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• Multifunctional projections in the left periphery

- **Complementizer**
  - Rosenbaum (1967) → first appearance
  - Bresnan (1970), (Chomsky 1981) → central role for certain syntactic operations (e.g. WH)
  - Chomsky (1986) → clausal head
  - Chomsky (1995 et seq.): multiple specifiers and edge positions

- The need for more functional projections, or, indeed, a sequence of two or more functional projections, was proposed:

-  **ΣP** (Laka 1990) → mainly for negation, but also for polarity, emphasis and other operators.

-  **FP** (Uriagereka 1995a,b): a functional projection for discourse properties and “point of view”. 
Rizzi (1997)

(1) ForceP (TopP*) FocP (TopP*) FinP IP

(See also Brody 1990, 1995; Benincà 2001)
§ 1. INTRODUCTION: THE CARTOGRAPHY OF FocP

• In many Romance varieties (and elsewhere), the focus constituent bearing the main prosodic prominence of the sentence can appear in a left-peripheral position:

(2) a. Abbiamo visto Paolo. (focus in situ) Italian
   have.1PL seen Paul
   ‘We saw Paul’/‘It was Paul that we saw.’

   b. PAOLO abbiamo visto. (Focus Fronting (FF))
   PAUL have.1PL seen
   ‘We saw Paul’/‘It was Paul that we saw.’

   b’. [FocP [PAOLO][focus] [Foc0][focus] [FinP pro abbiamo visto t ]] we-have seen

Focus Criterion (Brody 1990: 101, 1995; cf. also Rizzi 1997):
   A. At S-structure and LF the spec of an FP must contain a [+focus] phrase
   B. At LF all [+focus] phrases must be in an FP

→ A constituent bearing a [focus] feature moves to Spec/FocP, in a Spec/Head configuration with Foc0, which also bears a [focus] feature.
→ At the interface, Spec/FocP is interpreted as the focus, and the complement of Foc0 as the presupposition (Rizzi 1997) or background (in the sense of Krifka 2007).
Cartographic assumption: One Feature One Head (Cinque & Rizzi 2010: 54): “each morphosyntactic feature corresponds to an independent syntactic head with a specific slot in the functional hierarchy.”

Problem of the division of labour between syntax and pragmatics with respect to the different interpretations or types of focus:

Q: Which pragmatic or discourse features count as morphosyntactic features?

(3) a. Abbiamo visto Paolo. (F in situ: information focus)
   have.1PL seen Paul

   b. PAOLO abbiamo visto (, non Marco). (FF: contrastive focus)
   PAUL have.1PL seen not Mark
   ‘We saw Paul/It was Paul that we saw (, not Mark).’

Belletti (1999, 2004 et seq.): specialized FocPs:
   FocP in the left periphery of the clause  > contrastive focus
   FocP in the left periphery of the vP  > information focus

Cf. also É. Kiss’s (1998) distinction between identificational and information focus.
 § 1. INTRODUCTION: THE CARTOGRAPHY OF FocP


  ![Diagram of FocP structure]

  - Problem of the optionality of contrastive FF:
  - Rizzi (1997) on (contrastive) focus in situ: covert movement at LF
1. Introduction: The Cartography of FocP

- Benincà & Poletto (2004: 71), on the basis of information FF in Old Italian and in modern Southern Italian (simplified structure):

\[(4) \quad [ \text{Hanging Top} \ [ \text{Scene Setting} \ [ \text{LD} \ [ \text{LI} \ [\text{Contr. Focus} \ [\text{Inform. Focus}]\] ]]]]]\]

where LD = Left Dislocated, LI = List Interpretation (≈ Contrastive Topic)

- Benincà (2006: 61): the left periphery of Medieval Romance:

\[(5) \quad \{\text{Force} \ C^\circ\}[\text{Relwh} \ C^\circ]/\{\text{Frame}[\text{ScSett}[\text{HT}] \ C^\circ}\}\{\text{TOPIC}[\text{LD}] \ [\text{LI}] \ C^\circ\}\{\text{Focus}[\text{I Focus}][\text{II Focus}]/[\text{Interrwh}] \ C^\circ\}\{\text{Fin} \ C^\circ\}\]

- Cruschina (2012: 2019), based on Italian dialects (Sicilian, Sardinian):

\[(6) \quad \text{CFocP, TopP, IFoc, FinP}\]

Cf. Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl (2007) for a hierarchy of Top projections
§ 1. Introduction: The Cartography of FocP

On the other hand...

- Brunetti (2004, 2009) → a unification of focus:
  - same interface properties
  - same syntax
  - The (apparent) unacceptability of Focus movement with information focus (in an answer to a wh-question) is due to pragmatic factors related to conditions on ellipsis; the different interpretations are only pragmatic in nature.

- Interface approaches that question the need for a FocP and/or reject the idea of a syntactic [focus] feature responsible for focus movement:
  - stress-based approach → focus movement is triggered by a prosodic requirement (Szendröi 2001; see also Samek-Lodovici 2005, 2015);
  - pragmatic approach → focus movement is an (optional) interface-driven syntactic operation (discourse templates: similar to Focus Criterion but in pragmatic terms) (cf. Neeleman & van de Koot 2008, Neeleman et al. 2009; see also Horvath 2010).

- these approaches presuppose a direct communication between LF and PF...
However...

- The different interpretations of focus differ with respect to distinct prosodic properties and different distributions in terms of movement (cf. Bocci 2013, Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina [BBC] 2015, 2016, a.o.):

→ In the **Y-/T-model of the grammar**, there is no direct communication between the phonological (PF) and the semantic component (LF), which only interact via syntax (Chomsky & Lasnik 1977, Chomsky 1981, 1986, 1995) (the interface approaches clearly reject this model):

[Diagram showing the relationship between PF, LF, and syntax]

☞ If we want to keep a T-model of the grammar, we have to assume that the different focus interpretations associated with distinct prosodic properties are determined by **active features in the syntactic computation**, which provide specific instructions to the interfaces.
Problem: How many projections? How many features? One for each interpretation? (cf. information focus, contrastive/corrective focus, mirative focus, exhaustive focus, etc.).

Alternative proposal (Bianchi 2015, Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina 2015, 2016):
→ A separation between the special interpretation and focus
  
  • Different interpretations associated with focus => **CONVENTIONAL IMPLICATURES**

  which

  “are conventionally associated with the activation of a left-peripheral functional projection which bears an implicature-triggering feature”

  and which

  “depend on the availability of a focus structure yielding a non-singleton set of alternative propositions in the scope of the implicature trigger: we will dub them focus-associated implicatures” (FAI) (BBC 2015: 17)

(7) \([_{FP} \text{Force} \ldots \left[{_{\text{FaiP FAI}^0 \text{[mir]}} \ldots \left[{_{\text{FocP } YP_i \text{ [+]foc} \ldots \left[{_{\text{TP } \ldots \text{ <YP}_i \text{ > } \ldots \text{ ]}}}\right]}\right]}\right]}\]
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§ 2. Types of Focus

• **Focus** evokes a set of alternatives that share the same background  
  (Rooth 1985, 1992)

2.1 INFORMATION FOCUS

• Typical of answers to questions → the focus structure is imposed by the **question-answer congruence**  

(8) *A* is a congruent answer to *Q*, only if the constituent in *A* that corresponds to a *wh*-phrase in *Q* is focussed (i.e., F-marked). (Reich 2002)

The traditional view on Italian (and other Romance languages)

• The focal status of a constituent (i.e. the [focus] feature) is not a sufficient condition for FF in Italian and in other Romance languages:
  ❀ **information focus** occurs in a postverbal position, at least in Italian and in other Romance languages, including Spanish, Portuguese and – arguably – Romanian (Belletti 2004, Cruschina 2012, 2016).
§ 2. Types of Focus

(9)  a. Chi ha parlato?  
    who have.3SG speak.pp  
    ‘Who spoke?’

    b. Ha parlato **Gianni**.  
    have.3SG speak.pp Gianni  
    ‘Gianni spoke’

(10) a. ¿Qué compró Pedro?  
    what buy.pst.3SG Pedro  
    ‘What did Pedro buy?’

    b. Pedro compró **manzanas**.  
    Pedro buy.past.3SG apples  
    ‘Manzanas bought Pedro’

In these languages, thus, FF depends on the presence of additional or concomitant requirements/properties.
§ 2. TYPES OF FOCUS

VARIATION I

- In Sicilian and Sardinian FF is possible with *information focus* in congruent answers (Cruschina 2012, 2016a, Jones 1993, 2013, Remberger 2014):

(11) A: Unnì ti nni jisti airì sira? *Sicilian*
   where you= there.from= you.went yesterday evening
   ‘Where did you go last night?’

   B: Au cinema jivu.
   to.the cinema I.went
   ‘I went to the cinema’

(12) A: Su libru, a chie l’as dadu? *Sardinian*
   the book to whom it=you.have given
   ‘The book, to whom did you give it?’

   B: Su libru, a Maria l’apo dadu.
   the book to Mary it=I.have given
   ‘The book, to Mary I gave it’ (Jones 2013: 78)
2. Types of Focus

Variation II

- Other Romance appear more tolerant towards FF with information focus:

(13) A: ¿Qué comió Miguel?  
\textit{what ate Miguel}  
‘What did Miguel eat’  
\textit{Asturian}

B: Les pataques comió Miguel.  
\textit{the potatoes ate Miguel}  
‘Miguel ate potatoes.’ (Viejo Fernández 2008: 255)

(14) A: A qui va enviar la carta, el mariner?  
\textit{to who send.PST.3SG the letter the sailor}  
‘Who did the sailor send the letter to?’  
\textit{Central Catalan}

B: A la dama va enviar la carta el mariner.  
\textit{to the lady send.PST.3SG the letter the sailor}  
‘The sailor sent it to the lady.’ (Vanrell & Fernández-Soriano 2013)

Are these instances of ‘plain’ information focus? Can additional effects associate with FF in congruent answers (e.g. mirativity)?
§ 2. TYPES OF FOCUS

VARIATION III

• Also possible in Italian, but only with a special (surprise?) interpretation:

(15) A: **Sai come lo chiamava il suo amico?**

Do you know how his friend called him?

B: **“Novellino” lo chiamava.**

He called him *greenhorn*.

(S. Veronesi, *No man’s land*, Milan 2003, from BBC 2016)

NB: In Sicilian and in Sardinian, with information FF a special interpretation of the answer is also possible, but by no means necessary. FF is also frequent in identificational contexts, e.g. Sic. *Montalbano sugnu!* ‘I’m Montalbano’. 
§ 2. TYPES OF FOCUS

⇒ INFORMATION FOCUS

- The position varies across Romance according to the *(conventionalized)* answering strategy, in the sense of Belletti (2005, 2009):

For example:

- FocP in the left periphery of vP in Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, ...
- FocP in the left periphery of the CP in Sicilian, Sardinian, Hungarian, ...

- General problem: The *optionality of FF*: whenever Focus Movement is allowed, the in-situ option is also possible
§ 2. TYPES OF FOCUS

- An example (Cruschina 2015): grammaticality judgements on **FF in Sicilian** (1-100 scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+FF</th>
<th>–FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>86.85</td>
<td>81.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>83.16</td>
<td>86.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>84.47</td>
<td>85.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT.</td>
<td>84.82</td>
<td>84.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Average of acceptability rate in answers to questions (information focus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+FF</th>
<th>–FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>72.88</td>
<td>68.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>77.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>76.47</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT.</td>
<td>74.28</td>
<td>73.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** Average of acceptability rate with contrastive focus
§ 2. TYPES OF FOCUS

- **Focus** evokes a set of alternatives that share the same background  
  (Rooth 1985, 1992)

2.2 CONTRASTIVE FOCUS

- Contrast against an explicit focal alternative:

  (16) A GIANNI l’ho dato (non a Piero). *Italian*  
  to Gianni  it.CL-have.1SG give.PP not to Piero  
  ‘I gave it to John (not Peter)’. (Belletti 2004: 17)  
  \( \oplus \) implies the antecedent proposition: ‘I gave it to Peter’.

  (17) MANZANAS compró Pedro (y no peras). *Spanish*  
  apples buy.PST.3SG Peter and not pears  
  ‘Pedro bought apples (and not pears).’ (Zubizarreta 1999: 4239)  
  \( \oplus \) implies the antecedent proposition: ‘Pedro bought pears’.

\( \oplus \) Widespread view: *contrast* is the interpretive feature associated with FF in Romance (Rizzi 1997), a necessary requirement for FF to obtain (López 2009).
§ 2. Types of Focus

- Contrastive focus ➔ **Corrective focus** (Bianchi & Bocci 2012):

  ➔ *Contrast across utterances*: the asserted proposition (i.e. the corrective claim) is incompatible and inconsistent with an antecedent proposition which comes from a previous speech act:

  \[(18)\]  
  A: Hanno invitato Marina.  
  B: GIULIA hanno invitato, (non Marina).  
  ‘They invited Julie, not Marina.’

→ Contrastive/Corrective FF is possible in most Romance languages, with some limitations in French and in Portuguese, where clefts and postverbal focus, respectively, are preferred strategies over FF (at least for a group of speakers in Portuguese, cf. Costa & Martins 2011).
2. TYPES OF FOCUS

• **Focus** evokes a set of alternatives that share the same background  
  (Rooth 1985, 1992)

2.3 MIRATIVE FOCUS

• Type of focus related to new information which is particularly surprising or unexpected (Cruschina 2012, borrowing the term from linguistic typology, cf. DeLancey 1997, 2001, Aikhenvald 2012)

(19)a. Non ci posso credere! **Due bottiglie** ci siamo bevuti! *Italian*
  not to.it=can.1SG believe.INF two bottles REFL=be.1PL drunk
  ‘I can’t believe it! We drank two bottles!’

  b. ¡Por Dios, **dos botellas** se han bebido! *Spanish*
  for God two bottles REFL have.3PL drunk
  ‘My God! They have drunk up two bottles!’

Mirative FF is very common in (almost) all Romance varieties (Italian, Spanish, Romanian, Sicilian, Sardinian, Brazilian Portuguese, etc.).
§ 2. Types of Focus

Brazilian Portuguese

(20) a. Imagina só! Por essa bestinha da Júlia ele foi se apaixonar!
   imagine only for that animal of Julie he fell-in-love
   ‘Just imagine! He fell in love with that idiot of Julie!’

   b. Două luni mi-a luat să scriu acest articol! Romanian
   two months me it-took to write this paper
   ‘It took me two months to write this paper!’

• Despite the general idea that French does not allow FF to the left periphery of
  the sentence, in the corpus-based studies by Abeillé et al. (2008), cases of FF
  similar to our mirative focus have been described:

(21) a. Tu as beaucoup fumé? French
   you have.2SG a-lot smoked
   ‘Did you smoke a lot?’

   b. Deux cigarettes j’ai fumé.
   two cigarettes I have.1SG smoked
   ‘Two cigarettes, I smoked.’ (Sabio 2006: 175)
§ 2. Types of Focus

(22) a. Tu sais ce qui est arrivé? **Le candidat du patron**, ils ont refusé!

you know what is arrived the candidate of-the boss they have refused

‘Do you know what happened? They refused the boss’s candidate!’

b. **Trois heures** il avait de retard, le train!

three hours it had of delay the train

‘The train was delayed by three hours!’ (Abeillé et al. 2008, (10), (19))

• Hartmann & Zimmermann (2007: 389) on **Hausa**: “In our view, a focus constituent, or part of it, appears ex situ in order to mark its content or discourse function as unexpected or surprising in a given discourse situation.”

(23) **Mèeneenèe ya fàaru?**

what 3SG.REL.PERF happen

‘What happened?’

**Dabboobi-n jeejìi nee mutàanee su-kà kaamàa.**

animals-of bush PRT men 3PL.REL.PERF catch

‘(The) men caught wild animals.’
§ 2. Types of Focus

- **Focus** evokes a set of alternatives that share the same background
  (Rooth 1985, 1992)

2.4 Exhaustive Focus (Hungarian)

- FF involves exhaustive identification or exclusion by identification of the subset of the set of alternatives (Szabolcsi 1994, É. Kiss 1998):

\[(24)\]

- a. Mary **egy kalapot** nézett ki magának. *(exhaustive)*
  Mary a **hat.acc** pick.pst.3sg **out** herself.acc
  ‘It was (only) a hat that Mary picked for herself.’

- b. Mari **ki nézett magának egy kalapot.** *(informational)*
  Mary **out pick.pst.3sg** herself **a hat**
  ‘Mary picked for herself a hat.’ (É. Kiss 1998: 249)

(Exhaustive) FF is the preferred answering strategy in Hungarian.
I will return to this in §4.3.
§ 2. Types of Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Focus</th>
<th>FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Sicilian, Sardinian, Old Italian, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive</td>
<td>Sicilian, Sardinian, Italian, Spanish, Catalan, Romanian, B-Portuguese, % E-Portuguese, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirative</td>
<td>Sicilian, Sardinian, Italian, Spanish, Catalan, Romanian, Brazilian Portuguese, (French, ) ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustive</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ optionally in the low FocP
§ 2. TYPES OF FOCUS

- Non-contrastive emphatic/mirative FF:
  - Catalan (Vallduí 1992, 1995)
  - Italian (Brunetti 2004, 2009)
  - Brazilian Portuguese (Kato and Raposo 1996)
  - many southern Italian dialects, e.g. Neapolitan and Cosentino (Ledgeway 2009a:784–790, 2009b)
  - northern Italian dialects, e.g. Triestino (Paoli 2010)
  - Sardinian (Jones 2013)
  - Romanian (Zafiu 2013, Cruschina, Giurgea & Remberger 2015)
  - Spanish (Jiménez-Fernández 2015)
  - German (Frey 2010, Cruschina, Giurgea & Remberger 2015, Trotzke 2016)
  - Hungarian (Cruschina 2016b)

→ underlined references use the term ‘mirative’
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§ 3. THE TRIGGER OF FF

- The morphosyntactic **feature** triggering FF → **Italian** (Romance):
  b) **GIVENNESS** (Samek-Lodovici 2006, 2015) (+ prosodic requirement)

- The morphosyntactic **feature** triggering FF → **Hungarian**:
  c) **EXHAUSTIVITY** (Szabolcsi 1994, É. Kiss 1998) (→ §4.3)

- **Recall**: The focal status of the constituent (i.e. the [focus] feature) is not a sufficient condition for FF in Italian and in other Romance languages.

- In these languages, thus, FF depends on the presence of additional or concomitant requirements/properties.
§ 3. The trigger of FF

• Traditional cartographic analysis of FF

(25) a. PAOLO abbiamo visto. (FF)
PAUL have.1PL seen
‘We saw Paul’/‘It was Paul that we saw.’

a'. \([\text{FocP} [\text{PAOLO}]_{[\text{focus}]} [\text{Foc}^0_{[\text{focus}]} [\text{FinP} pro abbiamo visto t]]\]
Paul we-have seen

→ FF is an instance of feature-driven movement that takes place the syntax.
→ The trigger of movement is the [(contrastive) focus] feature.

Q: Are all instances of FF contrastive? (In the corrective sense → a salient focal alternative is available in the context and is ‘corrected’):
  o Information focus → does not trigger FF
  o Mirative focus → does trigger FF, but *is not always contrastive*
§ 3. THE TRIGGER OF FF

- The givenness analysis (Samek-Lodovici 2006, 2015)
  - the IP is marked as GIVEN, the [-GIVEN] focus must evacuate the IP;
  - the focal constituent adjoins to IP (creating IP*);
  - the remnant IP undergoes right dislocation (i.e. left dislocation + remnant inversion), so that the focus can receive main sentence stress (since the rest of the clause is dislocated).

\[(26) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \left[\text{IP}^* \text{Marco}_n \left[\text{IP} \text{ pro abbiamo visto } t_n \right] \right] & \quad \text{(focus evacuation)} \\
\text{b. } & \left[\text{TopP} \left[\text{IP} \text{ pro abbiamo visto } t_n \right]_i \emptyset_{\text{Top}} \left[\text{IP}^* \text{Marco}_n \ t_i \right] \right] & \quad \text{(remnant IP-topicalization)} \\
\text{c. } & \quad \text{(leftward movement of higher IP*)}
\end{align*}\]
§ 3. THE TRIGGER OF FF

• The givenness analysis (Samek-Lodovici 2006, 2015)

→ The initial trigger of the derivational steps that lead to FF is **givenness** (+ prosodic requirement that focus be in the rightmost position where it is assigned main prominence).
→ This analysis presupposes that in FF structures, the postfocal material (the background) is always given.

**Q:** Is the postfocal material given in all instances of FF?
  o Information focus → yes (in answers to questions)
  o Contrastive focus → yes (same as in the antecedent for contrast)
  o **Mirative focus** → **no, not always and not necessarily**

• **Mirative FF:**
  (i) It is not contrastive/corrective (i.e. there are not explicit alternatives);
  (ii) The background need not be given;
  (iii) It is **problematic** for both the contrastive and the givenness analysis.
Q: Is the postfocal material given in all instances of FF?
   o Information focus → yes (in answers to questions, (27))
   o Contrastive focus → yes (same as in the antecedent for contrast, (28))

(27) A: Unni ti nni jisti airi sira? Sicilian
where you= there.from= you.went yesterday evening
‘Where did you go last night?’

   B: Au cinema jivu airi sira.
to.the cinema I.went yesterday evening
‘I went to the cinema.’

(28) A: Hanno invitato Marina. Italian
    have.3PL invited Marina

   B: GIULIA hanno invitato, (non Marina).
    Julie have.3PL invited, (not Marina).
‘They invited Julie, not Marina.’
**§ 3. The trigger of FF**

- **Mirative FF:**
  
  (i) It is not contrastive/corrective (i.e. there need not be any salient alternative in the context):

  (ii) The postfocal material (the background) is not necessarily given: the context can be a broad focus sentence.

- **Italian**

  (29) Sapessi che sorpresa! Un anello di diamanti mi ha regalato!  
  knowCOND.2SG what surprise a ring of diamonds to.me has given  
  ‘What a surprise! He gave me a diamond ring!’

  (30) Ti rendi conto! Uno schiaffo mi ha dato!  
  realizeCOND.2SG a slap to.me has given  
  ‘Do you realize?/Can you believe it? He gave me a slap!’

 Unlike information and contrastive FF, mirative FF can occur in out-of-the-blue contexts, where the post-focal material is clearly not given (see Zimmermann 2007 on ‘partial focus movement’, see also Fanselow & Lenertová 2011 on ‘subpart of focus fronting’).
§ 3. THE TRIGGER OF FF

- Next questions:

Q1: Acceptability of mirative FF in Italian

Q2: Does the fronted constituent qualify as focus in the mirative condition?
   (a) Prosodically: Does it bear main prominence? Is the background prosodically subordinate?
   (b) Semantically: Does it evoke a set of alternatives?

Q3: Are mirative and corrective fronted foci grammatically distinct?

Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina (2015, 2016):
- Syntactic experiment → Q1
- Prosodic experiment → Q2(b), Q3
- Semantic analysis in terms of conventional implicatures depending on a focus structure → Q2(a)
§ 3. The trigger of FF

The syntactic experiment (Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina 2015)

• We tested 2 factors in a crossed design:
  a) ‘Focus situ’ with 2 levels (in situ vs. ex situ)
  b) ‘Context type’ with 3 levels (merely contrastive vs. corrective vs. mirative)

• 97 subjects;

• 36 experimental items presented under the following six conditions:

  (i) corrective context, in situ; (ii) corrective context, ex situ;
  (iii) mirative context, in situ; (iv) mirative context, ex situ;
  (v) merely contrastive context, in situ; (vi) merely contrastive context, ex situ.
§ 3. The Trigger of FF

Merely contrastive context: a clause-internal contrast between a focussed element and a parallel element in the negative tag:

(31) A: Io vi saluto, devo rientrare a casa.
    I you greet I.must go-back to home
    ‘I’m off, I have to go back home.’
B: */??[Il TAXI] ti conviene prendere, non [la metro]
    the taxi you’d better take, not the underground
    ‘You’d better take the taxi, not the underground...’

→ Focus is contrastive (there is a salient alternative in the context)
→ The postfocal material is not necessarily GIVEN: the context can be a broad focus sentence.

(There is no surprise or unexpectedness effect as with mirative focus)
§ 3. THE TRIGGER OF FF

- The results of the experiment show that:
  a) Focus in situ is preferred over focus ex situ, even when fronting is fully acceptable. The contrast between focus in situ (corrective and mirative) and focus ex situ (corrective and mirative) is strongly significant ($p<.001$).
  b) FF in mirative and in corrective contexts is accepted as equally good; no statistically significant difference of acceptance rate ($p>.05$).
  c) Merely contrastive focus does not license FF (contrast with corrective focus ex situ and mirative focus ex situ is ‘extremely significant’: $p<0.0001$).
THE PROSODIC EXPERIMENT (Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina 2015, 2016)

- The results show that:
  a) The mirative fronted constituent always bears main prominence.
  b) The rest of the clause is prosodically subordinate, exactly as with corrective focus.

  The fronted constituent in the mirative condition qualifies as focus from the prosodic point of view.

  c) In mirative contexts FF is typically realized with high plateau profile ending on the stressed syllable of the focus element and followed by a fall. The stressed syllable was associated with either H* or H+L*, and the right edge of the focus was associated with low phrase accent (L-).
  d) The prosodic mirative pattern is significantly distinct from the rising pitch accent (L+H*) observed in corrective contexts (cf. also Bocci 2013).

  In Italian, corrective FF and mirative FF are grammaticalized as two as distinct types of foci, marked by different phonological properties. Only mirative FF is possible in polar questions (cf. §4.2).
§ 3. THE TRIGGER OF FF

THE PROSODIC EXPERIMENT (Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina 2015, 2016)

↓↓
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The corrective import (Bianchi & Bocci 2012, Bianchi 2013, BBC 2015)

(32) A: **Hanno invitato** Marina.  
  have.3PL invited Marina  
  ‘They invited Marina.’

B: [GIULIA] **hanno invitato**, (non Marina).  
  Julie have.3PL invited, (not Marina).
  ‘They invited **Julie**, not Marina.’

– (32B) asserts the proposition ‘(John and Mary) invited Julie’;
– Narrow focus in (32B) yields a set of alternative propositions of the form ‘John and Mary invited x’, x an entity;
– (32A) asserts the proposition ‘John and Mary invited Marina’:

 расположен в фокусе, а не в движе

The proposition asserted in (32A) is a focus alternative of the proposition (32B).

(33) **Corrective import** → **Conventional implicature**

There is one focus alternative proposition, already introduced in the context, which is incompatible with the proposition expressed in the corrective reply.
The corrective import (33) is a conventional implicature (Potts 2005, 2007):

(i) It is a speaker commitment;
(ii) It is *not* backgrounded (i.e. already part of the common ground);
(iii) It cannot be denied by the speaker (cf. 34)
(iv) It is not sensitive to higher operators (*say* in (35)):

(34) A: Avete visto Gianni, vero?
   "You saw John, didn’t you?"
B: MARCO abbiamo visto. # E anche Gianni, certo.
   ‘It was Mark that we saw. # And John too, of course.’

(35) A: Gianni darà i documenti a Lucia.
   ‘John will give the documents to Lucy.’
B: No, ha detto [che [A ME] li darà].
   ‘No, he said that he will give them to me.’
· The mirative import (BBC 2015, 2016)

(36) **Una collana di diamanti** mi hanno regalato!
    a necklace of diamonds to-me have.3PL given
    ‘They gave me a diamond necklace!’

– Narrow focus in (36) yields a set of alternative propositions of the form: ‘they gave me x’, where x is an entity.

(37) **Mirative import → Conventional implicature**

There is at least one focus alternative proposition which is *more likely* than the asserted proposition with respect to a contextually relevant modal base and a stereotypical ordering source.

  - the contextually relevant modal base is the context set, i.e. the set of worlds compatible with the common ground information at the point when the proposition is asserted;
  - stereotypical ordering source → a conversational background assigning to every world the set of propositions which represent the normal course of events in that world (Kratzer 2012 [1981]).
Mirative FF does not yield a traditional focus-background partition, in that the background need not be given.

- The mirative import is characterized as a conventional implicature (building on Frey 2010), and the unexpectedness in terms of the comparative likelihood of alternative propositions (Grosz 2011).

- The mirative import can sometimes be interpreted with a bouletic nuance, whereby the asserted proposition is less (or more) desirable than another alternative. This corresponds to the use of a bouletic ordering source instead of a stereotypical one (cf. Grosz 2011).

(38) Caspita! Marina hanno invitato! *Italian*
    gosh/damn Marina have.3PL invited
    ‘Gosh/Damn! They invited Marina!’

On this account, mirative focus evokes a set of alternatives, which is necessary for a correct interpretation of the mirative implicature (NB: the alternatives need not be salient in the context).
The mirative import is a conventional implicature:

(i) It is a speaker commitments;
(ii) It is not backgrounded (i.e. already part of the common ground);
(iii) It cannot be denied by the speaker ((39)
(iv) It is not sensitive to higher operators, e.g. the question operator in (40), contrary to at-issue/descriptive entailments.

(39) Credevo che non sapesse cucinare, invece... Il pollo tandoori ha preparato! I-thought that not be-able.3SG cook instead the chicken tandoori has prepared

# Ma la cosa non mi sorprende... but the thing not me.CL surprises

‘I thought he couldn’t cook, instead... he made tandoori chicken!

# But that doesn’t surprise me.’

(40) Ma domani al mare andate? but tomorrow to-the seaside go.2PL

‘Are you going to the seaside tomorrow?’
Claim: The trigger of FF is the CI itself!

We propose a cartographic implementation of this idea...

a) These CIs have a direct impact on both the semantics and the prosody.
b) In compliance with the T-model of the grammar, the corrective or the mirative implicatures are triggered by a *syntactic feature*; this feature is prosodically signalled on the focus element.

- The different interpretations associated with focus are **CONVENTIONAL IMPLICATURES**, which

  “are conventionally associated with the activation of a left-peripheral functional projection which bears an implicature-triggering feature”

  and which

  “depend on the availability of a focus structure yielding a non-singleton set of alternative propositions in the scope of the implicature trigger: we will dub them focus-associated implicatures” (FAI) (BBC 2015: 17)

(41) \[[\text{FP Force } \ldots [\text{FaiP FAI}^0_{\text{[mir]/[corr]}} [\text{FocP YP}_i [+foc] \text{ Foc}^0_{[foc]} \ldots [\text{TP } \ldots <\text{YP}_i> \ldots ]]]\]
• **FF and non-at issue meanings in polar questions** (Bianchi & Cruschina 2016)

(42) Ma domani al mare andate? *Italian*
    but tomorrow to-the seaside go.2PL
    ‘Are you going to the seaside tomorrow?’

(43) Chi a Maria salutasti? *Sicilian*
    PTC ACC Maria greet.PST.2SG
    ‘Did you say hello to Maria?’

    Every day PTC draws Ivan
    ‘Is it every day that Ivan draws?’

    book PTC Anna read.PST.3SG
    ‘Was it a book that Anna read?’

    to.Paris+PTC Matti have.PRS.3SG be.PP
    ‘Is it Paris that Matti has visited?’
• **In Italian and Sicilian nuclear PQs:**
  (i) FF is not sensitive to the question operator and does not affect the question denotation (what is suspended is the truth value of the proposition, the speaker is nonetheless committed to non-at-issue meaning);
  (ii) FF contributes non-at-issue projective content (i.e. a mirative conventional implicature or a presupposition) which exploits the focus structure (i.e. the set of alternatives).

 ➔ **Contrastive/corrective focus is not possible in PQs**

• **Interaction between Polar Question operator and FF:**
  Approaches that differentiate nuclear PQs from total PQs by assuming that in the former the fronted constituent (i.e. a narrow focus) directly contributes to the ‘building’ of the interrogative clause (like with wh-questions) are too radical in that they fail to predict that nuclear PQs are answered by polar particles, like total PQs:
  o Holmberg (2014) → at the syntactic level
  o Dukova-Zheleva (2010) → at the semantic level
§ 4. **SEPARATING FOCUS FROM ITS MOVEMENT TRIGGER**

- We assume that in yes/no questions the Polar Question illocutive operator Q introduces in the context the polar set \{p, \neg p\}, consisting of the proposition expressed by the sentence radical and its complement.

*The proposition set approach* (Hamblin 1973, Karttunen 1977, Krifka 2001, a.o.)

This approach characterizes the denotation of a question as a set of propositions. The PQ operator is **on top of the sentence radical**: it takes in input the proposition expressed by the latter and returns a question denotation.

(45) \[ \alpha \ Q \ldots \quad \[ TP \ldots \] \]

Q: At which compositional level are the focus structure and the mirative import generated?
(37') *Mirative import* → **Conventional implicature**

There is at least one focus alternative proposition which is *more likely* than the asserted proposition with respect to a contextually relevant modal base and a stereotypical ordering source.

• The mirative import is a conventional implicature and cannot be cancelled:

(46) a. Chi a Maria salutasti? *Sicilian*

       PTC ACC Mary greet.PST.2SG

   ‘Did you greet Mary?’

b. .... Pinsava ca jirivu sciarriati.

       think.PST.1SG that are.PST.2PL fight.PST.PTCP.M.PL

   ‘I thought you had a row.’

c. # ... Propia cumu pinsava.

       exactly like think.PST.1SG

   ‘Exactly as I would have thought.’
The interlocutor B can confirm or deny the at-issue content of A’s question, and at the same time confirm or reject the mirative import conveyed by A’s question:

(47) A: Chi a Maria salutasti? Sicilian
   PTC ACC Mary greet.PST.2SG
   ‘Did you greet Mary?’

   B: Sì, chi c’è di stranu?
      yes what there-is of-strange
   ‘Yes, what’s strange about it?’

   B': Ma no, chi dici?!
      but not what say.2SG
   ‘No (way), what are you talking about?!’
• The mirative implicature requires a set of propositions that do not have an ‘open polarity’ within them. Hence, the implicature must be introduced by a functional layer higher than the focus structure but lower than the Q operator (which, we assume, introduces ‘open polarity’) → β

\[(48) \ [\alpha \ Q \ \ldots \ [\beta \ F-IMP_C \ [\gamma \ [FocP \ XP_F \ [FinP \ \ldots \ <XP_F >]] \sim C \ \gamma] \ \beta] \ \alpha] \ [TP \ \ldots ] \]

Semantic layers of interpretation:
- The TP expresses the proposition \( p \) (the sentence radical).
- The \( \gamma \) layer introduces a contextually relevant set \( C \) of alternative propositions.
- The \( \beta \) layer introduces the mirative import.
- The \( \alpha \) layer encodes the Q operator introducing the polar set.
§ 4. SEPARATING FOCUS FROM ITS MOVEMENT TRIGGER

- **Exhaustive focus in Hungarian**

→ FF involves exhaustive identification or exclusion by identification of the subset of the set of alternatives (Szabolcsi 1994, É. Kiss 1998):

(24') a. Mary *egy kalapot* nézett ki magának. (*exhaustive*)
   Mary a hat.ACC pick.PST.3SG out herself.ACC
   ‘It was (only) a hat that Mary picked for herself.’

   b. Mari ki nézett magának egy kalapot. (*informational*)
   Mary out pick.PST.3SG herself a hat
   ‘Mary picked for herself a hat.’ (É. Kiss 1998: 249)

 italiano FF is not (inherently) exhaustive (cf. Brunetti 2004)...
§ 4. Separating Focus from Its Movement Trigger

- **Hypotheses** on the nature of the exhaustive meaning:

  **Semantic**

  1. [+exhaustive] associated with structural focus/with the focus operator (Szabolcsi 1981), É. Kiss (1998).


  3. **Semantic Presupposition**

  **Pragmatic**

  1. (Conversational) implicature

  2. **Conventional implicature**
     - Gerőcs, Babarczy & Surányi (2014)

     Kas & Lukács (2013: 242):
     “The semantic presupposition and pragmatic implicature hypotheses are lending themselves as possible candidates, since both are concerned with the role of context and the latter with listeners’ inferences.”
QUESTION: 🤔
→ Is Hungarian FF always exhaustive in all contexts (not just in question-answer pairs)? Is it a necessary condition for Hungarian FF?

- QUESTION-ANSWER CONTEXTS
  • Onea & Beaver (2011: §3.4):
    1. “The exhaustiveness inference arises pragmatically from an association between the pre-verbal focus position in Hungarian and the answering constituent for a wh-question under discussion, in the sense of Roberts (1996) and Beaver and Clark (2008).”
    2. “Immediately pre-verbal focus in Hungarian is always the answering constituent to a (possibly implicit) question under discussion.”

• Within the pragmatic approach to FF in Hungarian, all experiments adopt question-answer pairs (following Onea & Beaver 2011). Even when an explicit question is not used, the accommodation of an implicit QUD is assumed (cf. e.g. Gerőcs et al. 2014).
§ 4. SEPARATING FOCUS FROM ITS MOVEMENT TRIGGER

- **Other Contexts** *(not all foci are answers)* *(Cruschina 2016b)*
- To determine whether the **exhaustive** interpretation, typical of question-answer pairs, is a semantic constant of FF, we should test FF in contexts that, presumably, do not require exhaustivity from a pragmatic and conversational viewpoint.

→ **Questionnaire** *(with 22 native speakers)* on:
   - (i) FF in mirative contexts *(including out-of-the-blue contexts)*;
   - (ii) FF in polar questions;
   - (iii) FF in corrective contexts.

☞ **NB**: I won’t discuss cases of answers to questions, but note that FF is found in ‘mention-some’ answers *(e.g. Where can you buy tooth paste over here? – For example, *in the pharmacy* you can buy it; Wedgwood 2005)* and in newspapers headings.
I. Mirative contexts

- (49) and (50) from É. Kiss (2007: 78): could (50B) have a mirative interpretation?

(49) A: MELYIK CSAPAT nyerte meg a világbajnokságot?
   which team won PRT the world-cup
   ‘Which team won the world cup?’

B: AZ OLASZ CSAPAT (nyerte meg a világbajnokságot).
   the Italian team won PRT the world-cup
   ‘The Italian team (won the world cup).’

(50) A: Mi történt?
B: AZ OLASZ CSAPAT nyerte meg a világbajnokságot!
   ‘What happened?’ the Italian team won PRT the world-cup
   ‘It was the Italian team that won the world cup.’

Comment from questionnaire: in (50) “B’s reply implies that it is a surprise that the Italian team won, so it’s weird to negate that in the continuation” (i.e. # bár ezen nem lepődöm meg... ‘but that doesn’t surprise me...’).
Examples from the questionnaire:

(51) [CONTEXT: Anna and Luca talk about Lea, Gianni and their recent wedding]

a) Azt hittem, hogy nincs pénzük! Képzeld!
A MALDÍV-SZIGETEKRÉ utaztak el nászútra!
‘I thought they were penniless!
Guess what! To the Maldives they went on honeymoon!’

  Continuation 1: → ... #  bár ezen nem lepődöm meg...
  but that doesn’t surprise me...

  Continuation 2: → ... és még a Seychelle-szigetekre is (elutaztak)!
  and to the Seychelles too (they went)!

b) # A MALDÍV-SZIGETEKRÉ volt az, ahova nászutra utaztak!
‘It is to the Maldives that they went on honeymoon!’

→ Continuation 1 is judged as odd, while Continuation 2 is considered natural.
A cleft cannot be used in the same context (not even in other languages, e.g.
English or Italian) → mirative focus is not exhaustive!

☞ There need not be any QUD, any presupposition and hence any identification...
II. Polar questions

(52) MARIT hívták meg?
    *Mary* they invited?

(53) a. A szomszédaikon kívül MARIT hívták meg?
    besides their neighbours, *Mary* they invited?

    b. MARIT hívták meg? És Jánost is? Őrület!
    *Marina* they invited? And John too? Oh dear!!

    c. MARIT hívták meg vagy MARIT ÉS JÁNOST (hívták meg)?
    *Mary* they invited or *Mary and John* (they invited)?

⇒ (53c) is possible, but better with *csak* ‘only’ for some speakers (note, anyway, that the exhaustive meaning in the first disjunct can be derived as an implicature associated with the disjunction (also in Italian)).
§ 4. SEPARATING FOCUS FROM ITS MOVEMENT TRIGGER

(54) Anna AZT A KÖNYVET olvasta el?
Anna that book read?

Meaning 1: → Was is really that book that A. read?
Meaning 2: → Is it that book that Anna read?
Meaning 3: → Is it only that book that Anna read?

(55) Márk SZICÍLIÁRA ment el?
Mark Sicily visited?

Meaning 1: → Was it really that book that A. read?
Meaning 2: → Is it Sicily that Mark visited?
Meaning 3: → Is it only Sicily that Mark visited?

⇒ For (54) and (55) speakers found that Meaning 2 (identificational) is the most prominent; Meaning 1 (mirative) is also possible (with the appropriate prosodic contour and context), but crucially Meaning 3 was barely chosen (by two speakers only who pointed out that it might be possible “depending on the context”).
III. Corrective contexts

(56) [CONTEXT: Anna and Luca talk about Lea, Gianni and their recent wedding]

A: Ha jól értettem, a Virgin-szigetekre mentek nászútra.
   ‘If I’ve understood correctly, they went to the Virgin Islands on honeymoon’.
B: Nem, tévedsz! A MALDÍV-SZIGETEKRE mentek nászútra, nem a Virgin-szigetekre.
   ‘No, you are wrong! To the Maldives they went on honeymoon, not to the
   Virgin Islands!’

• Accepted 100%, but is corrective focus exhaustive?
   YES, if we assume that the contextual set of focal alternatives only includes the corrective claim and the antecedent proposition (i.e. the target of the correction) (cf. van Leusen 2004);
   NO, Correction > “The alternative proposition and the corrective claim are incompatible descriptions of one and the same event” >> Only one alternative is excluded, but the predicate might still hold for others.

→ NB: They cannot be used to answer a question (e.g. in Romance).
QUESTION:

Is Hungarian FF always exhaustive in all contexts (not just in question-answer pairs)? Is it a necessary condition for Hungarian FF?

(i) FF in mirative contexts (including out-of-the-blue contexts);
(ii) FF in polar questions;
(iii) FF in corrective contexts.

exhaustivity seems to be a implicature conventionally associated with question-answer contexts...
Conclusions

- The different interpretations and distribution of foci can be accounted for, in a cartographic approach, by assuming that FF can be associated with a family of CIs (& presuppositions) which are directly encoded in the syntax.

- The different features for CIs are responsible not only for the semantic differences, but also for the distinct phonological properties and for the movement to the left periphery → 1 focus, different CIs

**THIS APPROACH** (BBC 2015, 2016) allows for a research enterprise both in:

- **Synchrony** → crosslinguistic variation w.r.t. the CIs that can be associated with FF, FF as a strategy associated with specific structures or contexts, etc.

- **Diachrony** → the conventional association with focus may change over time (cf. non-contrastive focus movement in Medieval Romance, Benincà 2006, Poletto 2014, a.o.).
Thank you!