

Are there two distinct Foci in Italian?

Lisa Brunetti, Università di Firenze/UCLA

UCLA, Department of Linguistics

3125 Campbell Hall

Los Angeles, CA 90095-1543

lisa@humnet.ucla.edu

323-939-6285

Are there two distinct Foci in Italian?

Abstract

It is commonly assumed in the literature (e.g. Rochemont 1986, Zubizarreta 1998, É. Kiss 1998, Belletti 2002, etc.) that two distinct Foci exist: a Focus that expresses new information and a Focus that expresses exhaustivity or contrast. The two Foci not only would have a different interpretation, but also a different prosody and a different syntactic structure.

The aim of this paper is to prove that, at least in Italian, Focus is a single phenomenon. I show that É. Kiss's (1998) arguments in favor of a distinction between two Foci in Hungarian and English do not hold for Italian. I also show that focal stress is always of the same type and is assigned by the same rule, whatever position and interpretation Focus has. I finally demonstrate that Focus expressing new information can move to the left periphery, and that the apparent unavailability of movement is the result of contextual constraints on ellipsis.*

* I am grateful to Daniel Büring, Aniko Czirmaz, Elena Guerzoni, Maria Rita Manzini, Kriszta Szendrői, and the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments. I take responsibility for all errors.

1. Introduction. A focused constituent in Italian either occupies a low position in the clause, as in 1, or moves and fills a high position, as in 2 (the focused constituent is written within square brackets indexed with ‘F’):

(1) Gianni ha vinto [la maglietta]_F.

Gianni has won the T-shirt

‘Gianni won the T-shirt’

(2) [La maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.

the T-shirt has won Gianni

‘It is the T-shirt that Gianni won’

Focus in 1 can either express new information or be used in contrast/correction contexts, as the exchanges below show respectively:

(3) a. Che cosa ha vinto, Gianni?

‘What did Gianni win?’

b. Gianni ha vinto [la maglietta]_F.

Gianni has won the T-shirt

(4) a. Gianni ha vinto la felpa.

‘Gianni won the sweatshirt’

b. No, Gianni ha vinto [la maglietta]_F.

no Gianni has won the T-shirt

According to most of the current literature (Rizzi 1997, Zubizarreta 1998, É. Kiss 1998, Belletti 2002, a.o.), Focus in 2 cannot express new information, it must always occur in contrast/correction contexts, as it is shown by the unacceptability of 5b versus the acceptability of 6b:

(5) a. Che cosa ha vinto Gianni?

‘What did Gianni win?’

b. ??[La maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.

the T-shirt has won Gianni

(6) a. La felpa, l'ha vinta Gianni.

‘As for the sweatshirt, Gianni won it’

b. No, [la maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.

no the T-shirt has won Gianni

In other words, these authors claim that two distinct Foci exist in Italian: one Focus that has a contrastive interpretation and can move to the left periphery, and one Focus that simply expresses new information and cannot move to the left periphery.¹

The aim of this paper, on the contrary, is to show that Focus in Italian is uniform both at the interfaces (interpretive and prosodic) and in the syntax, and therefore, that the difference between 5b and 6b is only apparent.

2. É. Kiss (1998). By taking into account data from Hungarian and English, É. Kiss (1998) proposes that two distinct Foci exist, which she calls Identificational Focus and Information Focus. In Hungarian, Identificational Focus moves to the spec of a F(ocus)P in the left periphery; in English, it is performed by a cleft. É. Kiss also suggests that a ‘contrastive’ Focus in Italian corresponds to Identificational Focus in Hungarian; however, in Italian, Focus either moves to the left overtly (cf. 2) or covertly (cf. 1). In the following sections I will make an accurate comparison of Italian data with the Hungarian (and English) ones, and I will show that É. Kiss’s distinction cannot hold for Italian Focus.²

É. Kiss proposes that the Identificational Focus and the Information Focus differentiate in the following respects:

(7) a. The Identificational Focus expresses exhaustive identification; the Information Focus merely conveys nonpresupposed information.

- b. Universal quantifiers, also-phrases, even-phrases, some-phrases cannot function as Identificational Focus; the type of constituents that can function as Information Focus is not restricted.
- c. The Identificational Focus does, the Information Focus does not, take scope.
- d. The Identificational Focus involves movement, the Information Focus does not.
- e. An Identificational Focus must be an XP available for movement, an Information Focus can be either smaller or larger.
- f. An Identificational Focus can be iterated; an Information Focus can project.

The first three points concern Focus interpretation. É. Kiss claims that an Identificational Focus expresses exhaustive identification, while an Information Focus merely expresses nonpresupposed information. I will discuss Focus interpretation in sections 2.1-2.4. Focus projection, which is a property related to the prosody, and other prosodic differences will be treated in section 3. The syntactic differences between the two Foci will be discussed in section 4.

2.1. Exhaustive identification. A first test É. Kiss provides in order to show that Identificational Focus expresses exhaustive identification consists of comparing the following two exchanges:³

(8) a. Mari [EGY KALAPOT]_F nézett ki magának

‘It was a hat that Mary picked for herself’

b. Nem, egy kabátot is ki nézett

‘No, she picked a coat, too’

(9) a. Mari ki nézett magának [**egy kalapot**]_F.

‘Mary picked herself a hat’

b. # Nem, egy kabátot is ki nézett

‘No, she picked a coat, too’

In 8, the identificationaly focused object represents the only thing Mary picked for herself; in 9, where the object is informationally focused, a hat is just one of the possible things Mary could have picked for herself. The sentence in b denies that Mary picked only one thing, therefore, it is appropriate only if it follows a sentence that asserts that Mary picked only one thing. In English, the same results are obtained when the sentence in a is a cleft (see the translation of 8 and 9).

Consider now the Italian example corresponding to 9:

(10) a. [Un cappello]_F ha comprato Maria.

a hat has bought Maria

‘Maria bought a hat’

b. # No, ha comprato anche un cappotto.

‘No, she bought a coat too’

10a cannot be followed by a sentence like 10b. Therefore, the moved Focus in 10a does not express exhaustive identification. The unacceptability of the exchange in 10 is even clearer if we compare it with an exchange where the first sentence contains a Focus associated with solo ‘only’. Only-phrases inherently express exhaustive identification, so the exchange should be perfect in this case. This is in fact born out by the example below:

(11) a. Maria ha comprato solo [un cappello]_F.

Maria has bought only a hat

‘Maria bought only a hat’

b. No, ha comprato anche un cappotto.

no has bought also a coat

‘No, she bought a coat too’

The exchange in 11 is as good as the Hungarian one in 8. The sentence in 11a excludes that

Mary bought something else apart from a hat.

2.2. Lexical restrictions. According to É. Kiss, further evidence that Identificational Focus expresses exhaustive identification comes from some lexical restrictions concerning Identificational Focus but not Information Focus. She argues that, while Identificational Focus performs a semantic operation characterized as ‘exclusion by identification’, the expressions above perform identification without exclusion. Therefore, their meaning is incompatible with the meaning of Identificational Focus.

Let us put existential quantifiers aside for the moment, and consider É. Kiss’s examples in 12-14:

(12) * Mari [MINDEN KALAPOT]_F nézett ki magának.

Mary every hat-acc picked out herself-dat

* ‘It was every hat that Mary picked for herself’

(13)* Mari [EGY KALAPOT IS]_F nézett ki magának.

Mary a hat-acc also picked out herself-dat

? ‘It was also a hat that Mary picked for herself’

(14) * Mari [MÉG EGY KALAPOT]_F is nézett ki magának.

Mary even a hat-acc also picked out herself-dat

* ‘It was even a hat that Mary picked for herself’

Both in Hungarian and in English the sentences in 12-14 are ungrammatical. In Italian, the same expressions can function as preverbal contrastive Foci. The sentences in 15 are fully grammatical:

(15) a. [Ogni proposta]_F ho preso in considerazione.

every proposal have-1sg taken into account

‘I took into account every proposal’

b. [Anche un cappello]_f gli ha comprato Maria.

also a hat him-dat has bought Maria

‘Maria bought him also a hat’

c. [Persino un cappello]_F gli ha comprato Maria.

even a hat him-dat has bought Maria

‘Maria bought him even a hat’

As for existential quantifiers, É. Kiss acknowledges that, even in Hungarian, an existential quantifier is bad even when it functions as Information Focus. The same happens in Italian, as you can see in 16. Therefore, the incompatibility of an existential quantifier with Focus doesn’t say anything about the difference between the two types of Focus.

(16) a. Chi stai aspettando?

‘Who are you waiting for?’

b. # Sto aspettando [qualcuno]_F.

‘I am waiting for someone’

I believe that the problem with an existential quantifier is its poor informative content, which doesn’t make it a good candidate to represent the informative part of a sentence. This is confirmed by the fact that the quantifier is accepted as Focus if it can be informative enough, like in the following context:

(17) a. Stai aspettando l’autobus?

‘Are you waiting for the bus?’

b. No, sto aspettando [qualcuno]_F.

‘No, I am waiting for someone’

The quantifier is informative because it indicates that I am waiting for a person, not for a means of transportation. Otherwise, the quantifier can be sufficiently informative if it is

included in a broader Focus, so that it does not constitute the only informative part of the sentence. This is shown in (18b) below:

- (18) a. Che cosa stai facendo?
 ‘What are you doing?’
 b. [Sto aspettando qualcuno]_F.
 ‘I am waiting for someone’

An anonymous reviewer points out that the incompatibility of an existential quantifier with a Focus position might be due to the incompatibility between an existential quantifier and ‘referentiality’ (cf. Cinque 1990) induced by the preceding sentence. If the sentence is a question like 16a, chi ‘who’ presumes a referential argument in the answer; if the preceding sentence is in contrast with the following one, the existential quantifier must refer to some specific individual to be contrasted with the individual of the preceding sentence. Evidence comes from the example the reviewer gives, reported below, where the context does not induce referentiality, and the existential quantifier can, in fact, be focused:

- (19) a. Tutti i tuoi amici si sono sposati. E tu? Cosa aspetti?
 ‘Your friends all got married. And you? What are you waiting for?’
 b. Aspetto [qualcuno]_F!
 ‘I’m waiting for someone!’

Of course, if the unacceptability of an existential quantifier as Focus is due to referentiality, my claim remains valid that that unacceptability does not bear any argument in favor of a distinction between two types of Focus.

2.3. Scope. É. Kiss says that only Identificational Focus takes scope. Also this property provides evidence that Identificational Focus expresses exhaustive identification. In fact, exhaustive identification is a property of only-phrases, and it is well known that only-phrases

take scope (see Longobardi 1992 for Italian).

É. Kiss shows that Identificational Focus interacts with the scope of a universal quantifier, but Information Focus doesn't. Her examples are given below:

- (20) a. Minden fiú [MARIVAL]_F akart táncolni. $\forall \gg$ Exhaustive identification
 every boy Mary-with wanted to dance
 ‘For every boy, it was Mary [of the relevant persons] that he wanted to dance with’
- b. [MARIVAL]_F akart táncolni minden fiú. Exhaustive identification $\gg \forall$
 Mary-with wanted to dance every boy
 ‘It was Mary [of the relevant persons] that every boy wanted to dance with’
- (21) a. Kikkel akartak táncolni a fiúk?
 ‘Who did the boys want to-dance with?’
- b. Minden fiú táncolni akart [a szépségkirálynővel]_F.
 every boy to-dance wanted the beauty queen-with
 ‘Every boy wanted to dance with they beauty queen’

According to what É. Kiss says, the meaning of 20a is that every boy wanted to dance with one of all the girls present in the ballroom, and did not want to dance with any other girl (universal quantification takes scope over exhaustive identification). The meaning of 20b, instead, is that Mary is the only girl in the ballroom that was asked to dance by all the boys; other girls may have been asked to dance by smaller subsets of boys (exhaustive identification takes scope over universal quantification). In 21, É. Kiss argues, the universal quantifier takes scope over the whole sentence. In fact, the example may be true in any situation in which some or all the boys wanted to dance with more than one person.⁴

Consider now the Italian example in 22:

- (22) a. Ogni ragazzo [con Maria]_F voleva ballare.
 every boy with Maria wanted to-dance

‘For every boy it was Maria that he wanted to dance with’

b. [Con Maria]_F voleva ballare ogni ragazzo.

with Maria wanted to-dance every boy

‘It was with Maria that every boy wanted to dance with’

Both in 22a and in 22b the focused phrase con Maria has moved to the left periphery. Therefore, the example corresponds to the Hungarian one in 20, where Focus is Identificational. However, contrary to what happens in Hungarian, the different position of the focused phrase does not yield a different truth value of the two sentences in 22. Both 22a and 22b mean that all the boys wanted to dance with one person, and that this person is Mary; neither sentence excludes that some boy wanted to dance also with other girls.⁵

2.4. Contrast. From what we have seen so far, we can conclude then that Italian Focus never expresses exhaustive identification. Nevertheless, one might wonder whether it is the effect of contrast that has to be considered as the semantic property that distinguishes Identificational Focus from Information Focus in Italian. In fact, in the Italian examples I gave so far, Focus is interpreted either as contrastive or as noncontrastive.

But what does ‘contrast’ mean? According to É. Kiss, Focus is contrastive “if it operates on a closed set of entities whose members are known to the participants of the discourse” (É. Kiss 1998:267). Since a D(iscourse)-linked wh phrase requires the speaker to select an individual from a closed set of known candidates (see Pesetsky 1987), É. Kiss predicts that a question with a D-linked wh phrase requires an answer with an Identificational Focus. É. Kiss says that in Italian this is born out by the examples below:

(23) a. Chi ha rotto il vaso?

‘Who broke the vase?’

b. # [Maria]_F ha rotto il vaso.

Maria has broken the vase

(24) a. Chi di voi due ha rotto il vaso?

‘Which of you two broke the vase?’

b. [Maria]_F ha rotto il vaso.

As a matter of fact, according to me and to my informants, the marginality of the sentence in 23b does not disappear at all if the same sentence is used as an answer to a D-linked wh question. Moreover, it seems to me that the difference between a Focus operating on a closed set of known entities and a Focus not operating on a set of known entities is a pragmatic difference, rather than a semantic one. Focus interpretation is always a contrastive one. When I say I ate ravioli and ravioli is focused, I contrast ravioli with any other possible type of pasta or food or edible object I might eat. Since I state that I ate ravioli, I state that I ate them and not something else. What else I didn't eat depends on the discourse context in which the sentence is uttered. If the sentence is preceded by You ate spaghetti, didn't you?, namely, by a sentence that asserts that I ate something different from ravioli, Focus will be explicitly contrastive; if it is preceded by a question like What did you eat for Christmas?, where no alternatives to ravioli are made explicit, it will not be explicitly contrastive. As Lambrecht (1994:290) points out, ‘the impression of contrast which we receive ... arises from particular inferences which we draw on the basis of given conversational contexts’.

These observations are formally expressed for instance by Rooth (1992) in his semantic theory of Focus. Rooth analyses several contexts in which Focus occurs: sentences with focusing adverbs, scales, question-answer (QA) pairs and contrasting sentences. He proposes a unified account for Focus in all those cases.

First, Rooth assumes that a focused phrase has a ‘Focus semantic value’. He indicates it with the notation []^f, to distinguish it from the ordinary semantic value []°. He defines it as ‘a set of propositions obtainable from the ordinary semantic value by making a substitution in the

position corresponding to the focused phrase' (Rooth 1992:76). For instance, the Focus semantic value of a sentence like (25a) is a set of propositions of the form 'I gave x to John', like those in (25b).

(25) a. I gave [a book]_F to John.

b. I gave a book to John, I gave a cd to John, I gave a watch to John, I gave a kiss to John, I gave an advice to John, etc., etc.

Second, Rooth states that:

(26) a. Focus interpretation at the level of a introduces a free variable g, restricted by the formula $g \ [a]^f$

b. The semantic value of any phrase b is a discourse object, available as an antecedent for free variables

c. If $[b]^o \ [a]^f$, the semantic value of a phrase b can serve as the antecedent for the variable introduced by focus interpretation at the level of the phrase a

In a sentence where a focused phrase a is construed as in contrast with a phrase b, the semantic value of b constitutes the antecedent for the variable g introduced by a. The crucial point is that the effect of contrast is not given by Focus, whose semantic interpretation does not change, but by the semantic object available as antecedent for the variable introduced by Focus. In other words, the effect of contrast depends on what precedes the sentence containing Focus, not on Focus itself. Quoting from Rooth:

A constraint requires that some semantic object is either a subset or an element of a focus semantic value. In fact, the difference between the different constraints lies just in the description of this semantic object. This suggests that the characterization of a contrasting object (e.g. as the semantic value of a question, or the underlying set of a scale) is not really part of the theory of focus (Rooth 1992:86).

Summarizing, given that Focus in Italian is never exhaustive, and assuming with Rooth (1992) that contrast is not a semantic property of Focus, I conclude that Focus in Italian is semantically uniform, namely it always expresses new information. The new information expressed by Focus can contradict what is stated in the previous discourse. The effect of contrast that consequently arises, however, is not determined by Focus, but by the discourse context in which Focus occurs.

3. Prosody. Before discussing the prosodic differences that have been claimed to exist between two Foci in Italian and in other languages (not only by É. Kiss 1998: see below Zubizarreta 1998, Donati and Nespor 2003), I would like to briefly mention my assumptions as far as the relation between Focus and stress is concerned.

First of all, I assume Jackendoff's (1972) principle below:

- (27) If a phrase P is chosen as the Focus of a sentence S, the highest stress in S will be on the syllable of P that is assigned highest stress by the regular stress rules.

Such a principle states the relation between Focus and the main sentence stress. Note, however, that it does not state any dependency of Focus on any rule of main stress assignment (the so called Nuclear Stress Rule, NSR). Main stress falls wherever a focused phrase is, no matter how the NSR is formulated. Within the focused phrase, then, stress is assigned according to the NSR. This means that a proper definition of the NSR only matters as far as the position of stress within the focused phrase is concerned. The position of main stress within the whole clause, instead, primarily depends on the position of Focus.⁶

As for the definition of the NSR, I follow Cinque (1993) and assume that it assigns stress to the most embedded element of a focused phrase. According to this formulation of the rule, a sentence with broad Focus (a sentence that is fully focused) will have main stress on its most embedded element. This is shown for example in 28 (italics indicate the stressed word):

(28) a. Cos'è successo?

‘What happened?’

b. [Ho rotto un bicchiere]_F.

‘I broke a glass’

If Focus is narrow, stress will appear on the most embedded element of the focused phrase:⁷

(29) a. Che cosa hai rotto?

‘What did you break?’

b. Ho rotto [un bicchiere]_F

‘I broke a glass’

3.1. Focus projection. É. Kiss claims that only Information Focus can project. Focus projection is the possibility for Focus interpretation to extend its domain to a larger constituent than the one containing the main stress. Chomsky's (1971) famous example showing Focus projection is given in 30. Focus in 30 can be taken as any of the bracketed phrases, as shown by the fact that the sentence can be followed by any of those in 31, depending on the context.

(30) He was [warned [to look out for [an ex-convict [with [a red shirt]]]].

(31) a. No, he was warned to look out for an ex-convict with a red tie.

b. No, he was warned to look out for an ex-convict with [a carnation].

c. No, he was warned to look out for [an automobile salesman].

d. No, he was warned [to expect a visit from the FBI].

e. No, he was [simply told to be more cautious].

Now consider the Italian example below:

(32) a. Che cosa è successo oggi?

‘What happened today?’

b. # [Tuo fratello ho incontrato]_F.

your brother have-1_{sg} met

c. [Ho incontrato tuo fratello]_F.

have-1_{sg} met your brother

‘I met your brother’

Both in 32b and in 32c stress is on fratello. However, in 32b the object tuo fratello has moved to the left periphery, while in 32c, it stays in situ. In both sentences, the DP object may be focused, because stress falls on the most embedded element of that phrase. However, in 32c, also the whole phrase can be focused, because stress also falls on the most embedded element of the whole IP.

The term ‘projection’ is perhaps misleading, since it seems to indicate a sort of ‘percolation’ of Focus interpretation (say, by means of a Focus feature) from the object to the whole clause. On the contrary, it must be taken only as a metaphorical term. Simply, it happens to be the case that there is a prosodic identity between two sentences with two different Focus domains (the DP object and the IP), because of the mechanism of stress assignment we postulate, namely Cinque’s NSR.⁸

Furthermore, it is not true that a Focus whose domain is larger than the constituent bearing stress can only express new information. For instance, in the Italian example below, a contrastive interpretation of Focus does not prevent it from having a domain that is as large as the whole IP:

(33) a. Gianni è ingrassato perché ha mangiato molti muffin.

‘Gianni got fat because he ate many muffins’

b. No, perché [_{IP} ha [bevuto [molte [birre]]]]_F.

‘No, because he drank many beers’

An anonymous reviewer wonders whether this example is appropriate to show Focus projection, given that ‘each of the two IPs is contrasted as a whole’, so ‘there is no ambiguity, no double reading.’ But the ambiguity of a sentence with respect to its Focus only arises when the sentence is in isolation, not when the sentence is given within an appropriate context. Note that 33b in isolation is ambiguous: stress on birre can also indicate that birre alone is focused. This is shown by the full acceptability of that sentence in the following context:

(34) a. Gianni è ingrassato perché ha bevuto molti cocktails.

‘Gianni got fat because he drank many cocktails’

b. No, perché ha bevuto molte [birre]_F.

‘No, because he drank many beers’

Summarizing, Focus projection is not restricted to Focus expressing plain, new information: any Focus interpretation can have a domain larger than the constituent containing the stressed word, if the context requires it.

3.2. Against two different kinds of stress and stress assignment rule. Zubizarreta (1998) claims that there are two different stresses indicating Focus, one that is assigned by the NSR and one that is assigned by a different rule that she calls Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule (E/CSR).

The NSR she proposes, at least for languages like Italian and Spanish, basically functions in the same way as Cinque’s (1993) one, namely stress is assigned to the lower node of the focused phrase.⁹ Focus associated with stress assigned by this rule can only express new information.

The E/CSR assigns stress to focused constituents that have a contrastive interpretation. The rule would explain a sentence like the one below.

(35) [Juan]_F llamó por teléfono (no Pedro).

‘Juan phoned (not Pedro)’

Zubizarreta says that stress in 35 cannot be assigned by the NSR, and that the sentence is fine only if Focus expresses contrast. Therefore, she argues that stress in 35 must be assigned by a different rule specific for stress associated with contrastive Focus.

Both assumptions Zubizarreta takes though are incorrect. As for the contrastive interpretation of Focus in 35, in section 4 I will show that Focus in the left periphery can also be noncontrastive. As for the assumption that the NSR is violated, note that stress falls on the most embedded element of the DP Juan, so the rule is definitely respected.

To see this more clearly, consider the definition of the E/CSR below:

(36) Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule (E/CSR)

A word with contrastive stress must be dominated by every focused constituent in the phrase.

Zubizarreta shows the validity of this rule by reporting the Spanish data in 37 and 38. If stress falls on rojo, the contrastive Focus can be either the adjective alone, or a larger element, up to the whole DP subject; if stress falls on gato, the contrastive Focus can only be el gato, it cannot be any larger constituent.

(37) a. El gato de sombrero [rojo]_F escribió un libro sobre ratones (no el de sombrero azul).

the cat of hat red wrote a book about rats not the-one of hat blue

‘The cat with a red hat wrote a book about rats (not the one with a blue hat)’

b. [El gato de sombrero rojo]_F escribió un libro sobre ratones (no el perro de chaqueta verde).

the cat of hat red wrote a book about rats not the dog of jacket green

‘The cat with a red hat wrote a book about rats (not the dog with a green jacket)’

- (38) a. [El gato]_F de sombrero rojo escribió un libro sobre ratones (no el perro de sombrero rojo).

the cat of hat red wrote a book about rats not the-one of hat blue

‘The cat with a red hat wrote a book about rats (not the one with a blue hat)’

- b. * [El gato de sombrero rojo]_F escribió un libro sobre ratones (no el perro de chaqueta verde).

the cat of hat red wrote a book about rats not the dog of jacket green

‘The cat with a red hat wrote a book about rats (not the dog with a green jacket)’

Rather than showing how the E/CSR works, it seems to me that these examples simply show the validity of the NSR. In fact, in 37 and 38, the NSR makes exactly the right predictions: when stress falls on the most embedded element of the focused phrase, the sentence is grammatical (see 37a, 37b and 38a); when stress does not fall on the most embedded element of the focused phrase, it is ungrammatical (see 38b).

Therefore, it seems to me that the E/CSR is superfluous, because it does not make different predictions from the NSR. This conclusion is dependent on the assumption that a non contrastive Focus can stay in a left peripheral position, namely that sentences like 35 or 37b can be answers to wh questions. As I said, evidence that such an assumption is correct will be given in section 4.

Also Donati and Nespó (2003) pursue the idea that there are two different kinds of stress for Focus: a neutral stress for Focus expressing new information, and an emphatic stress for Focus expressing contrast. They argue that an emphatic stress cannot project, and that a neutral stress cannot be associated to a Focus smaller than a word. We have already seen that

Cinque's NSR and Jackendoff's principle in 27 are sufficient to account for the constraints on Focus projection, and no special stress is required.

Let us consider then the second argument, namely that neutral stress cannot be associated to a Focus smaller than a word. Donati and Nespor say that a part of a compound, like black in the example below, can never be the information Focus of a sentence:

- (39) a. [**John just bought a blackbird**]_F.
 b. John [**just bought a blackbird**]_F.
 c. John just bought [**a blackbird**]_F.
 d. John just bought a ***[black]**_Fbird.

I claim that this restriction does not depend on the type of stress associated with Focus, but on purely pragmatic factors. A whQA pair is the more natural environment in which a focused constituent that does not express contrast can occur. Now, an answer strictly depends on its question. I think that it is this dependence that makes certain Focus domains unacceptable in whQA contexts.

Consider 39d. It is not possible to find a question whose answer is black. Black is part of the word blackbird, so its semantic content is not independent from the rest of the word. The only case in which black can bring new information by itself is when the information provided is metalinguistic. The context question for an answer with Focus expressing metalinguistic information is an echo question where the wh phrase occupies the position of the part of the sentence that the speaker didn't understand.

A question of this type is for instance the Italian one in 40a. The answer in 40b, whose Focus is leo-, is perfectly fine:

- (40) a. Hai visto un 'cosa'-pardo?
 Have-2sg seen a what pard
 b. Ho visto un [leo]_F pardo.

have-2sg seen a leopard

Note that the same kind of metalinguistic information is given by Focus in a contrastive context, as it is shown in 41. However, this context is easier to construct, since it does not have to be a wh question.

(41) a. Quel turista ha visto un ghepardo.

that tourist has seen a cheetah

b. No, ha visto un [leo]_F pardo.

no have-3sg seen a leopard

The more natural status of 41 does not challenge my claim, because again it is the context that makes Focus in 41 available, not the meaning of Focus itself. The context provides the background in which the Focus leo- must occur, namely quel turista ha visto un x-pardo. This kind of background is harder to obtain if the sentence is a wh question; consequently, the corresponding Focus contained in the answer to the wh question is also hard to obtain.¹⁰

In sum, not even Donati and Nespor's distinction between neutral stress and emphatic stress has any reason to exist.¹¹

4. Syntax. In the following sections I am going to discuss É. Kiss's syntactic arguments in favor of two distinct Foci. I am going to show that not even with respect to syntax can we identify two different types of Focus in Italian.

É. Kiss says that the identificationally focused constituent must move to the spec of FP (see point 7d above). The same structure is proposed for English clefts: the cleft constituent occupies the specifier of FP. As a consequence, Identificational Focus must be an XP, because it has to satisfy conditions on movement (see point 7e). Moreover, É. Kiss contrasts the possibility for Identificational Focus to iterate with the possibility for Information Focus to project (point 7f).

I have already shown that Focus projection is not a property restricted to noncontrastive Focus. As for Focus iteration, I assume with Rizzi (1997) that iteration is not a possible operation with Focus in Italian. What is important for our purposes is that the position of the focused element and its interpretation (contrastive or not) do not influence the availability of iteration. This is shown by the examples below:

(42) * [Gianni]_F [ieri]_F ho visto (non Pietro due giorni fa).

Gianni yesterday (I) have seen not Pietro two days ago

(43) a. Chi hai visto e quando lo hai visto?

‘Who did you see and when did you see him/her?’

b. * Ho visto [Gianni]_F [ieri]_F.

(I) have seen Gianni yesterday

As for Focus movement to the left periphery, we have seen in the introduction that only contrastive Focus seems to be allowed to move to the left periphery in Italian (cf. 5 and 6). This fact would support the idea that the syntax of contrastive Focus is different from that of noncontrastive Focus in this language. In the following sections, however, I will show that the unavailability of Focus movement when Focus does not express contrast is only apparent.

4.1. Movement. Consider again the example I gave in 5, repeated below as 44:

(44) a. Che cosa ha vinto Gianni?

‘What did Gianni win?’

b. ??[La maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.

the T-shirt has won Gianni

Rather than unacceptable, the sentence in 44b sounds redundant. As a matter of fact, a short answer with the focused item alone is much better, as illustrated below:

(45) a. Che cosa ha vinto Gianni?

‘What did Gianni win?’

b. [La maglietta]_F.

Is the focused DP in 45b in situ or did it move? I would like to propose that it moved to the left periphery. More precisely, I propose that 45b is the result of two operations: movement of the focused DP to the left periphery and ellipsis of the remnant IP. The structure of 45b is represented in 46:

(46) [DP La maglietta]_j [_{IP} ha [_{VP} vinto Gianni t_j]]

Note that, since I assume that ellipsis is PF deletion, and only constituents can be deleted, Focus movement is a crucial step in order for ellipsis to apply. In fact, if the focused constituent remained in situ, it would be embedded in a larger constituent containing also the nonfocused part. Therefore, ellipsis would be forced to apply to a chunk of that constituent, as in 47:

(47) * [_{IP} ha [_{VP} vinto [_{DP} Gianni] [_{DP} la maglietta]]]

A similar analysis for fragment answers is given by Giannakidou (2000) and by Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni (2002) as far as negative words are concerned. Consider for instance Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni’s analysis of n-words in Italian.

Italian n-words display a twofold behavior: in postverbal position, they behave like Negative Polarity Items (NPIs), preverbally, they behave like real negative words:

(48) Non ho visto nessuno.

not have-1sg seen nobody

‘I didn’t see anybody’

(49) a. Nessuno (*non) ho visto.

nobody have-1sg seen

‘I saw nobody’

Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni propose that n-words, because of their negative morphology,

carry a negative feature that must be checked. Feature checking takes place via movement to a Focus position (FP).¹² In 50b below, the same operation takes place, and then bare argument ellipsis applies, as shown in 51:

- (50) a. Chi hai visto? b. [Nessuno]_F.
 ‘Who did you see?’ ‘Nobody’

(51) [_{FocP} Nessuno_j [_{Foc} \emptyset _{+neg} [_{FP} ~~ho visto t_j~~]]

In my proposal, movement is not related to the negative morphology of the moved item, but to the fact that it is focused, so ellipsis occurs in all cases, not just with negative words.

4.2. Evidence for a movement-and-ellipsis analysis of short answers. Another account where fragments are treated in terms of (Focus) movement and ellipsis is Merchant (2003). Along the lines of Hankamer (1979), Morgan (1973), and others, Merchant presents several pieces of evidence in favor of such an approach to fragments.

First of all, he observes that in languages with morphological Case there is matching between the Case of the fragment DP (or PP) and the corresponding DP (or PP) in the full sentence. I report one of his examples (from Greek):

- (52) a. Pjos idhe tin Maria?
 ‘Who saw Maria?’
 b. O Giannis. / *Ton Gianni.
 the Giannis-nom / the Giannis-acc
 c. O Giannis idhe tin Maria / *Ton Gianni idhe tin Maria
 the Giannis-nom saw the Maria / the Giannis-acc saw the Maria

In Italian, only personal pronouns display morphological Case. In 53, the first person pronoun is nominative both in the fragment and in the full sentence.

- (53) a. Chi è andato alla manifestazione?

‘Who went to the demonstration?’

b. Io. / *Me.

I-nom / me-acc

c. Io sono andata alla manifestazione. / * Me sono andata alla manifestazione.

I am gone to the demonstration me am gone to the demonstration

Merchant also observes that Binding Theory is respected in fragment answers. His English examples below concern principles C, B, and A respectively:

(54) a. What does John_i think?

b. * That the bastard_i is being spied on.

c. * John_i thinks that the bastard_i is being spied on.

(55) a. Who did John_i try to shave?

b. * Him_i. / * John_i tried to shave him_i.

(56) a. Who does John think Sue will invite?

b. ??Himself. / ??John thinks Sue will invite himself.

The same results are obtained with the corresponding Italian data in 57-59:

(57) a. Che cosa pensa Gianni?

‘What does Gianni_i think?’

b. * Che lo scemo_i sia spiato.

‘That the idiot_i is being spied on’

c. * Gianni_i pensa che lo scemo_i sia spiato.

‘Gianni_i thinks that the idiot_i is being spied on’

(58) a. Chi ha cercato di radere, Gianni_i?

‘Who did John_i try to shave?’

b. * Lui_i / *Gianni_i ha cercato di radere lui_i.

‘Him_i’ ‘John_i tried to shave him_i’

(59) a. Chi crede Gigi_i che Laura inviterà?

‘Who does Gigi believes Laura will invite?’

b. * Se stesso_i. / * Gigi_i crede che Laura inviterà se stesso_i.

‘Himself’ ‘Gigi believes Laura will invite himself’

Concluding, Italian data support Merchant’s data by providing evidence that the fragment and the corresponding element in the full answer have the same properties.

4.3. Evidence for movement in fragments. Merchant (2003) also provides some pieces of evidence for movement in fragment answers.

A first argument is that, in languages that admit preposition stranding, the fragment is made of a ‘bare’ DP, while in languages that do not admit preposition stranding, the fragment includes the preposition. Below, I report Merchant’s data from English, which admits preposition stranding.

(60) a. Who was Peter talking with?

b. Mary. / * With Mary.

61 shows that Italian, which does not admit preposition stranding, requires the preposition in the fragment answer.

(61) a. Con chi ha parlato Anna?

with whom has spoken Anna

b. Con Carlo. / ?? Carlo.

with Carlo

A stronger piece of evidence for movement in fragments given by Merchant is island sensitivity. Island sensitivity in an answer to a wh question is difficult to test, because the corresponding wh question is also subject to island constraints. In order to avoid this

problem, Merchant adopts two strategies. One is to consider multiple wh questions where one wh element is within the island:

- (62) a. Which committee member wants to hire someone who speaks which language?
 b. Abby wants to hire someone who speaks Greek and Ben wants to hire someone who speaks Albanian.
 c. *Abby Greek, and Ben Albanian.

The other strategy is to ask yes/no questions with stress on a certain constituent, like that in 63: the question becomes an implicit wh question where the wh phrase replaces the stressed constituent. Since the constituent does not move to the left, the question is not subject to island effects.

- (63) a. Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
 b. No, she speaks the same Balkan language that Charlie speaks.
 c. *No, Charlie.

The ungrammaticality of the short answers in 62c and 63c is expected if the second fragments in 62c (Greek and Albanian) and the fragment Charlie in 63c have moved to the left prior to ellipsis. In fact, if the fragments derive from the full sentences in 62b and 63b, it is evident that their movement occurred across islands.¹³

The second strategy in particular gives the same results in Italian, as it is shown by the example below:

- (64) a. Melissa parla la stessa lingua balcanica che parla Tina?
 ‘Does Melissa speak the same Balkan language that Tina speaks?’
 b. No, parla la stessa lingua balcanica che parla Vito.
 no speak-3sg the same language Balkan that speaks Vito
 c. * No, Vito.

4.4. Ellipsis of the background. So far, I have shown that movement of Focus carrying new information is possible. I haven't explained yet why a sentence like 44b is marginal as an answer to the question in 44a. The example is repeated below as 65.

(65) a. Che cosa ha vinto Gianni?

‘What did Gianni win?’

b. ??[La maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.

the T-shirt has won Gianni

Marginality seems to be related to absence of ellipsis, as the corresponding short sentence in that context is fully acceptable:

(66) a. Che cosa ha vinto Gianni?

b. La maglietta.

Why should ellipsis be necessary, in order to make the sentence fully acceptable? Before giving an explanation for that, I would like to consider a different phenomenon, namely preverbal subject omission.

Lambrecht (1994) observes that the occurrence of a subject pronoun in a coordinate clause in English depends on the information structure of the two clauses. His examples are the following:

(67) John married Rosa, but didn't really love her.

(68) a. Who married Rosa?

b. John married her, but he didn't really love her.

c. *? John married her, but didn't really love her.

In 67, where the subject of the first clause, John, is not focused, omission of the pronoun in the second clause is possible; in 68, where John is focused, the pronoun cannot be omitted.

Lambrecht says that the contrast between 67 and 68c is explained ‘if we make the functionally reasonable assumption that for an argument to appear in phonologically null

form in English the referent of the argument must have been established as a topic in previous discourse' (Lambrecht 1994:136). In conclusion, Lambrecht shows that the absence of a preverbal subject in a sentence depends on the presence of a Topic antecedent for the omitted subject.

Given that a preverbal subject usually has Topic properties, the generalization made by Lambrecht (1994) for English can be reformulated by saying that a subject Topic is omitted whenever it has an antecedent that is also a Topic. I would like to extend such a generalization to background material in general and to apply it to Italian. Assuming that ellipsis is an instance of anaphora, and therefore elided material must have an antecedent (cf. Williams 1997), I argue that:

- (69) Ellipsis of the background in a sentence applies if the elided material has an antecedent which is also background.

Such a generalization gives the conditions of acceptability of an answer to a wh question.

To see how the generalization works, consider WhQA pairs. I assume that the wh phrase of a question, which corresponds to the focused constituent in the answer, is always the Focus of the question.¹⁴ In other words, a wh question and its answer have corresponding Foci. Then, also the background part in a wh question corresponds to that of the answer. Given the generalization in 69, this means that the background of the answer is usually elided. This is shown in 70 below.

- (70) a. [Che cosa]_F ha vinto Gianni?
 ‘What did Gianni win?’
 b. [La maglietta]_F ~~ha vinto Gianni~~.
 the T-shirt has won Gianni

The background of 70a and 70b is the same, namely the verb and one of its arguments (the subject). The background of 70b, then, has an antecedent in 70a, and therefore, given the

generalization in 69, it is elided.

Consider now contrastive exchanges. The informational partition of a contrasting sentence can be either the same or different from that of the preceding sentence. If the background part of the contrasting sentence has no antecedent in the preceding sentence, then ellipsis is not allowed. This is shown in 71.

- (71) a. La felpa, l'ha vinta [Gianni]_F¹⁵
 ‘Gianni won the sweatshirt’
- b. # No, [la maglietta]_F.
- c. No, [la maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.
 no the T-shirt has won Gianni
 ‘No, Gianni won the T-shirt’

While in a whQA context a short answer is preferred, and movement to the left is not visible, in this context a short answer is excluded, so movement to the left can be overtly seen.

Note that the absence of the predicate in 71b gives a very bad result. In fact, the fragment is ambiguous. The elided background clearly cannot be the same as that of the previous sentence, so the hearer does not have any clue to recover it, and s/he can only grab it intuitively, from the general sense of the conversation.

It is also possible that the background part of a contrasting sentence has an antecedent with the same discourse status. In such a case, given the generalization 69, the prediction is that ellipsis preferably applies, like in whQA pairs. This is in fact born out by the example below, where the background part of the first sentence is the same as that of the second sentence.

- (72) a. Gianni ha vinto [la felpa]_F.
 ‘Gianni won the sweatshirt’
- b. No, [la maglietta]_F.
- c. ?? No, [la maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.

The difference between whQA contexts and contrastive contexts is then in the fact that the former usually favor ellipsis, while the latter can either favor ellipsis or not.

It is important to highlight the fact that ellipsis is never obligatory. A full sentence with a preverbal Focus is not ungrammatical. However, the presence of an antecedent makes the background of that sentence ‘redundant’, and therefore, unacceptable in that context.

Furthermore, even when the context favors ellipsis, a full sentence is never completely unacceptable. What we have to consider is not just whether the full sentence is acceptable, but whether the short sentence is more acceptable than the full sentence.¹⁶

The same difference we have found among examples 70-72 holds also among examples 73-75 below, where it is the subject, rather than the object, that is focused.

(73) a. Chi ha vinto la felpa?

‘Who won the sweatshirt?’

b. [Gianni]_F / ??[Gianni]_F ha vinto la felpa.

Gianni has won the sweatshirt

(74) a. Paolo ha vinto [la felpa]_F.

‘Paolo won the sweatshirt’

b. # No, [Gianni]_F / No, [Gianni]_F ha vinto la felpa

(75) a. La felpa, l’ha vinta [Paolo]_F.

‘Paolo won the sweatshirt’

b. No, [Gianni]_F / ?? No, [Gianni]_F ha vinto la felpa.

When the elided predicate is not made of the verb and its argument but of the verb alone, the contrast between sentences with ellipsis and sentences without ellipsis, in contexts where ellipsis is preferable, is less evident. This is consistent with my proposal. In fact, the burden of the background part is much smaller in these sentences, and therefore, the redundancy effect is consequently weaker. See the following examples, where the first person subject has

been dropped:

(76) a. [Che cosa]_F hai vinto alla gara?

‘What did you win at the race?’

b. [La maglietta]_F. / ?[La maglietta]_F ho vinto.

the T-shirt have-1sg won

(77) a. [La felpa]_F hai vinto, vero?

‘You won the sweatshirt, didn’t you?’

b. No, [la maglietta]_F. / ? No, [la maglietta]_F ho vinto.

no the T-shirt have-1sg won

Note however that, in a contrastive context where ellipsis should not occur, the sentence with ellipsis is still very marginal, as it was in previous examples in 71 and 74.

(78) a. La felpa, almeno, [l’hai vinta]_F.

‘At least, you won the sweatshirt’

b. # No, [la maglietta]_F. / No, [la maglietta]_F ho vinto.

Summarizing, both information Focus and contrastive Focus can move to the left periphery. However, movement of information Focus is generally accompanied by ellipsis of the non-focused part of the sentence, because of the conditions on ellipsis stated by the generalization in 67. This makes movement not overtly visible. Movement of contrastive Focus, instead, is not always accompanied by ellipsis, so it is sometimes overtly visible. This gives the impression that only a contrastive Focus can move to the left.

An anonymous reviewer observes that, according to my condition on ellipsis, the following non redundant exchange should be correct, which instead is not:

(79) a. Che risultato ha raggiunto Gianni?

‘What result did Gianni achieve?’

b. # Una medaglia ha vinto.

a medal have-3sg won

‘He won a medal’

The unacceptability of 79b as an answer to 79a does not contradict what I said above. We have seen that the main sentence stress must fall on the focused phrase and, within the focused phrase, on the most embedded element of it. Stress in 79b is on medaglia.¹⁷ Thus, Focus of 79b can only be the object, it cannot be the whole sentence. But 79b should be fully focused, given the question it answers; hence, it is unacceptable in that context. If una medaglia were in situ (Ha vinto una medaglia), then stress on medaglia would be appropriate to indicate that the whole IP is focused, and the sentence would be fine as an answer to 79a.¹⁸

4.5. In situ Focus. A full sentence with an in situ Focus is acceptable in contexts which would require ellipsis, as those in 80 and 81:

(80) a. [Che cosa]_F ha vinto Gianni?

‘What did Gianni win?’

b. (Gianni) ha vinto [la maglietta]_F.

Gianni has won the T-shirt

(81) a. Gianni ha vinto [la felpa]_F.

‘Gianni won the sweatshirt’

b. No, (Gianni) ha vinto [la maglietta]_F.

Why is the background material acceptable when Focus stays in situ? If you recall, in section 4.1. I said that ellipsis is not allowed if the focused item remains in situ, because it would be forced to apply to a chunk of a constituent. I think that it is the impossibility of having ellipsis that makes the material preceding Focus tolerable.

(82) * [_{IP} [_{DP} Gianni] [_I ha vinto [_{VP} [_{DP} la maglietta]]]

Note, however, that the subject can be omitted, because Italian has null subjects. In that case,

as expected, the result is more acceptable.

4.6. Movement of information Focus without ellipsis. I have shown that the unavailability of information Focus movement in Italian does not depend on the fact that Focus expresses new information, but on the fact that information Focus occurs in an answer to a wh question. Thus, if we find a different context which does not provide an antecedent for the background, information Focus movement should be visible. I believe that the following sentence occurs in such a context:

(83) Ora ricordo: [i guanti]_F mi ha regalato Luigi per Natale.

now remember-1sg the gloves me-dat has given Luigi for Christmas

‘Now I remember: it was the gloves that Luigi gave me as a present for Christmas’

The sentence is uttered ‘out of the blue’, as it is clear from the fact that it begins with Sai... ‘You know...’. However, the sentence is not all new. That Luigi gave me a present for Christmas is background, namely it was uttered in a discourse event that took place in a relatively recent past, and is recalled to attention by the speaker of 83. The speaker utters that sentence as a continuation of that prior discourse event. Since the background in 83 does not have an antecedent that is immediately recoverable from the current discourse context, ellipsis does not apply.

4.7. Why movement?

Having shown that Focus in Italian is uniform at both the interfaces and the syntax, a problem that arises is how to account for the difference between Hungarian Focus and Italian Focus, given that both can move to the left periphery but, when the former moves, it gets an exhaustive interpretation, when the latter moves, it does not get an exhaustive interpretation.

Horvath (2000) proposes that Focus movement in Hungarian is not triggered by a Focus feature, but by an Exhaustive Identificational feature. In her account, a focused phrase associates (by movement) to an Exhaustive Identificational operator in the left periphery in the same way as it associates with operators like only, also. In other words, she says that Focus in Hungarian has the same properties in both positions: what changes is that, when Focus moves, it associates with the Exhaustive operator, hence the exhaustive interpretation. Such an account can explain the differences between Italian and Hungarian: in Italian, Focus movement is just Focus operator movement; in Hungarian, Focus movement is movement to an Exhaustive operator, which is independent from Focus.

Another question that may arise with a single account for Focus is why Focus can either move to the left periphery or stay in situ, given that its interpretation is the same in both cases.

Belletti (2002), among others, proposes that a low (contrastive) Focus moves to the left periphery, and then remnant movement of the IP applies to a higher position. In other words, Focus movement occurs both when Focus is high and when it is low, but in the second case another movement, that of the remnant IP, occurs so that Focus ends up again in the lowest position of the clause. Belletti's analysis allows us to say that Focus always occupies a position in the left periphery. This result, however, is gained at the expense of proposing two positions for the remnant IP. Therefore, it seems to me that the problem of having two structures is not solved, but just shifted.

I would rather keep a more traditional assumption, namely that Focus in situ moves at LF to the same position as the moved Focus. In other words, I assume that there is no real difference between the in situ and the moved position of Focus.¹⁹

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have shown that Focus in Italian is a single phenomenon, both at the interfaces and in the syntax.

From an interpretive point of view, I have challenged É. Kiss's (1998) claim that there are two different Foci, one that expresses exhaustive identification and one that expresses new information. All tests É. Kiss uses in order to show this difference do not work for Italian, so at least for this language it is not possible to conclude that there are two semantically different Foci. Italian Focus never expresses exhaustive identification.

Although Focus in Italian can express contrast, I have argued that this property cannot be considered as a semantic distinction between two Foci. In fact, I have followed a branch of studies, among which Rooth (1992), that claim that contrast is not a semantic property, but rather, it is an effect of the discourse context in which Focus occurs.

From a prosodic point of view, I have shown that Donati and Nespor (2003) are wrong when they claim that a contrastive stress and a noncontrastive one determine different domains of Focus interpretation. Italian data show that Focus projection to the whole clause can occur also when Focus is contrastive. As for the claim that a noncontrastive Focus cannot be smaller than a word, I have argued that it depends on the fact that it is very difficult (although not impossible) to formulate a *wh* question on a part of a word; consequently, it is also difficult to have the corresponding answer with information Focus.

I have further shown that Zubizarreta's Emphatic/Contrastive Stress Rule is not necessary, as it makes the same predictions as the NSR, namely that stress on a focused phrase is assigned to the most embedded constituent of the phrase.

Being Focus uniform at the interfaces, I have made the prediction that its syntax is also uniform. This idea contrasts with the fact that Focus movement in Italian can apparently occur only when Focus is contrastive: Focus on the left periphery cannot answer a *wh* question. I have argued that this restriction is not due to Focus, but to contextual constraints

on ellipsis. I have proposed a generalization which says that ellipsis of the background in a sentence occurs if it has an antecedent that is also background. The results of such a generalization are that in a whQA pair, Focus movement has to be followed by ellipsis; in a contrastive pair, Focus movement can or cannot be followed by ellipsis, depending on the information structure of the first sentence of the pair. Therefore, although a focused element can always move to the left periphery, in a whQA pair the movement is followed by ellipsis of the rest of the sentence, so it is not overtly visible; in a contrastive pair, ellipsis does not always follow, so Focus movement to the left can be overtly visible. That gives the impression that only contrastive Focus can move to the left periphery.

References

- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2003. The features of movement in Romanian. Retrieved August, 2003 from University of Bucharest Web site: <http://www.unibuc.ro/eBooks/filologie/alboiu/>
- Alonso-Ovalle, Luis, and Elena Guerzoni. 2002. Double negatives, negative concord and metalinguistic negation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago.
- Avesani, Cinzia and Mario Vayra. 1999. Costruzioni marcate e non marcate in italiano. Il ruolo dell'intonazione'. Atti delle X Giornate GFS, ed. by Donatella Locchi, Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale. 1-14.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2002. Aspects of the low IP area. The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 2, ed. by Luigi Rizzi. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benincà, Paola; Salvi, Giampaolo; and Lorenza Frison. 1988. L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. Grande Grammatica italiana di consultazione I, ed. by Lorenzo Renzi and Giampaolo Salvi. Bologna: Il Mulino. 115-225.

- Benincà, Paola and Cecilia Poletto. 1999. Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. Paper presented at the Workshop on the Cartography of Syntactic Positions and Semantic Types, Pontignano, Italy.
- Brunetti, Lisa. 2003. A Unification of Focus. Florence, Italy: University of Florence dissertation.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1971. Deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation. *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, ed. by Danny D. Steinberg and Leon A. Jacobovits. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 183-216.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. Types of A-bar dependencies. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1993. A null theory of phrase and compound stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24. 239-267.
- D'Imperio, Maria Paola. 1997. Narrow focus and focal accents in the Neapolitan variety of Italian. *Intonation: Theory, Models and Applications. Proceedings of an ESCA Workshop*, ed. by Antonis Botinis; Georgios Kouroupetroglou; and George Carayiannis, Athens, Greece. 87-90.
- Donati, Caterina, and Marina Nespør. 2003. From focus to syntax. *Special Issue of Lingua* 113, ed. by Asli Goksel and Sumru Ozsoy. 1119-114.
- Drubig, Hans Bernhard. 1994. Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus. *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs* 340.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74. 245-273.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2000. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Frascarelli, M. 2004. L'interpretazione del Focus e la portata degli operatori sintattici. *Atti del Convegno Nazionale 'Il Parlato Italiano'*, ed. by Federico Albano Leoni et al., Napoli, February 2003.

- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2000. Negative ... concord? *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18. 457-523.
- Gryllia, Stella. 2003. Why a preposed focus phrase needs not to be interpreted exhaustively *Studies in Greek Linguistics*, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki.
- Haidou, Kostantina. 2003. The syntax-prosody interface of Focus phenomena in Greek. PhD Thesis. SOAS, University of London.
- Hankamer, Jorge. 1979. Deletion in coordinate structures. New York: Garland.
- Horvath, Julia. 2000. Interfaces vs. the Computational System in the Syntax of Focus. *Interface Strategies*, ed. by Hans Bennis, and Martin Everaert. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics. 183-206.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form. Topic focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1992. In defence of the Correspondence Hypothesis: Island effects and parasitic constructions in Logical Form. *Logical Structure and Linguistic Structure*, ed. by C.-T. James Huang, and Robert May. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 149-196.
- Merchant, Jason. 2003. *Fragments and ellipsis*, ms.
- Morgan, Jerry. 1973. Sentence fragments and the notion 'sentence'. *Issues in linguistics*, ed. by Braj B. Kachru; Robert B. Lees; Yacov Malkiel; and Angelina Pietrangeli. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 719-751.
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. Wh-in-situ: Movement and Unselective Binding. *The representation of (in)definiteness*, ed. by Eric Reuland, and Alice ter Meulen, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 281-337.
- Rochemont, Michael. 1986. *Focus in generative grammar*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A Theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1.1.75-116.
- Szendrői, Kriszta. 2001. *Focus and the Syntax-Phonology Interface*. London: UCL dissertation.
- Williams, Edwin. 1997. Blocking and anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 28.4.577-628.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa. 1998. *Topic, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Notes

¹ The existence of two different Foci has been claimed also for other languages in the literature. See for example Rochemont (1986) for English, É. Kiss (1998) for Hungarian, Zubizarreta (1998) for Spanish, Alboiu (2003) for Romanian, etc.

² É. Kiss's arguments in favor of two distinct Foci have also been partially challenged for Italian by Frascarelli (2000).

³ I indicate Identificational Focus with capital letters, Information Focus with boldface.

⁴ It is not clear to me how É. Kiss can show that this Focus does not take scope, given the fact that she does not compare 21b with a sentence with the opposite order of the two scope-taking elements, namely with the focused item occupying a position higher than that of the universal quantifier.

⁵ Contrary to what an anonymous reviewer believes, in 22 I do not want to compare a

sentence with an in situ Focus with a sentence with a moved Focus. Rather, I want to compare two sentences with a moved Focus, namely a Focus that É. Kiss believes to be Identificational, like that in the Hungarian example in 20. It is this kind of Focus that should give rise to scope interactions with a universal quantifier. In the Italian example, however, it does not, because 22a and 22b have the same meaning.

⁶ Rochemont (1986) and Reinhart (1995), among others, reformulate the NSR so that it can also account for the relation between Focus and stress. I claim instead that the dependency of stress on Focus cannot be ascribed to a prosodic rule. Although the NSR, as formulated by Cinque (1993), is respected within the focused phrase, nevertheless it does not say anything about the position the focused phrase occupies in the sentence. See Brunetti (2003, chapter 2) for a detailed discussion on this point. In Brunetti (2003, chapter 6) I also give a nonprosodic explanation of the relation between stress and Focus. I propose that Focus is encoded in the grammar by means of an intonational morpheme, which is represented by the pitch accent falling on the focused phrase.

⁷ Assuming as I do that the NSR does not determine the position of Focus, but simply the position of stress within a phrase, when the focused element is a head alone, stress simply falls on the head itself. The Focus of the following sentence provided by an anonymous reviewer, with stress on tre, can only be the head of the NumP tre.

(i) Ho visto tre studenti.

Have-1sg seen three students

⁸ The two sentences might differ in the type of stress indicating narrow Focus and broad Focus respectively. See Avesani and Vayra (1999), D'Imperio (1997), a.o.

⁹ For languages such as English, German and French, Zubizarreta (1998) proposes that the NSR works differently: it is not the depth of embedding that is relevant for stress assignment, but the order established by a sequence of selected heads (selectional ordering).

¹⁰ Similar observations could be made about focused determiners, prepositions, or other functional elements.

¹¹ The two stresses have no reason to be distinguished even from the point of view of their acoustic properties. See Brunetti (2003, chapter 4) for some arguments. See also the references quoted therein, in particular Frascarelli (2004), which presents empirical acoustic data against a distinction between a contrastive stress and a neutral stress.

¹² An account for negation where the negative element moves to spec,FocP is also given by Frascarelli (2000).

¹³ Similar data concerning island effects with fragments had already been given in the literature. See for instance Pesetsky (1987) and Drubig (1994), although their theoretical conclusions are different.

¹⁴ I assume that the matching between Focus and stress is not required when the focused phrase is a wh phrase; main stress in a question does not fall on the wh phrase, but at the end of the clause. For more details on Focus in wh questions, see Rochemont (1986) and Zubizarreta (1998).

¹⁵ The object is left dislocated, since VOS order with Focus on the subject (see i), is very marginal in Italian.

(i) *? Ha vinto la felpa [Gianni]_F.

has won the sweatshirt Gianni

¹⁶ An anonymous reviewer observes that in Greek an answer corresponding to that in 70b, without ellipsis, is fine. Given what I have just said in the text, what would have to be checked is whether in Greek the short answer in 70b is preferable than the full sentence. If the acceptability of a short and a full sentence is exactly the same, then the generalization I have proposed in 69 does not work for Greek. This would mean that in Greek the uniformity of Focus is syntactically evident. (As for the uniformity of interpretation, see Gryllia (2003) and

Haidou (2003) who show that Focus in Greek can be either identificational or informational both in the left periphery and in situ).

¹⁷ The reviewer does not specify where stress should be in this sentence. However, stress on any other position would make the sentence ungrammatical.

¹⁸ The reviewer also argues that my argument is contradicted by the wellformedness of the following exchange:

(i) a. Che medaglia ha vinto Gianni?

‘What medal did Gianni win?’

b. [La medaglia d’oro]_F ha vinto.

the medal gold have-3sg won

‘He won he gold medal’

I guess that with this kind of example the reviewer wants to highlight the difference between an exchange with a ‘regular’ wh-question and an exchange with a D-linked wh-question. It doesn’t seem to me though that with the latter, an answer with a preverbal Focus is more acceptable, as I have already pointed out when discussing É. Kiss’s (1998) examples 23 and 24. The exchange in i is in effect not bad, but this is because the subject in the answer is omitted (cf. 76), not because the question is D-linked.

¹⁹ For a more detailed discussion on this issue, and slightly different conclusions, see Brunetti (2003, chapter 6).