

TOPICALIZATION OF CASE-MARKED NOMINALS: TOPICALIZATION OR LEFT DISLOCATION

Dr. Talat Masood,

Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Swabi.

Abstract:

This paper tries to draw a line between topicalized and left dislocated constructions in Pashto. In Pashto topicalized constructions, there is a resumptive clitic pronoun in the originating place of the topicalized nominal if the topicalized nominal carries either ergative case or accusative case. This gives the impression that these constructions in Pashto are not truly topicalized; rather, they are instances of left dislocated constructions. However, through data and analysis it is established that such constructions are not left dislocated elements per se; rather, Pashto has a tri partite system vis-à-vis topicalization and left dislocation: some are topicalized, some are left dislocated, and some are topicalized with a resumptive clitic pronoun. The third type owes its origin to a larger over riding aspect of the Pashto language, namely, Pashto has syntactic split-ergativity along the dimension of tense. Thus, nominals bearing ergative and accusative cases are unable to move to A-bar position unless they are enabled to do so through the compensatory strategy of insertion of a resumptive clitic pronoun.

Key words: topicalization, left dislocation, clitics, syntactic ergativity, Pashto

Introduction

This paper is about topicalized constructions in Pashto as exemplified in (1, 2):

1. [pen, [_{CP} Peter ye mathawi]]
pen Peter 3RP break.PRS
'The pen, Peter is breaking.'
Lit: 'The pen, Peter is breaking (3P).'
2. [Rob, [_{CP} tha wail [_{CP} che pencil ye math k_o]]]
Rob you say.PST COMP pencil 3RP break do.PST
'Rob, you said, broke a pencil.'
Lit: 'Rob, you said, (he) broke a pencil.'

As per standard terminology, these constructions could be considered as instances of topicalization; however, their surface structure could give the impression that they are instances of left dislocation. The goal of this study is to establish that these left dislocated looking constructions are not left dislocations; rather, they are topicalization constructions essentially.

In the available literature on topicalization and left dislocation, it is a standard theory that a left dislocated element leaves a relevant pronoun behind in the place from where it originated while in topicalization the element topicalized does not leave a pronoun behind. In Pashto, however, there are some constructions where, if on the one hand, we have topicalized elements in the left periphery, on the other, the topicalized element often leaves a resumptive clitic pronoun behind. This, taken on the face value, would mean that these are no true topicalization constructions; rather, they are left dislocated constructions. The major goal of this paper is to disambiguate this impression.

To achieve the stated goal of the paper, different examples of topicalization and left dislocation in Pashto will be considered. Initially, an effort will be made to see whether forming both types of constructions in Pashto is possible or not. For this, this study will first consider cases of topicalization with reference to different syntactic structures and later on with reference to different tenses. This is important in the context of the fact that in Pashto in the past tense we have Erg-Abs case alignment while in the present and future tenses we have Nom-Acc case alignment. Afterwards, the same process will be repeated for left dislocation

The paper is organized as follows: Section 1 introduces the topic. Section 2 gives a brief literature review of topicalization and left dislocation. Section 3 deals with topicalization in Pashto. Section 4 sheds light on left dislocation in Pashto. Section 5 presents the discussion and analysis. Section 6 is about the results. Section 7 concludes the paper.

Over the years, topicalization and left dislocation have been discussed both individually and in terms of the relation between the two. Some of the well-known accounts, which have discussed topicalization from various angles, are Bianchi & Frascarelli (2010), Cinque (1997), Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007), Georgiou (2023), Haegeman (2004), and Miyagawa (2017). Some of the well-known accounts which have discussed left dislocation are Anagnostopoulou (1997), Alexiadou (2006), Álvarez (2010), Andrason (2016), Andrason, Westbury & van der Merwe (2016), Baker (2003), Boeckx & Kleanthes (2005), De Cat (2007a, 2007b), Delais-Roussaire & Sleeman (2004), Feldhausen (2012), Lambrecht (2001), Manetta (2007), Ozerov (2024), Rodman (1997), Tizón-Couto (2012), Van Riemsdijk & Zwarts (1974/1997), Westbury (2014), Yamaizumi (2011). At the same time, Benincà & Poletto (2004), Bortolussi (2017), Bortolussi & Sznajder (2014), Greenberg (1984), Gundel (1975), Haegeman (2006a, 2006b, 2012), Hudson (2003), Moezzi pour (2013), Rivero, (1980), Rizzi (1997), Yoshimoto (2023), to name a few, instead of discussing topicalization and left dislocation individually, have tried to explore the relation between the two from one angle or another.

Topicalization in Pashto is explored, first, in terms of different structural constructions and later on in terms of different tenses.

Topicalization in terms of different syntactic structures will show to us if the varied structures have any effect on topicalization or not.

3. $[[hagha_i \text{ } [_{CP} t_i \text{ } pen \text{ } mathawi]]]$ (topicalization of subject)
 he pen break.PRS
 'He is breaking a pen.'
4. $*[[pen_i \text{ } [_{CP} hagha \text{ } t_i \text{ } mathawi]]]$ (topicalization of object)
 pen he break.PRS
 'Pen, he is breaking.'

5. $[thə_i \quad [_{CP} t_i \quad khanday]$ (topicalization of subject)
 you laugh.PRS
 'You are laughing.'

6. [*Peter_i* [_{CP} *t_i* *khandi*]] (topicalization of subject)
 Peter laugh.PRS
 'Peter is laughing.'

7. [$z\alpha_i$ [$_{CP}$ t_i *prevazzum*]] (topicalization of subject)
I fall.PRS
'I am falling.'

8. [*Peter_i [_{CP} t_i prevazzi]*] (topicalization of subject)
 Peter fall.PRS
 'Peter is falling.'

717

9. [*hagha_i* [*CP t_i bemar day*]] (topicalization of subject)
he ill be.PRS
'He is ill.'
10. [*day Erika_i* [*CP Peter t_i roor day*]] (topicalization of predicate nominal)
of Erika Peter brother be.PRS
'Peter is Erika's brother.'
Lit: 'Erika's, Peter is brother.'

Topicalization in terms of different tenses

Present Tense

In the present tense, the subject can be topicalized from its originating position without leaving a pronoun behind. However, the topicalization of object is not possible unless a resumptive clitic pronoun is inserted in the place from where the object has been topicalized.

11. [[*hagha_i* [*CP t_i class safa kawi*]]
he class clean do.PRS
'He is cleaning the class.'
12. *[[*class_i* [*CP hagha t_i safa kawi*]]
class he clean do.PRS
'Class, he is cleaning.'
Lit: 'Class is cleaning him.'
13. [[*class* [*CP hagha ye safa kawi*]]
class he 3RP clean do.PRS
'Class, he is cleaning.'
Lit: 'Class, he is cleaning (him/her).'

Future Tense

In the future tense, like the present tense, the subject can be topicalized but not the object. Topicalization of the object is only possible if a resumptive clitic pronoun is added in the place from where the object nominal is topicalized.

14. [[*hagha_i* [*CP t_i ba class safa kawi*]]
he will class clean do.PRS
'He will clean the class.'
15. *[[*class_i* [*CP hagha ba t_i safa kawi*]]
class he will clean do.PRS
'Class, he will clean.'
16. [[*class_i* [*CP hagha ba ye safa kawi*]]
class he will 3RP clean do.PRS
'Class he will clean.'
Lit: 'Class he will clean (3P).'

Past Tense

For topicalization in the past tense, consider the following examples:

17. *[[*haghə_i* [*CP tha wail*]] [*CP che t_i class safa kəo*]]
he you say.PST COM class clean
do.PST
'He, you said, cleaned the class.'
18. [[*haghə_i* [*CP tha wail*]] [*CP che class ye safa*
kəo]]
he you say.PST COM clean 3RP
clean do.PST
'He, you said, cleaned the class.'

Lit: 'He, you said, (he/she) cleaned the class.'

19. [*class_i* [*CP haghə_i* *t_i* *safa* *kɔo*]]
class he clean do.PST

'Class he cleaned.'

As can be seen from the examples above, the topicalization of subject is not possible. To make topicalization of the subject possible, a resumptive clitic pronoun is added. One thing to be noted is the fact that the object nominal moves ahead of the resumptive pronoun when resumption is resorted to. This has perhaps to do with the internal mechanism of Pashto, namely, to render a pronoun clitic, some element must be focus moved ahead of it. The topicalization of object in the past tense is possible as is shown by the last example.

Left Dislocation

For left dislocation, the same pattern is repeated as was the case with topicalization: namely, left dislocation is first considered with reference to different syntactic structures and then with reference to tenses.

Left dislocation in terms of different syntactic structures:

Left dislocation with reference to different syntactic structure will enable us to see whether the change of syntactic structure has any effect on it or not.

Transitives

20. [[*Peter_i* [*CP haghə_i* *pen* *math* *kɔo*]]
Peter he pen break do.PST

'Peter, he broke a pen.'

21. [[*Erika_i* [*CP haghə_i* *Peter tha* *gori*]]
Erika she Peter to see.PRS

'Erika, she is looking at Peter.'

22. *[[*shisha_i* [*CP Erika* *daghə_i* *math* *kɔa*]]
Mirror Erika she(near) break do.PST

'Mirror Erika she broke.'

23. *[[*shisha_i* [*CP Erika* *daghə_i* *mathawi*]]
Mirror Erika she(near) break.PRS

'Mirror Erika she is breaking.'

Unaccusatives

24. [*shisha_i* [*CP daghai* *prevatha*]]
Mirror she(near) fall.PST

'Mirror, she fell.'

Unergatives

25. [*Peter_i* [*CP haghə_i* *khandi*]]
Peter he(far) laugh.PRS

'Peter he laughs.'

Copular

26. [*Peter_i* [*CP haghə_i* *bemar day*]]
Peter he(far) ill be.PRS

'Peter he is ill.'

As could be seen from the examples above, left dislocation is possible from the subject position but difficult from the object position.

Present Tense

In the present tense, left dislocation is possible from the subject position but not from the object position.

27. [*Peter_i* [*CP haghə_i* *ball wahi*]] (left dislocation of subject)
Peter he ball hit.PRS

- ‘Peter he is hitting the ball.’
28. $*[ball_i, [_{CP} Peter \quad t_i \quad wahi.]]$ (left dislocation of object)
Ball Peter hit.PRS
‘Ball Peter is hitting.’
Lit: ‘Ball is hitting Peter.’
29. $[ball_i, [_{CP} Peter \quad ye_i \quad wahi.]]$ (left dislocation of object)
Ball Peter 3RP hit.PRS
‘Ball Peter is hitting (3P).’

Interestingly, an effort to left dislocate the object results in topicalization construction.

Future Tense

The same is case with the future tense. Here the left dislocation of the subject is possible but not that of the object.

30. $[Peter_i, [_{CP} haghā_i \quad ba \quad ball \quad wahi.]]$
Peter he will ball hit.PRS
‘Peter he will be hitting the ball.’
31. $*[ball_i, [_{CP} Peter \quad ba \quad t_i \quad wahi.]]$
ball Peter will hit.PRS
‘Ball Peter will be hitting.’
32. $[ball_i, [_{CP} Peter \quad ba \quad ye_i \quad wahi.]]$
Ball Peter will 3RP hit.PRS
‘Ball Peter will be hitting (3P).’

As was the case with the present tense, an effort on left dislocation of the object in the future tense results in a topicalized construction.

Past Tense

33. $[Peter_i, [_{CP} haghā_i \quad ball \quad wowahalo.]]$
Peter he ball hit.PRF.PST
‘Peter he hit the ball.’
34. $[ball_i, [_{CP} Peter \quad haghā_i \quad wowahalo.]]$
ball Peter he hit.PRF.PST
‘Ball Peter hit (3P).’
35. $*[ball_i, [_{CP} Peter \quad ye_i \quad wowahalo.]]$
ball Peter 3RP hit.PRF.PST
Lit: ‘Ball Peter (3P) hit.’

Interesting results emerge from the past tense left dislocation instances. Dislocation of the subject is possible in the past tense. Similarly, dislocation of the object is possible with full pronoun; however, it is not possible with a resumptive clitic pronoun.

Results and discussion

A look at the different constructions in terms of topicalization and left dislocation shows that the patterns are not uniform. When topicalizing an element, the behavior is not changed by the change in structure of a construction. As can be seen from the relevant examples, topicalization is possible in all types of grammatical structures. However, when it comes to tenses, topicalization patterns change. In the present tense, the subject can be topicalized but not the object. It is the case with the future tense as well, where the subject could be topicalized but not the object. The object can only be topicalized if a resumptive clitic pronoun is added in the place from where the topicalized element was moved. In the past tense, we have a different situation. The object can be topicalized without the addition of a resumptive clitic pronoun in the place from where the object was topicalized; however, at the same time, in the past tense, the subject cannot be topicalized. The only situation when the

topicalization of the subject in the past tense is possible is if a resumptive clitic pronoun is inserted in the place from where the subject is topicalized.

For left dislocation, a look at the examples given above shows that in transitive constructions subjects could be left dislocated but not the objects. Any attempt at having constructions where objects are left dislocated results in ungrammaticality. Since, in the rest of the constructions, only subjects are there, hence no issue of ungrammaticality arises. For left dislocation, in terms of tenses, we have different patterns. In the present tense, the subject can be left dislocated but not the object. To make the left dislocation possible, a resumptive clitic pronoun needs to be added. Similarly, in the past tense, the subject can be left dislocated. However, the object cannot be left dislocated, even if a resumptive clitic pronoun is added. In the future tense, we have the same pattern, as was the case with the present tense. Here the subject can be left dislocated but not the object. The object can be left dislocated only if a resumptive clitic pronoun is added at the originating site of the left-dislocated element.

A look at the overall picture conveys the fact that in some cases, the subjects cannot be topicalized or left dislocated while in others the objects cannot be topicalized or left dislocated. However, in some cases, the originating place of the topicalized or left-dislocated elements have proper pronouns while in other cases the originating place of the topicalized or left-dislocated elements have clitic resumptive pronouns. This shows that, in Pashto, topicalization of the object in the present and future tenses is not left dislocation as could be assumed in the first reading of these constructions; similarly, topicalization of the subject in the past tense is not left dislocation as could be assumed in the first sight of the constructions. Rather, it is due to a larger scheme of the Pashto language.

In Pashto, there is a TAM based split-ergativity. Constructions in the present and future tenses have Nom-Acc case alignment while constructions in the past tense have Erg-Abs case alignment. Since, I have been advocating the idea that ergativity in Pashto is syntactic in nature and accusative case bearing objects in the present and future tenses and ergative case bearing subjects in the past tense cannot be moved to an A-bar position; therefore, topicalization of these nominals is ungrammatical. However, as many syntactically ergative languages across the globe resort to different compensatory strategies (antipassivization, agent focus, anti-agreement, nominalization of the vP, and resumption, to name a few) to make A-bar movement possible. It is also the case with Pashto, where to overcome the ban on A-bar movement, Pashto resorts to insertion of resumptive clitic pronouns. Thus, it could be concluded that in Pashto when A-bar movement of ergative and accusative case bearing nominals is involved we have insertion of resumptive clitic pronouns while when there is left dislocation we have insertion of proper pronouns. The following examples reproduced from the forgoing paper gives a picture of topicalization and left dislocation in Pashto:

36. $[[hagha_i \text{ } [_{CP} t_i \text{ } pen \text{ } mathawi]]]$ (topicalization of subject)
he pen break.PRS
'He is breaking a pen.'
37. $*[[pen_i \text{ } [_{CP} hagha \text{ } t_i \text{ } mathawi]]]$ (topicalization of object)
pen he break.PRS
'Pen, he is breaking.'
38. $[[pen_i \text{ } [_{CP} hagha \text{ } ye_i \text{ } mathawi]]]$ (topicalization of object)
pen he 3RP break.PRS
'Pen, he is breaking.'
39. $[Peter_i, [_{CP} hagha_i \text{ } ball \text{ } wahi.]]]$ (left dislocation of subject)
Peter he ball hit.PRS
'Peter he is hitting the ball.'
40. $*[[ball_i, [_{CP} Peter \text{ } t_i \text{ } wahi.]]]$ (left dislocation of object)

- ball Peter hit.PRS
'Ball Peter is hitting.'
Lit: 'Ball is hitting Peter.'
41. [*ball_i* [*CP Peter ye_i wahi.*]] (An effort on left dislocation of object results in topicalization of the object)
- ball Peter 3RP hit.PRS
'Ball Peter is hitting (3P).'

Conclusion

This paper started with an effort to disambiguate the impression that some cases of topicalization in Pashto could be possible instances of left dislocation. To achieve that end different topicalization and left dislocation constructions with reference to different syntactic structures and tenses were considered. It turned out that the topicalization instances, which could be considered as left dislocation constructions were proper topicalization structures. The confusion is attributable to the fact that Pashto being a TAM based split-ergative language resist the movement of accusative case bearing nominals and ergative case bearing nominals to A-bar positions. To compensate for the ban on A-bar movement in Pashto, it resorts to the compensatory strategy of resumptive clitic pronoun insertion. Hence, those topicalized constructions, where resumptive clitic pronouns as a compensatory strategy were inserted, looked like as if they were left-dislocated constructions.

References

- Anagnostopoulou, E. (1997). Clitic left dislocation and contrastive left dislocation. In E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk and F. Zwarts (Eds.) *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. pp. 151–192.
- Alexiadou, A. (2006). Left dislocation (including CLLD). In M. Everaert and H.C. van Riemsdijk (Eds.) *Blackwells Companion to Syntax*, Vol. 2. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 669–699.
- Álvarez Huerta, O. (2010). Les constructions Hanging Topic Left Dislocation et Clitic Left Dislocation en latin. Talk delivered at *Colloque International de Syntaxe Grecque et Latine*, Nov. 26th–27th, Paris.
- Andrason, A. (2016). To resume or not to resume: Some remarks on 'resumption' in left dislocation constructions in Polish, and its relevance for Biblical Hebrew. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 50. 185–199.
- Andrason, A., J. Westbury, C.H.J. and van der Merwe. (2016). Left dislocation: An exploration in linguistic typology. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 50. 1–20.
- Baker, M. (2003). Agreement, dislocation, and partial configurationality. In A. Carnie, H. Harley, and M. Willie (Eds.) *Formal Approaches to Function in Grammar: In Honor of Eloise Jelinek*. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins. pp. 107–132.
- Benincà, P. & Poletto, C. (2004). Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In Rizzi L. (ed.). *The structure of CP and IP, The cartography of syntactic structures* 2, 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bernard Bortolussi. (2017). Topicalizations, left dislocations and the left-periphery. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 16, 10.5565/rev/catj.208. hal-03852122
- Bianchi, Valentia and Mara Frascarelli. (2010). Is topic a root phenomenon? *Iberia: An*

- International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2(1): 43–88.
- Boeckx, C. and Kleanthes G. (2005). Left dislocation in Germanic. In W. Abraham (ed.) *Focus on Germanic Typology*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. pp. 131–144.
- Bortolussi, B. & Sznajder, L. (2014). Topicalization versus Left dislocation in Biblical Latin. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13(2): 163-195.
- Cinque G. (1997). ‘Topic’ constructions in some European languages and Connectedness. In Anagnostopoulou E., van Riemsdijk H. & Zwarts F. (eds.). *Materials on Left Dislocation*, 93-118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- De Cat, C. (2007a). *French Dislocations*. Oxford University Press.
- De Cat, C. (2007b). French Dislocation without Movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 485–534.
- Delais-Roussaire, E., Doetjes, J., and Sleeman, P. (2004). Dislocation. In F. Corblin and H. de Swart (Eds.) *Handbook of French Semantics*. Palo Alto: CSLI Publications. pp. 505–530.
- Feldhausen, I. (2012). *Prosodic Aspects of Clitic Left Dislocation in Spanish*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Frankfurt and Université Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle.
- Frascarelli, Mara and Roland Hinterhölzl (2007). Types of Topics in German and Italian. In K. Schwabe and S. Winkler (eds.) *On Information Structure, Meaning, and Form*, 87–116, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Georgiou, R., (2023). Greek Topicalization: How do properties move? *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 8(1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.16995/glossa.7954>
- Greenberg, G.R. (1984). Left Dislocation, Topicalization, and Interjections. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 2(3). 283–287.
- Greenberg, Gerald, R. (1984). Left dislocation, topicalization, and interjections. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2: 283–287.
- Gundel, J. (1975). Left Dislocation and the Role of Topic-Comment Structure in Linguistic Theory. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 18. 72–31.
- Haegeman, Liliane. (2004). Topicalization, CLLD and the left periphery. In Benjamin Shaer, Werner Frey, and Claudia Maienborn (eds.) *Proceedings of the dislocated elements workshop, ZAS papers in linguistics*, vol. 35, 157–192. Berlin: ZAS.
- Haegeman, Liliane. (2006a). Argument fronting in English, Romance CLLD and the left periphery. In Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, and Paul Portner (eds.) *Negation, tense and clausal architecture: Cross-linguistic investigations*, 27–52. Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane (2006b). Conditionals, Factives, and the Left Periphery. *Lingua* 116: 1651–1669.
- Haegeman, Liliane. (2007). Operator movement and topicalization in adverbial clauses. *Folia Linguistica* 41: 279–325.
- Haegeman, Liliane. (2012). *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hudson, Richard. (2003). Trouble on the left periphery. *Lingua* 113: 607–642.
- Lambrecht, K. (2001). Dislocation. In M. Haspelmath, E. König, W. Oesterreicher, and W. Raible

- (Eds.) *Typology and Language Universals*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. pp. 1050–1078.
- Manetta, E. (2007). Unexpected Left Dislocation: An English Corpus Study. *Pragmatics* 39. 1029–1034.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. (2017). Topicalization. *Gengo Kenkyu* 152: 1–29.
- Moezzi-pour, F. (2013). *Towards Rethinking Left-Detached Position and Pre-Core Slot in RRG: Evidence from Clitic Left dislocation Constructions in Persian*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259044914_Towards_rethinking_the_Left_Detached_Position_in_RRG_Evidence_from_external_possession_in_Persian
- Ozerov, P. (2024). Left Dislocation in Spoken Hebrew, it is neither topicalizing nor a construction. *Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2023-0174>
- Rivero, M.L. (1980). On Left Dislocation and Topicalization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11. 363–393.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337, Kluwer, Dordrecht, the Netherlands.
- Rodman, Robert. (1997). On left dislocation. In Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwarts (eds.) *Materials on left dislocation*, 31–55. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tizón-Couto, D. (2012). *Left Dislocation in English: A Functional-Discoursal Approach*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Van Riemsdijk, H. & Zwarts, F. (1974/1997). Left dislocation in Dutch and the status of copying rules. In E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk, and F. Zwarts (Eds.), *Materials on Left Dislocation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 13–30.
- Westbury, J. (2014). *Left Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach*. PhD dissertation, University of Stellenbosch.
- Yamaizumi, M. (2011). Left Dislocation in Japanese and Information Structure Theory. *NINJAL Research Papers* 1. 77–92.
- Yoshimoto, K. (2023). Topicalization and left dislocation: An experimental study. *Gengo Kenkyu*, 163: 139-166. doi: 10.11435/gengo.163.0_139