc.

---

[13] The first characteristic of the prosody is that it is not perfectly congruent with any level of organization of the discourse, but it can be potentially congruent with all levels.

Intonation in co-occurrence with syntactic, semantic and other locutionary properties is used as a contextualization device in conversational activities to signal the status and contextual presupposition of segments and utterances (Selting 1992: 237).

Contrary to previous approaches, so-called morphological theories do not establish a link between intonational morphemes and a particular value, cf. Rossi 1999.

As pointed out among others by Chafe (1987) and Lambrecht (1994), different statuses regarding IS have also formal correlates in prosody.

Chafe (1994) has adopted a functional approach to prosodic phenomena by opposing himself to, for example, Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg 1990:

The approach followed / --- / developed out of a different tradition, in which the sounds of language are transcribed in terms of perceived phenomena judged to express significant aspects of function and meaning. (Chafe 1994: 56)

Chafe assigns special features to the pronunciation of different items according to their informational charge:

Those concepts which are already active for the speaker, and which the speaker judges to be active for the hearer as well, are verbalized in a special way, having properties which have often been discussed in terms of 'old' or 'given' information. The general thing to say is that given concepts are spoken with an attenuated pronunciation. The attenuation involves, at the very least, weak stress. Typically, though not always, it involves either pronominalization or omission from verbalization altogether. (Chafe 1987: 26)

Although several authors have underlined the importance of prosody in Information Structuring, it is not easy to find comprehensive studies that encompass different aspects of the question. One of the reasons for that must be that it is not easy to find a consensus concerning pertinent features that will be observed and analysed; a second problem is linked to the question about the most adequate level and the degree of precision in analysis. And thirdly there are at most two different approaches concerning the treatment of data: should it be sufficient if we look (or rather listen) at the data as linguists, but using the same means as all other speakers and listeners, i.e without using any technical means, just as any ordinary listener receives the message or would it be more adequate to look only at data which are processed by machines and programs and thus are quantified and measurable? Then another question arise – what are the pertinent features that are to be measured and quantified?

The importance of intonation had also been noted long ago by Praguan linguist F. Daneš who distinguished between primary and secondary functions of intonation. In its primary function, as this term indicates, it functions as a 'basic device', in its secondary function, it can be replaced by other means. According to Daneš, intonation has two primary functions: delimitation and

discourse structuring. The main secondary function of intonation is modal, i.e. the characterization of the utterance according to its intention (Daneš 1960: 48).

A.-C. Simon (2004) has investigated the links between prosody and the internal structure of texts: she claims that these two features can have three types of relations: firstly, prosody can confirm the delimitation already established by other means; secondly, prosody can help to establish with more assurance the results of an analysis; thirdly, prosody may be of no help at all, since it cannot be correlated with the results of the analysis.

3.6.1. Detachment constructions and prosody

Given that the treatment of detached constructions in relation to the prosodical features of the speech is still highly problematic in the present framework, no specific analysis of Estonian from this perspective will be proposed in this thesis. The interest towards this domain (more generally towards IS and prosody) is growing among Estonian linguists and some syntactic accounts have been recently attempted (Sahkai, Kalvik & Mihkla 2013a, 2013b, Salveste 2013).

I consider that this aspect provides material for a separate research, taking into account the fact that was pointed out in the previous chapter about the lack of studies on clause prosody in Estonian and other major problems linked to the treatment of prosody and Information Structuring in discourse. Some works can be mentioned that deal with prosody in relation to the detached constituents: Coveney 2003, Walker 2004, Astruc 2004 (about Catalan), Leonarduzzi & Herry 2006, Grobet & Simon 2009, Avanzi 2009, Brunetti, Avanzi & Gendrot 2012.

One central problem lies also in the perspective of analysis and the non-communication or incompatibility of theoretical and empirical principles adopted for researches: if a study is carried out from the point of view of a phonetician, it is rarely compatible with pragmatic or syntactic frameworks that the linguists of these domains consider as prerequisites of their research and vice versa: when a pragmatician or syntactician wants to integrate another dimension like prosody in its analysis, it often receives a very critical reception from phoneticians – and most probably, the researchers in other domains are not even informed about these works. Hence, approaches trying to combine the outcome of different research problematics and domains could be fruitful in the future.

M.M.J. Fernandez-Vest has in several of her works drawn attention to this challenge, given that when analysing detached constructions, researchers fre-quently point to the specific prosodic features of these structures, but different approaches often seem incompatible (Fernandez-Vest 2009: 199, 2015: 222–224). As concerns her proper approach, she considers prosody an essential criterion when identifying, for example, detached constructions (together with discourse particles); more generally, prosody makes it possible to determine the

enunciative strategy chosen by the speaker as binary strategy 1 (Th-Rh) or binary strategy 2 (Rh-Mn). She points also to the fact that it is of utmost importance to apply the same analytical framework to short and long utterances, which is the condition that makes it possible to investigate the IS in natural speech (Fernandez-Vest 2009: 200).

She has observed about the Sami language and Finnish (interlanguage) spoken by Samis that the discourse is structured primarily by intonation, secondly by discourse particles, whereas the word order comes only in third place (*ibidem*: 181).

As concerns the approach chosen here, it is assumed that the analyst is able to interpret the prosodical features like any other speaker who participates in the conversation; besides that, due to the lack of a proper methodology it is not possible to present these data as usable for drawing conclusions about the functions of prosody in discourse, so I will only limit my description to the audible data and refer to some studies about other languages: consequently, the examples that are discussed in this thesis were chosen not only by identifying the detached structures in the transcription, but also by carefully listening to the recordings.

These unsolved questions regarding the prosody and its relation to other levels of description certainly provide material for future research.

4. ESTONIAN LINGUISTICS AND INFORMATION STRUCTURING

Information Structuring as a phenomenon of the pragmatic level has not been treated in depth by linguists working on Estonian. IS enters into some studies in relation to questions of the order of constituents and more generally, in relation to problems on the morphosyntactic level. These linguistic phenomena lack clear markings on the morphosyntactic level (just as definiteness, for example), so that they are divided between several categories – prosody, word order, etc. However, thanks to the notable development of corpus linguistics in Estonia during the last decades there is more interest among linguists towards spontaneous oral language, and these questions can be more adequately addressed when one can take into account the special features of oral speech.

The most recent descriptive grammar of Estonian language (Erelt et al. 1993: 13–14) distinguishes between the semantic and pragmatic functions of the sentence constituents. From the pragmatic viewpoint, the sentence functions as a message and its constituents have certain functions that can be described by using terms such Theme-Rheme, known-unknown, Focus.

Theme is defined as the point of departure of the message and Rheme is the remaining part of the information. Theme is also called the 'pragmatic subject'. As a rule, the distinction between the two can be made by using the word order criterion: the sentence begins by the thematic constituent, followed by the rhematic part. The focus is defined as part of a sentence that is under special attention, for example:

(7)
Sinu   kasvatasin   ju   MINA   üles.
you.GEN grow.PST.1sg PRTCL me   up
'You were brought up by ME'

EKG gives examples of non-contextual sentences, i.e. sentences with a 'neutral' structure of information: '*Peeter luges raamatut*' ('Peter read a book.') According to the authors, the choice of a Theme in such a sentence depends on the meaning of the predicate – which always has a certain pragmatic orientation in addition to its primarily semantic orientation.

In the 70s there were some works in the field of pragmatics that operated with the notion of information structure (Õim 1973, Metslang 1978b, Erelt 1979), essentially in the context of the School of Prague. However, the IS as such was not the main object of investigation, but these works still made a valuable contribution having introduced these problematics to the Estonian public. H. Metslang's (1978a) dissertation analyses syntactic regularities in parallelisms of Estonian octosyllabic verses (runic songs), taking into account the aspects of information structure (on the theme-rheme scale): the components theme and rheme are distinguished in primary language use as well as in poetic

language use; the information structure of the main verse is compared to that of the whole parallelism group and generally, the network of determination relations is investigated in constructions of parallel verses.

Another example of notions of IS being applied in the analysis of a literary text is the investigation of a short story written by G. Maupassant from the point of view of information packaging (Amon 2008).

Kaja Tael (1988a, 1988b, 1990) has studied IS in relation to word order and syntactic structure. Her work is still today one of the most comprehensive studies using the notions of IS: she has also tried to clarify some terminological questions and to apply some specific approaches to the Estonian data. Tael considers the syntax and the informational level as two levels that are closely linked to each other and argues that with regards to the word order questions the syntactic parameters are not sufficient and she proposes using IS to achieve a better description of sentence structure.

In her works she discusses word order and IS in different domains: firstly, in comparison with the Finnish language (Tael 1988a); secondly, she studies the word order in impersonal clauses in Estonian (Tael 1987); she has also made a general introduction to the problematics of the IS with an overview of the main studies in this domain (Tael 1988b). For the purposes of her analysis she makes the distinction between strong Theme and strong Rheme on the one hand, and weak Theme and Rheme on the other. In addition to these elements she also uses the notions of Focus of Theme and Focus of Rheme that encompass the emphatic constituents and describe the weight of each constituent. Topic is used on the level of the linear structure of the sentence, i.e. the constituent order, and it represents the first element of the sentence that may or may not coincide with the Theme. She defines these mentioned categories as follows: Theme as what has been speaked about and Rheme as what is said about it. The topicalization is referred to as a phenomenon that consists of placing a constituent at the first position for emphasis. The different constituents of the phrase (strong and weak Theme/Rheme etc.) seem to be defined in her studies firstly according to the semantic parameters, and by the same token she tries to find a correlation between the syntactic functions and the elements she distinguishes on the level of IS (Theme/Rheme etc). One of the problems of such an approach can be the necessity of distinguishing the constituents in very great detail, i.e. to every syntactic group there should be found a correlate on the pragmatic level, but the latter can not always be so easily defined. For example, Tael (1987: 88) proposes analysing a very short clause as follows:

(8)
Käitumishindeks	pandi	kolm.
mark_for_conduct.TRL	give.PST.IMPS	three
Strong rheme	weak rheme	rheme focus

When we try to follow previously given definitions of Theme and Rheme we see that they cannot help to distinguish between these two constituents, and it is even more difficult to try to assign a graduation inside these two categories, even if it is possible to understand why the author has made such choices.

Another problem is related to the corpus used, because the clauses she analyses do not come from an oral corpus (that is, however, something one can not really criticize about studies carried out in Estonia in the 1980s); the examples serve to illustrate the argument of the author but it would be quite difficult to apply these distinctions to authentic examples from oral language. As a conclusion she argues that one of the main rules that organize the IS level in Estonian is the principle of 'the heaviest element at the end'. In the light of her results she also formulates the main constraint of constituent order in Estonian – the V2 principle. As a result she argues that the basis of word order in Estonian is Information Structuring: the Theme is placed at the first position, and the heavier information (Rheme) comes at the end. The prototypical Theme in Estonian is subject and the neutral word order SVX but it is not the basic word order. She explains it as follows: due to the V2 constraint and the fact that the first position can also be filled by several emphatic elements, the Topic is not necessarily the Theme of the sentence. When there is topicalization, a new word order structure is created that follows the V2 constraint and that is why she considers topicalization as one of the main elements that organize the constituent order in Estonian.

Neither of the above-mentioned studies has used examples of spoken language; Tael has examined a corpus of journalistic texts. That leads to a situation that has been frequently observed where the authors use some very clear-cut examples that fit into their demonstration but these examples cannot be replaced by oral clauses because it is not possible to achieve the same results.

Another study dealing with the notions of Information Structuring is the PhD thesis of L. Lindström (Lindström 2005) and the articles that are part of it. Her study is mostly dedicated to the constituent order phenomena, especially to the place of the predicate in different clause types. To explain the constituent order she uses the categories of IS as defined by Prince (Lindström 2004), i.e. known, unknown and inferable information. In the first part of her PhD, Lindström makes a general introduction to the relevant debate about word order and IS. In her analysis she refers mostly to the classification of E. Prince (1981) and in one article to the distinction of Topic-Focus by K. Lambrecht (1994). Her study deals mainly with the place of the predicate and she explains the variation of word order by the influence of the IS; her approach is discourse-based. When studying the subject NP she concludes that the constituent order NP+VP is preferred when the NP contains discourse known information and the inversion of word order appears when the NP contains new information in the current discourse (Lindström 2005: 102). In general she confirms that her data show the common tendency that has been established for other European languages that the given/known information comes in the first place and the new information

that often carries more syntactic weight comes at the end of the clause. She reaches several interesting conclusions about word order in Estonian and the possible role of Information Structuring at the syntactic level. However, Information Structuring as a pragmatic category is not central to her study, she refers to it in order to explain and interpret different phenomena concerning the the word order in Estonian.

Information Structuring has also been mentioned in relation to the diachronic developments: T. Lehtinen 1992 (cited by Lindström 2006: 876) has argued that IS has played an important role in the change of basic word order in Estonian (SOV>SVO); he has made an observation according to which the verb is placed at the end of a main sentence or a subordinated sentence when the sentence does not carry new information and because of this the word order is not very important as there is no new constituent to be placed at the end of the sentence and thus the verb can move to the end. L. Lindström tries to investigate further these arguments by looking at the role of IS in word order changes in Estonian. She refers to the definition of Focus by K. Lambrecht (1994) and shows how the Focus placed at the beginning of the clause contributes to the maintaining of the verb-final word order in subordinate clauses in Estonian. She points out that in the oral language, certain sentence types where the Focus is typically in the first position (interrogative sentences) have kept the verb-final word order, whereas in other types of sentences (relative, certain temporal and conditional clauses) where new information is promoted, the verb tends to be placed in a central position (like in a neutral declarative main sentence) while the new information moves to the end. When there is no new information, the verb is still placed at the end even if the first position is occupied by the Topic or by some neutral element and inversely, when there is new information available, the verb moves to another position because the new information is placed at the end: according to L. Lindström, this observation confirms the importance of Information Structuring, which commands the word order in Estonian more than grammatical constraints (*ibidem*: 887–888).

Another study that deals to some extent with IS, in particular in relation to topical elements, is the PhD thesis of K. Hiietam (Hiietam 2003) on definiteness in Estonian. She considers definiteness from a typological point of view and stresses the syntactic and semantic aspects of definiteness. In one chapter she also investigates the definiteness on the pragmatic level and tries to find correspondences between the pragmatic expressions of 'Topic' and definiteness.

She defines Topic following King (1995) as 'the noun phrase which represents what the discourse is about' (Hiietam 2003: 252) and divides according to King the phrase into three constituents: Topic, Focus and discourse neutral material (*ibidem*: 253). The Topic is thus defined by using semantical criteria.

She tries to find out which constructions or pronouns are used as Topic markers; firstly she makes a distinction between continuous and return-pop topics; according to her, the adnominal pronoun '*see*' is mostly a marker of

identifiability/definiteness whereas the pronominal '*see*', as well as '*siin*' ('here') and '*seal*' ('there'), are Topic markers.

However, as her study focuses on definite elements, she distinguishes only topical elements and opposes them to the other two types of constituents as much as necessary for the purposes of her work, so that the IS in general is not under investigation. Her aim is to find out which lexical elements correspond to the topic position and she arrives at the conclusion that the most identifiable Topics are pronouns; they mark the most accessible information and are also maximally definite (Hiietam 2003: 17).

To sum up, already in the 70s and 80s there were some attempts in Estonia to present the works of the Prague school, including some very general presentations and first definitions of the problematics; then, a syntactic approach tried to put into relation syntactic functions and the terms of the IS framework (Tael). It is obvious that for some reason these questions did not interest Estonian linguists, because the next studies only came after more than a ten-year pause (Lindström). However both approaches start from the syntactic level and try to explain syntactic phenomena by using the categories of information structure. There seems to be some kind of consensus among the linguists about this concept even when it is not defined explicitly: the references made to Topic, for example, seem to assume that this notion encompasses the 'known' constituent of the phrase, even if the authors referred to are somewhat different: for example, Lindström refers to Prince and Lambrecht, Tirkkonen (Tirkkonen 2006) refers to Gundel when she describes the different cognitive statuses of referents in discourse – activated, in focus, etc. According to Tirkkonen, discourse is often about human referents that constitute thus the topic of the discourse; and by the same token, these elements also tend to be in focus, because the speaker wants to bring them to the center of attention (Tirkkonen 2006: 12). This illustrates one of the problems that occur due to the different terminological and theoretical backgrounds that have been observed by numerous investigations about the definition of Topic using the concept of Focus of attention, (see Reinhart 1982), where Topic is referred to as expressions that represent the centre or Focus of attention of the speaker; the same definition can also be found in Van Oosten 1986).

As these problems have not been thoroughly discussed by Estonian scholars one should not expect to find many studies that combine different approaches or that tend to bring together several fields of research; there has not really been any discussion about concepts and different theoretical approaches. One not very extensive study, however (Pajupuu & Tael 1989) tries, with a view to synthesizing longer text units with more natural intonation, to combine syntactic and pragmatic features, as treated in the works of Tael, and the acoustic parameters of a sentence. They used the concepts of Information Focus (IF) referring to F° peaks and Rhematic Focus (RF) referring to the pragmatic peak of the sentence (which does not always coincide with IF) and in their study they compared the perception of these two features in natural speech as well as

synthesized speech. They drew the conclusion that IF helps to recognize sentence RF and when the two features do not coincide this can cause serious problems in interpreting the sentence (Pajupuu & Tael 1989: 300–301).

Another more recent investigation about intonation in the syntactic framework that uses some notions of the IS background is from N. Salveste (2012): it is an experimental study about the perception of Focus in sentences presented to a group of native speakers aiming to determine the role of intonation (vs word order) in the perception of Focus. She draws the conclusion that prosody is primary in determining the Focus, compared to the position of the focalized element in the sentence.

The investigation of Sahkai et al. (2013a) is a production study elaborated following the methodology of the production experiments in different languages by S. Skopeteas et al. 2006 (*Questionnaire on Information Structure*); the analysis of Estonian data is performed with Praat by using the notions of IS in a syntactic framework in relation to the prosodic production of identical sentences with different 'focus structures'. This method, as well as the one used in Salveste 2012, and similarly to the studies of Tael, represents the syntactic approach and its findings cannot be compared to my results.

The notions linked to the packaging of information are also part of the works of another Estonian linguist, R. Pajusalu (specifically 1995, 2005, 2009 about Estonian pronouns) who analyses referential relations, the Estonian pronominal system and deixis – to mention the questions that are somewhat linked to the problematics addressed in this thesis. Her studies will also be referred to in the chapter dealing with resumptive pronouns in detached constructions.

Estonian pronouns *see* and *ta* are also central to an experimental study (written sentence completion task) carried out by E. Kaiser & V. A. Vihman (2010) in order to find out, in the framework of saliency/accessibility theories, which is the preferential pattern for using these anaphors.

In addition to this study, a comparative typological investigation about third-person pronouns in Estonian and Finnish should also be mentioned here (Kaiser & Hiietam 2004).

We can generally observe here the same problem which has led several linguists to suggest abandoning the notions of Theme and Rheme, namely the definition of basic terms and the level of analysis. If this is done appropriately, all these controversial terms can still be used; the debates that can be observed over several decades show that there are some phenomena that need to be investigated in more depth. In Estonian linguistics, the terms of IS have not been used within a coherent approach, rather different researchers have tried to insert those notions into their existing framework of analysis (mostly syntactic) which leads to a somewhat inconsistent impression of the whole domain. However, one can not criticize the use of these terms in well-limited syntactic analyses where today a certain terminological stability seems to be attained.

5. THEME AND MNEME (POST-RHEME, TAIL) AS INFORMATIONAL CONSTITUENTS

In this chapter some relevant aspects of investigating the informational categories that are associated with the constructions analysed in this thesis will be presented. As has been explained in previous chapters and will be illustrated in the present chapter, the approach chosen here presumes that Information Structuring as a level of description of the language is at the same time a dynamic process at the discourse level where the minimal communication unit can consist only of a Rheme. Besides the rhematic constituent, an utterance can contain a Theme and/or a Mneme.[14] The dynamic process is understood in a way that when a constituent is first introduced in the Rheme, it can become a Theme in the next utterance. The constituent Rheme as such is not addressed as a separate object of investigation in this thesis; in the detachment constructions that are analysed here, the Rheme corresponds to the main clause (containing a resumptive element), and depending on the approach, in a more general perspective the Rheme can be defined as the predicate or 'what is said about the Theme', or the 'new' information. These definitions can also be somewhat problematic, but at this point it can be considered that in detached constructions, their identification should not be highly problematic, given the quite limited formal definition of these constituents.

One remark should be made before introducing different sections of this chapter: its content may leave an impression of imbalance, given the fact that the constituents before the Rheme will receive much more attention than those following the Rheme. This can be explained by two factors: first, the Theme and its functions has long been the subject of controversy, as this constituent can be relatively lengthy and contain multiple and diverse constituents (different frames, lexical NPs etc.), so that some important aspects of all these problematics should inevitably be mentioned or clarified here, given that this constituent has inspired countless studies and I can refer to only some of them; second, this imbalance has been present through the whole history of investigation of the above-mentioned constituents: the role of Post-Rheme at the informational level has been recognized on a larger scale notably later than the

---

[14] The term 'Mneme', proposed by M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest, could also be used here, given that it would be less associated to syntactic or other approaches which use the notions like Post-Rheme, but for consistency reasons in Estonian the latter was preferred, given that in Estonian there all less difficulties linked to the prolific terminology (to be more precise, there are still no term referring to this constituent in Estonian on the level of Information Structuring) and therefore a more transparent term (Post-Rheme) was used in the text of the present thesis in English as well as in Estonian summary. The term 'Tail' was left aside for the same reasons, moreover, its original lexical meaning should have given a specific character to this term, compared to others that are neutral and more widespread in this sense. The term 'Anti-Topic' has been discarded because of the overt opposition with Topic, which was not considered as primary and adequate in our framework.

role of Theme and the main constituent analysed in this regard is precisely the final detachment, whereas thematic constituents present much more variety: in consequence, the general problematics associated with thematic constituents have an understandably larger scope and the questions introduced here regarding elements other than initial detachments do not need to be addressed any more in the chapter dedicated to initial detachments, whereas the post-rhematic element is mostly (but not exclusively) represented by the construction that will be addressed in the dedicated chapter.

The following sets of problems will be discussed in this chapter: Theme (thematic elements) in discourse, a-thematic utterances, and Post-Rheme as an informational constituent. However, this section does not attempt to cover all the problematics, as it constitutes only a background for the main object of the thesis.

5.1. Theme and the thematic field from the informational perspective

The analysis of detached constructions in the framework of the present thesis is carried out mainly from the perspective of Information Structuring, i.e. the investigated constructions (initial and final detachments) are considered in relation to the relevant IS categories; however, as the whole problematics linked to the IS in discourse is certainly beyond the scope of the present work, only a narrower category of detached constituents (see the description in chapter 6.1.) is selected and discussed in order to cover the most typical and basic examples as a first approach to this question.

Since the different methodological approaches to analyse thematic elements are numerous and do refer to very different theoretical backgrounds, here we very briefly introduce some of those which are not of equal importance for the present research: for example, some syntactic analyses are referred to only because they have pointed to certain problems which are of great interest in many ways, for example the questions linked to prosody etc. The researches about Estonian have not until now really taken into account the informational level for itself, which is why the thematic elements have always been described from a syntactic point of view and in general have not been analysed in a more systematic way.

Some investigations have considered in more detail the different thematic/ framing constituents and have come to the conclusion that the thematic group can be quite extensive: according to some French researchers who work on spontaneous oral and its prosodical characteristics from a syntactic point of view, this is the case for French, where in oral language the thematic group is made up of several disjunct elements that define a frame and add modal or referential information (Morel & Danon-Boileau 1999: 21–22) before intro-ducing the proper Theme (*support lexical* in their terminology) followed by the

rhematic element. They give an example typical for oral language (a contrived example, however): '*Non, mais moi, question saumon pour la pêche, l'Ecosse, tu vois, c'est ce que je préfère*' (literally: 'No, but me, about salmon, for fishing, the Scotland, you see, that's what I prefer') where the first two framing elements serve to narrow progressively the cognitive frame for interpretation and set the predication zone, whereas only the third element introduces the proper Theme as a referential expression (*l'Ecosse*), followed by a verbal element functioning as a discourse particle (*tu vois*), and by the Rheme.

C. Blanche-Benveniste also describes these 'frames' that can precede the utterance according to a quite regular order: for example, in the case of several temporal complements before the main verbal group (*noyau verbal*), the first temporal is the most inclusive and the last one has the narrowest range (Blanche-Benveniste 2000: 117–118):

(9)
-avant, quand nous étions en vendanges manuelles, euh quand les vendangeurs arrivaient, eh ben il fallait vendanger.[15]

Following the different examples in the corpus, she proposes a possible sequencing of these constituents – if they are to occur all in the same utterance, which is not usually the case (*ibidem*: 120):

1. point of view; 2. place; 3. time; 4. dislocated with resumption (locative or temporal);, 5. dislocated without resumption; 6. main verbal group.

M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest considers, from the point of view of IS, the informational constituents within a dynamic process which encompasses in spontaneous discourse two main communicational strategies: Theme-Rheme, Rheme-Mneme. In discourse, these constituents are understood as corresponding to whole clauses; moreover, these 'labels' are not assigned as immutable properties, but change as the communication progresses: when an item is introduced for the first time in Rheme it becomes a Theme in the following utterance.

Thematic constituents have been grouped according to their syntactic properties and other characteristics by Charolles (1997); following him these constituents can be divided in two groups: first, constituents that set a frame for the universe of discourse, like spacial, temporal, knowledge-based etc., and secondly, constructions that serve to introduce a Theme: for example in English *as concerns…*, *as to…,* or in French *en ce qui concerne… pour ce qui est de…* or in Estonian *mis puudutab…* etc. There can also be less 'idiomatic' expressions that indicate the introduction of a new Theme, but these are left out of the scope of the present study.

---

[15] 'before, when we were in manual grape harvesting, when the grape pickers arrived, well, one had to harvest.'

According to M. Charolles, expressions that introduce a Theme are used, unlike other expressions setting a frame of discourse, when the referent has been mentioned or is inferable from the previous discourse; there is in general also a pronominal coreference. That is why he argues that these expressions are fundamentally different of other frame-setting expressions, such as temporal or place adverbials, but they can be used as introducing a frame only when they are not brand new in the discourse (Charolles 2003: 26).

A small case study that I carried out in order to better realize the influence of Indo-European language showed that in translations the specific thematic expressions like *as concerns*… influence to a large extent the choice made be translators, for example when translating from French into Estonian. In Estonian, the literal translation of this expression has the same meaning (*mis puutub*…), but is less frequent and probably also used to a lesser extent as a means for structuring the text/discourse. From a set of 43 examples (literary texts and self-aid books) of translations from French into Estonian, in 25 cases the translator has used the 'literal' equivalent in Estonian *mis puutub* which was, based on my intuitive assessment, in certain cases not very felicitous. In contrast, in translations from Estonian into French, the marker *quant à* appears in very high proportions compared to the expression in the original language: in a corpus of 103 sentences, where in French *quant à* is in first position as the thematic marker, only 11 sentences in Estonian display the expression *mis puutub*. The equivalent *quant à* is used in French whereas in Estonian in half of the cases the focusing (sometimes contrastive) adverbial *aga* is used. In other cases, the pronoun *ise* 'self' and other emphatic pronouns are used; quite often, when in Estonian the thematic constituent is in the first position or the pronoun displays a longer form (thus indicating its thematic nature), the construction *quant à* is also systematically used in French.

In this section some views about the thematic elements that precede the Rheme were briefly presented, followed by a short discussion of specific Theme-introducing constructions. However, the choice was made not to give prominence to these problematics in this thesis, as there are many different approaches to this question, for example in French linguistics, and this subject merits a dedicated analysis.

5.1. A-thematic utterances

Besides the utterances that contain one or several thematic constituents, there also exist utterances that have no identifiable Theme – the whole utterance is rhematic. These types of utterances have been called a-thematic or thetic utterances.

A-thematic utterances have been described by several researchers who have pointed out (Fernandez-Vest, Combettes, Dik, Lambrecht) that an utterance can be rhematic, without containing any thematic constituents. According to

Fernandez-Vest, a required minimal communicative unit in communication is Rheme and it can be very short, as we have seen already in example (4) in section 3.4.

Thetic sentences have been defined as sentences which present an entity or a situation as new in the discourse. They do not require any presupposition or previous contextual elements and often the verb refers to a location or to the existence of the entity in question; frequently, the utterance sets a locative, temporal or other type of frame to the following discourse.

Thetic statements can be formed by using different morphosyntactic means, such as subject inversion, intonation, etc.

Ulrich (1985) made a supposition about the word-order differences in Romanian by arguing that VS structures represent thetic judgements whereas SV structures represent categorical judgements, so that VS sentences may have a grammatical subject, but they never have a subject 'in the logical sense', which would be a theme or a topic. According to Sasse, this claim could be extended to all Romance VS structures (Sasse 1987: 535).

Subject inversion for thetic statements can be observed in many languages, as in this example proposed by Sasse for Hungarian:

> (10)
> a. Ugat   a   kutya.
>   Barks *indef.art.* dog
> *A kutya ugat.
> *'The DOG is barking.'

> (11)
> b. Ez   a   hülye kutya már   megint   ugat.
>   DEM *indef.art.* silly dog   already again   bark
> 'This silly DOG is BARking again.'

Sasse (1987) proposes some domains where thetical statements are likely to occur most often:
1. Existential statements (presence, appearance, etc.)
2. Explanations (like responding to the question 'what happened?')
3. Surprising or unexpected events
4. General statements (aphorisms)
5. Background descriptions
6. Weather expressions
7. Statements relating to body parts.

Lambrecht & Polinski 1997 give examples of different mechanisms that are used for forming thetic utterances in languages: impersonal or existential constructions (*il y a* in French) or intransitive propositions with an existential indefinite subject, locative inversion, prosodic proeminence, non-nominative case marking the absence of grammatical agreement on the finite verb. All these

properties serve to indicate that the utterance in question has to be interpreted as a whole, without any predication on the subject.

Next (contrived) examples are proposed in order to illustrate these type of elements in Estonian. Example (12) shows the absence of agreement of the verb which is in the singular, in comparison to the example (14) which contains a predication and agreement marking on the verb:

(12)
Peenral   kasvab   lilli.
Border.ILL grow.3sg flower.pl.PART.
'In the border, there are flowers growing.'

(13)
Peenral   kasvavad lilled.
Border.ILL grow.3pl flowers
'In the border, there are flowers growing.'

(14)
Lilled   kasvavad peenral.
Flowers grow.3pl border.ILL
'The flowers grow in the border.'

Example (13) also shows a locative inversion which is typical for thetic sentences; it could be translated as 'In the border, there are flowers growing'. As for the difference between (12) and (13), it is probably due to the case semantics (nominative vs. partitive), the last being interpreted as less definite, because of the mostly definite reading of the nominative. The typical subject occurs in the nominative. In the example (14), a predication of the subject is clearly present; this might be considered as a prototypical sentence with a subject in the first position and the locative in the post-verbal position, which is interpreted as new information. The only problem is related to the somewhat artificial nature of this example,'The flowers grow in the border', which can be used for illustrating prototypical sentences but cannot serve as a basis for explaining these phenomena in natural oral language.

Here we consider thematic elements as elements that have at least some identifiable trace in the utterance: it has been argued (Grobet 2002) that there can be several Themes in an utterance, some of them being implicit ones (like participants of the conversation, etc.), so that it is possible to distinguish background Themes and main Theme. However, this approach can lead to a quite complex interpretation of the utterances, especially when it is a question of longer excerpts. In the present study we consider that Theme is an element which leaves a trace in the utterance and serves as a point of reference for the following discourse; we do not search for different implicit elements. The thematic group can nevertheless be quite complex, having an internal hierarchy and containing several elements that precede the Rheme.

5.2. Post-Rheme (Anti-Topic, Mneme, Tail) as the third informational component

As illustrated in previous chapters, Information Structuring has been studied from extremely various viewpoints and the consensus about which units or elements should be distinguished within it has not yet been reached. However, in the present study it is assumed firstly that different constituents can only be analysed in relation to the others (there can be no definition in absolute terms) and secondly, it can be derived from the first assumption that there can not be any predefined opposition between different constituents: they are determined on the basis of a textual approach within a given utterance/sequence. From a dual opposition that has already been described in the Ancient Greek period, later in the twentieth century other approaches have been developed that distinguish three main informational constituents. It should also be underlined that the third constituent, Post-Rheme or Mneme,[16] although it has been described within different approaches (grammar, sentence/textual perspective), nevertheless has in common most of its characteristics in different frameworks, so that it is not just an 'additional' element for the purposes of analysis, created for all these elements that do not fit into the existing ones. At the level of Information Structuring it is necessary to adopt a more subtle approach, compared to syntactic accounts, for example, where Theme and Post-Rheme can both be designated as 'topic-promotion devices'.

The existence of a third informational component has been pleaded by different researchers like K. Lambrecht, S. A. Dik, M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest, J. Perrot etc.

Depending on the background of the researcher, it has been given various designations and some of its characteristics have remained controversial across the studies.

Lambrecht 1994 has underlined the existence of a third component called in his theory 'Anti-Topic', but his approach is not discourse-based.

With the identification of the third element it has been possible to account for certain elements that occur at the end of the utterance, distinguished by a special intonational pattern and special semantic or cognitive characteristics. These segments are usually performed at a lower pitch; for English and French it has been suggested that the intonation is flat and the semantical properties can be characterized as showing a 'circular cohesion' (Fernandez-Vest 1994, 2006: 182), i.e. the speaker often repeats the initial question or thematic element or modifies it slightly, but on the discourse level can this process encompass a larger excerpt, so that the element in question assures cohesion beyond the utterance where it occurs. More specifically, it refers to two successive predications where after the first predication the order of constituents is

---

[16]   Regarding the terminological choice cf. also the beginning of chapter 5 in the present thesis.

reversed and presented in the second one, thus allowing for changes in enunciative strategy (Fernandez-Vest 2006: 182). This phenomenon should be distinguished from iconic cohesion, which refers to the simple repetition of the constituents or a sequence.

It should be noted here that unlike the Theme and initial detachment, this third constituent coincides with the operation of detachment (produced in the form of final detachment).

Fernandez-Vest (2004a), based on different corpora of oral speech, argues that this constituent (in her terminology *Mnémème* or Mneme in English) also has some other properties, such as the possibility of having additional material between the main clause and the Mneme and the double occurrence of Mnemes in discourse.

Final detachment allows the identification after the Rheme, considering that the detached element is not separated by a pause or hesitation and occurs typically in highly interactional contexts. According to Fernandez-Vest, final detachment seems to be triggered by a cognitive automatism, whereas the occurrence of initial detachment is mainly driven by the underlying principle of discourse activity that the first element is the one that one will be talking about (Fernandez-Vest 2006: 190).

This author underlines the fact that final detachment does not stem only from the thematic part of the utterance and it is not only a "postponed Theme": this argument is supported on the one hand by the occurrences where the Mneme serves as basis for upcoming Theme and on the other hand by the fact that a Mneme can also refer to elements presented in the Rheme (Fernandez-Vest 2006: 190–191).

Fernandez-Vest also includes other constituents in this category that occur in, for example, enumerations with plain intonation, having little informational charge and referring to the initial hypertheme (Fernandez-Vest 2006: 188); in that case the binary strategy Rheme-Mneme is present.

Dik, in his *Theory of functional grammar* (1997), describes these constituents that he calls 'Tails' as a type of Extra-clausal Constituents (ECC). He defines the latter as follows:

(i)   ECCs either occur on their own, or are typically set off from the clause proper by breaks or pause-like inflections in the prosodic contour; they are 'bracketed-off' from the clause by such prosodic features.

(ii) ECCs are never essential to the internal structure of the clause with which they are associated; when they are left out, the clause still forms an integral whole.

(iii) ECCs are not sensitive to the grammatical rules which operate within the limits of the clause, although they may be related to the clause by rules of coreference, parallelism, and antithesis which may also characterize relations between clauses in ongoing discourse.

     (Dik 1997: 381)

He distinguishes four different functions of ECCs with respect to the structure and organization of discourse events: interactional management (greetings, addresses, minimal responses, etc), attitude specification (expressives), discourse organization (boundary marking, orientation, Tails), and discourse execution (responses, tags).

Here we are mostly interested in the third function of ECCs, i.e. the discourse organization.

Dik divides the measures taken in order to secure a proper organization of the discourse over three pragmatic functions: boundary marking, orientation and Tail. Regarding point ii) or the option to leave out these constituents, this can be true from the grammatical viewpoint in the sense that the main clause will still remain grammatical, but certainly not from the pragmatic and semantic viewpoint, since the main clause contains only a resumptive pronoun and the final element can have different functions in discourse, as will be shown in chapter 8 dedicated to final detachments.

Languages differ in the frequency with which they use constructions of this type (Dik 1997: 401):

> The clause may be followed by loosely adjoined constituents which add bits of information which may be relevant to a correct understanding of the clause. Such constituents may also be added to parts of a clause, for example, to terms.

They are mostly described as constituents that present information meant to clarify or modify (some constituent contained in) the unit to which they are adjoined.

(15)
I like John very much, our brother I mean.

(16)
John gave the book to a girl, in the library.

This example (16), however, is not a final detachment in the sense of the present investigation, as there is no resumptive coreferential pronoun in the main clause.

According to Dik, Tail may also occur as parenthetical insertions within the clause (*ibidem*: 401–402).

Tails cannot usually be produced in absolute form, because they are always adjoined to some preceding material and thus must carry the correspondent marking, cf. an example from Russian:

(17)
v etom   magazine   ix   mnogo, **televizorov**   (*televizory).
this.PREP shop.PREP they.ACC many **television.pl.ACC** (*television.pl.NOM)

An example from oral Estonian:

(18)
E: aga (0.4) ega   te   Ilmest   ei   tea   midagi
   but NEG.PRTCL you.pl Ilme.ELA NEG   know.NEG.2pl something.PART

Neeme   õest   vä
Neeme.GEN   sister.ELA   Q

'But (0.4) don't you know anything about Ilme, **the sister of Neeme**?'
(OCTU)

In this example, instead of a resumptive pronoun there is the name of a person in the main clause, which is specified in the detached construction, allowing to identify better the referent in question.

In studies with a Conversational Analysis background the final detachments have been among others described as a conversational repair strategy in the sense of Schegloff (1979):

> S, after having produced a pronominal element in the body of the clause, fearing that the reference may not be clear, adds more explicit information in the Tail;
> The repair is most often 'self-initiated';
> It is usually preceded by a short pause;
> It is often accompanied by a metacommunicative expression such as *I mean*;

The strategy is typically used when in the eyes of S there may be a lack of clarity concerning the reference. This occurs especially when (i) the pronominal element in the clause might be taken as coreferential to more than one entity in the preceding discourse, (ii) when the referent is 'inferable' (SubTopic) rather than explicitly mentioned in the preceding discourse; such SubTopics are typically part-new, part-given, and S cannot always be certain that A has already established the appropriate 'bridging assumptions'. (citation by Dik 1997: 403)

This constituent will be dealt with in greater detail in the chapter dedicated to final detachments.

6. DETACHMENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN LANGUAGES: A GENERAL PERSPECTIVE

This chapter is dedicated to the detachment constructions in general, based on the definition of these constructions in the framework of the present thesis: first of all, they will be characterized as universals in spontaneous oral speech and after that different properties (formal, semantic, stylistic) of these constructions will be discussed. The examples come from Indo-European languages, completed by examples of Finno-Ugric languages, mostly Estonian, and besides the examples from my corpus, some occurrences of detached constructions in written texts (or written media) will also be illustrated, among others. Finally, the questions related to their stylistic and rhetorical properties and their frequency will be discussed.

The aim of this chapter is to make an introduction to this category of constructions in language from a more general perspective and to take the discussion progressively towards the approach that has been chosen in the present thesis and by the same token to point to the problems or characteristics that have been already identified for other languages. It should be noted that this category can be considered in a narrower interpretation (like the one used in the present thesis) or a broader interpretation, according to which it encompasses all cases where an element has been detached from a clause.

6.1. Detachment constructions as a universal in unplanned discourse: general characteristics and definitions

Detached constructions have traditionally been considered as one way of introducing the Theme or marking the division of the constituents of a sentence into thematic and rhematic ones (cf. Bally 1944: 36).

Two types of detachments have been described (in syntactical approaches, TGG (transformational generative grammar) and others, also called 'dislocations'): occurring at the beginning of the utterance and at the end of the utterance (or paragraph), often called left and right detachments (or dislocations). However, the terms 'left' and 'right' refer to the sentence (and more precisely to a short, linear textbook sentence) and are not appropriate to a textual level where long excerpts can not be divided by using this approach. Referring to a detached construction, we are necessarily referring at first to their form which allows us to recognize them. In order to have a more neutral approach, I have used the terms 'initial' and 'final' detachments.

This type of construction often appears as problematic in syntactic accounts (difficult to describe, having a grammatically unclear link between the detached element and the main clause, different functions etc.). The status of detachments in the syntax as well as in discourse or other approaches dealing with discourse has raised many questions, for example, as to the semantic or grammatical

properties of initially detached constituent(s): even if it is often pointed to the fact that initial (left) detachments serve to introduce a new Theme, a closer analysis of these peripheral constituents has revealed that all constituents do not refer to the Theme of the following discourse.

Depending on the definition of Theme and Rheme and the framework adopted, the constituents detached at the 'left' are analysed in more or less detail: if Theme is defined as the 'point of departure' and 'what the sentence is about' it is difficult to interpret certain types of sentences in languages like French or English which allow the anteposition of only a limited number of constituents and where the first position is not occupied by a constituent which serves as the basis of predication (Theme+Rheme) but by a constituent which serves as a frame to the sentence. Following this, Chafe proposed to use the term of 'topic'[17] for distinguishing this type of constituent: 'Typically, it would seem, the topic sets a spatial, temporal, or individual framework within which the main predication holds' (Chafe 1976: 50). These constituents are argued to always occupy the first position and are totally (syntactically and prosodically) independent of the following sentence. This is not, however, the most common definition of 'topic' such as used by many other researchers in relation to the information packaging in discourse.

In several other studies, 'topic' in the sense of Chafe, is referred to as 'frame', for example, S. Prévost (2003: 55) suggests that 'frame' and 'topic' are situated in the extremities of a continuum with a common space in the middle where it is quite difficult to distinguish one from another. Under (sentence) topics she classifies elements such as lexical topic introductions (as concerns...) or left detachment (detached coreferential topic, ex. 19); frames are represented by the examples where the first position is occupied by spatial or temporal adverbials (20) or by detached non-coreferential topics (21).

> (19)
> Paul, il ma téléphoné hier.
> 'Paul, he called me yesterday.'
>
> (20)
> La nuit, tous les chats sont gris.
> 'At night, all cats are grey.'
>
> (21)
> Paul, ses parents sont vraiment adorables.
> 'Paul, his parents are really nice.'

Sometimes, framing adverbials do not only determine a framework or thematic domain of a phrase (or a larger chunk), but they can also present a (referential) element that is the real topic of the phrase (example 20 modified), cf. Le Goffic

---

[17] Here, capital letters are not used, in order to refer to the specific interpretation of this term by W. Chafe.

1993: 463 who refers to the possibility (improbable, though) of continuing the description about *la nuit* the night', which will be in this case the topic and not only a framing element. However, as this example is a proverb, this interpretation is to be taken mainly as a possible option applicable in different circumstances.

In many syntactic theories, a distinction between these two is attempted, but it is more generally admitted that both terms cover basically the same type of constituent. The details of these discussions will not be presented here; it seems plausible to consider that these pre-clausal elements (adverbials under some conditions, referential NPs) are part of the thematic element in a phrase. However, in my analysis, the examples that will be discussed are limited to the most typical occurrences in the corpus, so that the larger thematic frames containing adverbials etc. will not be addressed.

The point of departure of the typological investigation in the domain of detached constructions is the existence of a regular topical organization pattern in so-called 'topic-prominent' languages (Li & Thompson 1976). These types of constructions are assumed to exist in the informal register of all languages (Maslova & Bernini 2006: 74) but are unequally conventionalized and thus occur with a variable frequency in languages. It has been suggested, for instance by Gundel, that this structure is probably a universal property of 'unplanned discourse' (Gundel 1988b: 238–239) and generally, she claims, based on a study on topic constructions in 30 languages from different language groups, that firstly, "Every language has syntactic topic constructions in which an expression which refers to the topic of the sentence is adjoined to the left of a full sentence comment" and secondly, the same principle is also found regarding the position at the "right of the full sentence comment" (Gundel 1988b: 231).

In the framework of Information Structuring, detached constructions have been analysed respectively as 'special themes' and 'post-rhemes' (Fernandez-Vest, Grünthal-Robert 2004: 291–292). This has also been the point of departure of the present thesis: in different spontaneous oral corpora, the Estonian language seems to make regular use of detachment constructions. As these constructions are not really 'grammaticalized' in Estonian and remain in consequence relatively marked in (formal or written) discourse, it seemed more appropriate to analyse them in informational categories and not in syntactic terms. The use of these constructions shows their productivity, especially in oral speech where they act as one possible means of managing the referents and therefore spontaneous oral speech is more adapted to their analysis.

Lambrecht (1987b, 1994) has discussed the differences and similarities between the uses of initial detachments in French and in English, which both use this construction to quite a large extent, but still display important differences. According to him (in a sentence-based approach), in French, this construction is used systematically in cases where the subject is the 'topic' of the sentence, whereas in English this is not the case. In English, topical subjects are unaccented and non-topical subjects are accented, but since French cannot

mark this difference by prosody, it has to use syntactical means (detached construction). The following examples of three different types from Lambrecht 2000 illustrate this tendency.

> a. initial detachments (or final detachments) for topical subjects (LD and RD in his terminology);
>
> b. have-clefts for sentences without any topic;
>
> c. it-clefts for focal subjects; and
>
> d. SV(O) for subjects with low topicality/background sentences).

> a. Ma voiture elle est en panne.
> b. J'ai ma voiture qu'est en panne.
> c. C'est ma voiture qu'est en panne.
> d. Ma voiture est en panne.

In English, the same information is conveyed by sentence prosody:

> a. My car broke DOWN.
> b. My CAR broke DOWN.
> c. My CAR broke down.
> d. My car broke DOWN. (However, a. and d. are ambiguous)

English can be thus considered as a subject-prominent language in the sense that Information Structuring does not modify the SV(O) word order, but French resembles more a topic-prominent language, because the Information Structuring always takes priority over syntax.

According to some researchers (Picabia 1991, Combettes 1998), there are two types of detached constructions: the ones which do not obligatorily have a pronominal link, and more importantly which contribute to the meaning of the sentence through new information, whereas the other type of detached constructions do not add any new information. Combettes makes this distinction clear when he studies detached constructions in French: on the one hand, there are referential expressions (topicalizations) where coreference is established between the referential expression and usually an anaphoric pronoun, and on the other hand there are non-referential, usually qualifying expressions where a coreferential link is established between the implicit referent of detached construction and the referent which is referred to by the nominal expression (Combettes 1998: 14).

Another identifying criterion is, according to Combettes, the secondary predication that is present in the latter case. These constructions are often also considered as appositions, cf. the following examples 22–24.

> (22)
> *Stupéfaite*, elle s'immobilisa.
> 'Stunned, she stopped.'

(23)
Cette décision, *trop hâtive*, a été mal acceptée.
'This decision, too hasty, was poorly received.'

(24)
Il est sorti, *exaspéré par ces remarques.*
'He went out, exasperated by these remarks.'
 (Combettes 1998: 11)

In Estonian academic grammar, detached constructions have not been described in detail: it is only mentioned that these constructions, which contain a separate element without any grammatical link with the verb, do not fall into the scope of syntactic description.

(25)
Kuld – sellest   metallist   unistasid   alkeemikud.
gold   DEM.ELA metal.ELA   dream.PST.3pl alchemists
'Gold – about this metal dreamed the alchemists.'
(Erelt et al. 1993: 124)

The Estonian grammar considers these elements as independent nominal phrases and uses the term *topik* to describe them. It is interesting to note that according to the authors, 'this kind of *topik* is rather an independent nominal phrase than an element of another phrase. In written text these two phrases are conventionally bound together' (*ibidem*: 124). From a pragmatic point of view, Estonian grammar describes the two principal elements that are not bound by syntactic means as pre-theme ('*eelteema*') and specifying tail ('*täpsustusjätk*') and defines them as follows: pre-theme is a phrasal constituent that refers to the element about which the following message is relevant, for example:

(26)
Poiss – temaga   on   meil   palju muret.
boy   he.COM be.3sg we.ADE much trouble.PART
'The boy – we have a lot of trouble with him.'

A pre-theme can be a noun (in the nominative) or an infinitive (*da*-infinitive) and from a syntactic point of view it is considered as an independent phrase.

   Finnish grammar, however, also includes under initial detachments cases where the lexical element bears the same case marking as the resumptive pronoun in the main clause (Hakulinen *et al*.: 973). In my corpus there were very few examples of this type and I considered them a variant without any special implications concerning their semantics or informational charge.

   According to the Estonian grammar, specifying Tail is an element that adds something to a phrasal constituent, for example:

(27)

Ta on   tore poiss, see   sinu vend.
he be.3sg nice boy   DEM   your brother
'He's a nice boy, that brother of yours.'

 When this element is formed by a substantive, it can also be considered a type of apposition (Erelt et al. 1993: 196).

In Finnish linguistics, several studies have dealt with detached constructions, not necessarily as the main subject, but as an adjoining domain that helps to shed light on other problems investigated (Helasvuo 2001, Etelämäki 2006). For example, in her study about free NPs, Helasvuo 2001: 126 discusses so-called referential NPs that serve to bring a topic into the discourse, qualified as forward-looking (they are interpreted in the light of what follows) and projecting more talk on that item. In this category, she includes topic constructions as well as "antitopic" constructions by using the general term "topic construction" for both. Her examples tend to show that topic constructions in Finnish are used to focus on a specific referent (mentioned before or taken as a member of a set). She also underlines their formal characteristics as unattached clausal arguments that are well suited for their function of focusing or highlighting a referent (*ibidem*: 130). She relates their functioning to the general prototypical functions of manipulating reference, as described by Hopper and Thompson 1984.

Another interesting domain of investigation that sheds light on the interface syntax-information structure is the acquisition of detached constructions by children or by foreign-language learners. This aspect will not be dealt with in the present thesis, but since one study that deals, among other things with the children's narratives in Estonian (Hint et al. 2013) shows that compared to adults the determiners are very rarely used before the NP by children aged 6–7 years, some remarks can be made concerning this aspect. The aforementioned study, which was carried out with picture-based narrative task, concluded that children do not mark systematically the informational status of the referents with different determiners and compared to adults, children used the determiners mostly for marking first mentions of referents, whereas adults use the determiners for referents that are already accessible or known (Hint et al. 2012: 177–179). This finding can be associated to the remarks put forward by Hickmann and Roland (1990) about the acquisition of detached construction in French. They suggest that the structure itself is acquired more easily than the pragmatic categorization underlying it – children at the age of four are already reported to use the initial detachment construction, but to refer to new entities (this can be linked also to the general tendency of very young children to give new information before given information) and only progressively do they begin to use this construction in the same way as adults do. This tendency confirms that the distinction of old-new information requires a complex set of skills which are more difficult to acquire than the constructions as such, which are at first used in an inappropriate way by young children.

6.1.1. Some formal properties of detached constructions

As far as the 'basic' type of detached constructions is concerned, there are not many controversial approaches as to their formal characteristics; however, a more precise description is needed in order to make a distinction between the constructions that are under investigation here and some other types of detached constructions or borderline cases which will remain beyond the scope of the present thesis. Some examples can also show the formal characteristics of detached constructions, but from the informational point of view they can not be analysed as detached constructions or will not be analysed here as such, given that this analysis concentrates mainly on a basic type of detachments in order to propose a first general overview of this linguistic phenomenon.

A simplified scheme containing different constituents and levels of analysis can be proposed in order to give a visual overview of detached constructions as well as the domains that are concerned in the analysis of the approach chosen here. These tables are created based on the data from my corpus.

Table 4

	Initial detachment	Main clause (resumptive word)
Grammatical category	NP, pronoun (+relative clause)	pronoun, pro-form
Casual marking	nominative	nominative, partitive, etc.
Syntactic function	syntactically not linked to the main clause	subject, object, oblique object etc.
Informational constituent	theme	part of the rheme
Informational status	identifyable, sometimes new in the discourse	coreferential with the detached element

Table 5

	Main clause (resumptive word)	Final detachment
Grammatical category	pronoun, pro-form	NP
Casual marking	same as on detached element	nominative, partitive etc.
Syntactic function	subject, object, oblique object	subject, object, oblique object
Informational constituent	rheme	post-rheme
Informational status	coreferential with the detached element	identifyable

Four main formal characteristics of the detached constructions pointed out by K. Lambrecht in a typological overview are the following: extra-clausal position of a constituent, or possible alternative intra-clausal position, pronominal coindexation and special prosody (in Haspelmath et al. 2001: 1050). According to him, only the first criterion is necessary, though not sufficient. The pronominal element can be a syntactically free personal pronoun, a syntactically bound atonic pronominal morpheme (clitic), an inflectional suffix or a null-element (sometimes a possessive pronoun or affix) (*ibidem*: 1051). Most often the resumptive pronoun is in subject function, but can also be an object – in Estonian most commonly *seda* (demonstrative pronoun *see* in partitive) or an oblique object *seal* (demonstrative proadverb 'there'). The fact that these constituents are extra-clausal means that their omission does not cause structural or semantic unacceptability, but from the informational or communicational point of view their presence is neither optional nor arbitrary.

Some syntactically similar constructions share certain common features with initial detachments; here, based on Lambrecht 2001 Topicalization and Focus-Preposing could be mentioned; similarly, the final detachment has to be distinguished from Clitic-Doubling and Extraposition and subject-inversion constructions (for examples cf. Lambrecht 2001: 1052–1054).

There can also be different framing constructions that will be exemplified further, which do not satisfy the criteria for qualifying as detached constructions: the so-called unlinked Topic constructions (Lambrecht *ibidem*: 1057–1058) that use phrases introduced by *as for*, etc., or do not use any theme-introducing expressions and where one can sometimes see a metonymical type of relation between the constituents.

As for the syntactic categories of detached elements, the most common category is the noun phrase, followed by prepositional phrases and adverbials and verb-headed phrases; pronouns also occur quite often in detached constructions. In languages where it is possible, one can also find detached adjective phrases (*ibidem*: 1062).

In the present study I look only at detached noun phrases, proper nouns and pronouns; however, I do not analyse vocatives as detached constructions, although from the formal point of view they share some of the characteristics with detached constructions (detached nominal element and pronominal in the main clause).

The questions referring to the informational status of the detached constituents (identifiability etc) will be discussed further, but typologically, it is considered that the detached element has to be identifiable and thus in languages with definiteness marking the detached elements are definite or must have a generic reading.

R. Geluykens evokes the possibility of establishing a scale for different types of initial detachments, ranging from cases where there is a strong structural link between the detached constituent (no intervening pause, turn or other elements) and the main clause, to cases where there is some structural boundary between

the two (pause, whole utterance or even more than one utterances, etc.) (Geluykens 1992: 25).

Due to their formal differences, initial detachments and final detachments are not similar in terms of the cognitive cost of their treatment: in the case of initial detachment, the referential information, which comes first, is put into the memory and can therefore be developed much further compared to final detachment constructions where there is no such referential information (because of the bare pronoun) and which is thus more costly in terms of treatment of information (one has to wait for the referent to be clarified at the end of the utterance). This imposes a constraint on the distance between the main clause and the detached element – the latter will not be placed very far from the cataphoric pronoun. However, this type of consideration is more valid in a syntactic framework and sentence-based analysis: one cannot argue that the pronoun generally arrives "out of nowhere" in the discourse, so this claim about the lack of referential content has to be adjusted, considering the fact that it is precisely the referential framework that makes it possible to use such a construction.

6.1.2. About the semantic aspects related to the detached constructions

The two parts of a detached construction (a 'complete' clause and a preceding or following NP which is not the argument in another clause) maintain a special semantic relationship. K. Lambrecht has argued that the main characterization of these extra-clausal constructions should be made on the pragmatic, not on the syntactic or on the semantic level (Lambrecht 2001: 1066), as there is no grammatical relation between the referent and the predication; on the other hand, R. Geluykens maintains that their characterization only makes sense in semantic terms, given that the main relationship between the two main constituents is of a semantic nature – the central notion being that of coreferentiality (Geluykens 1992:19). I tend to agree with the latter in the sense that the simple thematic constructions without coreferential elements will not be considered as initial detachments in the narrow sense, although syntactically they are not easy to distinguish from them (cf. also unlinked Topics *in* Lambrecht 2001: 1057–1059):

(28)
As concerns theatre, I don't like musicals.

D. Apothéloz (1997: 206–207) proposes in the framework of Conversation Analysis that the functionalities of detached constructions can be observed in three domains: first of all, there are so-called intentional effects where there is a grammaticalized link between the construction and its effect in cases such as establishing a Theme, a contrast or setting a frame of interpretation for initial

detachments and disambiguation of the reference for final detachments. Secondly, there are less coded functions, such as competing for floor or showing the continuation with the preceding discourse for initial detachments and showing a transition and possible end of turn for final detachments. The third group of functions is related to discursive activity and the cognitive conditions of performing it: facilitating the treatment of information, allowing the ongoing construction of discourse (making place for hesitations, facilitating the reception, etc.).

The semantic aspects will be dealt with in the analysis of examples of final detachments in chapter 8.

6.1.3. Detached constructions in written texts: some examples from Estonian

Although in the present thesis the object of study, detachment constructions, is examined in oral language, where it occurs most often, it could be interesting to reflect briefly on the occurrence of these constituents in written texts, which would give some clues about their grammaticalization, coding and acceptability in different contexts. As a more detailed treatment goes beyond the scope of this study, I propose only a very brief overview and some perspectives.

I have done no systematic research on written corpora in order to collect a representative amount of examples, the occurrences having been assembled during the preparation of the present thesis, in a quite subjective manner, in different written media such as newspaper articles (paper and online publications), readers' comments to web publications, Internet forums, but also original fiction texts. Due to the non-coherent way of collecting the examples, I can not draw any far-reaching conclusions about their frequency or preferential contexts of occurrence. Nevertheless, based on the assessment of the collected examples and their sources, their occurrence of course confirms some general principles which seem to be valid cross-linguistically: the frequency of detachment constructions raises significantly as soon as the register used approaches more informal registers. There are some rare examples in fiction novels (dialogues or narrative parts) or in journalistic texts (referring to a person's speech, quoting his/her words), but much more occurrences can be found in web forums, chat rooms and the comments of users on different websites, newspapers for instance. In these environments the speakers/authors use several other features that balance the restriction of not being able to see/hear the other participants and bring the text closer to spontaneous oral speech (through lexical, syntactic, typographical means). I assume that the use of detachment constructions also forms one of these markers which can be used more or less intentionally (we find here again the question of the 'planning' of the discourse, but here the question is about a written text which is a kind of intermediate genre between oral speech and the written text).

Following my subjective assessment, compared to initial detachments, final detachments tend to be less visible in written texts in Estonian. This can partly be attributed to their different discourse functions (it is easier to follow a text where the full lexical element is given first) and also to the written coding of these constructions, as they can occur in another sentence, separated by punctuation marks other than a comma, and therefore be less easily identifiable. However, it seems that in translated texts these constituents occur more often, which means that they are acceptable in Estonian, easy to adapt to Estonian syntax, but the translators are probably not conscious of their stylistic or other effects and functions, and it can also be assumed that they do not necessarily take into account the stylistic and pragmatic coherence at the discourse level, but rather work on the sentence basis. Consequently, it is plausible to consider that a translation corpus would not be representative of the use of this construction in Estonian – it shows only what is possible, but does not allow any conclusions to be drawn about their real functioning in language. That is why we only present examples that are produced in the original Estonian (non-translated).

Another easily accessible resource is language production on the Internet and different media (discussion boards, comments, etc.). This is today a hybrid genre where traditional spelling rules are not respected and where one clearly finds more features that are typical to oral language.

Let us first consider some examples of final detachments from discussion boards.

> (29)
> Ma olen emale kirjutanud taolise kirja ja palju enamgi veel. Mitte midagi. Tundus, et **see** hoopis vihastas teda, **see minu kiri**.
>
> 'I have written such a letter to my mother and much more. Nothing. It seemed rather that **it** made her angry, **this letter of mine**.'
> (PK 30/08/2012)

In this sequence the first *see* 'it' can be more generally interpreted (the fact of writing a letter) before the detached NP is added which specifies the referent. In addition, here, the question of intentionality or planning arises – the author could also use the nominal element in the main clause, but the solution chosen here has probably to do with the general strategy in the discourse: the information in the main clause is on the foreground and in this construction the accented part of it is more salient when compared to a less segmented sentence (*see kiri hoopis vihastas teda*).

> (30)
> Minu poiss ütles, et ka nende klassis oli tema eelkooli klassikaaslane nutma hakanud - lapse asi, võõrad õpetajad ja teistsugune olukord, lapsele tekitas see kõik stressi. Ma ei usu, et **see** ülesannete pärast juhtus, **see nutu asi**.

'My son told that in their class also one of his classmates in preschool course began to cry – typical for a child, unfamiliar teachers and a different situation, all this caused stress for the child. I don't believe that **it** happened because of the exercises, **this crying thing**.'
(PK 09/02/2013)

In this example from the same Internet forum one can see the similar tendency – the final detachment specifies the exact reference of the general pronoun *see*. The referent of the lexical element is presented as somewhat vague (*see nutu asi*, 'this crying thing'), but probably considered as necessary, because of another possible referent (*stress*).

This type of example seems to follow quite a general pattern – in principle, the written text can be planned in a way that those quite lengthy constructions can be avoided. However, the written text on a forum page cannot quite be compared with any other (more formal) written text – there are certainly degrees as to their 'orality' or informal character, which means that probably the forum posts and web comments show more constructions typical to oral language, and chat room discussions and other real-time web discussions are even more oral-like than forum posts, etc.

As I have implied above, in written texts the initial detachments tend to be more frequent and more easily identifiable, compared to final detachments. Their use is probably also more marked due to the fact that final detachments can be related to different phenomena of rightward extension-like afterthoughts, repairs, additions, etc., whereas initial detachments do not have this type of variation. One subtype of initial detachments that could be identified in the oral corpus (detached constituent followed by a relative clause) is also present in written texts.

The following examples have been chosen in order to represent the main types of occurrences:

Example (31) comes from a novel: it displays a monological excerpt where the main character, Melchior, is giving the denouement of the story.

(31)
Kes oli see, kes raius tal maha pea ja toppis suhu mündi, Gotlandi vana ortugi. **See Gotlandi vana münt**, **see** ei andnud mulle hetkekski asu.
'Who was that who chopped off his head and stuffed a coin in his mouth, an old Gotland ørtug. **This old coin of Gotland**, **it** did not leave me at peace in any moment.'[18]
(I. Hargla *The mystery of St Olaf*)

---

[18] Here, the translation is literal; see the discussion about the published translation in section 6.1.4.

In fictional texts one can also consider the stylistic effects of this type of construction: the narrator is explaining at the end of the story how he found the solution to the mystery and the detachment construction creates here a kind of redundancy or repetition which could be seen as a figurative parallel to his long reasoning process, which takes place throughout the whole story. This can also be related to McLaughlin's findings, based on the suggestions of Marnette (2005: 50–63) that showed detachment constructions occurring in excerpts illustrating the inner speech of the narrator (McLaughlin 2011: 226). This interpretation is also supported by the absence of a question mark in the first sentence, which lexically and grammatically is obviously an interrogative sentence.

Example (32) is a reader's comment to a newspaper article. The punctuation has not been changed, some spaces have been added or erased for better lisibility. We can see that the author respects the punctuation of written language, using emoticons at the same time; the sentence is quite complex, with several levels of subordinates, and consequently the insertion of the pronoun contributes to the clarity of the sentence.

> (32)
> **See hetk**, mil telerist näidati hiina sportlast, kes endale tuhka pähe raputades nuttis ja rahvalt andestust palus (et oli Hiinat hullult maailma ees häbistanud:), kuna ta võitis olümpial HÕBEMEDALI mitte kulla:), **see** ei taha kuidagi meelest minna.
>
> '**This moment** when they showed on the TV a Chinese sportsman who cried sprinkling ashes on his head and asked forgiveness from his people (because of having brought shame on China before the whole world :), because he won a SILVER MEDAL at the olympics (not a gold :), **this** I can hardly forget.'
>
> (EPL Online 21.08.2012 comment about '*Graafik: Eesti on IQ tasemelt maailmas 15.kohal*')

Since the thematic part of this utterance is quite long, the resumptive pronoun *see* receives a rather more general reading, which encompasses the preceding subordinates and leaves the first NP *see hetk* in the background.

In the next example (33), a web comment, we can see a pronominal detachment which is resumed in the object role in the main clause. Pronominal detachments occur almost exclusively in utterances where the pronoun is specified by a relative clause. In other cases, the longer stressed form of pronoun is used instead of a detachment construction.

> (33)
> Poisid on aktiivsemad, püsimatud. Õpetajatel on nende ohjeldamisega probleeme, ei tohi ju kurjema pilguga kah otsa vaadata. Tekib karistamatuse tunne! Pubeka eas ei mõelda ju kaugema tuleviku peale, kui nädalavahetus ja pidu. Lastakse lõdvaks ja pärast, kui aru pähe tuleb, on juba liiga raske tagasi

järje peale saada. **Need, kes on korralikud ja tahavad õppida**, **neid** kiusatakse ja nende elu tehakse põrguks.

'The boys are more active, restless. The teachers have difficulties in containing them, they don't have the right even to look at them severely. They get the sense of impunity! The teenagers don't think any further ahead than the weekend and party. They stop putting in any effort and later when they recover their senses, it is too difficult to get back on the right path. **Those who are well-behaved and want to learn**, **they** are being bullied and their life is made hell.'

(EPL 31.08.2012 comment about '*Poiss ei taha kooli minna, milles asi*')

The following examples show the diversity of possible resumptive elements. In the three following sequences the initial detachment is specified by a relative clause; this pattern seems to be quite frequent in certain types of written texts where the 'correctness' of grammatical constructions can be overlooked and thus the repetition of the resumptive word after the relative does not constitute a stylistic error.

Example (34) is another occurrence of detached pronominal, resumed by a pronoun in adessive case.

(34)
Ma ei saa isegi sekretäriks minna, sest ma ei oska seda tööd. Nõutakse ju kogemusega või vähemalt vastava haridusega inimesi. **Need**, **kes koolid alles lõpetanud**, **neil** ongi kerge tööle saada.

'I can't even become a secretary, because I can't do this work. Experience or at least the appropriate education is needed. **Those who have just finished their studies**, **they** can find a job more easily.'

(PK 14/09/2012)

Another typical example is (35) where the resumptive element is the locative proadverb *seal*.

(35)
Peame arvestama, et **need ühiskonnad**, **mis on demokraatias elanud palju kauem, seal** on õige ja vale eristamine märksa kategoorilisem ja selgem.

'We have to understand that **those societies that have lived in democracy much longer**, **there** is a much more categoric and clear distinction between right and wrong.'

(Postimees Online 28.03.2013 P. Kivine '*Veerpalu kahe tooli vahel*')

In the web comment given in example (36) we can see a typical referential adjustment made possible by the detachment construction process that facilitates the elaboration and the treatment of the information. The detached element is a substantivized adjective *minusugused* ('people like me'): it is specified by a relative clause ('who need more detailed explanations') and

resumed by the postpositional phrase *meie peale* ('on us'). The examples 33–36 all contain contrasted elements which are probably one of the reasons for using detached constructions.

> (36)
> Meie koolides ei ole mõtlemine ja loomingulisus au sees, tähtis on töö ära vastata, reaalsete teadmiste omandamine ei huvita kedagi. Kellel reaalainete peale taipu, neil pole probleemi, aga **minusugused**, **kes vajaksid veidi detailsemat asjasse süvenemist**, **meie peale** ei viitsi keegi aega raisata.
>
> 'In our schools, thinking and creativity are not esteemed, it is important to pass the test, but acquiring real knowledge does not interest anyone. Those who are good in science, they don't have problems, but **those like me**, **who would need a more detailed insight**, nobody wants to waste time **with us**.'
>
> (Postimees Online, 26.09.2012 comment about the article of M. Hallik '*Milleks meile matemaatika*?')

Another occurrence in example (37) comes from a newspaper text about the process of the making of a film about twenty years before; the text refers to the words of the director of the film, without however making further comments about the original interview or conversation. This results in a sentence which contains several features typical to oral and informal language, and from the stylistic point of view is even somewhat striking, as this sentence is the only one where the words of the person are referred to – elsewhere he is quoted directly and in consequence the orality markers are not as salient as here.

> (37)
> Ulfsak meenutab, et filmi ettevalmistamist alustasid nad rubla ajal, ja neid nagu natuke oli, aga võtete ajaks oli rahareform toimunud ning **kroone**, **neid** ei olnud nagu enam üldse.
>
> 'Ulfsak recalls that the preparation of the film began at the time of the rouble, and them they did have to some extent, but at the time of shooting the monetary reform had taken place, and **the crowns**, **them** there were no more at all.'
>
> (*Eesti Ekspress*, 03.10.2013)

In this sentence there are two parallel, contrastive elements from which the second occurs in a detachment-like construction. This is not however a typical detachment, as the lexical item (*kroone*) is not in the nominative, but in the partitive like the resumptive word. This example still illustrates the general context of occurrence of such borderline constructions, where the main characteristics are the proximity with orality, other features typical to informal speech (the repetition of the mitigating particle *nagu*), and the segmentation of information which is also typical for oral language etc.

The last example (38) comes from a newspaper interview with the Estonian writer Andrus Kivirähk; the whole text contains different markers of orality

which can to some extent be related to the image of this media personality (a witty humorist, close to the 'ordinary' people). The markers of orality can also be identified in this excerpt (*jah, seal Prantsusmaal, see tähendab*), in addition to some lexical elements which refer to the non-formal use of language (the verb *viitsima* 'to bother', the adjective phrase *vähe igavad* 'a bit boring').

Also in this example two elements are opposed in the last utterance – the fact of going to France on the one hand and of making a presentation on the other.

> (38)
> 'Ussisõnad' … jah olla seal Prantsusmaal üllatavalt menukad, lähengi järgmisel nädalal seda esitlema. Ausalt öeldes eriti ei viitsiks, see tähendab, Prantsusmaale sõidaks muidugi hea meelega, aga **need esitlused**, **need** on vähe igavad.

> '"The man who spoke snakish" … yes, is in France apparently surprisingly successful, I will be going to present it next week. To be honest, I don't feel like doing it, that is, to France I would go willingly, but **these presentations**, **they** are a little bit boring.'

> (*Maaleht*, 11.04.2013)

In conclusion, it can be said that the initial detached construction occurs in written language, as expected, more frequently in language uses that are closer to oral language. However, in some cases we can see that this is not the case, especially no other marker of 'orality' is obviously used, which demonstrates that the only and unique reason for using this construction is not to convey the 'orality'. This aspect will be developed somewhat further in the next section dedicated to the stylistic and rhetoric effects of detached constructions. These utterances can often be seen to contain contrasted or opposed elements.

These constructions adapt well to the so-called hybrid genres, on the Internet, for example, where it is possible to compose quite long sentences, combine different detached constructions within them and at the same time use devices that are typical of the informal communication in these media, such as emoticons. Another clearly distinct type is a detachment construction followed by a relative clause: in these cases, the use of the resumptive pronoun contributes to 'track' the reference, as the relative clause can be quite long and therefore the initial referent not so easy to identify. Depending on the type of text and genre, it seems that the detached constructions followed by the relative clause (and the resumptive pronoun in the main clause) can also be acceptable in more formal genres, but so far I tend to assume that in very formal language use they are considered redundant. This aspect merits a more thorough analysis.

6.1.4. Rhetorical and stylistic effects of detached constructions

Detachment constructions are generally considered as not being neutral structures from the stylistic point of view: they create different effects on a stylistic level, depending on the environment of their occurrence (oral language, iconic use of language, different types of written texts, etc.).

Due to the lack of studies about detachments in Estonian, it is not possible to draw an overview of the different effects of these constructions in Estonian, however, we can make some assumptions after having analysed my corpus of oral language (main conclusions of this analysis will be given at the end of the present thesis) and having examined some examples of their use in written texts in the previous chapter. At this point, we can note, regarding the use of detachments in written language (there are not enough examples anyway to allow any generalizations) that the effects we can identify so far seem to result mostly from the use of a relatively marked oral language device itself, which creates an effect of orality first by its formal characteristics (doubling of the same type of constituent, pronoun and its lexical counterpart, segmentation of the information), subjectivity (examples occurring often in contexts of assessment, storytelling with a strong personal implication, etc.) and a certain grammatical looseness, especially in written texts where the redundancy present in detached constructions is not acceptable in all genres, such as in technical or legal texts.

It is difficult to assess to what extent the use of these constructions is intentional or iconic in, for example, fictional texts, taking into account the fact that in these environments the occurrences do not always display other features typical to oral language, i.e. the sequences in question are not specifically presented as uses of oral speech. The main effects may thus be associated to the subjectivity and stylistic intentions in a more narrow sense. This question merits a more thorough research with an appropriate corpus.

To these considerations we can also add some ideas advanced by N. E. Enkvist (1975: 108–113) about iconic cohesion in texts: these phenomena, however, concern not only the domain of stylistics, but also narratology and text linguistics and stylistics. He uses the central notion of "iconic cohesion", defined as phenomena influencing the cohesion of a text, stemming from the fact that some part of the text is the reproduction of another part of the text (*ibid*: 108); the main types of isomorphism described by the author are phonetic phonological and syntactic iconicism. Phonetical iconicism is subject to changes from one speaker to another (in rhythm, for instance) whereas phonological iconicism remains as such independently of different language users. The detached constructions that are under investigation here can also in some types of texts be considered to represent a certain iconicism: for instance, these phenomena can occur in narrative texts where a speaker is either presenting a list of elements, making repetitions or resuming a sequence using elements that have been already been introduced before.

The examples of some other languages tend to show that the grammaticalization of detached constructions and the multiplicity of stylistic and rhetorical effects are interdependent. In French, detached constructions are described as helping to create special rhetorical/stylistic effects in different registers like journalistic discourse, advertisements, theatre texts etc. However, it would not be appropriate to automatically make a direct link between the effects of this construction in oral language and in written language, as, for example, Blasco-Dulbecco (1999: 94) explains, arguing that the distribution of this structure as used by writers in fictional texts is to a large extent different from its distribution in the real oral language they are trying to imitate. One should take into account language-specific uses, such as in French where there are some grammaticalized detached structures which are widespread in oral as well as in written language; Barnes (1985: 49) refers to them as grammatically triggered and gives examples of the type *NP … c'est* ('NP it is'). In that case, these constructions do not convey any special stylistic effect.

Another interpretation of certain occurrences is proposed by Marnette (2005), who makes the distinction between speech and thought; this allows the cases where there are no special oral features and the type of discourse resembles rather subjective inner speech, comparable to diary posts, to be explained. She proposes a continuum of registers ranging from external speech to thoughts and attitudes (*ibidem*: 50–63). The next example, which was presented briefly in the previous section, seems to be of that type. Here, the main character is referring to his thoughts he had throughout the whole story.

> (39)
> Kes oli see, kes raius tal maha pea ja toppis suhu mündi, Gotlandi vana ortugi. **See Gotlandi vana münt**, **see** ei andnud mulle hetkekski asu.[19]

> 'Who was it that chopped off his head and stuffed a coin in his mouth – a weathered Gotland ørtug? **That old coin of Gotland** did not leave me at peace for a mere moment's time.'

> (I. Hargla *Oleviste mõistatus*, p. 267, translated by A. Cullen)

Interestingly, the published translation does not contain the detached construction. According to the translator, he globally made his choices based on the narration style of the main character throughout the whole book: his speech is mostly constituted of long, fluent sequences, he has a tendency to speak quickly. That aspect probably made him avoid a construction which creates a sort of disconnexion between two main constituents, after the nominal element.[20] However, the translator has maintained the repetition of the referent in NPs – one at the end of the sentence and the other at the beginning of the next

---

[19] 'Who was it that chopped off his head and stuffed a coin in his mouth, an old Gotland ørtug? This old coin of Gotland, it did not leave me at peace at any moment.'
[20] Communication by A. Cullen on 21.11.2013.

sentence – this choice certainly also takes into account the style and the rhythm of the original text.

An example from the oral corpus (40) shows a specific use of detached constructions in a context of determining different agents in a sequence which is constituted of several clauses, each of them displaying clear sequencing of information in order to oppose or to identify the referents. A similar pattern of introducing a referent is also used (although not a detached construction, but a presentative utterance (*siin on katoliiklased*)) in the next utterance which contains reported speech; at the end of the sequence, the speaker reverts back to the past and his own perspective. In this case it can be argued that the detached constructions contribute to the inner cohesion of the sequence, based on the similar constructions that are used to structure the whole paragraph.

> (40)
> et kui sa   mäletad   Pärtliööd   et seal   oli
> that if you   remember   St-Bartholomew_night.PART that there be.PST.3sg
>
> samamoodi et ikkagi **need   katoliiklased nemad** pidid   enda
> same_way that PRTCL **DEM.pl catholic.pl   they**   have to.PST.3pl own
>
> kodud   ära   märgistama ja siis **need   kes hakkasid   neid**
> home.pl ADV mark.INF2 and then **DEM.pl who begin.PST.3pl DEM.PART**
>
> **protestante   taga otsima   need**   vaatasid
> **protestant.pl.PART ADV search.INF2 DEM.pl**   look.PST.3pl
>
> ohoo siin on   katoliiklased neid   me ei   puutu
> oh   here be.3pl catholic.pl   they.PART we NEG touch.NEG.1pl
>
> aga näed   siin kõrval on   need protestandid need
> but see.2sg here beside be.3pl these protestants DEM.pl
>
> kohe   aeti   vardasse
> at_once   impale.PST.IMPS skewer.ILL
>
> 'if you remember St Bartolomew, it was the same way for these Catholics; they had to mark their houses and then those who began searching for Protestants, they looked (and said) 'wow here are Catholics, them we won't touch, but you see here next to them are those Protestants', and they were at once skewered.'
> (PCTU)

The most recent Finnish grammar makes also reference to the stylistic aspects of detachment constructions (Hakulinen *et al.* 973):

> (41)
> Ja **lumisade**, **se**   on   jälleen sakenemassa Lahden   maisemissa.
> and **snowfall DEM** be.3sg again   thickening   Lahti.GEN landscape.pl.INE
>
> 'And **the snowfall**, **it** is again thickening in Lahti landscapes'

In this chapter some sets of questions related to the stylistic effects of detached constructions were addressed, on the basis of some studies about French with regards to Estonian, so far it has only been possible to make certain assumptions; given the scope of the present thesis I cannot attempt a comparison between the uses in oral and written languages here.

6.1.5. Occurrence and frequency of detached constructions as universals of spontaneous oral speech

There have been several investigations into the relative frequency of various dislocated structures (Gregory & Michaelis 2001, Timmis 2009 for English). For Finno-Ugric languages there are no extensive quantitative works. It has been argued about Finnish, for example, that final detachments are more frequent in spontaneous oral language than initial detachments (Hakulinen & Karlsson 1979, Sulkala & Karjalainen 1992: 190).

In general, studies about French and English have revealed that initial dislocations are clearly more frequent than right dislocations (Ball 1983; Lambrecht 1987a; Ashby 1988) (L. K. Heilenman & J. L. McDonald 1993: 167).

With regards to diachronic studies, there are none available concerning detached constructions in Estonian and generally, except one preliminary study about final detachments (Amon 2009) there are no works dedicated exclusively to detached constructions. For initial detachments in English, one can refer to Pérez Guerra & Tizón-Couto 2004, in French Pagani-Naudet 2005 (detachments in general as a stylistic process), Combettes 1999b, Marchello-Nizia 1999; regarding right dislocations in Romance languages there is Simone 1997, in English Pérez-Guerra 1998, and in Italian d'Achille 1990.

In a syntactic investigation H. Sahkai claims that Estonian language seems to not make an extensive use of prototypical dislocations in order to 'topicalise or focalise elements' (Sahkai 2003: 149). She refers (Sahkai 2002: 84) to Lyons who argues that a true right dislocated phrase 'is certainly not an afterthought' (Lyons 1999: 231) and the left dislocation should not use the resumptive pronouns in order to 'rectify the case of the dislocated expression' (Sahkai: *ibidem*) – which is what she found they did in the corpus she studied. She comes to a conclusion that Estonian has probably some other means for highlighting elements in a phrase, for example with a relatively free word order that allows to front different elements. She suggests also that the constructions she is studying (doubling demonstrative constructions like '*see Morten*', '*siin kodus*') could be one of the most natural ways to translate dislocated constructions into Estonian and vice versa:

> Marie, je la déteste – Ma vihkan seda Mariat;
> Ma che faranno tutti, a Parigi? – Mida nad kõik seal Pariisis teevad?

At first sight, it seems, however, that these constructions do not really highlight the elements in question ('*seda Mariat*', '*seal Pariisis*'); this could be done in the first sentence by fronting: *seda Mariat ma ei salli* and in spoken language there are certainly other possibilities for highlighting these items. The determiners used in both cases indicate that these elements are thematic or identifiable (adnominal *see* has also been considered in Estonian as a 'topic marker' by Hiietam 2003). In addition to that, the phenomenon called 'highlighting' in a syntactic approach is not precise enough to be taken over in a framework that addresses the structuring of the information in discourse.

Comparing French and Finnish, J. Härmä argues that in Finnish, where constituents tend to be linked by the use of cases and where constituent order is more flexible, these constructions are not so widely used because there is no need to extract a constituent by such means. However, this author (Härmä 2003) has also suggested that compared with some other Indo-European languages, the flexibility of constituent order doesn't seem to play a crucial role in the use of detached constructions, even if in Romance languages detachments could be, according to him, considered as showing a certain degree of grammaticalization in this respect.

Based on her corpuses, Fernandez-Vest 2006: 199 claims that initial detachments are more frequent in monological texts whereas final detachments occur more often in dialogues.

Detached themes in the first position have been considered in earlier studies about Finnish as 'emphatic' (Koivisto 1966, Leino 1982), but in the recent Finnish grammar they are presented in their various functions, especially pragmatic and discursive ones, and are no longer characterized as emphatic (Hakulinen *et al.* 2004: 972–974, 1013–1014), but as constructions that contribute to the information packaging by raising a subject that will be dealt with in the following clause and have a textual rather than a syntactic link between two clausal constituents.

7. INITIAL DETACHMENTS IN CORPUS

7.1. Introduction

General formal properties of the examples were presented in section 1.2.1. During the analysis of occurrences, the following points will be discussed:

- type of discourse, short presentation of the background where appropriate;
- formal properties of the utterance (type of utterance, formal characteristics such as question words in the case of questions, short overview of the answer where appropriate);
- the characteristics of the introductory sequence;
- formal properties of the detached element (grammatical case, composition);
- linking of the detached element and the main clause (pause, particles);
- properties of the resumptive pronoun (grammatical case, type of pronoun);
- semantic and informational characteristics: presence/absence of the referent in previous discourse; presence of the referent in general semantic frame of the discussion; persistence of the referent in subsequent discourse; the role of the whole utterance containing the detached element in thematic progression (represents a central element, an occasional example in an ongoing development etc.).

The pronominal element in the main clause will be referred to as 'resumptive word' (or 'resumptive pronoun'). Occasionally, the terms of 'foreground'/ 'background' will be used in the analysis and this demands some explanation. This distinction comes originally from the analysis of narratives and written texts; the terms 'main structure'/'side structure' are also used for referring to approximately the same constituents. This distinction concerns the main storyline and side developments, mainly on the temporal scale – which is the most salient property in the analysis of narratives. In oral discourse, in principle, it is possible to establish the same type of distinction; however, there are generally two types of use of these terms: first of all, referring to the original distinction stemming from the analysis of narratives, i.e. a use in a narrower framework, and secondly, a use in a general meaning, i.e. describing the state of knowledge of the discourse participants or general properties of detached constructions ('brings the referent to the foreground in the discourse'). In the present thesis it was considered that an exact reference to the original framework of analysis of narratives was not appropriate, as this is not the framework I am using for discussing the examples and no systematic distinction of main structure and side structure is made in the analysis of utterances. However, it was considered that, especially in the case of initial detachments, the underlining of their capacity for taking out or highlighting the referents and discussing the different conditions for performing this is adequate as one element of the analysis. In consequence, the terms 'foreground'/'background' are used in the discussion of examples of initial detachments, and the scope of

these terms is illustrated during the analysis and therefore limited only to the purposes of illustration within the ongoing investigation.

It was decided not to refer to predefined scales of accessibility, as this type of classification, due to its questionable added value in our framework (difficulties of defining clear boundaries), seemed to create additional problems in itself and not to facilitate the discussion.

7.2. Initial detachments introducing a complex constituent

This chapter will analyze the initial detachments which are associated with a relative clause serving to identify the referent, as well as some other examples of initial detachments that are considered as heavy constituents because of their formal characteristics (long or complex lexical elements). Utterances with a specifying relative clause that serve to resume a longer sequence will be discussed in chapter 7.3.

One type of utterance forms a separate and quite extensive group in my corpus: detached NPs specified by a relative clause. They make up to 30% of all examples of initial detachments.

To begin, two examples, one from an oral corpus, the second from a fiction text and illustrating the use of detached pronouns, will be briefly presented, followed by an overview of the characteristics of these structures, based on the occurrences in my corpus.

The first example (42) shows quite a simple type of relative clause (about the possibility offered by the teacher of getting better marks instead of '2's).

> (42)
> aga:: (.) ülejäänud (.) **kahed mis siin   on   neid**
> but   remaining   **two.pl what here   be.3pl DEM.pl.PART**
>
> ei   ole   üldse: (0.5)
> NEG   be.NEG.3sg at all:
>
> mm plaaniski   mul   lasta   teil   parandada.
>   plan.INE+clitic   me.ADE   let.INF   you.ADE   redo.INF
>
> 'But **the remaining twos that are here, these** I have absolutely no intention to let you redo.'
> (OCTU)

This construction allows, in relative clauses of variable length, the referent given by the detached element to be specified. Another characteristical feature of these utterances is the fact that they also permit the introduction of pronominal detachments (ex. 46–48) which otherwise are not used in Estonian,

as there are no clitic pronouns and the longer, stressed forms are appropriate in cases where a pronoun needs to be emphasized.

The combination of two pronominal forms without any relative clause (long form of the personal pronoun+short form) which is typical, for example in French (stressed pronoun+ clitic *moi je, toi tu* etc), is not impossible in Estonian, as can be seen in the following example from an original fictional novel:

(43)
Ja ei olnud üldse tema süü muide, ta oleks täitsa hea meelega minuga jäänd.

Aga	**mina**,	**ma**	lihtsalt	sain	järsku	aru,
but	**me**	**I**	simply	get.PST.1sg	suddenly	mind

et	olen	nagu	valesse	rööpasse	libisend.
that	be.1sg	like	wrong.ILL	track.ILL	slip.APP

'And it wasn't her fault, by the way, she would have willingly stayed with me. But **me**, **I** just suddenly understood that I have like slipped to the wrong track.'
(R. Raud *Rekonstruktsioon*, p. 149)

Here it can be noted that the pronominal forms of the first sentence are replicated in the second sentence: in literary texts the questions of stylistics and rhythm are also relevant; the opposition and emphasis is highlighted by the use of the conjunction *aga* which introduces the first-person pronoun which is opposed to the pronoun *tema/ta* in the first sentence.

This construction (*mina, ma*) occurs in Estonian probably only in contrastive contexts, whereas in languages where it has been grammaticalized, like in French, it has mostly lost this literal meaning to the point that it is no longer considered as a prototypical detachment but rather as a simple way to introduce the subject pronoun.

Moreover, this sequence – which is not extracted from direct speech – uses clear marks of informal register (particle *nagu*, the form *–nud* contracted in *–nd*.

Relative clauses in general (regular relative clauses, with no detached elements) are assumed to be more common in written language in comparison to spontaneous oral language; together with other types of more complex syntactic and morphological forms they are argued to characterize the detachment/ distancing (as opposed to interpersonal involvement which is marked in oral language by different collaborative means like repairs, overlaps, etc.) (Tannen 1982).

The relative clause described in this work is a variant of the typical relative clause known from written language, due to the repetition of the pronominal or adverbial after the subordinate clause at the beginning of the main clause.

Most often, relative clauses are divided into two groups according to the type of relation between the antecedent and the relative subordinate clause: re-

strictive and non-restrictive (Erelt et al. 1993: 312–313), also called determinative and appositive respectively.

In non-restrictive relative sentences typically the relative clause adds information about or describes the head, whereas in restrictive relative sentences its scope is restricted and it is used for classifying or determining the head. The majority of the examples found in the corpus are of the restrictive type, both interpretations are possible in some written examples. Since I have not analysed a sufficient group of written examples, no comparison can be made about these two groups, but the different interpretations (restrictive vs non-restrictive) may be the illustration of the fact that the written language makes a different use of relative clauses or that simply non-restrictive relatives are not widely used in spontaneous oral speech, as the oral language tends to be more 'contextualized' and simple descriptions are not so frequent in dialogues.

There are some works about the relative clause in spoken Estonian (Lindström 2004, Õunap 2005), but no dedicated general analysis has been done about all types of relative clauses. From the typological point of view, restrictive relative clauses are assumed to be more frequent in written language; however, according to M.-L. Helasvuo, this type is, for example, more common in spoken Finnish, probably due to its 'lighter' structure (Helasvuo 1993: 164–167).

In a framework of an ongoing larger study about relative clauses in Finnish, R. Laury and M.-L. Helasvuo (forthcoming) have divided the relatives specified by a detached element according to the direction of referential continuity (forward/backward linking with a coreferential mention respectively before or after the occurrence in a relative clause). Forward-linking constructions occur in their corpus within a longer turn, whereas backward-linking ones are embedded in sequences with frequent turn transition. They point to some other differences between the two types, but only forward-linking detached constructions followed by a relative clause form a coherent group in terms of form and function, which allows them to conclude that the heavy NP with a restrictive relative clause referring to a specific referent projects a predication to follow (by the same participant); nevertheless, its referent does not become topical.

Considering the examples of my corpus, different questions can arise about these types of utterances (detached constructions + relative clauses), which are quite frequent (30% of examples of all utterances containing initial detachment constructions) and seem to respond to a certain necessity in oral language. The 'classic' relative clauses are probably too heavy and do not correspond to the specific needs of oral communication – without repeating the pronominal element their structure would be too complex, given the fact that sometimes the relative clause that specifies the head can be quite lengthy and contain much information.

A general tendency about these occurrences is the non-persistence of the referents in following discourse – they will not become topical, but remain local examples or marginal illustrations of an argumentation. Alternatively, this type of utterance can also resume a longer sequence.

7.2.1. Formal properties

As the majority of examples constitute a quite homogeneous group (containing a specifying relative clause), the formal properties described here deal with this category of examples and the remaining examples are characterized in the discussion section.

Typically, the detached element is in the nominative. A non-typical occurrence is represented by the occurrence where the detached element is not resumed by a pronoun but is repeated as such in the main clause. In the sense of the basic definition of detached constructions this example does not belong to the category under examination either, but it was nevertheless included for the following reasons: its context of occurrence seems to be typical (resumption of a sequence), some formal properties also coincide with those characteristic to regular detachment constructions (a short pause before the main clause, a connector at the beginning (*nii et*) which introduces the detached element).

The relative clause also allows the use of a pronominal detached element – three examples of that type will be presented.

As for the grammatical case of the resumptive element, the vast majority of them is in nominative (one in the object function and the others are subjects); however, two of them are in the partitive (object function), one in the comitative and two contain locative proadverbs (*seal* 'there').

The pronouns do not show any particularities, except for one example where the distal pronoun *too* is used (the discussion of this case follows in section 7.2.2.).

In order to introduce this section, let us consider first an example from written text.

The following example is an illustration of a structure *detached element+ relative clause+main clause containing a resumptive pronoun* in written text (fiction novel) in which the main referent given in the detached element is resumed by a pronominal in the main clause. The detached referent is in the nominative case whereas it would have been possible to begin with the referent in the partitive and not to repeat it by a pronominal in the main clause. The specifying enumeration is quite long and if the generic item *kõik ürikud* 'all documents' were in the partitive, the elements in the list should also have been in the partitive and this would have made the sentence heavier.

> (44)
> Kõik ürikud, meeskohtu kohturaamatud, vasallide palvekirjad, maatehingud, milles Toompea võimud on osalenud, olgu see siis Taani ajal või ordu ajal, kõiki neid hoitakse siin ruumides.
>
> 'All documents, court books of land court, petitions of the vassals, land transactions where the authorities of Toompea have participated, whether in the Danish or order era, all these are being stored in these premises.'[21]
> (I. Hargla, *Pirita kägistaja*, p. 230)

---

[21]   Translated by the author of the present thesis.

With regards to the studies about other languages, I did not find any specific analyses on this particular type of utterance except in Finnish, even when the detachments with relative clauses are included in the analysed corpora (Barnes 1985 about French, Geluykens 1992 about English, for example). R. Geluykens gives many examples of oral conversations where the NP is introduced and followed by various elaborative material – relative clauses and other specifications. With regards to English, he draws up a typical conversational scheme where the referent is first introduced by speaker 1, then acknowledged (using different conversational means) by speaker 2, and only after that does speaker 1 utter the main clause (example 56, the original transcription modified, Geluykens 1992: 36). However, in the major part of his examples only a pause intervenes between the detached element and the main clause.

> (45)
> C: 'this letter which stands for 'us for /---/ 'zero
> B: yes
> C: now 'I've 'always taken 'that as a 'Greek letter but it isn't

These kinds of instances do not seem to be common in spoken Estonian; I found only some marginal examples of that type in my corpus.

The examples from written texts tend to suggest that the repetition of the pronominal after the relative clause occurs especially when the relative clause is long and serves to present or identify a person, but the stylistic aspect cannot be ruled out either, given that this example contains an enumeration that begins with the proadjective *kõik* which is repeated at the beginning of the main clause.

However, it is worth noting that the occurrences of relative clauses after a detached item were in narrative parts and descriptions where no other specific markers of orality were present, so that it is plausible that the pattern of detached construction has more to do with the staging of information and the structuring of complex sentences.

Given that in written texts these types of utterance were not exceptional (other examples were not included in this discussion, as this is not the main subject of investigation), it is possible to assume that this type of construction probably has certain advantages in light of the heaviness of longer relative clauses in written language: the sentences in question contain several clauses (descriptive or identifying) and often an enumeration and a wide variety of information. Besides that, there seems to be one type of detachment-like construction where an NP is used instead of the resumptive pronoun.

7.2.2. Discussion of examples from the oral corpus.

This chapter will analyze the initial detachments which are associated with a relative clause serving to identify the referent, as well as some other examples of initial detachments that are considered as heavy constituents because of their formal characteristics (long or complex lexical elements). Utterances with a

specifying relative clause that serve to resume a longer sequence will be discussed in chapter 7.3.

With regards to the formal characteristics of detachments with relative clauses, we can see the quasi-obligatory definiteness/identifiability marker *see/need* before the head of the relative clause, but there can also be a pronoun on its own. In these examples the referent has not been mentioned before and in both cases the restrictive relative clause creates a new 'local' referent which serves as an example or illustration within an argumentation and will not be mentioned again in following sequences.

In this section, the resumptive pronoun is always followed by the finite verb, which is not necessarily the case for other types of initial detachments.

The following three examples contain only a pronoun as the detached element. In the first two examples the referent is animate and human, in the third one it is inanimate and abstract.

(46)
V2:	n:o	Eesti Moos näiteks		kõik	'oma	töötajate	elud
	PRTCL	Eesti Moos example.TRL		all	own.GEN	worker.pl.GEN	life.pl

on	'ära	kindlustand	ma=i=tea	kas	'raamatupidajad
be.3sg	ADV	insure.APP	know.NEG.1sg	Q	bookkeeper.pl

ka=aga	.hh	aga	**need**	**kellel**	**'välitöödega**
too but		but	**DEM.pl**	**who.ADE**	**fieldwork.pl.COM**

pistmist	**on**	**need**	on	kõik	kindlustatud.
link.PART	**be.3sg**	**DEM.pl**	be.3sg	all	insure.PPP

The speaker at first utters a general assumption (that all employees have a life insurance) that will be moderated afterwards, followed by a more restrictive group determined by the detached pronoun and the relative clause. The repetition of the pronoun *need* also allows the avoidance of the juxtaposition of the verb form *on* ('to be' third person of present indicative and auxiliary in the next clause), as the relative clause ends with this form, and thus to stage information in a more fluent manner by beginning the main clause with the subject. The referent of the pronoun *need* in the detached construction, which is unmentioned before as such, is somewhat contrastive (compared to another group, 'bookkeepers'), but at the same time is included in the larger group ('all employees') given at the beginning. The referent itself will not remain in the discussion, as the aim of the utterance was to give an example of a society which proposes insurance to its workers who run a certain risk at work.

In the next example (47) the person referred to with the demonstrative *see* is a marginal character in the discussion, since the main discussion is about the other competitor, but the referent is nevertheless developed in several turns, as the participants add different pieces of information about him.

(47)

A: [{--}	**se]**	**kes:**	**nagu**	**'võitis=**	**teda**	**seal**
	[DEM] who		**like**	**win.PST.3sg**	**he.PART**	**there**

kuueteistkümne=finaalis	**se**	jõudis	nagu	'nelja
round_of_sixteen.INE	**DEM**	arrive.PST.3sg	like	four.GEN

'parema	hulka=vel.
better.GEN	among yet

'**The one who beat him in round of sixteen**, **he** made it later even to the semi-final.'
(OCTU)

In this example (47) there seems to be no marked transition between the relative clause and the main clause that follows; in contrast, example (48) contains a filled pause (inspiration). This example has an abstract referent in the detached construction ('things you did in second grade') with a generalizing meaning – referring to schoolwork at a very young age, in contrast to real work at adult age. This referent will not be discussed in further conversation.

(48)

M:				[ja 'kui]	sul
				and when	2sg.ADE

on	'tarvis	'tegelt	kui	sul	tegelt	'elus	on
be.3sg	need	really	when	2sg.ADE	really	life.INE	be.3sg

tarvis	akata	(.)	'arvutiga	midagi	tegema
need	begin.INF	(.)	computer.COM	something	do.INF2

sis='see=	mis= sa	**tegid**	**teises**	**'klassis**,
then **DEM**	**what you**	**do.PST.2sg**	**second.INE**	**grade.INE**

.hh [{**see**	mingit	tähtsust	ei	oma.}]
DEM	any.PART	importance.PART	NEG	have.NEG.3sg

'And when you have to do in your real life something with a computer then **what you did in the second grade**, **it** has no importance.'
(OCTU)

Based on the three examples that were discussed in this section, it is possible to suggest some aspects that make the use of detached constructions+relative clause more felicitous compared to classical relative clauses: as the pronouns are referentially a very large category the interpretation of the utterance is made easier when the appropriate pronoun is repeated once more before the verb of the main clause ; in some cases, the use of subject+verb in the main clause may avoid stylistically unsuccessful formulations, like the juxtaposition of two similar copular verbs *on … on* (example 46).

Another example of a referent introduced as an illustrative element can be found in example (49): the school from which the speaker graduated has not been explicitly mentioned, even if the discussion is about studies and diplomas. This referent will not be developed further. The speaker uses the most simple verb form *on* 'is' for linking the detached element and the predication: this type of relationship (creating a sort of metonymic link 'the school is education') might not be considered as precise enough for written texts, but is quite regular in oral speech where information pieces are just juxtaposed and by doing this more complex case marking and verbs are also avoided.

(49)
V: põhimõtselt **'see (.) kool mis mul 'lõpetatud on see**
  in_principle **DEM school that 1sg.ADE finish.PPP be.3sg DEM**

on praegu Eestis kõige 'kõrgem 'erialane 'haridus
be.3sg now Estonia.INE most high.COMP professional education

meil Eestis.
1pl.ADE Estonia.INE

'In principle **this school that I have finished**, **it** is now the highest available professional education here in Estonia.'
(OCTU)

The next instance (50) comes from a phone conversation with a travel agent and shows quite a long specifying sequence with an enumeration of different elements inside the relative clause before the rhematic element *need kaetakse* ('they will be covered'). This is a conditional sentence where the speaker H gives feedback in several turns.

(50)
(.)
V: .hhhhh vot see et kui teil näiteks {-}eee hhhhhh
        PRTCL DEM that if you.ADE example.TRL

'haigestute ägedalt,
fall_ill.2pl seriously
(0.4)

H: jah=m
        yes
(1.1)
V: nii .hhhhhhhh ja vajate 'arsti abi,
        so and need.2pl doctor.GEN aid.PART
(0.3)
H: mhmh

V: .hh **need** **'kulud** **mis teil** **'lähevad ütleme**
     DEM.pl expenses that you.2pl.ADE go.3pl say.1pl

teie **'ravimiseks ja te- a e:t 'ravimiteks** **ja**
you.2pl.GEN healing.TRL and you drugs.pl.TRL and

'haiglaraviks **võib-olla** **ja=ja** **võibolla arsti**
hospital_care.TRL maybe and and maybe doctor.GEN

vi'siidi **tasuks** **ja** **vot** **need** 'kaetakse.
visit.GEN charge.TRL and **PRTCL DEM.pl**cover.IMPS

V: 'If you for example fall seriously ill
H: yes
V: so and you need medical assistance
H: mhmh
V: **those expenses that you take for let's say medical aid and medicines and hospital care maybe and for visits to doctor, these** will be covered.'
(OCTU)

In this example by beginning the main clause with the markers *ja vot* followed by the resumptive pronoun *need* allows a necessary balance to be given to this utterance as a whole, which would otherwise end on a too steep fall (if only the verb *kaetakse* were used).

The connecting marker *ja vot* links together the long relative clause and the main clause: *ja* can be linked to the preceding enumeration where the connector *ja* has been used many times, *vot* is a particle that has different functions when it occurs alone, but here it seems to have quite a typical focusing function. As the preceding sequence contains several conditional clauses, quite a long relative clause that contains repairs, hedging or hesitation means (*ütleme, võib-olla*), the main message (verb) is focused on using the discourse markers *ja vot* at the intersection of the detached constituents and the main clause. Nor will the referent be developed further here, because the main topic is 'insurance' and its conditions; the referent of the detached construction is used only once more as an illustration.

The particle *eks* in the next example (51) serves to mark the end of the elaborative sequence (the relative clause); pronounced together with the preceding group, it shows that the speaker refers to a previously mentioned fact, indicating that the listeners should be aware of it: she has indeed described before the referents in question, 'twenty-one additional/reserve stadiums'. This utterance has a hesitant start, but with the repetition of the deictic *seal* throughout the whole utterance the speaker manages to formulate a more coherent message.

(51)
A: [.hh]   et=sis=   oli=   et= no=   et (.) et=seal= **ned**
             that then   be.PST.3sg   that PRTCL   that that there **DEM.pl**

'kakskend 'üks 'varu 'staadjoni   mis=seal (.) seal selle   'pea
twenty-one   reserve stadium.PART   that there there DEM.GEN main

'staadjoni: 'lähedal olid=   eks,   need 'kõik   olid=   ka
stadium.GEN   close   be.PST.3pl PRTCL DEM.pl all   be.PST.3pl also

meil   seal 'ilusamad   kui 'Kadrioru   'staadjon.
we.1pl.ADE there beautiful.pl.COMP   than Kadriorg.GEN   stadium

A: 'So there was that (.) that **these twenty-one additional stadiums that were
near to the main stadium**, right, **these** were all more beautiful than our
Kadriorg stadium.'
(OCTU)

To the resumptive pronoun *need* the pronoun *kõik* is added which underlines the
main idea of the comparison. Here again, the first part of the sequence is more
fragmentary, whereas the main clause is formulated clearly.
The referent in the detached construction is present in the discussion, but needs
to be specified again, as it is a 'collective' referent and not a central one and
meanwhile other referents have been developed.

    The example (52) comes from a narrative; three first clauses set the frame
(description of the space and the main event) before the detached element is
introduced, preceded by a transition marker *aga* and an evaluative adverb
imekombel.

    The referent in the detached construction (*see mees* 'that man') in this
instance is mentioned as a minor character, introduced by association – the
initial question being about the food-making process and work in the kitchen at
the Patarei prison. The speaker describes the steam boilers in the kitchen and
refers to a noteworthy event when one boiler exploded. In consequence the
referent is new and will not be mentioned afterwards either. The relative clause
serves to specify the name of the man in question.

    (52)
siis tal   see   köögis   oli   niimoodi et seal
then he.ADE   DEM kitchen.INE be.PST.3sg   like_that that there

olid   need   katlad olid   aurukatlad
be.PST.3pl   DEM.pl boilers be.PST.3pl   steam_boilers

ja   see minu   ajal   veel   ükskord veel   katel
and DEM my   time.ADE   yet   once   yet   boiler

lõhkes	see	aga imekombel	**see**	**mees**	**kes oli**
explode.PST.3sg	DEM	but miraculously	**DEM**	**man**	**who be.PST.3sg**

see	**Jaki**	**nimeline**	**seal**	**too**	jäi	veel	ellu
DEM	**Jak.GEN**	**named**	**there**	**DEM**	stay.PST.3sg	still	live.ILL

ainult	seljast	selja	kõrvetas	ära
only	back.ELA	back.GEN	burn.PST.3sg	ADV

'Then in the kitchen it was like that that there were those steam boilers and once in my time a boiler exploded, but miraculously **the man who was there**, **called Jak**, **he** survived; only burnt his back.'
(LM2)

This speaker uses many pronominal forms and proadverbs. His discourse is characterized by a very rapid pace, many self-repairs and it is possible that these elements help to 'anchor' his speech.

Too as a pronoun referring to a human is, according to Pajusalu (2006, 2009), usually a second option when referring to a minor character and when a personal pronoun has already been used for the main character. This assumption is, however, based on a written corpus.

The speaker in question has not a very marked dialectal background, but he comes from South Estonia, which has probably influenced his use of pronouns, taking into account also his age (*too* is mostly used by Southern Estonians). The pronoun *too* occurs here as a resumptive element. The referent is first introduced by an adnominal demonstrative *see* ('this man') and after that specified by the relative clause, which is used in order to give his name. This use corresponds to the findings of Pajusalu (2006 : 249) who argues that in this type of reference chain *too* comes before the pronoun *see*. It corresponds also to the properties pointed out by Pajusalu (2009: 128) as reference to a person from the background or the past. *Too* can also be seen as marking in a certain way the transition between different informational constituents as it occurs at the beginning of the main clause (immediately preceding pronominal or adverbial elements were *see, seal,* the latter being of the 'distal' type).

The referent of this utterance is undoubtedly a marginal example, he will not be mentioned again.

The same would be expected if the indefiniteness marker *üks* were to have been used. However, *üks* gives the impression of a new (maybe more important) character; *see mees* is inserted more fluently in the flow of the discourse, even if there seems to be a little contradiction in the presentation by the speaker as an identifiable entity and its complete newness in the discourse.

This example displays a clear case of using a brand-new element in detached construction (never mentioned before, not being part of common knowledge, not inferable from the discourse frame). The relative clause seems to be compulsory in this case in order to specify in some manner the identity of the referent.

One can see that in the last examples discussed in this section the proadverbs *siin* and *seal* (spacial deictics 'here', there') are regularly used. One can also question their functions in these utterances – are they used in the sense of deictics and what other roles do they play in these sequences? These elements seem to serve as an anchoring device in several ways: their primary function as deictics can be identified in examples where it is a question of referring anaphorically to a spacial entity (*köögis-seal*); the proadverb *siin* can refer to something that is close to the speaker (physically or in a more abstract manner), as in example (42) at the beginning of section 7.2. (*ülejäänud kahed mis **siin** on* 'the remaining twos that you have here'); *siin* and *seal* create an internal contrast between the present of the interlocutors and a distance in time and space with some other element, as will be shown in example 73 (*need kultuuritegelased kes **siin** mainisid /.../ nendega oli **seal** sellel perel oli nüüd suhtlemist nendega*). In example 51, about comparing the stadiums, the occurrences of *seal* do not carry exactly the same meaning: while in the first part of the utterance *seal* is mentioned twice as a spacial positioning at first place, the last occurrence in the comparison (*need olid ka kõik ilusamad kui meil **seal** Kadrioru staadion*) is not so straightforward: besides the spacial meaning it also conveys a more subjective evaluation: due to the attitude expressed by the speaker one can perceive a voluntary distancing and somewhat pejorative connotation; it also functions as a determiner in oral language.

Example (53) also comes from a conversation by phone (client service); the interrogation is about the contact details of the client.

> (53)
> | kas | **see** | **meil** | mis | teil | siin | on | see | melesta |
> |-----|---------|----------|-----|------|------|-----|-----|---------|
> | Q | **DEM** | **mail** | what | you.ADE | here | be.3sg | DEM | melesta |
>
> | punkt | kitse | punkt | ri'äppl | mail | punkt | ee- | kas | **see** | on | õige |
> |-------|-------|-------|---------|------|-------|-----|-----|---------|-----|------|
> | dot | kitse | dot | reappl | mail | dot | ee- | Q | **DEM** | be.3sg | correct |
>
> 'Is this **e-mail that you have here**, this 'melesta dot kitse dot ri'äppl mail dot ee'– is **it** correct?'
> (OCTU)

Due to the specificity of the relative clauses following the nominal detached element, it seems that the transition between the relative and the main clause is often marked by pauses, hesitations, particles etc., as the relative clause can be quite long and therefore raises the need to give more clues for interpreting the complete utterance.

The thematic element in example (53) (*see meil*) has been referred to eight turns before its reintroduction by the detached construction (*ma näen=et teil on siin meili'aadress*): at first, the speaker V asks a question about sending the bills by e-mail; after that another topic is developed (change of package) and then the

speaker V returns to the e-mail address of the client, in order to check its validity.

The detached constituent is built up as follows: at first, the interrogative word *kas* is introduced, followed by the detached element *see meil* which is specified by a relative clause *mis teil siin on*; after this element, the speaker spells the element (e-mail address) which was mentioned first in the detached item; she uses the demonstrative *see* before the 'citation' of the address. Only after this 'double' detached element comes the main clause *kas see on õige* which also begins with the same interrogative word *kas* that had already been used at the beginning of the utterance. In cases like the example (53) the detached constituent allows the presentation of more complex constituents at the foreground – in nominative case – which makes their processing easier; the use of the detached construction seems particularly adapted in cases where there is an element that resembles a citation or a 'label' that is preferably used in a non-modified form.

Another typical interrogative particle *või* (variant *vä*) is used in the next question (54) where the nominal element is specified by a restrictive relative clause. The intersection Theme-Rheme is marked by the particle *siis* ('then'). This example contains an introductory utterance, formed like a declarative complement clause (*aga muidu on et*).

> (54)
> H: mhmh hh aga muidu   on   et ee **hotellid** noh   kus   need ee kus
>   but otherwise be.3sg that   **hotels** PRTCL where DEM.pl where
>
> randa   ei   ole   siis **seal** peab   nagu eraldi mingit
> beach.PART NEG be.NEG.3sg then **there** must.3sg like separate some.PART
>
> rannamaksu   [maksma või]
> beach_fee.PART [pay.INF2 Q]
>
> 'Uhuh, but otherwise it is that **hotels** where, well, where there is no beach, then **there** one has to pay a special beach fee?'
> (OCTU)

The discussion is about travel arrangements and the travel agent has suggested to the client that he/she choose a hotel with a beach; this triggers H's question who returns to one previously mentioned referent, but there have been four intermediate turns in between; this disruption is signalled by the introduction of the utterance by *aga muidu* ('but otherwise').

Here the nominal element does not bear a definiteness marker due to the following relative clause that serves to determine it; the particle *noh* is placed between the detached noun and the relative clause. The resumptive proadverb is *seal* ('there'). The relative clause itself contains a repair – the speaker first introduces a plural pronoun *need*, which is then abandoned (marker *ee* showing the stopped formulation work).

The referent 'hotels' as specified (hotels without a reserved beach) has not been mentioned before, but the accommodation in general forms a part of the general discussion framework; it will be mentioned once more in the answer, but will not persist as the Theme in the following turn.

In the next example (55) the narrator relates his experience of prisoner camps in the Soviet Union. As in the two previous examples and the two following examples, it can be suggested that the detached construction allows the discourse to be better structured and/or to form a support for argumentation: in these examples, the implication of the speaker seems to be higher than in everyday dialogues and the structuring of the information flow in more sequenced parts gives more weight to the arguments and examples of the narrator.

> (55)
> ja   siis **need   ületalve   seisnud   need   mädanenud kartulid**
> and then **DEM.pl over_winter stay.APP DEM.pl rotten   potatoes**
>
> **neid**   võeti   siis ja küpsetati   ära (.) siis see
> **DEM.pl.PART** take.PST.IMPS then and bake.PST.IMPS ADV then DEM
>
> oli   niiütelda see   niiöelda lisa   veel
> be.PST.3sg so_to_say DEM so_to_say supplement more
>
> 'And then **these rotten potatoes left from the previous year, these** were taken then and baked and so it was a so-called supplement.'
> (LM2)

The question is about finding food in the camp and he explains how they managed to find rotten potatoes from the previous year. The element in question is present in the immediately preceding sequence, its introduction through a detached construction serves to illustrate the description of the ex-prisoner; the speaker interrupts its initial construction momentarily in order to add the expressive adjective (*mädanenud* 'rotten'). One could argue that with this type of discourse presenting an item in the nominative clearly contributes to the illustrative/argumentative weight of the utterance – undoubtedly this construction captures the attention of the listener better than casually integrated lexical elements.

The detachment construction in the nominative also facilitates the processing of information, as the detached element in question is quite long and contains a minor repair or addition.

In this chapter the detached constructions modified by a relative clause were discussed. This construction allows the specification, sometimes in quite lengthy developments, of the referent given by a detached element. These constituents also permit the introduction of pronominal detachments which otherwise are not characteristic to Estonian, as there are no clitic pronouns and the longer stressed forms are appropriate in such cases where a pronoun needs to be emphasized. In

Estonian, the repetition of the two respective pronominal forms (long and short) is not a typical means for emphasizing or introducing a pronoun – in such cases the long (stressed) form of the pronoun alone is used.

Mostly two types of occurrences can be identified: firstly, the referents that are created as new by the detached NP + relative clause, and the entities that have already been mentioned, usually two or more utterances back. In both cases, the referents will not become topical – they remain local examples or marginal illustrations of an argumentation. This type of occurrence can also resume a longer sequence when one refers back to a previous discussion or a question, sometimes in more general terms, and in this case the relative clause contributes to establishing a clear referential link with an element that otherwise has remained too far for linking back to through only a simple detached construction.

As a general feature in many examples the presence can be seen of the numerous deictics, especially the spacial deictics *siin* and *seal*: this aspect could also be related to the specific utterance type (detached construction+relative clause) that by essence carries a specifying or situating function. This feature is typical for spontaneous oral speech in general, but in examples discussed under this section the deictics seemed to play a more important role, especially, although not exclusively, in cases that concerned events in the past.

We do not have enough examples to allow us to confirm the tendency that seems to be present in these types of utterances (markers occurring at the intersection of the relative and main clause), but it can be pointed out here that there are various elements between two informational constituents, i.e. before the rhematic constituents – we find different connectors and particles (*ja vot*), some of which are bound to the end of the thematic part (*eks*), some of which mark different types of links between two informational constituents (*siis, aga*). With regards to other boundary markers, especially pauses, there does not seem to be any regularity. In some examples where the relative clause serves to resume a longer sequence, there was a pause or a slowdown, but more examples are needed in order to draw conclusions about this aspect.

7.3. Initial detachments and management of the referents in the immediate discourse environment

7.3.1 Formal properties

This section will examine examples where the initial detachments (ID) participate in the process of managing and adjusting the reference in the close discourse environment: here, one finds the typical cases of initial detachments which select a referent from a larger set of items, competing referents and other cases where the initial detachment is used with other textual functions like hedging or postponing. First a short summary of their characteristics in the corpus will be made, followed by the analysis of the examples.

One quite extensive group of IDs in my corpus appear in interrogative utterances; some examples were included in the previous chapter based on formal criteria (relative clause); the remaining examples are discussed here where the fact of selecting one referent of a set creates a natural predisposition for the occurrence of interrogative utterances, i.e. asking questions about one specific referent. Of 16 examples discussed in this section, 9 are interrogative utterances.

Two types of dialogues are represented: everyday conversations and information queries in institutional dialogues (mostly asking information by phone about travel arrangements or other services).

Initially detached elements are mostly in the nominative, as are the resumptive pronouns.

The vast majority of questions are yes/no questions; one question can be interpreted as a rhetorical one.

Typically, the detached elements are preceded by different (theme-shifting, etc.) expressions and particles, the most frequent ones being *aga*, *näiteks* ('but', 'for instance'). They bear almost exclusively the definiteness/identifiability marker which corresponds to the demonstrative pronoun (*see/need*). The definiteness marker can be missing in cases where the detached constituent is a proper noun.

In order to offer a better lisibility, some parts of sequences may be omitted in the analysis: depending on the length of the examples, the answers can be left out, as well as the interlinear glossing for some rare cases which are also assumed to be interpretable without the glosses.

7.3.2. Discussion of examples

The example (56) comes from an interview where a poet is interviewed by a student, but they know each other already before this conversation. The question concerns three last lines in a poem and the author's message behind these verses. In his answer, the poet first gives an affirmative response and explains his motivations.

The answer is expanded on several turns, but the exact referent is not mentioned again – the interviewee makes a further reference to it with the pronoun *see* ('*aga siis oli* see *küll jah*', 'but then was *it* yes').

(56)
mh aa seda   ma tahtsingi   küsida   et mm **need   viimased**
         DEM.PART I   want.PST.1sg+clitic ask.INF that   **DEM.pl last**

kolm rida (.) kas **see**   on: (.) tõsine   deklaratsioon sul
three lines   Q   **DEM** be.3sg serious declaration   you.ADE

 'Mh aa what I wanted to ask was that mm **these three last lines,** is **it** a serious declaration from you?'
(OCTU)

This example begins by an introductory utterance before the detached element; it can be interpreted as an attenuating means or a smoother transition, due to the fact that the detached element that follows has not been mentioned as such in previous discourse (the hesitation marker *mm* between the introduction and the detached element also probably contributes to the transition which marks a change of subtopic in the discourse). However, from the point of view of the informational status, it can be considered as an element extracted from a set or a framework and corresponds to the common knowledge of the participants.

From the formal point of view, the whole utterance can be divided into three parts: first, the introduction, surrounded by the dialogue markers *mh aa* and *mm*, secondly, the detached element itself ('these last three lines') and thirdly, the main clause which begins by the interrogative particle *kas.* A micropause separates the nominal element and the main clause which begins with the question word *kas*.

The detached constituent *need viimased kolm rida* and the resumptive pronoun *see* do not show grammatical agreement (plural determiner 'these' and singular pronoun 'it'). These types of occurrences are relatively frequent in the corpus, and I decided to analyse them as detached constructions, bearing in mind that these elements, typically occurring in spontaneous oral language and causing no interpretation problems in the conversation, display features characteristic to discourse under construction and therefore naturally present incoherencies as to agreement and grammatical constructions. This type of inconsistency appears when the resumptive element links the detached element to another lexical element which is not exactly at the same level of generalization. Here, the detached element refers to a specific material item (three lines of a poem), understood as the content of these verses, whereas the main clause already makes reference to this interpretation, not to the plural element in the detached clause. In consequence, there is no coreference in a narrow sense in the main clause and the detached element.

In this example we can assume that the detachment construction is triggered by the combination of several factors: first, the speaker introduces the lexical element (*need viimased kolm rida*), which is a relatively heavy constituent; the question word *kas* comes only after this constituent, after a short pause, and therefore a pronoun is required in the copular construction which constitutes the main clause. Here the detachment construction allows also a rather long and heavy constituent to be presented first, placing it in the foreground.

In the next example (57) the introduction is formally a yes/no question, but it is completed by a content question to which an answer is expected. This sequence comes from an information query by phone.

At the end of the introduction (*aga kas te oskate öelda et näiteks* 'could you tell me for example'), the nominal element (the bus leaving at 5.20 pm) is preceded by a typical pre-thematic element *näiteks*, 'for example'. This utterance displays one central characteristic of spontaneous oral speech – delivering information by portions, separated by discourse particles and/or other

editing devices. This conversation takes place by phone, so that more elements for keeping contact and staging information can be assumed to be necessary.

> (57)
> H: .hh et kas kella ‘viie aeg kuskil ‘läheb Tartust ‘Elvasse ‘buss.
>   that Q clock.GEN five.GEN time around go.3sg Tartu.ELA Elva.ILL bus
> (10.7)
> V: ‘kuusteist ‘viiskümend ‘iga=päev, ‘seitseteist ‘kakskümend (.) ‘tööpäeviti.
>   sixteen fifty every day seventeen twenty on_working_days
>
> H: seitseteist ‘kakskümend tööpäeviti jah?
>   seventeen twenty on_working_days yes
>
> V: jaa, ja siis on ‘seitseteist ‘kakskümend=viis ‘iga=päev.
>   yes and then is seventeen twenty-five every day
>
> H: mhmh .hhhhhh aga kas te oskate öelda et näiteks **see ee**
>   but Q you can.2pl say.INF that example.TRL **DEM**
>
> **seitseteist kakskümmend see buss** (0.3) .hhh
> **seventeen twenty DEM bus**
>
> et=ee mis ‘kell **ta** on siin üleval selles Aardla peatuses.
> that what o’clock **he** be.3sg here up DEM.INE Aardla stop.INE.
>
> H: ‘Is there a bus going from Tartu to Elva around five o’clock?
> V: Sixteen-fifty every day, seventeen-twenty on working days.
> H: Seventeen-twenty on working days, yes?
> V: Yes, and then it is seventeen twenty-five every day.
> H: But can you say that for example **this seventeen-twenty this bus**, when is **it** here up in Aardla bus stop?’
> (OCTU)

The detached construction is built up as in an analytical construction which allows the referent to be identified (determiner *see* + hesitation marker *ee* + ‘seventeen-twenty this bus’). The transition of the detached element (Theme) and the main clause (Rheme) is clearly marked (pause, hesitation, repetition of complementizer *et* which can be linked to the introductory clause *kas te oskate öelda et näiteks*).

Another interesting point is that the pronouns are used in order to refer to the nominal elements: this question will be examined further as there will be more examples that allow some conclusions to be drawn about their use. Here we can see the pronoun *ta*, which mostly refers to animates, resuming the inanimate referent (a bus).

In previous turns three possible options are proposed: one bus at 4.50 pm (overlooked by the speaker H), 5.20 and another at 5.25 pm; the latter is the one that is mentioned immediately before the utterance containing the detached

element; that means that the speaker H chooses between two referents, processes the received information and the detached construction refers to the more distant constituent. The lengthy introduction before the detached element is probably also due to the relative distance of the previous mention, even if the real distance is not very important (2 turns), but the two elements are also very similar in formulation, which is why there is a need for a clear distinction between them.

This example shows a case where the detached construction is used in order to point to one referent among several (formally quite similar) items, and more specifically, to go back to a referent mentioned before the very last, competing item.

In the following three examples (58-60), which will be discussed together due to their relative formal and contextual similarity, we can see a series of questions from an institutional dialogue (asking information about a spa and the additional services). The speaker uses a similar pattern in all three cases: the theme introduced by *aga*, followed in one example by the interrogative particle and in the two other examples also showing a typical combination of *aga näiteks* ('but for example') before the nominal constituent – in these cases the question word *kas* comes at the beginning of the main clause.

There is no perceptible pause in the examples (58) and (60), whereas in example (59) there is a short pause between the ID and the main clause.
In the example (60) the resumptive word is the proadverb *sinna*, 'there' in the illative sense, governed by the verb *kinni panema* ('make an appointment').
In the last example we again find the complementizer *et* which is used in a combination with the interrogative particle *et kas* which occurs quite often in spoken language questions.

> (58)
> H: =mhmh mhmh jah ega 'kõik vist   ei 'sobi   [ned]
>   yes NEG all   probably NEG suit.NEG.3pl DEM.pl
>
> 'protseduurid.=
> treatments
>
> V: [jah]
>   yes
> V: =ei   sobi   jah=
>   NEG suit.NEG.3pl yes
>
> H: aga kas **need   protseduurid need**   on   nagu sis   õhtul
>   but Q **DEM.pl treatments   DEM.pl** be.3sg like PRTCL evening.ADE
>
> või: kui   saabumisel või=s ommikul   või kuna=ne- need   siis
> or   when arrival.ADE or   morning.ADE or when   DEM.pl PRTCL

nagu on
like be.3pl

'But **these treatments, they** are like in the evening or when we arrive or in the
morning or when are they then?'
(OCTU)

(59)
aga näiteks   **need   mullivannid** (0.8) kas **need**   on   nagu ka
but example.TRL **DEM.pl jacuzzis**   Q   **DEM.pl** be.3sg like also

sis   ujulas   siis   ka nagu eraldi   tasu   eest (.)
PRTCL swimming_ pool.INE PRTCL also like separate fee.GEN for

näideks   õhtul
example.TRL evening.ADE

'But for instance **these jacuzzis**, are **they** also like in the swimming pool like for
a special fee, for example in the evening?'
(OCTU)

(60)
aga näiteks   **see   bõuling** et   kas **sinna**   tuleb siis   ka nagu
but example.TRL **DEM bowling** PRTCL Q   there.ILL must PRTCL also like

aeg   kinni panna (.) ennem, (.) näiteks   kui   seal õhtul   mingi
time book.INF   before   example.TRL when there evening.ADE PRTCL

mängida tahad
play.INF want.2sg

'But for instance **this bowling**, is it necessary to book a time slot **there** before,
for example when you want to play it in the evening?'
(OCTU)

With regards to the status of the referents at the moment they are mentioned in
the detached construction, two cases are present here: the referent in the
detached element in examples (59) and (60), *mullivannid* 'jacuzzis', *bõuling*
'bowling' have not been mentioned before, but are inferable by association
(different services proposed in a spa hotel); the referent in example (58) *need
protseduurid* has been mentioned by the same speaker H two turns back, with
no other competing referent in between (nevertheless, the speaker introduces it
again with a full NP (*need protseduurid*). Moreover, this is not the first time this
referent is mentioned: it has also been discussed in previous turns where the
agent explains how the visitors can make an appointment with a doctor who will
decide which treatments they should have. After this sequence another question

will be asked about these treatments: in this utterance the Theme (*need protseduurid*) is in the subject position with no detachment.

These examples show that the use of the pre-thematic markers *aga* and *aga näiteks* is related to the status of the referents: *aga näiteks* introduces here inferable but unmentioned referents (as if one could make a selection among a certain set of possible referents), whereas *aga* reintroduces a referent which is present in the discussion. It is worth noting that the referent *need protseduurid* is in all cases (in detached constructions and simple utterances) introduced by a full NP; this aspect could be explained by the fact that it is an inanimate abstract entity which is less easy to track throughout the conversation – between the mentions of this referent, several turns are inserted containing other details about appointment times etc.

With regards to the persistence of the referents in subsequent turns, it can be noted that in example (60) the referent is once more mentioned by a full NP. In these examples generally, the full NPs are the preferred means of introducing the referents, independently of their presence in the discourse – this could be attributed to the specific nature of the conversation where the speaker seems to have a list of items he wants to ask questions about and the reference tracking by the use of pronouns can turn out to be more costly in terms of the processing of the information.

Example (59) comes shortly after in another thematic development – the question is about the saunas and the swimming pool not being free of charge in the evening. Here, the answer is simple and this element will not be mentioned later.

The referent in example (60), bowling, will not be discussed any further. After the answer to this question the speaker H asks another specifying question about payment options and this closes the discussion about this item.

In this conversation, the speaker seems to have a recurrent pattern of introducing different referents by initial detachment constructions which allows her to bounce from one element to another.

In example (61) we can see another type of formulation of an interrogative: the word order is one of declarative utterance, with the interrogative particle *jah* at the end, whose function is asking for confirmation and already offering an answer (Hennoste 2012: 684–686). The speaker makes a self-repair at the end of the utterance, replacing the verb *on* 'to be' by a more precise verb *algab* 'to begin'.

(61)
H: [mhmh] (.) aga noh   **see Meribel see**   on   ainult veebruarist
                    but PRTCL **DEM Meribel DEM** be.3sg only February.ELA

sis   algab   jah
PRTCL begin.3sg yes

V: Meribel akkab   jah vabariigi   aastapäevast
    Meribel begin.3sg yes republic.GEN anniversary.ELA

H: 'But **this Meribel, it** only starts from February, yes?
V: Meribel begins, yes, from Independence Day'
(OCTU)

The turn begins with an acknowledgment marker *mhmh*, followed by a micropause. The new Theme is introduced by the connector *aga* combined with the particle *noh* which is multifunctional (postponement, staging of the information etc). This example can be considered as a *pivot* construction: after the detached element, the main clause begins by *see on ainult veebruarist sis*, but a more specific verb *algab* 'begins' is added to the utterance, followed by the question marker *jah.* The answer echoes the form of the question by using formally the same marker *jah* for confirmation and contains a more precise element for dating (Independence Day in February). In this example, the detached constituent allows the introduction of an unmentioned entity; in general, there are relatively frequent cases where the detached item is a proper noun or a complex constituent, as these elements are more easy to present in nominative form, taking into account the fact that names are processed somewhat differently to the remaining information, especially when a name has not been mentioned before, its identification could be more difficult than any other lexical word that is semantically more linked to the text.

This nominal constituent (the hotel, referred to as *see Meribel*) refers to a new referent in the conversation, but it can be assumed as being present in the general frame of the exchange.

In the next example (62) the speaker reformulates her initial question which begins with the verbal phrase and ends up by presenting a sort of final detachment[22] or *pivot* construction.[23] The question of the speaker H is presented in two turns, the second one takes the first utterance as a support, with approximately the same semantic content, but specifies it in a shorter utterance introduced by a detached item. The speaker probably realises that the referent she uses in the first utterance is not quite appropriate (in previous turns both types, travel insurance in general and the health insurance were mentioned, but the salesperson was first explaining the conditions of the travel insurance; in consequence, the speaker H probably wants to make the referent more general and uses a construction beginning with a detachment (*kindlustus*) which repairs

---

[22]   The first main clause, the utterance by H can be considered as Rheme, followed by a lexical support (*see tervisekindlustus* 'this health insurance'), but the proadverb *seal* is not exactly coreferential and the use of the complementizer *et* is not typical at the intersection of those constituents, so that this structure seems to announce that there is rather more to come, marked by the repetition of the complementizer *et*.

[23]   *Pivot* constructions will be briefly discussed in section 8.8.2.

and replaces the first one. The connector *et* which seems to link together the different constituents in this sequence is used before and after the lexical element and repeated once more before the main clause. The question word *mida* combined with *et* seems to establish a link with the preceding discourse (the referent being mentioned immediately in the previous turn); this also probably explains the fact that exceptionally the nominal element has no determiner.

(62)
H: mhmh aga mis seal täpselt siis   kaetakse= [et   see tervise]
          but what there exactly PRTCL cover.IMPS [PRTCL DEM health]

kindlustus=et
insurance PRTCL

V: [mt=hhhhh]
V: nii
   so
H: ʻ**kindlustus** et   mida **see** ʻõlmab
   insurance PRTCL what **DEM** contain.3sg

H: ʻUhuh, but what exactly will be covered then, this health insurance?
V: [….]
V: yes

All elements, beginning with the first introduction of the nominal constituent, are preceded by the complementizer *et*, but its functions are not the same depending on its position (before a referent, before a Rheme). In the last utterance (*kindlustus*, ʻinsurance'), the repetition of *et* could be an echoing effect marking the continuation after the repair and at the same time it contributes to the segmentation inside the sequence delimiting the Theme and the Rheme. The reformulation of the question can also be triggered by the fact that the feedback from V (*nii*, followed by an unclear syllable *so*) has not quite confirmed her understanding of the first question.

With regards to the complementizer *et*, L. Keevallik (2008) has shown that in conversations its use encompasses so-called 'multiple voices' by establishing a link between the actual utterance at the beginning of which it is used and the previous turn(s). The same mechanism seems to also operate in many of my examples where *et* is used. Of course, the link between the preceding discourse may not be as explicit as that: quite often, there is no such information given by the previous speaker, but the utterance in question seems to refer to background knowledge or shared knowledge (it occurs in questions about different travel services and it is assumed that the person who will answer is competent to do so).

Example (63), like example (60) contains the connector *et kas*, which has some specific characteristics compared to the simple connector *kas* in interrogative utterances: it allows the segmentation of the sequence and marks

the transition between different informational constituents. In example (63) particles are added at the end of the utterance which modify the state of knowledge of the speaker: *kas* at the beginning of the utterance is marking total absence of knowledge, but this state is being attenuated by particles like *või* at the end of the utterance; for the scalar repartition of different markers, cf. Hennoste 2012: 684.

This example contains an alternative question in the main clause and also some contradictory elements which are relatively frequent in oral language where the utterance is being modified by the speaker.

Here again, the referent is introduced in contrast with the previous one (Canary islands *vs* Egypt as travel destination); the referent *Kanaari saared* has been mentioned once in a list at the beginning of the conversation, and after a discussion about several other referents, the speaker brings in this one in order to discuss other alternatives. This referent persists during several turns, as the speaker V explains the advantages of this travel destination.

(63)
tundub   aga   näiteks   **net=ee Kanaari saared** et   kas **seal** on
seem.3sg however example.TRL **DEM.pl Canary Islands** PRTCL Q **there** be.3sg

nagu enamvähem   sama (.) või kas **seal** on   nagu rohkem midagi   vaadata
like more_or_less same (.) or Q   **there** be.3sg like   more   something look.INF

või et   noh.
or PRTCL PRTCL

'It seems however that for example **these Canary Islands**, is **there** like more or less the same or is there anything like more to see?'
(OCTU)

In the introductory clause the modal verb *tunduma* ('to seem') is combined with two particles that are typically used before the introduction of a new Theme, *aga* marking an opposition and *näiteks* ('for instance') referring to a choice being made between a set of referents.

The speaker first says something which is on the epistemic scale relatively probable, using the verb 'to have the impression that', 'to seem', but then asks an alternative question according to the same pattern (*et kas seal/või kas seal*) which challenges this assertion. It is possible that this contradiction has also been perceived by the speaker herself who at the end proposes also a third, truncated 'alternative' (*või et noh*) that shows her incertainty. The detached element contains a hesitation marker *ee* after the demonstrative *net* (pro *need*); this pattern (a pause or a filled pause between the demonstrative and the lexical element) seems to be quite frequent with referents that are not immediately present. Besides the lexical retrieval it can also be linked to the status of the referent: given that the correct pronoun is used, the speaker has made her choice

about the paradigmatic framework and in consequence marks rather the informational status of the referent.

In the next example (64), to some extent similar to the previous one, the generic referent is talked about in the whole sequence (pupils going on a school trip), but in the detached construction one specific group is extracted and characterized by two attributes (age and origin), *meie ned ütleme neljateist viieteist aastased* (the idea being that the pupils of that age in Estonia don't speak Russian, so that they have to speak in English with pupils from Latvia whose mother tongue is Russian). The detached construction serves to establish a contrast between the two elements, marked by the first possessive pronoun *meie* ('our').

(64)
V: 'mhmh. .hhhh 'et=äää, 'et 'nad 'oma'vahel   'nagu 'ka 'siis 'ika (0.3)
                    that   that they among_themselves like   also then PRTCL

mmm (0.6) 'üldiselt 'nagu 'meie, (.) **'ned   'ütleme 'neljateist 'viieteist**
              generally like   our   **DEM.pl say.1pl fourteen fifteen**

'aastased 'nad 'vene   'keelt   'ei 'räägi,   ja 'siis 'nad
old.pl   they Russian language.PART NEG speak.NEG.3pl and then they

'omavahel   'ikkagi 'on   'sunnitud 'siis 'rääkima:::: (.) 'inglise $
among_themselves PRTCL be.3sg oblige.PPP then speak.INF2   English

'keeles, .hhh 'et 'vähemalt 'niigi   'palju
language.INE that at_least   so+clitic much

'That that they among themselves like also in general like our let's say **fourteen to fifteen-year-olds, they** don't speak Russian and then among themselves have to speak in English, at least that's something'
(OCTU)

The speaker has some difficulties in formulation: during the hesitative beginning she probably realises that her idea might not come through, and she abandons it (the fact of speaking English among the pupils), marked by pauses and filled pauses, and begins again with a generalization *üldiselt* and introduces the referent in a more individualized manner, permitting it to be better focused on in the detached construction.

This example demonstrates how the detached construcion permits a refocusing on an item, giving a clearer illustration of an idea which otherwise has been formulated in too elliptic terms.

Example (65) also displays a case where a larger set is mentioned first (*sõbrad* 'the friends') and then a more concrete element is extracted from this group (two particular persons named Mati and Tiiu).

(65)

L: ja: ja need 'sõbrad tulevad nüd ikka= noh 'suurem enamus,
    and and DEM.pl friend.pl come.3pl now PRTCL PRTCL big.COMP majority

K: mhmh

L: tuleb 'täna. (0.5) 'eile olin ainult 'selle 'pärast et **Mati**
    come.3sg today yesterday be.PST.1sg only because that **Mati**

ja Tiiu et **nad** sõitsid 'Rootsi täna. .nhh
and Tiiu that **they** travel.PST.3pl Sweden.ILL today

L: 'And and these friends will come, well, the major part of them…'
K: mhmh
L: will come today; yesterday I was here only because **Mati and Tiiu, they** went
to Sweden today.'
(OCTU)

This example and the following example contain the names of persons in detached constructions. The names are by principle identifiable elements. In the current example the names are mentioned only once, since they are used as secondary illustrations.

There is also a contrast linked to the temporal background (*eile/täna*, 'yesterday/today') – the speaker explains that most of the friends come to the birthday party the same day, but that she was there because of the two persons who came one day before. The complementizer *et* is repeated at the beginning of the main clause in order to mark the continuation of the causal conjunction *sellepärast et* 'because'. It can be suggested that using a detached construction here allows the information to be presented in a less concentrated manner, as these referents are mentioned without any other interpretative clue and the information can be integrated in a smoother way.

In the next example (66) we can see an inverse case, where the name has been introduced immediately before the actual occurrence in the detached construction; there are no other competing referents. The name is preceded by the discourse particle *noh*, the most frequent particle in spoken Estonian (Hennoste 2000, Keevallik 2003: 351). At the beginning of the utterance this particle can have several functions (postponement, thematic shift) according to Hennoste (1994, 2000, 2001). In the present case, the speaker picks up the name as the Theme and its referent remains to some extent contrasted to the speaker Ke who first says that she has paid her share and wants to know what should be done with the share of Miku.

(66)
Ke: aa siis ma tahtsin   veel sellest ee 'tasust   rääkida. (.) 'mina
        then I   want.PST.1sg more DEM.ELA fee.ELA speak.INF   I

annan   enda   poole   'ära
give.1sg own.GEN half.GEN ADV

Kr: mhmh

Ke: aga kuidas 'Mikuga   on.
    but how   Miku.COM be.3sg

Kr: noh   'Miku, täna teda   näiteks   'küll   ei
    PRTCL **Miku** today **he.PART** example.TRL PRTCL NEG

olnud   ja nii edasi, noh 'vaata   ise.
be.NEG.PST.3sg and so_on   PRTCL look.IMP.2sg self

Ke: 'And then I wanted to speak about the fee. I will give my part.
Kr: uhuh
Ke: but what about Miku?
Kr: Well **Miku**, today for example **he** was not here and so, do as you wish.'
(OCTU)

As this example is somewhat divergent compared to the introduction of detached elements in other occurrences, it can be suggested here that the use of the detached construction may also constitute a discursive strategy of post-poning the answer; this is coherent with the use of the particle *noh* and when considering the general content of this conversation (the question of paying for the lesson seems to be a somewhat delicate subject in this conversation).

In the next example (67), which is a relatively informal interview with a poet, the initial detachment seems to drive the attention of the listener to a specific item, in order to indicate that the speaker has the intention to continue with the item he introduced in his previous sequence as a new element (*see väikses mustas see esimene* 'the first one in the small black' refers to the first poem in a compilation). In between there is a little disturbance arising from the fact that the speaker seems to interpret the backchannel reactions of the interviewer as an intention to make a longer intervention and therefore his first turn is followed by an interruption and an interrogation *ah?*, whereafter he resumes his initial idea by using a detached construction.

(67)
K: (-) (...) on=   sul   seda: (0.5) tihti juhtunud   et sa (.) kirjutad
            be.3sg you.ADE DEM.PART often happen.APP that you write.2sg

nii et sa ei 'tea   et sa 'kirjutad. (1.5)
so that you NEG know.NEG.2sg that you write.2sg

I: e tihti ei   ole, (.)   a-aga sis   jah, ee ilus näide   on   see (0.8)
    often   NEG be.NEG.3sg but   PRTCL yes   nice example be.3sg DEM

ee väikses   mustas   see   esimene l-luuletus ehk. (0.5)
   small.INE black.INE DEM first   poem   maybe

K: mh

I: ehk   siin ka. (0.5) see=
   maybe here too   DEM

K: =(---)

I: ah? (1.8) vata   **see   väikse   musta   esimene, see**   on   ka
   ah?   PRTCL **DEM small.GEN black.GEN first   DEM** be.3sg also

kirjutatud nii et ma ei   teadnud, (.)   ja se= on   ometi (.)
write.PPP so that I   NEG know.NEG.PST.1sg and DEM be.3sg nevertheless

korraliku   rütmiga (.)   või üsõnaga   vor-vormis luuletus. (.)
proper.GEN rhythm.COM or in_one_word form.INE   poem

K: 'Has it occurred often to you that you write without knowing that you are
writing?
I: Not often, but yes a beautiful example is this er, in the small black
compilation, this first poem maybe.
K: mh
I: maybe here too. This…
K: =(---)
I: Ah? You see, **this first (poem) in the small black**, **it** has been written without
knowing, and it is a poem with a proper rhythm or that is to say a poem with
form, though.'
(OCTU)

The discourse particle *vata* before the lexical element is another form of the
particle *vaata/vat* (cf. Hennoste 2000: 1801, Keevallik 2008: 36). Here, the
form *vata* introduces an explanatory sequence in the main clause. In the
detached element, the previously mentioned item can be reformulated in a more
contracted construction, without mentioning the word 'poem' *luuletus* again and
the combination of the particle and the form of detached element helps to
refocus the listener's attention on the idea of the speaker.

   The next example (68) shows a construction which seems to be quite typical
in dialogues in English (cf. Geluykens 1992, see example 45): after the
introduction of the NP by speaker V speaker H acknowledges it by the dialogue
word *mhmh*, followed by the main clause. This type of example, however, was
rare in our corpus. Moreover, the detached element *selle taignaosa* is not in the

nominative and this fact could also play a role in the reaction of the listener. In the present case, it helps to build up the internal structure of the sequence – after the question of H, V is gradually giving instructions contained in a recipe (she reads them by phone) which can also influence the use of backchannel reactions.[24]

(68)
H: kuidas see   on   sis   mingi (.) p:u[dis- 'pudi tehakse   või.]
    how   DEM be.3sg then some   mash   mash make.IMPS Q

V: [{-} (.) 'räägin   sulle.] .hh need (0.5) ee .hh
                                              tell.1sg you.ALL DEM.pl

selle taignaosa,
DEM.GEN dough_part.GEN

H: mhmh

V: **selle**   vahustad   'pehme (.) rasvaine 'suhkruga? kergeks
    DEM.GEN whip_up.2sg soft.GEN fat.GEN sugar.COM light.TRL

'vahuks .hh siis   segad   kui- kuiv´ained   omavahel?
froth.TRL   then mix.2sg dry- dry_ingredients among_them

H: 'How is it then made, a sort of mash or…?
V: I will explain to you, these **this dough part,**
H: mhmh
V: **this** you will whip up with soft fat and sugar in order to obtain a light froth, then you mix up separately the dry ingredients.'
(OCTU)

The particle *mhmh* has been characterized by T. Hennoste mainly as a distanciating marker, but it also has other functions (Hennoste 2000: 1788–1792); here it seems more as an acknowledgement marker, as the question came from the speaker H who then confirms the choice of the thematic element by speaker V and shows her continuing interest in the subject. In general, the dialogues in my corpus do not mark this type of acknowledgment; initial detachments occur in a rather monologic environment. It is not impossible that in Estonian these types of backchannel reactions at the intersection of two constituents in this particular construction are less expected in conversations, or that detached elements, especially in the nominative, seem to be too 'open' to expect a systematic feedback: this construction might be perceived as being centred on the speaker only, not demanding a feedback after the introduction of

---

[24] It should also be noted that recipes constitute a specific type of discourse in regard to the reference, the most prominent feature of the referents being their alteration during the projected cooking process (cf. G. Kleiber 1997).

the detached constituent. Here, however, the speakers do not overlap and this construction seems intuitively perfectly natural.

Here also, the detached element comes after a false start: the speaker repairs the first, plural pronoun, by introducing the singular lexical constituent.

Quite naturally, the referent in question will not be mentioned as such in further conversation, as the question is about following instructions in a recipe.

In the next example (69) the speaker answers the question of the interviewer who asks about his experience in the infamous Patarei prison in Tallinn during WW2 and more specifically about how the prisoners were called out from the cells.

(69)
no   ikka   no   see   ju   süsteem käis   ju   niimoodi
PRTCL PRTCL PRTCL DEM PRTCL system go.PST.3sg PRTCL like_this

Patareis   eks ole ee (1.2) **see** (0.7) **koridorivalvur** (0.6) **see** (.) tegi
Patarei.INE PRTCL   **DEM**   **corridor_guard**   **DEM** made.PST.3sg

luugid lahti ja ütles   seal noh   tol   ajal   ei
hatches open and say.PST.3sg there PRTCL that.ADE time.ADE NEG

olnud   nummerdatud vangid ütles   et eks ole et Martson
be.PST.NEG.3sg number.PPP prisoners say.PST.3sg that PRTCL that Martson

Georg Valmari   poeg (1.0) tulge   välja
Georg Valmar.GEN son   come.IMP.2pl out

'So well, the system was like this in Patarei: (1.2) **this corridor guard, he** opened the hatches and said – well in that time the prisoners did not wear numbers – he said, Hanson Georg son of Voldemar, you come out.'
(LM2)

The speaker first makes a more general introduction and then introduces the nominal element as a detached entity *see koridorivalvur* ('the corridor guard') followed by the rhematic part. Here we also find a parenthetical insert or at least a sequence that is not at the same level as the remaining utterance (*noh tol ajal ei olnud nummerdatud vangid*) – its status is marked by the discourse particle *noh* at the beginning of the insert and the fact that the speaker then resumes his narration with the verb *ütles* followed by the markers *et eks ole et*. Here we can see the referent in question appearing only once; this is part of the thematic frame (prison>guard). The resumptive pronoun is *see*, which seems to be a regular choice when the referent is a background character and the events related are distant in time.

Following this example one can conclude that using a detached construction allows the information to be staged more fluently, when one has to introduce a

referent which has not been mentioned before, but can still be identified by the listener as part of the thematic frame.

The next example (70) comes from a spontaneous dialogue, but here also the referent is a person referred to by his name:

(70)
A: e:::t näiteks   'nääd= nüd   **Eiki 'Muldala seda**=   sa
    that example.TRL PRTCL=PRTCL **Eiki Muldala DEM.PART** you

'mäletad   eksju.
remember.2sg PRTCL
(0.2)

E: jah, see   kes tegi   [neid   'pil]te
   yes DEM who make.PST.3sg DEM.pl.PART. picture.pl.PART.

me käisime   ['nende juures]=ä.
we go.PST.1pl [at_their_place]

A: [noh]   [jaah]
                                   [PRTCL]   [yes]
   (0.4)

A: 'For example, well now, **Eiki Muldala**, you remember **him**, don't you?
E: Yes, him who made those pictures, we went at their place.
A: Well yes…
(OCTU)

The elements used in the long hesitation sequence before show that the speaker A tries to remember his name; this person has not been mentioned before during the conversation. The anaphor in the main clause is the demonstrative *seda* (*see* in partitive). The demonstrative pronoun *see* seems to create somewhat more distance (in time or space) and that is why it was used more naturally in this context – the speaker asks the listener about remembering the person in question or not and we can see that the speaker first also has some difficulties in remembering the name. Pajusalu 2009: 126 claims that the status of the referent in discourse can influence the choice of anaphoric pronoun: for temporary referents which are not yet in focus, the demonstrative *see* can be used. A more general principle about the choice between personal pronoun *ta/tema* and the demonstrative *see* referring to animate entities is stated in the Estonian academic grammar: demonstratives are used for 'less-known and more distant' persons and 'the speaker detaches the referred person from him/herself and the hearer' (Erelt et al. 1993: 209).
    Here another less frequent interrogative particle *eksju* is used at the end of the utterance; like *jah* or *onju*, this particle refers to the questioning being on the

epistemic scale more like asking for confirmation and offering an answer. This variant seems to be more informal compared to *eks ole*.

The intention of the speaker A remains somewhat unclear as it concerns the introduction of the name of the person, because the participant E intervenes with her question about the person and A cannot develop her initial idea. In any case, this referent is completely new in the discourse (this aspect is also signalled by the word *näiteks* ('for example') which is often used in order to mark referents that are not active or present) and after a short discussion about her will be abandoned.

Example (71) comes from a longer narrative where the speaker is explaining that in old times there were almost no robberies in villages and the doors were not even locked in the countryside, but after that he gives a concessive counter-example of some locked farm buildings where valuable reserves were stocked: he first introduces the general term *aidad* ('granaries') before specifying two subsets in the detached construction, *viljaait, lakaait*. The very first utterance thus makes a general statement, ended by the particle *eks ole* which has an alignment function and refers to the interlocutors' common knowledge.

(71)
P: aiad   olid   küll   lukus   eks ole
    barn.pl be.PST.3pl PRTCL lock.INE PRTCL

K: mhmh

P: **riideait   viljaait kalaait   need**   olid   kõik lukus
    clothes_storeroom granary fish_shed DEM.pl be.PST.3pl all   lock.INE

P: 'The barns were nevertheless locked isn't it,
K: mhmh
P: **clothes storeroom**, **granary, fish shed, these** were all locked.'
(LM1)

In the main clause, the resumptive word *need* ('these') is reinforced by the indefinite pronoun *kõik* ('all') and the whole utterance has a somewhat repetitive pattern which probably contributes to the argumentation of the speaker who develops, in several sequences, the idea that at that time there was no criminality by giving several eloquent examples.

The detachment construction which is used here serves typically two main objectives: firstly, it contributes to the staging of information in an illustrative part of the utterance and secondly, it gives more cohesion to the referential expression. As both detached elements are in the singular, it would be less felicitous (but nevertheless not impossible) to continue without the plural pronoun *need*, which somehow encompasses he first general plural referent *aidad*.

7.4. Initial detachments and management of the referents in the larger discourse environment

In this chapter, examples will be discussed for which it seemed important to underline their functioning on the discourse level: besides the examples where the initial detachment serves to introduce a general conclusion, also one example with quite complex referential linking and one example where the detached element exceptionally introduces a referent in a generic sense are analyzed here.

7.4.1. Formal properties

All examples discussed in this chapter are affirmative utterances and come mostly from rather monological types of discourse. In many cases, however, there has been, often quite far from the actual occurrence of the detached construction, a broader theme or a question to which the speaker is giving an answer.

As a rule, the detached nominal element is preceded by an identifiability marker, a demonstrative *see/need*. In this chapter will also be discussed two examples where these markers are omitted, for different reasons.

When the resumptive pronoun is not in nominative, there can be found pronouns in partitive, comitative and elative cases.

7.4.2. Discussion of examples

First of all an example (72) will be discussed where the detached lexical element has a generic sense, but is extracted as a concrete item and maintained during quite a long discursive sequence. This conversation is about (typical) clients in a bookshop where the speaker has worked (referred to as *inimesed* 'people'). This referent is already present in previous turns where the participants talk generally about 'people' in shops and also a question was asked about answering the questions of people who enter the shop. The speaker KT is explaining here why she decided not to go straight to the clients in order to propose some help in finding the products in the shop.

(72)
KT: noh=
EA: =mhmh=
KT: ='**inimene** noh > hea 'küll ma ei 'lähe **teda** 'segama $
      person PRTCL PRTCL I NEG go.NEG.1sg **he.PART** disturb.INF2

siis kui **ta** juba 'loeb ega ma ei saa **teda** aidata
then when **he** already read.3sg NEG I NEG can.NEG.1sg **he.PART** help.INF

'lugeda   eks < $ hee aga noh (.)   nii 'alguses   kui   **ta** nagu 'otsib=   või
read.INF PRTCL   but PRTCL so beginning.INE when **he** like search.3sg or

(.) > a **ta** on ise   alles 'segaduses   **ta** ei   tea   ka 'täpselt
       he is himself still   confusion.INE **he** NEG know.NEG.3sg also exactly

'mida **ta** nagu 'tahab= ja < (-) **ta** tahab   alles mingit   'pilti
what **he** like want.3sg and   **he** want.3sg just some.PART picture.PART

luua   ja= ja üldse   ja=noh
create.INF and and PRTCL and PRTCL

'**A person**, well I will not go to disturb **him** when **he**'s already reading, I can't
help **him** read, but when **he**'s looking around at first or if **he** is still lost and **he**
doesn't know exactly what **he** wants and **he** wants to get an overview.'
(OCTU)

The detached element is constantly resumed in following discourse by the pronoun *ta* (nominative form) or *teda* (partitive form). The lexical element at the beginning of the utterance is followed by a combination of two particles (*noh, hea küll)*. One of the functions of *noh* is temporizing or delaying, and it acts also as a segmentation marker at the intersection of sequences (in this example in combination with *aga* on line 2). In the analysed example *noh + hea küll* is thus placed at the intersection of the detached element and the rheme. *Hea küll* is clearly a conceding marker.

The pronoun *ta* refers to the detached item during the whole extension where the speaker KT is developing her example, but again further on the term *inimesed* will be introduced, as this referential device is valid only for this specific example and does not refer to a concrete person, but is a generalization.

The next example (73) is extracted from an interview which contains longer narrative sequences and this utterance closes one sequence (the speaker returns to the initial question and answers it). It shows another possibility for the occurrence of initial detachments on the discourse level, with the function of closing a sequence; as for the informational status of the detached element, it can be seen that it refers to an entity that has already been mentioned (but with a generalizing scope, as at first different persons were mentioned by their names).

(73)
 ja ilmselt   **need (.) kultuuritegelased kes siin (1.0) mainisid** (1.2)
and probably **DEM.pl intellectuals   who here   mention.PST.2sg**

tõepoolest (.) ee kindlasti **(0.1) nendega**   oli   seal (1.0) sellel
indeed   certainly   **they.COM** be.PST.3sg there   DEM.ADE

perel   oli (1.2)   oli   nüüd suhtlemist   (0.8) **nendega**
family.ADE be.PST.3sg be.PST.3sg now interaction.PART   **they.COM**

'And probably **these intellectuals that you mentioned here**, indeed, certainly, this family had relations **with them**.'
(LM1)

The opening question (did the interviewee know personally some eminent intellectuals who were contemporary to him and lived on the same island?) is situated quite far from the answer and in his answer the speaker begins by giving various examples and details and only at the end of the sequence comes to a conclusion and thus gives an affirmative answer. In fact, the speaker probably realizes that he has not exactly answered the question that was asked and tries to reach a coherent conclusion by using many modal adverbs, spacial deictics *siin* 'here' and *seal* 'there' that create an internal contrast in the discourse and help to situate it, repeating the pronoun *nendega* 'with them' etc. The process of the ending of the sequence is also marked by the progressively slowing tempo.

The detached item (in the nominative) is followed by the relative pronoun *kes* also in the nominative, which needs to be reinterpreted when the transitive verb *mainima* is introduced which calls for the partitive. The ongoing formulation and reinterpretation process is marked also by the use of the modal adverbs *tõepoolest, kindlasti* and the repetition of the resumptive pronoun *nendega*, which assures the cohesion with the verb in the main clause (*oli suhtlemist*). The deictics *siin/seal* also help to situate the two discursive universes – in the relative clause the speaker refers to the previous discourse with the deictic *siin* whereas in the main clause he refers to past events using the deictic *seal*.

The next example (74) demonstrates the case where the detached construction is used in monological developments and operates clearly on the discourse level: in this type of occurrence, the detached element contains the (abstract) entities/ideas that may have already been referred to in previous discourse or can represent the outcome of an idea elaborated in the sequence.

(74)
sellepärast et (1.6) ma: ei   tea   vanasti   see algas
because   that   I   NEG know.NEG.1sg back_then DEM begin.PST.3sg

ikka   väga sügavalt kodust (1.2) kodust   pihta ütleme 'vanaema
PRTCL very deep.ABL home.ELA home.ELA ADV say.1pl grandmother

'vanaisa (.) nende 'suhtumine nad niimoodi ei   õpetanud   ega ei
grandfather their   attitude   they this_way NEG teach.NEG.APP   nor NEG

pidand loenguid   vaid 'lihtsalt nad'olid   'niisugused 'nagu nad
tell.APP lecture.pl.PART but   simply they be.PST.3pl such   as   they

'olid (1.2) nii et **see   põhiline (1.3) põhiline ausus** hhh (0.7) **see**
be.PST.3pl so that **DEM main   main   honesty   DEM**

tuli   ikkagi suurelt osalt   sealt
come.PST.3sg PRTCL big.ABL part.ABL there.ABL

'because I dunno in old times it began deep from home, already grandmother
grandfather, their attitude, they didn't teach nor gave lectures, but they just were
as they were, so that this **fundamental (.) fundamental honesty** phh (.), **it** came
mostly from there.'
(LM1)

The combination of particles *nii+et* serves to introduce the conclusion. In this
type of occurrence, there seems to be no clear internal contrast nor any
extracting from a set or a group. However, previously, the speaker has deplored
today's crisis of ethics which to some extent could form an opposition to the
main idea of the current sequence. The detachment construction seems to fit to
the general intention of the speaker who develops his ideas in an instructive
style, with quite a strong personal involvment, and uses several stressed entities
to support his argumentation. In this sense, the detached construction
contributes to the general structure of the sequence.
One should note also the particular arrangement of elements in one of the
clauses in this sequence (*vanaema vanaisa nende suhtumine*) which shows a
juxtaposition typical to oral language. Here it might contribute to the
accentuation of the speaker's message, because the two persons (grandmother
and grandfather) given as examples constitute the most important elements of
his argumentation and are later referred to by personal pronouns.
    The next example (75) also shows a case of assuring cohesion at the
discourse level by introducing a detachment construction: its referent (*see
haridus poistel*, 'the education of the boys') has been developed in a more
detailed manner long before this occurrence (about 60 turns). In this instance, a
grandmother answers by phone some questions from her grandchild about the
relationships between parents and children in her time; the question in this
example asks about the outcomes of her education methods in general in
relation to the results she had expected.

(75)
H: aga: mis sa   arvad   kas: nagu need   sinu 'kasvatusmeetodid .hh nagu
    but what you think.2sg Q   like DEM.pl your education_method.pl like

'mõjusid   =et   kas 'kasvasid   nendest   'lastest (.)
give_effect.PST.3pl PRTCL Q grow.PST.3pl DEM.pl.ELA children.ELA

'sellised lapsed   nagu sa 'ootasid.
such.pl   children like you expect.PST.2sg

V: .hh ma ütleksin   jaa, enamvähem.
        I say.COND.1sg yes more_or_less

H: mhmh=

V: =võibolla jah, .hh midagi   jäi   seal (.) muidugi **see .hh**
     maybe yes   something stay.PST.3sg there   of_course **DEM**

'haridus poistel,   sellest   on   mul   väga 'kahju.
education boys.ADE DEM.ELA be.3sg me.ADE very sorry

H: 'But what do you think were your education methods like efficient, did your
children become like you wanted them to?
V: I'd say yes, more or less.
H: Uhuh
V: Maybe yes something did not, of course, **this education of the boys**, **this** I
really regret.'
(OCTU)

The idea expressed by the speaker V has been evoked already in this
conversation a long time ago, so that in this example the detached construction
allows an idea already presented before to be revoked using short expressions,
the modal particle *muidugi* ('of course') points to the fact that the speaker
presumes it to be known to both of them. Again, the beginning of the utterance
contains an outline of an idea that is abandoned, followed by the detached
element which makes the idea clear, referring to a known entity and
highlighting it.

The next sequence (76) displays two cases of initial detachment: the first
referent is introduced with a proper noun (*Juuli-tädi*) and resumed by the
pronoun *see*, and the second referent is inserted in a kind of polyphonic
utterance *ei poisid noh nemad ei söö seda*. In the first case there is a pause at the
intersection of the detached element and the main clause, and in the second case
the particle *noh* is located at this position.

The general topic of this sequence is the non-willingness of the children to
eat the meat of the animals bred on the family farm, but the speaker quite
thoroughly develops the description of the bad character of the animal.

(76)
H: [meil   oli ee (.)   meil   oli   ee] (1.0) meil   oli ee (0.8)
   [we.ADE be.PST.3sg we.ADE be.PST.3sg]   we.ADE be.PST.3sg

vanasti: poisid 'väiksed olid,   sis oli   meil   üks
back_then boys   little.pl be.PST.3pl then be.PST.3sg we.ADE one

'oinas kodus (0.8) noh   ja nemad 'õpetasid   kurjad vaimud selle
wether home.INE PRTCL and they   teach.PST.3pl evil.pl spirits.pl DEM.GEN

136

oina   nii 'kurja(h)ks hehe et **'Juuli-tädi** (0.5) **see** ei   tohtind
wether.GEN so evil.TRL   that **Juuli-aunt   DEM** NEG can.NEG.PST.3sg

ültse liikuda   niigu   'kummardas nii oinas pani   'plaksti:, ja
at_all move.INF as_soon_as bow.PST.3sg so wether put.PST.3sg plaksti and

ta 'käis   'lahtiselt   ka ja siis pärast panime (0.5) küll   'köide
he go.PST.3sg unattached too and then later put.PST.1pl   however cord.ILL

see läks   ügsgord 'põllu= pääle teda 'edasi lööma   näed
DEM go.PST.3sg once   field.GEN on   he.PART forward hit.INF2 see.2sg

'niivisi, (0.5) ja 'jäi   sinna   kummargi jäi   sinna
like_this   and stay.PST.3sg there.ILL bowed   stay.PST.3sg there.ILL

oina   'meelevalda ja ei saand   'ära ka sealt
wether.GEN mercy.ILL   and NEG can.NEG.PST.3sg away also there.ABL

enam.   niigu   niigu   'tõusis   nii oinas pani
any_more. as_soon_as as_soon_as stand_up.PST.3sg so wether put.PST.3sg

jälle plaks 'pikali. hehe ja siis, ku 'ära   tapsime, (1.2) ei **poisid**
again plaks down.   and then when ADV kill.PST.1pl   no **boys**

noh   **nemad** ei 'söö   seda: (0.5) ee seda   just see ma=i
PRTCL **they**   NEG eat.NEG.3pl DEM.PART DEM.PART just DEM I   NEG

'mäleta   mis ta   'nimi oli   [sel   'oinal.] (.)
remember.NEG.1sg what he.GEN name be.PST.3sg DEM.ADE wether.ADE

K: [mhmh mhmh]

H: 'We had back then when the boys were little, we had a wether at home and
they little bastards made this wether so evil that **aunt Juuli she** couldn't move
around at all: when she bent down the wether hit her and he went around also
unattached and then later we attached him with a cord though; she went once to
the field to move him on you see like that and stayed there trapped at the mercy
of the wether and couldn't leave at all. As soon as she stood up the wether put
her down and when we killed him – **no, the boys, they** don't eat it, I don't
remember what its name was, this wether.'
(OCTU)

The referent tracking in this sequence merits a more detailed discussion.

   The first human entity is *poisid* ('the boys'), introduced in a thematic
temporal frame *vanasti poisid väiksed olid* ('once when the boys were little')
and referred to by the pronoun *nemad* 'they'; then the person *Juuli-tädi*, a new
referent, is introduced in a detached construction and referred to by the
anaphoric demonstrative *see* or immediately after this pronoun also by the zero

pronoun. The use of the pronoun *see* (and not the alternative *ta/tema*, more usual when referring to humans) can be associated to the distance in time, also to the fact that the main human entity in this sequence are 'the boys' and maybe there is also the influence of the fact that the speaker is describing in a detailed manner the interaction between a human and an animal. With regards to the attitude of the speaker towards this person, the conversation does not contain this kind of background information which would allow this aspect to be taken into account. The detached construction again seems to be more appropriate here, as the referent is a new entity. As for the use of pronouns throughout the whole sequence, we can see that after the next mention of the wether in the full lexical item (*oinas*), the personal pronoun *ta* will remain assigned to the animal, while the demonstrative *see* will refer to the human (*see läks ügsgord põllu=pääle teda edasi lööma* '**it** went once to the grassland to move **him** on'). This intriguing regularity can be explained by the fact that the wether seems to have a more central position in this sequence (mentioned eight times, including two anaphors and one null subject) and this resolution of reference is the easiest way to continue the narration; otherwise it would have been necessary to reintroduce a lexical entity.

The referent *poisid* ('the boys') is picked up again at the end of the sequence in a detached construction which makes reference to their attitude as perceived by the speaker (the negation word *ei* reports the refusal expressed by the boys). At the intersection of the detached element and the main clause is the particle *noh*, which can also indicate the somewhat polyphonic composition of this utterance. The speaker intends to continue the utterance, trying to remember the name of the wether; in this sense, the pronoun *seda* marks the effort of recalling its name. From the point of view of information, the referent *poisid* ('the boys') is one of three main actors in this sequence, but first the narrator sets the temporal frame ('when the boys were little') and after some developments arrives again to this referent at the end of the sequence. 'The boys' will also be briefly addressed in the next turn, after feedback from the listener, when the speaker gives another illustration of the same situation.

The last example of this section is not a typical detachment construction if one considers it from formal aspects perspective (nominal element is repeated as a whole), however, it has several properties that bring it close to this structure. Here, the speaker V (travel agent) enumerated different expenses that can occur during a journey and which are up to 100% reimbursed by the insurance company, so that this utterance closes the whole sequence. The nominal element is doubled as a whole, not resumed by a pronoun. It can be related to stylistic aspects or to the need for cohesion – the generic term *need kahjud* ('these losses') occurs as such for the first time and the message in the main clause *need kahjud hüvitatakse* ('these losses will be compensated') is the central one, as the agent is trying to sell the travel insurance to her client.

(77)
V: [nii=et] (0.2) **need   'kahjud mis teie 'saite** (0.4)   **need   kahjud**
     so that   **DEM.pl losses   that you get.PST.2pl DEM.pl losses**

hüvitatakse.
compensate.IMPS

'So that **these losses that you had, these losses** will be compensated'
(OCTU)

The connector *nii et* marks the conclusion of a sequence. In this utterance two micropauses separate different constituents: before the detached element and at the intersection of the detached item and the main clause. The exact content of the referent in question *need kahjud* can be considered as being present in the discourse, as this term is used as a generalizing means.

This example, which is formally divergent from the typical pattern, was thus included in the discussion because it was considered that the introduction of the detached element itself adhered to the typical rules brought out for detached constructions (referent present in the discourse frame, resumption of a sequence), although the formulation of the main clause (repetition of the lexical element) was not congruent with the general pattern.

The conclusion of previous chapters will be made after a short overview of some other regularities observed during the analysis concerning the marking of the boundaries of informational constituents and the choice of resumptive words in analysed sequences.

7.5. The informational status and persistence of detached elements

In this section a short summary will be made of the informational status and persistence of detached elements in the examples analyzed in chapter 7. The question arises about the informational status of these elements (previous mention in the discourse, presence in the situation, clues given by the speaker for helping the interpretation of the information by the listener) and their persistence in the discourse (for how long these entities will be discussed, possible developments by the discourse participants in following utterances, possible re-shift to these themes later in following discourse, etc.).

In general, the detached elements contain often somewhat complex items, or items that are more easily identified when presented in the nominative, such as names.

The examples containing a relative clause that specifies the detached construction are often formulated as a commentary or present an argument that illustrates the idea of the speaker. These elements are not central ones and generally are mentioned only once.

Based on the examples discussed in this chapter it is possible to conclude that in most cases the referent in a detached construction is generally linked to the frame of the previous discussion: it can be retrieved by association or by general presumption (the person called on for information is presumed to be able to answer questions about different entities within a certain framework), in some cases referents are introduced as contrastive elements or picked up from previous exchange, when several other referents have been developed in the meantime.

One distinct group of examples are the information requests in institutional dialogues where the client asks questions about certain services (mostly travel services, hotels, services in hotels, spas, etc.). These entities may not be present in the situation, but they are present in the 'frame' of the discussion: the conversation has usually been introduced by the client who has given the general direction of his/her request. The referents, however, tend to be absent in the immediately preceding exchange, rather they are picked up from the introduction that was made long before the actual occurrence. Different cases can be identified, but the general tendency is that the thematic elements are ad hoc requests and do not stay in the discussion as persisting referents. Quite often, the same 'pattern' of question can be found in several subsequent interrogations: the speaker seems to adopt a certain form of question (intial detachment) and uses the same pattern just by changing the referents and the content of the question. The introduction by a detached construction thus allows a return to a previously mentioned element and often the detachment alone is not sufficient – the transition is indicated by various markers, the most frequent ones being *aga*, *aga näiteks*. According to R. Geluykens, whose main claim is that initial detachments in English introduce mostly irrecoverable referents, all these markers, respectively *but* and *for instance* in English, also hesitations, serve as cues that the speaker will introduce irrecoverable material (*ibidem* : 60), but this is not as straightforward as that – he has also a certain amount of counter-examples in his corpus. Independently of the exact content of the term 'irrecoverable', which can receive different interpretations, my data tend to confirm the tendency that additional material is needed in order to introduce detached elements in the discourse, permitting the planning process to be accounted for or marking the status of the referent which is not present in the immediate discourse frame.

7.6. Marking the boundaries of informational constituents

There is no unique or regular pattern showing the boundaries of the thematic and rhematic parts of the utterances; this feature is represented by a complex of different means. It should also be noted that the detached lexical elements do not play the same role in the discourse – sometimes they form an occasional

example or illustration, whereas in other cases they introduce a more important conclusion by the speaker.

The examples of my corpus did not enable any clear regularities to be found in the use of different devices. In any case, prosody was not a systematically investigated level in the present thesis, although this aspect was always considered when selecting and interpreting examples. Nevertheless, some remarks can be proposed.

1. There can be a relation between the use of marked devices (pauses, particles, hesitations, filled pauses) and the length or the complexity of the detached element, which is thus more distinctive in utterances where other elaborative material is present after the detached lexical element and the main clause. The particles used are *siis*, *ja vot, noh, noh hea küll, et, eks*. Some markers like *eks* are more clearly associated to the previous clause (an assertion demanding consent) and many of them are probably multifunctional, typically to that category, marking the boundaries at the same time as other functions such as hedging or postponement etc. It is certainly a more cautious approach to try to concentrate on specific examples without attempting a generalization and not to place all the aforementioned devices on one level – a more detailed investigation could certainly reveal more regularities that could not be discovered within the limits of the present study.

2. The initial detachments in questions form a separate group in the sense that the interrogation itself is marked by different devices, in yes/no questions quite often by the interrogative word *kas*, which can be placed at the beginning of the whole utterance (before the detached element), or in most examples at the beginning of the rhematic element (at the intersection of two informational constituents), or sometimes can be repeated after having been used already at the beginning of the utterance (in the case of a more complex thematic element). Often the interrogative word *kas* is preceded by the complementizer *et* and in this case they form a contracted interrogative particle *et kas*, which is placed at the intersection of two informational constituents, at the beginning of the main clause.

3. Pauses do not occur very often at the intersection of informational constituents. There can certainly be pauses that are hardly perceptible, but it was not possible to draw conclusions on the basis of perceptible or even micropauses in the examples of the corpus. They certainly play multiple roles: for example, it could be seen, regarding the detached constructions, that in some cases the discourse was sequenced in such a way that short pauses occurred between the determiner and the lexical element.

4. In general, the introduction of lexical elements in questions was preceded by substantial discursive material such as particles, hesitations, repairs, introductory utterances, related to the facts that the questions displayed more 'new' referents (not mentioned before, inferable) compared to other types of

utterances and that formulating a question probably demands more effort and editing.

5. A general discourse-building pattern can be observed in several cases where the detached construction is preceded by a first attempt at conveying more or less the same idea that will be expressed in clearer terms in the detached construction. In these cases specific markers are also used as particles, hesitations, filled pauses etc.
6. The role of discourse adverbs should also be underlined: they point to different attitudes on epistemic scale and variable status of information: *muidugi* (shared opinion), *ilmselt* (conclusion), *tõepoolest* (confirmation).

7.7. Coreferential pronouns (resumptive words) in detachment constructions

In this section a short summary will be given about the resumptive words used in the main clause of detached constructions; some variation can be observed in the examples analysed. I focus here on the cases which go beyond the main rules governing grammatical agreement, typical pronouns for animate and inanimate referents etc.

1. In some utterances the singular or plural referents do not show agreement in the detached element and in the main clause where the resumptive word is used. This can be attributed to the general characteristics of spontaneous spoken language which is at all times discourse in construction, so that the reference needs to be repaired or adapted constantly. This type of incoherence seems to be quite regular and does not call for any specific repair mechanisms or reactions from the listener as it is by principle an auto-repair. As the detachment construction is performed in two clearly separated parts with a semantic link between the two, this adaptation can also be used for going beyond the exact coreference as in the following example:

> (78)
> K: mh aa seda   ma tahtsingi   'küsida, et mm **need   viimased**
>   DEM.PART I   want.PST.1sg+clitic ask.INF that   **DEM.pl last.pl**
>
> **three lines** (.) kas **see**   on: (.) 'tõsine deklaratsioon sul. (12.0)
> **'kolm 'rida**,   Q   **DEM** be.3sg serious statement   you.ADE
> (OCTU)

We could also see that in the case where the reference does not appear as problematic and the referential frame is given in the discourse, this type of adjustment inside an initial detachment construction can be quite a felicitous way of avoiding other repair mechanisms.

2. Variation of resumptive elements in the case of animate-inanimate referents.

Typically the demonstrative determiner *see/need* is resumed by the same pronoun in the main clause, but exceptions do occur for both animate and inanimate referents.

The inanimate referents are not always resumed by the pronoun dedicated to inanimates (*see, need*), but by the personal pronoun *ta, nad*.

(79)
see   buss- mis kell   **ta** on
DEM bus what o'clock **he** be.3sg
(OCTU)

(80)
M: [õudsalt vahva jah (1.5) ei see   on   'just   'kihvt,] (1.8) no (.)
    terribly cool yes   no DEM be.3sg precisely nice   PRTCL

tegelikult 'see   **pool** kokkuvõttes **ta** ei   'ole   ju   'väike.
in_fact   **DEM side** all_in_all   **he** NEG be.NEG.3sg PRTCL small
(OCTU)

We referred in different sections of this chapter to the works of R. Pajusalu who has identified certain regularities in the preferred use of anaphoric pronouns.
With regards to the animate referents, and more specifically humans, the most usual way to refer to them is to use the personal pronouns *ta* ('he'), *nemad/nad* ('they').

But sometimes the animate referents are referred to by a pronoun typically used for inanimates. This type of use seems to form a pattern and tends to occur in more narrative sequences of discourse. This use can indeed be preferred in the case of minor (human) characters and it also seems that it occurs especially in narratives about past events and when the person is designated by his name. This tendency was confirmed by my data.

3. Variation of proximal/distal demonstrative pronouns: the corpus does not provide a sufficient amount of examples to enable conclusions to be drawn about the variation of these elements. In addition, the use of the distal demonstrative *too* is quite limited not to say inexistent among persons without a Southern dialectal background. In two examples that occurred in our corpus, one can be explained by the origins of the speaker whereas the second establishes a textual contrast between two items.

4. The pronominal system of Estonian is rather limited and virtually no variation/opposition can be expressed via this category, but one example of a study where the variation of different pronouns has been taken into account

is the investigation of M. Etelämäki (2006) where she focuses on the Finnish pronouns, especially *tämä*, and their functions within initial and final detachment constructions that receive different interpretations according to the pronoun used. She analyses the use of the pronoun in the detached constituent as well as the resumptive element.

7.8. Initial detachments in discourse: conclusion

In several different studies, the informational status of detached elements has received many controversial interpretations, for example Geluykens' claims, regarding English, that 'topic' constructions introduce new (irrecoverable) referents; on the other hand, Ashby (1988: 212) assumes that only half of topic constructions in French refer to new referents; according to him, detachments are a primarily topic-shifting or topic-creating device (Ashby 1988: 217), i.e. they are used for structuring longer stretches of discourse. Both found that the referents of topic constructions usually continue to be talked about in subsequent discourse; sometimes, however (Geluykens 1992:155), the referent is not reintroduced as such, but serves to bring in some other referents that are linked to the referent of the topic construction (cf. Chafe 1976:50).

The examples of my corpus demonstrated that the detached elements almost in all cases bear the definiteness (or rather identifiability) marker *see* (*need*).

Three types of situations can be described as occurring most often in the case of initial detachments:
1. The referent of the detached construction is present in the situation or in the cotext, i.e. has been explicitly mentioned before. In certain cases, the referent is again reintroduced by the detached constituent in a new perspective, most often in a contrastive environment or when other referents have been developed meanwhile (*return-pop*).
2. The referent of the detached construction is a member of a larger set or group of referents and is extracted from that group as an illustration or developed as an example, support for argumentation, etc.
3. In narrative sequences, the initial detachments can also serve to come back to an initial idea or to resume the whole sequence, even without the referent in question being mentioned explicitly before. This occurs with rather more abstract notions and this use in general contributes clearly to the structuration of the discourse.

Sometimes the detached construction introduces a completely new element, but this seems not to be their primary function; moreover, the referents introduced in such utterances will not be dealt with over a long time – they perform a shift of perspective, but remain rather 'local' Themes. A special case is represented by the interrogatives where the proportion of new referents (not mentioned before) is naturally more important due to the nature of the interrogative

utterance itself. The initial detachments in interrogative utterances seem to structure the discourse within a given thematic frame. These types of examples occur typically in information requests where the discussion is about a special service, and inside this framework the constructions with initial detachment allow the introduction of different requests, even about referents that have not been mentioned before. Their persistence in the discourse is variable: sometimes a short answer is sufficient, whereas sometimes more questions are asked in following turns.

Thus it is possible to sum up the functions of initial detachments in discourse in the following terms:

They allow information to be staged gradually, by mentioning first the thematic element which will be talked about in the main clause. This property of giving information by portions is typical of oral language where more analytical constructions and different postponement devices are used in order to allow the formulation and editing necessary in linear real-time conversation. This aspect is important, when we take into account the informational status of the referent: when an accessory or unmentioned referent is introduced, the structure of the detached construction allows the information to be processed more easily. Also, sometimes the coherence singular/plural is improved by the use of detached constructions which usually contain a subject pronoun followed by the verb. The detachment constructions, by their inherent structure, also participate at the stylistic or rhetorical level in the discourse – highlighting certain elements in the nominative, without a previous reference or grammatical link, probably helps to capture the listener's attention.

Detached constructions occur mostly inside a given sequence or thematic framework and frequently a contrastive context can be identified. However, one group of examples displayed the occurrences where the initial detachment was used for resuming a longer narrative sequence. The formal characteristics (presence of the identifiability marker) of these constructions permit the introduction of elements with variable informational status: these can be referents present in the situation, inferable from the ongoing discourse and in combination with relative clauses, or even completely new referents which are described and specified by the relative clause. Generally, their informational status is not problematic and is not challenged by other participants during the exchange; moreover, as the major part of occurrences in Estonian seems not to be presented as challengeable (no acknowledgement required from the listener after the introduction of the detached element) and takes place in a monological surrounding (argumentation based on an example, extraction of an element from a larger set), the feedback from the listeners, if there is any, is not related to the informational status of the referent.

8. FINAL DETACHMENTS IN SPOKEN ESTONIAN

8.1. Introduction

Final detachments, like initial detachments, have been approached in different fields of linguistics: as far as the informational status of these constituents is concerned (activation, newness), they present a particular interest because of their role in the discourse. Depending on the approach, these elements have been described as extra-clausal constituents (Tails) by Dik (*Functional grammar* 1978) or a repair strategy (Geluykens 1987a) or in interactional terms by Horlacher&Müller 2005, Horlacher 2012; other terms used include *dislocation des membres de phrase* – 'dislocation of the members on the sentence' (Bally 1909), *phrase segmentée* – 'segmented sentence' (Bally 1944), antitopic (Chafe 1976, Lambrecht 1994), afterthought (Givón 1976, Ziv 1994), *appendice* (Mertens 1990, Apothéloz & Grobet 2005), Mneme (Fernandez-Vest 2006, 2015), *postfixe* (Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1990), *énoncé à détachement* (Fradin 1990), *incise finale* (Morel 1992); there are also numerous syntactic accounts on the 'right dislocations'.

Here, final detachments are investigated as a construction that has a role to play in Information Structuring; from this perspective, different researchers have spoken, for example, about Anti-Topic (Lambrecht) or *post-rhème*, *mnémème,* Mneme (Fernandez-Vest) which link this constituent to other constituents on the level of Information Structuring (Theme and Rheme).

In the present study the term 'final detachment' is preferred, when speaking about the construction, similarly to the pre-rhematic constituent which is called 'initial detachment', as there is no need to link or to oppose this constituent directly to the Theme or to the constituent (i.e. initial detachment) that contains the Theme of the utterance. However, Post-Rheme is used when referring to the third informational constituent (cf footnote 14).

Although initial and final detachments share clearly a certain amount of characteristics, (which were also taken as grounds for their treatment within one analysis), they should not be seen as two absolutely symmetrical and parallel forms. The main common points of the two constructions encompass the properties such as being extra-clausal constituents with a detached nominal element linked to a resumptive pronoun in the main clause. They are assumed to perform special functions on the level of Information Structuring and are especially productive in (informal) oral language. The analysis will reveal also some important differences between the two structures.

8.2. Formal properties and main problems

The main characteristics of final detachments have been described as follows: they occur mostly in oral/informal language; they have a special prosodical pattern (flat intonation). From a formal point of view, they contain a resumptive

pronoun or a clitic in the main clause; the detached lexical element follows the main clause and carries the casual marking of the element in question (in languages where this is possible). Different functions have been associated with these constituents: clarification, disambiguation, repair, recall of the main Theme etc. On the one hand, there are approaches that consider that this constituent is used in discourse above all for specifying the reference or correcting an error of formulation, while on the other is the viewpoint that they are programmed as such in the ongoing discourse, without any idea of repair or adjusting the reference.

Estonian scientific grammar (Erelt et al. 1993) treats these constructions as 'specifying tails', defining them as elements that add something to the clause.

(81)
Ta on tore poiss, see sinu vend.
'He is a nice guy, this brother of yours.'

They are considered as not falling within the scope of the syntax, because there is no grammatical link between the two elements of the sentence. They have not been described in Estonian at the discourse level.

According to K. Lambrecht (Lambrecht 2001: 1068), final detachments ('Antitopic' in his terminology) are characterized by the following features: from a syntactic point of view, final detachments are more closely connected with the predicate-argument structure of the clause than initial detachments. The main phrase containing the pronominal can be, in the case of initial detachments, extended by different types of clauses (complement, relative clause, etc), so that the nominal element and the pronominal are not adjacent; this is not possible in the case of final detachments.

Case marking in final detachments is more restrictive than in initial detachments: the nominal element bears the same case marking as the cataphoric constituent in the main clause.

There is also another constraint at the reference level: the detached constituent must be coreferential with the pronominal element, whereas in the case of initial detachments this criterion is less strict.

M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest argues that final detachment allows for identification after the Rheme, considering that the detached element is not separated by a pause or hesitation and occurs typically in highly interactional contexts. According to this author, final detachment seems to be triggered by a cognitive automatism, whereas the occurrence of initial detachment is mainly driven by the underlying principle of discourse activity that the first element is the one that one will be talking about (Fernandez-Vest 2006: 190).

She also underlines the fact that the final detachment does not stem only from the thematic part of the utterance and it is not only a "postponed Theme": this argument is supported on the one hand by the occurrences where the Mneme serves as a basis for the upcoming Theme and on the other hand by the

fact that a Mneme can also refer to elements presented in the Rheme (*ibidem*: 190–191). But Fernandez-Vest also includes other constituents in this category that occur in, for example, enumerations with plain intonation, having little informational charge and referring to the initial hypertheme (*ibidem*: 188); in that case, the binary strategy Rheme-Mneme is present.

The prosodical difference between initial and final detachments is explained by K. Lambrecht by their different syntactic connectedness: the initial detachments are syntactically independent, whereas final detachments are syntactically connected with the preceding elements and do therefore not bear a clear accent (Lambrecht 2001: 1071). The questions related to the prosody will be addressed in the next section.

Final detachments are somewhat similar to some of the constructions that Discourse Analysis considers as a certain type of repair mechanism (afterthoughts). These two types of constructions have been analysed as different ones, for example by Ashby (1994) in French and Fretheim (1995) in Norwegian; according to K. Lambrecht (*ibidem*: 1076), who also refers to the arguments of Ziv (1994), afterthoughts constitute separate intonation units, they are thus accented and preceded by a pause – which is not the case for final detachments. Also expressions or particles that refer to the repair function in afterthoughts, should help to make the difference. This controversy will be discussed further, along with examples from spoken Estonian. Some researchers tend to think that one should not consider together two radically different constructions: final detachments (planned as such, as part of the speaker's 'grammar') and repairs or afterthoughts (occasional formulation work). In addition it is admitted that there are many constructions that have some formal properties in common with typical final detachments, such as apostrophes, appositions, parentheticals, but which do not fill all criteria that allow them to be considered as final detachments (for discussion see Apothéloz & Grobet 2005: 98–102).

Different constituents can be indeed detached after a clause; in this sense, there are some categories that we will not investigate here, for example, infinite constructions etc., also vocatives are considered as falling outside of the scope of this study.

In Estonian, as in English, the stressed forms of pronouns do generally not occur alone in detached constituents, whereas in French it is a strongly grammaticalized phenomenon, to the point that the construction with *moi je* in initial detachment is not considered as a detachment any more. In English there is the possibility of using the stressed pronoun *I*, as with the longer form of the pronoun, *mina*, in Estonian. In French, the stressed form can not be used without the clitic *je*.

In languages with relatively flexible word order like Estonian one can raise the question about the possible variation of word order when considering final detachments: in interrogative utterances in spontaneous oral language, the subject is often placed at the end of the utterance; there can be a resumptive

pronoun, so that the utterance can be considered as a final detachment, but the pronoun is not compulsory, in which case the utterance follows the quite regular pattern in oral language of placing the subject at the end. This tendency has been examined by L. Lindström (2002: 102), who has explored the conditions which favour the word order VS in spontaneous oral language. According to her, the following conditions favour the apparition of the VS order in Estonian, one of the most important criteria being the 'agentivity' (the scale going from first- and second-person pronouns to full NP referring to inanimate referents):

> The utterance begins with a possessor adverb
> The subject phrase refers to a non-human
> The subject phrase is a full NP
> The subject phrase conveys the new information in discourse

The next example fills most of the conditions in this regard: the possessor adverb *tal* (he-ADE), the subject is not human (*operatsioon,* 'the operation'), the subject phrase is a full NP (*see operatsioon*) and in this conversation the reference to the operation intervenes for the first time (the marker *aa* at the beginning of the utterance indicates the introduction of a new item, or the fact that the speaker recalls an element), although the participants seem to be familiar with the event in general.

> (82)
> V1: {aa.} no   okei siis. (0.5) .hh a 'meie lähme üldiselt   vist
>   PRTCL okay then.   we   go.1pl generally probably
>
> 'maale   ära   präegu nii=et   noh   [me] lähme 'Kasparit
> countryside.ALL away   now   so that PRTCL we   go.1pl Kaspar.PART
>
> vaatama.
> look.INF2
>
> H: [mhmh]
> (0.5)
> H: **aa kuidas tal   'läks   see   operatsioon.**
>   **how   he.ADE go.PST.3sg DEM operation**
>
> V1: 'Okay then. We will go now in principle to the countryside, so that we will see Kaspar.
> H: Uhuh.
> H: **How did it go**, **his operation**?'
> (OCTU)

In this sequence the interrogative utterance does not contain a resumptive pronoun, but the use of *see* in the main clause is absolutely possible (*kuidas tal see läks see operatsioon*).

149

In oral language the VS word order corresponds to a general tendency of giving first the predication followed by the subject of the predication. How, then, should one make the distinction between final detachments and variation of word order in Estonian? In the present thesis the examples without the resumptive pronoun were in general not considered as detached constructions, as we do not yet have clear-cut criteria permitting making a distinction between the two, if it were justified to do so. In some cases, there is a clear pause before the detached element, but as this feature does not occur systematically in final detachments, we cannot establish a rule for defining all cases of detached constructions. Moreover, the constructions without the resumptive pronouns should be examined on their own, as various constructions can be found under this category, taking into account also other formal properties, for example in interrogative/assertive utterances (prosody), which should be analysed separately.

8.3. Prosody

As prosody enters into so many theories and definitions in relation to detached constructions, the following questions have arisen (however, global and adequate answers have been difficult to find):

Is prosody a distinctive criterion in defining detachment constructions, especially final detachments? Can prosody be of use in distinguishing between final detachments and repairs (supposing that these two should be considered as distinct from each other)? Is there a typical prosodical pattern to be found? Is it valid for all types of utterances or should we look for it in each type of utterance separately (affirmative, interrogative, exclamative)?

The claim about the 'typical' prosodical pattern has been criticized by several authors who have a background in phonetics: the prosodical characteristics of the final detachment is conditioned following Rossi 1999 by the prosody of the main clause whose intonation is being 'copied' in the detached element. According to Avanzi (2009: 60) this idea of the prosody of final detachment being flat is recurrent in many works, often without any founding on real data. The prosodical features (occurrence of pauses, intonation) have also been used as a means for distinguishing between so-called typical final detachments and afterthoughts (Ziv 1994: 639), but to date there is no comprehensive cross-linguistic typology permitting such distinctions.

In some recent works, different authors seem to conclude that in the present state of research it is not possible to find clear correlations between prosody and other levels of description (syntax, pragmatics) and the functional level in discourse (Fernandez-Vest 2004b, Simon 2004).

In consequence, and due to the fact that this thesis is not primarily a research on prosody, I have chosen to observe the prosodic features without using specific software and equipment; certainly, the analysis of examples demands more attentive listening than regular discourse participants who listen to the

discourse only once and at the same time are occupied with planning and production. The added value of a more thorough prosodic analysis did not appear sufficient at this stage, taking into account the fact that this type of approach would have necessarily diminished the amount of examples being included in the study. However, as was also explained in section 3.6.1., prosody is an investigation level of major importance when one works with real examples, but with regards to the current object of investigation, initial and final detachments, it seemed more appropriate to leave this aspect to a more specific investigation on some types of examples (different types of utterances, different types of detachments or using other limitative criteria). In addition it should be noted that a considerable amount of valuable researches using oral corpora have not included the prosodical features on a clearly defined basis, relying on more intuitive criteria or simply on a close and attentive listening of the examples; inversely, the investigations about prosody in this type of construction (detachments) are necessarily limited with regards to the number of examples and the generalization level they may reach.

8.4. Informational status of the referent

In the present study I have chosen not to make an extensive overview about the literature addressing the question of the informational status of the referent, as in different approaches different languages have been studied, using varying methods, and generally, one can see the somewhat contradictory and over-lapping definitions the authors are using when determining the informational status of the referent. However, some essential questions will be addressed in this section, using the most simple and univocal terminology.

One of the controversial questions about final detachments has been the status of the detached element: is it always a known entity or can it also be a new referent in the ongoing discourse? Most researchers tend to think that the final detachment can not introduce a new entity, it has to be 'discourse-active' or 'semi-active' (Lambrecht 1996: 186).

Final detachments occur mostly after predications which concern events that are known to both participants, i.e. that can be considered as shared knowledge (Aijmer 1989: 149); compared to initial detachments, their referents are more accessible (more frequently mentioned in the immediate preceding context) (Ashby 1988: 212–213).

With regards to the informational charge of final detachments in general, it is admitted that these constituents serve to introduce (in a known framework) or reintroduce an element (Apothéloz 1997, Horlacher 2012). Apothéloz and Grobet (2005: 116) underline the articulation of this construction between two planes, where naturally the main clause containing the pronominal element is situated at the foreground and the lexical element in detached construction is at the background. These authors also see a parallelism with the prosodical

organization (*ibidem*: 118–119) which demands an important effort (and also implication) from the speaker when he/she is uttering the clause with a resumptive pronoun, followed then by the detached element with a lesser vocal dynamism.

Horlacher (2012: 265) argues that as far as conversational actions are concerned, the final detachment in French is not primarily a topic-promoting/ creating device, but rather it marks passing to the next action. It is also used in order to confirm the pertinence of a topical item and serves to backlink, i.e. contains a referent mentioned sometimes quite a long time before the occurrence in the detached construction. In this sense, her results do not contradict the general assumptions about the informational status of the detached element being mentioned before or being known by the participants.

In the following sections, where the examples of Estonian will be analysed, the status of the referent will also be described in relatively general terms, taking into account the following criteria: the referent being mentioned immediately before the actual occurrence; the referent being mentioned before in the discourse/the presence of other competing referents between the two occurrences; the referent not being mentioned before (as far as the recording can be relied on). The persistence of the referent in following turns will also be noted, where appropriate, with a special accent on the managing of the referents at the discourse level, i.e. beyond the actual utterance.

8.5. Functions in discourse

Detachment constructions have been first described at sentence level, with examples from written texts or created by the authors. These types of approaches are still widespread in different domains of investigation: for instance, syntactic analyses most often use examples of sentences, considering the grammaticality or non-grammaticality of the constructions under invest-igation. This is, of course, not true of all syntactic works, as there are also more and more corpuses of oral language available. The generative framework also mostly makes use of these types of examples.

When analysing real examples from conversations, sentence is not an appropriate category. The detached constructions are by definition linked to a main clause, which is the Rheme of the utterance, but they are not limited to only one clause: the referent of the detached element can be present in previous discourse or can be developed after its occurrence in a detached constituent. Therefore, we always have the level of discourse that is present.

Fernandez-Vest (2004a) makes a demonstration of the textual functions of final detachments by arguing that they are not a mere repetition of the Theme, but serve as elements which assure the circular cohesion of the sequence and have a special role to play in recalling its main object. This constituent has also a phatic function, as it contributes to the confirmation of a common ground for

the discourse participants (Fernandez-Vest 1994: 202). The examples of K. Aijmer about English show that final detachments tend rather to have a role in the social plane: the speakers use them in order to create intimacy between the participants in situations where there is already some common ground; often, speakers use evaluating or expressive terms (Aijmer 1989: 153, 150).

Depending on the type of corpus, on the person who is speaking, the occurrence of these elements can be quite variable. They have been studied mostly in the framework of one sentence, but as much as possible, in the present analysis their textual dimension will also be considered. These constituents seem to be a cross-linguistic phenomenon in oral language, however, the languages do not use them with strictly identical functions and quite naturally, differences lie also in the frequence of their use and in the prevalence of one or another type of such constructions. H. Sahkai (2003) has argued that, in Estonian, final detachments do not have the same functions as those in some Indo-European languages, like French or English, even if syntactically there is no difference between them. According to her argumentation (in a syntactic framework), as in Estonian, 'topicalization' in general is not usually performed by 'dislocations', final detachments do not either carry this function, but could be rather considered as an 'occasional repair strategy' (Sahkai 2003: 84, 86). However, in our corpus, there seem to be at least two groups of examples which may form a continuum: one group that can be associated to the repair function in discourse and another group where the repair function does not play a role at all and where it is clear that the construction has already been planned as such. Consequently, my approach here is somewhat different, as we observe on the textual level two different functions of these detached constructions and do not try to link one principle defined in syntactic framework (topicalization) to these constructions in Estonian: final detachment has its proper functions in relation to the thematic continuity and the cohesion of the discourse that cannot be assimilated to the thematization (or 'topicalization'). Moreover, final detachment is not just a 'repetition' of the Theme when considered in the framework of the discourse, as we will show further, and this can be demonstrated especially at the textual level: at the sentence level, examples like 'she is not here, your wife?', do not show the functioning of this constituent in discourse, where it carries different functions and participates in more complex articulations – this utterance can not occur in any situation, but there are always certain conditions under which it is possible (common knowledge, appropriate situation, a certain relation between the participants etc.).

The next excerpt illustrates the fact that the final detachment can have multiple roles in discourse: it gives more cohesion to the discourse, helps to specify the reference while the whole sequence is 'under construction' (the correction of the pronoun *neid >seda* (plural demonstrative *need* in partitive *>see* 'it'in partitive) and it also marks the end of the sequence by assuring circular cohesion (the use of the term *struktuur* at the beginning and at the end of the sequence). At the beginning it is said about the restructuring of the forest

management system that some kind of structure already exists; then the speaker tries to introduce a plural pronoun *neid*, probably wanting to develop the plural referent *metskonnad*, but abandons it, probably because it is too specific to be described by a verbal element and after a short pause resumes with an utterance that contains the singular pronoun *seda* which will be referred to by the final lexical element that carries the same casual marking (partitive) and is clearly associated to the more general referent *metskondade struktuur*, introduced at the beginning of the sequence.

> (83)
> A: a   kas mingi kava või mingi programm on   juba   olemas ka või
>   but Q   some plan or some   program   be.3sg already existing also or
>
> on   see (.) aint mingi   tuleviku (.) [suunat]
> be.3sg it   only something future.ILL direct.PPP
>
> E: [täpset]   programmi   ei   ole   veel=hh
> E: exact.PART program.PART NEG be3.sg yet
>
> K: ((ebakindla häälega)) präägu   on   nagu see alu: jah seline nagu:
>   ((uncertain voice))   right_now be.3sg like DEM base yes such like
>
> **metskondade**   **struktuur** noh   on   midagi   on
> forest_managegement_units.pl.GEN structure PRTCL be.3sg something be.3sg
>
> nendel   juba   olemass, aga täit   noh   täpselt veel maha pandud
> they.ADE already existing   but full.PART PRTCL exactly yet down put.PPP
>
> nagu ei   ole, (1.0)   aga e midagi   on   nendel   ikka   olemass,
> like NEG be.NEG.3sg but   something be.3sg they.ADE PRTCL existing
>
> ja:= ja neid   hakatakse   nüüd iga:=iga (1.0) pidevalt
> and and DEM.pl.PART begin.IMPS now every every   constantly
>
> hakatakse   **seda**   siis välja töötama   **seda**   **struktuuri**. (1.0)
> begin.IMPS **DEM.PART** then out work.INF2 **DEM.PART** **structure**.**PART**
>
> K: ((hesitating voice)) 'Right now there is like this: yes like **a structure of forest management units** something like this they do already have, but the whole system is not determined yet (1.0), but something they have already and and these will be now every every (1.0) **it** will be progressively built up, **this structure**.'
> (OCTU)

In different frameworks, several researchers have advanced the idea that final detachments do not only serve to clarify the referent: for example, Horlacher and Müller (2005), in the Conversation Analysis framework discuss their

disambiguating function in the interactional perspective and tend to think that this is not their primary function. Based on the examples of their corpus, they propose that the 'right detachments' serve to manage a disagreement in the discourse interaction. On the pragmatic level, they found that these constituents are used mostly in the context of (positive or negative) assessment. It is true that this claim can be supported by some evidence from my corpus: there are indeed examples that contain different evaluation devices, such as adjectives, adverbials of informal register, but it is difficult to analyse their frequency, especially because the detached constituents appear naturally in copular constructions, and oral conversations are anyway often about assessment, characterization, personal impressions etc. Horlacher 2012, in her PhD dedicated to final detachments, lays emphasis on the so-called incremental function of final detachments in the framework of Conversation Analysis (a more detailed account is given in the next section 8.6.).

The recent Finnish Grammar describes this construction as a stabilized and grammaticalized device whose function is to specify and characterize the constituent referred to by the pronoun. From the formal point of view, the Grammar states that often the particle *ni* is placed between the detached lexical element and the main clause (Hakulinen et al.: 1013). As an example that invalidates the claim according to which the main function of this structure is to add a clarification, the grammar proposes a dialogue where the listener does not wait for the detachment construction to be added, but rather begins his/her own turn.

(84)
V: Onks **nää** tuonne Kuopioon tehty [**nää matkat**.
    be-INTERR **DEM.pl** there Kuopio-ILL do-PPP **DEM.pl travels**
A: [Nii o.
                                               So be-pl.

V: 'Are **they** made to Kuopio, **these trips**?
A: Yes, they are.'

8.6. Distinction between final detachments and 'afterthoughts' or repairs

This controversial distinction has been discussed for several languages and from different approaches: is it necessary and relevant to make a distinction between afterthoughts or self-initiated repairs (cf. Schegloff et al. 1977) and final detachments, the first constituent being understood as an expression which serves only to eliminate potential referential ambiguity and can thus also contain other features that refer to a repair mechanism (reformulations, hesitations etc.) and the second as primarily an information structuring device, which has other motivations of use. Ashby (1994) has shown the existence of a phonological

distinction between final detachments and afterthoughts in French; T. Fretheim (1995) has discussed this distinction for spoken Norwegian, arguing that these two types of constituents cannot be assimilated and that there is no continuum between these categories: afterthoughts are by their structural characteristics more dissociated from the main clause ('Norwegian RDs (right detachments) belong to grammar, afterthought phrases do not' (*ibidem*: 53)). There are more examples of analyses that show the macro-syntactic independence of afterthoughts (Ziv 1994, Ziv & Grosz 1994, Lacheret-Dujour 2003).

Ziv and Grosz (1998: 295–298) draw this distinction using examples of English and referring to previous works (supported by Hebrew) and argue that there are mainly four differences between these two phenomena:

1. Position: final detachments ('right dislocations' by the authors) can only occur in clause final position, whereas in afterthoughts it can occur in other positions as well; the following example (94) shows an NP in afterthought:

> (85)
> I met him, your brother, I mean, two weeks ago.

2. Possibility of extracting this element outside of its clause: this is not possible in case of a final detachment, as in the next example:

> (86)
> *The story that he told us was interesting, Bill. (where NP is non-vocative)

This is however possible in the case of afterthought:

> (87)
> Remember the two of them were telling us all sorts of stories?
> Well, the story that he told us was very interesting, Bill, I mean.

Here, the only difference is the addition of another sentence, for setting the context and making a reference to two possible items, which allows then a looser referential link in a contextualized sentence, typical to oral language.

3. Referentiality: in final detachments, the pronominal must be coreferential with the NP, whereas in afterthoughts the reference can be corrected by the final constituent as in the next example.

> (88)
> I met John yesterday, Bill, I mean.

It is not clear, however, if this distinction should also be maintained in cases where the contrast between two referents is not so evident: there can be other

types of clarifications such as grammatical cases or other relations. Moreover, in this sentence there is no pronominal used, but the repair of the referent.

4. Intonation: according to the authors, final detachments seem to constitute a single contour with no pause between the two elements, whereas in the case of afterthoughts there is a distinct pause and the two elements form two different intonational units.

This point can be corpus-/language-specific, but if the authors consider specific repair constructions as afterthoughts, it is plausible that there are pauses or other markers between the two parts of the utterance.

These distinctions seem thus somewhat artificial: firstly, the examples have been invented, the authors use a written-type sentence without context and for demonstration purposes add systematically a marker of repair (*I mean*).

Inversely, M. Avanzi suggests that final detachments and afterthoughts share a certain prosodical feature such as using a mechanism of prosodical copy of a preceding segment in the detached constituent (Avanzi 2009: 65–66).

K. Lambrecht (2001: 1076) uses similar arguments in favour of a clear distinction between these constituents, adding another point: the frequent and conventionalized use of dislocated pronouns which shows that these cases cannot be considered as repairs (afterthoughts).

As this distinction has been evoked in numerous works and by authors of different backgrounds, it seems to be based on a phenomenon which may be difficult to describe, but needs still to be treated in more detail in order to take into account the different cases of elements detached at the end of the clause. In this sense, the present analysis is a first attempt to approach these problematics in spoken Estonian.

Geluykens (1987a), who analyses a corpus of English examples, considers most final detachment occurrences (Tails in his terminology) as repairs, but at the same time gives some examples of cases which cannot be interpreted as repairs and are assumed to be functionally different from the latter ones, because of the fact that the referent seems to be clear without any repair and the use of the detached element seems to be therefore planned by the speaker. It should also be noted that he underlines the fact that there is no pause between the two constituents in some instances, as in the following example:

(89)
A: (…) she's been talking about leaving and going a train . teacher's training college –
B: but she's brilliant that girl

The next example from Geluykens (*ibidem*: 124) illustrates another case of detached construction with no possible interpretation as a repair, since this construction is clearly planned as such and is formulated within a special evaluative frame. These types of occurrences probably form a separate pattern.

(90)
 He did it to me again, the bastard.

Apothéloz and Grobet 2005 propose several arguments in order to support the distinction between final detachments (appendixes in their terminology) and repairs: they consider that appendixes are part of the grammar of the speaker, thus planned elements in the discourse, and use two distinct terms for these phenomena – construction and configuration (Apothéloz & Grobet 2005: 108). They recognize however that it is not always easy to assign a clear status to this type of utterance – for example, pauses that have been in some other works mentioned as a distinctive criterion are not reliable, because the occurrence and the perception of pauses can receive very different interpretations. According to these authors, final detachments are programmed in advance (thus are not repairs) and they do not form an intonationally independent unit.

Horlacher 2012 suggests a more cautious approach, by showing that rather these constructions form a continuum and there are no reliable criteria permitting a clear distinction to be drawn between them. She analyses a corpus of French examples, concluding that these constructions are to be examined as flexible, potential patterns in a constantly changing syntactic environment. She uses the term 'increment' for all these types of structures. According to her, and based on the analysed examples, there is no single criterion such as prosody or syntax which could help to distinguish between final detachments (right detachments in her study) and afterthoughts, and that it is not necessary. I adopted a similar approach in the present work, based on the observation that the examples seem to form a continuum as it is difficult to determine clear-cut criteria for distinguishing between the two; however, in the final part of the next section, where the examples from corpus will be analysed, those cases where repair mechanisms are clearly identifiable (abandoning of an initiated structure, clear self-repairs etc) will be discussed within a separate group.

8.7. Overview of the examples and formal properties

In the first group the examples of final detachments that occur at the end of a longer sequence and have a generalizing/closing function will be analysed – in this case, there is a referential framework that may already contain the occurrences of the element in question, but at the end of the sequence there are also other devices that mark the closing function (concluding connectors like *nii et* etc.).

In the second group will be discussed the examples that contain a referent present in the referential framework (this point can be common to the first two groups), but the utterance containing the final detachment does not occur as a conclusion or closing of a sequence, but rather drives the communication forward: it can be a question or a speaker who continues to develop an idea in following utterances. There were also some very few examples where the final

detachment seemed to introduce a brand-new referent in the ongoing conversation – the referent can nevertheless be known/identifiable by the participants, but has not been mentioned before and intervenes as a thematic shift.

In some cases, referents are naturally abandoned as no other statements are made on the subject, but with no generalizing effect which could be observed at the level of the discourse, beyond one utterance.

The third group contains examples that display markers of repair and thus resemble repair constructions.

In Estonian, the pronominal element can be dropped in the main clause. In this case there must be other criteria permitting which constructions can be considered as final detachments and which not (they can be word order variations etc.), but as was explained previously, only occurrences with a resumptive word in the main clause were selected to be addressed in the present study. As there are many borderline and questionable cases displaying the subject constituent at the end of the utterance, one example will be proposed here for discussion which could be considered as a final detachment despite lacking a pronoun. In general, as my aim here is not to find clear-cut and immutable criteria for defining this category, we consider these examples case by case without trying by any means to find a narrow pattern.

In example (91), the referent has been mentioned before, but not in the immediately preceding utterances: after having commented about the room in question, the conversation turns to the general layout of the house, whereafter the previous referent *see tuba* ('this room') is again introduced by the speaker A in a context of disalignment (the visitors have agreed that the layout of the house is very nice) and using another term.

(91)
M: jah täpselt ä (1.8) väga vahva, (1.2) väga vahva projekteering on
    yes exactly   very nice   very nice   layout   be.3sg

sellel   majal
DEM.ADE house.ADE

K: on   jah.
   be.3sg yes

A: tegelikult on   jube   jama (.) **see   ruum**.
   actually   be.3sg terrible failure **DEM room**

K: miks.
   why

M: 'Yes exactly, very nice, this house has a very nice layout.
K: Right.
A: Actually **it's a complete failure this room**.
K: Why?'
(OCTU)

As the discussion is about evaluating the rooms, the participants use qualifying terms from the informal register (*jube jama*, 'complete failure').

The speaker A introduces her utterance by a sentence adverb *tegelikult* ('in fact', 'in reality'), then adds a qualification *jube jama* followed by the final detachment *see ruum*.

The qualifying element is composed of two familiar terms, an intensity adverb *jube* ('terrible') and an evaluative word *jama* ('rubbish, failure'). The detached element follows after a short pause. The last referent before the room in question is mentioned again had been the house in general, and that is also why the speaker has to again introduce the room which is 'present' in the situation and has also been under discussion in the discourse before, but needs to be mentioned again, as the previous comment was made about the house as a whole. Had the speaker used the initial detachment or just placed the thematic element *see ruum* at the beginning of the utterance instead of the final detachment, it would not have been clear enough: we would expect the first element to be more accessible than it had been, because of the last mention of *sellel majal* ('this house'). This is a position where final detachments can serve to reintroduce an accessible element in the ongoing discourse. The short pause between the main clause and the nominal element also illustrates the segmentation which characterizes the detached constructions. The pronominal element could be inserted in this utterance ('tegelikult on *see* jube jama see ruum') without any specific effect.

The referents of the detached constructions discussed in the following sections are mostly inanimate: there are four animate referents (two names of persons). The grammatical functions of the resumptive elements can be described as follows: they have a subject function in 14 cases, an object function in 6 cases, and other functions in 6 cases (adverbial *seal* ('there') occurs four times, *sellega* ('with this') and *tal* (pronoun 'he' in adessive) one time).

8.8. Examples of final detachments from oral corpus

The examples to be discussed are divided into three groups according to the status of the lexical element in the discourse in order to permit the discussion of different facets of these constituents: firstly, the detached lexical element introduces a generalization on a level which is different from the main clause; secondly, the detached element refers to an element present in the situation or in the cotext (referential frame); and thirdly, different cases where the detached

element seems to be part of the discourse elaboration process leading to a repair, specification or readjustment of the reference.

8.8.1. Final detachments: generalizing, resumption of a sequence

The examples analysed in this group can be characterized as follows: they are mostly narrative sequences where the speaker gives an explanation, first by introducing rather concrete examples or arguments, and ends by resuming her explanation by a final detachment construction which is often in the form of an assessment. The lexical element in this construction leads to a refocusing or reinterpretation of the sequence. It can also constitute a support for further development; in this case, the lexical element serves to make a provisional statement. In the four examples discussed here we find the abstract, generalizing terms: *jutustus, stoori, katsetus, elud,* 'narration, story, experience, lives'.

> (92)
> ja sakslased 'tema   'panid   'vangi'na (.) 'välja 'kaevama (.) venelaste
> and Germans he.GEN put.PST.3pl prisoner.ESS out   dig.INF2   Russian.pl.GEN
>
> tapetud esimesi   Kuressaare   lossi   mm hoovi
> kill.PPP first.pl.PART Kuressaare.GEN castle.GEN courtyard.GEN
>
> keldritest (.)   mitte kaevust   tema ainult keldrist   nurga
> basement.pl.ELA NEG well.ELA he   only   basement.ELA corner.GEN
>
> keldrist (0.5) oma kätega (.)   kaapis   neid   laipu
> basement.ELA own hand.pl.COM dig.PST.3sg DEM.PART pl body.pl.PART
>
> välja mm ee **see   on   jube (.) jube   see   tema jutustus mm**
> out   **DEM be.3sg horrible horrible DEM   his   narration**
>
> **selle kohta**
> **DEM.GEN about**
>
> 'And the Germans made him as prisoner dig out the first [persons] killed by Russians, in the basements of the yard of Kuressaare castle; not from the well, he only dug from the basement, the basement at the corner, with his own hands dug out these bodies. **It is horrible horrible, his narration about it**.'
> (LM1)

The same term, *jube* ('horrible'), occurred in the previous example (91) in adverbial form serving to add intensity to an assessment. In this example, it is used in its literal sense, but since it still expresses intensity and emotion, it also falls under the group of examples where the detached element comes after a qualificative adjective, often in informal register.

While in many examples of final detachments the detached nominal element, without being just optional, can be deleted and the utterance still remain acceptable, the present example does not allow such suppression, due to the presence of another temporal frame and the assessment in the commentary of the speaker (*see on jube see tema jutustus selle kohta*).

This excerpt comes from a longer sequence where the person who is interviewed talks about the tragic events that one of their contemporary persons had to undergo during World War II. The speaker first introduces a construction which contains the qualifying term *jube* ('horrible') where the verb *olema* ('to be') is in the present, so that the utterance is not about the situation back then, but the speaker's evaluation of the narration of the situation. This clause is preceded by a short hesitation and the following excerpt is uttered in a lower pitch with a descending contour. Maybe it can be considered that the final detachment also carries the function of repair mechanism (afterthought): the speaker gains some time, by pausing and by repeating the adjective, then he uses several devices in order to specify some details in his utterance (*tema jutustus* 'his account' preceded by the demonstrative pronoun *see*, followed by a specifying addition *selle kohta* 'about it').

Nevertheless, this case seems to display a typical property of final detachments which is the possibility of placing a statement at the foreground (and which allows the formulation with minimal effort, using a resumptive pronoun, of something – usually a predicate, an evaluation – which is emphasized by the speaker) and only after that introducing the lexical element which can still be searched for and adapted during the formulation process.

In the present example, as the sequence goes on, it becomes clear that the speaker does not convey his own evaluation of the situation but his impression about the narration of the events in question, so that the detached element helps to establish the right perspective during the formulation process.

According to the results of Horlacher (2012: 309), evaluative utterances, like the one that was analysed in example (92), formulated as final detachments are often dedicated to the closing of a 'topic' or a sequence, and sometimes they can also be expressed as a proverb or other generalizing device in order to mark the end of the sequence. In my corpus there were no proverb-like statements, but generally the Estonian data confirm this assumption about the textual functions of these generalizing devices.

This property can also be considered as a more general tendency in final detachments: the nominal element serves on the one hand to point to a referent which is inferable from the context, but on the other hand it sometimes introduces a more general term which contributes to the cohesion of the discourse. This construction has in the present case a somewhat retroactive scope – in this light, the previous discourse is reinterpreted, but no other clarification is needed, although the last element is placed on another level. In this regard, the question of different repair strategies can be raised, but I choose

to consider as repairs the cases where it is possible to identify some linguistic means that refer to this function, like repetitions, pauses, hesitations, reformulations etc., the functions of some of them remaining inevitably for a subjective evaluation.

Let us consider now the example (93) that comes from a narrative text: the interviewee explains where his mother was living after the war and describes her apartment, a maid's room.

> (93)
> Meil korter oli maha põlenud ja ta elas **seal** siis selles siis õõ kus ma sain kah tema korteri see oli see endine parun hesseni korter tähtvere (.) kakskümmend (.) korter üks see **seal** noh oli nigu ee tähendab **see** ee **teenija toakene** sinna oli sis (.) läbi köögi läbi minnes ja sinna oli pandud ee ehitatud sisse pliit koos soemüüriga (.) nii vastu seda (.) tähtvere mäge
>
> ja no   siis **sellega**   **seal** ta siis elas   kuni surmani
> and PRTCL then **DEM.COM there** she then live.PST.3sg until death.TERM
>
> niiütelda **selles   väikeses   toas**
> so_to_say **DEM.INE small.INE room.INE**
>
> 'Our apartment had burned and then she lived in the place where I also got her apartment, it was the former apartment of the baron Hessen at twenty Tähtvere street. There was a how do you say a small maid's room there, when you pass through the kitchen and there was installed a burning stove with the warming wall, so that against the Tähtvere hill and then **there** she lived until her death so to say, **in this small room**.'
> (LM2)

This speaker is characterized by a quite special type of speech: he is speaking very quickly and consequently leaves in his discourse a number of incoherences from the point of view of grammatical agreement and grammatical relations in general. He also quite often uses different mechanisms in order to complete or clarify his utterances. Here, the resumptive element of the detached construction is also imprecise: he first uses *sellega* (demonstrative *see* in comitative), then abandons it and resumes by *seal* (spacial adverb 'there') which is also multi-functional in oral speech and here is coreferential with the detached element, *selles väikeses toas* 'in this small room'. The adverb *seal* is already introduced at the beginning of the sequence (*ja ta elas seal siis*) and thus should be followed by a term indicating a spatial relation, but the speaker changes his strategy and gives some more details about his connection to this apartment, about the apartment itself, its location and only after that does he resume the construction he had started at the beginning; the locative relations can be tracked throughout the sequence (*seal* occurs twice before the final detachment, *sinna* also occurs twice when he explains the layout of the apartment; towards

the end of the sequence he also situates the apartment relative to exernal geographic marks (*vastu Tähtvere mäge* 'against the Tähtvere hill'). The main clause also contains a hedging marker *niiütelda* ('how do you say') after the phrase *kuni surmani* ('until her death'). The audio recording reveals that this marker is intended rather to soften the expression 'until her death' than to modify the detached constituent itself, which is also more plausible from the semantic point of view. The detached construction at the end thus allows referential cohesion in the whole sequence to be established: the speaker ends his explanation and also reaches from the semantic point of view a clearer conclusion (refers to an item previously mentioned in other terms (maid's room).

In the next sequence (94) the speaker is explaining why, in addition to her university studies, she is also studying at the music school. The verb *katsetama* 'to experiment' is already introduced at the beginning of the sequence; after that the speaker explains why she tries to follow two different courses together and then returns to her initial statement.

> (94)
> ma lihtsalt nagu katsetan et ma ise ka mõtlesin et et siuke kohutav enesepiinamine on et ei jõua midagi ülikoolis tehtud ja ei jõua midagi korralikult Elleris tehtud ja siis siis ongi nagu noh minul on nagu selline väike vajadus et kui ma kuulen midagi kuulen muusikat klassikalist muusikat siis ma pean teada saama mis tunne on nagu seda ise teha
>
> **see** '**ongi**   nagu 'katsetus   **see (0.3) Elleris   õppimine** (1.0)
> **DEM** be.3sg+clitic like   experience **DEM   Eller.INE learning**
>
> katsetan   'ise ka teha   seda   'sama   mida (0.9) teevad (0.9)
> attempt.1sg self also do.INF DEM.PART same.PART what   do.3pl
>
> 'suured 'interpreedid
> big.pl   musician.pl
>
> 'I'm just making an experience. I myself also thought that I am really torturing myself, because I don't manage to do anything at the university as well as at the Eller music school and then I have such a need that when I hear music something like classical music, then I have to know what it is like to do it myself. So **it** is like an experience, **learning at Eller**, I try to do the same thing that big musicians do.'
> (PCTU)

Regarding the formal properties in this example one can again notice a micropause between the demonstrative *see* and the lexical element – which is a nominalized form based on the verb *õppima* ('to learn').

164

At the very beginning the speaker has established a contrast between herself and another person who learns to play the same instrument, but on a level much higher than herself. The detached construction enables the speaker to refer back to the beginning of this sequence where the idea of 'experience' is mentioned: here it can be considered as a device assuring the cohesion at the level of the whole sequence. Following the detached construction, the speaker explains in more detail her idea about 'having an experience'. The notion displayed in the final detachment, 'learning at Eller school', is part of the background of the sequence and indirectly present throughout the whole excerpt, as it seems not to be unknown to the listener.

In the detached construction in the next sequence (95) the speaker draws the distinction between a studying period and a professional career: she starts from the idea that her life is somewhat different now that she is working.

> (95)
> et et noh ei ole seda igapäevast nagu selles
> that that PRTCL NEG be.NEG.3sg DEM.PART daily.PART like DEM.INE
>
> mõttes õppimise kohustust ja loengutes käimise (.)
> sense.INE learning.GEN obligation.PART and lecture.pl.INE going.GEN
>
> kohustus et siis siis noh **need natukene on erinevad need**
> obligation that then then PRTCL **DEM.pl a_little be.3sg different.pl DEM.pl**
>
> **elud ikkagi ja see tööelu ja siis õppimise aeg** et
> **live.pl though and DEM work_life and then learning.GEN time** that
>
> õppimise ajal oli (0.5) nagu mõnes mõttes sõõ suurem
> learning.GEN time.ADE be.PST.3sg like some.INE sense.INE big.COMP
>
> vabadus oma aja organiseerimiseks eks ju
> liberty own.GEN time.GEN organising.TRL PRTCL
>
> 'There is no obligation to study every day and to attend lectures, **so that they are somewhat different, these lives**, working life and studying time, that during the studies you had in a certain sense more liberty to organise your time, didn't you?'
> (PCTU)

The detached element *need elud* (+*ikkagi*, an intensifying marker) assembles both 'lifestyles' under the term *elud* ('lives'). When creating the contrast in this utterance the speaker introduces a more general term 'these lives' before mentioning the two relevant terms, 'working life' and 'study period'. Here again, the detached element contributes to the structuring of a whole sequence: the comparison of these two lifestyles is not limited to the sequence that was

165

analysed here, but this utterance formulates the central idea of this discussion in a more general level which will be explained in the following utterances. It should also be noted in this regard that the term *elu* 'life' is not frequently used in the plural, but this form here allows the more abstract level needed for the generalization to be reached precisely.

In example (96), the final detachment also occurs in a conclusive utterance that links back to several previous utterances: the speaker is explaining how a little boy is afraid of an imaginary creature *tuust* that lives on their veranda. It should be noted that in the immediate surrounding there is another final detachment (*ta ei julge üldse sinna enam minna* (0.3) *sinna verandale*) containing the lexical element *veranda*. In both cases, the referents (*veranda* and the creature *tuust*) have been mentioned before; with regards to the final detachment analysed here, its referent, *tuust*, is recurrent in the whole sequence, but *veranda* is the one mentioned immediately before the actual occurrence of *veranda*.

(96)
ja   siis on   nii et praktiliselt ta ei   julge   üldse sinna enam
and then be.3sg so that virtually   he NEG dare.NEG.3sg at_all there any_more

minna (0.3) [naer] sinna verandale   **et   see   on   üks hirmus elukas**
go.INF   [laugh]there veranda.ALL **that DEM be.3sg one terrible creature**

see tuust
DEM 'tuust'

'and so he is virtually afraid of going there to the veranda, so that **it is a terrible creature, this "tuust"'**
(PCTU)

This occurrence seems to belong to a group of typical final detachments in Estonian that seems to be on the way of grammaticalization in oral language: these cases show a simple construction, formulated as one intonational unit, which can argued to be planned already as such, as there are no pauses, no editing mechanisms, no hesitations between the main clause and the detached element. The complementizer *et* stands at the beginning of a sequence where the speaker refers to the perspective of the child who is afraid of this creature. Semantically, these two utterances are related rather by a causal link, but it is not expressed by explicit linguistic means and is replaced by the reference to the child's viewpoint with a dedicated marker *et*. Although the principle that the detached element can be omitted here without any impact on the grammaticality of the utterance is also valid here, the sequence would not be that clear: first, the term *tuust* was mentioned some utterances back, and therefore the repetition of the central element of this sequence also gives the necessary cohesion to the whole sequence. In this sense, this example joins the examples of the previous group where the utterances containing a detached element that resumes a

sequence by recalling the element referred to in previous discourse were discussed. There is no need for disambiguation devices and no special prosodic features that would refer to some particular pragmatic function: the utterance is performed as one prosodical unit. Different researchers have used the term 'planification' or 'planned vs non-planned' when analysing final detachments (Fretheim 1995, Horlacher 2012): this dichotomy probably comes from the previously widely held viewpoint that final detachments are primarily used to correct an ill-formed utterance. However, Horlacher 2012 argues that these constructions should nevertheless not be regarded as 'planned' in a narrow sense, because in spoken language where communication is a real-time ongoing process and therefore the syntax is constantly being adapted, planification is not possible – the final detachment is just one possible means of terminating this construction (whole clause with a pronominal element).

This argument is not totally opposed to the idea supported in the present work, where the existence of final detachments whose function in discourse is not to repair an ongoing utterance is discussed: Horlacher's claims are to be considered in a larger perspective, meaning that the final detachment constructions, like other constructions in spoken language, are never totally preconceived as immutable forms, but are always potentially evolving and reinterpreted and remade in the ongoing discourse.

In the next example (97), friends are discussing a teleplay in which a woman comes to an apartment and acts as if it was her place, and at the end, as the speaker explains, it appears that the woman has invented the whole story.

> (97)
> nii et   nagu (.) tuli välja   just   et   et   see d----naine oli   **kõik**
> so that like   come out.PST.3sg exactly that that DEM   woman be.PST.3sg **all**
>
> **selle**   ise välja mõelnud   **selle**   **stoori**
> **DEM.GEN** self out   invent.APP **DEM.GEN story.GEN**
>
> 'so that it appeared that this woman had invented **it all** herself, **this story**'
> (OCTU)

The speaker has described the intrigue of the play and this utterance resumes the whole sequence as we can also see from other means used: the conclusive connector *nii et*, the verb *tuli välja* ('it appeared at the end'), and the pronominal *kõik selle* ('all this') in the main clause. The nominal detached element *selle stoori* 'this story' is a term of informal register; the loanword *stoori* is somewhat more eloquent than the standard word *lugu*; here it contributes to the summarizing of the sequence as a whole, as is also illustrated by the use of the resumptive element *kõik selle* 'all this', which refers back to several elements and is resumed by the term *selle stoori*.

The examples discussed in this section showed a particular type of use of final detachments: the lexical element is a rather abstract notion, used to close a sequence or to make a generalization at the end of (or midway through) an explanation or argumentation. In two cases, the speaker gives some further explanations on the basis of the detached element or the information given in the main clause, within the same lexical framework: *katsetus > katsetan, need elud > ja see tööelu*. In conclusion we can say that in some cases the element referred to in the final detachment is developed to some extent after its mention, when it constitutes a discourse structuring device on a more general level. They will not be developed as Themes (rather they are 'hyper-themes'): firstly, they are rather abstract notions, thus less easily thematized, secondly, they are used in the argumentation of one speaker, at the closing of a sequence or midway, so that the other participants do not typically intervene in order to challenge it or ask questions about it.

8.8.2. Final detachments: referent present in the situation or in the referential framework

In this section we will discuss the group of the most frequent occurrences of final detachments, where the referents of the detached element can be quite different regarding their informational status or further development in discourse: they can be concrete entities present in the situation, they can be elements entering in the referential framework of the conversation (inferable, reference by analogy, etc.) or they can be part of the common ground of the participants. I am aware of the fact that the boundaries of these categories are not clear-cut, because almost any information can be argued as being part of the common ground (and one should not forget also about the inherent limits of the texts in a corpus – the analyst can not always decide about the common knowledge of the participants and usually does not know about the previous exchanges of the participants); therefore, the approach chosen here is quite cautious and where it seems difficult to interpret the state of knowledge of the participants, this will not be done.

In the sequence (98) the detached element begins with the locative proadverb *seal*, followed by the construction *krundi peal,* which combines the lexical element *krunt* in the genitive and the postposition *peal*, coreferential with the locative adverbial *seal* ('there') in the main clause. The word *krunt* 'land lot' has not been mentioned before, but it is inferable from the larger context, as the participants are speaking about the reconstruction and extension of the house. This is not the central theme of the discussion, so it will not be mentioned again, as no one picks up the referent in question.

(98)
I: mis [mis] re´mont see {seal ´on} {--}(.) mida nad re´mondivad {´ära.} (0.5)
 what [what] repair DEM there be.3sg   what they repair.3pl   ADV
E: [et]
E: [that]
E: nad teevad   seda   tei- (.) seda   keskmist   tuba. (.) [{--}]
   they make.3pl DEM.PART DEM.PART middle.PART room.PART

 P: [ehitavad] juurde midagi,
           [build.3pl] more something

neil   **seal** ruumi   on   natuke **seal krundi= peal**. (1.2)
they.ADE **there** space.PART be.3sg a_bit **there plot.GEN on**

I: 'What is the repair they are making there? What are they renovating?
E: They are renovating this middle room. (.) [{--}]
P: building something in addition, they have a little bit space **there, on their
plot**.'
(OCTU)

In this example we see a final detachment in the locative form (*seal krundi peal*
'there on the land plot'), using an accessory referent that is introduced as new in
the conversation, but comes as a thematic extension to the ongoing discussion.
To the question asked by speaker I two participants give an answer, first a more
concrete answer by speaker E and after that speaker P adds a further comment.
Using the final detachment construction in this utterance allows less specific
and, in principle, new information to be conveyed in a more fluent way: the first
clause of speaker P is already referentially somewhat vague (*ehitavad juurde
midagi*, 'they are building something in addition') and the second part of the
utterance gives the explanation of the situation that is making the described
renovation works possible. This utterance also serves to close the subject of
discussion at this time (although several turns later a speaker asks a more
specific question about the outcome of the renovation).
    The following example (99) shows an occurrence of a final detachment in an
evaluative context: here, friends are discussing the invitation cards for a
Christmas party that they are planning to send to their teachers. Between the
main clause and the detached element is a micropause.

(99)
Re: et sis (.) sis   ei   sis   ei   ole   joonistada vaja.
    that PRTCL PRTCL NEG PRTCL NEG be.NEG.3sg draw.INF need

see   teine on   ka   ea (.) **se   kuradi koomiks** (1.2) mina alguses
DEM other be.3sg also good DEM bloody comic   I   beginning.INE

ei   saand   pihta enne   kui ma päkapiku ülesse l(h)eidsin (4.8)
NEG   get.NEG.PST.1sg ADV before when I elf.GEN ADV find.PST.1sg

169

Re: 'So that no, you don't have to draw. **The other one** is also good, **this bloody comic**. I didn't get it at first, before I found the elf.'
(OCTU)

At the beginning, after having proposed one card to be selected, the speaker answers the previous participant who asks whether it is her who should draw all the pictures on the cards. She says that she doesn't have to do this and draws their attention to another (*see teine*) funny picture, so this use can be considered as somewhat contrastive (the word *teine* is accented). Here again, the referent in question is present in the situation, but has not been immediately mentioned; it is probable that in the situation the speaker points to the object in question, but as my corpus is constituted of audio files, we cannot make any assumptions about the gestures and other means of non-verbal communication. Here, also, the speaker qualifies the referent (*ea* 'good') and the detached constituent contains another familiar term *kuradi* ('bloody').

The next example (100) displays another occurrence in an evaluative context. The speaker A is telling her dream about the fur coat she wants to borrow from her friend, but the latter refuses to do so and proposes instead another coat she has bought.

(100)
A: ja ma m:ina ei= tea, (.) si-   ma nägin   et sa (.) min- ma:=juba
   and I I   NEG know.NEG.1sg I see.PST.1sg that you I   I: already

mõtsin=   et, et ka- tahaks   kasukat   lae[nata]   onju. (0.8)
think.PST.1sg that that want.COND.1sg fur_coat.PART borrow.INF PRTCL

ja= ja ma nägin,   et sa olid   mingisuguse $ kasuka
and and I see.PST.1sg that you be.PST.2sg some.GEN   fur_coat.GEN

kuskilt   ostnud   ja siss tahtsid
somewhere.ABL buy.APP and then want.PST.2sg

M: [jah.]
        [yes.]
A: 'seda   mulle   anda=   ja (.) et seda   'oma=oma
   DEM.PART me.ALL give.INF and   that DEM.PART yours own.PART

ei   tahtnud   'anda, (.) ja 'see mul   oli   nii 'kole **see**
NEG want.NEG.PST.2sg give.INF and DEM me.ADE be.PST.3sg so ugly **DEM**

m(h)ulle ü(h)ldse ei   m(h)eeldind   **see   k(h)asukas**, (.) ja siss sa
1sg.ADE at_all   NEG like.NEG.PST.3sg **DEM fur_coat**,   and then you

mitte=midagi 'muud   minule ei   toonud   ja siis ma
nothing   else.PART me.ALL NEG bring.NEG.PST.2sg and then I

olin   nii õnnetu. $ (0.8)
be.PST.1sg so sad

A: 'And I don't know, I saw that you, I thought that I'd like to borrow the fur
coat. And a saw that you had bought a coat somewhere and then you wanted
M: Yes
A: to give it to me and you didn't want to give yours, and mine was so ugly, I
didn't like **it** at all, **this coat**, and then you didn't bring anything else to me and
then I was so sad.'
(OCTU)

There are two contrasted items (the new, proposed coat and the coat possessed
before). The utterance containing the final detachment is at the centre of this
sequence (it also has a particular pronunciation which marks the emphasis on
the whole utterance). The immediately preceding utterance refers to the second
item of the comparison (that the other person didn't want to give her own coat),
then the speaker returns to the item she didn't like by qualifying it first (*ja see
mul oli nii kole* , 'the one I had was so ugly') before formulating her principal
grievance *see mulle üldse ei meeldinud see kasukas* 'I didn't like it at all this
coat'. In this example one can question the disambiguating function of the final
detachment – when one looks at the utterance under investigation, there are no
explicit clues permitting the associatation of this referent to the new, just bought
coat. In order to get the interpretation right, one has to begin at the point where
the speaker introduces for the first time the concrete referent with an indefinite
pronoun *mingisugune* (*mingisuguse kasuka*), resumed by the anaphoric *seda*;
this item will be contrasted with 'her own coat', *seda oma oma*. This results in
the fact that the referent of the detached construction, referred to by the
demonstrative *see*, has to be sought in previous utterances.

The next example (101) comes from a context of disagreement: the
participants are arguing about the opinion expressed in the press about some
writers and in this sequence the speaker A prompts the speaker B to challenge
this opinion. Speaker A ends by saying that this opinion is not her personal
view, but formulated by others.

(101)
B: see on sinu 'isiklik 'järeldus. (.)
A: no [aga 'katsu] katsu nüd 'ümber lükata=se, [katsu 'ümber lükata $ 'see
'otsustus.$]
B: [mõni raamat on]   [mõni on 'ka mõni 'raamat on ka]
sa ei ole m 'selleteemalisi ['raamatuid eriti] 'lugend. mõni raamat on ka päris
[uvitav.]
A: [((köhatab)) [ei=   noh] 'm(h)ina pole
                                       NEG PRTCL I   be.NEG.1sg

seda   'järeldust   teind.   **selle**   tegid   oopis
DEM.PART conclusion.PART make.APP **DEM.GEN** make.PST.3pl instead

171

'teisel 'inimesed **selle** [´**järelduse.**]
other.pl person.pl **DEM.GEN** [**conclusion.GEN**]

B: 'It is your own conclusion.
A: But try now to disprove it, try to disprove this decision.
B: There are some books, some books there are, you haven't read the books about this subject, but some books are quite interesting.
A: ((coughing)) But I have not drawn this conclusion. **It** was drawn by other people, **this conclusion**.'
(OCTU)

In this sequence we see many repetitive and overlapping utterances and it can be presumed that the final detachment in last utterance helps the speaker to better accentuate her argument. There is also a rhythmic and parallelism effect, since all utterances where the speakers oppose their views and mention the terms 'conclusion' or 'decision' (*järeldus, otsustus*) have this term placed at the end of the utterance. However, there are no other competing elements, as *järeldus* 'conclusion' is the only possible referent mentioned in the previous utterance. Repeating this word once more at the end probably helps the speaker to better underline her position, and it can also be assumed that the verb *tegema* 'to make' in this type of clause achieves the adequate interpretation once the term *järeldus* is added to the main clause, as it is an abstract notion, whereas the verb is 'active', so that without the detached element this utterance would be too close to a prototypical utterance about human referents doing something concrete. In this sense the final detachment assures the internal cohesion of the sequence.

In the next sequence (102), which is a short phone call (the speaker H asks to speak to a person who is at a meeting), the referent of the detached construction (the meeting) has already been mentioned, but not in the two immediately preceding turns.

(102)
V: ee tal on hetkel 'nõupidamine. kes teda 'soovib.
(0.4)
H: Moos Xpangast.
(0.6)
V: mhmh et ma kirjutan teie 'numbri. (0.3) 'helistab teile ´tagasi.
H: jah jah mis te ise arvate kaua **see** võib kesta s**ee nõupidamine**
   yes yes what you self think.2pl how_long **DEM** can last.INF **DEM meeting**

V: 'He has a meeting right now. who is asking for him?
H: Moos from the xBank.
V: I will write down your number. He will call you back.
H: Yes yes. how long do you think **it** can last, **this meeting**?'
(OCTU)

Between the two mentions, the participants briefly develop the question of transmitting the message to the person who is attending the meeting. This example illustrates again the type of final detachment which seems to be programmed as such without any clues indicating a repair; the predicative part of the utterance has clearly more weight and can be considered as being at the foreground and the referent ('the meeting') which has not really been supplanted by any other referent, can be thus at the background and recalled easily by the participants.

The next example (103) displays a detached element in a question. This type of example joins the principle described in the previous example, where the construction used seems to be triggered by the necessity to give first the essential information as Rheme, followed by the subject in a detached construction. Speaker J is a child, he has been asked to eat something, but he has refused, saying that he is not hungry. Speaker E explains that the day before he had eaten a big pot of porridge, that is why he does not want to eat for three days, which leads to a somewhat humouristic exchange. Speaker A then asks 'Where is this porridge then?', to which J answers : 'in my stomach'.

> (103)
>   E: [eile] (.)   mis=ä (.) aa ta sõi=   ju   terve   poti
>   yesterday what   he eat.PST.3sg PRTCL whole.GEN pot.GEN
>
> putru   eile   ära   no=s= ta kolm päeva   ei
> porridge.PART yesterday away PRTCL he three day.PART NEG
>
> taha   süia   enam.
> want.NEG.3sg eat.INF any_more
>
>
> A: [aa.]
> J: [mheh] [heh]
> M: [nojah?]
>
>
> A: a   ku- (.) kus= sa **see**= sul   on   **see   puder**,
>   PRTCL where where you **DEM** you.ADE be.3sg **DEM porridge**
> (0.4)
>
> J: kõhus
>   stomach.INE
>   (0.6)
> A: kõhus=   aga: (0.3) 'punnis ei= ole   kuidagi. * mheh * (0.5) .nhhh
>   stomach.INE but   puffy NEG be.NEG.3sg anyhow
> (1.8)
>
> E: 'Yesterday what… Right, he ate a whole pot of porridge, he doesn't want to
> eat now for three days.
> A: Eh
> H: Uhuh heh

173

M: Right
A: But where where **it is this porridge**, then?
J: In my stomach
A: In the stomach, but it is not at all puffy.
(OCTU)

Speaker A has some difficulties with the formulation of the main clause, makes a false start *a ku-* and then abandons the construction with the personal pronoun *sa* ('you') and ends up by formulating a construction with a final detachment that 'erases' the abandoned structures by placing the lexical element at the end. With regards to the informational status of the referent *see puder*, it is only developed by one speaker. After the response ('in the stomach') to her question 'Where is all that porridge then?', speaker A tries to contradict it, by arguing that such a big quantity is not visible from the outside. Then, after a pause, she concludes the sequence by saying that one wonders where he hides it, and changes the subject of the discussion. If the lexical element was not introduced, the whole utterance would not be clear enough, as the question contains several elements that can receive a very broad interpretation from the semantic point of view (the demonstrative *see* ('it') and the verb *sul on* ('to have')). This example seems to also represent a general pattern in spoken Estonian: despite the hesitation markers at the beginning, which seems to be linked to the formulation process and not to the marking of the referent, these types of utterances occur quite often when a Rheme is associated to a previously introduced referent which places the referent at the background and allows a statement or a question to be formulated about this referent.

The next example (104) contains a final detachment in an open question. Two friends are speaking by phone about their studies and the jobs in their domain. The speaker H asks if V knows someone who works in the domain in question using the adverbial *seal* which refers to London. The detached element is preceded by a micropause, the question marker *vä* is at the end of the main clause.

(104)
H: a= sääl on   see   asi (.) küllalt 'tasemel vist=   vä.
    but there be.3sg DEM thing rather level.ADE probably Q
(0.5)
V: kule= ei=   tea,   keskpära- eestlased ikka   saavad seal tööd
    listen NEG know.NEG average   Estonians PRTCL get.3pl there work.PART

küll. (.)
PRTCL

H: on=   jah.
    be.3sg yes
V: jep
    yes

174

H: tead   ka kedagi   kes **seal** on   sis=   vä, (.) **selle**
     know.2sg also someone.PART who **there** be.3sg PRTCL Q   **DEM.GEN**

eriala   **peal.**
profession.GEN on
(0.8)

H: 'But the level there is quite high, isn't it?
V: Listen, I'm not sure, but the average Estonians get a job there, though.
H: Really?
V: Yes.
H: Do you know also someone who is working **there, in this sector**?'
(OCTU)

In this example the detached lexical element helps to interpret the utterance in a more narrow sense: the adverbial *seal* has already been introduced in previous turns (*sääl, seal*) referring to London, but here the speaker H refocuses his question to the field that has been mentioned before. According to the definition of final detachment construction, these two elements should be coreferential. However, the adverbial *seal* remains still somewhat polysemic here, as it can refer to London or be interpreted as the resumptive pronoun for *selle eriala peal*, but based on the definition of final detachment construction, it can be assumed that the lexical element assures cohesion in this regard, by indicating the way the resumptive word *seal* should be interpreted, but the two are not totally contradictory, since one is encompassed in the second (in London people work in the domain in question). One reason for using a detached construction could be the need to stage information in order to facilitate the formulation, as the item that will be detached is a rather complex one and if we consider the option of integrating it in the main clause, the latter will become somewhat heavy.

The next example (105) can also be regarded as a case where the detached construction helps to stage the information conveyed in a somewhat complex structure in the main clause: the speaker can postpone the lexical element and formulate her central message in the main clause.

(105)
A: mul=   oli   **se'sama** lõi   ju   'käe   peale 'ka
    me.ADE be.3sg **same**   erupt.PST.3sg PRTCL hand.GEN ADV   also

mis mul   'jala   peal oli,   **see 'viirus**.
what 1sg.ADE leg.GEN on   be.PST.3sg **DEM virus**

A: 'I had **the same,** affected also my arm, the one I had on my leg, **this virus**'
   (OCTU)

The speaker begins here by a possessive construction (*mul oli* 'I had') which could have been combined more easily with the lexical element (without using a

detachment construction), but then abandons it for a more complex relative clause in order to express a chronological evolution: this ends up in a *pivot* construction, the pronoun *sesama* acting as *pivot*. Here it seems that by leaving the lexical element at the end the speaker is able to concentrate herself first on the main clause where the resumptive word *sesama* (pro *see sama* 'the same') projects a lexical element after the comparison. In cases like this one, it would be difficult to support the idea, sometimes put forward, about final detachments being afterthoughts when the reference is unclear: on the contrary, it seems that the pattern of leaving a lexical element at the end with a coreferential element in the main clause is productively used by the speakers when the main clause tends otherwise to become too heavy, contain too many complex elements (relative clause) or needs to be foregrounded for some reason.

Pivot constructions are generally described as being composed of two syntactic structures which share one common point called the turning-point. This construction has syntactic definitions which illustrate the fact that two different structures are overlapped, but it has also many other interpretations (constructions that prepare or realise a transition, for example a thematic transition, proverbs or other types of resuming utterances at the end of a sequence etc). One of their characteristics in a syntactic framework is the absence of repair markers. From this perspective, the current example could be considered as a *pivot*, the pronoun *sesama* serving as the turning-point.

The next example comes from a long discussion that takes place while some participants are trying to edit a text on the computer.

> (106)
> A: aa (.) ma vaatan   kas ta (.) 'huvitav   et ta=i   anna
>   I   look.1sg Q   he   interesting that he NEG give.NEG.3sg
>
> **'seda**=t   auto'maatselt. **seda:**   **'suurt**   **'tähte**
> **DEM.PART** automatically **DEM.PART big.PART letter.PART**
> (1.4)
>
> A: 'I look if it… interesting that it doesn't give **it** automatically, **the capital letter**.'

Several detachment constructions occur in this quite long sequence. This frequency could be explained by the specific activity in the background: one participant is trying to change the settings in the text editor and at the same time is teaching others how to perform certain operations on the computer; the comments made by the speaker are to some extent similar to an internal monologue, like in this example where a construction is initiated, then abandoned, whereafter the speaker makes a remark about the text editor, where the final detachment can occur as an example of lexical retrieval or postponement while the background activity dictates the rhythm of the utterance.

In the next example, the referent of the detached construction has not been mentioned before in this conversation, but the dialogue reveals that the fact mentioned by the speaker V (that Ain's leg is in very bad condition) is assumed to be known by the other participant. Before this turn, the speaker V refers to several familiar persons by their first names, resumed in this utterance by the plural pronoun *nad*. The fact that the referent and its situation is known by both participants allows it to be first introduced after the main clause containing only the pronoun *ta* ('he').

(107)
V: ja 'lõuna=   ajal   lähen ma nüd (.) kahe'teistkümneks enne >
   and noon.GEN time.ADE go.1sg I   now   twelve.TRL   before

nad 'lõuna=   al   sõidavad 'ära < enne 'seda   ma 'tilgutan
they noon.GEN time.ADE travel.3pl away before DEM.PART I   drop.1sg

teda,   **tal**   on   ikka   'jalg nii 'hull **Ainil**=   et
he.PART **he.ADE** be.3sg PRTCL leg so   bad **Ain.ADE** that

V: 'and now by noon I'll go at twelve o'clock, before, after lunch they go away,
before that I'll give him the drops, **his** leg is so bad, **Ain**.'

                               (OCTU)

This way of introducing a referent seems also to constitute a type of 'opening' for a further development and in this conversation the aspect the speaker V referred to (bad condition) will actually be discussed for quite a long time. The main clause contains two parts, where the first clause is describing an action and the second is an evaluative utterance in a somewhat familiar register. The casual marking on the person's name reflects the form of the possessive construction (*tal on*).

In many works, the possibility for final detachments being totally new elements ('brand new') in discourse has been excluded. However, there are quite a number of counter-examples to be found in several studies. In any case, since these examples do not form the majority of occurrences and moreover, taking into account the fact that the notion 'new in discourse' can have many different interpretations, it is nevertheless clear that this is not the central role of these constructions in oral language. It is already predictable and conditioned by the form of this element: a cataphoric pronoun + a lexical element with a determiner which is at least an identifiability marker should designate primarily an entity which is not completely unknown or unidentifiable. In this section I discuss some examples from the corpus where the referent has not been introduced explicitly before. I assumed that some of these cases are worth considering separately, as they can reveal some specific characteristics of the functioning of final detachments in discourse.

In the example (108), M is talking about the exchange of a car. K asks when exactly they got the car, in her next turn M answers the question, but before that, at the beginning of the turn, she makes a seemingly irrelevant statement about the presence of another person (the first part of the exerpt is translated below).

(108)
M: täna said nad kollase. (0.8) täna oli Juhani Talinas ja sai kollase uue. (1.5) @ tuli (.) tuli nigu tibupojaga nelikend kilomeetrit @ (.) võis aind sõita, nüüd ootad=et [$ no nüüd on $]
K: [tuttuus=vä.]
M: $ jah tuttuus, (.) et nüüd on ees, ei ole. nüüd on ees, $ (.) Valve ütles et no see kuradi Juhani (ära) üle üheksakümne ikka kihuta $ ei saa bussi ära rikkuda. $ he heh mh-h-h (...)
K: kuna   sis   kätte saite.
   when then ADV receive.PST.2pl
M: ö **see**   oli   ka kaasas. (-) **se   Arman**. (1.0) hommiku (.)   tund
   DEM be.PST.3sg also along   **DEM Arman**.   morning.ADE hour

aega   käisid   oli   buss käes, kollane nigu tibupoeg
time.PART go.PST.3pl be.PST.3sg bus ADV yellow   like chick

ukse   ees. (1.8)
door.GEN in_front_of

M: 'Today they received it, a yellow one. Today Juhani was in Tallinn and got a new yellow one. He came like with a yellow chick, could only drive at forty kilometres, and I was waiting like   [now he's arrived]
K: [Is it brand new?]
M: Yes, brand-new. That now he's at the front of the house, but no, again – now he's arrived; Valve said that this damned Juhani (don't) drive at more than ninety kilometers you should not ruin the bus. (laughing)
K: When did you get it then?
M: H**e** was also with them, **this Arman**. They went in the morning, for one hour, they got the bus, yellow like a chick in front of the door.'
(OCTU)

The referent in question is introduced with a final detachment. It could be considered as a continuation of the previous turn (the speaker M maybe had the intention to develop this referent more, but the intervening question of K diverts her from this intention), but there doesn't seem to be a link with her previous turn either, and in the next utterances this referent will not be revoked. It is clear that this person is one of their common acquaintances, but since he is not 'anchored' anywhere in the current discussion, the final detachment seems to be one of the possible (non-marked) ways of introducing these types of background elements: the main clause is presented as the main information to be retained, and finally, the whole utterance functions as a kind of parenthesis.

As the speaker switches after that immediately to her response, it gives the impression that she does not consider this referent as a possible first-plane element. This aspect is also supported by the use of the demonstrative *see* referring to a person – if it was the personal pronoun *ta,* one would expect the referent to be more present in the discourse.

In the next sequence (109), the detached construction is used in a yes/no question.

> (109)
> M: a kule kas Siret töötab   ikka siis **seal** või, (1.0) **seal   kellaäris**=   vä.
>   listen Q   Siret work.3sg still then **there** Q   **there clock_shop.INE** Q
>
> Ar: ei=   ole   nüüd ei= ol
>   NEG be.NEG.3sg now NEG be.NEG.3sg
>
> M: 'Listen, is Siret still working there, in that clock shop?
> Ar: No, she isn't, now she isn't.'
> (OCTU)

Here, it can also be assumed that this construction helps to stage information in order to make it easier to interpret; the referent of the final detachment is nevertheless presented as being at least known to the participants. Clearly, this referent is not intended to become a Theme like in several other examples where the Rheme is actually about another entity, the final detachment being only an accessory item, taking some weight away from the main clause and contributing to its better understanding. In this example, there is a pause between the informational constituents; the role of pauses in these constructions is not very easy to define, as on the one hand their perception and nature are not unequivocal and on the other hand, in order to draw any conclusions about any regularities in relation to the informational charge of the constituents, the analysis should be quantitative, based on a large corpus. As we identified these uses as one not very frequent subtype without somewhat vague limits between the categories, this type of analysis will not be done here.

In this section some examples were discussed where the referent seems to be completely new in the discourse, but not completely unknown to the participants, or at least, these referents can be introduced without being challenged by other participants. Probably their specific form (final detachment) indicates that they are not intended to become a central element in the subsequent discourse and therefore the speaker digress briefly with these items; their function seems to be rather to alleviate the processing/formulating charge of the main clause, with the lexical element being 'pushed' forward, allowing more effort to be made in the formulation of the Rheme in the main clause. Here lies a difference with initial detachments, which contain a more marked projection to following turns, and at the same time, a closer link to the situation

or to the cotext/context – initial detachments seem to clearly mark that the referent can be linked to some element in previous discourse or to the situation. However, the 'newness' is delicate to establish, as in many cases one can identify a general thematic frame; moreover, the exact state of knowledge of the participants is impossible to define in a study with corpus material. One could still ask what are the 'advantages' of final detachments when it comes to the introduction of unmentioned/unlinked entities? Since it is a construction that allows the use of different elaboration devices and keeps separated the main clause and the lexical element, it helps to present the information gradually. This aspect can be important when the speaker wants to introduce a less known or unlinked referent, as this construction usually first displays a potentially polyvalent element (pronoun) and allows the 'rightwards expansion' in discourse.

In this section quite a heterogeneous category of final detachment occurrences was discussed, representing cases where the referent in a detached construction was either present in the situation or the referential framework. With regards to their insertion and persistence in the discourse, different cases were identified: the occurrence in conclusive utterances (marking the end of a development of a topic), assuring the circular cohesion of a sequence; the development of a Theme while the referent is immediately accessible; the occurrence in cases where the main clause contains a 'foregrounded' part of the discourse or a statement that carries a specific emphasis.

8.8.3. Final detachments: discourse in elaboration

In this section we will consider examples which contain explicit markers of elaboration of discourse: repairs (on reference, agreement etc.), hesitation markers, truncated utterances, false starts, inconsistencies which clearly make reference to the editing and repair processes. The major part of these phenomena do not cause problems in communication: either the speaker makes some (self-initiated) repairs, or he/she doesn't, but generally it does not affect the transmission or the reception of the message.

The first example in this section (110) is a request for information by phone to a travel agency.

(110)
V: /----/ (1.0) Euroopa Liidus   kehtib   see   haigekassa
                    European Union.INE apply.3sg DEM health_insurance_fund.GEN

tõend   et   vaata   et   eesti   kodanik on   siin
certificate that look.IMP that Estonian citizen be.3sg here

aigekassas   arvel   =ja.hhhhhh ja ja   teatud kulud
health_insurance_fund.INE account.ADE and   and and certain expense.pl

hüvitatakse. (1.0) aga **see** on ka piiratud, (0.2) **need hüvitamised**
reimburse.IMPS but **DEM** be.3sg also limit.PPP **DEM.pl reimbursement.pl**

sest (0.6) sest seal on oma vastutused ja ma=i tea
because because there be.3pl own responsibility.pl and I NEG know.NEG.1sg

mis seal veel kõik sees on et üldiselt soovitatakse
what there more all inside be.3sg that generally recommend.IMPS

ikkagi võtta ütleme aigekassast tõend.
PRTCL take.INF say.1pl health_insurance_fund.ELA certificate

V: 'In the European Union this certificate of Social Security is valid proving that
an Estonian citizen has Social Security here and certain expenses will be
reimbursed, but **it** is also limited, **these reimbursements**, because there are parts
to be paid by the patient and I don't know what else is included there, so that
generally it is advised to take this certificate from the Social Security.'
(OCTU)

The inconsistency between singular and plural pronouns does not seem to cause
difficulties for the interpretation of detachment constructions: on the contrary,
this construction allows, given the proximity of the pronoun and the lexical
element, this type of repair without major readjustments. Since the pronoun *see*
used in the main clause can receive a somewhat broader reading, the lexical
element helps to focus again on the main lexical element and reiterate the
appropriate term (*need hüvitamised*, 'these reimbursements'). Both constituents
are separated by a micropause.

Another example illustrates how the speaker leaves at the end of the
utterance a longer lexical element (in the partitive case) which is preceded by a
somewhat hesitative rhematic constituent where the pronoun *seda* occurs three
times. In this excerpt the participants are discussing until what date it is
acceptable to offer new year's greetings (and actually extending this period until
St. John's Eve, after which one could already begin to wish a good end of the
year).

(111)
K: $ see on 'Taluri 'variant v(h)õi. $ hehe
    DEM be.3sg Talur.GEN version Q

T: ei old 'Talur, ma ei mäleta kesse ütles
   NEG be.NEG.PST.3sg Talur I NEG remember.NEG.1sg who say.PST.3sg

see oli mingi (.) 'muus raadios. (.)
DEM be.PST.3sg some another.INE radio.INE

K: ah 'nii (.) 'Talur ka 'ükspäev **seda** seal (.) 'heietas ikka
   ah right Talur also one_day **DEM.PART** there ramble.PST.3sg PRTCL

seda (.)   **seda**   'uue   'aasta   soovimist=   ja. (5.5)
DEM.PART DEM.PART new.GEN year.GEN wishing.PART and

K: 'Is this Talur's version?
T: No, it wasn't Talur, I don't'remember who said it, it was something, on another radio station.
K: Ok, some days ago Talur was also rambling about wishing a happy new year and..'
(OCTU)

The referent of the detached constituent (wishing a happy new year) is present throughout this excerpt, and the final detachment marks the end of this development (followed by a longer pause and thematic shift). From the formal point of view, the speaker first introduces a pronoun in the main clause and then tries to formulate the lexical element that will be a nominalization of the previously mentioned verb. This example could be associated with those which use the detached constituent to mark the end of a longer sequence and a thematic development.

Another example below (112), from the same type of conversation, is formally a typical detachment construction. It contains, however, several editing mechanisms and the detached lexical element itself is specified (from a more general *pakett* to a more specific *kindlustus*).

(112)
H: ää='jah, ja üldse=   et 'mida **see**   nagu:::: 'hõlmab   endas=
       yes and generally that what **DEM** like   include.3sg self.INE

see   'pakett   või=see   'kindlust[us=e]e**=.hhhh
DEM package or   **DEM** insurance

H: 'Yes and in general what does **it** include, **this package or this insurance**?'
(OCTU)

Based on this type of example it can be noticed that the formulation is clearly made in two stages: at first, the speaker concentrates her efforts on the main clause, the predicate, whereas the demonstrative *see* leaves open the largest possible referential field (as there is no gender marking in Estonian) and following this, the lexical element will be specified. It is possible, sometimes, for the speaker to use the linguistic possibilities offered by this construction (and repair mechanisms) in order to put forward both lexical elements, by which one replaces the other. We can also note the smooth transition from the main clause to the detached elements.

    With regards to the persistence of referents in the subsequent discourse in this type of request, the examples confirm the general tendency of the referents of final detachments not to remain topical in longer sequences. Detachment

constructions used in questions allow a referent to be picked up at a 'local' level, without many costs in terms of referent introduction, to handle it at the same level (question-response) and typically, to pass on to the next items.

In some cases, the function of the pronoun seems to be as a support (placeholder) in order to gain time to find the appropriate referent and avoid perturbances in speech flow (Keevallik 2010: 159). This function can be extended to the majority of the examples in this section, as the presence of different repair mechanisms allows the formulation and elaboration effort in discourse to be seen and to take note of the possible role of detached constructions. Nevertheless, the main functions of detached constructions should not be limited to repairs only. It is, however, clear that the specific form of detachments allows several types of repairs of central importance in discourse elaboration: grammatical agreement and lexical changes on a paradigmatic scale, assuring at the same time a more or less smooth flow of discourse.

In example (113) the pronoun *seda* can be either considered as forming part of the main clause (due to the pause and hesitation that follow) or functioning as adnominal demonstrative, followed by an effort by the speaker to recall the exact lexical element.

> (113)
> A: tead=   sis= nad läksd   nii 'närvi seal, (0.8) 'Eiki tahtis
>   know.2sg then they go.PST.3pl so angry there   Eiki want.PST.3sg
>
> 'vaadata telekast   **seda** (1.0) ee '**Surematut**, (.)   Ann tahtis
> look.INF television.ELA **DEM.PART Immortal.PART** Ann want.PST.3sg
>
> vaadata   vaprad ja   ilusad, (.) mingi (.) 'üks on   kanal   kahes,   teine
> look.INF bold   and beautiful like   one be.3sg channel two.INE other
>
> on   'kolme   pealt. (1.0)
> be.3sg three.GEN ADV
>
> A: 'You know then they got so angry there, (0.8) Eiki wanted to watch on TV **this** (1.0) ee **Immortal**, [Ann] wanted to watch Bold and Beautiful, the one is on Channel Two, the other on the third channel.'
> (OCTU)

The latter seems more plausible, as typically the main clauses are grammatically complete (although the exact reference may remain unclear), but here, placing the pronoun at the end of the clause announces more to come – moreover, in this utterance the reference can not be known to other participants without the lexical element, as the speaker introduces it as unknown information.

Another example of detachment constructions (114) shows a specifying structure where the main clause contains already mentioned referents, but their mention has taken place six turns before the actual mention: the speaker L reiterates more explicitly the idea that has been present during the conversation,

that the theatre has been built during the first period of independence, underlining the fact that at this time, the quality of construction work was better than in Soviet times.

(114)
L: **need**   olid   ju   eesti   ajal   ehitatud-e **need**
   DEM.pl be.PST.3pl PRTCL Estonian.GEN time.ADE built.PPP **DEM.pl**

see-see **vana osa ja-a uus osa** siis tehti   ju   nii korralikult
this this old   part and new part then make.PST.IMPS PRTCL so correctly

need   müürid olid   nii võimsad. (2.08) mhhhh
DEM.pl wall.pl be.PST.3pl so stout.pl.

((ohkab, autoiste krägiseb))
((sigh, car seat crackles))

mis teha. (...) se= nõukogude-e aeg tegi   palju halba.
what do.INF DEM Soviet   time do.PST.3sg a_lot harm.PART

L: 'They** were built in the Estonian period **these this this old part and new part**, at that time very good work was made, these walls were so stout. Mhhh, what to do (…), this Soviet time did a lot of harm.'
(OCTU)

The main clause introduces a plural demonstrative pronoun (*need*), it will be repeated at the beginning of the detached construction and then replaced by the pronoun *see*, which carries the marks of editing (repetition of the pronoun) and determines two subsequent elements (*vana osa ja uus osa* 'old part and new part'). The detached construction at the beginning of the sequence serves to illustrate the position of the speaker who describes the good quality of construction at this time, leading to a general conclusion at the end of the sequence (Soviet time being harmful).

In the next example (115), we can see multiple repairs in a response to a yes/no question. The speaker E asks if the person in question is married. Speaker A gives an affirmative response, by saying that she has already been married for a long time, then starts another idea, referring to a certain person with whom she is not married, but after a second attempt to name the person (noh selle) abandons this strategy and tries to identify her actual husband (the father of her youngest children), but this utterance will also remain incomplete. This example cannot be classified as a prototypical final detachment either: formally speaking, in a final detachment, the case marking would be present already in the main clause (*sellega*).

(115)
E: =kule kas [Na'talja::] (.) 'Madarik. mis ta on   'abielus=   vä.
   listen Q Natalja   Madarik what she be.3sg marriage.INE Q
L: [{-}] ((näitab))
        [{-}] ((shows))
(0.3)
A: ta on   jaa? selle: (.)   ta=n 'ammu   ju   vata=ta=i=
   she be.3sg yes DEM.GEN she=s long_time PRTCL look she NEG

'ole   ju   'sellega   'abielu- (.) noh   selle (0.7) ta=on
be.NEG.3sg PRTCL DEM.COM marriage- PRTCL DEM.GEN she be.3sg

selle: (.)   noh   **nende   'viimaste   laste   'isaga.**
DEM.GEN PRTCL **DEM.pl.GEN last.pl.GEN child.pl.GEN father.COM**

E: 'Listen, this Natalja Madarik, is she married or what?
L: ((shows))
A: Yes, she is with this, she is married a long time ago, look she is not married
to him (.) that (0.7) she is with **this one** (.) **the father of her last children**.'
(OCTU)

At the end of this section an example (116) will be considered where the main
clause and the detached element occur in two different turns. Between the two
the second speaker gives an acknowledgment marker *mhmh*. Based on the
examples of the corpus, it can be said that this type of construction where the
speaker receives a feedback from the other participant after the main clause
seems to not be frequent in spoken Estonian. Moreover, the first clause can be
considered as complete from the grammatical point of view, but there are still
some lexical inconsistencies regarding the reference: the participants are talking
about queues, when the speaker H says that 'now it is three times a week' and
probably realises that 'queue' is not a felicitous term to be associated to this
expression about frequency and after some editing markers finds another term
aeg 'reception time, time slot'. In this sense the whole utterance of the speaker
H at the end of the sequence serves to make a lexical repair (queue *pro* time
slot), as in the main clause she has talked about 'three times a week' which is
not compatible with the notion 'queue'.

(116)
J: kell   üks jah? (.) ja siis lähme sinna   seal ei   ole
   o'clock one yes   and then go.1pl there.ILL there NEG be.NEG.3sg

mingit   järjekorda   vaja kinni panna.=
any.PART appointment.PART   need ADV book.INF

H: =ma arvan   et on   ikkagi vist   mingi järjekord seal st vähemalt=
    I think.1sg that be.3sg still   maybe some queue   there at_least

vata   tol   korral   ku   me tegime   mäletad,
look.IMP.2sg DEM.ADE time.ADE when we make.PST.1pl remember.2sg

J: jah siis oli   päris pikk järjekord.
    yes then be.PST.3sg quite long queue

H: mhmh. (.) a nüüd on   noh   **ta** kolm päeva   nädalas. (.)
    uhuh   but now be.3sg PRTCL **he** three day.PART week.INE

J: mhmh.=
   uhuh. =

H: =**see   järje[kord]** onju=   ja, või (.) **see** (.) **aeg**. (0.8) ja: (.) noh (1.5)
      DEM qu[eue]   PRTCL and or   **DEM time**   and PRTCL

ma ei   tea (.)   neli tundi ka
I   NEG know.NEG.1sg four hours also

J: [mhmh.]
   [uhuh.]

J: 'At one o'clock yes, and then we'll go there. there is no need to book an
appointment.
H: I think that there is still a kind of queue at least, that time we did it you
remember?
J: Yes, then was quite a long queue.
H: Uhuh (.) but now **it** is three times a week (.)
J: Uhuh
H: **this queue**, right, or (.) **this** (.) **time slot** (0.8) and (.) well (1.5) I don't know
(.) four hours it is.'
(OCTU)

The participants continue using the same term *järjekord* 'queue' which is
mentioned several times in the immediately preceding turns, but as we can see,
the predicate in the main clause makes the use of this term inadequate and leads
to the research of another term to use in the detached construction. The pronoun
ta is less frequent when referring to an inanimate referent (here also a rather
abstract element) and this might also be a reason for the speaker to want to
make a repair in order to specify the referent.

   The examples discussed in this section showed that the pattern of final
detachment construction is indeed one possible means of balancing the
inconsistencies during the discourse elaboration process in spontaneous oral
language. The repairs concern different entities in discourse: the agreement of
lexical and resumptive elements, and the semantic adjustment of the lexical
element (hyponyms, hypernymes).

8.8.4. Final detachments in discourse: conclusion

Final detachments have multiple functions in discourse; based on the examples of the corpus, the following points can be underlined.

Final detachments, as detached constructions in general, allow information to be staged; in the case of final detachments, these allow less known entities to be presented in a more fluid way: the resumptive pronoun opens a possible domain for interpretation and the detached lexical element preceded by a determiner achieves the process. The elements that seemed brand new in the discourse did not lead to difficulties in interpretation or identification. An investigation related to the use of the pronouns (espcially *tämä*) in Finnish (Etelämäki 2006: 72–82) reached somewhat similar conclusion in that detachments (which are not considered as self-repairs in this study) tend to occur in cases where a new viewpoint is presented about an ongoing topic or a topic shift is attempted, which is particularly evident when different pronouns are used (*se* in lexical element and *tämä* in the main clause). This type of variation is however not possible in Estonian due to the very simple pronominal system.

As concerns the status of the referent in the discourse, it appeared that in general, the referents of final detachments are present in discourse or its semantic framework (often, however, not exactly at the same level of specificity and their previous mention can be quite a long time ago); some cases appeared to display referents that were part of the mutual knowledge of the participants, but not mentioned in the ongoing conversation. This construction occurs often in an evaluative or emotional context, so it seems primary for the speaker to express his emotions first in a complete clause where the Rheme is a central element, allowing him to place the lexical element at the end.

This construction allows the Rheme to be placed at the foreground; in these cases the main clause may contain a statement which has a special weight in the argumentation or in the structuring of the discourse. This structure can also be assumed to alleviate the processing charge of the main clause, for instance in cases where the detached element is not to become topical, but is constituted of an accessory or marginal item from the point of view of topical development or the role of agents; in these instances the detached element occurs more often in oblique cases. In information processing terms, it can also be assumed that the referent is already present in the speaker's mind in the moment he is uttering the main clause and thus already introducing a certain category by a pronoun, allowing him to concentrate rather on the rhematic part of his utterance, which demands more effort and is the actual constituent that pushes the communication forward.

About the grammaticalisation or conventionalization of this structure it can be concluded that a certain amount of final detachments seemed to represent quite a regular pattern in spoken Estonian (there were no pauses, no editing markers). In this sense, the present study confirms the findings of several researchers who have pleaded for a clear distinction between afterthoughts or repairs and final detachments. These occurrences are used as if they were

planned as such by the speaker (the lexical element is not added afterwards in order to make the reference clearer) and it seemed also that interrogative utterances could be a basis for this evolution. However, it was not yet possible to identify with certainty those discourse types or utterance types that could favor the occurrence of these constructions on a path of grammaticalization; a special investigation and an extended corpus with less formal variation is needed to carry out this analysis.

One of their functions is to assure circular cohesion or to help the reinterpretation of a sequence, especially in longer narrative excerpts. This process is often reflected by different editing markers: the speaker seems to make special effort in order to reach a generalization which demands a lexical retrieval or a recategorization of lexical elements. Nouns that are introduced by the generalization are rather abstract and will therefore not be developed later, but can serve as a basis for further developments.

When examples contain explicit markers of repair, this mechanism concerns mostly grammatical agreement and the semantics of the referent. In some borderline cases, the pronoun seems to act as a placeholder or anticipated determiner, rather than a typical resumptive word.

9. CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis initial and final detached constructions in spontaneous oral in Estonian were analysed, where these constructions participate in multiple ways in the structuring of information and discourse building-up processes in ongoing communication.

The detachment constructions were defined on the one hand by certain formal criteria, and by certain semantic and informational properties on the other.

As initial detachments only those constructions which contained either a full NP, a proper noun or a pronominal element in the detached position were analysed; as for final detachments, generally the principle of having a core-ferential resumptive element was retained (detached constituents were full NPs and proper nouns), although some exceptions to these criteria were also discussed. Final detachments were considered as forming a continuum, ranging from typical constructions to structures that contained several repair devices and could thus be considered rather as repairs with some structural similarities to typical final detachments.

Initial detachments are used in discourse most often as structures, allowing the introduction of contrastive elements, elements supporting an argumentation, as examples, or items forming part of a thematic frame, especially in questions where they can occur in 'listings'. In narrative or monological excerpts the detached construction allows the speaker to come back to an initial question or responds to a need to resume a longer sequence.

Being in the nominative permits the introduction of more complex elements in a more fluent way in the discourse.

The analysis revealed that discourse particles play an important role in the segmentation of utterances from the informational point of view: different markers occur at the intersection of Theme-Rheme in the case of initial detachments. It was found that the particles *aga* or *aga näiteks* were very frequent when new referents were introduced within a certain thematic frame. Also pauses were found between informational constituents, but no regularities could be identified as to their occurrence. There could be a correlation in the case of initial detachments between the occurrence of such markers and the distance of the main clause from the lexical elements, but this claim needs more support from quantitative investigations.

It was also possible to observe the variable use of different pronominal forms, depending on the status of the referent and the general referential frame: *see* and *ta* are generally assigned to inanimates and animates respectively, but this tendency can be completely reversed in the case of specific referential relations that are built up for example between first-plane and second-plane elements, or where there are several competing referents of different natures.

The repair or reinterpreting nature of detachments can also be observed in the case of initial detachments where the speaker regularly makes false starts

and struggles to formulate the desired utterance, and where the initial detachment, by its 'decondensed' nature, helps to clearly bring out the exact referent first (this process also being simplified by the fact that these constituents appear in the nominative case) and then to convey the speaker's message about this referent. This way, the formulation effort is concentrated especially on the sequence preceding the lexical element itself, when the speaker has taken the floor, trying to bring in a referent that is sometimes difficult to formulate in clear terms, but the initial detachment as a construction has certain properties (nominative case) that alleviate the difficulty of formulation, so the speaker is generally able to arrive at a clear result in terms of reference.

As for final detachments, the formulation effort is somewhat different, because the Rheme is placed at the foreground (often one can find it in evaluative or emotional contexts that reinforce this impression) and receives the most attention and editing effort, but given that the cataphoric pronoun is not often modified later in the detached construction, it confirms the existence of a closer link between the main clause and the detached lexical element already during the formulation process: the speaker seems to already have in mind the lexical element he is going to place after the main clause.

In the case of final detachments there is a pattern that seems quite regular in oral speech: the speaker seems to have planned this construction as such (although it cannot be assured in all cases, since oral language is in a constant adaptation and adjustment process during communication). It can still be argued that speakers often 'intentionally' form utterances that call for a final detachment (or other functionally similar means), when they make utterances containing pronouns and where there are no referents present that can be resumed by the pronoun or when there are several competing referents and only one will be picked up. This type of utterance offers the possibility of setting the Rheme at the foreground, put the accent on 'action' and leave the question of reference for later resolution; this corresponds to the need of oral speech to give information by portions and to assure that the discourse participants understand the status of the referents in an adequate manner.

Based on these findings, it is possible to make some assumptions about the relative frequency and conventionalization of these constructions in spoken Estonian: it seems generally less grammaticalized compared to French, for example, where there are certain recurrent question types where the detached construction is the preferred construction in many discourse types; also, some other structures seem to be conventionalized in French, like definition requirements (Fernandez-Vest 2015:44). As for the Estonian data, no such general pattern could be observed, but nevertheless it seems that in the case of initial detachments the most dynamic type of utterance in this regard is also the interrogative and this type of utterance could form the basis for the ongoing grammaticalization of this structure. As concerns the final detachments, similarly, the interrogatives showed clear stabilized patterns in our corpus, to

which can also be added the resumptive function of final detachments that mark the end of a development, often by a generalization performed by the lexical constituent.

The corpus used for this analysis was made up of relatively different discourse types (spontaneous conversations, institutional dialogues, interviews), but didn't cover all types of oral language use and as the approach was qualitative, it was not possible to draw conclusions by taking account the particular types of discourse. However, it can be presumed that the longer (monological) excerpts favoured the appearance of detached constructions in a more generalizing function, the institutional dialogues (containing many information requests) displayed many occurrences in interrogative form, allowing the introduction of elements that were not mentioned in the immediate surroundings or were only present in the given thematic frame, and the more spontaneous conversations contained more examples of evaluative utterances or emotional expressions that were often associated with final detachments.

As concerns the Information Structuring processes at the discourse level, it could be noted in many cases that the referents of detached constructions did not stay topical during long sequences. However, in the case of initial detachments, the referents can remain in a discourse during several turns, and specifically, they allow a reinterpretation of a whole sequence or resumption of an initial idea that have been overshadowed meanwhile by other referents and developments. Besides adding a new perspective, the initial detachments can also have some textual functions like postponing the predicative part of the utterance.

One type of final detachment seemed to function at the discourse level, constituting a resuming element after a longer sequence; by this, they help to assure a circular cohesion in discourse or to get the exact reference right, when during the ongoing conversation there have been disturbances as to the correct referent.

As a common characteristic of these constructions it can be observed, stemming from their basically oral nature (and related also to the corpus that was analysed for the purposes of the present thesis), that they allow the information to be staged in the ongoing discourse and the necessary adaptations to be made in real-time communication. This leads to the differences between these two constructions from the point of view of managing the information in discourse. From this perspective, these two constructions seem to be fundamentally different, when one considers the way of introducing the referent: in the case of initial detachments, most effort is given to the formulation of the lexical element itself. Often, this is preceded by various discursive material or a draft of the idea for which a more felicitous formulation is sought. In this case, the initial detachment comes as a sort of resolution (usually no repairs are associated to the detached element); however, at the same time, the discourse building work continues, as the lexical element is given in the nominative and the exact predication is added afterwards, accompanied by a resumptive word in

an adequate grammatical case. With regards to the final detachments, the approach is completely different: first, a predication is given, usually in a quite smooth formulation (sometimes, however, the speaker makes some self-repairs to the resumptive word). Given that the grammatical case is usually conditioned by the resumptive word, which has to be inserted to the main clause without creating disturbances, the transition from this element to the final lexical element demands less effort, even if the semantic 'gap' is filled only at the end. Having said that, the analysis has also revealed that this construction allows the introduction of several types of referents as regards their informational status, so that it can be concluded that this type of construction is sufficiently grammaticalized in order to permit a non-problematic interpretation during the communication process.

At the discourse level, and related to the different informational status of the discourse referents, the use of initial and final detachments allows the referencing processes to be managed, since these constructions are able to encompass a wide range of referents with regards to their status in the ongoing discourse: most typical referents are present in the discourse or in the thematic frame, but associated to the relative clauses, the initial detachments can introduce new (unmentioned) referents in the discourse; this also characterizes final detachments, where the pattern of giving first the predication, followed by the referent probably provides a necessary processing means for introducing unmentioned referents.

Possible further investigation domains could be linked to questions that could not be addressed in the framework of the present thesis: the complex problem of integrating the prosodical level into the investigation; analysis of other types of detached constructions or some borderline constructions, taking better into account the specificities of Estonian; contrastive analyses on typologically close languages, such as Finnish or other Finno-Ugric languages; quantitative studies and studies on certain types of detached constructions that could be on the way of grammaticalization in Estonian. The possible grammaticalization of these constructions could be observed by performing analyses on other types of corpora, taking into account the influence of Indo-European languages, especially English.

REFERENCES

Adam, J.-M. 1990. *Elements de linguistique textuelle.* Liège: Mardaga.

Adam, J.-M. 2004. *Linguistique textuelle. Des genres de discours aux textes*. Paris: Nathan.

Aijmer, K. 1989. Themes and tails: The discourse functions of dislocated elements. – *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, *12*, 137–154.

Aijmer, K. 2002. *English discourse particles. Evidence from a corpus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Aijmer, K. 2006. *Pragmatic markers in contrast*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Ammann, H. 1928. Die menschliche Rede: sprachphilosophische Untersuchungen. Teil 2: Der Satz. Lahr i.B., Schauenburg.

Amon, M. 2008. La progression informationnelle: aspects textuels. Montes, S., Taverna, L. (Eds.). *La Mère Sauvage de Maupassant. Une nouvelle face à ses méthodologies. – Synergies, Pays Riverains de la Baltique. GERFLINT*. Tallinn: Tallinna Ülikool, 37–52.

Amon, M. 2009. Les détachements finaux en estonien oral: productivité et fonction-nement. M.M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest; Danh Thanh Do-Hurinville (Eds.). *Plurilinguisme et traduction – des enjeux pour l'Europe*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 151–164.

Apothéloz, D. 1997. Les dislocations à gauche et à droite dans la constructions des schématisations. D. Miéville et A. Berrendonner (Eds.). *Logique, discours et pensée.* Bern: Peter Lang, 183–217.

Apothéloz, D. & Zay, F. 1999. Incidents de la programmation syntagmatique: reformulations micro- et macro-syntaxiques. – *Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 21*, 10–34.

Apothéloz, D. et Grobet, A. 2005. Appendices dans le discours: aspects syntaxiques, prosodiques et pragmatiques. – *TRANEL, 41*, 95–126.

Ashby, W. J. 1988. The syntax, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics of left- and right-dislocations in French. – *Lingua, 75*, 203–229.

Ashby, W. J. 1994. An acoustic profile of right-dislocation in French. – *Journal of French Language Studies, 4*(2), 127–145.

Astruc, L. 2004. Right-dislocations: influence of information structure on prosodic phrasing and intonation. – *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 1*, 1–14.

Auchlin, A. 1986. Complémentarité des structures thématiques et fonctionnelles pour l'accès aux interprétations dans le discours. – *Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 7*, 169–188.

Auchlin, A. & Ferrari, A. 1994. Structuration prosodique, syntaxe, discours: évidences et problèmes. – *Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 15*, 187–216.

Auer, P. 1996. On the prosody and syntax of turn-continuations. – E. Couper-Kuhlen & M. Selting (Eds.). *Prodosy in conversation. Interactional studies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57–100.

Auer, P. & di Luzio, A. (Eds.). 1992. *The contextualization of language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Avanzi, M. 2009. Aspects prosodiques de la dislocation à droite en français. – D. Apothéloz, B. Combettes et F. Neveu (Eds.). *Les linguistiques du détachement. Actes du colloque international de Nancy, 7–9 juin 2006*. Berne: Peter Lang, 59–71.

Avanzi. M. 2011. La dislocation à gauche en français spontané. Etude instrumentale. – *Le Français Moderne, 79*, 157–175.

Avanzi, M., Brunetti, L., & Gendrot, C. 2012. Extra-Sentential Elements, Prosodic Restructuring, and Information Structure. A Study of Clitic-Left Dislocation in Spontaneous French. – *Proceedings of Speech Prosody 2012*, Shanghai (China), 270–273.

Ayres-Bennett, W. & Carruthers, J. 2001. *Studies in the modern French language.* Harlow: Longman.

Ball, R.V. 1983. Noun, pronoun, and discourse structure in French. – *Modern Languages*, *64*, 229–239.

Bally, C. 1909. Traité de stylistique française, vol.1. Genève: Librairie de l'Université Georg & Cie.

Bally, C. 1944 [1932]. *Linguistique générale et linguistique francaise*. Seconde édition entièrement refondue. Berne: A. Francke S.A.

Barnes, B. K. 1985. *The pragmatics of left detachment in spoken standard French.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Beaugrande, R. de, & Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to text linguistics.* London-New York: Longman, coll. Linguistic Library, 1–11.

Berrendonner, A. 1983. 'Connecteurs pragmatiques' et anaphores. – *Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 5*, 215–246.

Berrendonner, A. 1990. Pour une macro-syntaxe. – *Travaux de linguistique, 21*, 25–36.

Blanche-Benveniste C., Borel B., Deulofeu J., Durand J., Giacomi A., Loufrani C., Meziane B., & Pazery N. 1979. Des grilles pour le français parlé. – *Recherches sur le français parlé, 2*, 163–205.

Blanche-Benveniste, C. et Jeanjean, C. 1987. *Le français parlé.* Paris: Didier Erudition.

Blanche-Benveniste, C. Bilger, M., Rouget, C., van den Eynde, K., & Mertens, P. 1990. *Le français parlé. Etudes grammaticales*. Paris: Editions du C.N.R.S.

Blanche-Benveniste, C. 2000. *Approches de la langue parlée en français*. Paris: Ophrys.

Blasco-Dulbecco, M. 1999. *Les dislocations en français contemporain. Etude syntaxique.* Paris: Champollion.

Bolinger, D. 1952. Linear modification. – *Publications of the Modern Language Association, 67*, 1117–1144.

Chafe, W. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. – Ch. N. Li. (Ed.) *Subject and topic*, New York: Academic Press, 27–55.

Chafe, W. 1982. Integration and involvment in speaking, writing and oral literature. – D. Tannen (Ed.). *Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy*. Norwood: Ablex, 35–53.

Chafe, W. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. – R. Tomlin (Ed.). *Coherence and grounding in discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Chafe, W. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: the flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University Press of Chicago.

Charolles, M. 1993. Les plans d'organisation du discours et leurs interactions. – S. Moirand et al. (Eds.). *Parcours linguistiques de discours spécialisés*. Berne: Peter Lang, 301–314.

Charolles, M. 1995. Cohésion, cohérence et pertinence du discours. – *Travaux de Linguistique*, *29*, 125–151.

Charolles, M. 1997. L'encadrement du discours : univers, champs, domaines et espaces. – *Cahier de Recherche Linguistique, 6*, 1–73.

Charolles, M. et Combettes, B. 1999. De la phrase au discours: rupture et continuité. – *Langue Française, 121*, 76–116.

Charolles, M. 2003. De la topicalité des adverbiaux détachés en tête de phrase. – M. Charolles & S.Prévost (Eds.). *Adverbiaux et Topiques, Travaux de Linguistique, 47*, 11–51.

Combettes, B. 1983. *Pour une grammaire textuelle*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Combettes, B. et Tomassone, R. 1988. *Le texte informatif. Aspects linguistiques*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.

Combettes, B. 1992. *L'organisation du texte*. Metz: Université de Metz.

Combettes, B. 1998. *Les constructions détachées en français*. Paris: Ophrys.

Combettes, B. 1999a. Système linguistique et textualité: le cas de l'oral. J.-M. Barbéris (Ed.). *Le français parlé. Variétés et discours.* Praxiling, Université Paul-Valéry-Montpellier III, 93–106.

Combettes, B. 1999b. Thématisation et topicalisation: leur rôle respectif dans l'évolution du français. C. Guimier (Ed.). *La thématisation dans les langues*. *Actes du colloque de Caen, 9–11 octobre 1997*. Berne: Peter Lang, 231–245.

Couper-Kuhlen, E. & Selting, M. (Eds). 1996. *Prosody in conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culioli, A. 1984. Sur quelques contradictions en linguistique. – *Communications*, *20*, 83–91.

D'Achille, P. 1990. *Sintassi del parlato e tradizione scritta della lingua italiana. Analisi di testi dalle origini al secolo XVIII*. Roma: Bonacci.

Daneš, F. 1960. Sentence intonation from a functional point of view. – *Word, 16*, 34–54.

Daneš, F. 1964. A three-level approach to syntax. – *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague, 1*, 225–240.

Daneš, F. 1967. Order of elements and sentence intonation. *To Honor Roman Jakobson*. The Hague: Mouton, 500–512.

Daneš, F. 1974. Functional sentence perspective and the organization of the text. F. Daneš, (Ed.). *Papers on functional sentence perspective*. Prague: Mouton, 106–128.

Daneš, F. 1967. Order of elements and sentence intonation. *To Honor Roman Jakobson*. The Hague: Mouton, 500–512.

Danon-Boileau et al. 1991. Intégration discursive et intégration syntaxique. – *Langages, 104*, 111–128.

Dik, S. C. 1978. *Functional grammar.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co.

Dik, S. C. 1997. *Theory of functional grammar.* Part 1 & Part 2, Kees Hengeveld (Ed.). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dressler, W. 1972. *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Du Bois, John. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. – *Language, 63*, 805–855.

Enkvist, N. E. 1975. Tekstilingvistiikan peruskäsitteitä. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Enkvist, N. E. (Ed.). 1982. *Impromptu speech: a symposium*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, coll. MSÅAF, 78.

Enkvist, N. E. 1984. Contrastive linguistics and text linguistics. J. Fisiak (Ed.). *Contrastive linguistics: prospects and problems*. The Hague: Mouton, 45–67.

Enkvist, N. E. (Ed.). 1985. *Coherence and composition*, Åbo: Åbo Akademi, coll. MSÅAF, 101, 14–17.

Enkvist, N. E. 1987. Text linguistics for the applier: an orientation. U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.). *Writing across languages: analysis of L2 text*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 23–42.

Erelt, M. 1979. *Eesti lihtlause probleeme.* Eesti NSV Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut. Tallinn: Eesti Raamat.

Erelt, M. et al. 1993. *Eesti keele grammatika II. Süntaks. Lisa: Kiri.* Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Eesti Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut.

Etelämäki, M. 2006. *Toiminta ja tarkoite. Tutkimus suomen pronominista* tämä. Helsinki: SKS.

Fernandez-Vest, M. M. J. 1994. *Les particules énonciatives dans la construction du discours*. Paris: PUF.

Fernandez-Vest, M. M. J. 2004a. Mnémème, antitopic : le post-rhème, de l'énoncé au texte. S. Carter-Thomas & J. Fernandez-Vest (Eds.). *Structure informationnelle et particules enonciatives.* Paris: L'Harmattan, 65–104.

Fernandez-Vest, M. M. J. 2004b. Information structure and typological change: Northern Sami challenged by Indo-European models. M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest (Ed.). *Les langues ouraliennes aujourd'hui. Approche linguistique et cognitive. The Uralic languages today. A linguistic and cognitive approach.* Paris: Honoré Champion, 563–576.

Fernandez-Vest, M. M. J. 2006. Vers une typologie linguistique du détachement à fondement ouralien d'Europe. – *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris*, *101 (1)*, 173–224.

Fernandez-Vest, M. M. J. 2009. Vers une typologie informationnelle des constructions à détachement. – D. Apotéloz, B. Combettes & F. Neveu (Eds.). *Les linguistiques du détachement. Actes du Colloque International de Nancy (7-9 juin 2006).* Berne: Peter Lang, 251–262.

Fernandez-Vest, M.M.J. 2015. *Detachments for cohesion. Toward an Information Grammar of Oral Languages.* Berlin-Munich-Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Fernandez-Vest M. M. J. & Grünthal-Robert, T. 2004. Typologie de l'ordre des mots (ORM) dans l'interaction simulée: essai sur le dialogue de théâtre estonien, finnois, français. – *Linguistica Uralica, 4*, Tallinn, 40–59.

Firbas, J. 1964. On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis. – *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague 1*, 267–280.

Firbas, J. 1971. On the concept of communicative dynamism in the theory of functional sentence perspective. *Brno Studies in English 7*, 12–47.

Firbas, J. 1972. On the interplay of prosodic and non-prosodic means of functional sentence perspective. – *The Prague School of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, London, 77–94.

Firbas, J. 1974. Some aspects of the Czechoslovak approach to problems of functional sentence perspective. F. Daneš (Ed.).*Papers on functional sentence perspective*, Prague, 11–37.

Firbas, J. 1992. *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fradin, B. et Cadiot, P. 1988. Présentation: une crise en thème? – *Langue Française, 78,* 3–8.

Fradin, B. 1990. Approche des constructions à détachement: inventaire. – *Revue Romane*, *25 (1)*, 3–34.

Fretheim, T. 1995. Why Norwegian right-dislocated phrases are not afterthoughts. – *Nordic Journal of Linguistics, 18*(1), 31–54.

Fried, M., Östman, J.- O. 2005. Construction grammar and spoken language: the case of pragmatic particles. – *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1752–1778.

Gabelenz, G. von der 1891. *Die Sprachwissenschaft. Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse*. Leipzig: Weigel.

Galmiche, M. 1992. Au carrefour des malentendus: le thème. – *L'Information Grammaticale, 54*, 3–10.

Geluykens, R.1987a. Tails (right-dislocation) as a repair mechanism in English conversation. – J. Nuyts & G. De Schutter (Eds.). *Getting one's words into line: on word order and functional grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 119–129.

Geluykens, R. 1987b. Intonation and speech act type: an experimental approach to rising intonation in queclaratives. – *Journal of Pragmatics, 11*, 483–494.

Geluykens, R. 1992. *From discourse process to grammatical construction: on left-dislocation in English*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Givón, T. 1976. Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement. – C. N. Li (Ed.). *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 149–188.

Givón, T. (Ed.). 1983. *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Givón, T. 1988. The pragmatics of word order: predictability, importance and attention.

M. Hammond et al. (Eds.). *Studies in syntactic typology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 243–284.

Givón, T. 1992. The grammar of referential coherence as mental processing instructions. – *Linguistics, 30*, 5–55.

Goldberg, A.1995. *Constructions: a construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gómez-González, M. A. 2001. *The theme-topic interface. Evidence from English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Gregory, M. L. & Michaelis, L. A. 2001. Topicalization and left-dislocation: a functional opposition revisited. – *Journal of Pragmatics, 33*, 1665–1706.

Grobet, A. 2002. *L'identification des topiques dans les dialogues*. Bruxelles: Duculot.

Grobet, A. et Simon, A.-C. 2003. Interfaces prosodie-discours: le marquage intonatif des unités informationnelles. A. Mettouchi et G. Ferré (Eds.). *Actes du colloque 'interfaces prosodiques'*. Nantes: AAI, 179–184.

Grobet, A. et Simon, A.-C. 2009. Constructions à détachement à gauche: les fonctions de la prosodie. D. Apothéloz, B. Combettes, & F. Neveu (Eds.). *Les linguistiques du détachement*. Berne: Peter Lang, 289–303.

Guimier, C. (Ed.). 1999. *La thématisation dans les langues. Actes du colloque de Caen, 9–11 octobre 1997*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Gumperz, J. J. 1982. *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gundel, J. K. 1985. 'Shared knowledge' and topicality. – *Journal of Pragmatics, 9/1*, 83–107.

Gundel, J. K. 1988a. *The role of topic and comment in linguistic theory*. New York: Garland.

Gundel, J. K. 1988b. Universals of topic-comment structure. M. Hammond et al. (Eds.), *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. John Benjamins, 209–239.

Gundel, J. K. 1999. Topic, Focus, and the Grammar-Pragmatics Interface. – *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, *6.1.*, 185–200.

Gundel, J. K. 2012. Pragmatics and information structure. K. Allan and K. Jaszczolt (Eds.) *Cambridge Handbook of Pragmat*ics, 585–599.

Gundel, J. K., Fretheim, T. 2004. Topic and focus. L.R. Horn and G. Ward (Eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 175–196.

Gundel, J., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. – *Language, 69*, 274–307.

Hagège, C. 1984. Sur les trois structurations de l'énoncé dans les langues humaines. – *Lingua e stile, XIX, vol. 3, octobre*, 343–379.

Hakulinen, A, Karlsson, F. 1979. *Nykysuomen lauseoppia.* Jyväskylä: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Hakulinen, A. 2001a [1976]. Suomen sanajärjestyksen kieliopillisista ja temaattisista tehtävistä. – L. Laitinen et al (Eds.). *Lukemisto. Kirjoituksia kolmelta vuosikymmeneltä*. Helsinki: SKS. 91–156.

Hakulinen, A. 2001b [1984]. Huomautuksia tematiikasta, topiikista ja typologiasta. – L. Laitinen et al (Eds.). *Lukemisto. Kirjoituksia kolmelta vuosikymmeneltä*. Helsinki: SKS, 219–227.

Hakulinen, A. et al. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1967a. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. – *Journal of Linguistics, 3*(1), 37–81.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1967b. *Intonation and grammar in British English*. The Hague: Mouton.

Halliday, M.A.K. 2004. *An introduction to functional grammar*. Third edition. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Härmä, J. 2003. Dislocation et topicalisation: degrés de grammaticalisation. – *Verbum, 25*(3), 381–390.

Haspelmath, M., König, E., Oesterreicher, W., & Raible, W. (Eds.). 2001. *Language typology and language universals: an international handbook*. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft) vol. 1–2. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hazael-Massieux, M.-C. 1983. Le rôle de l'intonation dans la définition et la structuration de l'unité de discours. – *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, 78*, 99–160.

Heilenman, L. K. & McDonald, J. L. 1993. Dislocated sequences and word order in French: a processing approach. – *French Language Studies, 3*, 165–190.

Helasvuo, M.-L. 1993. Are relative clauses either restrictive or non-restrictive? A study of relative clauses in the Finnish Pear Stories. Anders Holmberg & Urpo Nikanne (Eds.).

Case and other functional categories in Finnish syntax. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 163–176.

Helasvuo, M.-L. 2001. *Syntax in the making. The emergence of syntactic units in Finnish conversation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hennoste, T. 1994. Pragmaatiline partikkel *noh* eesti keeles. Sissejuhatav ülevaade. H. Sulkala & H. Laanekask (Eds.). *Lähivertailuja 8*. Oulun yliopiston suomen ja saamen kielen laitoksen tutkimusraporteja 40. Oulu, 9–20.

Hennoste, T. 2000. Sissejuhatus suulisse eesti keelde. – *Akadeemia 5–12*: 5, 1117–1150; *6*, 1343–1374; *7*, 1553–1582; *8*, 1773–1806; *9*, 2011–2038; *10*, 2223–2254; *11*, 2465–2486; *12*, 2689–2710.

Hennoste, T. 2001. Sissejuhatus suulisse eesti keelde. – *Akadeemia, 1*, 179–206.

Hennoste, T. 2003. Suulise eesti keele uurimine: korpus. – *Keel ja Kirjandus, 7*, 481–500.

Hennoste, T. 2012. Küsimuse vorm, episteemiline staatus ja episteemiline hoiak. – *Keel ja Kirjandus*, *8–9*, 674–695.

Hickmann, M. & Roland, F.1990. Topiques et sujets dans les récits d'enfants français. Conférence invitée, Colloque du Réseau Européen des Laboratoires sur l'Acquisition des Langues, Bielefeld.

Hiietam, K. 2003. *Definiteness and grammatical relations in Estonian*. PhD thesis. University of Manchester.

Hint, H., Reile, M., & Pajusalu, R. 2013. Kontekst ja viitamine: argivestlused, legod ja narratiivid. – ESUKA – JEFUL 2013, 4–1, 161–183.

Hockett, Ch. F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics.* New York: Macmillan.

Hopper, P. J. & Thompson, S. A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. – *Language, 56*(2), 251–299.

Horlacher, A.-S. et Müller, G. 2005. L'implication de la dislocation à droite dans l'organisation interactionnelle. S. Pekarek-Doehler & M.- J. Béguelin (Eds.). Numéro special de *TRANEL 41: grammaire, discours, interaction. La structuration de l'information.* Neuchâtel: Travaux Neuchâtelois de Linguistique, 127–145.

Horlacher, A.-S. 2012. *La dislocation à droite revisitée. Une investigation interactionniste.* Thèse de doctorat. Université de Neuchâtel.

Kaiser, E. & Hiietam, K. 2004. A Typological Comparison of Third Person Pronouns in Finnish and Estonian. A. Dahl, K. Bentzen & P. Svenonius (Eds.), Nordlyd, 31(4). – *Proceedings of the Workshop on Generative Approaches to Finnic Languages*, 654–667.

Kaiser, E. & Vihman, V.-A. 2010. On the referential properties of Estonian pronouns and demonstratives. H. Götzsche (Ed.). *Memory, Mind and language*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 193–205.

Keevallik, L. 2003. Colloquial Estonian. *Estonian Language*, M. Erelt (Ed.). *Linguistica Uralica,* supplementary series, vol. 1, Estonian Academy Publishers.

Keevallik, L. 2005. Suhtluskeele uurimine partiklistunud verbivormide näitel. – *Keel ja Kirjandus, 7–8*, 535–548, 630–642.

Keevallik, L. 2008. Clause combining and sequenced actions: the Estonian complementizer and pragmatic particle *et*. – R. Laury (Ed.). *Crosslinguistic studies of clause combining: the multifunctionality of conjunctions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 125–152.

Keevallik, L. 2010. The interactional profile of a placeholder: the Estonian demonstrative *see*. N. Amiridze, B. H. Davis, & M. Maclagan (Eds.). *Fillers, pauses and placeholders*. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 139–172.

King, T. H. 1995. *Configuring topic and focus in Russian*. Stanford: CSLI.

Kleiber, G. 1992. Cap sur les topiques. – *L'information Grammaticale, 54*, 15–25.

Kleiber, G. 1994. *Anaphores et pronoms*. Louvain: Duculot.

Kleiber, G. 1997. Anaphore pronominale et référents évolutifs, ou comment faire recette avec un pronom. W. De Mulder, L. Tasmowski-De Ryck, & C. Vetters (Eds.). *Relations anaphoriques et (in)cohérence*, Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, Faux Titre 132, 1–29.

Koivisto, H. 1966. *Aleksis Kiven kielen irrallisista aineksista*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Krifka, M. & Musan, R. (Eds.) 2012. *The expression of information structure.* The expression of cognitive categories 5. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kuno, S. 1972. Functional sentence perspective. – *Linguistic Inquiry, 3*, 269–320.

Lacheret-Dujour, A. et Beaugendre, F. 1999. *La prosodie du français.* Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Lacheret-Dujour, A. 2003. *La prosodie des circonstants*. Paris/Louvain: Peeters.

Ladd, D. R. 1980. *The structure of intonational meaning*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lambert, F. & Nølke, H. (Eds.). 2005. *La syntaxe au cœur de la grammaire, Recueil offert en hommage pour le 60e anniversaire de Claude Muller*. Collection/Rivages/ linguistiques, PUR: Réseau des Universités de l'Ouest Atlantique.

Lambrecht, K. 1987a.On the status of canonical SVO sentences in French discourse. R. S. Tomlin (Ed.). *Coherence and grounding in discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 217–261.

Lambrecht, K. 1987b. Sentence Focus, Information Structure and the Thetic-categorical Distinction. – *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society 13*. Berkeley (California), 366–382.

Lambrecht, K. 1988. Presentational cleft constructions in spoken French. – J. Haiman & S. A. Thompson (Eds.). *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 135–180.

Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus and the mental representations of the discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lambrecht, K. 1996. Compositional vs. constructional meaning: the case of French *comme N*. – T. Galloway & M. Simons (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 5th SALT Conference*. Cornell University, 186–203.

Lambrecht, K. & Polinski, M. 1997. Typological variation in sentence-focus constructions. K. Singer, R. Eggert, & G. Anderson (Eds.). *Papers from the Panels, 33rd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* CLS, 189–206.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2000. When subjects behave like objects. An analysis of emerging S and O in sentence-focus constructions across languages. – *Studies in language*, *XXIV* (*3*), 611–682.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. Dislocation. – M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher & W. Raible, (Eds.). L*anguage typology and language universals: an international handbook. (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, 20). Vol. 2*, 1050–1078. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Laury, R. & Helasvuo, M.-L. (forthcoming). Detached NPs with relative clauses in Finnish conversations. – M. M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest & R. D. Van Valin Jr. (Eds.). *Information structure and spoken language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Le Goffic, P. 1993. *Grammaire de la phrase française*. Paris: Hachette.

Lehtinen, T. 1992. Suomen ja viron verbiloppuisista sivulauseista. – *Nordens Språk i Baltikum. Pohjoismaiden kielet Baltiassa*. Baltian maiden yliopistojen pohjoismaisten kielten opettajien kokous, Riika 26. 30.11.1991. Nordisk Språksekretariats rapporter. 18. Oslo, 70–82.

Leino, P. 1982. *Suomen kielen lohkolause*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Leonarduzzi, L. et Herry, N. 2006. Les dislocations à droite: entre détachement et intégration. Quelques aspects syntaxiques et prosodiques. – *Actes du colloque de l'ALOES*, mars 2006.

Li, K. 2009. *The information structure of Mandarin Chinese. Syntax and prosody*. University of Washington. Proquest, Umi Dissertation Publishing.

Li, S. A. et Thompson, C. N. 1976. *Subject and topic. A new typology of language*. Charles N. Li. (Ed.) *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.

Lindström, L. 2000. Narratiiv ja selle sõnajärg. – *Keel ja Kirjandus, 3*, 190–200.

Lindström, L. 2002. Veel kord subjekti ja predikaadi vastastikusest asendist laiendi järel. *Emakeele Seltsi aastaraamat*, Tartu: Emakeele Selts, 87–105.

Lindström, L. 2004. Sõnajärg lause tuumargumentide eristajana eesti keeles. *Lauseliikmeist eesti keeles*. Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele õppetooli preprindid 1. L. Lindström (Ed.). Tartu, 40–49.

Lindström, L. 2005. *Finiitverbi asend lauses. Sõnajärg ja seda mõjutavad tegurid suulises eesti keeles*. (Doktoritöö, Tartu Ülikool) Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Lindström, L. 2006. Infostruktuuri osast eesti keele sõnajärje muutumisel. – *Keel ja Kirjandus, 11*, 875–888.

Lindvall, A. 2005. Information structure in some East Asian languages or Is there a thing called subject? *Working Papers 51*, Lund University, Department of Linguistics, 125–142.

Linell, P. 2005. *The written language bias in linguistics. Its nature, origins and transformations*. London & New York: Routledge.

Lutz, L. 1981. *Zum Thema "Thema". Einführung in die Thema-Rhema Theorie*, Hamburg: Hamburger Buchagentur.

Lyons, C. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marchello-Nizia, C. 1999. *Le français en diachronie: douze siècles d'évolution*. Gap: Ophrys.

Marnette, S. 2005. *Speech and thought presentation in French.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Martinet, A. 1967. *Eléments de linguistique générale*. Coll. U2, Paris: Armand Colin.

Maslova, E. & Bernini, G. 2006. Sentence topics in the languages of Europe and beyond. G. Bernini & M. L. Schwartz (Eds.). *Pragmatic organization of discourse in the languages of Europe. Empirical approaches to language typology, 20–8.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 67–120.

Maynard, S. 1986. Interactional aspects of thematic progression in English casual conversation. – *Text, 6*, 73–105.

McLaughlin, M. 2011. When written is spoken: dislocation and the oral code. – *French Language Studies, 21*, 209–229.

Mertens, P. 1990. Intonation. Ch. IV in Blanche-Benveniste et al., 159–176.

Metslang, Helle 1978a. Nekotorye sintaksičeskie aspekty stihovogo parallelizma v estonskoj runičeskoj pesne. Dissertacija na soiskanie učenoj stepeni kandidata filologičeskih nauk. (MS)., Тартуский государственный университет (University of Tartu).

Metslang, H. 1978b. Keeleüksuste infostruktuurist. – *Keel ja Kirjandus, 7*, 410–418.

Miller, J. & Fernandez-Vest, M.M.J. 2006. Spoken and written language. G. Bernini& M. L. Schwartz (Eds.). *Pragmatic organization of discourse in the languages of Europe. Empirical approaches to language typology, 20–8.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 9–64.

Moeschler, J. et Reboul, A. 1994. *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de pragmatique.* Paris: Seuil.

Mondada, L.1994. *Verbalisation de l'espace et fabrication du savoir. Approche linguistique de la construction des objets de discours.* Lausanne: Université de Lausanne.

Mondada, L. 2003. Parler topical et organisation séquentielle: l'apport de l'analyse conversationnelle. *Verbum, 25/2*, 193–219.

Morel, M.-A. 1992. Intonation et thématisation. – *L'Information Grammaticale, 54*, 26–34.

Morel, M.-A. & Danon-Boileau, L. 1998. *Grammaire de l'intonation, l'exemple du français*. Paris-Gap: Ophrys**.**

Morel, M.-A., Danon-Boileau, L. 1999. Thème, préambule et paragraphe dans l'oral spontané en français. C. Guimier (Ed.). *La thématisation dans les langues. Actes du colloque de Caen, 9–11 octobre 1997*, Berne: Peter Lang, 359–377.

Morris, Ch. 1938. Foundations of the theory of signs. – *International Encyclopedia of Unified Science, Vol. 2, No. 1*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Neveu, F. 1998. *Etudes sur l'apposition*. Paris: H. Champion.

Nichols, J. 1984. Functional theories of grammar. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 13*, 97–117.

Nølke, H. 1994. *Linguistique modulaire. De la forme au sens*. Louvain: Peeters.

Nuyts, J. & de Schutter, G. (Eds.). *Getting one's words into line: on word order and functional grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications, 119–129.

Oosten, J. van. 1986. *The nature of subjects, topics and agents: a cognitive explanation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Ouyang, I. C., Kaiser, E. 2012. Prosody and information structure in a tone language: an investigation of Mandarin Chinese. – *Language and Cognitive Processes,* http://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/2xV6Mfnn3TKHq8iEFHr7/full

Pagani-Naudet, C. 2005. *Histoire d'un procédé de style. La dislocation, XIIe–XVIIe siècles*. Paris: Champion.

Pajupuu, H. & Tael, K. 1989. The acoustic parameters and the perception of certain elements of pragmatic structure. – *Fyziologick akustika, psychoakustika, akustika hudby a reci*, 298–301. The 28th Acoustic Conference on Physiological Acoustics, Psychoacoustics, Acoustics of Music and Speech. October 3–6.1989 Strbske Pleso – High Tatras, Czechoslovakia, 298–301.

Pajusalu, R. 1995. Pronominit *see*, *tema* ja *ta* viron puhekielessa. *Sananjalka, 37,* 81–93.

Pajusalu, R. 2000. *Isikule viitav nimisõnafraas argivestlustes. – Emakeele Seltsi aasta-raamat 1998–1999*. Tallinn: Emakeele Selts, 50–66.

Pajusalu, R. 2005. Anaphoric pronouns in Spoken Estonian: crossing the paradigms. R. Laury (Ed.). *Minimal reference: the use of pronouns in Finnish and Estonian discourse*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 107–134.

Pajusalu, R. 2006. Death of a demonstrative: person and time the case of Estonian *too*. – *Linguistica Uralica XLII, 4*, 241–253.

Pajusalu, R. 2009. Pronouns and reference in Estonian. – *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung, 62*(1/2), 122–139.

Paul, H. [1880] 1975. *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Halle: Niemeyer.

Pekarek-Doehler, S. 2001. Dislocation à gauche et organisation interactionnelle. – *Marges*

Linguistiques, 2, 177–194.

Pérez-Guerra, J. 1998. Integrating right-dislocated constituents: A study on cleaving and extraposition in the recent history of the English language. – *Folia Linguistica Historica XIX*, 7–25.

Pérez-*Guerra*, J. & Tizón-Couto, D. 2004. These hands they are apt enough to dislocate and tear thy flesh: On left dislocation in the recent history of the English language. *–* *ZAS Papers in Linguistics, 35*(*2*), 449–464.

Perrot, J. 1978. Fonctions syntactiques, énonciation, information. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, 73*, 85–101.

Perrot, J. 1994a. Eléments pour une typologie des structures informatives. – *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, 2*, 13–26.

Perrot, J. 1994b. L'ordre des mots dans l'énoncé-message: principes et illustrations. – *Tema, 1,* 33–50.

Picabia, L. 1991. Article zéro et structures apposées. – *Langages, 102*, 88–102.

Pierrehumbert, J. & Hirschberg, J. 1990. The meaning of intonational contours in the interpretation of discourse. P. Cohen, J. Morgan, & M. Pollack (Eds.). *Intentions in communication*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 271–311.

Prévost, S. 1998. La notion de thème: flou terminologique et conceptuel. – *Cahiers de Praxématique, 30*, 13–35.

Prévost, S. 2003. Les compléments spatiaux: du topique au focus en passant par les cadres. – *Travaux de Linguistique, 47*, 51–77.

Prince, E. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. P. Cole (Ed.). *Radical pragmatics*. New York: New York Academic Press, 223–255.

Reinhart, T. 1982. *Pragmatics and linguistics: an analysis of sentence topics*, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington.

Rossi, M. 1999**.** *L'intonation: le système du français : description et modélisation.* Paris**-**Gap: Ophrys**.**

Roulet, E. 1991. *L'articulation du discours en français contemporain.* Third edition. Berne: Peter Lang.

Roulet, E. 1996. Une approche modulaire de l'organisation topicale d'un fragment d'entretien. – *Cahiers de Linguistique Française, 18*, 11–32.

Roulet, E. 1999. *La description de l'organisation du discours. Du dialogue au texte.* Paris: Didier (Collection LAL).

Roulet, E. 2001. *Un modèle et un instrument d'analyse de l'organisation du discours* (en collab. avec L. Filliettaz. A. Grobet et M. Burger). Berne: Lang (Collection Sciences pour la communication).

Sahkai, H. 2002. *Demonstrative doubling in a cross-linguistic perspective.* Master of Art thesis. University of Tartu.

Sahkai, H. 2003. Demonstrative doubling in Spoken Estonian. – *Trames, 7*(2), 120–144.

Sahkai, H., Kalvik, M.-L., Mihkla, M. 2013a. Prosody of Contrastive Focus in Estonian. – *INTERSPEECH 2013: 14th Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association, Lyon, France, August 25–29, 2013, Proceedings.* International Speech Communication Association, 315–319.

Sahkai, H., Kalvik, M.-L., Mihkla, M. 2013b. Prosodic effects of the information structure in Estonian. – *Proceedings of International Conference: Nordic Prosody XI, Tartu, 15.-17.08.2012. (Ed.) E. L. Asu-Garcia.* Peter Lang Verlag, 323–332.

Sahkai, H. 2014. Demonstratives and Information Structure in Estonian (manuscript).

Sasse, H.-J. 1987. The thetic/categorical distinction revisited. – *Linguistics*, *25*, 511–580.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. – *Language*, *53*, 361– 382.

Schegloff, E. A. 1979. The relevance of repair to syntax-for-conversation. T. Givón (Ed.). *Disourse and syntax*. New York: Academic Press.

Schlobinsky, P. & Schütze-Coburn, S. 1992. On the topic and topic continuity. – *Linguistics, 30*, 89–121.

Selting, M. 1992. Intonation as a contextualization device: case studies on the role of prosody, especially intonation, in contextualizing storytelling in conversation.

P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.). *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Simon, A.-C. 2004. *La structuration prosodique du discours en français*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Simone, R. 1997. Une interprétation diachronique de la "dislocation à droite" dans les langues romanes. – *Langue française*, *115*, 48–61.

Skopeteas, S., Fiedler, I., Hellmuth, S., Schwarz, A., Stoel, R., Fanselow, G., Féry, C. & Krifka, M. 2006. Questionnaire on Information Structure. – ISIS, Vol. 4.

Sulkala, H. & Karjalainen, M. 1992. *Finnish*. Descriptive Grammar Series. London: Routledge.

Sörés, A. 2004. La structure informationnelle du hongrois. M. M. J. Fernandez-Vest (Ed.). *Les langues ouraliennes aujourd'hui. Approche linguistique et cognitive. – The Uralic languages today. A linguistic and cognitive approach.* Paris: Honoré Champion, 517–532.

Tael, K. 1987. Sõnajärg eesti umbisikulistes lausetes. *Dialoogi mudelid ja eesti keel.* (TrÜ toimetised 795. Töid eesti filoloogia alalt.) Tartu: Tartu Riiklik Ülikool, 86–94.

Tael. K. 1988a. *Sõnajärjemallid eesti keeles (võrrelduna soome keelega).* H. Metslang (Ed.). Preprint KKI-56, Tallinn.

Tael, K. 1988b. Infostruktuur ja lauseliigendus. – *Keel ja Kirjandus, 3*, 133–143.

Tael, K. 1988c. Referendi tuntus, mainitus ja määratus. *Noored filoloogias*, ENSV TA Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut: Tallinn.

Tael, K. 1990. *An approach to word order problems in Estonian*. CIFU-7 Debrecen, 27. august–2. september 1990. Eesti teaduste akadeemia Preprint: Tallinn.

Tannen, D. 1982. The oral/literate continuum in discourse. – D. Tannen (Ed.). *Spoken and written language*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1–16.

Tiainen-Duvallon, O. 2002. *Le pronom anaphorique et l'architecture de l'oral en finnois et en français.* Thèse de Doctorat. EPHE, Paris.

Timmis, I. 2009. 'Tails' of linguistic survival. – *Applied Linguistics, 31*, 325–345.

Tirkkonen, M.-E. 2006. *Demonstratiiv- ja kolmanda isiku pronoomenid ranniku- ja kirdemurretes.* Magistritöö. University of Tartu.

Ulrich, M. 1982. *Thetisch und kategorisch*. Tübingen: Narr.

Van Dijk, T. 1977. *Text and context. Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse.* London: Longmans.

Van Oosten, J. 1986. *The nature of subjects, topics and agents: a cognitive explanation.* Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistic Club.

Vilkuna, M. 1989. *Free word order in Finnish. Its syntax and discourse functions.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Walker, G. 2004. On some interactional and phonetic properties of increments to turns in talk-in interaction. E. Couper-Kuhlen & C. Ford (Eds.). *Sound patterns in interaction. Cross-linguistic studies from conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 147–169.

Weil, H. 1844. *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes. Question de grammaire générale*. Paris: Joubert.
https://archive.org/details/delordredesmots02weilgoog

Weinrich, H. 1989. *Grammaire textuelle du français.* Translated by G. Dalgalian and D. Malbert. Paris: Didier/Hatier.

Wundt, W. 1900. *Völkerpsychologie. 1&2. Sprache.*

Õim, H. 1973. Presuppositions and the ordering of messages. F. Kiefer (Ed.). *Trends in Soviet theoretical linguistics. Foundations of Language: Supplementary Series*, Vol. 18. Dordrecht- Boston: Reidel, 123–134.

Õunap, R. 2005. *Relatiivlause eesti keele suulises kõnes.* BA. University of Tartu.

Östman, J.-O. & Virtanen, T. 1999. Theme, comment and newness as figures of information structuring. K. van Hoek & A. Kibrik (Eds.). *Discourse studies in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 91–110.

Ziv, Y. 1994. Left and right dislocations: discourse functions and anaphora. – *Journal of Pragmatics, 22*, 629–645.

Ziv, Y. & Grosz, B. J. 1994. Right dislocation and attentional state. R. Buchalla & A. Mittwoch (Eds.). – *Papers from the Israel Association of Theoretical Linguistics Meetings.* Jerusalem: Akademon Press.

Ziv, Y. & Grosz, B. J. 1998. Centering, global focus and right dislocation. M. A. Walker, A. K. Joshi, & E. F. Prince (Eds.). *Centering theory in discourse*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 293–307.

Other corpus sources:

Eesti Ekspress, 03.10.2013

Maaleht 11.04.2013 Jüri Aarma. "Andrus Kivirähk: pole mõtet ainult kõrtsis kiruda."

Hargla, I. 2010. *Oleviste mõistatus.* Tallinn, Varrak.

Hargla, I. (forthcoming in 2015) *Apothecary Melchior and the Mystery of St Olaf's Church*. Translated by A. Cullen. London: Peter Owen.

Hargla, I. 2013. *Pirita kägistaja.* Tallinn, Varrak.

Raud, R. 2012. *Rekonstruktsioon*. Tallinn: Mustvalge.

Web sources:

http://sport.postimees.ee/1182948/veerpalu-sportlased-ongi-teistsugused

Web forum Perekool (PK)

http://www.perekool.ee/index.php?id=36679&class=forum_schnell&action=view_post&post=9302463

http://www.perekool.ee/index.php?id=110699&class=forum_schnell&action=view_post&post=9586169

http://www.perekool.ee/index.php?id=43743&class=forum_schnell&action=view_post&post=9327990

Postimees online

http://arvamus.postimees.ee/985724/martin-hallik-milleks-meile-matemaatika

EPL Delfi online

http://epl.delfi.ee/news/online/poiss-ei-taha-kooli-minna-milles asi.d?id=64899564&com=1&no=0&s=1

http://epl.delfi.ee/news/arvamus/paavo-kivine-veerpalu-kahe-tooli-vahel.d?id=65888170

KOKKUVÕTE

Käesolev doktoriväitekiri „Initial and final detachments in spoken Estonian: a study in the framework of the Information Structuring" ("Lahktarindid suulises eesti keeles: uurimus infostruktuuri raamistikus") käsitleb lahktarindeid suulises eesti keeles infostruktuuri raamistikus.

Lahktarindeid (inglise keeles *detachment constructions, dislocations*) peetakse suulises spontaanses kõnes universaalseteks konstruktsioonideks, mida kasutatakse enam mitteformaalses keelekasutuses ja suhtlussituatsioonis, kuid keeleti on nende esinemus ja funktsioonid küllaltki erinevad. Eesti keeles neid varem uuritud ei ole.

Lahktarinditena vaadeldakse käesolevas uurimuses konstruktsioone, mida iseloomustab asesõna sisaldav pealause ning kas enne või pärast pealauset esinev samaviiteline leksikaalne element (noomen(ifraas), pärisnimi, teatud juhtudel ka rõhuline asesõna).

Ettetõstetud teemaga tarind:

> muidugi **see .hh ´haridus poistel, sellest** on mul väga ´kahju

Postreemat sisaldav tarind:

> jah jah mis te ise arvate kaua **see** võib kesta **see nõupidamine**

Neid konstruktsioone on seostatud infostruktuuri tasandi ja mõistetega: kui leksikaalne element eelneb pealausele, käsitletakse seda (esiletõstetud) teemana, mille kohta pealauses (reema) midagi väidetakse. Kui leksikaalne element esineb pärast pealauset, on seda seostatud postreemaga, mis on teema ja reema kõrval kolmas infostruktuuriline üksus. Keeltes, kus esinevad käänded, on teemana esinev üksus tavaliselt nimetavas käändes, ent pärast pealauset esinev üksus on samas käändes mis pealauses asuv (katafooriline) asesõna. Nende tarindite vorm viitab üldiselt sellele, et leksikaalne element on kas tuntud või käsitletakse seda diskursuses kontekstist tuletatavana, kuna pea kõigil juhtudel on leksikaalse elemendi juures demonstratiivpronoomen *see/need*, mis viitab identifitseeritavusele.

Et eesti keele kohta ei ole tehtud infostruktuuri tasandit eraldi käsitlevaid uurimusi ning valdkond tervikuna on väga mitmeplaaniline ning probleemiderohke, antakse väitekirjas ülevaade selle valdkonna problemaatika tekkeloost ja antud väitekirja juures olulisematest allikatest. Infostruktuuri kui eraldi uurimistasandit süntaksi ja semantika kõrval eristatakse lähtuvalt Praha koolkonna töödest, mis tol ajal käsitlesid küll kirjaliku teksti struktuuri, kuid tuvastasid ja määratlesid mitmed olulised põhimõtted, mida järgnevates uurimustes on edasi arendatud ja muudele tekstiliikidele rakendatud. Käesolevas väitekirjas toetutakse ka M.M.J. Fernandez-Vesti uurimustele infostruktuuri kohta, milles ta

on sõnastanud alljärgnevad põhimõtted: minimaalne ja ainsana vajalik infoüksus on reema, mis võib koosneda ainult ühest sõnast, nt nimisõnast, mis kätkeb endas käsklust. Reema kõrval tuvastatakse infoüksusena teema (*Theme*) ning kolmanda üksusena postreema (*Post-Rheme, Mneme, Mnémème*). Sageli on suulises kõnes infoüksuste liigendusmehhanismid kas teema+reema või reema+postreema (Fernandez-Vest 2009: 252); see on asjakohane nimelt siinse uurimisteema raames, mis vaatleb konstruktsioone, kus need elemendid ei ole pealausega süntaktiliselt seotud.

Kuivõrd Eestis on prantsuskeelsed allikad mõnevõrra vähem tuntud ning prantsuskeelses traditsioonis on antud temaatikale pühendatud arvukalt uurimusi, on ülevaatesse kaasatud ka teatav hulk prantsuse keeles avaldatud töid.

Selles uurimisvaldkonnas on märkimisväärsel hulgal probleeme terminite ja nende definitsioonidega. Sageli osutatakse raskustele juba üheainsa keele siseselt, kus on korraga käibel erineval ajal kasutusele võetud termineid, mida eri koolkondades erinevalt ja pahatihti ka vastuoluliselt tõlgendatakse; lisaks sellele, kuivõrd uuritav probleemidering on käsitletav ka võrdlevates uurimustes või üldkeeleteaduslikes lähenemistes, tekitab segadust ka eri keeleruumide terminoloogiline lahknevus. Töös viidatakse ka mõnedele uurimustele, mis seda aspekti käsitlevad, kuid selle küsimuse käsitlemine ei ole käesoleva väitekirja eesmärk. Eestikeelne terminoloogia jääb seni üsna napiks: keeleteaduses on käibel üldised infostruktuuri terminid teema ja reema ning Erelt et al. Eesti keele grammatikas (1994) on eelmainitud leksikaalsete elementide kohta kasutusel mõisted eelteema ja täpsustusjätk. Need konstruktsioonid defineeritakse alljärgnevalt: eelteema on tähistab elementi, mille suhtes sellele järgnev info on oluline. Süntaktilisest vaatenurgast käsitletakse seda iseseisva fraasina (Erelt et el. 1993: 196).

> Poiss – temaga on meil palju muret.

Selle tarindi puhul on leksikaalne element reeglina nimetavas käändes ning pealauses sisalduv pronoomen võib olla põhimõtteliselt kõigis käänetes, kuid korpuse põhjal on kõige sagedasemateks nimetav, millele järgnevad osastav kääne, kohamäärsõnad seal, seda, esineb ka omastavat, kaasaütlevat, seestütlevat käänet.

Täpsustusjätku määratletakse eesti keele grammatikas kui elementi, mis lisab midagi lause moodustajale ning on samas vormis pealause asesõnaga.

> Ta on tore poiss, see sinu vend.

Eesti keeles ei ole seni kasutatud eraldi terminit tähistamaks neid konstruktsioone üldiselt (*detachment*), sestap on käesolevas töös välja pakutud mõiste *lahktarind*. Terminite *eelteema* ja *täpsustusjätk* eeliseks on nende n-ö läbipaistvus, kuid veidi problemaatiline on *eelteema* mitmetimõistetavus – termin viitaks justkui ka asjaolule, et tegemist on teemale eelneva elemendiga, samas

kui see konstruktsioon ise ongi teemaks. *Täpsustusjätk* viitab funktsioonile, mida sellele tarindile kõige sagedamini omistatakse, ehkki ka käesolevas töös satub see aspekt mõnevõrra kahtluse alla. Oluline oleks hoida lahus ühelt poolt infostruktuuri tasandi üksuste nimetused ja teiselt poolt vaatlusaluste tarindite nimetused.

Väitekirja ülesehitus on järgmine: esmalt tehakse sissejuhatus infostruktuuri temaatikasse ja probleemideringi üldisemalt, seejärel käsitletakse käesolevas töös kasutatud lähenemise väljakujunemist ning mõjutusi. Seejärel antakse ülevaade enamikust eesti keelt käsitlevatest uurimustest, milles on kasutatud infostruktuuri mõisteid, ehkki need tööd on üldiselt süntaksi vallast ning ei oma käesoleva uurimusega väga palju kokkupuutepunkte. Korpuse analüüsi käigus vaadeldakse kaht vaatlusalust tüüpi lahktarindit eraldi.

Väitekirja eesmärgiks on määratleda eesti suulises kõnes esinevate tüüpilisemate lahktarindite vormilised omadused ja funktsioonid, vaadelda nende konstruktsioonide toimimist lausungite ja diskursuse infostruktuurilise ülesehituse seisukohalt, kirjeldada lahktarindites esinevate referentide informatsioonilist staatust (varem mainitud ehk antud, diskursuse üldisest raamistikust tuletatav ehk ligipääsetav, eelnevaga seostamatu ehk uus, referendi püsivus edaspidises kõnes) ning nende rolli pikemate kõneüksuste referentsiaalse ühtsuse tagamisel. Referentide staatuse määratlemisel ei ole lähtutud konkreetsete skaalade jaotustest, nagu näiteks E. Prince'i või W. Chafe'i referendi ligipääsetavuse skaalad, kuna need sisaldavad paratamatult üleminekuid kontiinuumina ning püüd väga detailselt referendi tuntust tuvastada (ka formaalsete tunnuste alusel) ei tundunud ka kasutatud korpust arvesse võttes asjakohane, kuna mitmes aspektis sisaldavad need skaalad siiski oletatavuse/eeldatavuse dimensiooni. Lisaks sellele käsitletakse siinses töös diskursust dünaamilise protsessina, mille käigus referentide staatus järk-järgult muutub vastavalt uute referentide sissetoomisele või varasemate referentide uuesti mainimisele ning seega on keeruline omistada selle protsessi käigus referentidele niisuguseid absoluutseid väärtusi. Referendi staatuse määratlemisel lähtutakse tunnustest, mida antud korpuse näidete raames on võimalik tuvastada, st kas referent on eelnevalt mainitud või mitte, kas ta on diskursuse temaatilisest raamistikust tuletatav või eelnenud vestlusega seostamata. Kõnelejate varasema suhtluse või ühiste teadmiste kohta ei ole võimalik oletusi teha.

Suulise kõne näited pärinevad kolmest allikast: Tartu Ülikooli suulise kõne korpusest, kahest Eesti Kirjandusmuuseumi intervjuust ning Tartu Ülikooli eesti keele spontaanse kõne foneetilisest korpusest.

Alljärgnevas tutvustatakse väitekirja osade kaupa põhjalikumalt.

Käesolev töö lähtub Praha koolkonna uurimustest laiemalt levima hakanud põhimõttest, et keeles on eraldi uuritav infostruktuuri tasand, mis eristub süntaksist ja semantilisest tasandist. Infostruktuuri ehk keele pragmaatilise liigenduse tasand on universaalne, morfosüntaks aga määratleb keelespetsiifilised piirangud, kuid tähendus tekib nende kahe tasandi koostoimes (Fernandez-Vest 1994:

197). Ülevaates infostruktuuri käsitlevate tööde kohta peatükkides 2–3 tuuakse pärast lühikest ajaloolist sissejuhatust esmalt esile mõned läbivad probleemide-ringid (terminoloogia, eelkõige erinevate ja vastuoluliste terminite rohkus, erinevate keeleuurimise valdkondade kokkupuuted selle tasandiga ja sellest tulenevad raskused) ning seejärel käsitletakse lähemalt käesoleva väitekirja raames olulisi uurimusi, millest enamik käsitleb infostruktuuri temaatikat teksti või diskursuse tasandil. Lisaks sellele tehakse lühikesed sissevaated mitmesse probleemistikku, millel on kokkupuuteid käesoleva töö uurimisküsimustega, kuid mille põhjalik käsitlemine ei kuulu siiski käesoleva töö põhieesmärkide hulka, kuna tegemist on esimese üldisema käsitlusega: teksti ehk diskursuse tasand versus lausungi tasand, kirjaliku ja suulise keelekasutuse eripärad, pro-soodiaga seotud küsimused.

Peatükk 4 teeb sissevaate eesti keelt käsitlevatesse uurimustesse, milles on kasutatud infostruktuuri mõisteid, enamasti süntaksiuurimise valdkonnas.

Viies peatükk käsitleb eraldi infostruktuuri tasandi üksusi teema ja post-reema; antakse ülevaade definitsioonidest, mis on asjakohased käesoleva väite-kirja teoreetilises raamistikus ning selgitatakse, missugune lähenemine siinses töös valiti. Teema on infostruktuuri üksus, mis on leidnud väga laialdast käsit-lust ning osutunud seetõttu ka kõige problemaatilisemaks. Siin töös lähtutakse Praha koolkonna töödest tulenevast määratlusest, mille kohaselt teema on see, mille kohta reemas midagi väidetakse. Kuivõrd antud töö käsitleb ainult teatavaid konstruktsioone, milles leksikaalne element ongi esile tõstetud, kas reema ees või selle järel, siis ei olnud vajadust seda definitsiooni põhjalikumalt kohandada. Postreema puhul on seosed kitsamad selles mõttes, et kui ettetõstetud teema puhul on lahktarind ainult üheks teema vormistamise võimaluseks, siis postreemat kui infostruktuuri tasandi üksust ongi eelkõige vormiliselt seostatud vastava lahktarindiga ning palju muid võimalusi tuvastatud ei ole.

Kuuendas peatükis kirjeldatakse lahktarindeid keeltes üldiselt kui universaal-seid konstruktsioone spontaanses suulises kõnes: käsitlemist leiavad nende vormilised, semantilised omadused, stilistilised jooned ning nende esinemise sagedus. Tuuakse ka mõned näited kirjalikest tekstidest eesti keeles, mille puhul võib ka täheldada, et selle tarindi kasutamise ajendiks ei ole tõenäoliselt n-ö suulise keele imiteerimine, vaid et sellel konstruktsioonil on ka kirjalikus keele-kasutuses spetsiifilisi funktsioone, mida võiks vastavate keelekorpuste abil lähe-malt uurida, ehkki teatud tüüpi kirjalikes tekstides, nt formaalses keelekasu-tuses, neid tarindeid arvatavasti ei esine. Eri keelte puhul on nende tarindite analüüsi juures olnud ka rõhuasetus mõnevõrra erinev – inglise keele kohta on Geluykens 1992 väitnud, et n-ö topiku konstruktsioonid toovad sisse uusi (*irrecoverable*), st eelnevaga seostamata referente, prantsuse keele kohta on aga väidetud, et see omadus kehtib ainult pooltel juhtudest ning enamasti on nende tarindite eesmärgiks pikemate kõneüksuste liigendamine (Ashby 1988).

Seitsmes peatükk analüüsib korpuse näidete põhjal ettetõstetud teemat sisaldavaid tarindeid, mis on vormiliste tunnuste alusel jagatud kolme rühma:

esiteks näited, mis pärinevad küsilausetest, teiseks näited, kus teemale järgneb veel seda täpsustav relatiivlause ning kolmandaks ülejäänud näited.

Eesti keele näidete põhjal võib nende tarindite funktsioonid ja omadused kokku võtta alljärgnevalt:

Lahktarindi referent on kas suhtlussituatsioonis või diskursuses olemas, st varem mainitud. Lahktarindi abil tuuakse sisse ka varem mainitud referenti mõnest uuest vaatenurgast, enamasti kontrastina või juhtudel, mil vahepeal on juttu olnud muudest referentidest.

Sageli esineb ka juhtusid, kus lahktarindi referent on osa mingist suuremast rühmast või komplektist, millest ta ühe illustreeriva näitena esile tõstetakse või kasutatakse kõneleja argumentatsiooni toetuseks. Tihti on see tarind üks element järjestikuse loendi näol sissetoodavatest referentidest.

Narratiivsetes või monoloogilistes lõikudes võimaldab ettetõstetud teema ka tulla tagasi mõne varasema mõtte juurde või võtta kokku kogu pikem lõik – seda ka juhtudel, mil antud referenti varem selgelt mainitud pole. Nendel juhtudel on tegemist sageli abstraktsemate mõistetega ning lahktarindi funktsiooniks on diskursuse üldisem liigendamine.

Mõnel juhul tuuakse lahktarindiga sisse ka uus referent, kuid see ei tundu olevat suulises kõnes selle konstruktsiooni põhifunktsiooniks; niisuguste näidete puhul viiakse uue referendi sissetoomisega läbi näiteks perspektiivi muutus, kuid referent ei jää diskursuses pikemalt püsima. Erijuhuks tunduvad olevat küsilaused, kus varem mainimata referentide osakaal on suurem, kuid nendes näidetes täidavad lahktarindid diskursust struktureerivat ülesannet teatava temaatilise raamistiku siseselt, kus näiteks esitatakse järjestikuseid küsimusi teatud teenuste kohta. Mõnikord piirdub vastus ühe lausungiga, kuid esineb ka näiteid, kus järgnevate voorudes lisandub veel küsimusi.

Ettetõstetud teemaga lahktarind võimaldab suulisele kõnele tüüpiliselt edastada infot jaokaupa, mainides esmalt lihtsas vormis (nimetavas käändes) teemat, mille kohta pealause midagi väidetakse või küsitakse. Kui diskursusesse tuuakse sisse kõrvaline või varem otseselt mainimata referent, aitab lahktarindi kasutamine infot kergemini töödelda ja esitada. Vahel illustreerib seda aspekti ka asjaolu, et pealauses parandatakse pronoomeni ainsuse/mitmuse ühildumist ning on ka tõenäoline, et niisugune kaheosaline tarind aitab kuulaja tähelepanu paremini köita.

Kaheksandas peatükis analüüsitakse pealausele järgneva postreemana toimivat leksikaalset üksust sisaldavaid lausungeid. Selle peatüki näited on jagatud nelja rühma vastavalt funktsionaalsetele joontele: esiteks, pikemat lõiku kokkuvõtvad tarindid, teiseks referentsiaalses raamistikus või situatsioonis olemasoleva referendiga tarindid (hõlmab põhimõtteliselt ka esimest rühma), kolmandaks uut referenti sissetoovad konstruktsioonid ja neljandaks enam parandusmehhanismiga sarnanevad näited, kus lahktarind toetab selgemalt formuleerimisprotsessi ja sisaldab ka vastavaid tunnuseid. Postreema puhul on ammuseks küsimuseks, kas selle põhifunktsioon on täpsustav-parandav ehk kas see tarind

on kõnes algselt niisugusena planeeritud või otsustab kõneleja seda kasutada siis, kui pronoomeni abil antud referent jäi tema hinnangul ebaselgeks, või on tal kõnes ka muid ülesandeid. Infostruktuuri eraldi tasandina käsitlevad autorid on väitnud, et nimetatud tarind omab selget rolli ka diskursuse ühtsuse tagamisel (Fernandez-Vest) ning ka muudes teoreetilistes raamistikes on leitud, et nendel tarinditel on suulises kõnes mitmeid erinevaid ülesandeid (nt Horlacher 2012 konversatsioonianalüüsi vaatenurgast).

Korpuse analüüsi põhjal võib väita, et selle tarindi üks funktsioone eesti suulises kõnes on reema esiplaanile asetamine ja selle arendamine, mida oli näha näidetest, kus pealause sisaldas kõneleja argumentatsiooni või diskursuse struktureerimise seisukohast kaalukat sisu. Sellisel juhul on põhirõhk pealauses sisalduval predikaadil ning referendi lõplik identifitseerimine leksikaalse elemendi näol jäetakse sellest protsessist väljapoole. Võib ka arvata, et selle konstruktsiooni kasutamine aitab pealause töötlemist lihtsustada, näiteks juhtudel, mil lahktarindi leksikaalne element ei jää vestluse püsima olulise referendina, vaid on lihtsalt marginaalne näide – tihti on siis leksikaalne element kohakäändes.

Nagu ka ettetõstetud teemaga tarindite puhul, on ka postreemaga konstruktsiooni puhul oluline aspekt võimalus infot eraldi üksuste kaupa esitada (esmalt pronoomen pealauses ja seejärel leksikaalne element selle järel); see lubab sujuvamalt diskursusesse sisse tuua vähem tuntud referente järkjärgulise protsessi kaudu, kus pronoomen avab n-ö võimaliku tõlgendusvälja ning leksikaalne element lausungi lõpus viib selle protsessi lõpule. Ka eelnevaga täiesti seostamatute referentide sissetoomine ei tekitanud diskursuse loomise ega vastuvõtmise juures probleeme.

Teatud hulk postreemat sisaldavaid tarindeid tunduvad olevat eesti keeles laialt levinud ning niisugustena ka kõnelejate poolt planeeritud: need ei sisalda mitte mingeid toimetamismarkereid ega pause ning kõneleja otsus seda tarindit kasutada ei paista lähtuvat tundest, et pealause pronoomen üksi jääb ebaselgeks ja vajab hiljem leksikaalse elemendi näol täpsustamist, vaid kõneleja on lähtunud muudest, tõenäoliselt diskursuse struktureerimise, referendi informatsioonilise staatuse ning sellest tuleneva diskursuse väiksemate üksuste kaupa edastamisega seotud kaalutlustest.

Pikemate narratiivsete lõikude puhul on täheldatav spetsiifilisem referentsiaalset või argumentatiivset ühtsust tagav funktsioon; lahktarindiga on võimalus pakkuda kogu pikemale lõigule uus tõlgendus ning vastav referent võib olla mainitud vestluses väga ammu, kuid vaatlusalune konstruktsioon võimaldab ta väiksema pingutusega uuesti sisse tuua ning selle tarindi eripära lubab ühelt poolt esitada referenti n-ö ligipääsetavana ja teiselt poolt ka kuulajal mitmejärgulise protsessi käigus referendi sissetoomisega kohaneda.

Näidete puhul, mis sisaldavad selgeid parandusmarkereid, on parandusmehhanismid seotud eelkõige ainsuse/mitmuse ja referendi semantikaga. Mõnedel piiripealsetel juhtudel tundub pronoomen käituvat pigem kohatäitja kui tüüpilise samaviitelise pronoomeniga – niisugustes näidetes on selgelt tegu

täpse referendi formuleerimise püüdega ning pronoomen osaleb kõne koostamise ja edasilükkamise protsessis. Niisugused näited esindavad pigem konstruktsioone, mida tuntakse termini *afterthought* all, kus tõepoolest lausungi järkjärgulise formuleerimise juures ilmneb kõnelejapoolne selgem kavatsus midagi pealausele lisada.

Diskursusepartiklid mängivad olulist rolli lausungite informatsioonilisel liigendamisel: teema-reema ja reema-postreema üleminekul leiame mitmeid erinevaid partikleid; esines ka pause, kuid ei olnud võimalik tuvastada mingit reeglipära. Juhtudel, kui teemas sisalduv leksikaalne element jäi näiteks relatiivlause tõttu pronoomenist üsna kaugele, oli partikli kasutamine tõenäolisem, kuid kõik need aspektid vajaksid edaspidi põhjalikumat vaatlemist. Tüüpiline oli ka partiklite *aga* ja *aga näiteks* kasutamine teatud temaatilises raamistikus uute referentide sissetoomiseks.

Infostruktuuri seisukohalt võib üldiselt öelda, et lahktarindiga vestlusse toodud referendid ei jää väga pikalt püsima – enamasti ei ole seega tegemist vestluse kesksete elementidega, kuid olulisemad tunduvadki just nende tarindite erinevad võimalused kõrvalisemate, keerukama formuleeringuga (pikk noomenifraas) ning mitmesuguse informatsioonilise staatusega referentide sissetoomiseks ja diskursuse struktureerimiseks.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Marri Amon
Date of birth: 03.08.1974
Citizenship: Estonian
Address: Eha 20-19 Tartu 50108
Phone: +3725244604
E-mail: marri.amon@ut.ee

Education:
University of Tartu, PhD student 1998–2008, 2011–2014
E.S.I.T (Pariis), 2002, conference interpretation, MA
Université de Paris III La Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1997, D.E.A.
University of Tartu, 1996, *baccalaureus artium* (French language and literature)

Professional experience:
2006– lecturer of Romance philology, University of Tartu

Publications:

Amon, M. 2008. La progression informationnelle: aspects textuels. Montes, S., Taverna, L. (Eds.). La Mère Sauvage de Maupassant. Une nouvelle face à ses méthodologies. *Synergies, Pays Riverains de la Baltique. GERFLINT*. Tallinn: University of Tallinn, 37–52.

Amon, M. 2009. Les détachements finaux en estonien oral: productivité et fonctionnement. M.M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest; Danh Thanh Do-Hurinville (Ed.). Plurilinguisme et traduction – des enjeux pour l'Europe. Paris: L'Harmattan, 151–164.

Amon, M. (forthcoming). Le détachement initial en estonien parlé: son rôle dans la construction et la structuration du discours. *Études finno-ougriennes*, *47*.

ELULOOKIRJELDUS

Nimi: Marri Amon
Sünniaeg: 3. august 1974
Kodakondsus: Eesti
Aadress: Eha 20-19 Tartu 50108
Telefon: +3725244604
E-post: marri.amon@ut.ee

Haridus:
Tartu Ülikool, doktorant 1998–2008, 2011–2014
E.S.I.T (Pariis), 2002, kutsemagister, konverentsitõlge
Université de Paris III La Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1997, D.E.A (magistrikraad)
Tartu Ülikool, 1996, bakalaureusekraad

Teenistuskäik:
alates 2006 romaani filoloogia lektor, Tartu Ülikool

Publikatsioonid:

Amon, M. 2008. La progression informationnelle: aspects textuels. Montes, S., Taverna, L. (Toim.). La Mère Sauvage de Maupassant. Une nouvelle face à ses méthodologies. *Synergies, Pays Riverains de la Baltique. GERFLINT*. Tallinn: Tallinna Ülikool, 37–52.

Amon, M. 2009. Les détachements finaux en estonien oral: productivité et fonctionnement. M.M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest; Danh Thanh Do-Hurinville (Toim.). *Plurilinguisme et traduction – des enjeux pour l'Europe*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 151–164.

Amon, M. (ilmumas). Le détachement initial en estonien parlé: son rôle dans la construction et la structuration du discours. *Études finno-ougriennes*, *47*.

DISSERTATIONES LINGUISTICAE
UNIVERSITATIS TARTUENSIS

1. **Anna Verschik.** Estonian yiddish and its contacts with coterritorial languages. Tartu, 2000, 196 p.
2. **Silvi Tenjes.** Nonverbal means as regulators in communication: socio-cultural perspectives. Tartu, 2001, 214 p.
3. **Ilona Tragel.** Eesti keele tuumverbid. Tartu, 2003, 196 lk.
4. **Einar Meister.** Promoting Estonian speech technology: from resources to prototypes. Tartu, 2003, 217 p.
5. **Ene Vainik.** Lexical knowledge of emotions: the structure, variability and semantics of the Estonian emotion vocabulary. Tartu, 2004, 166 p.
6. **Heili Orav.** Isiksuseomaduste sõnavara semantika eesti keeles. Tartu, 2006, 175 lk.
7. **Larissa Degel.** Intellektuaalsfäär intellektuaalseid võimeid tähistavate sõnade kasutuse põhjal eesti ja vene keeles. Tartu, 2007, 225 lk.
8. **Meelis Mihkla.** Kõne ajalise struktuuri modelleerimine eestikeelsele tekst-kõne sünteesile. Modelling the temporal stucture of speech for the Estonian text-to-speech synthesis. Tartu, 2007, 176 lk.
9. **Mari Uusküla.** Basic colour terms in Finno-Ugric and Slavonic languages: myths and facts. Tartu, 2008, 207 p.
10. **Petar Kehayov.** An Areal-Typological Perspective to Evidentiality: the Cases of the Balkan and Baltic Linguistic Areas. Tartu, 2008, 201 p.
11. **Ann Veismann.** Eesti keele kaas- ja määrsõnade semantika võimalusi. Tartu, 2009, 145 lk.
12. **Erki Luuk.** The noun/verb and predicate/argument structures. Tartu, 2009, 99 p.
13. **Andriela Rääbis.** Eesti telefonivestluste sissejuhatus: struktuur ja suhtlus-funktsioonid. Tartu, 2009, 196 lk.
14. **Liivi Hollman.** Basic color terms in Estonian Sign Language. Tartu, 2010, 144 p.
15. **Jane Klavan.** Evidence in linguistics: corpus-linguistic and experimental methods for studying grammatical synonymy. Tartu, 2012, 285 p.
16. **Krista Mihkels.** Keel, keha ja kaardikepp: õpetaja alagatatud parandus-sekventside multimodaalne analüüs. Tartu, 2013, 242 lk.
17. **Sirli Parm.** Eesti keele ajasõnade omandamine. Tartu, 2013, 190 lk.
18. **Rene Altrov.** The Creation of the Estonian Emotional Speech Corpus and the Perception of Emotions. Tartu, 2014, 145 p.
19. **Jingyi Gao.** Basic Color Terms in Chinese: Studies after the Evolutionary Theory of Basic Color Terms. Tartu, 2014, 248 p.
20. **Diana Maisla.** Eesti keele mineviku ajavormid vene emakeelega üliõpi-laste kasutuses. Tartu, 2014, 149 lk.

21. **Kersten Lehismets.** Suomen kielen väylää ilmaisevien adpositioiden *yli*, *läpi*, *kautta* ja *pitkin* kognitiivista semantiikkaa. Tartu, 2014, 200 lk.
22. **Ingrid Rummo.** A Case Study of the Communicative Abilities of a Subject with Mosaic Patau Syndrome. Tartu, 2015, 270 p.
23. **Liisi Piits.** Sagedamate inimest tähistavate sõnade kollokatsioonid eesti keeles. Tartu, 2015, 164 p.