Contrast from a Contrastive Perspective

VALÉRIA MOLNÁR

Lund University, Sweden

valeria.molnar@tyska.lu.se

ABSTRACT. The main concern of the paper is to address some problems that arise when defining the concept of *contrast* and to clarify the relation between contrast and other concepts of information structure. As to the definition of the notion of contrast, we need to separate the semantic and pragmatic aspects of contrastiveness as well as identify different types within these two main categories. There is abundant cross-linguistic evidence for the hypothesis that certain types of contrast motivate a more fine-grained analysis of topicality and focusing. It will be argued, however, that contrastiveness not only is a relevant feature for the parametrization of topicality and focusing, but that contrast indeed represents an autonomous concept of information structuring.

1 Introduction

The main concern of the paper is to clarify the relation between *contrast* and the two main concepts of information structure *topic* and *focus*. This requires a *definition* of contrast and the specification of the *compatibility* of different contrast types with focusing and topicality.

I will argue for the following assumptions:

(i) the notion of contrast is a **linguistically relevant phenomenon** and does not only arise "from particular inferences which we draw on the basis of given conversational contexts" (Lambrecht 1994: 290): the feature contrastiveness has *syntactic* and *phonological* consequences for the realization of topic and focus;

(ii) the **distinction of different types of contrast** is necessary in order to explain its impact on linguistic forms, and above all the separation of the *pragmatic level* of contrastiveness from the *semantic*, quantificationally based, level is required;

(iii) the **linguistic status of contrast** must be differentiated: contrast is not simply a feature of topicality and focusing, but it seems plausible to regard contrast –in certain languages and in certain constructions– as a further *autonomous "packaging phenomenon"*. On the basis of cross-linguistic evidence contrast must be included into the inventory of pragmatic categories.

99

I would like to start my discussion with some introductory remarks on the basic notions of contrast, topic and focus and the relations between them.

According to a theory neutral definition (cf. Bußmann 1990: 419), the notion of **contrast** has two main dimensions: firstly, it is used as a synonym for "opposition" – either on the paradigmatic or syntagmatic level – and secondly it also includes also another aspect, namely highlighting by accent.

The notion of **focus** is related to highlighting in some sense, too. The view that focus is the "information centre of the sentence" and contains the new, non-presupposed part of the utterance is widely accepted in the literature. It is fore-grounded most often by stress while the rest of the utterance remains in the background. Besides this syntagmatic (horizontal) type of highlighting, it is claimed that highlighting in the paradigmatic (vertical) dimension may also be involved. The basic idea is that a set of alternatives exists for the focused constituent which stands in opposition to all of them. Obviously, the two main properties of contrast - opposition in two directions and highlighting - are also typical of the notion of focus. **Contrast** and **focus** are thus often regarded as very closely related concepts in linguistic research.

According to an extreme view, focusing is always contrastive - and as all utterances contain a focus, all utterances must necessarily be contrastive - or as Dretske (1952) puts it, "all contingent statements contrast […] one state of affairs with another". While Bolinger (1961: 87) defends the view that "in a broad sense every semantic peak is contrastive", Dretske (1972: 412) argues that "contrastive statements" must be regarded as a special class, because they "embody a dominant contrast, a contrastive focus, a featured exclusion of certain possibilities". In examples (1) and (2) from Dretske, different contrasts are featured: in (1) the verb *sold*, but in (2) the nominal phrase *my typewriter* stands out as the focal point and embodies the dominant contrast:

(1)   I *sold* my typewriter to Clyde.

(2)   I sold *my typewriter* to Clyde.

The decisison as to whether or not focusing is inherently contrastive depends on how important we judge dominant contrast to be. If not only highlighting, but further conditions such as "a featured exclusion of certain possibilities" need to be met for contrast, then contrast can only be an optional and not an obligatory property of focusing.

As to **topic**, three definitions dominate the linguistic landscape. Firstly those which define topic as the notion of *aboutness* (Reinhart 1982) or as an "address pointer", also called "link" by Vallduví (1992). According to another influential view, the topic should be regarded as the notion of *frame*: "the topic sets a spatial, temporal, or individual framework within which the main predication holds" (Chafe 1976: 51). A third definition of topic is given with recourse to *old information*: the topic is either identified as given information or in weaker versions, the "givenness condition" is an important part of topicality.

In none of these three definitions do the properties of topicality have a direct relation to the notion of contrast. The separation of the topic from the rest of the sentence can be made in an explicit, emphasized way, but this is not necessarily so. In the analysis of the **relation of contrast to topic**, their compatibility is a controversial issue, especially in theories where emphasis only can be assigned to focus.

2   The definition of the notion contrast

The most important criteria that are discussed in the literature in connection with the definition of contrast are listed below with regard to their hierarchy (in order of importance):

- highlighting

- dominant contrast

- membership in a set

- limited set of candidates

- explicit mentioning of alternatives

The relevance of the criteria is judged in different ways - leading to different types of distinctions between the contrastive and non-contrastive, regular foci. It is important to note that the judgements are partly dependent on the theoretical approach, partly on the type or number of languages taken into consideration and the presence of obligatory formal marking of the distinction in these languages.

The basic requirement for contrastiveness is the existence of highlighting. Not only Bolinger links every semantic peak to contrastiveness, but also Lambrecht (1994) regards highlighting as a sufficient condition of contrast. According to the overwhelming majority of linguists, though, the existence of a "dominant contrast" dividing the utterance into two parts - background (also called "presupposition") and focus - is a necessary requirement of contrast. Rochemont (1986: 52) distinguishes contrastive focus from presentational focus on the basis of this criterion.

A further condition of contrast is membership in a set, namely that we can generate a set of alternatives for the focused constituent - or as Jackendoff (1972: 243) puts it "a coherent class of possible contrasts with the focus." This condition is regarded as a sufficient prerequisite of contrast also by linguists working in the framework of "Alternative semantics" (e.g. Rooth 1985). In many approaches, however, "membership in a set" is narrowed down to the requirement of a *closed* set. The decisive criterion for contrastiveness is thus, according to Halliday (1967), Chafe (1976) and Rooth (1992), the availability of a limited number of candidates. Halliday (1967: 206) defines "contrastive" "as contrary to some predicted or stated alternative" and Chafe (1976: 34) also favours the view – opposed

to Bolinger's suggestion – that "contrastive sentences are qualitatively different from those which simply supply new information from an unlimited set of possibilities". When the set of possibilities is unlimited, the sentence supplies only "new information" and fails to be contrastive.

While Chafe regards "the limited number of candidates" as the essential distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive readings, Jacobs (1988: 113) claims that the candidates *excluded* must be explicitly mentioned in the context. According to Jacobs, the focus of negation is thus inherently contrastive (3), while the contrastiveness of foci of the illocutionary operators is context-dependent, only present in case of explicit mentioning of alternatives (4):

(3)   Dieses Buch hat mir nicht$_2$ Kláus empfohlen, sondern Gérda.
$$F_2$$

(4)   A: Ich fürchte, daß wieder die Schwéden gewonnen haben.

B: Keine Angst! Diesmal haben wír gewonnen.
$$F_1$$

(5)   Wießt du, wer gewonnen hat? Wír (haben gewonnen)!
$$F_1$$

There are further controversial questions in connection with the definition of contrast, namely whether it should be regarded as a gradient or distinct notion and whether or not contrast is an independent phenomenon of information structure.

If one shares Bolinger's and Lambrecht's opinion, according to which focusing is always contrastive, then utterances can only be *used* contrastively and it is only possible to speak of "clear or less clear instances of contrastiveness". Even for this gradient approach the "clearest instances of contrastiveness" are those "in which a focus designatum explicitly contradicts a stated or predicted alternative" (Lambrecht 1994: 290). Most approaches argue, however, for the non-gradient character of contrastiveness and for a distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive cases on the basis of one of the above-mentioned criteria. A relevant task for linguistic theory is to take a stand in this controversy, by expanding the data to a large number of languages so that cross-linguistically valid arguments can be made.

The second important theoretical question is the linguistic status of contrast - based on the impact of contrast on linguistic realization. The standard view represented by linguists working within different theoretical frameworks (see above Dretske, Bolinger, Halliday, Rochemont, Rooth, Jacobs etc) is that contrast cannot be regarded as an independent phenomenon of information structure, but only as a feature of focusing and topicality, which serves to further parametrize these notions. Analysing contrast as a "packaging phenomenon" was, however, suggested by Chafe in 1976 and also by recent linguistic analyses of Finnish data.

3 The linguistic relevance of contrast - *within* focusing and topicality

In opposition to the view according to which contrastive cases cannot clearly be separated from non-contrastive ones, there is abundant evidence (i) that contrast in many languages can be optionally marked or even *must* be marked by grammatical means, and (ii) that certain formal phenomena (syntactic, morphological and phonological) can only be explained with recourse to the notion of contrast. Consequently, contrast should be a linguistically relevant phenomenon, and not only a cognitively motivated category.

3.1 Contrast vs. Focus

Contrast – or the presence of certain kinds of contrastiveness – motivates the internal differentiation of focusing. It is plausible to assume that the notion of contrast applies only to those foci which operate on predicted or stated alternatives and do not simply express new information. A further differentiation of contrastive foci seems to be motivated by the status of alternatives: explicitly mentioned alternatives trigger other syntactic patterns than simply predicted alternatives.

A distinction between two main types of focusing is suggested on the basis of empirical data from Hungarian by É. Kiss (1998). The **dichotomy** "identificational focus" vs. "information focus" is based on differences both in syntactic realization and semantically relevant content. The most important *syntactic* difference is that the information focus remains in situ (6) while the operator ("identificational") type must be moved to a special operator position, in Hungarian e.g. into the preverbal position (7) (cf. É. Kiss 1998: 249):

(6) Mari ki nézett magának EGY KALAPOT.
    'Mary picked for herself A HAT.'

(7) Mari **egy kalapot** nézett ki magának.
    Mary a   hat.ACC picked out herself.DAT
    'It was a **hat** that Mary picked for herself.'

The *semantic* difference can be specified as follows: while the focus operator "represents a subset of the set of contextually or situationally given elements for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold" (É. Kiss 1998: 245), the information focus only conveys new, nonpresupposed information. The sentence (7) containing a focus operator expresses that it was *only a hat and nothing else* Mary picked out for herself, whereas the information focus in (6) merely presents *a hat* as new information, without suggesting that the hat was the only one of a set of relevant things for Mary.

From a cross-linguistic perspective, the different types of contrastiveness demand, however, a further division of the focus field - not only a dichotomy, but even a **trichotomy** seems plausible. This is the result of a necessary distinction

of two types of contrastive foci, also represented syntactically: The focus operator operating either on a contextually *open* or *closed* set requires movement to a verb-related Focus-position. Movement into the verb-adjacent Focus position - which according to proposals made within generative frameworks is located in the left periphery of the sentence, i.e. in the Focus projection of the CP-domain (see below 5.2.) - is overt in so-called Focus languages (e.g. Hungarian, Basque), but can also be covert and delayed until LF (as in English). On the other hand, for the focus type by which alternatives are excluded from a *closed* set, movement is not necessarily verb-related, but in this case the left-peripheral position is decisive. Contrastive foci are moved in syntax into a projection appearing sentence-initially in surface structure in a great number of languages (Italian, Spanish, Catalan, Rumanian, Arabic, Greek, Russian, Finnish etc).

The difference between the two types of Focus movement can be illustrated by comparing Finnish and Hungarian data: in Finnish the leftmost position of the sentence is responsible for the expression of contrastiveness (8-B) and can be occupied only when the focused constituent refers to alternatives in a contextually limited set where the alternatives are known to the participants of the discourse. This explains why (9-A) is not an appropriate answer to a general informative question (9-F1) or to a constituent question (9-F2) if the alternatives are not explicitly mentioned or at least present in the minds of the discourse participants (cf. Järventausta & Molnár, 2001):

(8) A: Pekka lensi Tukholmaan.
         'Pekka flew to Stockholm.'

     B: [KONTRAST **Reykjavikiin**] Pekka lensi .
         'To Reykjavik, Pekka flew.'

(9) F1: What did Pekka do?

     F2: Where did Pekka fly?

     A: * [KONTRAST **Reykjavikiin**] Pekka lensi.
                    Reykjavik-to   Pekka flew

In Hungarian the opposite is true: the focus operator must be adjacent to the finite verb in surface structure (10-B1), but is not necessarily related to contextually specified alternatives:

(10) A: Hova   repült Péter?
          Where flew   Peter
          'Where did Peter fly?'

      B1: Pter   [FOCUS **Reykjavikba**] repült.
           Peter   to Reykjavik   flew
           'Peter flew to Reykjavik.'

      B2: * [FOCUS **Reykjavikba**] Péter replt.

Basque yields also strong evidence for the assumption of two contrast-related focus positions. In Basque, both types of contrast-related focusing are possible: Etxepare (1997) distinguishes between "emphatic focus" (11-a), the verb-related focus (here incidentally in sentence-initial position, but as (11-b) shows its verb-adjacent position is essential for grammaticality), and "contrastive focus" on the left periphery of the sentence (12-b) excluding a contextually explicit alternative (12-a) - however without the restriction on verb-adjacency:

(11) a. PATATAK **maite ditu** Jonek.
         potatoes   love   AUX Jon
         'It is potatoes that Jon loves.'

      b. * PATATAK Jonek **maite ditu**.

(12) a. MIKELI, ardoa **ekarri diote**.
         for-Mikel wine bring   AUX
         'It is for Mikel that they brought wine.'

      b. JONEK, ardoa **ekarri du**.
         Jon   wine bring   AUX
         'It is Jon that brought the wine.'

3.2   Contrast vs. Topic

Contrastiveness is not only marked in the field of focusing, but also in combination with topicality, in the latter case often by the use of special **syntactic** patterns such as topicalization and left-dislocation. Left-dislocation and topicalization seem highly restricted in discourse: they serve to change the current topic of conversation, and contrastiveness in some sense is important for the adequate use of these marked constructions. The relevance of contrastiveness in the case of topicalization in English is illustrated by Prince (1984: 218) by the difference in appropriateness of examples (13) and (14):

(13) A: You see every Woody Allen movie as soon as it comes out.
      B: No - *Annie Hall* I saw (only) yesterday.

(14) A: Why are you laughing?
      B: # *Annie Hall* I saw yesterday. I was just thinking about it.

The proper use of left-dislocation in (15) is also motivated by the fact that the left-dislocated constituent *gallstones* is contrasted with *nervous breakdown* (cf. Prince 1984: 221):

(15) "Everybody has their little <u>bundle</u>, believe me. I'll bet she had *a nervous breakdown*. That's not a good thing. *Gallstones*, you have them out and they're out. But *a nervous breakdown*, it's very bad … "

Contrastiveness in combination with topicality is not only expressed by marked syntactic constructions but also by **intonational** patterns. Here the "I-contour" (fall-rise accent) in German or the "B-accent" in English are the most thoroughly investigated phenomena. Büring (1997: 69) claims that recourse to alternatives is typical not only for focusing but also for topics realized by the fall-rise, in the latter case giving rise to the "residual topic":

(16) Q: What did the pop stars wear?
      A: The [FEMALE]$_T$ pop stars wore [CAFTANS]$_F$.

      Residual Topic: What did the male pop stars wear?

On the basis of the data presented we can conclude that the notion of contrast must be regarded as a linguistically relevant phenomenon, because contrast is a necessary condition for the use of certain syntactic and phonological means - both in the field of focusing and topicality. The data from different languages show, however, that this notion is important to a different degree - depending on which language and which specific structure is considered. In those languages where formal marking of contrast is only optional and not unambiguous (as in English or German), the strict distinction of the contrastive and non-contrastive cases is empirically not so well-founded - supporting the gradient view of contrast. From a cross-linguistic perspective it seems well-motivated, though, to assume that the notion of contrast has a crucial impact on linguistic forms, in many languages demanding an obligatory formal realization.

4   Contrast types

The data give empirical evidence also for the hypothesis that there is a need for differentiating the notion of contrast, because languages require a division between contrast and non-contrast with recourse to *different* criteria presented above. Firstly, the distinction between contrasting within a closed, limited set on the one hand, and recourse to alternatives within an open set, on the other, seems motivated: in the former case, contrastiveness has a **pragmatic** character and the realization of contrast is relevant, whereas in the latter case contrast is **semantically** anchored and operation on quantificational domains seems important. Secondly, we need to distinguish different semantic operations on quantificational domains and assume different types of exclusion.

4.1   Contrast: pragmatic vs. semantic level

The distinction between the pragmatic and semantic level of contrasting in the case of **focusing** is motivated by the syntactic difference in their realization. In both cases the focus type involved is "narrow focus", leaving one part of the sentence backgrounded.

Movement of a narrow focus into the left sentence-peripheral position is possible in many languages (in Finnish, Spanish, Italian, Rumanian, Russian), but only when the relevant set is limited. This type of contrast I will call **CONTRAST** - using a special notation with capital letters. The difference between the grammaticality of the Italian examples (17) and (18) (cf. Zubizzareta, 1998: 20) can only be explained by the fact that the explicit mentioning of the relevant alternative(s) (or at least their salience in the speaker's and hearer's minds) is a necessary condition for movement into the left periphery:

(17)   Who ate an apple?

   *Gianni ha mangiato una mela.
   'Gianni has eaten an apple.'

(18)   GIANNI ha mangiato una mela (non Piero).
   'Gianni has eaten an apple (not Piero).'

For the semantically anchored "narrow focusing", where recourse to a *closed* set is not absolutely necessary, the target position of the focus movement is obligatorily verb-related - without the restriction on the location on the left-periphery. In Hungarian the preverbal position (Spec-F-position) is involved (19) and Focus movement takes place in surface structure:

(19)   A: Ki   evett almát   tegnap?
           who ate   apple-Acc yesterday
       'Who ate apple yesterday?'

       B1: Tegnap   [FOCUS **János**] evett almát.
           yesterday   John   ate   apple
       B2: * [FOCUS **János**] tegnap evett almát.
       B3: * Tegnap evett almát [FOCUS **János**].

A contextually anchored contrast is even possible without the semantically based exclusion. This is typical for contrastiveness in the field of **topicality** - expressed by means of topicalization and by using different types of left dislocated structures which are employed "to mark a shift in attention from one to another of two or more already active topic referents" and "often have a 'contrastive' function" (Lambrecht 1994: 183). For this type of contextually anchored contrast I would like to suggest the label **LD-CONTRAST**.

4.2   Semantic distinctions

In the linguistic literature two types of "exclusion" of alternatives are distinguished. Most attention has been paid to the type of exclusion typical of the Hungarian **Focus Operator** specified as "exhaustive identification" (É. Kiss 1998).

The identification of one member of a set performed by an operator focus in the Hungarian sentence (20-B) entails that all other members of the set are excluded:

(20) A: Ki   jár   Lundban egyetemre?
         who is going Lund-in university-to
     'Who is studying in Lund?'

     B: [PÉTER]_F jár   Lundban egyetemre.
        Peter   is going Lund-in university-to
     'It is PETER who is studying in Lund.'

A further type of exclusion is the operation type which is performed when elements are realized with the fall-rise accent. Even by highlighting with the prenuclear rising accent of an "I-contour", a set of alternatives is induced and excluded. Nevertheless, with the rising accent the exclusion is "weakened". This accent type signals thus not the exclusion of *all* other members of the set (21), but that there is *at least one* member for which the predication (or a part of it) does not hold:

(21)   [PÉTER]_{CT} [LUNDBAN jár egyetemre]_F.
        'As for PETER, he is studying in LUND.'

Also Jacobs (1997) (commenting on Büring's 1997 proposal) emphasizes that the first highlighting of "I-Topikalisierung" contains recourse to alternatives, but this has not the same status as the one connected with focusing. The crucial difference between them is that only after utterances with "I-Topics" can questions be left open; this is not possible with utterances that only contain focus.

To express the similarity between the operator focus and the contrast expressed by the fall-rise, it was suggested in Molnár (1998) that both notions are associated with the feature [+ exclusive]. This feature appears, though, in the two cases in combination with different values of another feature [+/- exhaustive]: For the focus operator the features [+ exclusive] and [+ exhaustive] are characteristic expressing that all alternatives are excluded, whereas the contrastive topic contains the combination [+ exclusive] and [- exhaustive] , indicating the exclusion of only one or some of the relevant alternatives. The difference between the two exclusion types can thus be described by the opposition of "**strong exclusion**" ("*all*-exclusion") and "**weak exclusion**" ("*some*-exclusion").

The information structural value of the weak exclusion is differently judged in literature: it is subsumed either only under focus, called "Contrafocus" by Kenesei (1989), or only under topic - called "S-Topic" by Büring (1997), "I-Topik" by Jacobs (1997). I would like to suggest the label "**I-CONTRAST**" for this exclusion type, emphasizing by this term not only the importance of intonation for this type of contrast, but also that it cannot be restricted simply to topicality or focusing.

(22) **CONTRAST TYPES**:

	focus?	topic?
closed set	**CONTRAST**	**LD-CONTRAST**
open set	**FOCUS OPERATOR**	**I-CONTRAST**

5   The linguistic status of contrast

In the last part of the paper I would like to argue that the linguistic status of contrast must be differentiated: contrastiveness is not only a feature of topicality and focusing, but it seems plausible to regard contrast - in certain languages and certain constructions - as an autonomous phenomenon of information structure.

This proposal is, however, not uncontroversial. Lambrecht (1994: 290) claims that "contrastiveness, unlike focus, is not a category of grammar but the result of the general cognitive processes referred to as 'conversational implicatures'". Quite different is Chafe's approach, according to whom "the status <u>focus of contrast</u> is different from the status <u>new</u>" (1976: 38). Chafe separates the notion of contrastiveness from the notion of focus, on the one hand, claiming that the latter participates only in the given-new distinction. On the other hand, he argues for the distinction between "real topics" of the topic-prominent languages and contrastiveness in the so-called "double foci of contrast". The latter is found in the left dislocation (23) and topicalization structures of English (24), containing "possible pairings of theatrical events with certain times":

(23)   As for the pláy, John saw it yésterday.

(24)   Yésterday, John saw the pláy.

Chafe emphasizes that contrastiveness in both cases - in "single focus of contrast" as well as in "double focus of contrast" - should be regarded as a further "packaging phenomenon" *besides* topic and focus. Data from several languages demonstrate, however, that contrast can overlap with topicality and focusing in different ways. According to the main hypothesis of this paper, from a cross-linguistic perspective, the notion of contrast cannot be reduced to a feature serving to differentiate topicality and focusing, nor can it be regarded as a notion standing *besides* topic and focus in information structure. As contrast – in certain languages, in certain structures – can be superimposed on and combined with the notions of topic and focus, the notion of contrast should be added to the inventory of relevant information structural categories. The two main instances of contrast attested empirically which support this claim will be discussed below.

5.1   I-CONTRAST

As to the phonologically realized type of contrastiveness, the "**I-CONTRAST**", it is easy to prove that this contrast type does more than simply identify topicality: the analysis of the constituent carrying the (fall-)rise accent in (25) as topic seems

plausible, whereas the contrast marked by the fall-rise in (26) cannot be related to topicality. In these case one could only claim a secondary focusing, without topicality, though:

(25) [Auf der /NEUNundfünfzigsten Straße]$_T$ habe ich [die SCHUHE\]$_F$ gekauft.
      "On fifty NINTH Street I bought the SHOES."   (Büring 1997)

(26) Man \/MUSS das Buch   \NICHT mögen (, aber man KANN).
      one must   the book-Acc not   like   but one can
                                                        (Jacobs 1997)

In English the assignment of the fall-rise accent is not restricted to intonation structures containing two pitch accents, but is possible with a single pitch accent. Hetland (2001) claims that in these cases (27) the constituent with the fall-rise accent must be regarded as the nuclear focus of the sentence:

(27) Q: Did you feed the animals?
      A: I fed the ˇcat.
                  [Inf.Focus, fall-rise]

The function of "I-Contrast" seems identical in all analyzed cases - independently of its cooccurence with topic or focus: it evokes alternatives and is connected with open questions, motivating the analysis that I-Contrast is a superimposed notion on both topicality and focusing.

5.2   KONTRAST

The second type of contrast which can be claimed to be an autonomous notion of information structure is **KONTRAST** in Finnish. In Finnish, the *type* of pitch accent (i.e. the fall-rise contour) is, however, not an obligatory, decisive means for expressing contrastiveness. Here, it is primarily the syntactic position that is involved in the formal realization of contrastiveness. The Finnish data demonstrate clearly that "the semantic function of contrast may cut across, and supersede the functions of topic and focus" (É. Kiss 1995: 6). The KONTRAST-Position can apparently host not only a contrastive focus, but also a contrastive topic and appears in two different sentence patterns called by Vilkuna (1995: 249) "TOP pattern" and "FOCTOP pattern". Whereas in the so-called FOCTOP-sentences (29-b), the KONTRAST-position is occupied by the nuclear focus of the sentence, in the TOP-sentences (30-b), the highlighted constituent in the KONTRAST-position is topic, followed by a further highlighted constituent, namely the nuclear focus. Cf. Järventausta & Molnár (2001):

FOCTOP-sentence (28-b):

(28) A: Pekka lensi **Tukholmaan**.
          Pekka flew to Stockholm
      'Pekka flew to STOCKHOLM.'

110

B: [KONTRAST **Reykjavikiin**] Pekka lensi.
'Pekka flew to REYKJAVIK."

TOP-sentence:

(29) a. [KONTRAST **Tukholmaan**] Pekka lensi [FOCUS **Finnairilla**],
       'To STOCKHOM, Pekka flew by FINNAIR,'

    b. [KONTRAST **Reykjavikiin**] (Pekka lensi) [FOCUS **Icelandairilla**].
       'To REYKJAVIK, Pekka flew by ICELANDAIR."

As to the *semantic* operations performed by KONTRAST in the case of a contrastive topic and a contrastive focus, É. Kiss (1998: 270) notes that they are different in the two cases: while "the contrastive focus exhaustively identifies the subset for which the predicate holds", "the identification performed by the contrastive topic is nonexhaustive." The Finnish contrast is, thus, as opposed to the Hungarian focus operator, semantically fairly underspecified (Vallduví & Vilkuna 1998: 83).

The *syntactic analysis* of KONTRAST in Finnish requires that several syntactic and pragmatic features be considered. The position is *left peripheral* and can only host a constituent if it refers to explicitly mentioned - or at least contextually salient - alternatives within *a closed set*. The KONTRAST-position is somewhat different from the sentence-peripheral CONTRAST-position of other languages (like Italian or Russian), in that it cannot only be occupied by the contrastive focus, but even by a contrastive topic. The KONTRAST-position in Finnish – as opposed to the Focus-position in Hungarian – is *not verb-related*, which is also typical of the Topic position in Hungarian: the difference is, though, that the Topic position can be iterated, whereas *KONTRAST is unique*.

The listed features require the modification of the structural representation of clauses proposed by Rizzi (1997) within the generative framework. Rizzi dissolves the left-peripheral complementizer layer - the category of CP - into a number of different functional projections, hosting besides a free functional morpheme various operator-like elements such as topics, focalized elements, interrogative and relative pronouns. Below the highest functional phrase ForceP which provides information about the clausal type (or the "specification of Force"), he assumes a topic-focus field, which in Italian involves a FocP surrounded by recursive TopPs. In Rizzis SPLIT-CP-model (1997), however, only the TOPIC- and FOCUS-projections host constituents with specific discourse interpretations, and its expansion thus seems necessary by introducing a KONTRAST-P in the left periphery of the sentence (30):

(30) ForceP **KontrP** TopP* FocP TopP* FinP

The KONTRAST-projection in the articulated CP-domain is not verb-related and cannot be licensed by the same type of "Affective Operator Criterion" (cf. Rizzi 1991) as the Focus. According to my proposal, a K-feature should be made responsible for the licensing of the constituent in the Specifier-position of the KONTRAST-projection. This K-feature must guarantee the so-called "discourse connection" (cf.

Haegeman & Guéron 1999: 536) and requires (i) the absolutely leftmost position, (ii) the explicit mentioning of relevant excluded alternatives within a closed set, (iii) - or alternatively, in case of Contrastive topic, that the discourse connection be warranted by the givenness or high degree of "identifiability" of this constituent.

6 Conclusion

The data surveyed in this paper have served to show that the notion of contrast is a linguistically relevant phenomenon and cannot merely be regarded as "conversational implicature" arising from focusing in certain conversational contexts (Lambrecht 1994: 291). Even though in certain languages formal marking of contrast is optional – thus not allowing a clear-cut distinction between contrastive and non-contrastive cases – empirical data from a great number of languages show that contrast has a crucial impact on linguistic forms, requiring the obligatory use of certain phonological and syntactic means.

It was also argued that further distinctions within the notion of contrast itself seem necessary, in order to make explicit the impact of contrastiveness on linguistic forms: above all the separation of the pragmatic level from the semantic - quantificationally based - level is motivated by linguistic data. The different types of contrast – realized in certain positions and with specific accent types – are, however, not directly bound to certain discourse pragmatic interpretations. Contrast is thus compatible both with focusing and topicality, with the restriction that the preferred relations are dependent on the type of contrast. The possibilities and restrictions of the co-ocurrence of the different contrast types with topic and focus are partly due to universal, and partly to language specific regularities.

The most important claim of the work presented is that the linguistic status of contrast must be analyzed in a more differentiated way than has been the case hitherto in linguistic research: from a cross-linguistic perspective, contrastiveness is not simply a feature of focusing and topicality. Contrast must be established - on the basis of evidence from certain languages and in certain constructions - as a further category of information structure, *superimposed* ontopic and focus.

[1] Bolinger, D.L. 1961. Contrastive accent and contrastive stress. *Language* 37

Bibliography (1), 83-96.

[2] Bußmann, H. 1990. *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Kröner.

[3] Büring, D. 1997. *The meaning of topic and focus: the 59th Street Bridge accent* (Routledge studies in German linguistics 3]. London: Routledge.

[4] Büring, D. 1999. Topic. In P. Bosch and R. van der Sand (eds) *FOCUS. Linguistic, cognitive, and computational perspectives. Part II Semantic interpretation of focus phenomena*. [Studies in Natural Language Processing], 142-165. New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[5] Chafe, W. L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C.N. Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, 25-55. New York, San Francisco and London: Academic Press.

[6] Dretske, F. J. 1972. Contrastive statements. *The Philosophical Review* 81: 411-437.

[7] É. Kiss, K. 1995. Discourse configurational languages. Introduction. In É. Kiss, K. (ed.) *Discourse Configurational Languages.* 3-27. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[8] É. Kiss, K. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74 (2): 245-273.

[9] Etxepare, R. 1997. Two types of focus in Basque. In B. Agbayani and S.-W. Tang (eds) *Proceedings of the 15th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics,* 113-127. Stanford. CSLI. Distributed by Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[10] Haegeman, L. and Guéron, J. 1999. *English Grammar. A generative perspective.* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

[11] Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English II. *Journal of Linguistics* 3: 199-244.

[12] Hetland, J. 2001. Contrast, the fall-rise accent, and information focus. Ms.

[13] Jackendoff, R.S. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar* [Studies in Linguistics Series 2]. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press.

[14] Jacobs. J. 1988. Fokus-Hintergrund-Gliederung und Grammatik. In H. Altmann (ed.) *Intonationsforschungen*, 89-134. [Linguistische Arbeiten 200] Tübingen: Niemeyer.

[15] Jacobs, J. 1997. Bemerkungen zur I-Topikalisierung. *Linguistische Berichte* 168, 91-133.

[16] Järventausta, M. and Molnár, V. 2001. Diskurskonfigurationalität im Finnischen und im Ungarischen. Ms.

[17] Kenesei, I. 1989. Logikus-e a magyar szórend? [Is Hungarian word order logical?]. *Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok* 17: 105-152.

[18] Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

[19] Molnár, V. 1998. Topic in focus. On the syntax, phonology, semantics and pragmatics of the so-called 'contrastive topic' in Hungarian and German. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* vol. 45 (1-2): 89-166. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

[20] Prince, E. 1984. Topicalization and left-dislocation: A functional analysis. In S.J. White and V. Teller (eds) *Discourses in reading and linguistics.*

[Annuals of the New York Academy of Sciences 433], 213-225. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.

[21] Reinhart, T. 1982. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. Reproduced by the Indiana University Ling. Club.

[22] Rizzi, L. 1991. Residual verb-second and the Wh-criterion. *Technical Reports in Formal and Computational Linguistics 2* (Faculté des Lettres, Université de Genève).

[23] Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

[24] Rochemont, M.S. 1986. *Focus in generative grammar* [Studies in Generative Linguistic Analysis 4]. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

[25] Rooth, M.E. 1985. *Association with focus.* Ph.D.diss. University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

[26] Rooth, M.E. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 75-116.

[27] Vallduví, E. 1992. *The informational component.* New York and London.

[28] Vallduví, E. and M. Vilkuna. 1998. "On rheme and kontrast". In P.W. Culicover and L. McNally (eds) *The limits of syntax*, 79-108. [Syntax and Semantics, Volume 29].

[29] Vilkuna, M. 1995. Discourse configurationality in Finnish. In K. É. Kiss (ed.) *Discourse configurational languages*, 244-268. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[30] Zubizarreta, M.L. 1998. *Prosody, focus, and word order* [Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 33]. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press.