

1. The study of information structure belongs nowadays to the most topical issues of research in theoretical linguistics. The views vary, but it has been widely accepted that though a bipartition of the sentence into T(opic) and F(ocus) (or whatever terms the particular theories may apply) is basic, a more detailed differentiation within the two parts (rather than more dichotomies) should be introduced. The **main objectives** of the present paper are (i) to put under scrutiny the possibility/necessity to work with a notion of contrastive topic and to formulate an operational criterion for it, and (ii) to specify how the set of alternatives underlying the contrast is conditioned. The framework we subscribe to is the Functional Generative Description (FGD), with a dependency-based underlying structure of the sentence, in which both the relations of dominance (head and modifier) and precedence (underlying word order, contextual boundness and T and F) are being distinguished without the necessity to work with constituents in addition to the opposition of heads and other nodes.

2. In FGD, the semantic basis of the articulation of the sentence into **T and F** is the relation of **aboutness**: a prototypical declarative sentence asserts that its F holds (or does not hold) about its T: F(T) or non-F(T). Within both T and F, an opposition of **contextually bound** and **non-bound** nodes is distinguished, which is understood as a grammatically patterned opposition, rather than in the literal sense of the term. Examples (1) and (2), taken from the **syntactically annotated Prague Dependency Treebank** (PDT), illustrate the typical layer (the sentences are supposed to be pronounced with an unmarked position of the intonation center, i.e. with its placement at the end of the sentence).

3.1 Rooth (1985) characterizes **focus** as a choice from **a set of alternatives**. However, to a certain degree also topic can be considered as a choice from a set of alternatives, i.e. as more or less contrastive – the (more or less restricted) set of alternatives is „given“ by the preceding co(n)text (see 4. below). In this paper, we focus on contrastive topics but leave aside such specific cases as (3) in which the choice of T is maximally restricted, i.e. uniquely determined by the context.

3.2 We want to show that contrastiveness is not just a matter of degree. Hajicová, Partee and Sgall (1998, 151) introduce the notion of **contrastive (part of) T** in connection with the occurrences of the so-called focussing particles in T, see (4); they use the index *c* to mark the item in such a position. The notion of contrastive T, however, should not be restricted to cases with focalizers, see (5) as compared with (3).

3.3 To substantiate an introduction of some opposition in linguistic description, one has to look for an **operational test**. Following up Koptova's (1999) observation that short forms of pronouns in Czech cannot be used in certain positions in T, we use a test based on the opposition of strong and weak personal pronouns (*jeho/ho* ,him.Acc.', *jemu/mu* ,him.Dat', *tobe/ti* ,you.Dat', *tebe/te* you.Acc.', or any personal pronoun in Nom./the zero form), cf. *jeho* in (6)(a), where *he* is contrasted with *she*; there is no such contrast in (b).

The functioning of the test is illustrated by (7), which is a modification of (4), with a masc. noun standing for *Mother Theresa*. A difference between a T without such a contrast and a contrastive element in T (*ho* vs. *jeho*) is documented by (8)(a) and (b), respectively. It remains to be investigated under which conditions the (optional?) rise of pitch on (a part of) T (i.e. 'hat contour') can be taken as a criterion for contrastive T.

3.4 Contextually bound elements typically stand in T while the contextually non-bound ones are in F. However, this need not be so, as our analysis of (2) exemplifies: elements deeply embedded (i.e. dependent on an item that differs from the main verb) may occur as contextually non-bound items (contrastive or not) within T (or as bound items in F of the whole sentence). A **bound item in F** may be also **contrastive**, as illustrated by (9); the long pronoun *tebe* is used, being a part of F but not the F proper (which is the verb *mrzí*; notice the position of the intonational centre in the E. translation).

4. The **set of alternatives** underlying the contrast in T is conditioned by most different factors, both cotextual and contextual (situational). We understand as relevant a scale (or a partial ordering) concerning the explicitness of the set of alternatives (SA) underlying the contrast. An explicit delimitation, as thus a relatively strong type of contrast can be found in (5) and (6). The contrast appears to be weaker in case the SA is not delimited explicitly, as in (10). In certain cases there is just one antecedent; this concerns cases with the focussing particle in T, as in (4), cases with a "new" T (coreferential with an item of F, rather than of T, in the preceding co-text), as in (3), as well as cases in which the contrast is being newly established, as in (9), in which *he* is presented as being in contrast to other individuals.

5. In the full version of the paper, more illustrations are adduced from PDT and it is shown how the theoretical conclusions about contrastive T, its degrees are being captured by the annotations and how the operational criteria are applied.

### Examples:

(Note: function words such as prepositions and auxiliary verbs do not have a node of their own on the underlying level of FGD and thus in our schematic notation they are included in brackets. The intonation center if in a marked position (i.e. if it is not placed at the end of the sentence) is denoted by capitals. The index b denotes the given element as contextually bound, elements with no index are considered to be contextually non-bound; the index c denotes the given element as a contrastive T, or, in (9), a contrastive contextually bound element of F. The elements of F of the Czech sentences are denoted by italics.

(1) (V) noci (ze) soboty (na) nedeli skoncil (ve) vojenském prostoru Ralsko sjezd majoru.

Lit.: (At) night (from) Saturday (to) Sunday ended (in) military area Ralsko meeting-Nom. of-majors

Question: What happened during the night from Saturday to Sunday?

T: v noci ze soboty na nedeli

F: skoncil ve vojenském prostoru Ralsko sjezd majoru

(1') (V) noci.b (ze) soboty.b (na) nedeli.b *skoncil (ve) vojenském prostoru Ralsko sjezd majoru.*

(2) Rota novácku (pri) příležitosti sjezdu vycistila vojenský prostor (od) munice.

Lit.: Squad of-novices (at) occasion of-meeting cleared military area (from) munition.

Question: What did the squad do at the occasion of the meeting in the military area?

T: rota novácku pri příležitosti sjezdu vojenský prostor

F: vycistila od munice

(2') Rota.b novácku (pri) příležitosti.b sjezdu.b *vycistila vojenský.b prostor.b (od) munice.*

(3) (Preceding context: Kde se mluví cesky?) Cesky se mluví v Cesku.

(Where is Czech spoken?) Czech is spoken in Czechia.

(3') Cesky.b (se) mluví.b (v) *Cesku.*

(4) (Who criticized even MOTHER TERESA as a tool of the capitalists?) JOHN criticized even Mother Theresa as a tool of the capitalists..

(5) (Preceding context: Mluví se cesky v Cesku nebo na Slovensku?) Cesky se mluví v Cesku, na Slovensku se mluví slovensky.

(Is Czech spoken in Czechia or in Slovakia?) Czech is spoken in C., while in S., SLOVAK is spoken.

(5') Cesky.b se-mluví.b *v-Cesku, na-Slovensku.c se-mluví.b slovensky.*

(6)(a) (Petr ji nazval konzervativcem.) Potom jeho urazila ona.

Petr called her a conservative. Then she insulted him

(6)(b) (Petr ji nazval konzervativcem.) Potom ho ona opustila.

Petr called her a conservative. The she LEFT him.

(6')(a) Potom jeho.c urazila.b *ona.*

(6')(b) Potom ho.b ona.b *opustila.*

(7) (Kdo kritizoval i PAPEŽE jako nástroj kapitalismu?) I jeho kritizoval Honza.

(Who criticized even the POPE as a tool of the capitalists?) JOHN criticized even him.

(8)(a) (Kdy jsi ho videl?) Videl jsem ho vcera.

(Where have you seen him?) Lit.: I-saw Aux him yesterday

já-b ho-b videl.b *vcera*

(b) Jeho jsem videl vcera (a ji už před týdnem).

Lit. Him I-saw yesterday (and her already a week ago).

Jeho.c já.b videl.b *vcera (a ji.c už před-týdnem).*

(9) ( People were very happy about the development of that case. And what about him?)

Priznal se, že jeho osobne to mrzí.

Lit.: He-admitted that him personally (it) bothered.

He admittted that he personally was BOTHERED by it.

on.b *priznal-se jeho.c osobne to.b mrzí*

(10) (Terry has many friends.) My **brother** is *one of his closest schoolmates*.

Note: Boldfacing denotes the rising pitch here.