

# On the Necessity of In-Situ Focalization

Vieri Samek-Lodovici

University College London

Paper presented at the 50<sup>th</sup> Poznań Linguistic Meeting

Keywords: Left-periphery, Contrastive focalization, Focus projection, Italian

Ever since Rizzi (1997), many scholars of word order effects due to focalization have assumed the existence of a unique left-peripheral FocP projection dedicated to contrastive foci. Even when visually in-situ, these foci are claimed to obligatorily move to the specifier of FocP in order to be identified as focused (Rizzi 2017:335-336, 2018:150-152, Bianchi 2019).

Semantically, focalization does not need movement to FocP. Rooth's alternative semantics model successfully calculates the focus value of focused constituents even if they remain in-situ (Rooth 1992, Wagner 2020: section 3.16). My talk explores a set of constructions where focalization in the specifier of FocP is impossible for structural reasons, leaving focalization in-situ as the only possible analysis.

For example, hanging topics are uncontroversially assumed to be base-generated above FocP (Benincà 2001, Benincà & Poletto 2004, Giorgi 2015) or as an unintegrated orphan constituent (Shaer & Frey 2004). As such, they are unable to move to FocP and, therefore, ought to be unable to focalize. Instead, as expected of focalization can occur in-situ, focalization remains possible; see (1B) in dialogue (1). Incidentally, hanging topics systematically require clitic-doubling even when focused, challenging the assumption that focus is necessarily incompatible with clitic-doubling.

(1) A: Tu non parli abbastanza con tuo figlio.  
You not speak enough with your son  
'You do not speak enough with your son.'

B: MioMARI<sub>HT,F</sub> non ci parlo abbastanza! Non mio figlio.  
My husband, (I) not cl speak enough! Not my son  
'I do not speak enough with my HUSBAND. Not my son.'

A second example: contrastive foci can occur in interrogative clauses, see the second sentence in (2). This is expected if these foci can focus in-situ, but it is predicted impossible if they must move to specFocP, since this specifier is here filled by the wh-phrase.

(2) Va bene, Anna parla oggi. Ma quando<sub>wh</sub> parla MARIA<sub>F</sub>?  
Goes well, Ann speaks today. But when speaks Mary?  
'Ok, Ann speaks today. But when will Mary speak?'

Third: interrogative clauses can be focused. See (3), where both sentences are uttered by a teacher speaking to her students and correcting the question uttered in (a) with that in (b). Focalization in specFocP is impossible because FocP here lies inside the focused sentence. Focalization instead remains unproblematic under focalization in-situ where the top projection can be marked with a focus feature.

(3) a. Quale potenze straniere hanno interferito nelle elezioni Italiane?  
Which powers foreign have interfered in-the elections Italian  
'Which foreign powers interfered with the Italian elections?'

b. Anzi. [Cos'ha fatto l'Italia per difender-si dalle interferenze russe?]<sub>F</sub>

Or-Rather. What has done the=Italy to to-defend-self from-the-interferences Russian?  
'Or rather. What did Italy do to defend itself from Russian interferences?'

Fourth, focused verbal heads, like 'CHIAMATO' in reply (4B) in dialogue (4), are expected if focalization can occur in-situ, but problematic if requiring movement to specFocP. Heads cannot move to specifier positions and the auxiliary 'ha' blocks head-movement to the head of FocP.

(4) A: Marco ha incontrato Maria.  
Mark has met Mary.  
'Mark met Mary.'

B: No. Marco ha CHIAMATO<sub>F</sub> Maria. Non l'HA incontrata.  
No. Mark has called Mary. (He) not cl=has met.  
'No. Mark CALLED Mary. He did not meet her.'

Fifth, the uniqueness of FocP predicts at most one focus per clause. Yet, multiple foci are possible, see (5) and the related growing body of literature (e.g. Krifka 1991, Beck & Vasisht 2009, Wagner 2009, 2020). Multiple foci are unexpected under FocP but unproblematic under focalization in-situ.

(5) Con MARTA<sub>F</sub> ha giocato MARCO<sub>F</sub>.  
With Marta, has played Mark.  
'As for who played with MARTA, rather than other people, MARK played with her.'

The talk will provide several additional examples across all the above constructions, including the focused clitic-doubled hanging topics examined in (1), which, to the best of my knowledge, have not yet been discussed in the focalization literature. It will also examine the theoretical consequences for genuine instances of left-peripheral foci, exploring the possibility that these foci move leftwards to escape a discourse-given distressed clause (Samek-Lodovici 2015) or to mark the domain of contrast (Neeleman et al 2009), rather than in order to reach specFocP.

## References

- Beck, Sigrid & Shrvan Vasisht. 2009. Multiple Focus. *Journal of Semantics* 26(2). 159–184.
- Benincà, Paola. 2001. The Position of Topic and Focus in the Left Periphery. In Guglielmo Cinque & Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 39–64. Amsterdam: Elsevier. Retrieved from
- Beninca, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Vol. 2, 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2019. Spelling Out Focus-Fronting Chains and Wh-Chains: The Case of Italian. *Syntax* 22(2–3). 146–161.
- Giorgi, Alessandra. 2015. Discourse and the syntax of the left periphery. In Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl, & Andreas Trotzke (eds.), *Discourse Oriented Syntax*, 229–250. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1991. A Compositional Semantics for Multiple Focus Constructions. In Steven Moore & Adam Zachary Wyner (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistics Theory (SALT) I*, Vol. 10, 127–158. Cornell University.
- Neeleman, Ad, Elena Titov, Hans van de Koot & Reiko Vermeulen. 2009. A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast. In Henk van Riemsdijk, Jan Koster, & Harry van der Hulst (eds.), *Alternatives to Cartography*, Vol. 100, 15–52. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative syntax*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2017. Uniqueness of left-peripheral focus, 'further questions', and Int. In Laura Bailey & Michelle Sheehan (eds.), *Order and structure in syntax I: Word order and syntactic structure*, 333–344. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2018. A note on left-peripheral maps and interface properties. In Mirko Grimaldi, Rosangela Lai, Ludovico Franco, & Benedetta Baldi (eds.), *Structuring Variation in Romance Linguistics and Beyond: In honour of Leonardo M. Savoia*, 149–160. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1(1). 75–116.
- Samek-Lodovici, Vieri. 2015. *The Interaction of Focus, Givenness, and Prosody. A Study of Italian Clause Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Shaer, Benjamin & Werner Frey. 2004. 'Integrated' and 'non-integrated' left-peripheral elements in German and English. In *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop: ZAS Berlin.*, Vol. ZAS papers in linguistics Vol. 35, 465–502. Berlin: ZAS.
- Wagner, Michael. 2009. Focus, topic, and word order: a compositional view. In Jeroen van Craenenbroeck (ed.), *Alternatives to Cartography*, Vol. 100, 53–86. Walter de Gruyter.
- Wagner, Michael. 2020. Prosodic Focus. In D. Gutzmann, L. Matthewson, C. Meier, H. Rullmann, & T. Zimmermann (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*. Wiley–Blackwell.