GELUYKENS, RONALD (1992). *From Discourse Process to Grammatical Construction: on left-dislocation in English.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. xi + 182 pp.

The notion expressed by Halliday in the early seventies that "the system itself reflects the functions it has evolved to serve' (1971:65-6) has found support in similar statements in more recent years (Levinson 1983, Dik 1989). According to this view, a functional approach to language will provide a basis for explaining the nature of the language system. Ronald Geluykens follows this trend in stating in his opening paragraph that his aim is to "investigate the link between discourse function and syntactic form, and the ways in which grammatical form is a reflection of communicative function". The linguistic form chosen is left-dislocation (LD) and the language is English.

The author rightly uses a data-base that focuses on spontaneous conversation — *the Survey of English Usage* — with other discourse types used for comparative purposes. Not surprisingly, his quantitative data confirm a native speaker's intuitions that LD in English is far more frequent in conversation than in any other discourse type, and that its occurrence in the written mode, in letters and fictional dialogue, is largely a reflection of its conversational functions, with no occurrences of LD at all in scientific writing and in fictional writing that is not dialogue.

Unlike some corpus-based studies, however, Geluykens' work is not limited to a purely quantitative analysis and in this he shares the view put forward by Schiffrin (1987) that quantitive data should be used to support a qualitative analysis. In particular, the analyst should not deal exclusively with the prototypical instances of a pattern, dismissing the "exceptions" as statistically irrelevant; rather, each case should be examined on its own merits, since the apparent exception may provide evidence for the validity of some general claim. This accords with Schiffrin's awareness that a single instance "can suggest the need for an explanation which covers a wider variety of phenomena" (Schiffrin 1987:68).

Methodologically, Geluykens's study is innovative in that it combines concepts traditionally used in Discourse Analysis (DA) with insights and methodology taken from Conversational Analysis (CA). The merits and demerits of each of these two schools are discussed in the ample Theoretical Preliminaries. From DA the attention accorded to information flow is found to be invaluable, and various definitions of Givenness and Topicality are discussed and adapted to make them more operational. Conversely, the centring on narrative text so often found in this approach is rejected in favour of attention to conversation, for the analysis of which the more interactional turn-taking method of CA is adopted. It is this combination which will provide the necessary framework for the claim which Geluykens puts forward regarding the discourse function of LD in English.

Givenness is to be assessed in terms of "recoverability" defined as information which is derivable from the discourse record. Recoverable/irrecoverable are not to be understood as a simple binary distinction between recoverable and not recoverable, but rather on a scale ranging from totally recoverable, through not recoverable to inferred. Inferability, based on Prince (1981), appears to include what Brown & Yule describe as "automatically activated" connections between

sentences as well as the inferencing that means work for the hearer in order to "bridge the gap" in the discourse (Brown & Yule 1983:257ff).

Topicality, or "aboutness" is rightly dissociated from initial position, although as Geluykens recognises, it remains difficult to make operational the pretheoretical notion of what a text or a part of the text is about (Dik 1989, Downing 1990a and Downing 1991). Granting that no perfect correlation exists between the presence of a referent in the discourse and its relation to aboutness, Geluykens proposes his own characterisation of topicality, based in some respects on Givón's (1983) concept of "topic continuity". Topic continuity is based on two factors, "lookback" and "persistence". Lookback relates to the relationship of an item to the preceding discourse, and is taken care of by Geluykens' "recoverability". Persistence measures the duration of a particular topic through the ensuing discourse. For Givón this is measurable "in terms of the number of clauses to the right" (1983:15), which as Geluykens points out, runs into several problems. Firstly, a cut-off point of 20 seems somewhat arbitrary; secondly, a topic may be maintained while "jumping a clause" as in Geluykens' example (12a) of Chapter 1 *John died. They said it was cancer. He was 77,* and may even be maintained indirectly. Thirdly, it is claimed that the quantitative approach adopted by Givón is unsuitable for the analysis of conversation, which requires the cooperation of at least two participants. Instead, topicality will be adjusted to the turn-taking system, and a degree of topicality will be considered significant if an element recurs in any of three positions: in the same speaker's turn, in the hearer's turn, or in the turn following the hearer's turn.

These preliminaries are necessarily detailed and extensive in that they provide the basis on which Geluykens makes his claim that the main function of LD in English is the introduction of new (and topical) referents in what is essentially a co-operative effort between speaker and hearer. According to this view, the referent is introduced by a speaker, is then acknowledged by the hearer, and in the third stage, is typically elaborated upon by the first speaker. This fits in with the notion of "transition relevance place" (TRP) between turns introduced by Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson (1974) which occurs with the end of syntactic units or of prosodic units, and is rare in other places, at least among native English speakers. The grammatical construction of LD is, therefore, the result of a conversational strategy which gets built into the syntax.

A formal syntactic description is consequently inadequate, and a semantic characterisation is proposed. For this, Geluykens adopts different terms from those in current use. The noun phrase preceding the main clause is labelled the referent (REF), the main clause itself is the Proposition (PROP) and the coreferential pronominal element he calls the Gap (GAP). Of these, the term "Gap" is potentially confusing since, as Radford points out (1988:531), dislocation involves no gap; on the contrary, the clause linked with the dislocated constituent contains some expression referring back, in the case of LD, to the dislocated NP. In what in generative grammar is called Topicalisation, by contrast, there is a gap. Adapting Radford's example (9)(1988:530) for the purpose we can compare:

(1)   *That kind of antisocial behaviour,* can we really
        tolerate it? (Left-dislocation)

(2)   *That kind of antisocial behaviour* can we really
        tolerate? (Topicalisation)

The choice of the term GAP, therefore, is not the most fortunate.

Furthermore, as a result of the playing-down of formal features there is no mention, to the best of this reviewer's knowledge, of the relationship of LD to embedding and recursiveness. In other languages, such as Spanish, left-dislocated structures can be embedded freely (Rivero 1980) and can also occur recursively (Downing & Caro 1993). While Radford does not discount the operation of a recursive rule on universalist grounds, he finds that recursive dislocation in standard varieties of English has "a somewhat odd flavour" (Radford 1988:532) as in (3) (Radford's (19), adapted):

> (3)   ?That kind of car, in this kind of parking lot, you'd
>   be crazy to want to leave it there.

In the standard English of the Survey of English Usage it is unlikely that instances of "stacked" LDsuch as (3) would occur; and no doubt it may be presumed that in a "resolutely empirical" and corpus-based study such as that of Geluykens, no examples of these features were thrown up in the data.

More worrying is the fact that on occasion an example listed as an instance of LD does not correspond with at least this native speakers' intuitions of what an LD element is. Example (22) of Chapter 6 is one such:

> A: (..)-/cos *there was this !other ! "friend of" mine* # that /knows about
> the same a! "mount as" me #and *he/actually* 'got an 'honours: 'viva#. (..)
> (S.2.9.42.5)

Even though *this other friend of mine* is coreferential with he, it is also an argument in a presentative *there* clause, rather than being an isolated noun phrase. How does it then qualify as an LD element? Functionally, the presentative structure itself introduces the new potential topical referent (Downing 1990). Moreover, this clause is coordinated with the PROP clause.

Other examples, such as the extract below of (23) in chapter 3 might more convincingly be analysed as non-starter sentences, rather than instances of LD. This is suggested by the presence of *are* and the pause after *the Caucasians:*

> B: be/cause. *the Cau!Wcasians* # are . I/don't know about racial # I/don't
> really under[stand much about] race # but *lin/guistically they're u!nique#*.
> (S.211.76.1)

While it is no doubt true, as Geluykens suggests, that the speaker felt the need to introduce *the Caucasians*, despite its link with a previous mention of *Caucasian*, this does not mean that all such introductions are achieved by means of LD.

In Chapter 2, referent-introduction is examined from the point of view of interaction. The "acknowledgement" of the introduced referent can be explicit or implicit; thus, LDs are classified as having an intervening turn between the REF and the PROP, as having a pause, and as turnless and pauseless. Pauses are interpreted as "silent acknowledgement" of the new referent on the part of the hearer. That is, since there is no expressed rejection of the new topical referent, the speaker takes this as tacit acknowledgement. Pauseless LDs, according to Geluykens' analysis of the data, mainly occur in specific discourse conditions, such

as questions and answers. As an explanation to other, more recalcitrant instances, Geluykens suggests that in some cases the speaker can take it for granted that his REF will be accepted by the hearer, and so can do without an acknowledgment. One question that springs to mind in this area is that, if LD indeed represents a collaborative effort between speaker and hearer, why isn't it more common in English? And the doubt remains, that if topic-introduction really depended on acknowledgement, few potential topics would stand much chance of survival.

Chapters 3 and 4 are devoted to the referent-introduction function of LDs from the point of view of recoverability and topicality respectively. The concepts are further discussed, subclassified and illustrated with examples from the data-base.

In Chapter 5, other functions of LD are discussed, particularly that of contrastiveness. Here, in contrast to Halliday's view that contrastive emphasis is a kind of newness (1985:277), Geluykens prefers to regard irrecoverability and contrast as separate phenomena, informationally unrelated, although both constituting forms of highlighting. According to this view, once an item is involved in a constrastive set its recoverability status is cancelled and becomes irrelevant, since it will be highlighted whether it is recoverable or not.

Chapter 6 explores the prosodic aspects of LD and finds that tone unit boundaries (tonality) and the placement of the tone nucleus (tonicity) are relevant to LD; in particular the final pitch movement on the REF reflects the conversational function of LD.

In Chapter 7, devoted to other discourse types, Geluykens finds that in non-conversational discourse, in which LDs are much less frequent, some functions are almost identical to the conversational uses, while others are quite different. The latter comprise the use of LD for emotive reasons, for identificational reasons, or as an alternative to a comment adverbial. Here, several of the examples quoted would fall within the category of "viewpoint subjuncts" (Quirk et al 1985:8.89), which to this reviewer at least appears a more satisfactory classification. It might be preferable, one feels, not to attempt to draw these into the LD category, even as "quasi-LDs", since they tend to weaken the distinctiveness of the LD structure. While it is true that initial position is made use of to fulfil a variety of discourse functions, these functions, such as retrospective linking and prospective projection, (re)introduction of new potential topics, contrast, etc. are realised by a number of different structures and types of unit. A tighter limit to what LD can include, structurally, would have been beneficial here, as in several other places in this book.

Setting LD in English within a broader perspective, in Chapter 8, the author compares the use of LD in English with its equivalent in other languages such as French and Italian. A comparison of formal features and co-occurrences is not given. Interestingly, Geluykens finds that the English data do not confirm the floor-seeking function that in conjunction with LD as a topic-shift device, Duranti and Ochs (1979) claim for Italian; the reason suggested is that, since referent introduction is negotiated by speakers of English, a competitive floor-seeking use is not necessary. At the same time, Geluykens suggests that the highly interactional nature of LD in English accounts for its relative non-integration into the grammar. This, however, does not adequately explain the fact that LDs produced by non-native speakers of English often sound decidedly odd. Nor does it explain to what degree left-dislocation is acceptable to educated English speakers. In other words, where is the cut-off point at which LD becomes socially unacceptable?

In Italian, on the other hand, since negotiation of topic introduction is less of a concern for Italian speakers, the three-stage acknowledgement process proposed by Geluykens for English is absent, and syntactization has been largely achieved, although some interaction is present. In French, finally, LD has progressed even further than Italian on the road to syntactization, and the interactional dimension is judged to be completely absent. The initial findings for LD in Spanish conversation (Downing & Martínez Caro, 1993) confirm the prediction that Spanish is closer to French and Italian than to English, and suggest a distribution of functions whose realisations have become totally integrated into the grammar.

In general organisation, method, argumentation and wealth of detail this book is excellent and thought-provoking. It would have been helpful, for the purpose of identification, to have numbered the examples consecutively right through the book, instead of numbering for each chapter separately. And if one worries at times at the inclusion of certain of the examples under the label of LD, about the extent to which LD is allowed to wander, and about the cooperative nature of the device, as claimed by Geluykens, the work nevertheless provides what will assuredly be the standard treatment of left-dislocation in English for some time.

REFERENCES

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dik, S.C. (1989) *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Downing, A. (1990a) Sobre el tema tópico en inglés. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada*. Anejo 1. ed. M.T. Turrell. *Nuevas corrientes lingüísticas. Aplicación a la descripción del inglés*. 119-128.

Downing, A. (1990b) The discourse function of presentative *there* in existential structures in Middle English and present-day English: a systemic-functional perspective. *Occasional Papers in Systemic Linguistics*. Vol.4. 103-126.

Downing, A. (1991) An alternative approach to theme: a systemic-functional perspective. *WORD*, volume 42, number 2. 119-143.

Downing, A. & Martínez-Caro, E. (1993). The discourse-pragmatic functions of left-dislocation in Spanish. J. Fernández-Barrientos Martín ed. *Proceedings of the International Conference of Applied Linguistics. Robert Di Pietro. In Memoriam*. Universidad de Granada. 282-295.

Givón, T. ed. (1983) *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1971) Language in a social perspective. In Halliday (1973) *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold. (First published in *Educational Review,* June 1971).

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prince, E. (1985) On the given/new distinction. *Papers from the 15th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. 267-278.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & J. Svartvik. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Radford, A. (1988) *Transformational Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivero, Mª L.(1980) On Left-Dislocation and Topicalization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry*, volume 11 number 2. 363-393.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & G. Jefferson. (1974) A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50. 696-735.

Schiffrin, D. (1987) *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Angela DOWNING
Universidad Complutense

EL PODER Y EL GÉNERO EN SHAKESPEARE

ADELMAN, Janet: *Suffocating Mothers* (Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, *Hamlet* to *The Tempest*), Nueva York y Londres: Routledge, 1992. 379 + xii págs.

WAYNE, Valerie (ed.): *The Matter of Difference* (Materialist Feminist Criticism of *Shakespeare*), Nueva York y Londres: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991. 277 + x págs.

SINFIELD, Alan: *Faultlines* (Cultural Materialism and the Politics of Dissident Reading), Oxford:Clarendon Press,1992. 365 + xi págs.

El subtítulo del estudio de Adelman hace temer que estemos una vez más ante el vicio de origen de cierta crítica (especialmente de la norteamericana) :formulaciones teóricas de otras disciplinas, preferentemente en los últimos años el psicoanálisis lacaniano, se superponen a textos literarios para llegar a conclusiones determinadas de antemano. Sin embargo, las primeras páginas muestran ya algunas diferencias importantes. La exposición introductoria comienza con una referencia específica al texto shakespeareano (*King Henry VI, Part 3*, 3.2.153-68), y al proponer su tesis acerca de la existencia de fantasías sobre la madre en el teatro de Shakespeare, Adelman presenta las condiciones materiales de la crianza de los hijos en el período isabelino. Podemos resumir la tesis de Adelman de la manera siguiente: las obras tempranas de Shakespeare(la primera tetralogía, *The Comedy of Errors* , *Titus Andronicus*) presentan figuras maternales poderosas. En las líneas antes mencionadas de *King Henry VI* Ricardo sitúa en el vientre de su madre el origen de su deformidad, y en una interpretación algo discutible Adelman aduce que la imagen de pesadilla en la que Ricardo se imagina atrapado en