

神戸市外国語大学 学術情報リポジトリ

Identification Focus in the Written Bulgarian Language

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 神戸市外国語大学外国学研究所 公開日: 2025-01-22 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: YOVKOVA-SHII メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://kobe-cufs.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/2000150

Identification Focus in the Written Bulgarian Language

Eleonora YOVKOVA-SHII
University of Toyama

This study examines the realization of the pragmatic role of focus on the grammatical subject of the simple Bulgarian declarative sentence, especially regarding the so-called identification focus. The purpose of the study is to examine whether there exist any mechanisms on the base of which the two types of focus, i.e., identification focus and information focus, can be distinguished in the written Bulgarian language. Four criteria will be used in the analysis, i.e., type of the information, type of the set of alternatives, sentential position, morphological markedness for definiteness.

Keywords: Bulgarian, written language, subject, identification focus, information focus

1. Introduction

The problem of focus and its mapping on the syntactic components of the sentence has been discussed a lot recently, and many works which deal with the information structure of languages pay special attention to the problem of focus. The problem of focus has been examined from different perspectives, e.g., its opposition to topic, the mechanisms of its realization, the types of focus, etc.

Focus is a universal pragmatic category. Again, every sentence has a focal element, and focusless sentences do not exist since “all sentences have some update potential” (Vallduví & Engdahl 1996: 469). However, the types of focus and the mechanisms of their realization across languages vary a lot. Different studies categorize different types of focus. Moreover, different terms

(‘information focus’, ‘regular focus’, ‘contrastive focus’, ‘identification(al) focus’, ‘closed focus’, ‘open focus’, ‘emphatic focus’, ‘exhaustive focus’, ‘broad focus’, ‘narrow focus’, etc.) have been proposed, sometimes even for one and the same phenomenon, or *vice versa*, one and the same term has been used to describe different focus phenomena.

This study deals with the identification focus and explores its realization on the grammatical subject of the simple Bulgarian sentence. Our main interest is the differentiation of identification focus and information focus. We analyze mainly identification focus but refer also to information focus as far as the comparison of the two types of focus is relevant for the discussion of identification focus. The main purpose of the study is to explore whether there exist any properties or mechanisms on the base of which identification focus can be distinguished invariably.

We examine the written language and discuss mainly the realization of focus on the grammatical subject of the sentence. The reason to deal with the subject is, first, that subject is the syntactic component, which alongside the predicate, undergoes mostly focalization, and, second, since in the written language the distinction of the pragmatic roles, especially regarding the subject, is a pretty difficult matter, subject has not been discussed much in the previous studies dealing with the information structure of the Bulgarian sentence¹.

There do not exist any uniform mechanisms for focalization and focalization can be realized in different ways. Word order is a significant, although not an absolute, factor in the focalization process. We will pay attention to word order and the position of the subject in the sentence, but examine also other mechanisms which have not been sufficiently examined in the previous studies, e.g., the grammatical marking for definiteness/indefiniteness, and which, in our opinion, can be viewed as effective mechanisms in the focalizing process.

The paper is organized as follows. Chapter 2 makes general remarks about focus. In section 2.1 we summarize some of the already proposed definitions of focus, and propose a definition for focus which will be used in our study. Section

¹ In the spoken language, the pragmatic roles can be differentiated on the base of the prosodic features (logical stress), which are not available in the written language. Again, concerning the grammatical object, Bulgarian possesses specific invariant mechanisms (e.g., clitic doubling) for topicalization of the object. That is the reason why many studies deal primarily with the grammatical object when they discuss the information structure of the Bulgarian sentence.

2.2 discusses the focus types and the terms used in the literature for focus types. In section 2.3 we discuss the differences between information and identification focus. Chapter 3 presents the main analysis of our study and discusses the identification focus in Bulgarian. Chapter 4 provides a summary.

2. Focus

2.1. Definition

Different definitions have been proposed for focus. Lambrecht (1994: 213) defines focus as “the semantic component of a pragmatically structured proposition whereby the assertion differs from the presupposition”. Krifka (2008: 247), on the base of the theory of ‘alternative semantics’ (Rooth 1985, 1992), says that “focus indicates the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions” and “any kind of focus, contrastive or not, is assumed to evoke a set of alternatives against which the focus constituent is evaluated.” Following Dik & Hengeveld (1997), Erteschik-Shir (2007: 38) points out that the focal information is that information which is most important and salient in the given communication setting, often being new, but if not new, re-emphasizing already available information.

To be able to discuss identification focus under the label of focus, we will accept Krifka’s definition (2008: 247) adding to it the above mentioned remarks of Erteschik-Shir (2007: 38) and define focus as follows: focus is that pragmatic component which **“indicates the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions”**, and expresses the most important and salient information in the proposition which is usually new or, if not new, re-emphasizes already available information.

2.2. Focus Types

As already mentioned in the Introduction, different studies categorize different types of focus and different terms (‘information focus’, ‘regular focus’, ‘contrastive focus’, ‘identification(al) focus’, ‘closed focus’, ‘open focus’, ‘emphatic focus’, ‘exhaustive focus’, ‘broad focus’, ‘narrow focus’, etc.) have been proposed sometimes even for one and the same phenomenon, or *vice versa*, one and the same term has been used to describe different focus phenomena. Thus, for instance, ‘information focus’ is called in some studies (Janinskaja 2016) ‘broad focus’, and ‘identification focus’ is called ‘narrow focus’. Again, for what

we refer to as ‘identification focus’, terms like ‘contrastive focus’, ‘emphatic focus’, ‘exhaustive focus’ have been used (Zubizarreta 1998, Krifka 2008, Neeleman & Vermeulen 2012).

Regarding Bulgarian, we use the terms ‘information focus’ and ‘identification focus’ and, also, distinguish ‘identification focus’ from ‘contrastive focus’. The reason for the latter will be given below.

2.3. Information Focus vs Identification Focus

There is a general tendency to distinguish between information focus and identification focus in the following way. Information focus is commonly thought of as that part of the utterance that introduces new (non-presupposed) information into the discourse, namely by providing an answer to a *wh*-question. A single constituent of the sentence or the whole sentence can be in the scope of the information focus. Identification focus, on the other hand, “is necessarily associated with a contextually determined set of alternatives, for which the predicate holds potentially” (Zubizarreta 1998: 6). Information focus is present in every sentence since, as we mentioned, every sentence has some update potential, while not every sentence contains an identification focus. Again, identification focus is not uniform across languages (Kiss 1998).

In the languages where identification focus is presented, this type of focus is marked in a special way by prosodic, or syntactic, or morphological means, which set it formally apart from mere information focus (Vallduví & Vilkuna 1998). Zimmermann (2008: 348), following Hartmann (2008) and the references therein, states that “prosodic evidence from intonation languages, however, suggests that contrastive focus² is not fully independent of information focus, as contrastive focus differs only gradually in intonation from information focus”. Similarly, Krifka (2008) argues that contrast is simply a pragmatic feature, and there is a little reason to distinguish ‘regular focus’ (i.e., information focus) and contrastive focus neither from a formal nor from a functional perspective. Further on, Krifka (2008: 258–259) claims that the answer to the question Q: ‘*What do you want to drink, tea or coffee?*’ A: *I want tea.* “doesn’t seem to be more contrastive than an answer to the non-restricted question ‘*What do you want to drink?*’”, referring to the first as ‘closed focus’ and the latter as ‘open focus’. Zimmermann (2008: 351)

² Identification focus in our terminology.

argues something similar, saying that “it is impossible to predict the presence or absence of a contrastive marking on a focus constituent α just on the basis of its inherent properties, or its immediate discourse function as an answer, correction, etc. Rather, the presence or absence of a special grammatical marking on α depends on the specific discourse requirements at a specific point in the discourse. These are influenced by the intentions of the speaker and his/her assumptions about the knowledge state(s) of the hearer(s).”

On the contrary, evidence from Hungarian (cf. Kiss 1998) suggests the opposite. Discussing the situation in Hungarian, Kiss (1998: 247) argues that information focus and identification focus (in Kiss’s terminology) are associated with distinct structural positions and these two types of focus should be distinguished.

As can be seen from the above-mentioned arguments, there does not exist a uniform theory concerning the distinction of identification focus and information focus, and the distinction depends on the individual language.

3. Identification Focus in Bulgarian

As already mentioned, identification focus is realized differently across languages. In Hungarian, as Kiss (1998) states, it is associated with a certain structural position. In Japanese, for instance, it is marked by the same formal feature (particle *ga*) as the information focus.

For Bulgarian, we would claim that identification focus is formally and semantically closer to topic than to focus. Again, we will show that there exist some properties on the base of which identification focus can be distinguished from information focus, although the distinction of the two is not absolute and fundamental and is related to a great extent to the contextual situation. In the study we pay attention to the properties given in 1)–4), and examine the information focus and identification focus in regard to them.

- 1) type of the information
- 2) type of the set of alternatives
- 3) sentential position
- 4) morphological markedness for definiteness

Again, we will claim that the distinction of the identification focus is rather

pragmatic than formal since the realization of the above mentioned properties are bound to the discourse.

Before proceeding with the analysis, some remarks should be made concerning the distinction of ‘identification focus’ and ‘contrastive focus’ in Bulgarian.

As the definitions of focus displayed, identification focus is called usually ‘contrastive focus’, and identification focus and contrastive focus are generally treated as one and same thing. In Bulgarian, however, it would be more appropriate to distinguish identification focus from contrastive focus for the following reasons. Identification focus is always contrastive (always associated with a set of alternatives) while contrastive focus is not necessarily identificational (i.e., contrast does not require identification). Again, identification focus is exhaustive in meaning (excluding all irrelevant alternatives), while contrastive focus (in our interpretation) need not be exhaustive. Finally, contrastive focus nouns can be both indefinite and definite (examples (1), (2)), while identification focus nouns, as discussed later, are necessarily definite³.

(1) *Máž (a ne žena) kara kolata.*

‘A man (not a woman) is driving the car.’

(2) *Mážät (a ne ženata) v tjahnoto semejstvo kara kolata.*

‘The man (not the woman) in their family is driving the car.’

Next, we will examine the characteristic features of identification focus in comparison to information focus, regarding the properties given in 1)–4).

It has been said that information focus is the domain of new (non-presupposed) information, i.e., the new part in the sentence describing what has been said about the topic, or as the information of the sentence that makes contribution to the hearer’s knowledge store (Vallduví 1992). Information focus usually presupposes a *wh*-question. The opposite, i.e., an answer to a *wh*-question is necessarily an information focus, however, is not true, because, as Shimoji (2018: 90) has argued, a *wh*-question evokes a set of alternatives, but it cannot

³ Consequently, the subject in example (1) cannot be interpreted as identification focus.

entail the exclusion of any subset of alternatives since the alternative is not yet specified.

Information focus usually reveals the new, non-presupposed information (examples (3), (4)), however, the referent of the information focus can express already available (known to the hearer) information, as can be seen from the referent of the *wh*-question in (5).

- (3) Q: *Koj igrae na dvora?*
 ‘Who is playing in the yard?’
 A: *Dete/Edno dete igrae na dvora.*
 ‘A child is playing in the yard.’
- (4) Q: *Kakvo stana?*
 ‘What happened?’
 A: *Dete/Edno dete padna v rekata.*
 ‘A child fall into the river.’
- (5) Q: *Koj igrae na dvora?*
 ‘Who is playing in the yard?’
 A: *Deteto na sāseditē igrae na dvora.*
 ‘The child of the neighbors is playing in the yard.’

On the contrary, identification focus expresses usually already available information⁴. It has been said (Krapova 2004: 3) that identification focus “conveys new information only indirectly: by emphasizing the information the speaker typically brings forward a (potentially) novel quality or property of what is being talked about”.

- (6) Q: *Koja (ot vsichkīte) e Marija?*
 ‘Which one (of all) is Marija?’
 A: *Momicheto s dālga kosa.*
 ‘The girl with long hair.’

⁴ Example (5) can function as well as identification focus.

The availability of information is made explicit by the formal feature of definiteness⁵. While information focus nouns can be both indefinite (example (3)) and definite (example (5)), identification focus nouns should be definite (example (6))⁶.

Information focus operates within an open set of alternatives (Krifka 2008). One possible open set of alternatives for the answer to the question in (3) is displayed in (7).

- (7) Q: *Koj igrae na dvora?*
 A: open set = {N1*dete(to)* ('a/the child'), N2*momche(to)* ('a/the boy'), N3*kuche(to)* ('a/the dog'), ...}

On the contrary, identification focus is contrastive and exhaustive in meaning, "excluding some or all irrelevant alternative referents to the focused element" (Skopetas & Fanselow 2010: 170). Quoting Zubizarreta (1998: 6), Krapova (2004: 3) states about contrastive focus⁷ that it "is necessarily associated with some contextually determined set of alternatives for which the predicate holds potentially, by pointing out the unique member (or subset) of that set". One possible closed set of alternatives for the answer to the question in (6) can be as shown in (8).

- (8) Q: *Koja (ot vsichkite) e Marija?*
 A: closed set = {N1*momicheto s dälga kosa* ('the girl with long hair'), N2*momicheto s käsa kosa* ('the girl with short hair'), N3*momicheto s rusa kosa* ('the girl with blond hair')}

Some lexical means have been pointed out as important factors in the distinction of the focus types. König (1991) and Dryer (1994) say that focus particles (focalizers) like *only* and *even* are involved in the semantic interpretation of the narrow focus (in our terminology, the identification focus). Again, it has been

⁵ Definiteness is marked in Bulgarian by the definite article (-ät/-ta/-to/-te), agglutinated to the stem of the noun.

⁶ The indefinite phrase *Momiche s dälga kosa* could not be an answer to the question in (6).

⁷ In the previous studies about focus in Bulgarian, the term 'contrastive focus' is usually used for what we call identification focus.

claimed that cleft sentences are one of the mechanisms for marking focus. Cleft sentences signal the exhaustive interpretation of the contrastive/identification focus which *in-situ* (i.e., information) focus lacks. In relation to clefting, for Bulgarian, we pay attention to the focus particle *imenno* ‘exactly’ and test the difference between information and identification focus using this particle. We argue that information focus cannot occur with *imenno* (9), while identification focus can occur with this focalizer (10). The inconsistency (ungrammaticality) with *imenno* in (9), expressing information focus, is because information focus works within an open set of alternatives for which the property of exhaustiveness expressed by *imenno* is inappropriate. However, without a *wh*-question, in situations where *firmata* ‘company’ can be interpreted as the exhaustive member of a closed set of alternatives (i.e., the process is exclusion of the non-correct referents by indicating the correct one), the co-occurrence is possible (10).

(9) A: ***Koj*** *plašta za ekskurzijata?*

‘Who pays for the trip?’

B: **Imenno firmata plašta.*

‘Exactly the company pays.’

(10) closed set = {N1*firmata* ‘company’, N2*otdelăt* ‘department’, N3*učastnitzite* ‘participants’}⁸

Imenno N1*firmata (e tazi, kojato) plašta za ekskurzijata.*

‘Exactly (it is) the company (that) pays for the trip.’

The properties 1) type of information and 2) set of alternatives, that we discussed above, are purely pragmatic/discourse properties (i.e., depend on the discourse requirements) and can be verified only in the context. On the other hand, 3) sentential position and 4) markedness for definiteness are formal features indicated in the sentential structure. Next, we examine the properties of 3) and 4).

We will start with 4). Definiteness/indefiniteness is closely related to the type of information and has been already mentioned briefly above but we discuss this feature again in details below.

Topical subjects in Bulgarian are necessarily definite. Focal subjects can be

⁸ One possible closed set with three members.

indefinite or definite. Indefiniteness is expressed by the bare (non-articled) form of the noun (*mǎž* ‘a man’), or by adding the numeral *edin* ‘one’⁹ to the noun (*edin mǎž* ‘a man’). Definite subjects are marked by inflecting the morpheme of the definite article (see footnote 5) and post-fixing it to the stem of the noun, as in *mǎž-ăt* ‘the man’. The definite article possesses long and short forms by which the syntactic roles (subject/object) are distinguished but this formal distinction exists only in the singular masculine (*mǎž-ăt/mǎž-a*). For feminine, neuter, and plural, one and the same form is used for both syntactic roles (*žena-ta/žena-ta* (fem. sg.) ‘the woman’, *dete-to/dete-to* (neut. sg.) ‘the child’, *ženi-te/ženi-te* (pl.) ‘the women’).

Information focus subjects can be indefinite or definite, however, indefinite subjects are more usual. Non-articled subject nouns are most easily interpreted as the constituent expressing information focus. This is since new, non-presupposed information and ‘determinedness’, the basic feature of definiteness, are incompatible. However, definite information foci also exist (cf. example (5)).

Identification focus, on the other hand, cannot be indefinite. This fact is related to its operation as an indicator of already available information, a semantic property which it shares with the topic. This type of focus conveys new information only indirectly by updating “the information the speaker typically brings forward a (potentially) novel quality or property of what is being talked about” (Krapova 2004: 3)¹⁰. As Tisheva (2013: 24) argues, besides ‘old’ information (or, the topic), the definite article can be used to mark ‘new’ information, which, however, is already available to the hearer and the hearer thus

⁹ The status of *edin* as an indefinite article has been greatly disputed, and we will avoid mentioning to *edin* as an indefinite article.

¹⁰ The necessity for updating can be explained by the following claim of Zimmermann & Onéa (2011: 1665): “[T]he notion of contrast ([author’s note] Zimmermann & Onéa talk about ‘contrastive focus’) refers to the fact that a particular focus content, or a particular speech act containing a focus, or a particular focus-background partition, is unexpected for the hearer from the speaker’s perspective, and may thus create problems for the successful update of the common ground: since unexpected facts, or discourse moves, are more difficult to accept or accommodate, the speaker will often try to facilitate the hearer’s plight of adjusting her background assumptions accordingly, which is a precondition for successful update. One possibility for the speaker to direct the hearer’s attention, and to facilitate the task of shifting the background assumptions, is to use a non-canonical, i.e., a structurally more complex sentence that comes with additional grammatical marking in form of, for instance, a particular intonation contour, syntactic movement, a cleft structure, or the insertion of morphological markers.”

just re-emphasizes (updates) the information which he/she already possesses. Consequently, definiteness can be considered one of the invariant features of identification focus. Our claim is supported by the claim of Skopeteas & Fansalov (2010) who say that ‘identification focus’ is more likely to induce focus marking than ‘non-identificational focus’ (=information focus)¹¹.

Finally, we will examine the two types of focus in relation to word order. The problem of the sentential position of the subject is closely related to the formal feature of (in)definiteness and we will discuss word order in relation to the category of (in)definiteness.

Word order is a factor usually taken into consideration when the information structure of the Bulgarian sentence has been discussed. However, few studies deal with the distinction of the two types of focus regarding the sentential position.

Bulgarian has free word order, and all theoretically possible linearizations of the sentential components can be observed¹². Consequently, the constituents of the sentence can be placed in different positions. Due to the lack of case marking, at first glance, it seems astonishing how the syntactic roles can be defined in sentences with free word order. As Rudin (1986: 14), however, has pointed out, although the word order in Bulgarian is quite free, it is not completely so.

Bulgarian has a canonical ‘neutral’ word order SVO where the initial subject is most easily interpreted as a topic. Ivanchev (1957) calls this word order ‘objective word order’ and says that the objective word order is much more prevalently found in the written language than the spoken language, since in the written language there can be no recourse to logical stress or intonation for the signaling of ‘rheme’¹³ (see also footnote 1). In the normal situation, the linearization of the elements goes from ‘old’ (known information/topic) to ‘new’ (unknown information/focus), as in (11).

- (11) [Detzata]_T [igrajat v dvora]_F.
 ‘The children are playing in the yard.’

¹¹ As we displayed already about the information focus in Bulgarian, there exist cases where the noun phrase expressing information focus is definite, but this is not the default situation in the case of the information focus.

¹² Dyer (1992: 56) lists 49 possible structures for the simple Bulgarian sentence.

¹³ Ivanchev uses the term ‘rheme’ for what we call ‘focus’.

Krapova (2004: 1) states that, word order, at least in the preverbal field (left periphery of the sentence) “is to a large extent shaped by information structure requirements”.

Tisheva (2009: 245) and Gebert (2009: 315) assert the idea that in simple declarative sentences the word order achieves discourse prominence. Thus, in Bulgarian, topic and focus can be found both at sentence-initial and sentence-final positions. The order of the constituents depends not on their syntactic role but rather on their discourse/pragmatic function (topic, focus) (Tisheva 2007). Thus, initial subjects need not be topic. Again, subjects need not occupy initial position.

Non-canonical word orders are derived from the basic one by means of movement operations triggered by information-structural features. The movement of the elements whose typical position is before the verb to a post-verbal position is generally viewed as focalization, while the opposite movement, i.e., the movement of the elements whose typical position is post-verbal to a pre-verbal position is regarded as topicalization (Tisheva 2013: 19). Since the canonical position of the subject is preverbal, the process of focalizing subjects is usually related to the movement of the subject to a post-verbal position (Tisheva & Dzhonova 2006). Krapova (2004), however, argues that the post-verbal position is the canonical position for focal subjects, and it is the verb (predicate) which undergoes movement ahead.

Bare (non-articled) noun subjects can express contrastive or information focus. When the sentence occurs without any previous context, information focal subjects occupy more often final position in the sentence (example (12)), while initial focal subjects indicated by bare nouns can express either information or contrastive focus (examples (13)).

- (12) *Čakaše ni dālǎg păt.*
 ‘A long journey was waiting for us.’

- (13) A: *Koj se davi?*
 ‘Who is drowning?’
 B: *Dete (a ne vǎzrasten) se davi.*¹⁴

¹⁴ Without the *wh*-question, this sentence, can function also as all-new information (A: *Kakvo*

‘A child is drowning.’ (= ‘A child (not an adult) is drowning.’)

Janinskaja (2016) claims that the VS(O) structure in Bulgarian is used to express ‘broad focus’ (=information focus). The observation of Janinskaja is not wrong, as example (12) displays but, as shown in examples (3) or (13), SV(O) structures, also, can express information focus, and, thus, information focus subjects need not come finally (or, post-verbally).

Subject nouns with *edin* can also function as information focus due to the function of *edin* as a ‘presentative marker’.

(14) *Imalo edno vreme edin kral. Kraljat_[T] imal dvama sina.*¹⁵
 ‘Once upon a time there lived a king. The king had two sons.’

(15) *Edna žena se odeli ot grupata.*
 ‘A woman left the group.’

Identification focus is most naturally related to the left periphery of the sentence (16).

(16) *Deteto na sāseditē igrae na dvora.*
 ‘The child of the neighbors is playing in the yard.’

Deteto na sāseditē, in the preverbal position, as in (16), can function as topic or identification focus¹⁶. The distinction of topic and identification focus can be made only contextually, but a test with clefting can be used for the verification of the identification focus, as in (17).

(17) *Deteto na sāseditē e tova (dete), koeto igrae na dvora.*
 ‘It is the child of the neighbors who is playing in the yard.’

stana? ‘What happened?’ B: *Dete se davi.* ‘A child is drowning.’)

¹⁵ The function of ‘presentative marker’, i.e., introducing a new referent into the discourse, becomes explicit by the second sentence where *kraljat* becomes the old/known information and turns into a topic.

¹⁶ Or, as in (5), when answering a *wh*-question, it can function as an information focus, as well.

Krapova (2004) similarly argues that ‘contrastive’ (=identification) focus is related with the left periphery of the Bulgarian sentence. Janinskaja (2016: 707), also, says that non-final foci are narrow and/or contrastive. Identification focus is mostly realized in the sentence-initial position, although, this position should not be considered absolute. The structural property, i.e., sentence-initial position of identification focal subjects, however, can be viewed as evidence for their semantic/pragmatic similarity (i.e., availability of the information) to topic. The similarity of topic and identification focus is also reflected in the formal similarities, i.e., definiteness. Although definiteness is not a decisive factor for the information structuring of the sentence (Fesenmeier 2009: 233), as Vaseva-Kadankova (1980: 119–120) has pointed out, the actual division of the sentence, namely, the functional sentence perspective, can be realized by the article. Ivanchev (1957)’s study, also displays that there is a relationship between sentential word order and determinedness/definiteness, i.e., the sentence proceeds from the information which already has been designated (and definite) to the information which has been specified to a lesser degree. Dyer (1992: 57) claims that determinedness is an important factor in the construction of SVO structures in Bulgarian. Based on such claims, it could be said that the more natural position of the identification focal subjects in Bulgarian, which are basically definite, is sentence-initial.

4. Summary

As the analysis displayed, four properties can be established for the differentiation of identification focus and information focus in the literary Bulgarian language, namely, 1) type of the information, 2) type of the set of alternatives, 3) sentential position, 4) morphological markedness for definiteness. Concerning 1) the type of information, it was shown that information focus can express both non-presupposed (new) information and already available information, while identification focus expresses only already available information. In relation to 2) the type of the set of alternatives, the analysis displayed that identification focus and information focus differ clearly, since identification focus works within a closed set of alternatives, and information focus works within an open set of alternatives. In relation to 3) the sentential position, it was shown that both information focus and identification focus can occupy either initial or final position in the sentence, however, initial position is the more natural position for

identification focus, while information focus more naturally occupies sentence-final position. The sentence-initial position of the identification focus is in tight relation to its formal similarity, i.e., definiteness, to topic. The analysis displayed that identification focus is always definite in form, while information focus can be both definite or indefinite.

The summary of the above mentioned properties is given in Table 1.

Table 1

focus type	type of information	set of alternatives	±article	sentential position
identification focus	available	closed set ----- points out (identifies) the unique member	+article	initial or final
information focus	non-presupposed/ available	open set ----- does not point out any unique member	±article	final or initial

Properties 1) and 2) can be verified only contextually. The properties of 4) the sentence-initial position, 3) the feature of definiteness, and 1) the semantic feature of availability of the information are shared by the two types of focus. Besides, the properties of 1), 3), and 4) are not specific properties of the focus but rather inherent properties of the topic. Consequently, it should be concluded that, although there could be established some mechanisms on the base of which identification focus can be differentiated from information focus in Bulgarian, the differentiation is not absolute and invariant, but rather discourse bound.

Finally, on the base of the semantic property (type of information), the syntactic property (sentential position), and the morphological property (definiteness) analyzed above, it could be claimed that identification focus in Bulgarian is featured by properties which make it closer to topic than focus.

References

- Dik, S., Hengeveld, K. (1997), *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part II: Complex and Derived Constructions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dryer, M. (1994), *The Pragmatics of Focus-Association with only*. (Unpublished paper delivered at the 1994 Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America).
- Dyer, D. (1992), *Word Order in the Simple Bulgarian Sentence: A Study in Grammar, Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam-Atlanta.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (2007), *Information Structure*. Oxford: University Press.
- Fesenmeier, L. (2009), On two functions of verb-subject order in Old Italian. In: *Information Structure and Its Interfaces*, ed. by L. Mereu. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 229–265.
- Gebert, L. (2009), Information structure in Slavic languages. In: *Information Structure and Its Interfaces*, ed. by L. Mereu. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 307–322.
- Hartmann, K. (2008), Focus and emphasis in tone and intonation languages. In: *The Discourse-potential of Underspecified Structures: Event Structures and Information structure*, ed. by Anita Steube. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin & New York, pp. 389–412.
- Ivanchev, S. (1957), Nabljudenija vārhu upotrebata na člena v bālgarskija ezik [Observations upon the usage of the article in the Bulgarian language]. *Bālgarski Ezik*, VII, No.6, pp. 499–524.
- Janinskaja, K. (2016), Information structure in Slavic. In: *Information Structure*, ed. by C. Féry, S. Ishihara. Oxford: University Press, pp. 709–732.
- Kiss, K. (1998), Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74, pp. 245–273.
- König, E. (1991), *The Meaning of Focus Particles*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Krapova, I. (2004), Word order in topic-focus structures in the Balkan languages. *L'Europa d'oltremare. Contributi italiani al IX congresso internazionale dell' association internationale d'etudes du sud-est Europeen*, Tirana, 30 agosto-3 settembre 2004. Romania Orientale 7 XVII, pp. 139–161.
- Krifka, M. (2008) Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55, 243–276.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994), *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neeleman A., Vermeulen R. (2012), *The Syntax of Topic, Focus, and Contrast. An Interface-based Approach*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Rooth, M. (1985), *Association with Focus*. PhD Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Graduate Linguistics Student Association (GLSA), Amherst/MA.
- Rooth, M. (1992), A theory of focus interpretation. In: *Natural Language Semantics* 1, pp. 75–116.
- Rudin, C. (1986), *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and wh-Construction*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
- Shimoji, M. (2018), Information structure, and focus-marking hierarchies in Ryukyuan languages. *Gengo Kenkyu* 154, pp. 85–121.
- Skopetas, S., Fanselow G. (2010), Focus types and argument asymmetries: a cross-linguistic study in language production. In: *Comparative and Contrastive Studies on Information Structure*, ed. by C. Breul, E. Göbbel. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 169–197.
- Tisheva, Y. (2007), On right dislocation and marginalization in Bulgarian. In: *Linguistic Investigations into Formal Description of Slavic Languages*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang International Verlag der Wissenschaften, pp. 389–397.
- Tisheva, Y. (2009), Za slovorednite modeli na bălgarskoto prosto izrečenie [On the word order models of the Bulgarian simple sentence]. *Otgovornostta pred Ezika* [Responsibility for language] 3, pp. 244–255.
- Tisheva, Y. (2013), *Pragmatični Aspekti na Ustnata Reč* [Pragmatic aspects of the speech]. E-izdanie na Tsentăr za Semiotični i Kulturni Izsledvanija.
- Tisheva, Y., M. Dzhonova (2006), Starijat “nov” topik [The old “new” topic]. In: *Slavistika i Obštество* [Slavic studies and society], comp. M. Mladenova, I. Monova. Sofija: Heron press, pp. 231–237.
- Vallduví, E. (1992), *The Informational Component*. New York: Garland.
- Vallduví, E., Engdahl E. (1996), The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics* 34, pp. 459–519.
- Vallduví, E., Vilkuňa, M. (1998), On rheme and kontrast. In: *The Limits of Syntax*, ed. by P. Culicover, L. McNally. Academic Press, New York, pp. 79–106.
- Vaseva-Kadankova, I. (1980), Nabljudenija vărzu ednorodnite časti na izrečenieto s oĝled na aktualното členenie [Observations on the Homogeneous Parts of the Sentence in Relation to the Actual Division]. In: *Sbornik prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*, pp. 119–129.
- Zimmermann, M. (2008), Contrastive focus and emphasis. *Acta Linguistica*

Hungarica 55, pp. 347–360.

Zimmermann, M., A. Onéa (2011), Focus marking and focus interpretation.

Lingua 121, pp. 1651–1670.

Zubizarreta M. L. (1998), *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.