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CHAPTER 3
WORD ORDER AND INFORMATION STRUCTURE IN RUSSIAN: THE DATA

The myth about the Russian “free” word order has long been dispelled. Numerous studies on Russian have shown that its word order flexibility is constrained by IS. Consider the sentences in (1) and (2).

(1) Vlad udet vy fevrale.
   Vlad.NOM leave.FUT.3SG in February.LOC
   ‘Vlad will leave in FEBRUARY.’

(2) V fevrale udet Vlad.
   in February.LOC leave.FUT.3SG Vlad.NOM
   ‘In February VLAD will leave.’

The sentences in (1) and (2) do not render the same information and cannot be used interchangeably. (1) provides information about the time of Vlad’s departure, while (2) is coherent in the situation when either the identity of the person leaving or the upcoming February events are questioned (i.e. either Vlad is Focus by itself or a part of a wider sentential Focus).

A basic SVO sentence can undergo all six logically possible transformations, each having a different informational load, although sometimes the distinctions are very subtle. In the present chapter we will consider the possible structure-meaning pairings. This will form the empirical basis for the analysis to be developed later.

It is impossible to provide a fair description of word order-IS mapping in Russian without separating standard and colloquial language since the picture will differ slightly for these two registers. At the same time, there are some general tendencies that are observed in both Standard (SR) and Colloquial Russian (CR). In section 3.1 I start out with these general tendencies. And then, in section 3.2, I describe the peculiarities of CR.

3.1 Some general rules of IS-based sentence structuring in Russian

The word order in a Russian sentence usually corresponds to the universal pattern of information structuring, which can be represented as in (3).

(3) IS Ordering Rule
   Topic > (Discourse Neutral Material (DNM)) > Focus

The main requirement is that the part of the sentence corresponding to the Topic precedes the one corresponding to the Focus, with DNM in between the two.

The rule in (3) is given in terms of pragmatic Topic and Focus. As discussed in chapter one, the mapping between pragmatic Topic and structural topic is often one-to-one. The same can be said about DNM. Thus the position of a topic exponent corresponds to that shown in (3), i.e. it occurs at the left edge of the
Focus exponent in Russian is phonetically signalled by stress and occupies the sentence-final position. However due to the possibility to project, described earlier, the stressed constituent may be just a part of a bigger focal constituent.

In chapter one, I assumed that discourse is thematically organized, which implies that a sentence obligatorily contains a Topic, either individual or situational. Based on the general IS schema shown in (3) and the requirement on thematic discourse organization, the default structuring of an SVO sentence corresponds to the one in which the subject is interpreted as the Topic, and either the rest of the sentence or just the object gets the Focus interpretation. Thus presented out of the context, the sentence in (4a) would, by default, be structured as in (4b). The tendency of subjects to get Topic interpretation is well-attested cross-linguistically.

(4) a. Maša Orlova polučila novoje naznačenie.
   ‘Masha Orlova got a new appointment.’


However, there are situations when the Basic Word Order Rule clashes with the IS rule given in (3). Such a situation arises when, for instance, the object of the sentence receives Topic reading, or if the subject is (included into) Focus. Russian, being a discourse-configurational language, resolves such clashes in favor of IS. As a result, some syntactic transformations can apply in order for the sentence to be structured in accordance with (3). On the descriptive level, I will distinguish two types of such transformations: O(bject)-preposing and S(ubject)-postposing. Note that pre- and postposing is established relative to the verb, since in the canonical case the subject precedes and the object follows the verbal predicate. Moreover, speaking about preposing and postposing, I mean displacement to any position in the corresponding area, not just immediately pre- or post-verbal.

3.1.1 O-preposing: SOV, OSV, OVS.
Under O-preposing I subsume constructions in which the object moves across the verb, namely SOV, OSV, and OVS. OVS exhibits a mixture of O-preposing and S-postposing. Therefore it will be discussed under both rubrics.

The unifying factor for all the structures with O-preposing is that the object is excluded from Focus. Focus in such sentences corresponds either to the verb alone, as in SOV (5), or to a bigger phrase including the verb, as in OVS (6).

(5) (Context: What did your parents do to the old car?)
   Oni ee [prodali]Focus.
   ‘They sold it.’
The exact position of the preposed object depends on whether it is a topic or included into DNM. However, as noted by Yokoyama (1986) sometimes the accessibility status of the preverbal constituents intervenes. For example, when the topic and DNM both denote equally accessible discourse referents, e.g. both expressed by a pronoun, the sentence can be ordered on the basis of the Word Order Rule, and not on the basis of the IS hierarchy shown in (3). For instance, in (7) Petrov is clearly the discourse topic. However, preposing the object pronoun referring to this individual to the canonical topic position, i.e. sentence-initial, produces an infelicitous result.

(7) (Context: Where is Petrov?)
(#Ego) ja ego poslala v magazin. 19
he.ACC I.NOM he.ACC send.PST.FEM to shop.ACC
‘I sent him to the shop.’

In fact, when the subject refers to the speaker it usually precedes the object, even if the latter is felt to be the topic, unless the topic is made contrastive, as in (8), where the contrastive constituents are indicated by italics.

(8) (Context: Where are the Petrovs?)

a. Ego ja poslala v magazin, a ona
he.ACC I.NOM send.PST.FEM to shop.ACC and she.NOM
segodnja na bol’nićnom.
today on sick.leave.LOC

b. # Ja ego poslala v magazin, a ona
I.NOM he.ACC send.PST.FEM to shop.ACC and she.NOM
segodnja na bol’nićnom.
today on sick.leave.LOC

‘Him I sent to the shop, and she is on a sick leave today.’

The only difference between (7) and (8) is the presence of Contrast in the latter. In this case, despite the referential status of the subject, the canonical Topic > DNM ordering is observed. In order to account for sentences like (7), where the IS-based word order rule is seemingly violated, I follow Erteschik-Shir (2007) and assume that the file card for the speaker (and the hearer) is created automatically from the very beginning of the discourse. In a situation when there is a choice between

---

19 Hereinafter the symbol ‘#’ is used to indicate that the example is not ungrammatical but rather infelicitous in the given context.
making the 1SG pronoun or another pronoun the topic, the 1SG wins. This is what happens in (7), i.e. ego ‘him’ does not qualify as the topic even in the context of the given question. In order to regain its topic status it requires some additional emphasis, as in (8).

When the subject is lower on the accessibility scale than the object topic, the ordering Topic > DNM is preserved, as illustrated in (9).

(9) (Context: Why is Petrov so gloomy?)
Ego žena (?? ego) vygnała iz doma.
he.ACC wife.NOM kick.out.PST.FEM from house.GEN
‘His wife kicked him out of the house.’

Although the subject in (9) is not a brand-new entity and is anchored to the topic, it is lower on the accessibility hierarchy (Prince 1981).

In (9) the object is a topic and as such it occupies the clause-initial position. (10) gives an example of the object being moved to the middle field due to its DNM status.

(10) (Context: How did Petrov’s wife react when she found out about about his affair?)
Ona ego vygnała iz doma.
she.NOM he.ACC kick.out.PST.FEM from house.GEN
‘She kicked him out of the house.’

Note that O-preposing is obligatory only when the verb is included into the Focus. If the verb forms part of DNM, the object can but does not have to change its position, as shown in (11) where the focal part is given in bold face.

(11) a. (Context: What did you give Olga for her birthday?)
Ja ej podarila (ej) [šarf]\textsubscript{focus}
I.NOM she.DAT give.PST.FEM scarf.A
‘I gave her a SCARF.’

b. (Context: Who did you give that beautiful scarf to?)
Ja ego podarila (ego) [Ol’ge]\textsubscript{focus}
I.NOM he.ACC give.PST.FEM Olga.DAT
‘I gave it to OLGA.’

To sum up, O-preposing is employed in order to evacuate the object from the Focus field. Object scrambling as a way to escape from the focal domain is a universal phenomenon (Drubig 2003, Lambrecht 2001, Holmberg and Nikanne 2002). Depending on its IS status, either as Topic or DNM, the object in Russian moves either to the middle-field or to the sentence-initial position.

3.1.2 S-postposing
In the unmarked case, the subject in Russian precedes the verb, mainly due to the fact that it is often the topic, or at least DNM. S-postposing is employed when the
subject has to be included into Focus. The patterns we obtain in this case are (O)VS, VOS, and VSO. Let us discuss them one by one.

3.1.2.1 (O)VS
The (O)VS order is used under two circumstances: either the subject is narrowly focused (12), or it is properly included into the Focus (13-14). In either case it carries the main stress, i.e. functions as the focus exponent, which I indicate by bold face in the examples. Usually Focus projection proceeds from the object position. The sentences in (13) and (14) show that subject can also spread Focus. (13) is an example of the so-called thetic statement, in which the whole sentence corresponds to Focus. In (14) the subject forms an IS constituent with the verb, leaving the object outside of the Focus domain.

(12) (Context: Who broke the window?)
[Okno] razbil [Vladik]_focus
window.ACC  break.PST.MASC Vladik.NOM
'It was Vladik who broke the window.'

(13) (Context: Finally winter came.)
[Pošel] melkij snežok]_focus
go.PST.MASC thin snow.NOM
'It started snowing (with thin snow).'

(14) (What happened to the picture collection?)
[Odnu kartinu] priobrel [chastnyj kollektioner]_focus
one picture.ACC buy.PST.MASC private.NOM collector.NOM
and rest.ACC expropriate.PST.PL Bolsheviks.NOM
'O one of the pictures a private collector bought, and the rest the Bolsheviks expropriated.'

Verb-initial sentences like (13) are highly constrained in Russian. They are restricted to intransitive verbs. This is an unmarked order for natural phenomena constructions (15) and for sentences with verbs that denote an event typical of the subject entity (16) (Robblee 1994). In other words, it is an unmarked structure for thetics containing unaccusative verbs.

(15) [Nastupila] _focus
become.PST.FEM spring.NOM
'Spring has come,'

(16) [Zazvonil] _focus
ing.PST.MASC telephone.NOM
'The telephone rang.'

However, this VS inversion is not limited to unaccusatives and can also occur with agentive verbs, as shown in (17).
(17) a. (Context: I woke up in the middle of the night.)
   [Plakala  ženščina[focus.
   cry. PST.FEM woman.NOM
   ‘A woman cried.’

   b. (Context: Did anybody call me while I was away?)
   Da. Zvonila  ženja[focus.
   yes phone.PST.FEM Zhenya.NOM
   ‘Yes, ZHENYA phoned.’

The VS inversion shown in (15-17) is constrained in such a way that if there
appears another constituent, it must necessarily precede the verb. This concerns
both thetics (18) and sentences with a narrowly-focused subject (19).

(18) a. *[Nastupit  čerez dva mesjaca  vesna[focus.
   become.FUT.3SG in two months.GEN spring.NOM

   b. Čerez dva mesjaca   nastupit  vesna[focus
   in two months.GEN become.FUT.3S spring.NOM

   ‘In two months the spring has come.’

(19) (Context: Did anybody call me while I was away?)

   a. *Zvonila  v pjat’  ženja[focus.
      phone.PST.FEM at five Zhenya.NOM

   b. V  pjat’ zvonila  ženja[focus.
      at five phone.PST.FEM Zhenya.NOM

   ‘Yes, ZHENYA phoned at five.’

I exclude the adverbial modifier in (18) from the Focus domain and for the moment
I treat it as a situational Topic. This view will be revised when we discuss the
syntax of Topicalization in chapter five (section 5.2.2.1).

The subject of a transitive verb can also undergo inversion, but in this case
the object must be preposed so that we have a subject-object switch, giving rise to
an OVS sequence. The object in this case unambiguously gets a Topic
interpretation. This fact, once again, confirms the assumption concerning the
obligatorily thematic organization of the discourse. Namely, if there is an element
in the sentence which can fulfill the Topic function, be it an argument or an
adjunct, it has to front.
Note that (20) can also be a licit answer to a question like *What happened to the window?*, i.e. if Focus includes both the verb and the subject.

More constrained is the use of S-postposing with di-transitive predicates. In these constructions, S-postposing is permitted, and is, in fact, obligatory, only if the subject is narrowly focused, as in (21).

In this case, one of the internal arguments will be a topic and must obligatorily front. The other one, being included into DNM, can optionally stay postverbally.

If the subject of a di-transitive verb forms part of a wide Focus, S-postposing is prohibited.

In (22a) as well as in (22b) the subject constitutes a part of a bigger Focus. Both sentences contain a Topic: in (22a) it corresponds to the indirect, and in (22b) to the direct object. Nevertheless the subject in these sentences must occur preverbally, otherwise the sentences are unacceptable.

Quite expectedly, thetics with transitive verbs cannot be formed by S-postposing either. They are structured according to the basic word order rule, i.e. S > V (> IO) > DO (section 1.1.1) (23).
b. *[Protknul kakoj-to pridurok mne šiny] Focus.
pierce.PST.MASC some idiot.NOM I.DAT tires.ACC.

‘Some idiot broke my tires.’

As we see above, S-postposing is conditioned by the argument structure of the verb. Table 1 summarizes the discussion held in this section.

Table 1 VS inversion possibilities in Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate type</th>
<th>Unaccusative</th>
<th>Unergative</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Di-transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VS possibility</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Ok in OVS</td>
<td>Ok only if S is narrowly focused in O1 VO2 S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.2.2 VOS

The VOS construction, although possible, is quite rare. With respect to the Topic-Comment structure it is similar to the predicate cleft illustrated above and repeated in (25): the fronted verb phrase in VOS (as well as in a predicate cleft) functions as a contrastive topic. For instance, in (24) taking the mug is contrasted to using it as an ashtray.

(24) (Context: You see that somebody used your mug as an ashtray. Infuriated you ask - Who the hell took my mug? You get the following reply.)
[Brala kružku] Topic [ja] Focus, no toľ’ko čtoby popit’ take.PST.FEM mug.ACC I.NOM but only that.SUBJ drink.INF čaj. tea.ACC
‘As to taking the mug, I did it, but only to have some tea (from it).’

(25) [Napisat’ stat’u(-to)] Topic ja napisala.
write.INF article.ACC-(TO) I.NOM write.PST.FEM
‘As to writing the article, I DID write it.’

There is a structural difference: in (24) the verb within the fronted phrase is finite, while in a predicate cleft (25) it is an infinitive. As a result, in (25) the infinitive is doubled by the finite verb clause-internally. There is also a difference with regard to Focus-Background structure. Namely, in VOS Focus corresponds to the subject. In a predicate cleft, Focus is always on the polarity, that is why I do not put the focus exponent in (25) into the brackets indicating Focus.

3.1.2.3 VS(O): Narrative Inversion

The VSO construction presents an apparent violation to the constraint that bans S-postposing in transitive thetics, as discussed in 3.1.2.1. This construction is often referred to as Narrative (or Epic) Inversion. It is illustrated in (26) below.
(Context: beginning of an anecdote)

Once upon a time a man caught a golden fish.

As the name suggests, it occurs only in narrative/epical contexts, such as fairy-tales and anecdotes. Although it is functionally equal to thetics, in that the whole sentence is focal, its usage is restricted to a special register and it cannot freely alternate with canonical (transitive) thetics discussed above. The two differ not only in terms of style but also with respect to their phonological properties. In normal thetics the usual downgrading intonation is observed. Narrative Inversion constructions are characterized by the, so-called, framing intonation (Kovtunova 1976), whereby there is a double accentuation in the sentence: the first accent occurs on the fronted verb and the second on the last word of the sentence.

Narrative Inversion can also be observed with intransitive verbs. Recall from 3.1.2.1 that in intransitive thetics an adverbial modifier must be preposed. Under Narrative Inversion the modifier stays postverbally, inducing VAdvS order. Compare (27a), which is an example of a canonical thetic, with (27b), an example of Narrative Inversion.


Manure smoke (i.e. from burning manure) was floating over the farm.

[Kovtunova 1976: 121]

Given what we said earlier about the function of a preposed modifier in thetics, the main difference between a canonical thetic and a Narrative Inversion construction is that in the latter the adverbial is not promoted to the role of the situational Topic.

3.1.3 Summary of structure-IS pairings

Word order variation in Russian is a formal means to encode Topic and Focus and to structurally reflect the IS of a sentence. According to the IS ordering rule, Topic precedes the DNM which in turn precedes Focus. In structural terms, it means that topic occurs at the left and focus at the right edge of the clause. In the present chapter I provided a description of what the IS of different word order sequences can be. The description is necessarily not exhaustive. I concentrated mainly on sentences with obligatory constituents, i.e. S, V, O, and IO. I will not discuss adjuncts, unless their distribution is relevant for the ongoing discussion.

The summary of structure-meaning correlations is given in table 2. The table gives the articulation into Topic and Focus. The elements which are given in italics and are not included into either bracketed IS constituent represent DNM. Note that the only IS constituent which is obligatorily present is Focus. Topic and
DNM are not always expressed. The table includes all the possible IS articulations for a certain type of structure.

Table 2. Correlation between the word order and IS articulation in Russian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>IS composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S V O</td>
<td>[S]<em>{Topic} V [O]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[S]<em>{Topic} V O [O]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[S V O]_{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S V IO DO</td>
<td>[S]<em>{Topic} V IO [O]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[S]<em>{Topic} V IO DO [O]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[S V IO DO]_{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S V DO IO</td>
<td>[S]<em>{Topic} V DO [IO]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S O V</td>
<td>[S]<em>{Topic} O [V]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O/Avd) V S</td>
<td>[O/Avd]<em>{Topic} V [S]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[O/Avd]<em>{Topic} V S [S]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₁ V O₂ S</td>
<td>[O₁]<em>{Topic} V O₂ [S]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V O S</td>
<td>[V O]<em>{Topic} [S]</em>{Focus}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V S O</td>
<td>[V S O]_{Focus}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the general rules of IS-based sentence structuring. They are operative in SR as well as in CR. However the latter exhibits some peculiarities that are described in the following section.

3.2 Some peculiarities of word order in Colloquial Russian

The major difference between CR and SR is that focus in CR is not restricted to the clause-final position. Some researchers argue that in CR focus is, as a rule, preposed (Krylova and Khavronina 1986, Yokoyama 1986). The preposing can be either to the middle field, or to the left periphery of the clause. In my description, I take the subject to mark the border between the middle field and the clausal periphery, such that everything to the left of the canonical preverbal subject occupies a peripheral position. Focus preposing is illustrated in (28).

(28) (Context: What did his parents give Nikita for his birthday?)

   a. Oni emu ščenka podarili.
      they.NOM he.DAT puppy.ACC give.PST.PL

   b. Oni ščenka emu podarili.
      they.NOM puppy.ACC he.DAT give.PST.PL

   c. Ščenka oni emu podarili.
      puppy.ACC they.NOM he.DAT give.PST.PL

   ‘They gave him a PUPPY.’
As can be observed from (28a-28b) the position of the preposed focus inside the middle field is quite free relative to DNM.

A fronted focus is traditionally assumed to express narrow contrastive Focus (King 1995, Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Sekerina 1997, among others). Since it can occupy any of the preverbal positions, as shown in the example above, it is often assumed that this type of Focus is freely assigned in Russian to any constituent irrespective of its position in situ or moved (Junghanns and Zybatow 1997, Zybatow 1997, Sekerina 1997, van Gelderen 2003).

In order to find out what lies behind the freedom of focus position in CR I address two questions in this section. First - is it true that a moved focus is always narrow, i.e. a moved focus = Focus? And second – is it true that a fronted focus requires an additional interpretive load, such as being contrastive or exhaustive?

### 3.2.1 Tests for distinguishing different types of Focus: narrow versus wide, New Information versus Contrastive/Exhaustive

First of all, let us establish a number of tests that can help us to answer the questions concerning the properties of preposed focus in CR.

The traditional way to distinguish narrow from wide Focus is by applying a Question-Answer Congruence test. It is a fairly standard view that the part of the sentence questioned in a *wh*-question corresponds to the Focus in the answer. Thus a question in (29a) requires a narrow Focus which in this case coincides with the object, (29b) triggers a wider Focus, corresponding to the verb phrase, and (29c) needs the widest sentential Focus in the answer.

(29) Pinocchio is kissing the FAIRY.
   (a) Who is Pinocchio kissing?
   (b) What is Pinocchio doing now?
   (c) What is illustrated in this picture?

If it is true that preposed focus in Russian is narrow, we would expect that it is not possible to answer questions of the type (29b-c) with a sentence containing a preposed focus.

Another test I am going to use for distinguishing narrow from wide Focus is the association-with-*only* test. It was proposed that certain adverbs are inherently Focus oriented in that they only scope over the focal part of the sentence (Rooth 1996, Krifka 1992, among others). It is known that scope relations in discourse configurational languages tend to be preserved at the surface (Kiss 1995, Progovac 2005). Russian is not an exception in this respect (Ionin 2001). In Russian, focus sensitive operators, such as *tol’ko* ‘only’ and *daže* ‘even’, tend to linearly precede the element they scope over. Thus the English sentence in (30) is ambiguous between the reading in which *only* scopes solely over *wine* (30a) and another one wherein *only* scopes over the entire verb phrase (30b). In order to express the same meanings in Russian the operator *only* is placed immediately preceding either the object (31a) or the verb phrase (31b), depending on its scope. Narrow scope reading of *only* in (31b) is not unanimously accepted, to the extent that some speakers consistently reject it.
Charley only buys WINE in the supermarket.

a. He does not buy anything else in the supermarket.

b. And he does not do anything else in terms of household duties.

If movement of focus in CR blocks focus projection, the prediction is that in cases of toljko/daže modification, the scope of the operator must be limited to the fronted constituent.

There is by now a long-standing tradition of associating ex-situ focus with special semantic effects, such as contrast and/or exhaustivity (Tsimply 1995, Vilkuna 1995, King 1995, Rizzi 1998, Frascarelli 2000, Drubig 2003, Abels and Muriungi 2006, among others). There exist many tests envisaged to differentiate between New Information (NIF) versus Contrastive/Exhaustive Focus (CF) (Kiss 1998, Costa 1998, Abels and Muriungi 2006). It should be noted that most of the proposed tests are envisaged to elude exhaustivity rather than contrastiveness. This might be due to the fact that the distinction between the two semantic features is not very sharp. For instance, in her seminal paper Kiss (1998) states that “the identificational20 foci of different languages are specified for the positive value of either or both of the features [± exhaustive] and [± contrastive].” (Kiss 1998: 267). At the same time, in her definition of identificational Focus, Kiss explicitly introduces an exhaustivity requirement: “An identificational focus represents a subset of the set of contextually or situationally given elements for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold; it is identified as the exhaustive subset of this set for which the predicate phrase actually holds.” (Kiss 1998: 245). 21 Similarly, Umbach (2004) defines CF in the following way “a contrastive focus combines contrast in the sense of similarity and dissimilarity and, in addition, contrast due to exclusion.” (Umbach 2004: 166). Thus it seems that exhaustivity is indispensable with respect to CF.

Therefore in the description of semantic properties of preposed focus in CR, I will use exhaustive identification tests as well. In particular, I will resort to the Negation Test (Kiss 1998, Costa 1998) and distributional test (Kiss 1998).

The Negation Test is envisaged to show that when exhaustivity is accommodated, negation can scope only over the Exhaustivity Operator, with

---

20 The author’s cover term for Contrastive and Exhaustive Focus.
21 Emphases in the citations are mine.
lexical material being unaffected by it. For instance, the English sentence (32a) with an overt operator only can be felicitously corrected with (32b), where what is negated is not the type of drink, but the fact that it was the only type of drink consumed.

(32)   a. During the festival Martin only drank gin and tonic.
       b. No, he also drank some vodka.

Another variant of the Negation Test involves negation in coordinated structures. In the presence of the Exhaustivity Operator, using the same lexical item within the negation and within the assertion does not result in a contradiction. For instance, in (33) the contrast is between the size of the set of invited people rather than between the individuals themselves. This makes it possible to refer to the same individual simultaneously in the negated and the assertive part of the sentence.

(33)   I will not invite Sandra and Lydia, but only Lydia.

The prediction of these tests for CR is that if preposed focus expresses exhaustivity, Russian counterparts of (32-33) should be acceptable, without an overt exhaustivity operator.

Moreover exhaustive Focus is incompatible with universal and existential quantifiers and NPIs, since the latter are group-denoting and thus fail to express “exclusion by identification” (Kiss 1998: 252). If a preposed focus in CR is exhaustive, it should be subject to the same distributional constraint.

To test contrastive possibilities of Focus is a more difficult task. Bolinger (1972) suggests that Focus as such is contrastive to a certain degree due to the Gricean maxim of quantity. For instance, Russian speakers, when asked to decide on the meaning of a sentence like (34), pair it not only with (34a), which is the expected meaning of a NIF, but also with contrastive (34b) and/or exhaustive (34c) readings; despite the fact that it is a sentence with the canonical clause-final focus.

(34) Mama zvonila v pjanicu.
  mother.NOM phone.PST.FEM on Friday.ACC
  ‘The mother phoned on Friday.’
  a. Friday is one of the days when she phoned.
  b. She phoned on Friday, not on Monday.
  c. Friday was the only day when she phoned.

However, it is true that different contexts favor or disfavor contrastive implicature. Thus Rodionova (2001), discussing focus possibilities in Russian, makes the distinction between wh- and yes/no-question contexts.

(35)   a. Where are you going tonight? – We are going to the theatre.
       b. Are you going anywhere tonight? – We are going to the theatre.

A wh-question (35a) triggers the accommodation of a set of alternatives, which in this example comprises possible places. Thus answering (35a) involves choosing
one of the possible alternatives as the actual one. A yes/no-question does not trigger accommodation of the same set, i.e. the set of possible places. Asking a question like (35b) does not presuppose the truth of the proposition I am going to X, as does (35a). Therefore it can be argued that the exchange in (35b) differs from the exchange in (35a) in that the latter but not the former gives rise to the contrastive presupposition that no other places are planned to be visited. I will use this yes/no-question test in order to distinguish CF from NIF.

Below I give the list of the tests that will be applied to the Russian data in order to discover projection possibilities and semantic/pragmatic properties of preposed focus in CR.

Projection possibilities tests:  
- Question/Answer Congruence
- Association with Focus (only, even)

Exhaustive Identification:  
- Negation Test
- Distributional Test (* Q, *NPI)

Contrast Identification:  
- Question Test (yes/no- vs. wh-)

3.2.1.1  Projection possibilities of the preposed focus in CR

We have said that a preposed focus can occur in two sites: in the middle field and in the left periphery. The described tests will be applied to focus in both domains.

Consider (36-37). As indicated by the context in (36) and the list of possible questions in (37), middle-field focus does not necessarily encode narrow Focus. In fact, these sentences have exactly the same Focus projecting possibilities as their canonical counterparts, i.e. sentences with clause-final focus.

(36)  (Context: Listen! Come over to my place tonight!)

Vinca, pop’em ti, kinošku posmotrim ti.

wine.ACC drink.FUT.1PL film.ACC watch.FUT.1PL

‘We will have some wine, watch a movie.’

(37)  (Context: you receive a phone call from your son’s school.)

Vaš mal’čik [kabinet himii], raznes ti.

your boy.NOM classroom.ACC chemistry.GEN blow.up.PST.MASC

‘Your boy blew up the chemistry classroom.’

a. What did our son blew up?
b. What did our son do?
c. What happened?

The same result is obtained with Association-with-Focus test. As indicated by the possible continuations, (38) is ambiguous between a narrow object (38a) and a wide VP Focus (38b).
(38) a. Ja včera tol’ko produkty, kupila ti, a pro produkty, kupila ti, a pro
I.NOM yesterday only food.ACC buy.PST.FEM but about
napkins.ACC forget.PST.FEM
‘I only bought [food]_{foc} yesterday, but I forgot about [napkins]_{foc}.’

b. Ja včera tol’ko produkty, kupila ti, a ubrat’sja
I.NOM yesterday only food.ACC buy.PST.FEM but clean.up.INF
 NEG have.time.PST.FEM
‘I only [bought food]_{foc} yesterday, but I [did not have time to clean
up]_{foc}.’

If we apply the same tests to sentences with left-peripheral focus, we get the
following results. Question-Answer Congruence test (39) reveals that the widest
propositional reading is excluded in this case. This is further supported by the
infelicity of (40c). But, importantly, a focus in the peripheral position can encode a
wide VP Focus. Thus the felicity of the question in (39b). This is different from
what has been traditionally assumed.

(39) (Context: you receive a phone call from your son’s school.)
[Kabinet himii], vaš mal’čik raznes ti.
classroom.ACC chemistry.GEN your boy.NOM blow.up.PST.MASC
‘Your boy blew up the chemistry classroom.’
  a. What did my son blew up?
  b. What did my son do this time?
  c. # What happened?

(40) (Context: Guess what!)
a. Ja ušla s raboty.
I.NOM leave.PST.FEM from job.GEN

b. Ja [s raboty], ušla ti.
I.NOM from job.GEN leave.PST.FEM

c. #[S raboty], ja ušla ti.
 from job.GEN I.NOM leave.PST.FEM

‘I quit my job.’

That Focus projection up to the VP level is possible under preposing to the left
periphery is further supported by the Association-with-Focus test applied in (41).
(41) a. Daže okna, ona mne v etot raz pomyła tij, even windows.ACC she.NOM I.DAT in this time wash.PST.FEM ne toliko poly.
    NEG only floors.ACC
‘She even washed my windows this time, not only the floor.’

    b. Daže okna, ona mne v etot raz pomyła tij, even windows.ACC she.NOM I.DAT in this time wash.PST.FEM ne toliko musor vynesla.
    NEG only garbage.ACC take.away.PST.FEM
‘She even washed my windows this time, and not only took the garbage.’

To sum up, neither middle-field nor left-peripheral focus blocks Focus projection. The difference between the two is manifested with respect to the scope of Focus. Middle-field focus exhibits exactly the same projection possibilities as clause-final focus (narrow, VP, or sentential). Left-peripheral does not allow for the widest sentential Focus interpretation, but nevertheless can express VP Focus.

3.2.1.2 Semantic effects of focus preposing in CR
In this subsection we will test the interpretation of focus in different positions. Let us start with the middle-field preposing. The exhaustive identification tests in (42) and (43) show that there is a considerable speaker-variation with respect to the interpretation. Some speakers allow for both exhaustive (42a, 43) and non-exhaustive (42b) reading. Others consider only the continuation in (42b) to be felicitous and consistently reject (43).

(42)  Petrovy letom [v Pragu], poedut tij.
    Petrovs.NOM summer.INST to PragueACC go.FUT.3PL
‘The Petrovs are going to Prague in summer.’

    a. % Net! Oni ešče v Venu planirovali.
    No they.NOM also to Vienna.ACC plan.PST.PL
‘No, they also planned to go to Vienna.’

    b. A takže v Venu.
    and also to Vienna.ACC
‘And also to Vienna.’

(43)  % On mne ne kol’co, kupil tij, a kol’co
    he.NOM I.DAT NEG ring.ACC buy.PST.MASC but ring.ACC
    i ser’gi.
    and earrings.ACC
‘He bought me not only a ring, but a ring and earrings.’
The possibility of non-exhaustive interpretation is supported by both groups of speakers, which allows me to conclude that the middle-field focus is not licensed by exhaustivity.

Applied to the left-peripheral focus, the test gives the same results. While non-exhaustive continuation in (44b) is unanimously accepted by all speakers, exhaustive implicature is recognized only by some of them. The latter group judges (44a) and (45) to be possible.

\[(44) \quad \text{Petrov} \_{\text{i}} \, \text{начал'stvo} \, \text{v} \, \text{командировку} \, \text{послал} \, \text{t}_. \quad \text{Petrov.ACC management.NOM to business.trip.ACC send.PST.NEUT} \]

‘The management sent Petrov on business trip.’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \% \, \text{Nepravda! Ešče i} \, \text{Sokolova}. \\
& \text{no.true also and Sokolov.ACC} \\
& \text{‘That’s not true! They also sent Sokolov.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{I Sokolova tože.} \\
& \text{and Sokolov.ACC too} \\
& \text{‘And Sokolov too.’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(45) \quad \% \, \text{Ne} \, \text{jubku} \, \text{i} \, \text{mne mama sšilat,} \, \text{a} \, \text{jubku} \quad \text{NEG skirt.ACC I.DAT mother.NOM sew.PST.FEM but skirt.ACC} \quad \text{i bluzku.} \\
& \text{and blouse.ACC} \\
& \text{‘My mother sewed me not just a skirt, but a skirt and a blouse.’}
\]

Even more illustrative in this respect is the distributional test. Recall that, according to Kiss (1998), quantifiers cannot express exhaustive Focus and therefore cannot occur in the positions dedicated to this type of focus. As illustrated in (46), these types of constituents are unproblematic in the preposed, especially in the left-peripheral, position in CR.

\[(46) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Ničego} \, \text{ja emu ne govorila.} \\
& \text{nothing.ACC I.NOM he.DAT NEG tell.PST.FEM} \\
& \text{‘I told him NOTHING.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Vse} \, \text{ja ej ob\’jasnila.} \\
& \text{everything.ACC I.NOM she.DAT explain.PST.FEM} \\
& \text{‘I explained EVERYTHING to her.’}
\end{align*}
\]

I do not consider the middle-field position because this is the unmarked option for these elements (see section 1.1).

The data in (42-46) indicate that a preposed focus is not necessarily associated with an exhaustive implicature. Exhaustive reading is obligatory only with the overt exhaustivity operator, e.g. \textit{tol'ko} ‘only’. If \textit{tol'ko} is used in the examples above the grammatically judgments change accordingly for all speakers.
The yes/no-question test, envisaged to distinguish contrastive from non-contrastive Focus was first used in Rodionova (2001), who argues that sentences with preposed focus in Russian do not make good answers to yes/no-questions, but can be used as an answer to a wh-question, as shown in (47-48).

(47)  (Context: What did Jacob bring?)

\[
\text{Posylku Jakov (posylku) prines (posylku).}
\]

parcel.ACC Jacob.NOM bring.PST.MASC

‘Jacob brought a PARCEL.’

(48)  (Context: Did Jacob bring anything?)

\[
(? \text{Posylku) Jakov (? posylku) prines posylku.}
\]

parcel.ACC Jacob.NOM bring.PST.MASC

‘Jacob brought a PARCEL.’

My own pilot study showed that when speakers allow for cases like (48) with focus preposing, they tend to accommodate da ‘yes’ or net ‘no’ prior to answering the question. Thus answers to yes/no-questions with preposed focus can be analyzed as being mediated by an (implied) polarity particle, i.e. yes/no. This means that when a speaker answers a yes/no-question using a sentence with the preposed focus (48), (s)he is actually providing an answer to an implied wh-question. Therefore a preposed focus can be argued to be contrastive.

The data discussed in this section suggest that focus preposing does not have any repercussions with respect to exhaustivity, but, as indicated by (47), it can trigger Contrast. This opens up the possibility that focus preposing is licensed by Contrast in CR. However, I would like to propose that the contrastive implicature triggered by preposing is epiphenomenal. In the following subsection, I outline my own functional analysis of focus preposing in CR.

3.2.2 What triggers focus preposing in CR?

In section 2.2.1.1 I showed that preposing does not always affect projection possibilities. This undermines the assumption that displacement disambiguates Focus, narrowing it down (Rodionova 2001, Sekerina 1997). In section 2.2.1.2 we saw that assuming some kind of exhaustive operator position for the preposed focus may not be the right solution either, since exhaustivity is not its typical property in CR. The only suspect we are left with is Contrast, which may be the matter of difference between the canonical clause-final and the preposed focus. In order to better understand what distinguishes the two focusing options I carried out my own analysis of the CR corpus compiled by Zemskaya and Kapanadze (1978). This helps us to determine the exact discourse conditions on focus preposing.

The analysis revealed that Contrast is not obligatory with the preposed focus. One of the examples illustrating its non-contrastive usage is given in (49).
(49) I tam my perenočevali. Tak čego tam ešče…
and there we.NOM spent.night so what there else
I tam že my opyat’ [etu šlemovidnuju devicu],
and there PTCL we.NOM again this helmet-like.ACC chick.ACC
vstretili ti.
meet.PST.PL
‘And we spent a night there. Well, what else…And there again we met that
helmet-wearing chick.’

[Zemskaya and Kapanadze 1978: 95]

The above example is an extract from the story about a mountain trip. The guide,
who is referred to as that helmet-wearing chick, has been mentioned on several
occasions earlier in the discourse, which is reflected in the use of the
demonstrative. The sentence under consideration is included into the enumeration
of events that happened to the speaker. There is no reason to believe that the
referent of the fronted focus is contrasted in any way to other people who might
have been met during the trip.

Based on examples like (49), where no Contrast is implied, I conclude that
a preposed focus in CR need not necessarily induce Contrast. However, there is one
unifying property of all preposed foci which distinguishes them from canonical
clause-final ones: a preposed focus always refers to an entity or an event which is
highly accessible. Following Pesetsky (1987), I will refer to such foci as
D(iscourse)-linked. D-linking here has to be understood as defined in (50).

(50) A constituent is D-linked if it has been explicitly mentioned in the previous
discourse, is situationally given by being physically present at the moment
of communication, or can be easily inferred from the context by being in
the set relation with some other entity or event figuring in the preceding
discourse.

The definition in (50) establishes tree types of D-linking: explicit, situational (i.e.
physical presence), and set-related. Examples of each type were attested in the data
and are presented in (51-53).

(51) Explicit D-linking
A: Did they take you somewhere during summer?
B: To Finland, to Kuokkala.
A: Oh, really?
B: Inteligencija [v Kuokkalu] ezdila ti,
intellectuals.NOM to Kuokkala.ACC go.PST.FEM
‘The intellectuals went to KUOKKALA.’

[Zemskaya and Kapanadze 1978: 42]
(52) **Situational D-linking**
(A is at B’s place. They are talking about B’s parrot-pets. B’s daughter, Irisha, also takes part in the conversation.
B: The only thing you need to do is to clean their cage.)
Eta obyazannost’ [na Irise], lezit’.  
This duty on Irisha lie.3SG
‘This responsibility lies on IRISHA.’

[Zemskaya and Kapanadze 1978: 60]

(53) **Set D-linking**
(A and B discuss what A can do to her shoes that do not fit her. A proposes to give them away to B, but the size is too small.)
B: Nado [v komissionyi] ih otnesti’.  
MOD to second.hand they take.INF
‘We should take them to a second-hand shop.’

[Zemskaya and Kapanadze 1978: 64]

D-linking, in the definition of (50), is not a property limited to individual-denoting constituents. As we saw in section 2.2.1.1, a preposed focus can be a part of a bigger Focus. In order to maintain the analysis of preposing in terms of D-linking, I have to assume that in such cases either the fronted element per se or the entire phrase that constitutes the Focus is D-linked.

As stated in (50), a focal element can be either accessible from the preceding context directly (explicit mentioning), or indirectly (set-mediated accessibility). The latter type provides an explanation for why the preverbal focus in CR is so often described as contrastive. Both D-linking and Contrast require the availability of a contextually pre-established set. However, there is a difference between the two since Contrast requires a set consisting of at least two members, while D-linking is not constrained in such a way. Prior mentioning or situational givenness does not involve any set construal. Or rather, these cases can be treated as involving a one-member set including only the given entity.

Thus I propose that Contrast is not a basic feature of preposed foci in CR. It arises as an implicature if the element is D-linked to a multi-member set.22

There is another indication that the analysis in terms of D-linking might be on the right track. Relativized Minimality, as described in the Introduction, precludes movement over an element of the same type. Focus is quantificational, and so is Negation. Therefore we expect that focus in Russian cannot be preposed over Negation. This is true, as shown in (54).

---

22 My treatment of preposing in Russian is similar to Miyagawa’s (1987) analysis of Japanese wa as a set-denoting marker.
(54) (Context: You are organizing a party in my house and I still have no idea who you have invited. So tell me, who am I going to host on Friday?)

   I.NOM NEG invite.PST.MASC Volodins.ACC rest.NOM my friends.NOM invited.PART.PL

b. ?? Volodinyh ja (Volodinyh) ne pozval. ...
   Volodins.ACC I.NOM NEG invite.PST.MASC

‘I have not invited the VOLODINS. The rest of my friends are invited.’

However, it was also shown that Relativized Minimality can be obviated if the moving element has an extra feature, e.g. if it is D-linked (Starke 2001). And indeed, if we force a context that provides reference to a known set, focus preposing becomes possible (55).

(55) (Context: I can’t believe it! Did you really invite everybody to the party?)

   I.NOM NEG invite.PST.MASC Volodins.ACC rest.NOM my friends.NOM invited.PART.PL

b. Volodinyh ja (Volodinyh) ne pozval. ...
   Volodins.ACC I.NOM NEG invite.PST.MASC

‘I have not invited the VOLODINS. The rest of my friends are invited.’

(54) differs from (55) only in the contextual part. The Universal Quantifier in the context of (55) creates the set necessary for D-linking. The contrast between these two examples strengthens the hypothesis that focus preposing in Russian is licensed by D-linking.

The idea I want to emphasize is that D-linked Focus is not a different type of Focus. It is just Focus with an extra feature. This extra feature, e.g. [+D], does not force focus to prepose even in CR. As shown in (55a) leaving a clearly D-linked focus in its canonical position is equally acceptable. Therefore, I conclude that encoding of IS and encoding of D-linking are two independent mechanisms and formulate two separate rules for them. The IS Ordering Rule has been given earlier and I repeat it for convenience in (56).

(56) IS Ordering Rule
Topic > Discourse Neutral Material (DNM) > Focus

For D-linking I propose the other rule, which I call the Scrambling Rule. Scrambling is a neutral term for all sorts of leftward-moving operations with no
recourse as to the IS status. I suggest that the Scrambling Rule (57) constrains all kinds of preposing in Russian.

(57) Scrambling Rule
A D-linked constituent should be preposed to a position in the pre-verbal area.

In exempting D-linking from IS jurisdiction, I follow Reinhart (2006) who argues that an element is marked as D-anaphoric prior to establishing Focus structure of the sentence. This means that an element can be inherently D-linked, but it cannot be inherently focal or topical. Pronouns are the prototypical cases of inherent D-linking since they are always interpreted as having a discourse antecedent. However, the fact that a pronoun is intrinsically D-linked has no implication as to which IS role a pronoun can fulfill. Most often pronouns are interpreted as Topic or DNM. Nevertheless, pronouns are also licit as Focus, as in (58).

(58) (Context: Who did Sue get into a fight with at Paul’s party?)
In fact, she got into a fight with [HIM]_{focus}.

Sometimes the two rules given above produce the same outcome. This happens with topic and DNM preposing, because these are usually D-linked. However, (56) and (57) can also compete with each other, producing structures that violate either one or the other. This is what we observe with Focus in CR, where the clash between the two can lead to structures which violate (56).

The separation of D-linking from IS helps us to understand why preposing, in particular to the middle field, is allowed in thetics, as was shown above. At first sight, it might sound like a contradiction: D-linking in thetics, which are ‘all-new’ sentences. But if D-linking does not predetermine or otherwise condition IS, it comes as no surprise that a D-linked element can nevertheless constitute (a part of) Information. Take the sentence in (59).

(59) (Context: Look Sam, I need to tell you something.)
[I am leaving you]_{focus}.

Given the context in the brackets, the sentence represents a proper thetic. There is no indication in the previous sentence as to what the something can be, apart from the fact that, due to some general principles of communication, it has to be something relevant for the addressee. The sentence includes two pronouns, i.e. two D-linked elements, and nonetheless it constitutes an ‘all-new’ statement. Therefore IS of the sentence does not depend on referential properties of its constituents.

3.2.3 Middle-field versus left-peripheral focus
There is a certain difference between the middle-field and the left-peripheral focus. The latter requires a much stronger link to the preceding discourse in order to be licit. First, in such sentences not only should the entity in Focus be D-linked, but also the entire proposition should be anchored to the preceding discourse, minimally by
sharing the same Topic with the preceding sentence. Otherwise the exchange is completely incoherent.

(60) (Context: Masha’s sister studies at the university.)

a. Net![V školu], ona ešče hodí tž.  
   No to school she.NOM still go.PRS.3SG  
   ‘No! She still goes to SCHOOL.’

b. # [V školu], ee brat hodí tž.  
   to school her brother.NOM go.PRS.3SG  
   ‘Her brother goes to SCHOOL.’

c. A ee brat [v školu] hodí (v školu).  
   and her brother.NOM to school go.PRS.3SG  
   ‘And her brother goes to SCHOOL.’

In (60) the activities of going to school and studying at the university stand in an appropriate set relation. This should be sufficient for preposing. However, there is a Topic switch in (60b). Irrespective of the fact that the newly occurring Topic is anchored to the old one (through family membership), this Topic switch rules out (60b). A felicitous continuation can be either (60a), where left-peripheral focus preposing is possible due to Topic continuity, or else it should be like (60c), where the Topic is switched but then preposing can target only the middle field.

Furthermore, the left-peripheral focus must be D-linked to an immediately preceding sentence and the set-related antecedent must be explicitly mentioned. It is exactly this degree of accessibility that differentiates left-peripheral from the middle-field focus.

Another characteristic property of sentences with the left-peripheral focus is that they always express a strong commitment on the part of the speaker to the truth of the proposition. Such sentences are usually perceived as being highly emotional, expressing excitement, irritation, etc. They are often written with an exclamation mark and phonologically resemble exclamations (Yokoyama 1986). An example illustrating this is given in (61).

(61) (A: It was in summer! And she…she was on a business trip, and Lenya was away.  
   B: No! Lenya was there! Don’t you remember?  
   A: So it was then…)

B: S Lenej vy prihodili!  
   with Lenja.INST you.NOM come.PST.PL  
   ‘You came with Lenja!’

[Zeemskaya and Kapanadze 1978: 77]

The emphatic truth conditional effect of the left-peripheral focus is especially obvious with preposed quantifiers. As described in section 3.2.1.2, focused
quantifiers are allowed to occur in the sentence-initial position. This concerns not only universal (62) but also existential quantifiers (63).

(62)  \( Vse  \) ja \( ej  \) ob'jasnila.
    everything.ACC I.NOM she.DAT explain.PST.FEM
    ‘I explained EVERYTHING to her.’

(63)  \( Kogo-to  \) ved’ ja tam videla.
    somebody.ACC PTCL I.NOM there see.PST.FEM
    ‘I DID see somebody there.’

The use of quantifiers as left-peripheral foci might seem to be at odds with the assumption about their being D-linked. However, as shown in the translation, such sentences are interpreted as counter-presuppositional, i.e. they require that the proposition expressed in the sentence figure in the preceding context albeit with the opposite truth value. For instance, (63) can be used in a situation when you clearly saw somebody at some place, say at the crime scene, but your interlocutor is trying to assure you that the place was properly locked and therefore you must be wrong (e.g. (63) can follow a sentence like *There could not possibly be anybody in there*).

To recap, the middle-field and the left-peripheral foci differ with respect to two properties: (i) the degree of D-linking and (ii) their influence on the force of the sentence.

### 3.2.4 Prosodic properties of the preposed focus

It was argued above that focus fronting does not necessarily affect focal scope (wide vs. narrow). I also claimed that preposing is preconditioned by referential giveness (D-linking) rather than by Contrast. In order to further substantiate these claims I looked at the acoustic properties of the preposed and canonical focus. The findings are presented below.

Russian is an intonational language where Focus is necessarily encoded prosodically. The studies on Russian prosody show that prosodic means of Focus realization include pitch accent, syllable length, prosodic phrasing, etc. (Alter 1997, Zybatow and Mehlhorn 2000, Alter, Mleinek and Richter 2001, Mehlhorn 2004).

All the phonological studies I came across indicate that a two-way distinction is relevant for prosodic Focus encoding in Russian. On the one hand, wide Focus is intonationally different from narrow Focus. And on the other, contrastive Focus is distinguished from non-contrastive one.

Wide Focus is characterized by a continuously falling contour which proceeds in a downstep fashion (Alter 1997, Alter, Mleniek and Richter 2001). Narrow non-contrastive Focus presents a somewhat similar pattern but there is an additional low tone preceding the focused constituent, which ensures a phonological phrase boundary between the focus exponent and the rest of the sentence (Alter 1997, Alter, Mleniek and Richter 2001). Moreover, narrow Focus is characterized by a stronger fall on the accented syllable of the focused constituent (Zybatow and Mehlhorn 2000). Contrastive Focus is quite different from both wide and narrow non-contrastive Focus in that the contrastive accent in this case is a combination of rise and fall on the accented syllable. There were also noticed
differences in phonological phrasing of narrow, wide, and contrastive Focus. Alter, Mleniek and Richter (2001) argue that the exponent of narrow non-contrastive Focus forms a separate prosodic phrase but is in one intonational phrase with the rest of the sentence. Contrastive Focus requires that the focus exponent constitute an independent intonational phrase.

It is argued in all of the mentioned studies that the corresponding prosodic effects are attested independently of the word order, i.e. a certain type of Focus is prosodically encoded in the same way irrespective of the position of the focus exponent. I argued that preposing of a focus exponent is harmless not only to the pragmatic properties of Focus (contrastive/non-contrastive/exhaustive), but also to its projection possibilities (wide/narrow). The resulting prediction is that a preposed focus should exhibit the same three way prosodic distinction (wide vs. narrow vs. contrastive) as the clause-final one.

In order to test the prediction I carried out a small perception experiment. It has been shown previously that the described prosodic differences between different Focus types are perceptually salient (Mehlhorn 2004).

The testing material consisted of 40 recorded sentences with different types of Focus: sentential (news reporting); non-contrastive narrow and wide (answers to wh-questions); and contrastive narrow and wide (corrections). The number of sentences for each type was roughly the same: news reporting – 14; non-contrastive – 13; and contrastive – 13. The materials included sentences with both canonical post-verbal and preposed focus. The overview of the experimental material is presented in table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>The distribution of different word orders and different Focus types in the test sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentential Focus (news reporting)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question answers: narrow (VP)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-question answers: wide (VP)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections: narrow (VP)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections: wide (VP)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be noticed from the table, the distribution is uneven. This is done on purpose. First, since my main concern was the interpretation of preposed foci the majority of sentences are of this structural type. When deciding on the number of examples with wide versus narrow Focus and canonical versus preposed focus I took into consideration the tendencies which different types of Focus exhibit with respect to structural encoding and projection. I also considered the ambiguity that a focus in different positions can display. For example, it is easier to construe a one-to-one relation between a focus exponent and a pragmatic Focus whether the exponent is preposed or not. Therefore, I deliberately included more sentences with
wide Focus (28 in total). In terms of projection, a canonical postverbal focus can be associated with wide Focus more easily than a preposed one. Thus I selected more news reporting sentences with a preposed rather than with a postverbal focus. Because preposed focus has been traditionally claimed to render contrast, I included slightly more non-contrastive sentences (answers to questions) with a preposed focus and slightly more contrastive sentences (corrections) with a canonical focus.

First the testing material was prepared. For these purposes all the test sentences were embedded into coherent contexts such that the speakers could read them with a natural intonation. One female and one male speaker were chosen and all the 40 mini situations were distributed evenly between them, i.e. 20 mini dialogues each. They read the whole situation and were recorded. After that the contextual part of every mini situation was erased such that only the test sentences remain.

Seven monolingual Russian speakers participated in the perceptual experiment. The participants were presented the recorded sentences and asked to match them with one or more of the possible contexts given to them as a multiple-choice list. Each sentence was played three times. A sample test sentence and the corresponding multiple-choice list are shown in (64).

(64) Replayed sentence:
Ja babuške zvonila.
I.NOM grandmother.DAT phone.PST.FEM
‘I phoned the GRANDMOTHER.’

Context choice:
- a. Stating a fact: Why did it take you so long to open the door?
- b. Correction: I assume you talked to your girlfriend on the phone again.
- c. Answer to a question: Who did you call?

The analysis of the experimental data was carried out in the following way. I calculated how many times each test sentence was matched with each of the proposed contexts. Then I compared the results against the absolute number, i.e. a number which would be obtained if a given sentence were matched with the correct context by all the subjects.

The results are summarized in table 4. The topmost row contains the contexts the subjects could chose from (note that they could make multiple choices for one test sentence), and the leftmost column shows the targeted interpretation of Focus, i.e. the intonation of the sentence. The correct matches are given in bold face.
Table 4 The results of the perception experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolute number</th>
<th>News reporting/stating a fact (sentential)</th>
<th>Answering a question (non-contrastive)</th>
<th>Correction (contrastive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News reporting</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61 (62%)</td>
<td>37 (38%)</td>
<td>16 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contrastive narrow (wh-question)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10 (17%)</td>
<td>29 (52%)</td>
<td>27 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contrastive VP (wh-question)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>20 (57%)</td>
<td>20 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive narrow (correction)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7 (25%)</td>
<td>11 (39%)</td>
<td>14 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive VP (correction)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>26 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the experiment showed that the position of focus did not have any significant influence on the ability of the subjects to find an appropriate context. Recall that the majority of sentences contained a preposed focus.

Most often, more than one context was chosen for a particular sentence by all the participants. This shows that one and the same intonation can map onto different pragmatic functions. This fact is not surprising and has been noted for Russian previously (Odé 2007).

As the table shows, the easiest intonation to identify corresponds to ‘all-new’ sentences. 62% of the time the sentences with this intonation are correctly identified. Note that these test sentences are quite rarely chosen as “another possibility” for a sentence pronounced with a different intonation.

As the figures show, the size of Focus (narrow vs. wide) does not affect its identification. The correct context is chosen with roughly the same ease (or difficulty) for contrastive narrow (49%) vs. contrastive VP (40%) and non-contrastive narrow (52%) vs. non-contrastive VP Focus (57%).

There is a certain tendency with respect to which options were chosen in addition to or instead of the correct ones. Thus designated news-reporting sentences were occasionally matched with question-answer situations (38%) and very rarely with corrections (16%). The ambiguity equally often occurred between question-answer and corrective sentences and vice versa.

Upon the whole, the correct options were chosen more often than the erroneous ones. This replicates the findings of the studies mentioned earlier. Most importantly the experiment shows that there does not seem to be any correlation between the structural position of the focus exponent and interpretation of Focus as contrastive/non-contrastive or wide/narrow. Speakers are perfectly capable of determining the pragmatic felicity conditions just on the basis of the prosodic cue.

However, I should take some reservations. The majority of sentences contained the middle-field focus. Thus this assumption applies largely to a distinction between canonical versus middle-field focus. There were only four sentences with a peripheral focus exponent, and all were designated as corrections.
None of them caused any difficulty and they all were matched with the correct context.

3.2.5 Summary of structure-IS mapping in CR

The difference in sentence structuring between SR and CR is confined to the position of focus. Focus exponent in CR can leave its dedicated clause-final position and occur either in the middle field or at the left periphery of the clause.

In contrast to what has been previously assumed about focus fronting in Russian (Krylova and Khavronina 1986) I argued that this structural difference between SR and CR is not just a matter of style or genre. It was shown that preposing is preconditioned by D-linking. D-linking allows for but does not force focus preposing, since a D-linked focus can also remain in its canonical position.

It was shown that depending on the landing site of the preposed focus a different degree of accessibility is required. Preposing to the sentence-initial site requires not only Focus D-linking but also Topic continuity. Besides such sentences are always highly emphatic and reflect the speaker’s attitude.

3.3 Conclusion

In this chapter we established some rules of word order in Russian. It was proposed that there are two major pragmatic principles that underlie the ordering of sentence constituents in the language.

The first is the IS rule, according to which the main news, or Focus, should follow the commonly shared information. Thus in accordance with the IS rule, the topic in the sentence-initial position is followed by DNM, which, in turn, is followed by Focus with the focus exponent in the clause-final position. If the underlying SVO structure violates this IS rule it is subject to the corresponding modifications. On the descriptive level, I recognized two such re-ordering operations: O-preposing and S-postposing. O-preposing is used to evacuate a non-focal object from the Focus domain. S-postposing is employed to include the subject into the Focus domain.

Independently of the IS ordering rule, I proposed another rule operative in Russian, which I coined the Scrambling Rule. This rule has to do with the referential status of constituents and demands that D-linked constituents be preposed to a preverbal area. The interaction between the two ordering principles can result in one outranking the other. For instance in SR, the IS Rule is ranked higher than the Scrambling Rule. The opposite is attested in CR, where the focus exponent can leave its canonical clause-final position as a response to the Scrambling Rule.

I argued that D-linking is not an IS primitive and that the two rules must be kept apart.