UC Merced

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society

Title

Aspects of Information Structure Cross-Linguistic Evidence of Contrastive Topic

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/9jp2k39q

Journal

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, 21(0)

Author

Lee, Chungmin

Publication Date

1999

Peer reviewed

ASPECTS OF INFORMATION STRUCTURE:
CROSS-LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE OF CONTRASTIVE TOPIC

Chungmin Lee clee@snu.ac.kr
Seoul National University

I. Introduction

This paper addresses characterizing Contrastive Topic by critically examining in what sense it is both topical and focal as claimed by Krifka (1991), and supported by means of alternative semantics (Buering 1997, 1998), and a discourse model (Roberts 1996), thus clarifying aspects of information structure -- i.e., Topic-Focus structure -- and by explaining why scope inversion occurs and how reversed polarity or contrast implicature occurs cross-linguistically. A Contrastive Topic (CT), marked by either some high-toned prosodic feature such as a fall-rise contour or by some morphological marking such as a CT marker accompanied by some H-toned prosodic feature (in Korean and Japanese), induces a contrast set in the speaker's mind. The set is scalar in quantification and event-contrast in terms of affectedness or goal accessibility. Verbs are newly claimed to be included in CTs via event-contrast, contra others.

II. Event-Contrast

CTs are underlyingly based on concessive admission of an event/proposition with regard to a cell of a partition of the referent set denoted by a given or accommodated Topic in contrast with the rest of the alternatives in the Contrastive Set (Cset). Concessive admission, however, is for evocation of an implicature normally in the reversed polarity. Verbs/adjectives and other event-denoting predicates, contrary to what is commonly believed, can also be topical (occurring in the previous question) and thus contrastive. For the question 'Did she arrive already?,' the answer can be (1) with the relevant implicature from the contextually salient ordered scalar Cset:

(1) Arrive she did. *or* She arrived. ---
Contour: LH*LH%

Implicature: (But she is *not* ready for the performance.)

Cset on the scale: <be ready for the performance, arrive> The concessive affirmative admission of her arrival evokes implicating the denial or the reversed poalrity of the stronger alternative on the scale of event-expressions in different degrees of goal accessibility in the Cset by the Gricean maxim of quantity, Horn's (1972) and Gazdar's (1977) scales. Such effects occur in English, with B accent (Jackendoff 1972), virtually same as LH*LH%, in predicates *in-situ* or in VP preposing constructions (Ward 1985). The verb *arrive* in the answer is not new and can be topical, in an otherwise default (wide) focus *in-situ* position or in preposed/'topicalized' position. In this situation, Korean similarly shows a H-toned CT marker attached to the main verb stem (nominalized when necessary), which is followed by a light V, as in *tochak* 'arrival'-*UN* 'CT' *ha-yess-e* 'did.' The question can be directly whether she is ready for the performance and (1) can serve as an answer to the new question with a stronger negative implicature. Similarly, *didn't kill him* in the fall-rise contour or CT-marking as in Korean, implicates a weaker affirmative alternative such as *beat him* or *pushed him* from the scalar Cset of event expressions in different degrees of affectedness such as <*kill, beat, push*>.

III. Contrast in Quantificational Expressions

If a universal quantifier, numeral, modal operator or 'because' clause, being CT-marked, interacts with negation, it gets a narrow interpretation, because of the nature of the contrastive qualifying denial, e.g. in (2) but note (3) and (4):

(2) *All didn't come* H*LH% Interpretation: ¬∀

(3) **All came* H*LH% (in CT intonation)

(4) **motu -NUN o -ass eo (Korean)
all CT come Past Dec(larative)

In (2), negation is concessively partly admitted, naturally evoking a polarity-reversed affirmative implicature. On the contrary, the utterance (3) in the contrastive contour and its equivalent in Korean (4) are anomalous because of the lack of any stronger (higher) alternative to negate on the quantificational scale of relevant quantificational expressions. Numeral expressions in CT also evoke polarity-reversed implicatures. In this connection, denotational implicatures vs. meta-linguistic negation, CT of nominal referents and in embedded sentences, and Topic vs. Focus are explored.