benincà&Poletto_Top, Foc & V2 (draft)

Chapter · January 2004

2 authors:

Paola Benincà
University of Padova
70 PUBLICATIONS **1,039** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Cecilia Poletto
Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main
90 PUBLICATIONS **1,204** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

Italian infinitival relative clauses View project

Sociosyntax View project

Paola Benincà and Cecilia Poletto

University of Padova, CNR

Topic, Focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers[i]

1. Introduction

In this work we intend to contribute to the cartography of the CP layer and give a more detailed analysis of the portion of the CP structure that encodes theme/rheme distinctions, exploiting data from standard Italian and non standard varieties.

We interpret the cartographic program as an inquiry aiming at localizing functional projections and reconstructing 'a fine structure'. There is no limit, in our view, as to how many these projections will ultimately be, provided that there is a syntactic and semantic justification for them.

Cinque (2001), introducing his complex proposal concerning the mapping of IP structure, pointed out that it is necessary to begin by making assumptions that limit the range of variables to control; he made the very reasonable assumption that adverbs do not have to move in order to check features (they only move in marked constructions, for ex. when focalized, etc.). The left periphery is a field to which elements are moved to and, presumably also, within which they are moved. We have then to make assumptions of a different kind, in order to render the task of localizing the positions related to pragmatics a feasible one. One assumption that seems natural to us, and possibly valid even beyond the immediate scope of this article, is that there is a one-to-one relation between position and function, in our case between each pragmatic interpretation and a syntactic position in CP. This means that recursion of a projection is not admitted.

Our analysis will concentrate on the syntactic projections that have been defined as Topic and Focus in Rizzi's (1997) work on the split CP. We will address two properties of the structure in (1). The first property is CP recursion. Rizzi hypothesizes that Topic is a set of recursive projections (he indicates recursion with a *) occurring both higher and lower than a single Focus projection:

(1)   Topic*   FocusP   Topic*

Our claim is that recursion is not a possible option. Neither of the two fields we examine here is recursive in the sense that there is a virtually infinite set of totally identical Topic phrases or Focus phrases. We claim that what the stars in (1) indicate is a finite set of distinct FPs each of which can be labeled on the basis of the type of element it can host. We show that each projection has different

semantic properties and can host a single XP. Both fields contain a limited set of FPs each selecting a particular type of elements expressing a different semantics.

The second property of (1) we are going to discuss is the Topic projection lower than Focus. We will show that the projections lower than Topic all have the syntactic characteristics of focussed elements, namely they behave as operators. This conclusion permits us to identify two different fields in CP, a higher Topic field hosting non-operator elements, and a lower Focus field hosting operator-like elements[ii].

The paper is organized as follows: we will begin by presenting Benincà's (2001) arguments which show that the elements located lower than a contrastively stressed XP are not lower Topics, but Focus themselves. We will show that their trace behaves as a variable being sensitive to weak crossover, while the empty category related to Topics do not.

Hence, a) there is no Topic projection (or set of projections) lower than Focus, and the only possible set of positions for Topics is higher than Focus; b) Focus is not a single projection but itself a set of projections. In other words, in the portion of the CP layer that we are considering, there are two "fields", namely two sets of contiguous and semantically related projections, one for Topics and the second for Focus projections. In the spirit of what we have pointed out above, we will exploit the evidence in favor of an ordering of elements with different pragmatic functions in this area and examine the two fields in detail, sketching a first approximation of their internal "cartography". What distinguishes the Topic Field from the Focus field in general is the fact that TopPs are connected with a clitic or a *pro* in the sentence, while FocPs are moved to CP and leave a variable. These conclusions are reached mainly on the basis of data from Italian.

In section 3, we will concentrate on contrastive Focus. On the basis of data from a V2 Romance variety, Rhaeto-Romance, it appears that Focus can be split into: a) at least two contrastive Focus projections depending on the type of elements contrasted (adverbs or DPs) and b) at least one FocusP which is not marked for contrastiveness but just as "relevant information". We call it Informational Focus (IP), In order to do so, we will consider data of standard and non-standard Italian varieties, and compare it with Old Italian data concerning Informational Focus. We claim that one difference between Old and Modern Italian syntax is in the accessibility of the Informational Focus, which was freely accessible in main clauses in Old Italian, while in Modern Italian it is only accessible under some conditions.

Section 4. and 5. deals with the internal make up of the Left Dislocation (LD) positions. It has been repeatedly observed that in Italian an indefinite number of topics can be permutated in the left periphery, apparently without any consequence on the pragmatic interpretation. Following the tradition initiated by Cinque (1977), and developed in Benincà (1988) and Cinque (1990), we provide six empirical tests to distinguish between two types of thematized elements which we will refer to as Hanging Topics and Left Dislocated elements. We will then discuss the position of Scene

Setting adverbs and isolate the lowest position inside the Topic field to which a "List Interpretation" is assigned. We then present some hypothesis on the ordering of Left Dislocated elements.

The last section includes a speculation of the semantic characterization of these projections and the way they are layered[iii].

In this paper, we restrict our analysis to declarative clauses, although we will occasionally make reference to other sentence types as interrogative or relative clauses, when they become relevant for the syntactic tests we use.

2. LD only occurs above FocusP

In this section we address the question if it is really necessary to admit that TopP can appear in two different positions in CP; strictly related to this question is the shape of FocusP: is it a single projection or a field hosting more than one element?

As mentioned above (cf. (1)), Rizzi (1997) proposes the following structure for the Topic/Focus portion of the CP structure:

(2)   C…(TOP*)   (FOC) (TOP*)

In what follows we show that the lower Topic position(s) is not Topic at all, but an extension of the Focus field. Consider the following pair:

 (3)   a   *A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, lo regalerete

                TO GIANNI, a book of poems, you will give it

        b   Un libro di poesie, A GIANNI, lo regalerete

                a book of poems, TO GIANNI, you will give it

                'You will give a book of poems to Gianni'

Here the only possible order between the contrastively focalized PP *a Gianni* 'to John' and the Topic DP *un libro di poesie* 'a book of poems' is Topic Focus. The opposite order is strongly ungrammatical.

Suppose that what the contrast in (3) shows is precisely that no Topic position is available lower than Focus, as the ungrammaticality of (3a) suggests. The ordering of the Topic/Focus portion of the CP layer would thus be the one illustrated in (4).

(4) [TopicP [FocusP [IP]]]

If we make this assumption we are left with the problem of explaining sentences like (5) adapted from Rizzi (1997). We will argue that this is only apparent evidence in favor of LD appearing also on the right of Focus (from Rizzi (1997)) :

(5)   a   QUESTO a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire!

              this to Gianni, tomorrow, to-him should tell

              'Tomorrow we should tell this to Gianni'

    b   A Gianni, QUESTO, domani gli dovremmo dire!

              to Gianni, THIS, tomorrow, to-him should tell

    c   A Gianni, domani, QUESTO gli dovremmo dire!

              to Gianni, tomorrow, THIS to-him should tell

Note that a sentence like (5c) does not constitute a problem for structure (4), as we could analyze both the DP *a Gianni* 'to John' and the adverb *domani* 'tomorrow' as LD elements occurring in front of the focalized pronoun *questo* 'this one'. In (5b) the element occurring after the focalized pronoun, and considered by Rizzi an instance of LD Topic, is a temporal adverb. It can be shown that adverbs have to be kept distinct from DPs and PPs, because they can occupy a lower position occurring at the IP edge. The Paduan examples constitute evidence in favor of this claim:

(6)   a   Mario (l) compra na casa

              Mario (he) buys a house

              'Mario is going to buy a house'

    b   Mario, na casa, no*(l) la compra

              Mario, a house, not (he) it will buy

              'Mario is not going to buy a house'

    c   Mario, de so sorela, *(el) ghe ne parla sempre

              Mario, of his sister, (he) of-her speaks always

              'Mario always talks about his sister'

    d   Mario doman   compra na casa[iv]

              Mario tomorrow buys a house

              'Mario is going to buy a house tomorrow'

e   Mario doman l compra na casa

        Mario tomorrow he buys a house

In (6a) the subject clitic resuming the subject DP is apparently optional. If a LD object intervenes between the subject DP and the verb, as in (6b) and (6c), forcing an analysis of LD for the subject too, then the clitic becomes obligatory. Hence, the optionality of the subject clitic in (6a) corresponds to two different structures: if the subject clitic is not present, the subject DP occupies its usual preverbal position; if the subject clitic is present, the subject DP is left dislocated. This structurally non-ambiguous sequence can be used as a test for determining the position of preverbal adverbs. If an adverb intervening between the subject DP and the inflected verb forces the presence of a subject clitic, as a left dislocated objects does, this means that the only possible position for the adverb in a sentence like (5b) is a LD position, as it is the case for objects. On the contrary, if an adverb intervening between the subject DP and the inflected verb does not force the presence of a subject clitic, the subject DP can be analyzed as remaining in its usual preverbal position and not left dislocated.

The grammaticality of a sentence like (6d) shows that this is indeed the case: the adverb can occupy a position lower than the usual subject position, which is in turn lower than LD positions occupied by objects in (6b, c) and by the subject when the subject clitic is present.

Hence, adverbials such as *tomorrow* cannot be used as a test for determining the presence or the absence of a lower LD position, as they are themselves structurally ambiguous between a Topic and a post-subject position. Therefore, we will claim that sentences like (5b) are not relevant for deciding between structure (2) and (4), as the adverb is in the lower position. As for (5a) we point out that:

a) dative clitics are not as reliable as object clitics as a test for LD, as the following example shows:

(7)   Gliel'ho detto a Gianni

        to him-it have told to John

        'I told this to Gianni'

Here the dative *a Gianni* is doubled by the clitic *gli* even though the dative has not moved from its argument position;

b) intonation is not a crucial test for determining the position of an XP: an intonationally focalized element can be syntactically a LD. The following examples are a dialogue; speaker A produces a left dislocated object in the embedded clause, speaker B contradicts the assertion with a different

LD object, which is intonationally focalized, but syntactically a LD, as the resumptive object clitic shows. :

(8) A: Mi ha detto che il tappeto, lo compra l'anno prossimo

'He has told me that the carpet he will buy *it* next year'

B: No, ti sbagli, IL DIVANO *lo* compra l'anno prossimo

'No, you are wrong, THE SOFA he will buy *it* next year'

Given the evidence in (8), we will henceforth not consider intonation as a reliable test distinguishing between focalized and left dislocated elements. The fact that a Topic can be intonationally stressed, as (8) shows, suggests the other logical option, namely that focalized elements do not necessarily have to be intonationally stressed. Separating the intonational level from the syntactic one does not only account for (8), which is completely unexpected if we accept the equation: intonationally stressed = syntactically focalized. It also accounts for the behavior of these elements with respect to weak crossover. It is well known (see among others Chomsky (1981), Cinque (1990)) that the so-called 'weak crossover' constraint is in fact a test that singles out variable-operator structures. As a result, only focalized XPs appear to be related to a variable inside the clause.

A structure like (9a) is grammatical with the interpretation in which *Gianni* is the object in Topic and *suo* corefers with *Gianni*. On the contrary, (9b), in which the object is focussed, is ungrammatical, displaying the weak crossover effect.[v]

(9) a Gianni$_i$, suo$_i$ padre l$_i$'ha licenziato LD

Gianni $_i$, his$_i$ father has fired him$_i$

'Gianni has been fired by his own father'

b *GIANNI, suo$_i$ padre ha licenziato   Focus

GIANNI$_I$, his$_i$ father has fired t$_i$

Notice that (9b) is possible if *suo padre* "his father" is interpreted as the direct object and G*ianni* as the subject; if *suo padre* is the direct object, suo is correctly bound by a c-commanding antecedent, the sentence internal position of the focalized element in SpecIP. Weak crossover can be used as a test to distinguish between Topic and Focus elements in other cases. Note that Topics, even if intonationally focalized, always escape the weak crossover restriction:

(10)   A: Mario$_i$, suo$_i$ padre non lo vede mai

                Mario, his father never sees him

                'His father never sees Mario'

        B: No, GIANNI$_i$, suo$_i$ padre non lo vede mai

                no, Gianni, his father never sees him

                'No, his father never sees Gianni'

In fact, as we also argue below, in (10)B we have a constituent *Gianni* that still behaves syntactically as a Topic, and not as a Focus, although it is intonationally focalized. Let us now examine cases parallel to (5a) on the basis of the test of weak crossover and see if the XP located after the intonationally focussed XP, which in Rizzi's analysis is a lower Topic, behaves as a syntactic Topic or a Focus. If it is a lower Topic, it should be insensitive to weak crossover; if it is a Focus, it will obey the weak crossover restriction.

(11)   a   *A MARIA, Giorgio$_i$, sua$_i$ madre presenterà[vi]

                    to Maria, Giorgio, his mother will introduce

                    'His mother will introduce Giorgio to Maria'

        b   *A MARIA$_i$, Giorgio, sua$_i$ madre presenterà

                to Maria, Giorgio, her mother will introduce

                'Her mother will introduce Giorgio to Maria'

        c   *A MARIA, Giorgio, sua madre lo presenterà

                To Maria, Giorgio, his mother will introduce him

(11a) and (11b) show that both XPs *a Maria* and *Giorgio,* which are on the left of the subject *sua madre* have to be distinct in reference from the pronoun *sua*. Hence, they both behave as Foci, and not as Topics. Independent evidence that they are both focalized is given by the fact that there cannot be a resumptive clitic in these structures (cf. (11c) and (3a) above)).

Given the fact that the second element is not intonationally marked as prominent in any way, we will assume that more than one element can be in the Focus field, but just one is intonationally focalized. Moreover, we will assume that the one that is intonationally marked is the highest one of the Focus field. We will come back to this fact in section 3.

The sequence in (5a) is thus not to be interpreted as [Topic Focus Topic] but as [Topic Focus1 Focus2]. Thus, on the basis of the weak crossover test we claim that Focus can also host more than

one element, each with a peculiar function that we will just begin to explore and characterize. Hence FocP is not a single XP, but a "field", as Topic is (cf. Brody (1990) on Hungarian). We will now turn to the internal structure of this field.

3. The internal makeup of the Focus field

Up to now we have concentrated on the interplay of Topic and Focus and shown that:
a) There is no Topic projection lower than Focus
b) What is apparently a Topic projection lower than FocusP has been shown to have the movement properties of focalized constituents.

In what follows we will provide additional evidence for the hypothesis that Focus is to be conceived as a "field", namely a structural portion of the CP layer where contiguous projections encode different types of focalized elements. In order to do so, we will shift the language under examination and will turn our attention to non-standard Italian varieties. We will first point out some properties of regional Southern Italian, where one of the typical properties of V2 Medieval Romance appears to some extent maintained. Informational Focus is found in all of these varieties in sentence initial position, as the following examples show (12 a, b are from Benincà 1994):

(12) a *aço* dis-el plusor fiade (Old Venetian)
         this said he many times
         'He said this many times'

      b *una fertra* fei lo reis Salomon (Old Piedmontese)
         a sedan chair made King Salomon
         'King Salomon made a sedan chair'

      c *Un libro* comprasti? (Sicilian)
         a book bought
         'Did you buy a book?'

      c' Hai comprato *un libro* ? (Northern Italian)
         have bought a book?
         'Did you buy a book?'

      d *Antonio* sono (Sicilian)
         Antonio am
         'It's Antonio'

d'   Sono *Antonio*

       am Antonio

       'It's Antonio'

On the minimal assumption that the inflected verb in the Southern Italian dialects raises at least to AgrS, we can analyze elements in first position in sentences like (12) as occurring inside the CP layer. Therefore, Informational Focus is indeed syntactically encoded in the CP domain. We will further comment on these aspects in section 3.2.

3.1. Contrastive and Informational Focus in Rhaeto-Romance

Independent evidence for the assumption of a low Comp position signaling IFoc comes from the Rhaeto-Romance dialect of S. Leonardo, a V2 variety spoken in the Dolomites. This dialect displays a sentence particle signaling that the whole sentence is totally new information intended as the introduction of a new context (see Poletto and Zanuttini 2000). In sentences like (15a) *pa* conveys the meaning of totally new information, and can be uttered only in such a context[vii]. This is not the case for the neutral sentence in (15b):

(15)   a   Al ploi *pa*.

             SCL rains pa

             'It is raining'

       b   Al ploi

             SCL rains

       c   Ci bel c al è pa!

             how nice that SCL is pa

             'How nice it is!'

       d   Ci bel c al é!

             how nice that SCL is

The same context restriction is found in exclamative clauses like (15c) and (15d). A sentence like (15c) can only be uttered when it is new information, while (15d) is neutral in this respect. As expected by the fact that *pa* signals that the whole sentence is new, it is incompatible with contexts which entail a presupposition, as presuppositional negative or affirmative elements as the following (cf. Cinque (1976) on presuppositional negation *mica* in standard Italian):

(16)   a   *I n mangi *pa min* tres soni.

                 SCL neg eat pa neg always potatoes

                 'I do not always eat potatoes'

    b   *E* k i l a *pa* fat

                 yes that SCL have pa done

                 'Sure, I did it'

Poletto and Zanuttini (2000) show that the position of *pa* is the Spec of a low Comp projection, located lower than Contrastive Focus. *Pa* occurs after the inflected verb, which is expected given the fact that Central Rhaeto-Romance is a V2 language (see below); the following characteristics are worth noting: a) it appears higher than all adverbials located in the IP field (according to Cinque's (1999) hierarchy) as shown in (17); b) it is higher than a subject in a subject-verb inversion context (cf. (18a)); c) it is incompatible with lower complementizers such as the interrogative *s* "if" in embedded questions as shown by the ungrammaticality of (18b):

(17)   a   Al a *pa d sigy* mangé   (S. Leonardo)

                 SCL have pa of sure eaten
                 'He has surely eaten'

    b   *Al a *d sigy pa* mangé

                 SCL has of sure pa eaten

    c   Al a *pa magari* bel mangé

                 SCL has pa perhaps already eaten

                 'Perhaps he has already eaten'

    d   *Al a *magari pa* bel mangé

(18)   a   Inier a *pa* Giani mangé la ciara

yesterday has pa John eaten the meat

Yesterday John ate meat

b   *A i m a domané *s* al n fus *pa* bel.

SCL SCL me asked if SCL neg was pa nice

He asked me whether it was nice

Moreover, the same dialect provides evidence for assuming that even Contrastive Focus is not to be conceived of as a single projection.

Examples (19) and (20) illustrate the typical V2 pattern: when an element precedes the inflected verb, the subject is inverted as in (19) and it is not possible to have two constituents in preverbal position, as the ungrammaticality of (19c) and (20) shows.

(19)   a   T vas gonoot a ciasa sua   S. Leonardo

you go often at home his

'You often visit him'

b   Gonoot vas-t a ciasa sua

often go-you at home his

c   *Gonoot t vas a ciasa sua

Often you go at home his

(20)   a   *Da trai l liber ti a-i de a Giani

sometimes the book to-him have-I given to John

b   *L liber da trai ti a-i de a Giani

the book sometimes have-I given to John

This is true even for Left Dislocated items, as the ungrammaticality of (21a) shows[viii]:

(21)   *Giani, duman l vaiges-**t**

John tomorrow him see-you

Once stated the V2 character of this dialect, we focus on the analysis of main versus embedded V2. This dialect is neither a "generalized V2" language as Yiddish or Icelandic nor a "restricted V2 language" as German, Dutch and Mainland Scandinavian. It tolerates embedded V2 in all declarative sentences (though embedded V2 is excluded from all wh- contexts as relatives, embedded interrogatives etc.) although the type of element found in first position depends on the selecting verb: i.e. among the adverbials that can be placed in first position in a main clause, there

are some which are sensitive to the main verb once they are placed in an embedded V2 structure[ix]. While in main clauses a bigger class of adverbials can be found in first position, in embedded clauses the class of adverbials that can be found in first position depends on the selecting verb. Complements of bridge verbs display (as in many Germanic languages) essentially the same possibilities found in main clauses. If a non bridge verb is selected the class of adverbials which can be found in first position is more limited:

(22) a   Al m a dit c d sigy mang-ela a ciasa   bridge V

              he to-me has said that for sure eats-she at home

              'He told me that he is surely going to eat at home'

      b   *Al s cruzie c d sigy mang-la a ciasa   non-bridge V

              he is worried that for sure eats-she at home

The same contrast is found when the element in first position is an object.

(23) a   Al m a dit c L GIAT a-**al** odù

              he me has told that the cat has-he seen

              He told that he has seen the cat

      b   *Al s cruzie c L GIAT a-**al** odù

              he is worried that the cat has-he seen

This is not true for certain quantificational adverbs like the temporal ones:

(24) a   Al m a dit c DA TRAI l a-**al** odù

              he me has told that sometimes him has-he seen

              He told that he saw him sometimes

      b   Al s cruzie c DA TRAI l a-**al** odù

              he is worried that sometimes him has-he seen

              He is worried because he saw him sometimes

The descriptive generalization is that only focalized circumstantial and quantificational adverbs are insensitive to the class of the selecting verb, while other adverbs and objects can be contrastively focalized only when the selecting verb belongs to the bridge class.

There is a unitary way to analyze the contrasts between (22a)/(23a) versus (22b)/(23b) and (22b)

(23b) versus (24b). On the basis of the analysis of bridge verbs, which are usually claimed to have one additional CP layer, we propose that these contrasts have to be analyzed as follows: bridge verbs select a "full CP layer" with all CP projections available. Non bridge verbs on the other hand select only a smaller portion of the whole CP-structure, pruning the CP projections where objects and some adverbial classes are assigned contrastive Focus, while permitting the lower CPs to be filled.

All the elements in (22), (23), and (24) are interpreted as contrastively focalized, hence if what we have assumed so far is correct, there must be at least two Contrastive Focus projections available in the CP structure, one hosting adverbs or objects and one devoted to circumstantial and quantificational adverbs.

The Focus field is thus to be conceived as in (25):

(25) [Contr. CP1 adverbs/objects [Contr.CP2 circum./quant. adverbs [Informational CP]]]

In structure (25) Informational Focus is placed lower than both Contrastive Focus1 and 2 because the verb always raises higher than this projection in V2 contexts, occurring obligatorily to the left of the new information particle *pa* while it does not raise higher than the other two projections, as it occurs to the right of both focalized circumstantial and quantificational adverbs and other adverbs and objects.

3.2. Contrastive and Informational Focus in standard Italian

With structure (25) in mind let us now go back to the cases discussed in the previous section in which another XP occurs lower than Contrastive Focus in Italian[x]:

(26)   A GIORGIO, questo libro, devi dare
            TO GIORGIO, this book, you must give
            'You must give this book to Giorgio'

In section 2 we have shown that intonation is not in itself a test for determining whether an element is a Focus or a Topic, as higher Topics can also bear contrastive intonation, still maintaining the syntactic properties of non-operator elements (resumptive clitic, insensitivity to weak crossover). Likewise, elements that are not intonationally marked as contrastive Focus can still be inside the Focus field. On the basis of a syntactic test as weak crossover, we have claimed in section 2 that the

element located lower than Contrastive Focus still has the properties of an operator-moved element and is to be located inside the Focus field and not a lower Topic.

Following this line of reasoning, we might analyze *questo libro* in (27) as an Informational Focus, similar to the one used in Southern Italian or medieval Romance. But sentences corresponding to (12) (here repeated in (27)) are ungrammatical in standard Italian, unless intonationally and pragmatically contrasted:

(27) a   *Antonio sono

              Antonio am

      b   *Una portantina fece re Salomone

              a sedan chair made King Salomon

This difficulty can be dealt with assuming that in standard Italian the IFocus position is not accessible unless the Focus field has already been activated by a Contrastive Focus, while this would not be necessary in the Southern Italian varieties. More generally, we could say that the Focus field as such is only activated in standard Italian by explicitly marked elements; in this perspective, we can relate contrastive Focus, which is signaled in Italian by a special intonation, with another interesting Italian construction which involves a Focus-like anteposition without intonational contrast: it is the so called Anaphoric Anteposition (AA: see Benincà' 1988, 141), exemplified in (28a, b)

(28) a   Mi ha detto di portargli un libro e *un libro* gli ho portato

              me has said to bring-him a book and a book I him have brought

              'They told me that I should bring them a book and I did it'

      b   Le stesse cose ha detto ieri il fratello

              the same things said the brother too

              'His/her brother said the same thing yesterday'

      c   E questo farà anche lui

              and this will-do also he

              'He will do the same'

This construction appears to be another case where the Focus field needs a special context in order to be activated: in (28a) the context is given by a textual repetition of the element, in (28b, c) the anaphora is lexical ("the same, another, this", etc., often accompanied by a textual anaphoric adverb

in the body of the sentence, such as *anche* "too", solo "only", etc.). It is interesting to note that a lexical or pronominal subject cannot appear between the anteposed element and the inflected verb, as they have to be adjacent, as shown in (29):

(29)   *Le stesse cose il fratello ha detto ieri
         the same things the brother said yesterday

This suggests that in the AA construction the inflected verb is in a head whose Spec is not appropriate for a DP or NP subject. Similar effects are found with other types of A' movements, such as Focus movements, interrogatives and exclamatives. The effect is stronger in main interrogative clauses than in other constructions. The reason why preverbal subjects are not totally excluded in some cases could be that subjects apparently following a contrastive Focus in SpecAgr position are in fact in IFocus. Once this phenomenon is better understood, we will have at our disposal a new test to identify A' moved elements[xi].

Another case of movement to CP concerns indefinite quantifiers (see Benincà 1988, 142):

(30)   Qualcosa farò
         something I-will do
         'I will do something'

Again, we can interpret this one as a case of movement to Focus field of a marked element. In the perspective we are sketching concerning Focus, Italian would differ from a V2 language not in the path of the inflected verb in V2 contexts but simply in restricting the V2 contexts and requiring specific features on a nominal element to move it to CP, while a V2 language always has to move something to CP[xii].

Coming back to the question of the type of Focus projection hosting the DP *questo libro* 'this book' in (26), we have shown, on the basis of Rhaeto-Romance, that Contrastive Focus itself has to be split into at least two positions. This would lead us to hypothesise that the DP *questo libro* in (26) is not Informational Focus but a secondary Contrastive Focus position[xiii]. In this sense, we can further reflect on the semantics of sentences like (26): here the Focus is not on the first element *a Giorgio* itself, but on the relation between *a Giorgio* and *questo libro,* with respect to the predicate: this is the information to be contrasted with the preceding context. Moreover, as Federico Damonte has interestingly pointed out to us, the structure exemplified in (26) is perfectly good if both elements are arguments of the verb, but is very bad if only one is an argument and the other is a so called

'adjunct', as shown by the following contrast:

(31)　　a　　GIORGIO, di questo,　ha parlato.

　　　　　　GIORGIO, of this, has spoken

　　　　　　'Giorgio spoke about this'

　　　　b　　*GIORGIO, per questo, ha parlato.

　　　　　　GIORGIO for this, has spoken

 For the moment we will leave the matter of the exact label of this lower Focus position open, as it requires more specific research.

Summarizing, we have shown that non standard Italian varieties display Informational Focus positions lower than the Contrastive Focus Position, and that Contrastive Focus is a subfield in itself. The structure of the Focus field we have evidence for is the one in (25), repeated here as (32):

(32) [Contr. CP1　adverbs/objects [Contr.CP2 circum/quant adverbs [Informational CP]]]

More research is needed in order to enrich the cartography of the Focus field we have just begun to sketch, in particular trying to better understand the similarities between the different constructions involving movement of an element to CP in the Focus field.

4. The internal makeup of the Topic field

In what follows we concentrate on the Topic field and give a first approximation of its hierarchical structure. All the elements in the Topic field share at least two common properties: a) they are not related to a variable in the clause, differently from elements belonging to the Focus field; and b) they are all "known information" in some sense.

The constituents that appear in this area with the 'overall' characteristics of Topics, on a more careful examination show clearly distinct properties of a syntactic nature; this makes it possible to distinguish between two 'subfields' of the Topic field, Hanging Topic and Left Dislocation.

4.1. Two types of thematized arguments

Hanging Topic (HT) and Left Dislocation (LD) differ for a number of syntactic properties as already noted by Cinque (1982), Benincà (1988). We sum them up in what follows. The first test

that distinguishes between the two constructions is case: LD elements maintain the preposition of the internal elements they correspond to, HTs can only be DPs:

(33)   a   Mario, non ne parla più nessuno

Mario, not of-him talks anymore nobody

'Mario, nobody talks of him anymore'

    b   Di Mario, non (ne) parla più nessuno

Of Mario, not (of-him) talks anymore nobody

'Of Mario, nobody talks of him anymore'

(34)   a   Mario, gli amici gli hanno fatto un brutto scherzo

Mario, the friends to-him have done a bad joke

'Mario, his friends made him a nasty trick'

    b   A Mario, gli amici (gli) hanno fatto un brutto scherzo

to Mario, his friends to-him have made a bad joke

(33b) and (34b) are cases of LD, as the preposition occurs in front of the LD element, (33a) and (34a), where no preposition is realized, are cases of HT.

We can now use the first test to single out the two types of thematizations and show their different syntactic properties. First of all, there can be more than one LD element, while only a single HT position per clause is available:

(35)   a   *Gianni, questo libro, non ne hanno parlato a lui

Gianni, this book, they of-it haven't talked to him

    b   A Gianni, di questo libro, non gliene hanno mai parlato

to Gianni, of this book, they of it haven't talked to him

'They did not talk to Gianni about this book'

(35a) is a case of double HT (as the lack of prepositions on the two Topics indicates) and it is ungrammatical. When the two prepositions are present, hence the two Topics are LDs, the sentence is possible (35b).

The third difference concerns the necessity of a resumptive element corresponding to the Topic. LD elements require a resumptive pronoun only when they correspond to direct or partitive objects; the clitic is optional in the other cases (impossible if the type of argument has no appropriate clitic). If present, the clitic agrees with the Topic in gender, number and case. HTs always require a

resumptive pronoun expressing the type of argument: it only agrees with the HT in number and gender, not in Case.

(36) a   *Mario, non parla più nessuno

             Mario, not talks anymore nobody

      b   Di Mario, non parla più nessuno

             Of Mario, not talks anymore nobody

             'Mario, nobody talks of him anymore'

      c   Mario, non ne parla più nessuno

             Mario, not of-him talks anymore nobody

             'Mario, nobody talks of him anymore'

The contrast in (36) shows that the left dislocated PP in (36b) can occur without any resumptive pronoun, while the HT DP in (36a) is ungrammatical if no resumptive pronoun is present in the clause (cf. (36c).

The fourth test concerns the type of resumptive element that can be used for LD and HT. The copy of the HT can also be a tonic pronoun or an epithet, while the copy of a LD can only be a clitic:

(37) a   Mario, non darò più soldi a quell'imbecille

             Mario, not give anymore money to that idiot

             'Mario, I won't give more money to that idiot'

      b   *A Mario, non darò più soldi a quell'imbecille

             to M., not give more money to that idiot

Note also that the two types of thematizations can cooccur: the order is fixed, and it is HT-LD. In an embedded declarative clause the complementizer is located between the two Topics:

(38) a   Giorgio, ai nostri amici, non parlo mai di lui

             Giorgio, to the our friends, not talk never of him

             'Giorgio, to our friends, I never talk of him'

      b   *Ai nostri amici, Giorgio, non parlo mai di lui

             'To our friends, Giorgio, not talk never of him'

(38a) represents the order HT-LD, as only the second Topic is a PP, although they both correspond to PP arguments. (38b), which displays the reverse order, is ungrammatical.

(39)	a	*Sono certa, di questo libro, che non (ne) abbia mai parlato nessuno

        I am certain, of this book, that not (of-it) has ever spoken nobody

    b	Sono certa, questo libro, che non ne abbia mai parlato nessuno[xiv]

        I am certain, this book, that not (of-it) has ever spoken nobody

        'I am sure that nobody has ever talked about this book'

    c	Sono certa che, di questo libro, non ne abbia mai parlato nessuno

        I am certain that, of this book, not (of-it) has ever spoken nobody

    d	??Sono certa che, questo libro, non ne abbia mai parlato nessuno[xv]

        I am certain that, this book, not (of-it) has ever spoken nobody

(39a) is a case of LD, as the presence of the preposition shows. The only grammatical order between the complementizer and this type of thematized elements is *che*-XP, as the contrast between (39a) and (39c) shows. HT only allows the opposite order, as the pair (35b) and (35d).

The tests illustrated by (35) and (39) show that the order inside the Topic field of the CP layer is the one sketched in (40).

(40)	[HT [che [LD [LD …[IP]]]]]

Note, moreover, that HT is restricted in some types of embedded clauses. In relative clauses, for example, HTs are not possible, neither before nor after the relative pronoun:

(41)	a	*Una persona che questo libro non ne parlerà mai,...

        A person that this book not of-it will talk never

    b	*Una persona questo libro che non ne parlerà mai

        A person this book that not of-it will talk never

The corresponding sentences with LD are perfect if the order relative pronoun-LD is chosen:

(42)	a	Una persona che di questo libro non ne parlerà mai,...

        a person that of this book not of-it will talk never

        'A person who will never talk about this book...'

    b	*Una persona di questo libro che non ne parlerà mai,...

        A person of this book that not of-it will talk never

On the basis of the tests discussed so far we conclude that Hanging Topic has to be kept distinct from Left Dislocation and that it occurs in a unique FP located above LD, as illustrated in (40).

4.2 A position for Scene Setting adverbs

There is additional evidence that HT is not the only type of element which have to be separated from LD. Scene Setting adverbials also occupy a very high position, probably located immediately lower than HT but still higher than LD. This is immediately visible in a language like the V2 Rhaeto-Romance variety examined in section 3. In main clauses the class of Scene Setting adverbs can be intonationally focalized or not:

(43) a DUMAN va-al a Venezia
         TOMORROW goes-he to Venice
         'He is going to Venice tomorrow'
      b Duman va-al a Venezia
         Tomorrow goes-he to Venice

In the spirit or what we said so far, we might hypothesize that the two occurrences of the temporal adverb *duman* in (43a) and (43b) are not located in the same position: in (43a) the adverb is contrastively focalized, in (43b) it is not. However, in our view intonation is not sufficient for determining syntactic structure; we present another test that discriminates between two possible structures for these adverbs when they occur as the first element of the clause. As discussed above, Rhaeto-Romance tolerates embedded V2 of different types depending on the selecting verb. Even the more liberal class of selecting verbs, namely bridge verbs, does not tolerate a non focalized Scene Setting adverb in first position of an embedded V2 clause.

(44) a Al m a dit c DUMAN va-al a Venezia
         he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice
         'He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow'
      b *Al m a dit c duman va-al a Venezia
         he me has told that tomorrow goes-he to Venice
         'He told me that he is going to Venice tomorrow'

The contrast between (43b) and (44b), compared with the lack of contrast between (43a) and (44a), shows that the positions of focalized and non-focalized adverbs must be different. In a split CP perspective we can hypothesize that embedded V2 never has a position for Scene Setting, which is only available in root contexts. This also makes sense from the semantic point of view, as "setting the scene" is an operation done at the beginning of the utterance, not in an embedded context. The property of being confined to root contexts recalls the distribution of HTs, which are ungrammatical in embedded clauses in French, for example (see footnote 10 for Italian). We can hypothesize that standard Italian has a Scene Setting position too, in cases like (45):

(45)   Domani Gianni lo vedo

        tomorrow, Gianni I will meet him

        'Tomorrow I will see Gianni'

Standard Italian surely admits pre-subject temporal adverbs, nevertheless it does not provide a clear test for an independent Scene Setting position, as the temporal adverb in (45) can also be analyzed as a left dislocated element[xvi].

What can be shown on the basis of Italian data is that there is no Scene Setting position higher than Hanging Topic, as the ungrammaticality of (46b, c) testifies:

(46)   a   Mario, nel 1999, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel

                Mario, in the 1999 to-him have given the Prize Nobel

                M., in 1999, they gave him the Nobel Prize

        b   ??Nel 1999, Mario, gli hanno dato il premio Nobel

                in the 1999, Mario, to-him have given the Prize Nobel

        c   *Sul giornale, Mario, ne hanno parlato malissimo

                on the newspaper, Mario, of him have spoken very badly

A temporal adverb can indeed be located after a HT, but - as in (45) - it is indistinguishable from a Left Dislocated one. Hence, we will leave the matter of an independent Scene Setting position open. We simply point out that, if we are on the right track and the Scene Setting position has to be distinguished from the HP position for DPs (which would be a welcome result in a split-CP theory), we have to further split the Topic subfield into two portions: a Frame subfield and the LD subfield.

4.3. A position for Listed XPs

The Topic sublayer can be further split. If semantics is taken into account it is possible single out specialized subfields on the left of Focus. Well known semantic differences in the interpretation of LD can be taken to reflect syntactic differences: let us examine the case of the contrast within a given set, namely the case in which two elements belonging to the same list of already known items are contrasted. We will call this particular interpretation 'List Interpretation' (LI)[xvii]. In order to be clear we add a context to our examples:

Context: a farm producing a set of goods that are known to the people involved in the conversation.

(47)   a   La frutta la regaliamo, la verdura la vendiamo

            the fruit it give for free, the vegetables it sell

            'We give fruit for free, while we sell the vegetables'

      b   La frutta la regaliamo e la verdura la vendiamo

            the fruit it give for free and the vegetables it sell

      c   La frutta la regaliamo, invece la verdura la vendiamo

            the fruit it give for free while the vegetables it sell

Here the two elements *la frutta* and *la verdura* are singled out from a list and attributed different predicates. The two sentences can also be conjoined by the conjunction *e* 'and', as in (43b) or by *invece* "while".

Various tests can be applied for isolating the relevant interpretation. The first one results from the substitution of the two items with "the former - the latter", as shown in (48):

(48)   La prima la vendiamo, la seconda la regaliamo

      the first it sell, the second it give for free

      'We sell the former, we give the latter for free'

The second concerns Right dislocation. The RD position is only compatible with the "pure" thematization and not with the LI type of themathization. Whatever the analysis of RD is, the contrast in (49) shows that LI has to be distinguished from the more usual type of Left Dislocation.

(49)   a   La frutta la regaliamo, la verdura la vendiamo

            the fruit it give for free, the vegetables it sell

            'We give fruit for free while we sell vegetables'

b   *La regaliamo, la frutta e la vendiamo, la verdura

            it give for free, the fruit and it sell the vegetables

            *La regaliamo, la prima e la vendiamo, la seconda

            it give for free, the former and it sell the latter

In our view, the ungrammaticality of RD in LI is the consequence of a more general restriction: RD can only be a Theme, not a Topic. We call Theme a LD element that can be recovered from the immediate context. We call Topic an element that is present in the shared knowledge of the speaker and the hearer but is not accessible in the immediate context so that it cannot be recovered. Consider the following examples:

(50)   A   Hai visto i miei occhiali?

            have seen the my glasses

            'Did you see my glasses?'

     B   I tuoi occhiali, li ho messi sul tavolo

            the your glasses, them have put on-the table

            'I put your glasses on the table'

     B'   Li ho messi sul tavolo

            them have put on-the table

            'I put them on the table'

     B"   Li ho messi sul tavolo, i tuoi occhiali

            them have put on-the table, the your glasses

            'I put your glasses on the table'

     B'''   I tuoi occhiali, li ho messi sul tavolo, i tuoi occhiali[xviii]

            the your glasses, them have put on-the table, the your glasses

A sentence like (50B) is felicitous independently from the context: if there is a context like (50A), the LD object is interpreted as a Theme; if it is uttered without any available context, the LD element is interpreted as a Topic. A sentence like (50B') can only be uttered if there is a preceding context similar to (50A); if there is no preceding context, it is infelicitous, as there is no way to recover the Topic corresponding to the resumptive pronoun. Tentatively, we propose that RD is a copying process of a LD element, which can be either phonetically realized, as in (50B'''), or empty, as in (50B").

We can infer that the copied LD element can only be a Theme and not a Topic from the fact that

both B" and B'" require a context like (50A), and are infelicitous if (50A) is missing.

On the basis of what we said so far we can consider another interesting variant of the combination between the LI interpretation and RD, which we have shown to be ungrammatical in examples like (49). If the first item of the list is a RD and the second is on the left, the sentence is well-formed (cf. (51a)). This challenges our hypothesis that RD and LI are not compatible and leaves us without an explanation for the ungrammaticality of (49b,c) and (51b):

(51)   a   La regaliamo, la frutta, e la verdura la vendiamo

                  it give for free, the fruit, and the vegetables it sell

                  'We give fruit for free while we sell vegetables'

    b   *La frutta, la regaliamo e la vendiamo, la verdura

                  the fruit it give for free and it sell, the vegetables

But, if we apply the substitution test with "the former - the latter" on (51a) and insert the specific lexical items that single out the LI construction, we obtain (52), which is ungrammatical.

(52)   *La regaliamo, la prima e la seconda, la vendiamo

        it five for free the first and the second it sell

        'We give the former for free while we sell the latter'

Therefore, we conclude that (51a) is only an apparent counterexample to the generalization that LI and RD are incompatible.

The fact that RD cannot be a Topic was first noted by Benincà (1988) on the basis of sentences like the following:

(53)   a   Il vino lo porto io, la torta la porti tu

                  the wine it take I, the cake it take you

                  You take wine, I'll take the cake

    b   *Lo porto io il vino, la porti tu la torta

                  it take I the wine, it take you the cake

Now we can better characterize what kind of construction these sentences are: they are a special case of LI, where two lists are paired. This can be shown by the usual substitution test:

(54)   a   Il primo lo porto io, la seconda la porti tu

                the first it take I, the second it take you

                'I take the first you take the second'

        b   Il vino lo porta il primo, la torta la porta il secondo

                the wine it takes the first, the cake it takes the second

                'The former take wine, the latter takes the cake'

        c   L'uno porta il primo, l'altro porta la seconda

                the one takes the first, the other takes the second

        d   Il primo porta l'una, il secondo porta l'altra

                the first take the one the second takes the other

Both the elements on the left and the element in postverbal position can be substituted by "the former - the latter", as shown in (54a,b,c,d).

This construction uses both the LI in the left periphery as well as the in situ list, which is in general independently possible[xix]:

(55)   a   Regaliamo la frutta e vendiamo la verdura

                give for free the fruit and sell the vegetables

                'We give fruit for free and sell the vegetables'

        b   Regaliamo la prima e vendiamo la seconda

                give for free the first and sell the second

                'We give the first for free and sell the second'

In the spirit of what we have proposed above, we will assume that the construction we have characterized as LI corresponds to a syntactic position in the left periphery; now, we have to determine the precise position of this FP in the CP domain. A thematized argument or adverbial can be found on the left of LI elements, as the sentences in (56) illustrate:

(56)   a   Agli amici, la prima la vendiamo, la seconda la regaliamo

                to the friends, the first it sell, the second it give for free

                'We sell the first to the friends and give them the second for free'

        b   Agli amici, la frutta la vendiamo, invece la verdura la regaliamo

                to the friends, the fruit it seel, while the vegetables it give for free

                'We sell fruit to the friends, while we give them vegetables for free'

c   Di storia, ai primi ne parliamo, coi secondi ne discutiamo

     of history, to the first of it speak, with the second of it discuss

     'We speak of history with the former, while we discuss about it with the latter'

Interestingly, from the semantic point of view the thematized element occurring on the left of LI seems to be interpreted only as the Topic of the sentence, not necessarily as a Theme. Although this function is the same as that attributed to the Hanging Topic discussed in the previous section, the syntactic behavior of this kind of Topic is the one of a normal left dislocated element (for instance, it copies the preposition, it can be embedded, it does not always need to be doubled by a clitic, contrary to HT).

Hence, we define the position(s) before LI as LDTopics, in order to distinguish them from HT.

We would like to have a more solid empirical basis in order to be able to make further, finer distinctions. Therefore, for the moment we leave the matter at this point, proposing the following section of CP structure:

(57)   [LD   [LI   [Focus...]]]]

This is already a welcome result, it seems to us; if we are on the right track, the apparent recursion of the FPs will in the end disappear.

We have shown that it is possible to find different positions, which are specialized for a particular interpretation. A lot of work remains to be done in this domain, especially concerning syntactic tests which should go hand in hand with the interpretative differences we have described.

5. Conclusions

The cartographic project that aims to analyze the fine structure of the CP domain is based on the fundamental idea that the number of FPs present in the syntactic structure is finite and that each syntactic projection has its own special syntactic and semantic properties. In such a framework – it seems to us - there is no space for recursion. In this paper we have begun to trace a map of the so-called Topic/Focus elements, which does not involve recursion of any FP. We will now sum up some possible lines of research deriving from the analysis presented in this work and will speculate about some general properties that seem to partially depend on non-syntactic factors. We have claimed that the CP portion hosting Topic and Focus elements is to be split into two parts: a Topic field located higher than a Focus field. The Topic field can be further split into Frame and LD, as is shown in the structure in (58):

(58)

[Hang. Topic [Scene Sett. [Left disl. [List interpr [[$_{\text{CONTR. CP1}}$ adv/obj, [$_{\text{CONTR.CP2}}$ circ.adv. [$_{\text{INFORM. CP}}$]]]

|_____FRAME_____| |____THEME_____| |_____FOCUS_____| |__

Such a complex structure has two interesting properties, the first of which is most probably universal, while the second might be language specific. The first property concerns the relation between the semantics and the layering of the FPs involved: the highest projections are those which are already part of the information shared by the speaker and the hearer, the lower ones proceed towards new information. If we are right in our analysis of the Topic/Focus elements, the encoding of informational relations in the syntax of the left periphery follows a very precise semantic path[xx]. This property does not only hold of the layering of the three subfields, Frame, Thematization and Focus, but possibly also inside each field. Considering the Focus layer, we have localized Informational Focus in the lowest of the FPs, while contrastive Focus (which selects an element inside a given set and excludes all others) is higher: this can be seen as representing a progression towards simple 'new information'; in the same way, List Interpretation, which deals with a given set, follows the introduction of a theme. Moreover, the same 'progression towards new information' is also found in an unmarked sentence, as has been shown by Antinucci & Cinque (1977) with data from a language like Italian, where the free word order permits one to test more clearly the meaning of some restrictions[xxi].

A second interesting aspect concerns the layering of the elements which correspond to 'given information', namely Themes and Frame; the highest of the two subfields is the one which contains more salient information from the informational point of view: Frame is higher than Themes because it is the FP giving information about the main Topic and the "where and when" of the sentence. We will not enter a detailed analysis of the reason why this is so, but it seems clear to us that the reason why the layering of the projections is the one illustrated in (52) must derive from the fact it is the interface between syntax and pragmatics, the locus where informational characteristics of pragmatic relevance receive a syntactic encoding. Moreover, it is a well-known fact that the basic organization of information goes precisely from given to new. Thus, the reason why the left periphery of declarative clauses is built up in this way has to do primarily with pragmatic factors, just like the layering of the internal IP structure has to be reduced primarily to semantics. This is also coherent with Cinque's (1999) view that structure is part of the biological endowment.

The second property mentioned above concerns the operator-move procedure, which is available only to the XPs occupying the lowest of the three subfields: in standard Italian operator-movement

stops at the highest Focus projection (as the test of weak crossover shows), while all the Frame and Theme XPs use a different strategy (either "merge" or a distinct type of "move"). We do not know whether other languages have different properties and display operator-movement also for Themes and Frames, or whether the point where operator-movement stops in Italian is a universal fact. Nevertheless, V2 might provide evidence in favor of one of these two options.

References

Antinucci, F. & G. Cinque (1977) "Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano: l'emarginazione." *Studi di Grammatica Italiana*, 6, 121-146.

Ambar, M. (1988) *Para uma sintaxe da inversão sujeito-verbo em português.* Estudos Lingüísticos Lisboa.

Benincà, P. (1988) "L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate," in L. Renzi (ed.), *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione.* Il Mulino, Bologna, vol. 1, 129-194.

Benincà, P. (2001) "Syntactic Focus and Intonational Focus in the left periphery," in G. Cinque &G. Salvi, (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax Offered to Lorenzo Renzi.* Elsevier, Amsterdam, 39-64.

Brody, M. (1990) "Remarks on the Order of Elements in the Hungarian Focus Field," in I. Kenesei (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian*, Vol. 3*, Structures and Arguments*. Jate, Szeged, 95-121.

Calabrese, A. (1980) "Sui pronomi atoni e tonici dell'italiano." *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 5, 65-116.

Cecchetto, C. (1999) "A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance." *Studia Linguistica,* 53, 40-67.

Cecchetto, C. (2000) "Doubling Structures and Reconstruction." *Probus*, 12, 93-126.

Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Foris, Dordrecht.

Cinque, G. (1976) "Mica." *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Padova*, 1, 101-112 (reprinted in G. Cinque (1991) *Teoria linguistica e sintassi italiana*. Il Mulino, Bologna.

Cinque, G. (1977) "The movement nature of Left Dislocation." *Linguistic Inquiry,* 8, 397-412.

Cinque, G. (1982) "Topic Constructions in Some European Languages and Connectedness," in K. Ehlich & H. van Riemsdijk, (eds.), *Connectedness in Sentence, Text and Discourse*, Tilburg University, Tilburg, 7-41 (reprinted in E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk & F. Zwarts, eds. (1997) *Materials on Left Dislocation.* Benjamins, Amsterdam, 93-118).

Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A-bar Dependencies.* MIT Press, Cambridge.

Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and Functional Heads.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Firbas, J. (1964) "On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis." *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague,* 1, 267-380.

Gruppo di Padova (1974) "L'ordine dei sintagmi nella frase," in M. Medici &A. Sangregorio (eds.), I, 147-161.

Gregory, M. L. & L. A. Michaelis (2001) "Topicalization and Left-Dislocation: A functional opposition revisited", to appear in *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 1665-1706.

Gyuris, B. (2001) "Contrastive topics and alternatives", paper presented at the 5th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian, Budapest, May 2001.

Lipták, A. (2001) *On the Syntax of Wh-items in Hungarian*, LOT, Utrecht.

Lonzi, L. (1974) "L'articolazione presupposizione-asserzione e l'ordine V-S in italiano." in M. Medici &A. Sangregorio

(eds.), I, 197-215.

Medici, M. & A. Sangregorio (eds.) *Fenomeni morfologici e sintattici dell'italiano contemporaneo.* Atti del 7. Congresso della Società di Linguistica Italiana, 3 vols., Bulzoni, Rome

Munaro, N. & H-G. Obenauer (1999) "Underspecified *wh*-phrases in pseudo-interrogatives," ms., CNRS Paris-St. Denis / CNR Padua.

Obenauer, H-G. & C. Poletto (1999) "Rhetorical Wh-Phrases in the Left Periphery of the sentence." *Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, University of Venice.

Poletto, C. (2000) *The Higher Functional Field*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Poletto, C. & J.-Y. Pollock (1999) "On the left periphery of Romance Wh-Questions." This volume.

Poletto, C. & R. Zanuttini (2000) "Marking new information in the left periphery: the case of *pa* in Central Rhaeto-Romance." Talk delivered at the "VI Giornata di Dialettologia", University of Padua.

Prince, E. F. (1981) "Topicalization, Focus-Movement and Yiddish-Movement: A Pragmatic Differentiation," in *Proceedings of the 7th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, University of Berkeley, Berkeley, 243-264.

Rizzi, L. (1997) "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery," in L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 281-337.

Footnotes

[i] We would like to thank Guglielmo Cinque, Federico Damonte, Lidia Lonzi, Hans-Georg Obenauer, Luigi Rizzi, Laura Sgarioto, Margarita Suñer, Christina Tortora, Raffaella Zanuttini. For the concerns of the Italian academy Paola Benincà takes responsibility on sections 1, 2, 3, 3.2, 4.1, while Cecilia Poletto on sections 3.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.

[ii] We do not intend to make any specific claim about the way the focussed and topicalized elements are related to the empty category inside the clause. As for focussed elements, it might be the case that the link between the variable and the focussed XP is established by means of a null operator in some SpecC position. As for Topics, the relation between the null category and the Topic might be one of movement (as proposed by Cecchetto (1999) (2000)) or the Topic might be merged directly inside the CP (as proposed in Cinque (1990)). We do not intend to enter into this discussion and will simply make the claim that the two subfields we examine in this work have to be differently characterized with respect to the nature of the empty category they are related to inside the clause.

[iii] It would be interesting and important to check the possible overlapping of the projections we are going to illustrate in this paper and the results of recent research concerning pragmatic and syntactic properties of different types of 'fronting' in other languages: see for example Gyuris (2001), Lipták (2001) on Hungarian, Gregory and Michaelis (2001) on English, etc

[iv] Consider the following example:

(i)   *Mario doman ga dito che el compra na casa
         Mario tomorrow has said that he buys a house

In both sentences a resumptive clitic is necessary: this means that the adverb position at the IP border is only available for an adverb specifying the time of the event in the same sentence, and nothing can move into this position from another sentence.

[v] Note that the presence vs. absence of the clitic has no effect on the weak crossover restriction:

(i)   Di Gianni$_i$, suo$_i$ padre non parla mai
         of Gianni, his father not talks never
         'His father never talks about Gianni'

(i) contains a PP-Topic, which does not require a clitic, and nevertheless no weak crossover effect arises.

[vi] Note that this sentence has to be carefully contrasted with a parallel version without a possessive binding the focalized object:

(i)   ?A MARIA, Giorgio, mia madre presenterà
        TO MARIA Giorgio, my mother will-introduce
(ii)   ?A MARIA, Giorgio$_j$, sua$_i$ madre presenterà
        TO MARIA Giorgio, his mother will-introduce

 In order to evaluate this difference we have to factor out the resistance against preverbal subjects in these structures (see footnote 8).

[vii] The context given by the informants is the following: the speaker is looking out of the window while the hearer is not, but not when they are both looking out of the window.

[viii] Recall that, this variety being a V2 language, the adverb *duman* in a main clause such as (21a) is in a Spec of a CP projection (as is currently assumed for Germanic V2 languages as well); the position is then different from the one that has been identified for parallel sentences in Italian and Paduan (see (5) above).
Note that Left Dislocation is grammatical in interrogative clauses, as (i) shows:

(i)   Giani, inier, ci a-al pa fat?
                John yesterday what has-he interrogative marker done?
                'What has John done yesterday?'

For a detailed analysis of this asymmetry see Poletto (2000)

[ix] Even if the V2 linear constraint is respected, there is a class of adverbs (which cuts across modal, temporal and locative adverbials) that cannot occur in first position:

(i)   a   *Bel a-i mangè
                already have-I eaten
                I have already eaten
        b   *Tosc vagne-l
                soon comes-he
                He is coming soon

The reason why these adverbs cannot occur in first position might have to do with different factors, which we will not analyze here any deeper.

[x] In this work we do not consider the position of wh-elements, which might well be distinct from the one of both contrastive and informational Focus.

[xi] See also the (severe, for some speakers) marginality of sentences like (ii) with respect to sentences like (i):

(i)   A MARIA questo devi dire
        TO MARIA this have-to say
        'You have to say this TO MARIA'

(ii)   */? A MARIA questo Mario deve dire
         TO MARIA this   Mario has to say
         'Mario has to say this TO MARIA'

Interestingly a subject pronoun is more acceptable

(iii)   A MARIA, questo io devo dire
        TO MARIA this I have to say
        'I have to say this TO MARIA'

On the basis of Luigi Rizzi's judgements and comments we could conclude that the different status of sentence (ii) is to be traced back to the existence of two distinct grammars. The first one deals with Focus as it does with wh-movement, then it does not tolerate preverbal subjects when a focalized constituent is moved to the left. The second one marginally admits preverbal subjects when a focalized constituent is moved to Focus. This difference might depend on verb

movement to the C domain.

[xii] A second difference between V2 languages and Italian is that V2 languages also require verb movement when Topic positions are occupied, which is not the case of Italian. Hence, Italian V2 is restricted to interrogatives and Focus movement.

[xiii] It is important to stress that this secondary position cannot be singled out for a contrast, as the following examples show:

(i)   A GIORGIO, il tuo libro devi dare (non a Mario/* non il tuo articolo)
        To Giorgio, your book (you) have to give (not to Mario/not your article)

(ii)   A GIORGIO IL TUO LIBRO devi dare (non a Mario il tuo articolo)
        To Giorgio your book (you) have to give (not to Mario your article)

[xiv] Some speakers find embedded HT difficult to accept. This might be due to the semantics of this projection, which defines the "frame" the sentence refers to. In this sense its typical activation is in a main clause (cf. the scene setting position discussed in section 4.2). For those speakers who accept embedded HT, judgments vary depending on the selecting verb. In our view, this suggests that different verbs can select different portions of the CP complex domain.

[xv] This sentence is not completely ungrammatical; one possibility that comes to mind is that in Italian it is marginally possible to generate a complementizer higher than HT.

[xvi] It has to be underlined that Italian does not show any main versus embedded asymmetry with respect to scene setting adverbs; this is expected, since HT is also possible in embedded clauses.

[xvii] This class of Topics possibly corresponds to what has been named Contrastive Topic by some linguists; see for example Ambar (1988).

[xviii] A sentence like (50B''') differs from (50B'') in signaling that speaker B is annoyed by the question uttered in (50A) by the first speaker

[xix] We suspect that the postverbal list position in (53), (54) and (55) is parasitic on postverbal informational focus, which is in general allowed in Italian. This is shown by the fact that ergative postverbal subjects, which are not necessarily focus but can be part of presentational sentences, are not allowed in the *in situ* list construction:

(i)   ?*Arriva il primo e parte il secondo
        arrives the first and leaves the second

We will not further develop this point.

[xx] See, among many others, Firbas (1964), Gruppo di Padova (1974), Lonzi (1974), Prince (1981), Calabrese (1980), etc.

[xxi] As L. Rizzi pointed out to us, this does not seem to hold in interrogative structures, where a wh-item like *perché* 'why' can be followed by LD. It is clear that (at least wh-) interrogative clauses exploit additional projections of the left periphery, see, Poletto (2000) and Poletto and Pollock (this volume) for details. Moreover, wh-items are not always located in the same position: this is evident in rhetorical questions, where the wh-item occurs in a higher position with respect to true questions (cf. Obenauer and Poletto (1999)). The same can be argued on the basis of phenomena in exclamative clauses (as shown by Benincà (2001)) and for interrogatives with a special entailment (cf. Munaro and Obenauer (1999)).