Connectives, Subordination and Information Structure: Comments on Trubinskij's Observations on the "*-to … dak*" Model in the Pinega Dialects

Margje Post

ABSTRACT

The late Valentin Trubinskij, who was one of only a few Russian dialectologists study-ing Russian dialect syntax, made interesting observations on the combined use of the particles *-to* and *dak* in North Russian dialects to structure complex sentences, which he called the "*-to … dak*" model (Trubinskij 1970; 1984; Kolesov 1998). This paper dis-cusses the value his observations have today for the study of connectives, subordination, information structure and grammaticalization. Trubinskij found that the "*-to … dak*" model in North Russian dialects has the same function in syntactically diverse contexts, including structures with utterance-final *dak*, which is a North Russian peculiarity. Trubinskij's analysis of the function of the "*-to … dak*" model has inspired later stud-ies, where *dak* is explained as an information-structuring device. In the most recent, comprehensive analysis of North Russian *dak* presented here, *dak* is proposed to be an information-structuring pragmatic particle in all of its uses, and not only in the subset of contexts described by Trubinskij. *Dak* signals an asymmetric relationship between two information units, *x* and *y*, where *y* is based on *x*. One of the elements *x* and *y* can be left implicit. The particle *-to* can mark a word to be part of *x*, the point of departure on which the information *y* depends. Trubinskij characterizes the "*-to … dak*" model in complex sentences as expressing syntactic subordination, but its function as an alternative to sub-ordinating conjunctions should rather be seen as a side effect of its information-struc-turing function.

1. Introduction[1]

This article pays tribute to the late Valentin Trubinskij (1926–2010), the dialectologist from St Petersburg University, who passed away not long before the conference that led to the present volume was held. Trubinskij was one of the few Russian dialectologists who dedicated themselves to

---

the study of Russian dialect syntax. It is not surprising that the abundance of particles in North Russian speech attracted his attention. He wrote an article on the role of particle *-to* and its variants (*-ot, -ta, -tu, -ti* and *-te*) in the complex sentence, published in 1970 (cf. Trubinskij 1970). Part of this article focuses on the combined use of *-to* and the connective[2] *dak* in some Pinega dialects (Arxangel'sk province), where it is used as a device that structures the sentence, among others, as an almost standardized alternative to subordinating conjunctions. In the present article, we will explore the value of his ideas—40 years after they were published—for the study of connectives, subordination, information structure and grammaticalization in the light of later theories and studies of North Russian *-to* and *dak*, including a new, comprehensive analysis of North Russian *dak*.

Section 2 below provides an introduction to the connective *dak* in North Russian in order to provide the reader with background knowledge of this word. Section 3 summarizes Trubinskij's observations on *-to* and *dak* in the Pinega dialects. Section 4 discusses their value and presents the new analysis of *dak*, based partly on Trubinskij's findings. The paper ends with concluding remarks in section 5.

2. Introduction to the particle dak

The connective *dak* in North Russian has fascinated linguists, both before and after Trubinskij, above all because it can be used in an "exotic"[3] final position, as in (1) below:

(1) *Ona*   *davno ne robotat.*   *Bol'na*   *dak.*
    she.NOM.F.SG long   not work.PRS.3SG ill.NOM.F.SG *dak*[4]
    'She hasn't worked for a long time. She's ill, you know'.
    (Gecova 1999)

North Russian *dak* shares this syntactic peculiarity with *da* (2):

---

2   The term 'connective' is used in a broad sense for words with a connective function, linking units together, but these units need not be two contiguous linguistic expressions.

3   Quoting Preobraženskaja (1985).

4   The Russian examples are given in their original transcription but transliterated to Latin script, following Comrie & Corbett's (1993) transliteration system.

(2) *Kormjat   da pojat   da.*
     feed.PRS.3PL *da* give.to.drink.PRS.3PL   *da*
     'They feed them and give them something to drink (as well)'. (*DARJa*)

North Russian *da* and *dak* are not only used utterance-finally, but they can also start an utterance (3), and be used sentence-internally, either after the first clause constituent (4) or between two clauses (5):

(3) —*Dak vot tak,   no ešče čego   tebe   nado-to?*
     —*Dak* PRT like.this but also what.GEN you.DAT needed-*to*
     'Well, what else do you need (to know)?' (Varzuga; Murm.)[5]

(4) *Iván   to*[6] *dak znáet.*
     Ivan.nom -*to dak* know.PRS.3SG
     '(As for) Ivan, he knows'. (Pin. Arx.; Trubinskij 1970: 65)

(5) *Muž   by byl,   dak ne poexala   by.*[7]
     husband.NOM.SG SBJV be.PST.M.SG *dak* not go.PST.F.SG SBJV
     'If my husband had been here/If I had had a husband, I wouldn't have gone' (Arx.; Šapiro 1953: 62)

The utterance-final use of *da* and *dak* is spread across most of the North Russian area covered by the Russian dialect atlas (*DARJa* 3, part 2 (2004); map 11). Final *da* and *dak* have also been attested in areas further to the north and northeast of European Russia, which are not covered by *DARJa*, and in a range of Siberian dialects. A range of dialectologists have struggled to find their syntactic status and functions, and not only regarding utterance-final use.[8] Whereas North Russian *da* has barely been

---

5 My own examples from Varzuga are given in transliterated standard Russian orthography whilst retaining the dialect morphology. Sound files can be attained through the website *http://www.uib.no/persons/Margje.Post*

6 Contrary to tradition, Trubinskij writes the particle -*to* and its variants without a hyphen. Unfortunately, Trubinskij does not give any contextual information for his examples.

7 The comma, written in the original text (Šapiro 1953), cannot represent a pause, but only a syntactic boundary, since *dak* has later been found to be enclitic to the preceding unit; cf. section 4.5 below.

8 Leinonen remarked in 2002 that '[i]n North Russian, the particles *da* and *dak* are used widely for various functions which remain rather obscure' (Leinonen 2002: 129). In the same year, Preobraženskaja came to the conclusion that the syntactic nature of these

studied,[9] *dak* is discussed in more than twenty publications.[10] It is used
frequently and in a wide variety of contexts. The large dialect dictionary
of the Arxangel'sk dialects (Gecova 1999) sums up more than twenty dif-
ferent contexts for *dak*, and it is translated with words as diverse as the
subordinating conjunctions *esli* 'if', *potomu čto* 'because', the coordinat-
ing conjunctions *da* 'and' and *no* 'but', with the resumptive connective
tak 'so, then', with the pronoun *èto* 'this' and with the adverb *značit* 'this
means' (all from Gecova 1999). In addition, this dictionary mentions
a number of other meanings for which no translations into standard
Russian were found.

It seems obvious that utterance-final *da* is related to the correspond-
ing copulative coordinating conjunction *da* 'and'.[11] Similarly, final *dak*
must have developed from the anaphoric resumptive connective (Russ.
korreljat) *tak* 'then; so' (6); cf. the following example of Standard Russian
tak from a Russian-English dictionary (Wheeler et al. 1995: 527):[12]

(6) *Ty   ne sprosiš'   ego,   tak ja   sprošu.*
     you.NOM.SG not ask.FUT.2SG he.ACC then I.NOM   ask.FUT.1SG
     'If you won't ask him, then I will' (Standard Russian)

This anaphoric connective *tak*, in turn, can be considered to have gram-
maticalized from the deictic manner adverb and pronoun *tak* 'so; thus,
in that way'.

Post (2005) presents a new analysis of North Russian *dak* based on pre-
vious research and on new data from the dialect of Varzuga (Murmansk
province). This comprehensive study argues that *dak* is a pragmatic par-

---

postpositive particles was still incomprehensible from the point of view of Russian
grammar, and that the data on *dak* had not yet been sufficiently investigated (Preo-
braženskaja 2002: 121; 123).

9 Cf. Gecova 1999; Leinonen & Ludykova 2001; Post 2005, chapter 14.

10 Cf. Post 2005, chapter 6 for an extensive discussion of the literature on North Russian
   dak.

11 Other coordinating conjunctions in the North Russian dialects—*dai* (or *da i*), *a* and
   i—and the subordinating conjunction *ak* are also used in final position, but they are far
   less frequent in this function. Apart from *ak* (Nikitina & Požarickaja 1993), they have,
   to my knowledge, not been subject to study.

12 Leinonen and Ludykova suggest that the final use of *dak* might have developed
   under the influence of Komi-Zyryan, a neighbouring language with final connectives
   (Leinonen & Ludykova 2001; Leinonen 2002).

ticle in all cases and claims that the word has a core function as an infor-
mation-structuring device, not only in the complex sentences described
by Trubinskij, but across all of its uses. This study will be presented in
section 4 below.

3. Trubinskij on the "-to ... dak" model

Trubinskij's 1970 article centres on the role of the postpositive particle
-to and its variants (*-ot*, *-ta*, *-tu*, *-ti* and *-te*) in the structuring of sentenc-
es, based on data from the dialects of the Pinega region of the Arxangel'sk
province. The first part of this article presents an empirical study of the
distribution of *-to* and its variants in these Pinega dialects according to
the part of speech it is attached to (noun, pronoun, adjective, numeral,
verb or adverb) and according to case and number.[13] We will focus on the
second part of the article, which is dedicated to the frequent utterances in
these Pinega dialects where *-to* is combined with *dak*.

Postpositive *-to* and its variants can be very frequent in North Russian
dialects. It has been argued that it resembles a definite article, but, unlike
articles, it is neither obligatory, nor exclusively attached only to nouns. In
the Pinega dialects, *-to* is sometimes used after almost every word in the
first part of the sentence, as in (7) below:

(7) *u popá* to, *popófska* to *dóčka* to *óddana za prostógo, na Pokšén'gi* to,
     tót to *dom u rekí* to, *u ščél'i* to, *óddana* to *bylá, dak pósle svád'by
     popad'já skóko ras prixodíla k nam.* (Pin. Arx.; Trubinskij 1970: 57)
     'The priest's-*to*, the priest's-*to* daughter-*to* was married to a lay-
     man, down the Pokšenga river-*to*, that-*to* house over there down
     the river-*to*, at the fissure-*to*, she was married-*to*, *dak* after the
     wedding how many times the priest's wife visited us'.[14]

It is clear from the sheer frequency of *-to* in an utterance like (7) that the
speaker does not use the particle to underline each single word in the way
-to can in other varieties of Russian. Trubinskij claims that, in (7), *-to*

---

13 The choice of the variants *-ot*, *-ta*, *-tu*, *-ti* and *-te*, which are far less frequent than *-to* and
    not used consistently, is partly morphologically motivated, but the vowels tend to agree
    with the preceding vowel: *brat-ot bedn-ot* (NOM.M.SG); *žonka-ta* (NOM.F.SG); *golosá-ti*
    (NOM/ACC.PL); *knigu-tu* (ACC.F.SG); *baranu-tu* (DAT.M.SG).

14 For reasons of readability, this long example is not accompanied by glosses, but by a
    close translation.

has a hypotactic function together with the connective *dak*. In the words of Trubinskij—who was apparently not aware of theories of information structure at the time he wrote the article—*-to* and *dak* link the point of departure, the "less important part," with what is "from a communicative point of view the most important part" of the sentence (Trubinskij 1970: 58). The role of the postpositive elements—*-to* and its variants—in the "*-to … dak*" model is to single out the preceding words, but only to mark them as being less 'important' than the information expressed in the other part of the sentence (cf. Trubinskij 1970: 57), the underlining of which is the main goal of the speaker (Trubinskij 1970: 64).[15]

Trubinskij observed that the "*-to … dak*" model is used with the same function in syntactically different contexts. Symbolically, I will describe these different contexts as follows:

> A-*to dak* B.   and
> B, A-*to dak*.

A and B are linguistic expressions with varying syntactic forms: both can be clauses (or their equivalents) in a complex sentence, but A can be as short as a single word (added with *-to*) in a simple sentence. The order of A and B can vary, but *-to* and *dak* always take the same position: *-to* is used in the A-part (once or several times), whereas *dak* always follows immediately after A.

The most common context of the "*-to … dak*" model is an asyndetic complex sentence expressing a circumstantial relationship with the order subordinate clause—main clause (8):

(8) *s   Lénin   to gráda*[16]   *priédut   útrom*
    from Lenin- *-to* town.GEN.SG arrive.FUT.3PL morning.INS.SG
    f Šótovu   Góru,   dak véčerom   fsé   znájut.
    in Šotova.ACC Gora.ACC *dak* evening.INS.SG all.NOM.PL know.PRS.3PL

---

15 In a similar way, 'themes' can be singled out (in English usually with an accent) when contrasted with an alternative 'theme–rheme' pair, even though they are not the main focus of the utterance. Cf. the following example: 'Jim (T_1) is rich (R_1), but Jane (T_2) is even richer (R_2)'. For an explanation of the terms 'theme' and 'rheme' and information structure theories in general, cf. section 4.2 below.

16 Note that *-to* can be attached to the first part of a compound!

'If they arrive in Šotova Gora from Leningrad in the morning, then everyone knows about it by the evening'.
(Pin. Arx.; Trubinskij 1970: 62)

A second context is a complex construction with the inverted order of main and subordinate clause, with *dak* occurring in final position (9; from Trubinskij 1970: 63):

(9) *kómnatka   málen'ka   èka,   mnógo nat'*
room.NOM.F.SG small.NOM.F.SG this.NOM.F.SG much   needed
dróf   to, nóč'   to bol'šá   dak.
wood.GEN.PL -*to* night.NOM.F.SG -*to* big.NOM.F.SG *dak*
'This room is small, you need a lot of wood, after all, the night is long'.

The "-*to … dak*" model is also used in simple sentences; cf. (4) above and (10) below (cited from Trubinskij 1970: 63):

(10) *čerez ryp to zavód*[17]   *dak dólgo ittí   nat'.*
via   fish- -*to* factory.ACC.SG *dak* long go.INF needed
'Via the fish factory, (then/so?) you have to go for a long time'.

In his 1984 monograph, Trubinskij observed that subordinating conjunctions are almost absent in the Pinega dialects. The "-*to … dak*" construction has become a syntactic stereotype: he calls the construction a "*tipizirovannyj priem vyskazyvanija*", an almost standardized mode of expression (Trubinskij 1984: 36), which has virtually developed into the single grammatical means to express subordination in these dialects.

Trubinskij's other, minor observations on the "-*to … dak*" model—e.g. about the syntactic status of -*to* and *dak*—will be discussed in the following section.

4. Discussion
The discussion below evaluates Trubinskij's observations on the "-*to … dak*" model in the light of later theories and studies of -*to* and *dak*.

---

17   Here is yet another example of -*to* in the middle of a compound.

Trubinskij has shown that the "-*to* … *dak*" model is an alternative to subordinating conjunctions, but it is only one alternative among many (4.1). Trubinskij found that -*to* and *dak* play the same role in syntactically different structures. Later studies have applied information structure theories to the description of the functions of both -*to* and *dak*. Section 4.2 presents a new analysis of *dak* as an information-structuring device in all of its uses, but this analysis has a different view from Trubinskij's on the syntactic status of the two words and of the "-*to* … *dak*" model as expressing hypotaxis (section 4.5). Section 4.3 shows that the various syntactic structures containing the "-*to* … *dak*" model have some common characteristics, both prosodically and in the content they represent. Finally, only Trubinskij has observed an inter-dialectal difference in the use of -*to* and *dak* in North Russian. The development of this syntactic stereotype in these particular dialects can possibly be explained as a grammaticalization process (section 4.4).

4.1. Alternative to subordinating conjunctions

Trubinskij's first contribution to our understanding of complex sentences in Russian dialectal speech has been to show that the "-*to* … *dak*" model functions as a sufficient alternative to subordinating conjunctions.

Subordinating conjunctions are typically used to express various circum-stantial relationships—just like the "-*to* … *dak*" model. Mathiessen and Thompson (1988: 289) call the rhetorical counterparts to typical relationships expressed in syntactically subordinative structures 'Nucleus-Satellite' relationships. They are opposed to the 'List' relationships expressed in coordinative structures (ibid.). The study of the postpositive particle *dak* in the Varzuga dialect shows that *dak* supports the expression of asymmetric 'Nucleus-Satellite' relationships. In contrast, postpositive *da* supports symmetric 'List' relationships as a rhetorical parallel to syntactic coordination (cf. Post 2010: 235).[18]

Trubinskij was not the first to show that Russians can communicate successfully without subordinating conjunctions. In fact, in Russian dialectal speech, the clauses of a complex sentence are often merely juxtaposed, as Mansikka observed more than a century ago (11):

---

18   In Post (2010), the rhetorical counterpart of syntactic subordination is called *semantic subordination* (*semantičeskoe podčinenie*).

(11) *Prostudiŭsja   byŭ,   les   voziŭ.*
get.a.cold.PST.M.SG be.PST.M.SG wood.ACC.SG transport.PST.M.SG
'I had caught a cold, (when/after/nevertheless/because/…) I trans-
ported wood'. (Arxangel'sk province, Mansikka 1912: 140)

In spoken discourse, the intended relationship between the two pre-
dicative units is often obvious from the (linguistic and extra-linguistic)
context. In addition, gestures, facial expressions and prosodic means
(accentuation, intonation) are used: they reduce the number of pos-
sible interpretations of the relationship between the two predications.[19]
Furthermore, in some languages, including the North Russian dialects,
the intended relationship can be expressed (or implied) by connectives
other than conjunctions, such as the particles *-to* and *dak*. They have a less
specific meaning than conjunctions and adverbs. By using a particle, the
speaker hints at a certain type of connection without needing to bother
herself about the exact formulation of this connection (cf. Evtjuxin 1979).

We can conclude that the "*-to … dak*" utterances would probably be
interpretable even without the use of *-to* and *dak*, but these words cer-
tainly help the hearer find the intended relationship.

4.2. Information-structuring functions of -to and dak

More important is Trubinskij's observation that the "*-to … dak*" model
plays the same role in various syntactic structures: in simple sentences
and in complex sentences of both the forms "A *dak* B" and "B, A *dak*".[20]
Trubinskij was the first to observe the frequent use of *-to* in the A-part of

---

19 According to Keijsper (2003: 145), many prosodic syntagms—i.e. larger intonation
    units—even lack a verbal predicate, but they might contain an *intonational* predica-
    tion (Keijsper 2003: 145); cf. section 4.3 below.

20 Popov (1957) and Fedorova (1965) also noted a similarity, but Trubinskij appears to
    have been unaware of their work. Popov's study (1957) focuses on North Russian *da*,
    but a comparison of his examples of *da* with the use of *da* and *dak* in other dialects
    suggests that many of his examples are actually attestations of *dak*. Since the word
    behaves prosodically like a clitic, it is often pronounced fast and unclearly, so it may
    be that in some cases Popov did not notice the final [k]. It is also possible that *da* and
    dak are not differentiated in the dialect he studied, as it is spoken in the north-east
    of the Arxangel'sk province, an area along the border with Komi-Zyryan. In this
    language, *da* is used to express the functions of both *da* and *dak* in North Russian
    (Leinonen 2002). Unfortunately, Popov's interesting article remained almost unno-
    ticed and was probably still unknown to Trubinskij at the time he wrote this article,
    but he does refer to it in his 1984 monograph (Trubinskij 1984).

these structures. A comparison of these utterances shows that they have more in common than their diverging syntax suggests, as explained in section 4.3 below. In the present section we will have a look at the role of *-to* and *dak* in these structures.

Trubinskij's description of the function of the "*-to … dak*" model has inspired later analyses of the two particles. Both are often mentioned in relation to phenomena associated with information structure. Information structure shows how informational content is presented and related to other information in linguistic and non-linguistic contexts. It marks phenomena such as point of departure, information update, relative importance and contrast to alternatives. Sentences can be divided into categories such as 'theme' vs. 'rheme', 'topic' vs. 'comment' and 'background' or 'presupposition' vs. 'focus' (e.g. Halliday 1967; Keijsper 1985; Lambrecht 1994; Kruijff-Korbayová & Steedman 2003; Slioussar 2007). Alternative names for similar information structure theories are 'functional sentence perspective' (e.g. Firbas 1974; Švedova 1980) and 'information packaging' (e.g. Chafe 1976; Vallduví & Engdahl 1996; Molnár 2002).[21] Languages offer speakers a variety of options to code information structure, including word order, accentuation, syntactic constructions and morphological or lexical means, such as particles. Apart from dichotomies, tripartite or scalar informational structures are suggested, and divisions can be made at several levels; for instance, both theme and rheme can be emphasized.

4.2.1. *-to marks accessible, non-rhematic elements*
The North Russian particle *-to* has been studied more than once since 1970.[22] It is said to have a demonstrative-emphasising function. Demonstratives focus, or re-focus, a hearer's attention on a particular referent. North Russian *-to* marks accessible concepts (Leinonen 1998). Trubinskij remarks that, in the utterances containing the "*-to … dak*" model, *-to* is only used in the A-part. This fits well with findings in both standard Russian and in the dialects about the role of the particle *-to* in information structure: *-to* almost invariably cliticizes to 'thematic' parts of sentences; cf. Ovčinnikova (1976: 22) and Uzdinskaja (1996) on dia-

---

21 Kruijff-Korbayová and Steedman (2003: 254) give an overview of the literature on information structure in various languages in a large scheme, covering Czech, but not Russian literature.

22 Among others, by Ovčinnikova (1976: 22), Panzer (1984), Honselaar (1994), Uzdinskaja (1996) and Leinonen (1998); cf. Post (2005: 471–80).

lectal -*to* and McCoy (2001) on standard Russian -*to*.[23] The study of the dialect of Varzuga shows that not all words marked by -*to* are prototypical 'themes' in the sense that they express what the following assertion is about, but they appear never to be prototypical 'rhemes'—the core of what is said about the 'theme'.[24]

4.2.2. Dak in information structure

Merlin (1978) was the first to apply a theory of information structure—the theory of actual sentence perspective—to Trubinskij's description of *dak*, claiming that *dak* introduces 'rhemes'.[25] Others have followed (Lapteva 1976: 138; Nikitina & Požarickaja 1993: 165). Evtjuxin (1979: 202) claims that *dak* is one of several particles taking part in the communicative division into 'theme' and 'rheme'. In a later work, Trubinskij applies this theory as well and characterizes North Russian *dak* as an 'aktualizator' (Kolesov 1998: 166).[26] In Trubinskij's view, the "-*to … dak*" construction increases the division of the utterance (ibid.). In the study of *dak* in the dialect of Varzuga (Post 2005; 2010), the particle *dak* is also described as functioning as an information-structuring device, because the meaning of *dak* is related to functions and phenomena that are linked to information structure, such as aboutness, point of departure, presupposition, restriction of the nucleus, conditionality and contrast to alternatives. Furthermore, like many 'themes', the unit preceding *dak*, A, usually takes the first position in the clause.[27]

---

23   McCoy (2001) uses the term 'link' instead of 'theme', following a different information structure theory (Vallduví & Vilkuna 1998).

24   Due to space limitations, the reader is referred to Post (2005: 471–80) for argumentation.

25   In the theory of functional sentence perspective (cf. e.g. Švedova 1980), 'theme' is opposed to 'rheme'. The theme marks what the utterance is about and the rheme expresses what is said about this theme. In Merlin's understanding, 'theme' corresponds to the point of departure ('isxodnyj punkt') or determiner ('determinant'), and 'rheme' to the nucleus or core ('jadro') of the utterance (1978: 89). For a critical review of Merlin's article, cf. Post (2005: 309–15).

26   Kolesov (1998) is the second, unrevised edition of a course book in dialectology, written by several authors. Trubinskij has written the chapter on syntax. I have not found out when it was first published. Trubinskij's remark that *dak* usually introduces the 'nucleus' of the sentence ('jadro') suggests that he may have known Merlin's article (1978) by the time he wrote this chapter, although Merlin uses the term 'rema' more often than 'jadro'.

27   For a detailed discussion, cf. Post 2005, chapter 10.

Information structure theories, however, are not a perfect tool for describing *-to* and *dak*. One should keep in mind that neither *-to* nor *dak* is a grammatical, obligatory marker of 'themes' or 'rhemes': most themes and rhemes are not marked by these particles, and *-to* and *dak* cannot connect just any theme with any rheme; their use is more specific (cf. Post 2005: 312–15). Besides, information structure theories are used at sentence-level to characterize a division of roles between linguistic entities in single sentences, but only in a minority of cases does *dak* connect two linguistic expressions in the same sentence, as argued below in section 4.2.3.

4.2.3. *Dak expresses in all cases that y is based on x*
The new analysis of *dak* has resulted in a more precise characterization of its function: According to the new analysis of the Varzuga dialect, *dak* is an information-structuring pragmatic particle[28] with the following function:

> *The particle* dak *marks that what is expressed in B is based on A*[29]

As before, A and B are the two contiguous linguistic expressions connected by *dak*. We will call the contents of A and B 'information units'. The information unit expressed in A will be called x, and the one expressed in B—y. *Dak* marks that y is based on x, in other words, that a predication, y, is based on, and dependent on, a certain point of departure, x. Examples of x and y are cause and consequence (1), condition and result (5), (13), and the presentation of an item and a claim about this item, such as a dialect word and its explanation, as in (12):

(12) *A «lonis'» èto prošlyj god. A «onogdys»… èto nu, kogda-to tam. A onomed' dak na toj nedele. Es' takix slov mnogo očen'.*

---

28 Cf. Post (2005, chapter 13) for argumentation. *Pragmatic particles* are small, unaccentable words that are devoid or almost devoid of grammatical and truth-conditional meaning, which help to guide the hearer in linking the utterances to the linguistic and extra-linguistic context (cf. Foolen 2003).

29 In most cases, 'y is based on x' means that y is (logically, or only in some cognitive sense) dependent on x. The interrelationship between x and y need not be logical in a strict, formal sense; what is relevant is how their interrelationship is perceived and presented by the speaker.

'*Lonis*', that means last year. *Onogdys*', that is… well, sometime long ago. And *onomed*' *dak* means last week. There are many such words [= in our dialect]'. (Varzuga; Murm.)

In this metalinguistic comment, three dialect words for temporal expressions are first introduced and then explained: *lonis*', *onogdys*' and *onomed*'. The last word is connected to its explanation by *dak*. The information units represented in A are often set up against alternatives, either directly, such as here, or implicitly.

    Dak was found to have the same function in all uses, irrespective of its position in the utterance. The linguistic expression of *y* may positionally precede that of *x*, resulting in the 'reverse' structure "B, A *dak*"; cf. (1) from Gecova (1999) above and (13) from Varzuga (Murm.):

(13) *A   sejčas-to my xodim   xorovody-to   vot tože.*
But now-*to*   we go.PRS.1PL roundelay.ACC.PL-*to* PRT also
Na sceny-to   kogda dak.
on stage.LOC.SG-*to* when *dak*
'But now we dance roundelays, too. When we are on stage, that is'.

In spontaneous speech it is not uncommon that a point of departure, such as a condition, is expressed after an assertion is made that depends on it, in a separate prosodic syntagm, representing a separate cognitive act. Furthermore, one of the units *x* and *y* can remain unexpressed, only implied, i.e. either A or B, the linguistic representations of *x* and *y*, respectively, can be lacking. Spoken discourse is full of implicit communication. Connectives, such as *no, ved*', *značit* and *dak*, are not only used to connect linguistic expressions, but also—or perhaps even primarily—to connect elements in the relevant activated knowledge set (cf. Nørgård-Sørensen 1992: 187 on coherence relations). That is, they can mark links between linguistic material and non-linguistic, implied information. An example of the use of *dak* to connect an expression with implicit information is (14), which has the linguistic form "A *dak*":

(14) *Oj, opjat' bez   očkov   dak.*
Oh again without glasses.GEN.PL *dak*
'Oh dear, I forgot my glasses again'. (Varzuga; Murm.)

This utterance was pronounced when the speaker was invited to take a look at some pictures. By using the particle *dak*, the speaker not only expresses the fact that she has forgotten her glasses, but also that an inference should be made from this fact: *dak* strongly suggests a causal relationship. In this very economical way, she conveys the fact that it will be difficult for her to see what is depicted on the pictures (= *y*), because she has forgotten to bring her glasses (= *x*). By adding *dak,* she makes it clear why this remark is relevant. The same message would probably be inferred if the speaker had left out *dak* ("*Oj, opjat' bez očkov!*"), but the presence of the particle facilitates the processing.[30] In a Relevance Theoretical account (e.g. Blakemore 1987; Wilson & Sperber 1993), *dak* is a 'procedural marker', encoding a procedure for the hearer as to how the expression to which it is attached should be processed and related to other accessible information (Post 2005).

In his 1970 article, Trubinskij only described utterances where both A and B are expressed in the same utterance, i.e. the types "A *dak* B" and "B, A *dak*". He did not mean that *dak* plays the same role in every possible context. In contexts similar to (14), he calls final *dak*, following Šapiro (1953), a particle with an emphatic-conclusive meaning ("usilitel'no-zaključitel'noe značenie"; in Kolesov 1998: 166), such as in (15):

(15) *Fsego-to   povidala   dak.*
　　all.GEN.SG-*to* see.PST.F.SG   *dak*
　　'I have seen it all'. (Karelia; Kolesov 1998: 166)

According to the new analysis of *dak*, even this utterance represents two information units, of which one is based on the other. However, like (14) above, it has the structure "A *dak*", so only one of these units is expressed in the utterance. In other words, the expression *Fsego-to povidala* 'I have seen it all' represents a thought that has a certain implication, which the hearer is expected to be able to infer. The lack of context does not enable us to know what was meant, but it could well express the cause of something the speaker either has uttered earlier or has no need to express explicitly, because it is obvious to the hearer(s).

30　For more arguments, cf. Post (2005; 2010).

4.3. More similarities: prosodically expressed predication and categorical judgements

This section will show that Trubinskij's "*-to … dak*" utterances have more in common than their syntactic differences would suggest. Although they range from complex sentences through to simple sentences and to utterances with the 'reverse' order "B, A-*to dak*", they all have a similar prosody and they have much in common with categorical judgements.

A study of the prosodic characteristics of utterances containing *dak* in the Varzuga shows that both A and B, the expressions representing *x* and *y*, are relatively independent units, as they are both larger prosodic units.[31] No sound files are available for Trubinskij's Pinega examples, but in the more than 500 examples from Varzuga, both A and B carry at least one pitch accent each, usually a full accent with a large excursion (Post 2005).[32] Pitch accents single out information—as being new, relevant and/or or contrasted.[33] An example is the last part of (12), repeated here as (16). The utterance expresses an introduction of a dialect word, *onomed'*, and its explanation. The short A-part in this "A *dak* B" structure contains only a noun, introduced by the coordinating conjunction *a*, but *onomed'* carries a full pitch accent with a high tone on the stressed syllable:

(16) *A   onomed'   dak na toj   nedele.*
     and last.week.NOM.SG *dak* in that.LOC.F.SG week.LOC.F.SG
     '[…] And onomed' means last week'. (Varzuga; Murm.)

The Varzuga examples suggest that the same accounts for Trubinskij's examples from the Pinega region, e.g. in example (4), repeated here as (17):

(17) *Iván   to dak znáet.*
     Ivan.NOM *-to dak* know.PRS.3SG
     '(As for) Ivan, he knows'. (Pin. Arx.; Trubinskij 1970: 65)

---

31 They contain at least one prosodic syntagm; cf. Post (2005).

32 Keijsper (2003), following Odé (1989), discerns full and reduced pitch accents in standard Russian, and this is probably a useful distinction for North Russian dialects as well. The data suggest that only a few A-parts in the Varzuga dialect carry a reduced, and not a full, pitch accent.

33 Cf. Krahmer & Swerts (2001: 3), who do not mention relevance. According to Keijsper (1985), accent marks 'not not-*x*'.

It is very probable than both *Iván* in A and *znaet* in B carried a pitch accent with a large excursion. The verbless, but accented A-parts in (16) and (17) explicitly present something as being the topic of the following assertion. This is typical of categorical expressions. The term 'categorical judgement' was introduced by Franz Brentano and elaborated by Anton Marty (cf. Kuroda 1972: 154–55; Sasse 1987; Lambrecht 1994: 138–41). A categorical judgement consists of two separate cognitive acts: first, the act of identifying an entity—a 'predication base', in Sasse's (1987: 555) terminology—and second, the act of predicating (or denying) something about this entity (cf. Lambrecht 1994: 139; Sasse 1987).[34] Categorical judgements are opposed to 'thetic judgements', which consist of an assertion only. A thetic judgement lacks an independently recognized predication base and is thus a simple judgement, whereas a categorical judgement is a double judgement ('einfaches Urteil' vs. 'Doppelurteil'; cf. Lambrecht 1994: 138–41; cf. Sasse 1987).[35] Utterances like (16) and (17) represent categorical judgements, with the expression A representing the predication base and B the predication: first, the information is presented which the speaker wants to say something about, and which will serve as her point of departure, before an assertion is made about this unit. Unlike most categorical expressions, (16) and (17) are specifically marked as such—by the particle *dak*, often supported by *-to*.

Note that the term 'categorical judgement' can be understood as a cognitive concept, but it is usually only used to characterize categorical *sentences*, typically, simple sentences with a subject and a predicate, with the subject representing the predication base (cf. e.g. Kuroda 1972; Sasse 1987). This means that most utterances containing *dak* are not categorical sentences, since few of them have the form "subject–*dak*–predicate", and most expressions preceding *dak* do not represent grammatical subjects but some other point of departure, most often a circumstance.

---

34 Sasse (1987: 554) understands the second act, the act of predicating, as ascribing a property to the entity that serves as the predication base. These entities are typically expressed as grammatical subjects in a sentence (Sasse 1987; cf. e.g. Kuroda 1972).

35 Thetic expressions are found in a rather restricted group of sentences. They differ from categorical ones in several respects, for instance, in the type of assertion that is made: according to Sasse (1987: 555), both thetic and categorical expressions contain assertions; however, a thetic assertion is not a predication of some state of affairs about a predication base but a simple recognition of a state of affairs. For a discussion of thetic expressions, see e.g. Kuroda (1972) and Sasse (1987).

However, *all* utterances with *dak* have something in common with categorical sentences: they are linguistic reflections of a double judgement with an independently recognized base (an entity, or a circumstance, *x*, expressed in A or implied) and a predication about this base (*y*, expressed in B or implied).

As mentioned above, the A-parts are almost invariably singled out by a full pitch accent. That means that even A-parts not containing a verbal or nominal predicate can still represent a prosodically expressed predication. According to Keijsper (2003: 145), there are two types of predicativity: segmentally expressed predication—by means of a verbal or nominal predicate—and intonationally expressed predication.[36] Example (10) from Trubinskij (1970: 63), repeated below as (18), which lacks contextual information, contains only one verbal predication but, probably, two intonational predications:

(18) *čerez ryp   to   zavód*[37]   *dak dólgo ittí   nat'.*
   via   fish- -*to* factory.ACC.SG *dak* long   go.INF needed
   'Via the fish factory, (then/so?) you have to go for a long time'.

The elliptic and non-specific nature of spontaneous speech leads to frequent syntactic and semantic ambiguity, at least if you do not have access to context and prosody, so we do not know the exact content of the intonational predication in the A-part, *čerez ryp-to zavód* 'via the fish factory'. However, according to new analysis of *dak*, we do know that it presents something upon which B, *dólgo ittí nat'* 'it is a long walk', is based. The A-part might represent an assertion like 'remember that you (he/they etc.) have to go by the fish factory' or only the circumstantial 'if you go by the fish factory', and the fish factory might be contrasted with an alternative. In any case, the A-part represents a separate cognitive act, more precisely, it presents the circumstance on which the assertion expressed in B depends: '(so/then) it is a long walk'.

These examples show that most of the so-called simple sentences with the "*-to … dak*" model and the utterances with the reverse order of A and B are actually rhetorically equivalent to complex sentences, presenting

---

36 Keijsper argues that paratactic and hypotactic relationships can also be expressed in two different ways, grammatically and prosodically; cf. Keijsper (2003: 145).

37 Here is yet another example of *-to* in the middle of a compound.

two separate cognitive acts or even two (grammatically or prosodically) expressed predications.[38] Even short A-parts are larger prosodic units with a high degree of independence, presenting something as being the point of departure in a double judgement.

4.4. Inter-dialectal difference in the grammaticalization process
Interestingly, only Trubinskij has found inter-dialectal differences in the use of *-to* and *dak* between the various geographical areas in the north (cf. Kuz'mina 1993: 194). Only in the Pinega dialects has the "*-to … dak*" model developed into an almost standard device to express circumstantial relationships in polypredicative utterances. Trubinskij found that the "*-to … dak*" structure is far more frequent in the Pinega region than in other dialects, whereas subordinating conjunctions are exceptionally rare (Trubinskij 1984: 34).

Trubinskij's description suggests that—using a framework that was designed later—the development of this "*-to … dak*" model could be characterized as a grammaticalization process, where the degree of grammaticalization is subject to inter-dialectal variation. Grammaticalization involves semantic bleaching of a unit to a more grammatical item (cf. Heine et al. 1991: 2, Traugott 2003: 645). As regards the development of a syntactic construction, grammaticalization can be understood as a process that increases internal dependency (Haspelmath 2004, cf. also Givón 1979: 208). If Trubinskij's observations are correct, *-to* and *dak* have indeed assumed a new, more grammatical, function in the Pinega dialects as almost obligatory markers of syntactic subordination in complex sentences. The internal dependency between subordination and the use of both connectives has increased since circumstantial relationships are almost exclusively expressed by means of this construction, in which a combination of *-to* and *dak* is used.

However, it is questionable to call the function of the "*-to … dak*" model a grammatical, hypotactic function, as is argued in the next section. In any case, it has become a model with increased internal dependency.

---

38   More suitable concepts than *predloženie* 'clause; sentence' have been suggested for the description of elliptical spontaneous speech, such as 'predicative construction' (Zemskaja 1973; 1981), 'predicative unit' (Preobraženskaja 1985; Nikitina & Požarickaja 1993) and 'polypredicative utterance' (Zemskaja 1973; 1981; Preobraženskaja 1985).

It is important to stress that the model has not become fully grammaticalized, not even in the Pinega dialects, for the construction is not obligatory: similar utterances also occur without *dak*, and both *-to* and *dak* are also used in other functions, as Trubinskij remarks himself (Trubinskij 1970: 64; Kolesov 1998: 166). More data are needed, both from the Pinega dialects and from other North Russian dialects, to confirm Trubinskij's observations.

The Varzuga dialect (as recorded at the beginning of the 21st century) is clearly not of the Pinega type. In the data from Varzuga, *-to* and *dak* are indeed frequently combined, but *-to* is only found in less than half of the utterances containing *dak*. Furthermore, subordinating conjunctions are quite common in this dialect. Besides, *dak* is frequently used in *combination* with conjunctions, e.g. with *kogda* 'when' in (13), repeated below as (19) below:

(19) *A   sejčas-to my xodim   xorovody-to   vot tože.*
But now-*to*   we go.PRS.1PL roundelay.ACC.PL-*to* PRT also
Na sceny-to   kogda dak.
on stage.LOC.SG-to when *dak*
'But now we dance roundelays, too. When we are on stage, that is'.

4.5. Syntax: Hypotactic function?

Trubinskij (1970: 64) assigns a *hypotactic* function to *-to* and *dak* in complex sentences, suggesting that they express grammatical subordination, with *dak* functioning as a resumptive connective (*korreljat*) in complex sentences, correlating with *-to*, which he claims to be close to a conjunction (*sojuz*; Trubinskij 1970: 65). He claims that *dak* is a more frequent variant of *tak* (ibid.; cf. example (6) above of standard Russian *tak*), but *dak* is not a resumptive connective. A resumptive connective like *tak* is anaphoric, representing a previously expressed or activated unit in the second clause of a complex sentence. But in North Russian, *dak* is prosodically part of the preceding unit A, and not of B, a condition that had been noticed earlier by Fedorova (1965: 85–86). *Dak* has lost its anaphoric function and become a pragmatic particle (Post 2005, chapter 13).[39] Nikitina and Požarickaja (1993), following Trubinskij, refer to *dak*

---

39   This means that North Russian final *dak* has bleached semantics, which is one of the

as a universal '*korreljat*' in North Russian complex sentences, but they explain its function not as grammatical, but rather as actualizing. The combining of *-to* and *dak* with a subordinating conjunction in a single clause in (19) shows that the "*-to … dak*" structure does not *replace* subordinating conjunctions, as Trubinskij seems to suggest, but that it is a device that can convey similar relations, in a different way. The model has exactly the same function in other syntactic structures, which cannot be called hypotactic, such as the "A *dak*" structure in example (14). In my view, both *-to* and *dak* act as pragmatic particles, which function primarily at the level of information and discourse structure.

5. Conclusion

We have seen that, in his 1970 article, Trubinskij contributed to the study of connectives, subordination and information structure in several ways. His study also appears to give an example of an inter-dialectal difference in a grammaticalization process.

Trubinskij showed that both *-to* and *dak* are connectives with a role in structuring the North Russian utterance. He also showed a connection between syntactic subordination and other expressions of asymmetric relationships. Although his characterization of the role of *-to* and *dak* as dividing the sentence into a "most important" and a "less important part" is not very accurate, it has inspired later researchers to apply the new theories of information structure to describe *-to* and *dak* as information-structuring devices. In the most recent study of *dak*, based on the dialect of Varzuga, the word is explained more accurately as a pragmatic particle and a procedural marker, signalling an asymmetric relationship between two information units, *x* and *y*, where *y* is based on *x*. This means that the particle *dak* marks something as being the point of departure of an assertion or thought. The particle *-to* can be used to mark a word as being part of this point of departure. The relationship between x and *y* is, in most cases, circumstantial.

Trubinskij observed that the combined use of *-to* and *dak* connects not only clauses, but also smaller units, and they can be presented in reverse order: both as "A-*to dak* B" and as "B, A-*to dak*", in which A con-

_____

parameters of grammaticalization (cf. previous section). In this respect, the North Russian dialects differ from other varieties of Russian, where *dak* can be used as well, but only as an unstressed variant of *tak*, not as a final particle.

tains one or more occurrences of *-to*, and A and B are the linguistic representations of *x* and *y*, respectively. The Varzuga study showed that these various structures have a lot in common: even short A-parts are close to clauses, since they have a high degree of prosodic independence, and most of them are intonational predications presenting separate cognitive acts. Like categorical sentences, the "*-to … dak*" utterances reflect double judgements with an independently recognized base on which an assertion or thought is based.

Trubinskij described only a subset of contexts of *dak*, in which both *x* and *y* are represented by two contiguous linguistic expressions, here called A and B. But the particle appears to have the same function in all contexts. In these other contexts, one of the elements *x* and *y* remains implicit.

Neither *-to* nor *dak* is an element that is necessary in order to express circumstantial relationships or categorical judgements, not even in the Pinega dialects, but the use of both of them reduces the hearer's effort in finding the intended relationship between elements in the relevant activated knowledge set.

Some of Trubinskij's observations were dismissed. Even in complex sentences, *dak* is not a resumptive connective in the second clause but an enclitic particle, attached to the A-part. Trubinskij regards the "*-to … dak*" model as a syntactic device to express hypotaxis, but the functioning of *-to* and *dak* as an alternative to syntactic subordination should rather be seen as a side effect of their information-structuring properties.

References

Bitextin, A.B., 1994, *Časticy '-to', 'že', 'ved'' i vvodnye konstrukcii tipa 'kak izvestno' kak sredstva ukazanija na izvestnost' propozicional'nogo soderžanija predloženija slušajuščemu,* Avtoreferat diss. kand. fil. nauk, Moscow State University.

Blakemore, Diane, 2002, *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*, Cambridge.

Chafe, Wallace L., 1976, "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View," *Subject and Topic*, ed. C.N. Li, New York, pp. 25–56.

Comrie, Bernard & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), 1993, *The Slavonic Languages,* London & New York.

DARJa 3, 2004, = *Dialektologičeskij atlas russkogo jazyka: centr Evropei- skoj časti Rossii, Karty. Vypusk* 3, *čast' 2. Sintaksis. Leksika*, eds. R.I. Avanesov *&* S.V. Bromlej, Moscow.

Evtjuxin, V.B., 1979, "Aranžirovka dialektnyx tekstov s pomošč'ju častic," *Severnorusskie govory* 3, Leningrad, pp. 201–206.

Fedorova, K.A., 1965, "K voprosu o roli časticy 'dak' v konce predloženija," *Učenye zapiski Permskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni A.M. Gor'kogo* 137 (1), pp. 77–87.

Firbas, Jan, 1974, "Some Aspects of the Czechoslovak Approach to Prob- lems of Functional Sentence Perspective," *Papers on Functional Sen- tence Perspective*, ed. F. Daneš, Prague, pp. 11–37.

Foolen, Ad, 2003 [1996], "Pragmatic Particles," *Handbook of Pragmatics Online*, eds. J.-O. Östman, J. Verschueren *&* Ch. Bulcaen, URL: *http:// www.benjamins.com/online/hop/*.

Gecova, O.G., ed. 1999, *Arxangel'skij oblastnoj slovar'*, vol. 10, Moscow.

Givón, Talmy, 1979, *On Understanding Grammar*, New York.

Halliday, M.A.K., 1967, "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English: Part 2," *Journal of Linguistics* 3, pp. 199–244.

Haspelmath, Martin, 2004, "On Directionality in Language change with Particular Reference to Grammaticalization," *Up and Down the Cline: The Nature of Grammaticalization*, eds. O. Fischer, M. Norde *&* H. Perridon, Amsterdam, pp. 17–44.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi *&* Friederike Hünnemeyer, 1991, *Grammati- calization: A Conceptual Framework*, Chicago.

Honselaar, Zep, 1994, *Het gebruik van het partikel -to in de dialecten van het district Archangel'sk,* MA thesis, University of Amsterdam.

Keijsper, Cornelia Eva, 1985, *Information Structure: With Examples from Russian, English and Dutch*, Amsterdam.

Keijsper, Cornelia Eva, 2003, "Notes on Intonation and Voice in Modern Russian," *Dutch Contributions to the Thirteenth International Con- gress of Slavists, Ljubljana: Linguistics* (*Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 30), eds. J. Schaeken, H.P. Houtzagers *&* J. Kalsbeek, Am- sterdam *&* New York, pp. 141–214.

Kolesov, V.V., ed. 1998, *Russkaja dialektologija*, 2nd ed., Moscow.

Krahmer, Emiel *&* Marc Swerts, 2001, "On the Alleged Existence of Con- trastive Accents," *Speech Communication* 34 (4), pp. 391–405.

Kruijff-Korbayová, Ivana & Mark Steedman, 2003, "Discourse and Information Structure," *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* 12 (3), pp. 249–59.

Kuroda, Shige-Yuki, 1972, "The Categorical and the Thetic Judgement: Evidence from Japanese Syntax," *Foundations of Language* 9, pp. 153–85.

Kuz'mina, I.B., 1993, *Sintaksis russkix govorov v lingvogeografičeskom aspekte*, Moscow.

Lambrecht, Knud, 1994, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge.

Lapteva, O.A., 1976, *Russkij razgovornyj sintaksis: stroenie predloženija*, Moscow.

Leinonen, Marja, 1998, "The Postpositive Particle *-to* of Northern Russian Dialects, Compared with Permic Languages (Komi Zyryan)," *Slavica Finlandensia* 15, pp. 74–89.

Leinonen, Marja, 2002, "Morphosyntactic Parallels in North Russian Dialects and Finno-Ugric Languages," *Scando-Slavica* 48, pp. 127–46.

Leinonen, Marja & Valentina Ludykova, 2001, "Konečnoe slovo *da* v komi jazyke s areal'no-tipologičeskoj točki zrenija," *Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran aikakauskirja* 89, pp. 127–65.

Mansikka, Vil'o J., 1912, "O govorě Šenkurskago uězda Arxangel'skoj gubernii," *Izvěstija otdělenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoj akademii nauk"* 17 (2), pp. 86–144.

Mathiessen, Christian & Sandra A. Thompson, 1988, "The Structure of Discourse and Subordination," *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, eds. J. Haiman & S.A. Thompson, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, pp. 275–329.

McCoy, Svetlana, 2001, *Colloquial Russian Particles -TO, ZHE, and VED' as Set-Generating ("Kontrastive") Markers: A Unifying Analysis,* PhD thesis, Boston University, URL: *http://people.bu.edu/smccoy/*.

McNally, Louise, 1998, "On the Linguistic Encoding of Information Packaging Instructions," *The Limits of Syntax* (Syntax and Semantics 29), eds. P. Culicover & L. McNally, San Diego, pp. 161–83.

Merlin, V.V., 1978, "Častica *dak* kak sredstvo vyraženija aktual'nogo členenija," *Živoe slovo v russkoj reči Prikam'ja*, Perm, pp. 88–98.

Molnár, Valéria, 2002, "Contrast—from a Contrastive Perspective," *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, eds. H. Hasselgård, S. Johansson, B. Behrens & C. Fabricius, Amsterdam, pp. 147–61.

Nikitina, E.N. & S.K. Požarickaja, 1993, "Služebnye slova v prosodičeskoj organizacii dialektnogo teksta," *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu istoričeskomu jazykoznaniju: pamjati professora G.A. Xaburgaeva*, eds. B.A. Uspenskij & M.N. Ševëlova, Moscow, pp. 156–66.

Nørgaard-Sørensen, Jens, 1992, *Coherence Theory: The Case of Russian*, Berlin & New York.

Odé, Cecilia, 1989, *Russian Intonation: A Description,* Amsterdam & Atlanta.

Ovčinnikova, R.S., 1976, "K voprosu o sintaksičeskix funkcijax postpozitivnyx častic v govorax russkogo jazyka," *Russkij jazyk i ego dialekty* (*Voprosy russkogo jazykoznanija* 2), Kujbyšev, pp. 115–27.

Panzer, Baldur, 1984, "Parallel Internal Development or Interference? Post-positive Article and Possessive Perfect in North Germanic and Northern Russian." *Scandinavian Language Contacts*, eds. P.S. Ureland & I. Clarkson, Cambridge, pp. 111–32.

Požarickaja, S.K., 2005, *Russkaja dialektologija*, Moscow.

Popov, P.V., 1957, "Sojuz 'da' v Mezenskom govore," *Učenye zapiski: vinnickij pedagogičeskij institut im. N. Ostrovskogo* 5 (2), pp. 65–87.

Post, Margje, 2005, *The Northern Russian Pragmatic Particle 'dak' in the Dialect of Varzuga (Kola Peninsula): an Information Structuring Device in Informal spontaneous speech,* PhD thesis, University of Tromsø, URL: *http://hdl.handle.net/10037/246.*

Post, Marx'e, 2010, "O sposobax vyraženija semantičeskoj podčinennosti v severnorusskix govorax," *Fonetika i grammatika: nastojaščee, prošedšee, buduščee: k 50-letiju naučnoj dejatel'nosti Sofii Konstantinovny Požarickoj (Voprosy russkogo jazykoznanija* 18)*,* eds. M.L. Remneva & S.V. Knjazev, Moscow, pp. 232–42.

Preobraženskaja, M.N., 1985, "Služebnoe slovo *dak* v severnorusskix govorax," *Vostočnye slavjane: jazyki, istorija, kul'tura: k 85-letiju akademika V.I. Borkovskogo*, ed. Ju.N. Karaulov, Moscow, pp. 65–72.

Preobraženskaja, M.N., 2002, "O nekotoryx problemax issledovanija sintaksisa dialektnogo russkogo jazyka," *Avanesovskij sbornik,* ed. N.N. Pšeničnova, Moscow, pp. 118–24.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen, 1987, "The Thetic/Categorical Distinction Revisited," *Linguistics* 25, pp. 511–80.

Slioussar, Natalia, 2007, *Grammar and Information Structure: A Study with Reference to Russian,* Ph.D. thesis., University of Utrecht.

Šapiro, A.B., 1953, *Očerki po sintaksisu russkix narodnyx govorov*, Moscow.

Švedova, N.Iu., ed. 1980, *Russkaja grammatika,* vols. 1–2, Moscow.

Traugott, Elisabeth Closs, 2003, "Constructions in Grammaticalization," *A Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, eds. B.D. Joseph & R.D. Janda, Oxford, pp. 624–47.

Trubinskij, V.I., 1970, "Ob učastii postpozitivnoj časticy *to* v postroenii složnogo predloženija (po materialam pinežskix govorov)," *Severnorusskie govory*, ed. N.A. Meščerskij, Leningrad, pp. 48–66.

Trubinskij, V.I., 1984, *Očerki russkogo dialektnogo sintaksisa,* Leningrad.

Uzdinskaja, E.V., 1996, *Častica "-to" v russkix dialektax i v razgovornoj reči (funkcional'nyj aspekt),* Avtoreferat diss. kand. fil. nauk, Saratov.

Vallduví, Enric & Elisabet Engdahl, 1996, "The Linguistic Realization of Information Packaging," *Linguistics* 34, pp. 459–519.

Vallduví, Enric & Maria Vilkuna, 1998, "On Rheme and Kontrast," *The Limits of Syntax* (Syntax and Semantics 29), eds. P. Culicover & L. McNally, San Diego, pp. 79–108.

Wheeler, Marcus, Boris Unbegaun & Paul Falla, 1995, *The Oxford Russian Dictionary: Revised and Updated Throughout by Colin Howlett*, Oxford & New York.

Wilson, Deirdre & Dan Sperber, 1993, "Linguistic Form and Relevance," *Lingua* 90, pp. 1–25.

Zemskaja, O.A., ed.1973, *Russkaja razgovornaja reč',* Moscow.

Zemskaja, O.A., ed. 1981, *Russkaja razgovornaja reč',* Moscow.