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0. 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.
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 literature. It is foregrounded 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 decision as to whether or not focusing is inherently contrastive or not 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.
The properties of topicality have in none of these three definitions 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 also 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 - opposing 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 Kláus empfohlen, sondern Gérda.
(4) A: Ich fürchte, daß wieder die Schwéden gewonnen haben.
    B: Keine Angst! Diesmal haben wír gewonnen.
(5) Weißt du, wer gewonnen hat? Wír (haben gewonnen)!

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 or not.

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 or even must be marked by grammatical means, and (ii) that certain formal phenomena only can 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. 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 egy kalapot nézett ki magának.
Mary a hat.ACC picked out herself.DAT
'It was a hat that Mary picked for herself.'

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

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 (7) 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 (9-B1) 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 (8-A) is not an appropriate answer to a general informative question (8-F1) or to a constituent question (8-F2) if the alternatives are not explicitly mentioned or at least present in the minds of the discourse participants (cf. Järventausta & Molnár, 2001):

(8) F1: What did Pekka do?
F2: Where did Pekka fly?
A: * [KONTRAST Reykjavikiin] Pekka lensi.
   Reykjavik-to Pekka flew

(9) A: Pekka lensi Tukholmaan.
   'Pekka flew to Stockholm.'
B1: [KONTRAST Reykjavikiin ] Pekka lensi .
   'To Reykjavik, 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?'
    Peter to Reykjavik flew
    'Peter flew to Reykjavik.'

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:
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 bundle, believe me. I’ll bet she had a nervous breakdown. That’s not a good thing. Gallstones, you have them out and the’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] pop stars wore [CAFTANS].
   Residual Topic: What did the male pop stars wear?
On the basis of the presented data 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 (like 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.

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:

Peter to Reykjavik flew
'Peter flew to Reykjavik.'

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 (21) entails that all other members of the set are excluded:

(21) [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 (22), but that there is at least one member for which the predication (or a part of it) does not hold:
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, whereas the contrastive topic contains the combination [+ exclusive] and [- exhaustive]. 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.

(23) CONTRAST TYPES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>focus?</th>
<th>topic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>closed set:</td>
<td>CONTRAST</td>
<td>LD-CONTRAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open set:</td>
<td>FOCUS OPERATOR</td>
<td>I-CONTRAST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 focus of contrast is different from the status new" (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 (24) and topicalization structures of English (25), containing "possible pairings of theatrical events with certain times":

(24)  As for the pláy, John saw it yésterday.
(25)  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 (26) as topic seems plausible, whereas the contrast marked by the fall-rise in (27) cannot be related to topicality. In these case one could only claim a secondary focusing, without topicality, though:
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 (28) the constituent with the fall-rise accent must be regarded as the nuclear focus of the sentence:

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

The function of "I-Contrast" seems identical in all analyzed cases - independently of its cooccurrence 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 the expression of 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:

(29-a) Pekka lensi Tukholmaan.  
Pekka flew to Stockholm  
'Pekka flew to STOCKHOLM.'
(29-b) \textbf{KONTRAST Reykjavikiin} Pekka lensi.
Pekka flew to REYKJAVIK.

TOP-sentence:

(30)  a. \textbf{KONTRAST Tukholmaan} Pekka lensi \textbf{FOCUS Finnairilla},
To STOCKHOM, Pekka flew by FINNAIR,

b. \textbf{KONTRAST Reykjavikiin} (Pekka lensi) \textbf{FOCUS Icelandairilla}.
´to REYKJAVIK, Pekka flew by ICELANDAIR`.

As to the \textit{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 \textit{syntactic analysis} of KONTRAST in Finnish requires that several syntactic and pragmatic features be considered. The position is \textit{left peripheral} and can only host a constituent if it refers to explicitly mentioned - or at least contextually salient - alternatives within \textit{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 - opposed to the Focus-position in Hungarian - 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 us to assume an additional functional projection above the TOPIC- and FOCUS-projections. In Rizzi’s SPLIT-CP-model (1997) only the TOPIC- and FOCUS-projection host constituents with specific discourse interpretations, and its expansion thus seems thus necessary by introducing a KONTRAST-P in the left periphery (31):

(31) \textbf{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 certain 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-occurrence 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 on topic and focus.
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