Abstract
The paper is dedicated to some polysemous Russian particles as they are represented in the Active
dictionary of Russian (ADR), which is currently being compiled under the guidance of Yury
Apresjan at the Russian Language Institute (RAS), and the problem of lexicalized prosody. General
principles of ADR presuppose that all important properties of a lexeme are described in the lexical
entry including lexicalized prosody. The phenomenon of lexicalized prosody in Russian drew the
linguists’ attention about 30 years ago. The investigation is usually confined to phrasal stress as the
most frequently lexicalized and therefore the most lexicographically interesting prosodic pattern.
However, as far as discourse particles are concerned, not only phrasal stress but also intonation
pattern is of greatest interest. Two Russian discourse particles will be discussed. One of them is the
particle -to. Its different usages imply very different prosodic patterns. The other one is vot which
can be used not only as a demonstrative particle, but also as a xenomarker (quotation marker),
which requires a specific prosody.
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1 The Phenomenon of Lexicalized Prosody

As already mentioned above, the phenomenon of lexicalized prosody in Russian drew the linguists’
attention about 30 years ago. See (Apresjan 1980: 51; Nikolaeva 1985: 122; Pavlova 1987: 8;
Bulygina, Shmelev 1987; Zaliznyak Anna 1994; Boguslavsky 1996: 255, etc.). A very nice
overview of different approaches to this problem can be found in (Kobozeva, Zaharov 2004).
Mainly this phenomenon is connected with the communicative structure of an utterance, the
topic/focus opposition.

Thus, in ADR (Активный словарь русского языка) lexicalized prosody is treated the following
way:
Prosody comprises a wide range of phenomena, out of which ADR is concerned primarily with
those that pertain to phrasal stress as the most frequently lexicalized and therefore the most
lexicographically interesting prosodic pattern.
Lexicalized phrasal stress is always in some way tied up to the communicative structure of the
sentence. There are two groups of prosodic phenomena which are reflected in ADR: a) prosodic
syntagmatics; b) prosodic paradigmatics.
a) Prosodic syntagmatics. Certain lexemes, while themselves not prosodically marked, do, at the
same time, require prosodic accentuation of the words they are syntactically connected with. Thus,
the particle čto kasaetsja ‘as for X,’ ‘what concerns X’ marks the NP to the right of it, on which it is
syntactically dependent, as the contrastive rheme of the sentence, and b) Prosodic paradigmatics.
Prosodic paradigmatics deals with prosodic accentuation as a marker of differences among various
lexemes of the same word or different usages of the same lexeme. Prosodic accentuation tends to
mark the following categories of meanings: 1) negation; 2) quantification; 3) modalities of desire,
necessity and possibility; 4) evaluation; 5) facts and opinions. The presence of one or more of those
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meanings in the semantics of a lexical item allows one to form expectations concerning its prosodic properties.
This phenomenon can be illustrated with two different lexemes of the word *pozdno* ‘late.’
*Pozdno 1* ‘late 1’ means ‘at a late time’ and can either bear phrasal stress or be prosodically unmarked,
whereas *pozdno 3* which means ‘too late for doing X’ and combines the components of quantification, lost
possibility, and evaluation, always bears the main phrasal stress”. (Apresjan V. 2011).
As we can see, the main attention is paid to phrasal stress. However it should be mentioned that as
far as discourse particles are concerned, not only phrasal stress but also intonation pattern is of
greatest interest (see also Kodzasov 1996). I will provide two examples to illustrate my statement.

2 Russian Particle –to

In Russian two homonymous particles –to are present:
1) a particle forming indefinite pronouns: *кто*-то somebody, *какой*-то some, *почему*-то for
some reason, etc.;
2) a discourse particle with a number of meanings (see Shimchuk, Shchur 1999).

–to as a discourse particle is discussed in many articles, most thoroughly in (Bonnot 1990, 1991).
According to Bonnot, –to is mostly a topicalizing particle – “la particule de thematisation”.
However it has some lexemes implying a very unusual intonation pattern.
Let us compare the intonation of the following phrases:

(1a) Всё-то сразу не трать! Don’t spend all your money at once!
(1b) Всё-то я не потрачу! I will not spend all my money at once!
(1c) Всё-то вы знаете! You know really everything!

![Figure 1.](image-url)

2 For speech analyzing the Praat analyzer is used, see http://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/ All phrases were
read by one speaker (not by the author), female voice.
Figure 1 and Figure 2 look different, because (1a) is an imperative sentence, which presupposes a specific communicative structure, while in (1b) we see the regular topicalizing –to. And it is natural that here the so-called intonation construction 3, according to E. A. Bryzgunova’s classification (see Bryzgunova 1977; Russian grammar 1980) is represented. This intonation pattern is typical of general questions, for example.

However, the intonation of (1c) differs greatly both from (1a) and (1b). The example (1c) and Figure 3 demonstrate the so-called intonation construction 5 as defined by Bryzgunova which is characteristic of the Russian exclamations (Russian grammar 1982: 116-117) (its frequency contour is specified by the two – the sentence-initial and the sentence-final – tonal peaks).

The respective meaning of the particle –to can be realized in the sentences with a certain generalization: either containing a word like all, every, everything, always, never, etc., or a sort of a row:

Ох, человек, человек, всех-то ты победил, всюду-то ты навоёл порядок, только среди самого человечесства одни раздоры, скандалы, свары. [Виктор Розов. Удивление перед жизнью (1960-2000)]

Всегда-то он первый догадается! — прямо завидно. [Андрей Битов. Моя зависть (1965)]

Уж и вино отпустил! Можно сказать, что на чести. Попробовала я рюмочку, так и гвоздикой-то пахнет, и розаном пахнет, и еще чем-то. [А. Н. Островский. Бесприданница (1879)]

В биографии Галича, написанной Николаем Ароновым и переизданной в прошлом году "Новым литературным обозрением", собрана целая россыпь цитат, полных плохо
скрываемой зависти: и носки-то у него белые, и брюки трубочной, и цепочка от часов золоченая. И на стол-то накрывают — все на фарфоре, и на бегах он пропадает, и ужинает в "Национале", и запел он, как писал Нагибин, "от тщеславной обиды" (Ю Сапрыкин http://kommersant.ru/doc/2315038?fb_action_ids=459096970874370&fb_action_types=og.likes&fb_source=other_multiline&action_object_map=%7B%22459096970874370%22%3A584859334907138%7D&action_type_map=%7B%22459096970874370%22%3A%22og.likes%22%7D&action_ref_map=%5B%5D)

Now let us compare intonation of similar phrases with and without –to:

(2a) ВСЕГДА ты споришь! and Всегда ты СПОРИШЬ!
(2b) Всегда-то ты споришь!
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The phrases without –to are pronounced with a typical rhematic accent (here so-called intonation construction 2), two variants differ by location of phrasal accent. The phrase with –to from the point of view of intonation is very similar to our example (1с) Всё-то вы знаете! (intonation construction 5). From the point of view of semantics the difference between phrases with and without –to is also clear. Both phrases contain generalization (You always object). But without –to it is just a statement, while with –to the speaker pretends that the general idea itself is well known and he or she wants just to illustrate it and express certain feelings towards the situation that cannot be changed. There is one more lexeme of –to in combination with words like who?, what?, where?, when?, etc. So, these combinations are homonymous to indefinite pronouns, but have different meaning and imply a specific intonation pattern. Let us compare:

(3а) И он не с теми ходит где-то.
(3б) Опять он где-то ходит!
(3с) Он где-то ходит?

Где-то has here the meaning ‘somewhere’, -to is prosodically unmarked.

(3d) Где-то он ходит? 'If I knew where he could be now!'
Here a very interesting type of prosody is represented. It is typical of a specific illocution of mirroring the process of dreaming, or recollecting. It is marked by a rise on the tonic syllables which are followed by level, or slightly falling post-tonics. The tonic and post-tonics are substantially prolonged; (see Yanko 2008: 1090). The meaning of this –to can be described in the following way: ‘The answer to this question can hardly be found, but I am trying to imagine what it could be’.

One more lexeme of –to implying similar intonation pattern is worth mentioning. See the following examples:

(4) Уж бледная-то бледная;
Зашёл разговор о лошадях, и Печорин начал расхваливать лошадь Казбича: уж такая-то она резвая, красивая, словно серна, — ну, просто, по его словам, этакой и в целом мире нет [М. Ю. Лермонтов. Герой нашего времени (1839-1841)];
Pорадовались черемухе, все в нее головами нюхали, самая-то весна [И. С. Шмелев. Лето Господне (1927-1944)].

Here the particle stresses the idea of extremely high level or extent:
So we tried to demonstrate that lexicalized prosody is not always confined to phrasal stress. We see that some lexemes of the discourse particle –to imply certain intonation patterns.

3 Russian Particle –vot

The particle vot is also polysemous. Its basic meaning is demonstrative (Вот моя деревня). Some of the lexemes are stressed, some are not, some of them are prosodically unmarked. There is an interesting function of this particle as “xenomarker”.

This function is usually ascribed to the particles мол, дескать, де, as well as якобы and гыт (гыт). Most of them are etymologically connected with verba dicendi. Since the speaker uses xenomarkers to distance himself or herself from another person’s stand, these words quite often pragmatically imply a valuation, most often a negative one, of the reported speech. Their function, according to N. D. Arutyunova, consists in “marking Somebody Else’s presence” («маркировать присутствие Другого») (Arutyunova 2000: 448). It turns out, however, that the repertoire of means used as markers of quotation or retelling is much broader than it is generally admitted. Thus, the words ах, vot, так и так; the construction with imperative reduplication and the conjunction да (Привязалась: расскажи да расскажи), specific intonations of retelling, and some other phenomena can take over the same function (Levontina 2011).

Vot as xenomarker was discovered in (Podlesskaya, Kibrik 2009), namely as a means of “expressing threat and condemnation” in reported speech, cf.:

тоже на меня “/посмотрела, «/Вот! Я тебя /–в-выгоню-у и-из-3з ·(0.2) этой из ш= ·(0.2) “из ·(0.2) ”/школы!” [She looked at me too: “I’ll throw you out of this school!”].

See also:

Я стала говорить дома: вот, Наташа просила у меня прощения, я не простила ее… [I started telling at home – well, Natasha asked me to forgive her, and I didn’t…] [Н. Горланова, Метаморфозы].

Interestingly enough, the meaning of vot is not confined to threat or condemnation. Compare the following examples:

A она сидит и неет: «Воот, я такая несчастная…» [And she is sitting around, whimpering: “Oh, I’m so miserable…”];

Он расхвастался: «Воот, я самый крутой» [He started bragging: “Yeah, I’m such a cool guy”];

Привязалась: «Воот, как тебе не стыно, что у тебя за юбка» [She kept intruding on me: “Hey, what kind of a skirt is that? Shame on you!”];

A он все обещает: «Воот, деньги будут со дня на день, все отдам [And he keeps giving promises: “The money will be there any day, I will return everything I owe”].

Ну и что же, что она первая позвонила? A ты бы ей сказал: «Воот, я сам собирался тебе позвонить, поздравить» [Yes, she called first, so what? You should have said – I was planning to call you with the greetings myself].

It should be stressed that this lexeme demands certain intonation.

In (Yanko 2008: 109) an intonation pattern described is called “the intonation of mental activity”, i.e. situations of remembering, perplexity, sinking into daydreams, and also reported speech (Тетя сказала, надо чего-то там уко-олы делать [Aunty said we should make injections…]). This intonation pattern is described as follows: «Соответствующий акцент характеризуется подъемом тона и существенным удлинением ударного слога акцентоносителя ремы. Вся заударная область ровная (иногда с небольшим естественным падением)» [A rhyme of

---

3 ВОТ, ЧАСТ. вот 10, разг. ’говорящий передает чужие слова’: Мне говорят, вот, я плохая мать. (ADR, lexical entry was written by T. Krylova).
dreaming or recollecting: a rise on the tonic syllables followed by level or slightly falling post-tonics accompanied by lengthening the tonic and post-tonic syllables.]. Yanko notes, that by retelling a speaker does not copy somebody else’s intonation, but arranges his or her utterance with a specific “remembering” prosody.

However, although the prosody of retelling and remembering has much in common, these two intonation patterns are somewhat different. First of all, retelling is often affective and emotive, and the prosody in this case is emphatic, which is hardly possible in the case of remembering, perplexity, or sinking into daydreams. Secondly, by retelling, the phrase is often split into minor segments as against original speech. Cf.:

- И что он ответил?
- Да что ответил! «/Мама не разре/шает» [And what did he say? What could he say? Mommy won’t let me].

From the point of view of intonation, reported speech often turns to sounding rhythmical, pronounced with seriate tone rises and falls, similar to “listing” intonation: А он мне и говорит: «/Вот, /девушка, какая вы кра/сивая, как вас зо/вут, а пой/демте, погу/ляем, а /давайте теле/фончик» [And he tells me: Hey lady, you’re so pretty, what’s your name, let’s go for a walk, please give me your phone number].

For phrases with вот as xenomarker this type of intonation is obligatory: the particle only cannot express this meaning without this pattern, it implies certain prosodic outline of the whole phrase. That’s why it occurs mostly in oral speech.

![Figure 10.](image-url)
4 Conclusion

Such cases as our –то and вот are much more difficult for lexicographical presentation than the cases of lexicalized phrasal stress. As it was mentioned earlier, in ADR such features of lexemes are not fixed so far. I hope, however, that eventually this problem will be solved either with the help of short and clear verbal descriptions, or with signs like ∧, /−/, or similar. For the future digital version of ADR, audio-illustrations will be helpful in such cases (see Kobozeva, Zaharov 2004).
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