

## The Pragmatics of Main Clause Preposing in Japanese Spoken Discourse

Yoko FUJII<sup>\*1)</sup>

### 日本語の会話文における主節前置の談話語用論的分析

藤 井 洋 子

#### 要 旨

本研究は、日本語の副詞節＋主節のような複文の節順について、実際の会話文をデータとして談話語用論的分析を行ったものである。日本語の複文の節順は、副詞節＋主節という節順が普通であるが、実際の会話文では主節＋副詞節という有標の節順が起こる。本論文では、1) 日本語の複文における節順に対する規則、及び2) 主節前置の談話語用論的要因を探った。2) に関しては、自由な語順をもつ言語、すなわち語用論的要因によって語順が決定されることの多い言語の単文での文頭要素の特徴と比較しながら、談話内の話題性を中心に分析を行い、単文の文頭要素との共通点があるか否かの検証を試みた。

結果として、1) 日本語の一般的節順は、会話のエピソード中の出来事の時間的経過、及び、原因－結果、理由－結果、条件－結果、のような論理的経過を表す順序と一致すること、すなわち、これらを認知する人間の知覚的順序と一致すること、2) 主節前置は、a) 会話のエピソードの流れの中で、主節と先行する文がより密接な関係を持ち、エピソードの出来事の時間的経過、及び前述のような論理的経過を表す順序に忠実に従うために起こること、b) 主節そのものが、質問、質問に関する答え、焦点要素の存在、否定、文要素の強調などの語用論的に有標な情報を伝達する役割を持ち、その部分に焦点を当てる為に起こるということがわかった。そして、語用論的有標性が要因となる場合は、たとえ普通の節順、すなわち副詞節＋主節が前述のような時間的経過、ならびに論理的経過との一致をみていたとしても、これに優先することが明らかになった。

これらのことは、自由な語順をもつ言語の単文における文頭要素が果たす機能と、日本語の有標の節順における主節が果たす機能とが共通することを示唆しており、それらはまた、話し手の、会話参加者および会話の流れに対する認知状態が語順にどのように作用するかを示したものである。

---

\*1) 放送大学助教授 (外国語)

## 1. Introduction

Japanese is a strict predicate final language. Various constituent orderings, however, including predicate preposing occur in spoken discourse (see Hinds 1982; Clancy 1982; Fujii 1991; Ono and Suzuki 1992). Besides, not only constituent orderings but also clause orderings vary in real spontaneous conversations. This study observes the variation of clause orderings and specifically examines main clause preposing in Japanese spoken discourse.

The unmarked ordering of main and adverbial clauses<sup>1)</sup> in Japanese is adverbial-main ordering. Since Japanese is an agglutinative language and adverbial clauses ordinarily have the structure of clause plus conjunctive morpheme (for example, clause + *toki* 'when' - simultaneity, clause + *tara* 'if' - conditional, and clause + *keredo* 'although' - concession), the main-adverbial ordering, where the sentence ends with a conjunctive morpheme, gives the impression that the sentence is incomplete. Thus, *Tomodachi-wa terebi-o mite-imashi-ta, watashi-ga tazune-ta-toki* "My friend was watching TV when I visited her/him" is the marked clause ordering in Japanese. However, the marked ordering does occur<sup>2)</sup> in Japanese spoken discourse. This paper focuses on the occurrence of the marked clause ordering, in particular, main clause preposing, and examines: 1) clause order principles in Japanese and; 2) underlying motivating pragmatic factors of main clause preposing. The data used for this study is six thirty-five minute TV interviews.

## 2. Clause order principles in Japanese

Osgood (1980) has made a distinction between natural word order and salient word order in natural languages. While the natural word order is determined by perception basis, the salient word order carries a speaker's interests, involvement, focus, etc. (Tai 1983). According to his definition, the naturalness principle for

<sup>1)</sup> By 'adverbial' clauses, I mean clauses which express a time, a condition, a concession, a cause, a reason, or a manner in the same way as adverbs do in a clause. These have traditionally been called 'subordinate' clauses; however, since it is possible and very common in Japanese spoken discourse to have a clause-chaining construction (see below) which expresses meanings such as a time, a condition or others mentioned above, the term 'adverbial' rather than 'subordinate' can be adopted for those clauses.

Following Givón (1984 : 310), 'clause-chaining construction' is defined as the one where information is presented in long "chains" or thematic paragraphs without any conjunction(s) and in which mood, speech act and tense/modality are coded only in the paragraph-final clause. The assumption here is that non-final asserted verbs must have the same values as the final one, with respect to the above categories. In Japanese, co-ordinate clauses such as ... *shite* 'doing such and such ...' or ... *shi* 'doing such and such ...' can be considered clause-chaining constructions.

<sup>2)</sup> The proportion of marked to unmarked clause orderings in the present data is one to five.

sentencing is that : *the more sentences correspond in their surface forms to the cognitive structures developed in prelinguistic perceptuo-motor experience, the earlier they will be understood and produced by children and the more easily they will be processed in both comprehending and expressing by adults.* Thus, the distinction between naturalness and unnaturalness in English complex sentences is (the examples from Osgood (1980)) :

#### Natural

*After* she stuffed the turkey she roasted it.  
 She stuffed the turkey *before* she roasted it.  
*Because* she fell in love with John she went on a diet.  
 John drilled a hole in the coconut *in order to* drink its milk.  
*Although* it was stifling hot he wore his heavy sweater.  
*Although* he searched through all his pockets he couldn't find the wedding ring.

#### Unnatural

She roasted it *after* she stuffed the turkey.  
*Before* she roasted it she stuffed the turkey.  
 She went on a diet *because* she fell in love with John.  
*In order to* drink its milk John drilled a hole in the coconut.  
 He wore his heavy sweater *although* it was stifling hot.  
 He couldn't find the wedding ring *although* he searched through all his pockets.

Notice that the natural orderings are identical with the temporal order of event sequence or the logical order of causal state or event before effect state or event. The syntactic alignment of these natural orderings is mostly adverbial-main ordering except 'before' and 'in order to.' This implies that the unmarked ordering of adverbial-main clauses in Japanese is compatible with the natural order of human perception. Thus,

#### Natural

Kanojowa hao migaite-*kara* neta.  
 'After she brushed her teeth, she went to bed.'  
 Kanojowa hao migaita, neru-*maeni*.  
 'She brushed her teeth *before* she went to bed.'  
 Ame-ga hutta-*node* kouen-ni ikanakatta.  
 'Because it rained, I didn't go to the park.'  
 Kanojowa teo aratta, ryoorio suru-*tameni*.  
 'She washed her hands *in order to* cook.'  
 Toshokan-ni itta-*keredo* monga shimatteita.  
 'Although I went to the library, it was closed.'

#### Unnatural

Kanojowa neta, hao migaite-*kara*.  
 'She went to bed *after* she brushed her teeth.'  
 Kanojowa neru-*maeni* hao migaita.  
 'Before she went to bed she brushed her teeth.'  
 Kouen-ni ikanakatta, amega hutta-*node*.  
 'I didn't go to the park *because* it rained.'  
 Kanojowa ryoorio suru-*tameni* teo aratta.  
 'In order to cook she washed her hands.'  
 Monga shimatteita, toshokan-ni itta-*keredo*.  
 'It was closed *although* I went to the library.'

### 3. Motivating pragmatic factors of main clause preposing

#### 3.1. Motivating pragmatic factors of word order variation

Given the fact that most unmarked orderings of main-adverbial clauses in Japanese conform with natural order of human perception, the next question is when the unmarked ordering is violated in Japanese spoken discourse. In other words, what are the motivating factors for the occurrence of marked clause ordering ; that is, main clause preposing ?

Fujii (1992) found that all the preposed main clauses in the data code some pragmatically marked information. Pragmatically marked information is defined as the information which holds pragmatically marked/non-neutral relations to the context (Payne 1985, 1990). It includes ; single focus contrast, multiple (usually double) focus contrast, counter expectation, restatement, added detail restatement, questions and answers to information questions, threats, an assertion which is counter to cultural or situational expectations, negation of the constituent, heightened degree of the quality expressed by a constituent, and other non-neutral communicative intents (Payne 1990). Payne's findings (1987) show that the components which code these pragmatically marked information come in the pre-verbal position, that is, the initial position of a clause, in Papago, a fully-flexible word order language.

Another significant finding by Payne is that indefinite NPs precede the verb. Table 1 clearly shows these two findings.

Table 1 Preverbal vs. postverbal position relative to indefinite and definite statuses (Payne 1987)

	PREVERBAL		POSTVERBAL		TOTAL	
Indefinite	125	83%	26	17%	151	100%
Definite	6	2%	278	98%	284	100%
Prag. marked	38	95%	2	5%	40	100%
Other	1		4		5	
Total	170		310		480	

Givón (1988 : 275) has presented two factors controlling word-order pragmatics in fully-flexible languages on the basis of the similar word-order characteristics from the evidence of other fully-flexible word order languages (Givón 1983 ; Rude 1985 ; Mithun 1986 *inter alia*). Thus :

- (1) a. Relative predictability: 'Given the preceding discourse context, less predictable

- information is fronted' ;
- b. Relative importance : 'Given the thematic organization of the discourse, more important information is fronted'.

Further, he established the following principle :

- (2) Principle of communicative task urgency :

'A communicative task is more urgent when the information to be communicated is either *less predictable* or *more important*.'

What he claims here is that either less predictable information, that is, NPs with low topic continuity from the preceding discourse such as indefinite, new NPs, or more important information, that is, NPs with high topic continuity to the succeeding discourse, is fronted. The two factors are not complementary although one can overrule the other.

Although these findings are contrary to the Praguean old/given-new word order tradition, such is the case for clauses in spoken discourse in Japanese as well, which is not a fully-flexible but a relatively rigid SOV word-order type language. Fujii (1989, 1991) found that 73.91% of postposed clause elements show active or semi-active NPs (both are so-called old/given information, which are compatible to 'Definite' in Table 1) and 81.37% of the preposed VP carries some pragmatically marked information, (which is compatible to 'Prag. marked' in Table 1).

The issues to be discussed in this section, therefore, are : 1) whether less predictability or more thematic importance is a motivating factor of main clause preposing or if not, whether there are other motivating factors and ; 2) what kind of pragmatically marked information is a motivating factor for main clause preposing.

### 3.2. Thematic continuity of preposed main clauses

The above mentioned 'Relative predictability' (1 a) and 'Relative importance' (1 b) has a high implication to referential distance (unpredictability) and topic persistence (importance) respectively by Givón's topic continuity counting (1983)<sup>3)</sup>. Since the

---

<sup>3)</sup> The topic continuity counting is basically established for NP referents. The most current version of these text-measures is given below (Givón 1988) :

Discourse measurements of topicality

Anaphoric (Psychological dimension : 'Predictability') :

- a. Referential Distance (RD) : The number of clauses to the last occurrence in the preceding discourse ;
- b. Potential Interference (PI) : The number of semantically compatible referents within the preceding 3 clauses ;

Cataphoric (Psychological dimension : 'Importance') :

- c. Persistence : The number of recurrences of the referent in the subsequent 10 clauses.

issue here is not the referential distance of NP referents but that of main clauses, 'scope' is defined and measured in order to assess the thematic predictability of preposed main clauses; that is, the connection that exists between a preposed main clause and the preceding discourse. Following Ramsay (1987), I counted the number of clauses to the left of each main clause, which were necessary in order to understand the target<sup>4)</sup> clause. The number of 20+ clauses was assigned arbitrarily if the scope exceeded that number<sup>5)</sup>. I illustrate 'scope' in the following example:

- (3) A : Kore juunana-mai haite -iru -N -desu, sukaato.  
           this seventeen-CL<sup>6)</sup> wear -PRG -NM -COP, skirt.  
       B : Are, de, kore haite o -yome -ni iku -wake.  
           that, then, this wear HON -bride -DAT go -reason.  
       A : Sou-na -N -desu.  
           yes-COP -NM -COP.  
       B : *Omoi -deshou -ne, sore -wa -ne, ikura karada -ni*  
           heavy-COP -SP, that -TOP-SP, even body -DAT  
           tsukete-ru -mon -demo.  
           put.on -PRG -thing -although.  
  
       'A : This (photo shows that) she is wearing seventeen skirts.  
       B : Ah, then, does she get married wearing these skirts?  
       A : Yes.  
       B : *They must be heavy* even though she is wearing them (although she is not holding them).'

Notice that in order to understand the italicized preposed main clause, one needs to look back 2 clauses to the left *kore haite oyomeni ikuwake* 'does she get married wearing these skirts?', where the referent of the elided subject of the preposed main clause, *sorera* 'they' can be found in *kore* 'this.' Thus, the scope of this preposed main clause is in the prior two clauses.

In a similar way, thematic importance (persistence) is measured by counting the number of recurrences of the theme of the preposed main clause in the subsequent 10

<sup>4)</sup> The concept of measuring scope and the means of measuring it are similar to the methodology for counting referential distance (Givón 1983; Fujii 1991), the main difference being that with preposed main clauses one has to look for a previous reference for *an entire clause*.

<sup>5)</sup> This is also following Givón's (1983) methodology.

<sup>6)</sup> Abbreviations used in this paper are as follows:

ACC : accusative	CL : classifier	COP : copula
DAT : dative	DEST : destination	EXCL : exclamation
GEN : genitive	GER : gerund	HON : honorifics
INST : instrumental	LOC : locative	NEG : negative
NM : nominalizer	NOM : nominative	ONOMA : onomatopoeia
POL : polite form	PRG : progressive	PST : past
QU : question particle	SP : sentence particle	TOP : topic marker

clauses.

The following table illustrates thematic predictability (scope to the left) and thematic importance (persistence) of preposed main clauses :

Table 2 Thematic predictability and importance of preposed main clauses

Scope (Predictability)	No. of clauses	Percentage (%)	Persistence (Importance)	No. of clauses	Percentage (%)
0	13	23.64	0	15	27.27
$1 \leq x \leq 3$	39	70.91	1	13	23.64
$4 \leq x \leq 11$	0	0.00	$2 \leq x \leq 5$	15	27.27
$12 \leq x$	3	5.45	$6 \leq x \leq 10$	12	21.82
Total	55	100.00	Total	55	100.00

The scope of preposed main clauses indicates that the thematic predictability from the preceding context is very high since 70.91% of preposed main clauses have their scope between 1 to 3 in the preceding discourse. Furthermore, thematic importance is relatively high as well, that is, 49.09% of preposed main clauses have the recurrence of their theme more than once in the succeeding discourse. This will become more obvious if the results are compared to the thematic predictability and importance of *postposed* (postposed because of the occurrence of its main clause preposing) adverbial clauses in the following table :

Table 3 Thematic predictability and importance of postposed adverbial clauses

Scope (Predictability)	No. of clauses	Percentage (%)	Persistence (Importance)	No. of clauses	Percentage (%)
0	19	34.55	0	34	61.82
1	20	36.36	1	13	23.64
$2 \leq x \leq 10$	8	14.55	$2 \leq x \leq 5$	8	14.54
$11 \leq x \leq 20$	4	7.27	$6 \leq x \leq 10$	0	0.00
$21 \leq x$	4	7.27			
Total	55	100.00	Total	55	100.00

The thematic persistence of postposed adverbial clauses is extremely low, that is, only in 14.54% the theme occurred more than once in the succeeding context. Furthermore, postposed adverbial clauses have low thematic predictability since 70.91% of the postposed adverbial clauses show the scope of zero or 1 to the preceding discourse. The scope 1 to the left means that the postposed adverbial clauses only refer to its preposed

main clause. This result also supports the findings in Fujii (1992) ; namely, postposed adverbial clauses are less connected with the preceding discourse and they are closely connected to the main clause. Besides, most postposed adverbial clauses are not crucially necessary to comprehend the central proposition of the main clause. Postposed adverbial clauses, therefore, have a more purely *informational function*, that is, to add something, to confirm or to emphasize some elements mentioned in the main clause or non-immediate discourse, to give some condition or annotation, to delimit the information presented in the main clause, and to give some illustration in order to clarify the content of the main clause.

On the contrary, as mentioned earlier, preposed main clauses hold high thematic predictability and relatively high persistence to the succeeding discourse. This result indicates that they possess high thematic continuity in the discourse. In other words, they are thematically important in the main story line in the discourse.

The result that the preposed main clauses are thematically more predictable and important first appears as in Givón's claim that 'Relative importance' (that is, more important information is fronted) overrules 'Relative predictability' (that is, less predictable information is fronted) in main clause preposing in Japanese spoken discourse. However, notice that the scope of the preposed main clause indicating high predictability does not mean all the elements (predicate, its arguments, and satellites<sup>7)</sup>) in the clause are predictable from the preceding discourse, but means some element in the clause are presupposed. Commonly, an assertion contains presupposed elements from the preceding discourse and portion which presents some new information added or linked up to the elements. Normally, the new information is expressed in the predicate (Payne 1990). For instance, in the following example the scope of the italicized preposed main clause is 3 because *tomodachiga* 'the friend' in the clause has its cue in 3 clauses to the left ; that is, *asa 9-jini denwa kakattekite* 'I got a phone call (from my mother's friend)':

- (4) Asa 9 -ji -ni denwa kakat -te ki -te, yoru 9 -ji -no  
morning 9 -time -DAT TEL ring -GER come -GER night 9 -time -GEN

hikouki-de it -te, 20 -jikan kakat-te mukou -e it -te,  
airplane-INST go -GER, 20 -hour spend-GER over.there -DEST go -GER,

soshitara *hikoujou mukaeni kita tomodachi -ga nai -teru* -N -desu -yone,  
then airport to.see.me came friend -NOM cry -PRG -NM -COP -SP

<sup>7)</sup> Dik (1989: 72) defines that satellites are not required by the predicate ; they give optional further information pertaining to additional feature of the state of affairs, the location of the state of affairs, the speaker's attitude towards or evaluation of the propositional content, or the character of the speech act.



'mou dame -kamoshirenai' -t -tut -te.  
 already not.good -might -GER -say -GER.

"I got a phone call (from my mother's friend) at nine in the morning and flew (to Copenhagen) at nine at night, spending twenty hours, and then *the friend who had come to see me at the airport was crying*, saying, 'she might not be able to live.'"

However, the fact that the friend was crying is new information which is added to the main story line. Thus, some elements in an assertion function to link the present clause to the preceding discourse and other parts, normally predicate, add new information. This fact illustrates that even if the preposed main clauses have their scope close to the clauses, it does not necessarily mean that the whole clauses have high predictability. Rather, the preposed main clauses hold high predictability in terms of some presupposed elements but that they are less predictable in regard to the new information expressed in the predicate. Thus, it can be claimed that the preposed main clauses are fronted because they are *less predictable* about the new information and *more important* about the thematic continuity.

### 3.3. Motivating factor : Natural order of event and logical sequences

However, only the factors, less predictability and more importance, cannot be assumed to be primary motivating factors of main clause preposing since even main clauses in unmarked ordering can hold less predictability in terms of new information and more thematic importance as well. In addition to these factors, however, two stronger motivating factors of main clause preposing can be found in the data ; that is, 1) conformity with natural order of temporal order of event sequence of the main story line or logical sequence, such as cause-effect, reason-effect, condition-result and ; 2) pragmatic markedness in the main clause. The second factor will be discussed in the next section. Here, let us examine the first factor.

As explained earlier, that preposed main clauses have high predictability in terms

<sup>8)</sup> Since there are no particular morphosyntactic devices denoting grounding in Japanese, I mainly distinguish foreground from background following the properties that Hopper (1979 : 215) claims :

'...only foregrounded clauses are actually NARRATED. Backgrounded clauses do not themselves narrate, but instead they support, amplify, or COMMENT ON the narration. In a narration, the author is asserting the occurrence of events. Commentary, however, does not constitute the assertion of events in the story line but makes statements which are CONTINGENT and dependent on the story-line events.

In this study, adverbial clauses denoting the actual story line were judged as 'foreground' whereas those presenting supportive material which does not itself narrate the main events were judged as 'background.'

Fujii (1992)'s results for foregrounding and backgrounding show that 66.04% of the preposed main clauses function as foregrounding whereas 100% of the postposed adverbial clauses are backgrounding.

of some elements denotes that the clause is exactly on the thematic line of the story ; that is, the clause tends to be foregrounding<sup>8)</sup> or on the main line of the story. In particular, the data show that clause orderings in Japanese tend to conform with the perceptual order of temporal sequence of events of the story. This can be typically observed in Japanese clause-chaining construction, which probably is the most convenient device of connecting clauses. This is also exemplified very well in Example (4).

- (4) Asa 9 -ji -ni denwa kakat-te ki -te, yoru 9-ji -no  
morning 9 -time -DAT TEL ring -GER come -GER, night 9-time-GEN

hikouki-de it-te, 20-jikan kakat-te mukou -e it-te,  
airplane-INST go-GER, 20-hour spend-GER over.there -DEST go-GER,

soshitara *hikoujou mukaeni kita tomodachi-ga nai-teru* -N -desu-yone,  
then airport to.see.me came friend -NOM cry-PRGR -NM -COP-SP

'mou dame -kamoshirenai' -t -tut -te.  
already not.good -might -GER -say -GER.

"I got a phone call (from my mother's friend) at nine in the morning and flew (to Copenhagen) at nine at night, spending twenty hours, and then *the friend who had come to see me at the airport was crying*, saying, 'she might not be able to live.'"

In this example, the events, namely, the speaker got a phone call at 9 in the morning, he flew to Copenhagen by nine o'clock-airplane at night, it took twenty hours to get there, the friend who had come to see him at the airport was crying, she said 'your mother might not be able to survive,' were told exactly following the perceptual order of the temporal sequence of the events by employing gerundive form *-te*.

[the temporal sequence of the events]

phone call → get on the plane → spend 20 hours → arrive → see the friend crying  
→ listen to what she said

The final sentence particle *-yone* in the preposed main clause and the final gerundive form *-te* in the postposed clause manifest that the ordering of these two clauses is reversed. Thus, it can be claimed that the preposed main clause is dragged to the front in order to maintain the conformity with the perceptual order of the event sequence. The postposed clause adds the manner in which the friend was crying and at the same time gives the reason why she was crying. Here, the main clause cannot be comprehended without the adverbial clause, or at least it is hard to understand why the friend was crying without the postposed adverbial clause. However, maintaining the temporal sequence of the events of the story surpasses giving the reason for the act of the subject

of the preposed main clause.

The next example reveals that the clause ordering is identical with the logical sequence of reason-effect ordering.

- (5) O    -kyaku    -sama -ni    mukat-te    'ooi'-toka    'ut -ta'    -toka  
      HON -customer -HON -DAT face -GER hey-or    sell -PST -or

'kat-ta    -ka -ne' -to    iu    -koto -wa    sawaide    -mashi -ta    -kedo.  
 buy-PST -QU -SP -NM say -thing -TOP make.a.noise -POL    -PST -although

Demo sonotoki -wa    -ne mada-haiyuu-de    -wa    naishi, nandemonaiishi.  
 but    then    -TOP-SP yet    -actor -COP -TOP not,    nothing

*sono jibun-no koe -nante iu -no    -wa    ano ishiki*  
 that self -GEN voice-such say-GEN -TOP well consciousness

*shi-masen -deshi-ta -ne,    ano uta    -wa    suki-de    utat-te*  
 do-not.POL-COP-PST-SP, well song -TOP like -COP sing-GER

mashi-ta -kedomo -ee.  
 POL -PST-although-well.

"I shouted to the customers, such as 'Hey, I sold, "you buy.' But then I was not yet an actor or anything. *I was not conscious of my voice*, although I liked songs and sang."

In this example, the interviewer and the guest (the speaker) are talking about the speaker (an actor)'s beautiful voice and the speaker is looking back to his past when he was not yet an actor but a wholesale seller. The italicized clause is a preposed main clause which manifests the effect of its reason revealed in the immediate clause.

That is :

<u>Reason (previous clause)</u>	<u>Effect (preposed main clause)</u>
since I was not an actor yet	I was not conscious of my voice

The discourse, therefore, conforms with the perceptual order of reason-effect ordering even beyond so-called main-adverbial complex sentences. Here again, the postposed adverbial clause has nothing to do with comprehending the proposition of the main clause<sup>9)</sup> and with the main line of the story. It just adds something in regard to the

<sup>9)</sup> The main differences between marked (main-adverbial) and unmarked (adverbial-main) clause ordering is that proposition of the preposed main clause (marked ordering) is comprehensible without the adverbial clauses whereas that of main clause in unmarked ordering is not comprehensible without the adverbial clauses.

speaker's voice. The preposed main clause, therefore, is rather closely connected with the immediate clause<sup>10)</sup>. On the contrary, the postposed adverbial clauses here only hold informational function, which has nothing to do with either the natural order of reason-effect ordering or comprehension of the proposition of the main clause.

Presupposing that the clause orderings in Japanese basically conform with the natural order of event sequence or logical sequence, such as cause-effect, reason-effect, condition-result, the following orderings are logically possible :

When the main and adverbial clauses independently occurs,

- ( i ) if both main and adverbial clauses code foregrounding ; that is, they are on the main story line, then the ordering of the clauses becomes either adverbial-main or main-adverbial depending on their natural order ;
- ( ii ) if main and adverbial clauses code foregrounding and backgrounding respectively and the adverbial clause is necessary to comprehend the proposition of the main clause, then the order becomes adverbial-main ;
- ( iii ) if main and adverbial clauses code foregrounding and backgrounding respec-

<sup>10)</sup> As discussed in Section 2, the semantic relation between adverbial and main clause in unmarked ordering also conforms with the perceptual order of the events. Thus, the adverbial clauses in unmarked clause ordering is necessary to understand the flow of events, even if the clause plays a role as backgrounding. In the following example, the adverbial clause is functioning as backgrounding but necessary to correctly comprehend the proposition of its main clause.

Sorede reizouko ake -tara, oniku nai -n -desu-yone.  
then refrigerator open -if, meat not.be-NM-COP-SP.

Sorede, are reitouko irechat -tara, korekara kaitou deki-nai-kara,  
then, oh freezer have. put -if, from. now defrost can -not-since,

taihen -da -to omot -te, reitouko ake -temo nai -n -desu -yo.  
serious-COP -NM think -GER, freezer open -even not.be -NM -COP -SP.

'Then I opened the refrigerator but the meat was not there. Then, if I had put them into the freezer, *it would be a serious problem since it would take too much time to defrost them.* Then, I opened the freezer, but the meat was not there either.'

This passage illustrates a typical Japanese clause-chaining construction. The italicized clauses are an adverbial-main clause, the main clause of which is further chained to the following adverbial-main clauses. The italicized adverbial clause is semantically closely connected with the former clause 'if I had put them into the freezer.' The italicized main clause, therefore, has actually two adverbial clauses ; that is, 'if I had put them into the freezer' and 'because it would take too much time to defrost the meat from now.' The second adverbial clause is necessary to comprehend the proposition of the main clause, 'it would be a serious problem,' although it functions as backgrounding expressing the reason why it would be a serious problem. Thus, these clause orderings are identical to the natural order of reason-effect and condition-result orderings. [the event sequence and the speaker's psychological flow]

open the fridge→there is no meat→if I had put them into the freezer→*it would take too much time to defrost*→*it would be a serious problem*→I opened the freezer→there is no meat there either→

...

tively and the adverbial clause is not necessary to comprehend the proposition of the main clause, then the order becomes either adverbial-main or main-adverbial.

However, once the clauses are knitted in spontaneous discourse and hold some kind of relationship to the previous clause, the situation becomes more complicated and the actual outcomes are different. Thus, the above mentioned (ii) and (iii) possibly become as follows:

(iv) even if main and adverbial clauses code foregrounding and backgrounding respectively and the adverbial clause is necessary to comprehend the proposition of main clause, the order can become main-adverbial if the main clause is more connected with the previous clause in terms of natural order of event sequence or logical sequence of cause-effect, reason-effect and so on;

(v) if main and adverbial clauses code foregrounding and backgrounding respectively and the adverbial clause is not necessary to comprehend the proposition of the main clause and the main clause is more connected with the previous clause in terms of natural order, then the order becomes main-adverbial.

Thus, one of the strong motivating factors of main clause preposing is to maintain the conformity with the natural order of the temporal sequence of the main line of the story or with the logical sequence, such as cause-effect, reason-effect, condition-result orderings.

### 3.4. Pragmatically marked information

Another strong motivating factor for main clause preposing can be claimed to be pragmatic markedness. Payne (1990) claims that pragmatically marked speech acts include those in which the speaker assumes the hearer holds some proposition to be true, or alternatively assumes that the hearer has certain established links in his or her information network. In pragmatically marked speech acts, the speaker assumes that the hearer either (a) has some piece of information incorrectly linked to some other piece of information, or (b) that there is a link missing which really must be established. The speaker adopts some device in order to unlink the incorrect information and link to the correct one or fill in the missing gap with the information which the speaker wants the hearer to hold in his informational network. The information which codes such pragmatic markedness is called pragmatic marked information<sup>11)</sup>. The pragmatic marked information includes: single focus contrast, multiple (usually double) focus contrast, counter expectation, restatement, added detail restatement, questions and answers to information questions, threats, an assertion which is counter to cultural or situational expectations, negation of the constituent, heightened degree of the quality

expressed by a constituent, and other non-neutral communicative intents (Payne 1990).

One of the noticeable findings in regard to preposed main clauses in Fujii (1992) is that most preposed main clauses code pragmatically marked information<sup>12)</sup>. The following table shows the rate that preposed main clauses carry pragmatically marked information.

Table 4 Pragmatically marked information in preposed main clauses

PM/Non-PM factors		Preposed main clause	
		Number	Percent (%)
PM factors	Questions	12	21.82
	Answers to questions	16	29.09
	Focus contrast	5	9.09
	Negation	3	5.45
	Hightened degree	2	3.64
	Sub-total	38	69.09
Non-PM factors	Event sequence	11	20.00
	Logical sequence	6	10.91
	Sub-total	17	30.91
Total		55	100.00

As this table illustrates, 69.09% of all preposed main clauses code some kind of pragmatically marked information and 30.91% of them are fronted, as seen in the previous section, in order to conform with the temporal sequence of the events of the story or logical sequence of cause-effect, reason-effect, condition-result, and so on.

Of all preposed main clauses coding some kind of pragmatically marked information, 50.91% have something to do with the speech act of questions. Question words

<sup>11)</sup> Dik (1989 : 278) defines these pragmatically marked information as focal information as follows :

The focal information will ... concern the changes that S wishes to bring about in the pragmatic information of A .... Typically, then, the focal information in a linguistic expression pertains to the difference between  $P_s$  and  $(P_A)_s$  ...

The focal information will thus concern the changes that speaker wishes to bring about in the pragmatic information of A. Furthermore, he assigned focal information the pragmatic function Focus. One of the focalizing devices he presents is special constituent order : special positions for Focus constituents in the linear order of the clause.

<sup>12)</sup> If we compare the rate of the preposed main clauses with pragmatically marked information to that of main clauses in unmarked ordering, this characteristic becomes more obvious. Thus, of all main clauses in unmarked ordering in Fujii (1992) only 24.48% code pragmatically marked information.

are pragmatically marked information in that they are the participants' positive act to gain some piece of information which needs to be integrated into their knowledge network.

- (6) Saru -nanka -de kona -koto yat-teru saru -ga  
 monkey -and.the.like -INST like.this -thing do-PRG monkey -NOM

imasu-keredomo<sup>13</sup>). Sonna mijikaku nat -teru, tsuntsun.  
 be -though. that short become -PRG ONOMA

De itaku -nai -no, nui -tari kit-tari suru-toki -ni.  
 then hurt -not -SP, pull -and cut-and do -when-LOC.

"Some monkeys do such a thing. Some of your hair become that short. Then, *don't you hurt* when you pull and cut your hair?"

In the example, the speaker asks the guest if she hurts when she pulls or cuts her hair, which is her bad habit. The italicized clause is a preposed main clause which reveals a question, meaning if she hurts. The postposed adverbial clause reveals temporal relations to the proposition of the main clause, that is, when she pulls and cuts her hair. The question part, however, is fronted and the adverbial clause is functioning only to add the time reference as an annotation to the question.

Answers to question are the information to fill in the addressee's gap in his/her knowledge network.

- (7) A : Mou yahari zuibun go -katei-tte iu -ka go -shujin -ni  
 already after.all very.much HON -home-NM say-QU HON-husband-DAT

o -nare -ni -nari -mashita?  
 HON -get.used.to -DAT -become -POL.PST

B : Sou-desu-ne. Yatto nare -mashita, ichi-nen gurai-wa  
 yes-COP-SP. at.last get.used.to -POL.PST, one-year about-TOP

<sup>13</sup> *Keredomo* or *Kedo* (lit. 'although') here does not express a concession but the speaker's hedge, which often occurs at the end of a clause in Japanese spoken discourse. Maynard (1989: 33) analyzed the function of this kind of *kedo* as follows:

The function that *kedo* serves is not a grammatical one such as to connect the subordinate clause to the main clause, but, rather, an interactional one, which serves to create a softened statement ending. From a functional point of view, the displaced, truncated clauses are best considered independent and complete grammatical units, and they are best characterized as being followed by devices for verbal social packaging, *kedo*.

In this study, *kedo* expressing a concession is distinguished from *kedo* for "social packaging."

yappari nare -masen -deshita -kedo.  
 as.we.guess get.used.to -POL.NEG -COP.PST -although.

“A : Have you got used to the new home, well, your husband ?

B : Yes. *Finally I have got used to (him)*, although I did not get used to him for the first one year.”

The italicized clause of this example is an answer for A's question, 'Have you got used to your husband?' B was invited to this talk show when she had just got married but now has been married for three years. A is comparing the present state to that of B's three years ago. B is answering A's question, 'Yes. Finally I have got used to.' The postposed clause indicates concession, meaning 'although I did not get used to him for the first one year.' The function of the clause is to give an annotation to the main clause.

The next two examples illustrate single and double focus contrast respectively.

- (8) A : Nanka oyaji -tte -no -wa settokuryoku at-ta mitai -desu-nee.  
 somehow my.father -NM -NM -TOP persuasive.power be-PST appear-COP-SP.

B : *Anata-datte* zuibun settokuryoku aru, oya -no -chi -o  
 you -too very.much persuasive.power be, parent -GEN -blood -ACC

hii -te.  
 descend -GER.

“A : Somehow my father appeared to be very persuasive.

B : *You also are very persuasive*, being descended from your father (lit. parents).”

The italicized preposed main clause has single contrast, *anata* 'you', to the element in the preceding clause, *oyaji* 'my father.' In other words, B is contrasting 'you' to 'your father.' This is indicated in the expression of *anata datte* 'you also.' In order to contrast them, the clause is fronted and the clause 'being descended from your father' is postposed, which is giving the reason why he is persuasive.

The following instance illustrates a preposed main clause coding double focus contrast to its preceding clause :

- (9) Ikki kouhai -na -n -desu. *Boku-no* -ga senpai-de,  
 one.year junior -COP -NM-COP. I -GEN-NOM senior-COP,

toshi-wa hutatsu chigau -n -desu -kedo.  
 age -TOP two.years different -NM -COP -although.



“(He) is one year younger in the theatrical company. *I am senior*, although the age is two years apart.”

The preposed main clause has two elements contrasting to those in the preceding clause and the postposed clause gives an annotation that the age is two years apart. Thus, two pairs of contrasted items consist of the following sets ;

<u>Previous clause</u>		<u>Preposed main clause</u>
He	vs	I
junior	vs	senior

The main clause is assumed to be dragged in order to contrast these two elements.

The preposed main clause of the following example expresses negation. Negation is a pragmatically marked act in that the speaker assumes that the hearer possesses some incorrect (at least with respect to the speaker’s intended goal of the conversation) information and the speaker attempts to unlink the incorrect information and to link the correct information.

- (10) *Demo dakara kekkon -suru -mae -wa zenzen souiu*  
 but so marriage -do -before -TOP at.all such

*ganbou-nakat -ta -n -desu -ne, itsumo koi -o shite -ita -kara.*  
 desire -be.NEG -PST -NM -COP -SP, always love -ACC do -PRG -since.

“*So I didn’t have such desire at all before marriage* since I had always had someone who I liked.”

The preposed main clause expresses a strong negation which is expressed by ‘not ... at all’ and the postposed clause further explains the reason why she did not have desire to get married before marriage.

The next example illustrates the case where the main clause is preposed because the clause codes heightened degree of the quality expressed by the constituent.

- (11) *Ii o -koe -desu-ne. Mo hontooni ima mo hontooni*  
 good HON-voice-COP-SP. EXCL really now EXCL really

*kiki -hore-te -iru -n -desu, o -koe -ga hibi -ite.*  
 listen-like -GER-PRG-NM-COP, HON-voice-NOM sound-PRG.

“You have a very beautiful voice. *I really, well, really feel that I like to listen to your voice* since your voice sounds so well.”

Notice that the preposed main clause which expresses how the speaker is fond of the listener's voice uses an emphatic adverb *hontooni* 'really' twice and exclamatory word *mo* and the speaker further emphasizes her impression to the listener's voice by expressing *kiki-hore-te-iru* '(I) am enjoying listening to your voice' not by just saying 'I like your voice.' In the postposed adverbial clause, the speaker gives the reason why she likes to listen to his voice by repeating that his voice is very beautiful.

Thus, it can be claimed that pragmatic markedness is a strong motivating factor for main clause preposing in Japanese spoken discourse. The factor is very strong since it even overrules, as seen in the former section, the temporal sequence of events or the logical sequence, such as cause-effect, reason-effect, condition-result and so on. This is exemplified in the above examples; that is, in Examples (6) and (7), question and answer to the question respectively overrule the temporal sequence of events, and in Examples (8), (10), and (11), pragmatic markedness such as single focus contrast, negation, heightened degree of the quality expressed by a constituent overrule them as well.

Thus, preposed main clauses with pragmatic markedness concern changes in the hearer's information network that the speaker wishes the hearer to hold. As Dik claims, this kind of element receives primary focus. Preposed main clauses with pragmatic markedness, therefore, receive primary focus in the discourse.

#### 4. Conclusion

With some quantitative analyses and close examination of the data in spontaneous spoken discourse, we have investigated the thematicity of the preposed main clauses and motivating factors of main clause preposing. As a result, it has been confirmed that preposed main clauses hold high thematic continuity in the discourse and play an important role in the main line of the story. The pragmatic motivating factors of main clause preposing observed in this paper are: 1) the conformity to the perceptual order of the temporal sequence of the main story line or the logical sequence such as cause-effect, reason-effect, condition-result; and 2) pragmatic markedness of information coded in main clauses.

Thus, preposed main clauses are functioning as to maintain the temporal sequence of events of the main story line or logical sequence, and to correctly link the information which the speaker wishes the hearer to possess in the hearer's informational network or to fill in the hearer's information gap with the correct information which follows to the speaker's intended goal of the conversation. As a result, preposed main clauses coding pragmatically marked information, in particular, receive primary focus or salience. In other words, the preposed main clause invites the hearer to pay more attention. This fact suggests that not only the initial position of a clause in marked *word* order but also the initial clause of a complex sentence in marked *clause* order in

Japanese spoken discourse hold the same function of the initial constituent of fully-flexible word order languages. Consequently, we can expect as Givón suggests that, 'The string-initial position invites the hearer to pay more attention and thus to store and retrieve the information more efficiently.' Main clause preposing thus represents the speaker's cognitive state in which s/he manipulates the hearer's information network and the flow of the conversation.

## REFERENCES

- Chafe, Wallace. 1984. "How People Use Adverbial Clauses." *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, eds. by Claudia Brugman and Monica Macaulay. Berkeley, California : Berkeley Linguistics Society, 437-449.
- Clancy, Patricia. 1982. "Written and Spoken Style in Japanese Narratives." *Spoken and Written Language*, ed. by Deborah Tannen. Norwood, NJ : Ablex, 55-76.
- Dik, Simon. 1978. *Functional Grammar*. Amsterdam : North-Holland.
- . 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar- Part I : The Structure of the Clause*. Functional Grammar Series 9. Netherlands : Foris Publications.
- DuBois, J.W., S. Schuetze-Coburn, D. Paolino, and S. Cumming. 1991. "Discourse Transcription." Ms. University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Fujii, Yoko. 1989. "Right-Dislocation in Japanese." M.A. Thesis. University of Oregon.
- . 1991. "*Nihongo-buN ni okeru GojuN-no Gyakuten—DaNwa GoyooroNteki ShiteN karano BuNseki—* (Reversed Word Order in Japanese—A Discourse-Pragmatic Analysis—)." *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* No. 99. Tokyo : The Linguistic Society of Japan, 58-81.
- . 1992. "The Order and Functions of Adverbial Clauses in Japanese Spoken Discourse." *Masaic of Languages—Collected Papers Commemorative for Prof. Emeritus Natsuko Okuda's Seventy Years Old*. Tokyo : Mejiro Linguistic Society. 1992, 109-123.
- Givón, Talmy. 1983. "Topic Continuity in Discourse : An Introduction." *Topic Continuity in Discourse : A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*, ed. by Talmy Givón. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 4-41.
- . 1988. "The Pragmatics of Word-Order : Predictability, Importance and Attention." *Studies in Syntactic Typology, TSL 17*, eds by M. Hammond, E. Moravcsik, and J. Wirth. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 243-284.
- Hannay, Mike. 1991. "Pragmatic Function Assignment and Word Order Variation in a Functional Grammar of English." *Journal of Pragmatics 16*. 131-155.
- Hinds, John. 1982. *Ellipsis in Japanese*. Carbondale and Edmonton, Canada : Linguistic Research Inc.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1979. "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse." *Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 12, ed. by Talmy Givón. New York : Academic Press, 213-241.
- Maynard, Senko K. 1989. *Japanese Conversation—Self-Contextualization Through Structure and Interactional Management*. Advances in Discourse Processes Vol. XXXV. Norwood, NJ : Ablex.
- Mithun, M. 1986. "Is Basic Word Order Universal ?" *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse. TSL 11*, ed. by Russell S. Tomlin. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 281-328.

- Ono, Tsuyoshi and Ryoko Suzuki. 1992. "Word Order Variability in Japanese Conversation : Motivations and Grammaticization." *Text* 12(3). 429-445.
- Osgood, Charles E. 1980. *Lectures on Language Performance*. Springer Series in Language and Communication 7. ed. by W.J.M. Levelt. New York : Springer-Verlag.
- Payne, Doris L. 1985. *Aspects of the Grammar of Yagua*. Los Angeles : University of California dissertation.
- . 1987. "Information Structuring in Papago Narrative Discourse." *Lg.* 63. 783-804.
- . 1989. "Meaning and Pragmatics of Order in Selected South American Indian Languages." University of Oregon, MS.
- . 1990. *The Pragmatics of Word Order. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 7. eds. by Georg Bossong and Bernard Comrie. New York : Mouton, 189-238.
- Ramsay, Violeta. 1987. "The Functional Distribution of Preposed and Postposed 'If' and 'When' Clauses in Written Discourse." *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse. TSL* 11. ed. by Russell S. Tomlin. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 383-407.
- Rude, N. 1985. "Studies in Nez Perce Grammar and Discourse." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Tai, James H-Y. 1983. "Temporal Sequence and Chinese Word Order." *Iconicity in Syntax. TSL* 6. ed. by John Haiman. Amsterdam : Benjamins, 49-72.

(平成4年11月16日受理)