

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Focus and Focus Structures in the Romance Languages

Cruschina, Silvio

Oxford University Press
2022-06

Cruschina , S 2022 , Focus and Focus Structures in the Romance Languages . in M Aronoff
(ed.) , Oxford Research Encyclopedias : Linguistics . Oxford University Press , Oxford . <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefo>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/346466>

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.649>

unspecified

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Focus and Focus Structures in the Romance languages

Silvio Cruschina (*University of Helsinki*)

Summary

Focus is a key notion to understand processes of syntactic and prosodic readjustments in Romance. Since, prosodically, it must be the most prominent constituent in the sentence, focus associates with the nuclear pitch accent, which may be shifted from its default rightmost position when the syntactic position of the focus also changes. The application of specific syntactic operations depends both on the size and on the subtype of focus, although not always unambiguously. Subject inversion characterizes focus structures where the domain of focus covers either the whole sentence (*broad-focus*) or a single constituent (*narrow-focus*). Presentational constructions distinctively mark broad focus, avoiding potential ambiguity with an SVO structure where the predicate is the focus and the subject is interpreted as topic. In narrow-focus structures, the focus constituent typically occurs sentence-final (*postverbal focalization*), but may also be fronted (*focus fronting*) depending on the specific interpretation associated with the focus.

Semantically, focus indicates the presence of alternatives, and the different interpretations arise from the way the set of alternatives is pragmatically exploited, giving rise to a contextually open set (*information focus*), to contrast or correction (*contrastive or corrective focus*), or to surprise or unexpectedness (*mirative focus*). Whether a subtype of focus may undergo fronting in a Romance language is subject to variation. In most varieties it is indeed possible with contrastive or corrective focus, but it has been shown that focus fronting is also acceptable with non-contrastive focus in several languages, especially with mirative focus.

Finally, certain focus-sensitive operators or particles directly interact with the narrow-focus constituent of the sentence and their association with focus has semantic effects on the interpretation of the sentence.

Keywords

focus, focus structure, subject inversion, preverbal subject, fronting, presentational construction, nuclear pitch accent, contrast, mirative, corrective, focus particles, association with focus

1. Introduction

Focus is usually defined as the informationally new and most relevant part of a sentence. Together with topic, focus is a central notion of information structure, namely, the way in which information is packaged within a sentence according to the temporary state of the interlocutors' mind and background knowledge (Halliday 1967, Chafe 1976, Lambrecht 1994). The grammatical marking of focus – and of information structure in general – plays a fundamental role in the expression of the public communicative goals of the discourse participants and in the management of the common ground, i.e. the background information shared by the speaker and the hearer in a conversation (Krifka 2007). Crucially, however, focus marking is not uniform across languages and, even within the same language, there is not always a one-to-one relation between a specific interpretation and a given focus structure. In addition, different definitions of focus have been provided depending on the theoretical framework adopted and on the grammatical aspects investigated. This has led to the lack of a uniform definition of focus as well as to terminological confusion. Nevertheless, significant advances have been made in the last decades, yielding a better understanding of focus, its properties, and its grammatical correlates. In particular, scholars working on focus have addressed the following issues:

- the relationship between focus and new/old information;
- focus–background dichotomy and the generation of alternatives;
- the grammatical encoding of focus;
- the linguistic reflexes and correlates of different extensions of focus or focus structures;
- the linguistic reflexes and correlates of different (pragmatic) subtypes of focus;
- the association with focus of certain semantic operators and focus-sensitive elements.

The Romance languages have figured prominently in the research on focus and focus-related constructions. In fact, work on Romance has played an essential role in the debate on the issues mentioned above, especially on the syntactic and prosodic marking of focus according to the extension and the subtype of focus. The chapter is structured as follows. In the next section (§ 2), the issues that are fundamental to the definition of focus and that will serve as a preliminary introduction to the rest of the chapter will be discussed, with a special attention to the focus-background dichotomy, and the extension and the subtypes of focus. In the following two sections, the properties and the constructions associated with different extensions of focus will be presented, distinguishing between broad-focus structures (§ 3) and narrow-focus structures (§ 4). Special emphasis will be paid to the developments and achievements in the relevant research on the Romance languages with respect to the above-mentioned issues. Section 5, finally, deals with the semantic association between focus and focus particles.

2. Definitions

Ever since the work by the functional linguists of the Prague School (Sgall et al. 1973, Sgall et al. 1986), focus has been associated with the notion of *rheme*, conveying new information, as opposed to old or given information which is referred to as *theme* (or topic). It soon became clear, however, that the distinction between rheme/focus and theme/topic must be kept separate and independent from the newness and givenness of their referents (Sgall et al. 1973: 17). For Chafe (1976, 1987, 1994) the new-given opposition pertains to a different, psychological dimension concerning the activation of certain information in the short-term memory: in this model, given means *active* in the short-term memory, while new indicates *inactive* information that has not yet been introduced in context, nor in the addressee's mental state. Keeping the distinction of the two dimensions (new-given *vs* focus-topic), focus has been defined in relation to the illocutionary force of the sentence: it is the part of an utterance that is asserted in a declarative sentence or questioned in an interrogative sentence (Lambrecht 1994). The interconnection between focus and illocutionary force is stronger and more explicit in Lombardi Vallauri (2001, 2009), where focus is indeed defined as the part of a sentence that carries the illocutionary force (see also Cresti 2000). By contrast, topic is devoid of illocutionary force and only provides introductory or additional information that helps to cognitively locate the focus.

As pointed out by Gundel (1988), moreover, two notions of newness have been associated with focus in much of the earlier literature, calling for the need for further precision: linguistic expressions have been designated as new (or focal) not only when they identify the part of the sentence in which new information is communicated, but also when they introduce new referents into the discourse. Distinguishing these two dimensions of the new/old information dichotomy is essential to understand the grammatical impact of focus and, more generally, of information structure (see Gundel 1988, Lambrecht 1994, Gundel and Fretheim 2004, Cruschina 2012a).

According to the referential dimension, the referents denoted by the linguistic expressions within a sentence can be new or given to the interlocutors depending on whether they have been introduced into the conversation for the first time or have already been mentioned in the discourse. By contrast, the relational, sentence-internal opposition between newness and givenness refers to the relation between the constituents of a sentence, so that topic identifies what the sentence is about, while focus (or comment) is what is predicated of the topic (Reinhart 1982). In the referential sense, newness and givenness pertain to the association between linguistic structures and the mental states of the interlocutors, according to which linguistic elements can be defined as topical, active, familiar, or identifiable (Gundel et al. 1993, Lambrecht 1994). This dimension is certainly important for the choice between alternative referring expressions (e.g. pronouns *vs* full DPs), for the encoding of the same in terms of definiteness and specificity, and may influence the selection of certain constructions (e.g. presentational constructions, see Lambrecht 1994). However, it is ultimately the relational dimension that constitutes the core of information structure, inasmuch as it deals with the propositional content that is linguistically encoded in the format of a sentence, and with how this information is *packaged* according to discourse functions and to the knowledge and beliefs of the speaker and the hearer(s) (see Halliday 1967, Chafe 1976, Prince 1981, 1986, Vallduví 1992a, Lambrecht 1994).

Thus, the information-structure notion of focus can only be properly understood at the propositional level, in relation with the rest of sentence, namely, with respect to the complementary notion of

background and its extension over the sentence (i.e. which part of the sentence is in focus). Different interpretations, moreover, can characterize narrow focus. The focus–background dichotomy, the extension of the focus, and the semantic and pragmatic subtypes of focus will be discussed in more detail in what follows.

2.1. The Focus–Background Dichotomy and the Extension of Focus

A traditional way to elicit a narrow focus is by means of a wh-question. Wh-questions pose specific conditions on the focal structure of the answers, whereby an answer is felicitous or congruent if its focus constituent corresponds to the wh-phrase in the question. In question–answer sequences, therefore, there is a systematic correlation between the wh-question and the focus–background structure of its possible congruent answers (in the examples, boldface is used to indicate the focus of the sentence):

- (1) a. ¿Qué se compró María? (Sp.)
 what REFL buy.PST.3SG Mary
 ‘What did Mary buy (for herself)?’
 b. María se compró **una calculadora.**
 Mary REFL buy.PST.3SG a calculator
 ‘Mary bought a calculator (for herself).’
 (Gutiérrez-Bravo 2008: 381)

The focus constituent in (1b) identifies the most informative part of the sentence and corresponds to the missing argument in the open proposition (*Mary bought x*) that is presupposed by the question (1a) and that constitutes the background in the answer (1b). What is focal is thus new information, while the non-focus part of a sentence – the background in our terminology – lies outside the scope of assertion, or other illocutionary operators, and therefore contains information that is presupposed. On the basis of examples like this, focus and background have been defined as new and presupposed information, respectively (Jackendoff 1972). We have seen, however, that focus must be new not in the referential sense that it cannot have been previously mentioned, but in the relational sense that the speaker presents it as new information within the sentence it is contained and against the background:

- (2) a. ¿María se compró una calculadora o un libro? (Sp.)
 Mary REFL buy.PST.3SG a calculator or a book
 ‘Did Mary buy a calculator or a book (for herself)?’
 b. María se compró **una calculadora.**
 Mary REFL buy.PST.3SG a calculator
 ‘Mary bought a calculator (for herself).’

The denotatum of the nominal phrase *una calculadora* in (2b) is given, discourse-active information at the time of the utterance since it was mentioned in the alternative question (2a). “What is new is not its referent but the relationship between the focus expression and the proposition” (Lambrecht 1994: 211). The assimilation between background and presupposed information is also problematic, especially if the classical notion of presupposition is taken into account. Lambrecht’s definition of focus, for example, relies on the complement notion of presupposition. Even if it is certainly true that the non-focal part of the utterance is generally presupposed, notions such as newness or presupposition should not figure in the definition of focus, since they are “statistical correlatives, but not definitional features, of focus” (Krifka 2007: 30). Recent studies have moreover highlighted the different nature of the presupposition generated by focus (Büring 2004, Geurts and van der Sandt 2004, Kratzer 2004; see also Lombardi Vallauri 2001, 2009 for a different analysis of the relation between assertions and presuppositions and their relation with information structure).

The focus–background dichotomy must thus not be defined in terms of new vs old/presupposed information. A semantic definition of focus is in fact more helpful to understand the focus–background partition of the sentence (from Krifka 2007: 18):

- (3) Focus indicates the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions.

The idea that focus introduces a set of alternatives at the propositional level has been developed and worked out in formal detail within the theory of Alternative Semantics (Rooth 1985, 1992). In this framework, the ordinary semantic value of the focus expression is computed at a first level of semantic composition, while its alternative semantic value is calculated at a second level, using a recursive definition, and consists of a set of alternative propositions in which the ordinary semantic value of the focus expression is replaced by contextually appropriate alternatives. Within this perspective, the focus–background dimension is conceived of as independent from other information-structure notions such as givenness: the background of a sentence can be given, but need not be (see Féry and Krifka 2008, Dufter and Jacob 2009; see also Samek-Lodovici 2015 for a different view).

The typical examples of focus discussed in the literature involve *narrow* focus, whose domain only includes a nominal or a prepositional phrase. Narrow focus is generally contrasted with *broad* focus, which obtains when the focus domain extends over the entire sentence. The question-answer test is traditionally used to elicit narrow focus (cf. 1b), but broad focus can be also elicited in answers to appropriate questions such as *What happened?*, which yields focus on the whole sentence. The term broad focus has also been used to describe structures where the focus domain stretches over the whole verb phrase, as in answers to questions making reference to a given subject (e.g. *What happened to John? What did John do?*), leading to a degree of imprecision and potential ambiguity. I will use the term *predicate focus* to refer to those structures where the subject is part of the background and the predicate is the focus: this corresponds to the topic-comment sentence type (Lambrecht 1994: 221).

These different focus structures (narrow, broad, and predicate focus) are used in different communicative situations and are manifested across languages in distinct formal categories. Indeed, many grammatical aspects of a language, such as prosody or word order, are intimately connected with information-structural variation and in particular with the extension of the focus (see Lambrecht 1994, 2001, Büring 2010, 2016, Féry and Ishihara 2016).

2.3. Contrast, Emphasis, and Subtypes of Focus

The definition of focus presented in (3) is essential to understand the different subtypes of (narrow) focus and their relationship to contrast and emphasis. We have defined focus as the constituent of the sentence that semantically introduces a set of alternatives in the context of the utterance. In a sense, then, focus is always contrastive, in that the ordinary semantic value of the focus expression contrasts with the focal alternatives. It has been shown, however, that the focus constituent is marked differently, in the grammar, depending on how the focal alternatives are exploited and on whether they constitute an open or a closed set (see, e.g., Vallduví and Vilkuña 1998, Molnár 2002, Krifka 2007, Cruschina 2021). The first case is typical of answers to wh-questions providing missing or sought information, where the set of alternatives is pragmatically and contextually delimited, but in fact no specific alternatives are mentioned in the discourse (cf. (1b) above). This type of focus is generally called *information focus*, which may also be used to indicate covert questions (or questions under discussion) that are implicit in the context. In the second case, focus signals that alternatives – usually one – are given in the context and an explicit contrast is established between the focus constituent and the alternative antecedent, typically by way of correction or denial. The term *contrastive focus* should be restricted to this type of focus used for truly contrastive purposes (Krifka 2007: 33). To avoid confusion, the label *corrective focus* has been preferred to refer to this kind of focus (Bianchi and Bocci 2012).

When focus creates a contrast against beliefs or expectations based on common knowledge, an emphatic interpretation of surprise or unexpectedness arises (Krifka 1995: 227). The focus of this type has been labelled *mirative focus* (Cruschina 2012a). Focus can also be associated with an exhaustive interpretation (*exhaustive focus*), emphasizing the exhaustive identification or the exclusion by identification with respect to a set of alternatives. Exhaustive focus has been invoked to account for the interpretation of focus in clefts or in the preverbal position of Hungarian (see, e.g., É. Kiss 1998).¹

In the relevant literature, the labels for the subtypes of focus that we have just identified have been used with different meanings and to refer to different concepts, contributing to some terminological

¹ A further subtype of focus has been recognized in the literature: *verum focus*, namely, focus on the truth value or on the polarity of a sentence. Verum focus has been analysed as a particular case of narrow focus (Féry 2007) and different strategies have been described to mark this type of focus in Romance, including prosodic focus on the verb, fronting, and the use of polarity particles (Hernanz 2007, Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal 2009, Escandell-Vidal and Leonetti 2011, Giurgea and Remberger 2012b, Poletto and Zanuttini 2013).

confusion. The definitions outlined above simply make reference to the precise kind of *contrast* within the set of alternatives evoked by narrow focus: open contrast for information focus, explicit contrast for contrastive/corrective focus, contrast against expectations for mirative focus, and restrictive contrast for exhaustive focus. It is the unexpected new information contrasting with beliefs and expectations that yields those kinds of interpretation that are generally described in terms of *emphasis*, thus explaining the relation between focus, contrast, and emphasis (for a fine-grained classification of the focus functions within a functionalist perspective, see Dik 1989).

These subtypes of focus are generally considered to be pragmatic in nature and do not directly relate to the propositional content of the utterance, in that they do not have an immediate impact on the truth conditions of the sentence.² As will be shown below (cf. § 5), semantic uses of focus are possible with the phenomenon of association with focus (Krifka 2007). Nonetheless, it is generally acknowledged that these subtypes of focus are distinctly marked by prosodic and/or syntactic means in several languages, including Romance languages. With these definitions and this background in mind, we are now ready to move to the expression and to the marking of focus in Romance.

3. Broad-Focus Structures

Romance languages lack morphological markers of focus, and exclusively resort to syntactic and prosodic strategies to mark the different focus structures (i.e. broad- and narrow-focus) and subtypes of focus. Moving away from the predominant SOV order of Classical Latin, and through an alleged V2 stage in the Medieval period, today all Romance languages show an unmarked SVO order (Ledgeway 2012: 69, cf. also Chapter 71). Prosodically, the focus constituent must be maximally prominent in its domain of interpretation (Truckenbrodt 1995). Consequently, it must be assigned the most prominent metrical head of the sentence: it thus bears the nuclear stress. At the intonational level, then, this metrical head is associated with a pitch accent that qualifies as the *nuclear pitch accent* (NPA). In Romance, the NPA is assigned by default to the rightmost constituent of the sentence. Stress and NPA assignment are insensitive to the argument structure of the verb (see Zubizarreta 1998, 2016).

Unmarked word order and default NPA assignment characterize broad- and predicate-focus structures. SVO sentences can therefore be interpreted either as broad focus or as predicate focus, the only difference would concern the interpretation of the subject, which is a topic in predicate-focus structures and part of the focus in broad-focus structures. Moreover, it would be incorrect to assimilate these focus structures with the unmarked word order. As will be shown in the following sections, syntactically marked configurations may well be associated with a broad-focus structure. Therefore, despite the different mechanisms and strategies to mark distinct focus-background articulations, there is no strict one-to-one correspondence between information structure and syntactic word order, and a certain degree of ambiguity persists. In the presence of the unmarked word order SVO and the default assignment of the NPA to the rightmost constituent of the sentence, as in sentence (4), focus can project, in that different constituents containing the word bearing the NPA can be interpreted as focus (Selkirk 1995, Ladd 1996). The constituent associated with NPA is marked in bold in the relevant examples:

(4) O João quebrou **o vaso**. (Pg.)

(5) a. [O João quebrou **o vaso**]_{Focus}

b. O João [quebrou **o vaso**]_{Focus}

c. O João quebrou [**o vaso**]_{Focus}

the João broke the vase

‘João broke the vase.’

The syntactically and prosodically unmarked sentence in (4) can identify a structure with broad focus on the entire sentence (5a), a predicate-focus structure with focus on the verbal phrase (5b), or a sentence

² The pragmatic and semantic uses of focus cannot always be neatly separated. Some subtypes of focus have been argued to have a direct influence on the truth-conditional meaning (this has been claimed for exhaustive focus in Hungarian by Szabolcsi 1981 and É. Kiss 1998) or to be associated with conventional implicatures with a semantic – albeit not truth-conditional – interpretive import (Bianchi et al. 2015, 2016, Cruschina 2021).

with narrow focus on the direct object (5c). Thus, (4) is a felicitous answer to the question *What happened?*, with the focus structure in (5a), as well as an answer to the questions *What did John do?* (5b) and *What did John break?* (5c). All these focus structures satisfy the prosodic requirement that the element that is associated with the NPA must be contained with the focus constituent.

3.1. Unmarked Word Order, Subject Inversion, and Presentational Constructions

The syntactic effects of focus are generally considered in comparison with the unmarked word order. The most common diagnostics to determine the unmarked word order of a language is the elicitation of an out-of-the-blue context through questions like *What's happening?* under the assumption that in this context the whole proposition contained in the answer conveys new information and a broad-focus structure is thus yielded. If we apply this diagnostics to Romance languages, the only pragmatically felicitous order with a transitive sentence is SVO, as illustrated in (8) for Spanish:

- (7) ¿Qué pasó?
 ‘What happened?’
- (8) a. La enfermera salvó al paciente. SVO
 the nurse saved ACC-the patient
 ‘The nurse saved the patient.’
- b. #La enfermera al paciente lo salvó. SOV
 c. #Salvó la enfermera al paciente. VSO
 d. #Salvó al paciente la enfermera. VOS
 e. #Al paciente la enfermera lo salvó. OSV
 f. #Al paciente lo salvó la enfermera. OVS
- (Gutiérrez-Bravo 2008: 370)

However, in intransitive clauses, subject inversion (i.e. the order VS) may also correspond to the unmarked word order and express a broad-focus structure. Subject inversion of this type has been analysed as strictly connected with the null-subject property of the language (Rizzi 1982). Later work has however shown that, even though the null-subject property constitutes a necessary condition for subject inversion, it is yet not a sufficient property. Factors such as the argument structure of predicates, lexical-semantic properties of the verb, and the thematic prominence of arguments play a crucial role in making VS order the unmarked broad-focus structure (see Leonetti 2017).

Broad-focus subject inversion has been primarily associated with unaccusativity. It is indeed traditionally assumed that VS is the unmarked word order with unaccusative verbs, as in (9). It has soon been shown that, on closer scrutiny, the range of verbs that allow subject inversion is larger and includes unergatives (10).³ What the unaccusatives and the unergatives that allow subject inversion like those in (9)–(10) have in common is the supposed presence of a null locative/goal argument which contributes a deictic interpretation of the sentence, spatially and/or temporally related to the speaker (Pinto 1997, Tortora 1997, 2001, Sheehan 2010, 2016, Corr 2016, Leonetti 2014, 2017, Bentley and Cruschina 2018).

- (9) Morrió el güelu. (Ast.)
 died the grandfather
 ‘(My) grandfather died.’
 (Corr 2016: 1)
- (10) Ha telefonato Gianni. (It.)
 has phoned Gianni
 ‘Gianni has phoned (here/us).’

This type of inversion is additionally sensitive to the contrast between stage-level and individual-level predicates: it is disallowed with individual-level predicates, as shown in (11b), and is generally possible with predicates describing bounded eventualities (Bianchi 1993, Soare 2009, Bentley and Cruschina 2018), as in (11a):

³ The VS order qualifies as unmarked also with psychological verbs, where the sentence-initial position is occupied by the indirect object encoding the experiencer, rather than by the subject (cf. Chapters 71).

- (11) a. Sono disponibili alcune guide turistiche. (It.)
 are available some guides tourist
 ‘Some tourist guides are available.’
 b. *Sono poliglote alcune guide turistiche.
 are polyglot some guides tourist
 ‘Some tourist guides are polyglot.’
 (Bianchi 1993: 60)

These inversion structures are also possible in a non-null subject language like French, though subject to more constraints than in the null-subject Romance languages. The expletive pronoun *il* ‘it’, a temporal expression or a sentence-initial adverbial such *peut-être* ‘maybe’ or *sans doute* ‘doubtless’ must appear at the beginning of the sentence:⁴

- (12) a. Il est venu trois femmes. (Fr.)
 it is come three women
 ‘Three women have come.’
 b. Alors sont arrivés trois hommes en armes.
 then are arrived three men in arms
 ‘Then three armed men arrived.’
 c. Peut-être sont partis les enfants.
 maybe are left the children
 ‘Maybe the children left.’

An important difference between French and the null-subject Romance languages is that in the latter, but not in French, subject inversion is very commonly used to mark the subject as the sole focus of the sentence in a narrow-focus structure (cf. Section 4). The ambiguity of subject inversion as a strategy for both broad- and narrow-focus shows once again that the correspondence between information structure and syntax is not always univocal. Several studies have shown that distinctive prosodic properties may be associated with the two types of focus structure, which may thus remove potential ambiguities and ensure a formal contrast. However, the precise phonological properties, including distinct types of pitch accent, are different from language to language, and sometimes are even disputed, making it difficult to draw generalizations that could encompass all Romance languages (see Poletto and Bocci 2016 for an overview and for references).

The use of subject inversion for the expression of broad focus can also be observed in other constructions such as existentials (13) and locative inversion (14) (cf. Chapter 106):

- (13) Había unhas mulleres xunto á figueira. (Glc.)
 had.3SG some women next to-the fig tree
 ‘There were some women close to the fig tree.’
 (Longa et al. 1998: 137)
- (14) Dans le lac se reflétait un château. (Fr.)
 in the lake REFL reflected a castle
 ‘In the lake was reflected a castle.’
 (Bonami et al. 1999: 36)

Despite their different (apparently bi-clausal) composition, special types of existential and cleft constructions, called *presentational cleft constructions* in Lambrecht (1994, 2000, 2001, 2002) for spoken French, have also been associated with sentence focus (15). Similar constructions have also been described for Catalan (*eventive existentials*, see Leonetti 2008, Villalba 2013) and for Italian

⁴ Many other factors act as constraints on subject inversion in French, including register (cf., e.g., the so-called stylistic inversion) and sentence type (interrogative inversion or inversion in subjunctive clauses). For more details on subject inversion in French, see Bonami et al. (1999), Marandin (2001, 2011), and Lahousse (2006, 2011). See also Section 4.

(*presentational ci-sentences*, see De Cesare 2007, Cruschina 2012b, Bentley et al. 2015), as illustrated in (16a) and (16b), respectively:

- (15) a. Y a le téléphone qui sonne. (Fr.)
 there has the phone which rings
 ‘The phone is ringing.’
 b. J’ai une voisine qui fume.
 I have a neighbour who smokes
 ‘My neighbour smokes.’
 (Lambrecht 2002: 171, 177)
- (16) a. Hi ha la Maria molt enfadada / al telèfon / que espera. (Cat.)
 there has the Maria very angry to-the phone / that awaits
 ‘Mary was very angry/at the phone/waiting.’
 (Leonetti 2008: 141)
 b. C’è Maria che canta in un teatro di Berlino. (It.)
 there_isMary who sings in a theatre of Berlin
 ‘Mary sings in a theatre in Berlin.’
 (Cruschina 2012b: 97)

These constructions present a new entity into the discourse, of which something is subsequently predicated. They might thus be viewed as narrow focus in that they introduce a new referent, or as predicate focus insofar as this new referent functions as the topic of the following predicate. In fact, they are broad-focus structures because, unlike clefts proper, no sets of alternatives are evoked at the level of sentential subparts (e.g. the postcopular nominal constituent), and they are felicitous in out-of-the-blue contexts. From a functional perspective, presentational constructions with a postverbal subject are used to avoid the possible topic interpretation of a preverbal subject. In this sense, subject inversion in general can be seen as a strategy to guarantee the interpretation of the subject as part of the focus domain and to avoid the potential ambiguity of the subject in the SVO order (see Giurgea 2017).

I conclude this section with a controversial issue concerning the unmarked word order of broad-focus structures. We saw that VS is the most natural word order with unaccusatives and with some kinds of unergatives, while SVO characterizes broad-focus structures with transitive verbs. Nevertheless, VSO has often been considered to be more natural or at least equally good; the acceptability and the unmarkedness of this order in broad-focus structures, however, vary considerably across the Romance languages. VSO has been identified as a possible unmarked order of Spanish by several scholars. In fact, both SVO and VSO have been analysed as perfectly natural word orders in Spanish broad-focus declaratives (17). However, the VSO order is not equally admitted by all speakers and its acceptability seems to vary not only with respect to the type of argument structure involved in the sentence, but also in accordance with diatopic and individual variation (Hernanz and Brucart 1987, Ordóñez 2000, 2007, Zubizarreta 1998, Zagona 2002, Gutiérrez-Bravo 2007, 2008, Leonetti 2014, 2017).

- (17) a. María compró un coche. (Sp.)
 María bought a car
 b. Compró María un coche.
 bought María a car
 ‘Mary bought a car.’
 (Zagona 2002: 202)

Even more robust is the claim that the unmarked word order is VSO for Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, Cornilescu 1997), while the SVO order is characteristic of predicate-focus structures, where the subject is interpreted as a topic. Nevertheless, it seems that SVO is still the dominant and most common Romanian word order (Ledgeway 2012: 68–70, Zafiu 2013), and that in Romanian preverbal subjects are not necessarily topics (Motapanyane 1994, Hill 2002, Giurgea and Remberger 2012a, Giurgea 2017).

- (18) a. A citit Ion două cărți. (Ro.)
 has read Ion two books

- b. Ion a citit două cărți.
 Ion has read two books
 ‘John read two books.’

VSO in broad-focus structures is subject to stronger constraints in the other Romance languages. It is possible in Portuguese, though not so readily in answers to the what-happened question, where the most natural order remains SVO (Duarte 1987, 2003, Ambar 1992, 1999, Costa 1998, 2002, 2004), but is not available or is highly marginal in Italian and in Catalan (Belletti and Shlonsky 1995, Belletti 2001, 2004, Sheehan 2006, López 2009, Leonetti 2010, 2017).

3.2. Preverbal Subjects in Predicate-Focus Structures

In predicate-focus structures, the domain of the focus extends over the predicate, thus excluding the subject. This structure corresponds to the topic-comment sentence type, where the assertion relates the topic with the event denoted by the predicate. The analysis of broad-focus structures in the previous section has shown that subjects need not to be topics, but can be part of the focus embracing the entire sentence. In the same way, sentence-initial topics need not be grammatical subjects (cf. Chapter 100).

The distinction between broad- and predicate-focus structures remains one of the most blurred and controversial. Especially when it comes to the SVO order, the only difference concerns the interpretation of the subject, which is taken to be a topic in predicate-focus structures, while it is analysed as being part of the focus in broad-focus structures. The most common and typical diagnostics to distinguish between the two focus readings (i.e. between broad and predicate focus) with SVO, thus, remains the elicitation of an out-of-the-blue context through questions (cf. § 3.1), as shown in (19) which can be contrasted with the predicate-focus eliciting question in (20):

- (19) Q: ¿Qué pasó? (Sp.)
 ‘What happened?’
 A: [La enfermera salvó al paciente.]_{Focus} SVO
 ‘The nurse saved the patient.’
- (20) Q: ¿Qué hizo la enfermera?
 ‘What did the nurse do?’
 A: La enfermera [salvó al paciente.]_{Focus} SVO
 ‘The nurse saved the patient.’

In the Romance languages, the two different focus structures are not determined by grammatical properties, but rather by the expectations created with the questions in the context. Most studies on the information-status of the subject in the SVO order have concentrated on its syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties, especially with respect to two aspects: first, the topicality of the subject (including quirky subjects) and, second, possible specific grammatical properties of subjects that may help to distinguish between the two structures.

As for the first issue, as pointed out by Lambrecht (1994: 118), “topics are not necessarily grammatical subjects, and grammatical subjects are not necessarily topics.” Attempts exist in the relevant literature to tell apart the two notions in Romance. Rizzi (2005), for example, argues that topics, but not subjects, are characterized by a connection to the previous discourse, which he defines in terms of D(iscourse)-linking. Cardinaletti (2004) suggests that the distinction must be syntactically encoded, proposing a dedicated position for subjects. This position is not exclusively designed for the grammatical (nominal) subject of the sentence, but for the so-called (logical) *subject of predication* (see also Bentley and Cruschina 2018).

The second issue, namely, the grammatical distinction between the two focus structures in Romance, is still little understood. The linguistic research on the grammatical correlates of information-structure properties has concentrated on the focal *vs* non-focal status of the preverbal subject at the prosodic and syntactic level in narrow-focus structures, that is, with the subject as narrow focus (see Gabriel 2010, Bocci 2013, Feldhausen 2014). When the distinction between topical *vs* non-topical subjects has been taken into account, this was often in the light of the controversial hypothesis that, in null-subject Romance languages, all preverbal subjects are topics (Barbosa 1995, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998; see Costa and Duarte 2002, Sheehan 2006 for criticism). The prosodic

investigation, on the other hand, concentrated on the distinction between narrow focus and broad focus, thus not distinguishing between broad- and predicate-focus structures (cf. § 3.1). We can thus conclude that the unmarked SVO order allows for alternative focus readings according to the size of the focus domain. Such alternative readings are contextually determined.

4. Narrow-Focus Structures

Syntax and prosody often operate together in the grammatical coding of the focus within a sentence, yielding structures that are both syntactically and prosodically marked. However, they need not do so: the unmarked word order SVO may well be associated with a marked NPA, as in (21a). In this case, prosody alone tells us that we are dealing with narrow focus on the preverbal subject. Syntactic means are instead more commonly used in Romance to mark argument focus and to guarantee an unambiguous (or at least, less ambiguous) interpretation of the focus structure: (21b) features an unmarked assignment of the NPA to the rightmost constituent, but a marked (O)VS order.

- (21) a. **Gianni** ha rotto il vaso. (It.)
 Gianni has broken the vase
 b. (Il vaso,) l' ha rotto **Gianni**.
 the vase it.ACC has broken Gianni
 'Gianni broke the vase.'

- (22) a. Gianni ha rotto **il vaso**. (It.)
 Gianni has broken the vase
 b. **Il vaso** ha rotto Gianni.
 the vase has broken Gianni
 'Gianni broke *the vase*.'

The two options in (21) are available not only for subjects, but also for direct objects (22) and other constituents, so that we can conclude that, in Romance, two positions are associated with focus in narrow-focus structures: a postverbal position within the core of sentence and a preverbal position within the left periphery of the clause. The first position is typically sentence final – ignoring possible right-dislocated material, of course. I will call *postverbal focalization* (PoF) the positioning of the focus constituent in this postverbal position (21b, 22a), while I will refer to the placement of the focus constituent to the preverbal left peripheral position as *focus fronting* (FF) (21a, 22b). The two focus positions should be distinguished from focus in situ, that is, the focal strategy whereby the narrow focus is only marked by prosodic shift: the focus constituent remains in its unmarked position and no syntactic displacement takes place. Of course, PoF of objects may coincide with focus in situ, at least with respect to the superficial linear order (cf. 22a), in the same way as FF of subjects may coincide with focus in situ (21a). However, the distinction becomes more evident when it is the subject that undergoes PoF (21b) or when the object is focus fronted (22b).

PoF is the predominant strategy in Romance to mark narrow focus, FF being restricted to specific pragmatic and interpretive conditions, that is, to specific subtypes of focus. FF may also depend on the syntactic category of the focus expression, proving more common with quantifiers or quantified phrases,⁵ as well as in combination with focus particles (Brunetti 2009) (cf. § 5). As will be shown, these restrictions are stronger in some languages than in others. In the next sections, I will discuss the two narrow-focus structures (PoF and FF) in more detail (§§ 4.1–4.2), and will then turn to the role and effects of narrow focus in sentence types other than declaratives (§ 4.3).

4.1. Postverbal Focalization (PoF)

PoF is the most common syntactic configuration associated with narrow-focus structures in modern Romance (see, e.g., Zubizarreta 1998, Costa 2004). Indeed, in Romance postverbal foci are generally described as the most natural and pragmatically felicitous option in all contexts licensing narrow focus and, thus, with all subtypes of focus. It is traditionally claimed that FF must be sanctioned by a special interpretation of the focus constituent (e.g. with contrastive/corrective focus), while information focus

⁵ In some studies, it is actually argued that quantifier or quantified-phrase fronting should be distinguished from FF (see, e.g., Vallduví 1992b, Quer 2002, Cruschina 2012a, Leonetti 2017).

typically occurs postverbally. As shown in the following examples, only sentences with PoF are considered to be pragmatically felicitous answers to the corresponding wh-questions (Zubizarreta 1998, 1999, Gutiérrez-Bravo 2008, Fábregas 2916, Belletti 2004):

- (23) Q: ¿Quién compró los discos? (Sp.)
 who bought the records
 ‘Who bought the records?’
 A1: Los compró **una muchacha**.
 them.ACC bought a girl
 A2: #**Una muchacha** los compró.
 a girl them.ACC bought
 (Gutiérrez-Bravo 2008: 383)

- (24) Q: Chi ha parlato? (It.)
 who has spoken
 ‘Who spoke?’
 A1: Ha parlato **Gianni**.
 has spoken Gianni
 A2: #**Gianni** ha parlato.
 Gianni has spoken
 ‘Gianni spoke’
 (Belletti 2004: 21)

Information-focus subjects occurring in situ, in their preverbal position, are only considered to be pragmatically felicitous in the non-null subject languages French and Brazilian Portuguese, where narrow-focus subject inversion is rather limited, as shown in (25) and (26) (see, e.g., Zubizarreta 1998: 20, Drijkoningen and Kampers-Manhe 2012, Kato and Martins 2016). In both languages, an information-focus subject can alternatively – and more commonly in the spoken language – be introduced by a cleft sentence or, in fact, by a reduced cleft. Interestingly the cleft construction to mark information focus is not readily available for constituents other than subjects (27) (Beysade et al. 2004, Belletti 2007, 2009):

- (25) Q: Quem levou o meu laptop? (Pt.)
 who took the my laptop
 ‘Who took my laptop?’
 A1: Levou [**o ladrão**]_{Focus} (EuPt./ *BrPt)
 took the thief
 A2: [**O ladrão**]_{Focus} levou ele. (BrPt / *EuPt.)
 the thief took it
 ‘The *thief* took it.’
 (Kato and Martins 2016: 29–30)

- (26) Q: Qui dort? (Fr.)
 who sleeps
 ‘Who sleeps?’
 A1: **Jean** dort.
 Jean sleeps
 ‘Jean sleeps.’
 A2: *Dort **Jean**.
 sleeps Jean
 A3: C’est **Jean** (qui dort).
 it-is Jean who sleeps
 ‘It is Jean (who sleeps).’
 (Drijkoningen and Kampers-Manhe 2012: 66)

- (27) Q: Qu’est-ce-que t’as acheté? (Fr.)

- what you-have bought
 ‘What did you buy?’
 A: *C’est **un livre**.
 it-is a book
 ‘It is a book.’
 (Belletti 2009: 262)

In null subject Romance languages, by contrast, preverbal focal subjects are considered to be acceptable only with a contrastive or emphatic interpretation. Under this interpretation, these cases of narrow focus are not treated as in-situ foci, but have rather been analysed in generative syntax as involving a movement operation, either prosodically (Zubizarreta 1998) or syntactically (Belletti 2004, Bocci 2013) motivated. This would be a case of string-vacuous movement with no evident effects on the linear word order.

It should also be noted that the judgements in (25) and (26) have been disputed in the literature on the syntactic distribution of narrow focus in Romance. It has been shown that varieties such as Sardinian and Sicilian, FF with information focus, i.e. in the absence of special interpretations or readings, may prove common and even more natural in some contexts (see Jones 1993, Cruschina 2015, 2016, 2021 Bentley 2008). Similarly, some scholars have more recently reported different views and experimental data on different varieties of Spanish, showing that the preverbal position is not necessarily restricted to contrastive focus or emphasis, and that preverbal subject foci – but also other focal constituents – are indeed accepted by native speakers (see Gabriel 2010, Vanrell and Fernández-Soriano 2013, 2018, Uth 2014, Heidinger 2015, 2018, Jiménez-Fernández 2015a,b, Hoot 2016, Sánchez Alvarado 2018, Gutiérrez-Bravo et al. 2019; see also Kato and Raposo 1996 and Brunetti 2004 on the possibility of fronting a narrow focus in Brazilian Portuguese and in Italian, respectively). We will return to this issue in the next section on FF (§ 4.2).

The configuration resulting from PoF of subjects is grammatically very similar to subject inversion in broad-focus structures. There are however crucial differences between the two types of subject inversion in Romance. First of all, narrow-focus subject inversion (i.e. PoF of subjects) is only widely employed in null-subject languages, being very limited in French and, even if to a lesser extent, also in Brazilian Portuguese.⁶ Secondly, as we saw in Section 3.1, broad-focus subject inversion is conditioned by factors such as the argument structure and the lexical-semantic properties of the predicate, proving for example more natural and widespread with unaccusative verbs. On the contrary, narrow-focus subject inversion occurs more freely with all verb types, including transitive verbs, especially when the direct object is cliticized to the verb, as shown in the Gardenese Ladin example in (28):

- (28) Q: *Who wrote the letter to the newspaper?*
 A: La lëtra tla zaita l’à scrita la l’oma. (Grd.)
 the letter in-the newspaper it.ACC-has written the mum
 ‘It is the mum who wrote the letter to the newspaper.’
 (Casalicchio and Cognola 2018: 84)

An exception to this generalization is Brazilian Portuguese, where narrow-focus subject inversion is perfectly natural with an unaccusative verb such as *cair* ‘fall’ (29A), but a cleft would be preferred with other verb types as with the transitive verb *ver* ‘see’ (30A2) (from Kato and Martins 2016: 26):

- (29) Q: Quem caiu? (Pt.)
 who fell
 ‘Who fell?’
 A: Caiu **uma criança**. (EuPt./BrPt.)
 fell a child
 ‘A child fell.’

⁶ In French narrow-focus subject inversion is only possible in highly specific contexts. This type of subject inversion is called *elaborative inversion* in Marandin (2010), the *focus VS* in Lahousse (2006, 2011) and *inversion via permutation* in Marandin (2011). In support of their narrow-focus status, Marandin (2011: 332) shows that sentences with this type of inversion are judged as appropriate in answers to questions.

- (30) Q: Quem foi que viu un gato? (Pt.)
 who was that saw a cat
 ‘Who saw a cat?’
 A1: Viu **uma criança**. (EuPt./ *BrPt)
 saw a child
 A2: (Foi) **uma criança**. (EuPt./BrPt.)
 was a child
 ‘It was a child.’

A further controversial issue concerning narrow-focus subject inversion has to do with the actual position of the postverbal focus. The postverbal focus position is generally described as sentence final (see, e.g., Contreras 1976, 1991, Zubizarreta 1998, 1999). In many studies, moreover, the postverbal focus appears adjacent to the verb. When the subject undergoes PoF, any element that would normally occur in a postverbal position in the unmarked order (e.g. a direct or indirect object) is dislocated, so that the focus constituent is adjacent to the verb. This requirement, however, is subject to variation across Romance: it is stronger in Catalan and in Italian,⁷ but is weaker or even absent in Spanish, in European (but not Brazilian) Portuguese, and in Romanian, where the order VOS, with narrow focus on the subject, is possible even if the object is part of the presupposition together with the verb (Belletti and Shlonsky 1995, Belletti 2001, Zubizarreta 1998, 1999, Costa 2004, López 2009, Leonetti 2010, 2017, Sheehan 2010, Kato and Martins 2016, Lobo and Martins 2017):

- (31) Q: Chi ha rotto il vaso? (It.)
 who has broken the vase
 ‘Who broke the vase?’
 A1: L’ha rotto **Maria**, il vaso.
 it.ACC-has broken Maria the vase
 A2: ?? Ha rotto il vaso **Maria**.
 has broken the vase Maria
 ‘*Maria* broke it.’
- (32) Q: Cine a venit acasă? (Ro.)
 who has come home
 ‘Who came home?’
 A: A venit acasă **mama**.
 has come home mother-the
 ‘*Mum* came home.’
 (Lobo and Martins 2017: 38)

The syntactically marked nature of PoF is evident with subject inversion, but is not as obvious in the case of a focal direct object or any other constituent that would independently occur clause-finally. In the latter case, the narrow-focus configuration may be treated as an instance of focus in situ. Zubizarreta (1998: 21) considers SVOXP, where the focus constituent is not sentence final, agrammatical in Spanish and in Italian, but grammatical in French, showing once again that focus in situ is in fact only possible in non-null subject languages, not only with subjects but also with objects. These judgements are however controversial. As shown by Dufter and Gabriel (2016), a reordering of the postverbal constituents is admitted in clauses with a ditransitive verb when the direct object is in focus, yielding a reversal of the unmarked order of direct and the indirect objects (see also Domínguez 2002). In this case, French patterns with the other Romance languages:

- (33) a. Vaig posar [tots els llibres]_{Focus} sobre la taula. (Cat.)

⁷ VOS is not invariably excluded in Italian, but seems to be subject to a definiteness restriction (see Belletti and Shlonsky 1995, Pinto 1997), as well as to variation of acceptability among native speakers. The same order becomes more acceptable when the focalized subject bears contrastive focus (Calabrese 1992). On the VOS order in Romance from a comparative perspective, see also Lahousse and Lamiroy (2012) and Leonetti (2017).

- go.1SG put.INF all the books on the table
- b. Vaig posar sobre la taula [tots el llibres.]_{Focus}
 go.1SG put.INF on the table all the books
 (Dufter and Gabriel (2016: 432)
 ‘I put all the books on the table.’
- (34) a. Il a offert [un livre]_F à son frère. (Fr.)
 he has offered a book to his brother
 b. Il a offert à son frère [un livre.]_{Focus}
 he has to his brother offered a book
 ‘He gave a book to his brother.’
 (Dufter and Gabriel (2016: 432)

These data suggest that the position targeted by PoF does not necessarily coincide with the in-situ position. Despite being both grammatical, it is however still open to debate whether the two options in (33) and (34) are equally felicitous, or whether one is preferred over the other. Moreover, as with other focus structures, variation may well be at play across Romance.

As will be discussed in the next section, an interpretative property typically associated with FF in Romance is contrast. However, some Romance varieties such as French and some northern Italian dialects also have a strong preference for PoF in contrastive contexts (Paoli 2003, Lambrecht 1994, 2001, Cruschina 2012a: 97).⁸ It is generally assumed that clefts do not simply encode a plain information focus, but convey an exhaustive or contrastive interpretation (see Lambrecht 2001, De Cesare 2017; cf. Chapter 103).⁹ However, the French examples (cf. (26) above) show that in this language cleft sentences can also be used for information focus, although limited to focal subjects.

4.2. Focus Fronting (FF)

FF is a further construction available in Romance to mark narrow-focus structure. Given that it instantiates a marked configuration that depends on the information structure of the sentence and on the dynamics of the discourse, FF is typical of the colloquial and spoken language and is therefore less often found in narrative texts.¹⁰ An example of FF with a contrastive or corrective focus is given in (35):

- (35) **Cu tren-ul** merg la mare, nu cu mașina. (Ro.)
 by train-the go.1sg to seaside not by car-the
 ‘It is by train that I go to the seaside, not by car.’
 (Zafiu 2013: 575)

In this sentence, the instrumental prepositional phrase appears in a position different from that in which it would normally occur, i.e. to the right of the verb. This special displacement is also marked prosodically, in that the fronted focal constituent (*cu trenul*) bears the NPA of the sentence, as is typical of narrow focus. It is thus evident then that FF is a construction that is both syntactically and prosodically marked. Most studies on Romance FF have concentrated on the syntactic differences between FF and left dislocation of topics, showing that, unlike with dislocated topics, there can only be one focus per sentence, foci are incompatible with resumptive clitics and cannot co-occur with *wh*-phrases (see Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997; see also Cruschina and Remberger 2017 for an overview). Moreover, subordinate clauses with a structurally reduced left periphery, such as subject clauses, *if*-clauses and infinitival control clauses, can only host topics but not (contrastive) foci (Haegeman 2012).

⁸ It should also be noted that clefts can be used contrastively not only in French but in most Romance languages, and that in Romanian clefts are not available irrespective of the interpretation.

⁹ Exhaustivity is also the pragmatically ‘normal’ interpretation of information focus in Romance, but in answers to questions this interpretive import is weaker than in clefts and with FF in Hungarian (Frascarelli 2000, Brunetti 2004, Cruschina 2021).

¹⁰ The left peripheral focus position was apparently more freely available in Latin and in medieval Romance: even though for obvious reasons it is difficult to define its precise interpretive properties, sentence-initial focus does not appear to be limited to specific subtypes of focus (see, among others, Vanelli 1999, Salvi 2004, Benincà 2006, Devine and Stephens 2006, Poletto 2014).

On the theoretical side, special attention has been paid to the mechanism that triggers FF in Romance, attributing a crucial role to syntax, prosody, or the interfaces depending on the specific approach adopted. Three main approaches to FF, and to focus in general, dominate the specialist literature:

- (i) FF is triggered by an active syntactic feature (e.g. Jackendoff 1972, Rizzi 1997);
- (ii) FF is determined by prosodic requirements (e.g. Zubizarreta 1998, Reinhart 2006, Szendrői 2001, 2003, Samek-Lodovici 2015);
- (iii) FF is licensed at the interface as a strategy to disambiguate the domain of focus (e.g., Neeleman and van de Koot 2008; see also Horvath 2010).

Less attention has been paid to the precise interpretive properties associated with FF until quite recently. As we saw in the previous section, in question-answer contexts, information focus is typically realized in a postverbal position through PoF. By contrast, FF does not readily occur in answers to questions, but depends on the presence of additional or concomitant requirements. Since the semantics of focus, and thus the generation of a set of alternatives, concern all instances of narrow focus, irrespective of the subtype and of the position in which it surfaces, the (narrow) focal status of a constituent cannot be viewed as a sufficient condition for triggering FF. What, then, are the additional or concomitant requirements that license FF and that inherently associates with this configuration? As mentioned, a long-standing view is that in Romance, FF marks contrastive or corrective focus, whereby the focus constituent clearly contrasts with a salient alternative, which can be expressed in a negative tag (see Benincà 1988, Rizzi 1997, López 2009, Fábregas 2016, a.o.):

- (36) Una **tigre** abbiamo visto, non un leone. (It.)
 a tiger have.1PL seen not a lion
 ‘We saw a tiger, not a lion.’

The contrastive function of focus fronting is well attested crosslinguistically (see, e.g., Givón 2001: Ch. 15) and is indeed possible in most Romance varieties, to the extent that in several analyses contrast is considered to be a necessary requirement for FF to obtain (cf., e.g., López 2009). More precisely, it can be shown that the contrasting alternative must be salient in the preceding context, as is typical in corrective exchanges, where the clause with FF conveys a correction of a distinct alternative proposition already asserted in the context (e.g. ‘you saw a lion’). Hence, the more appropriate – and less ambiguous – label of corrective focus has been used for this subtype of focus (Bianchi and Bocci 2012, Bianchi et al. 2015).

It is undoubtedly true that most Romance languages employ FF as a syntactic strategy to mark contrastive focus. However, two problems have been recently raised in connection to this generalization. The first problem has to do with the extension of this generalization: French, some northern Italian dialects, and European Portuguese seem to represent exceptions to this pattern, inasmuch as cleft sentences or PoF would be used in these languages to mark contrastive focus, on a par with information focus. On closer scrutiny, nevertheless, FF seems to be possible in French, at least in the colloquial language, both in contrastive and in non-contrastive contexts (Stempel 1981, De Cat 2007: 2–3). As for European Portuguese, a recent study shows that contrastive FF is not categorically rejected by all speakers, and that a degree of variation must be acknowledged between a group of speakers that accept it (44) and a group of speakers that judge it ungrammatical or marginal (Costa and Martins 2011). In contrast, contrastive FF seems to be generally available in Brazilian Portuguese (Miotto 2003, Kato and Ribeiro 2009, Kato and Martins 2016).

The second problem concerns the precise interpretive value associated with this syntactic fronting construction. Recent work has highlighted that in many Romance varieties the contrastive value of the kind exemplified in (36) is not always necessary for FF to occur. This has been described for Romanian (Zafiu 2013, Giurgea 2016), Brazilian Portuguese (Kato and Raposo 1996), several southern Italian dialects (see, e.g., Ledgeway 2009a: 784–790, 2009b, Cruschina 2012a) and some northern ones (Paoli 2010), Sardinian (Jones 1993, 2013, Remberger 2010, Mensching and Remberger 2010), and some varieties of Catalan (Vanrell and Fernández-Soriano 2013) and of Spanish (Gabriel 2010, Vanrell and Fernández-Soriano 2013, 2018, Uth 2014, Heidinger 2015, 2018, Jiménez-Fernández 2015a,b, Hoot 2016, Sánchez Alvarado 2018, Cruschina 2019). FF has been judged as possible, in particular, with an ‘emphatic’ interpretation conveying unexpectedness and surprise (Cruschina 2012, Brunetti 2009, Paoli 2010):

- (37) (Pensa te!) Una **tigre** abbiamo visto! (It.)
 think.IMPR.2SG you a tiger have.1PL seen
 ‘(Guess what!) We saw a tiger!’

Drawing on the typological literature on the grammatical category of mirativity (DeLancey 1997, Aikhenvald 2004), this type of FF which is related to new information that is particularly surprising or unexpected has been named *mirative fronting* (Cruschina 2012a). Mirativity appears to be a recurrent interpretive trait of FF in Sicilian, but has also turned out to be a wide-spread interpretation associated with FF in Sardinian (Jones 2013) and other Romance varieties, including Italian (Cruschina 2012a, Bianchi et al. 2015, 2016), Romanian (Cruschina et al. 2015), and Spanish (Jiménez-Fernández 2015a,b, Cruschina 2019a).

Authier and Haegeman (2019) explicitly argue that mirative FF is possible in French (see also cases of FF in the corpus-based studies by Abeillé, Godard and Sabio (2008, 2009):

- (38) a. **Des sauterelles grillées** ils mangent dans ce pays. (Fr.)
 some grasshoppers grilled they eat in this country
 ‘Grilled grasshoppers they eat in this country.’
 (Authier and Haegeman 2019: 46)

This French example shows that, under the appropriate conditions mirative, FF can occur in out-of-the-blue contexts (see Bianchi et al. 2016). The articulation of the sentence into a focus expression and a (given) presupposition derivable from the context – which is typical of information focus, for example – can be missing with mirative focus. Nonetheless, mirative focus is a subtype of narrow focus that is prosodically marked as the most prominent constituent in the sentence and that gives rise to a set of alternatives. The set of alternatives includes propositions which only differ with respect to the value of the fronted expression and which are ordered along a scale of unlikelihood or unexpectedness: this is at the basis of the speaker’s evaluation of the event as surprising or unexpected (see Bianchi et al. 2015, 2016).

What still remains controversial is the acceptability of FF with information focus and the extent of this acceptability. As mentioned above (§ 4.1), FF of information focus is generally considered infelicitous or completely ungrammatical, but some scholars have more recently reported different views and data (see Kato and Raposo 1996, Brunetti 2004, Gabriel 2010, Cruschina 2012a, Hoot 2012, 2016, Jiménez-Fernández 2015a,b). A further complication in this respect is that, while contrastive or corrective focus is not possible in answers to questions, mirative focus is indeed possible, insofar as it conveys unexpected information which is also new. It is thus difficult to accurately control or detect for the presence or absence of mirative nuances in an answer to a wh-question that involves FF (see Cruschina 2021).

I conclude this section with a brief note on the optionality of FF, which poses problems both on an empirical and on a theoretical level, and which constitutes a general open issue in Romance: all values and interpretations associated with FF in a given variety appear to be possible with postverbal focalization. In other words, even when it is associated with a mirative or a corrective interpretation, in Romance the focus constituent need not be fronted, but may undergo PoF. Different solutions have been proposed to the problem of the optionality of movement, which make different predictions depending on the framework and on the approach adopted (see Brunetti 2009, Gabriel 2010, Bianchi and Bocci 2012, and Bianchi 2019),

4.3. *Narrow Focus and Sentence Types*

Focus and focus structures have been predominately investigated with respect to declarative sentences. Beside declaratives, some attention has also been paid to the similarities and interaction between wh-phrase and focus in wh-questions, in which however the focus structure is more rigid than in declaratives. The wh-phrase in interrogative sentences is fronted in all Romance varieties, although it

can stay in situ in some languages such as French and Portuguese (see Cheng and Rooryck 2000, Ambar and Veloso 2001, a.o.).¹¹

The *wh*-phrase is typically considered to be the focus of the *wh*-question in which it occurs, and is therefore incompatible with a (further) narrow focus within the same sentence (Rizzi 1997, Shlonsky and Soare 2011), as illustrated in (39) and (40).¹² The obligatory subject inversion that is found in *wh*-questions in most Romance varieties (40) is structurally motivated and should not to be related to the information structure of the sentence (Leonetti 2018, Bianchi et al. 2017).¹³

- (39) a. *Cui **un CD** i-ai cumpărat (,în loc de un roman)? (Ro.)
 who.DAT a CD him.DAT=have.2SG bought instead of a novel
 b. ***Un CD** cui i-ai cumpărat (,în loc de un roman)?
 a CD who.DAT him.DAT=have.2SGbought instead of a novel
 (Shlonsky and Soare 2011: 662)
- (40) a. Cui i-a cumpărat Ion un CD? (Ro.)
 who.DAT him.DAT=has bought Ion a CD
 ‘For whom did Ion buy a CD?’
 b. *Cui Ion i-a cumpărat un CD?
 who.DAT Ion him.DAT=has bought a CD
 (Shlonsky and Soare 2011: 662)

A well-known exception to these generalizations is constituted by *why*-questions, which admit both a preverbal subject and a co-occurring narrow focus (see Rizzi 2001, Shlonsky and Soare 2011, Bocci et al. 2021). A great deal of variation characterizes the types and range of *wh*-elements that admit preverbal subjects in different dialects of Spanish (see Baković 1995, 1998 and Gutiérrez-Bravo 2005, 2008).

Unlike *wh*-questions, different focus structures are possible in yes/no questions (Cruschina 2012a, Bocci and Pozzan 2014, Bocci and Cruschina 2018), which in this respect are rather more similar to declaratives than to *wh*-questions. In French, however, (pronominal) subject inversion in yes/no questions is grammatically grounded, using once again clefts to express narrow focus (see, e.g., Rowlett 2007). Those Romance languages that admit FF in declaratives also allow it in yes/no questions with one important difference: contrastive/corrective FF is not possible because questions cannot be used to contrast or correct a previous question or assertion. This means that interrogative FF may only be used to simply seek new information (with information focus, cf. (41a)) or, more commonly, to emphasize that the new information sought is surprising and unexpected, as in (41b) (Bianchi and Cruschina 2016):¹⁴

- (41) a. **La voi** s-au întâmplat toate astea? (Ro.)
 at you.PL REFL=have.3PL happened all these
 ‘Is it (really) by you that all these things happened?’
 b. **Marina** hanno invitato? (It.)
 Marina have.3PL invited
 ‘Did they (really) invite Marina?’
 (Bianchi et al. 2016: (28))

Due to their possible emphatic import, declarative sentences with (mirative) FF have commonly be associated with exclaimatives. In fact, they are not exclaimatives proper, but (declarative) sentence exclamations, in the sense of Rett (2011) (see Cruschina, Giurgea and Remberger 2015). Like *wh*-

¹¹ Building on the assumption that the *wh*-phrase represents the argument focus of an interrogative sentence, *wh* in situ has been syntactically analysed as an instance of PoF (Kato 2013).

¹² Indirect questions, by contrast, exhibit different properties (see Rizzi 2001, Bocci and Cruschina 2018).

¹³ In French, *wh*-questions can take a wide range of forms, including subject inversion, which is however not obligatory. For an overview on the different types of inversion in French *wh*-questions, see Rowlett (2007: 199).

¹⁴ In Sicilian and in Sardinian yes/no questions, FF of nominal or adjectival predicates (as well as of non-finite verbal predicates in Sardinian) sounds unmarked and is often preferred to the version with postverbal focus (Jones 1993: 355, Cruschina 2012a: 61–64, Giurgea and Remberger 2012b).

questions, the focus structure of exclamatives is rather rigid and does not normally allow for an argument focus. Exceptions in this respect are however found, especially in Romanian, where FF is also possible in genuine exclamatives:

- (42) **Frumosă mașină** și-a mai cumpărat! (Ro.)
 Beautiful car CL.REFL.DAT-have.3SG more bought
 ‘What a beautiful car s/he bought!’/ ‘Is it beautiful, the car s/he bought!’
 (Cruschina et al. 2015: 2, 9)

In this example, what is surprising is not the denotation of the focal constituent, but the degree of a property. This is why this type of exclamative FF is restricted to scalar elements (adverbs or adjectives followed by a noun). In other Romance languages, by contrast, exclamative FF seems to be limited to a small number of evaluative adjectives (e.g. Spanish *bonito* ‘pretty’, *menudo* ‘small, trivial’, *valiente* ‘brave, great’) or to special exclamative particles (e.g. Spanish *vaya*) followed by a noun (Hernanz 2001, Andueza 2011, Escandell-Vidal and Leonetti 2014, Tirado Camarena 2016):

- (43) a. ¡**Bonita fiesta** me organizaste! (Sp.)
 nice party me organized.2SG
 ‘What a nice party you organized for me!’
 (Andueza 2011: 128)
- b. ¡**Vaya coche** (que) te has comprado! (Sp.)
 wow/damn car that you.DAT have.2SG bought
 ‘What a car you bought!’
 (Tirado Camarena 2016: 463)

Further research is however needed in order to establish whether this type of fronting is actually related to information structure and whether the Spanish structures are fully or partially similar to those of Romanian.

5. Association with Focus and Focus Particles

From a semantic viewpoint, focus is generally thought not to have an impact on the truth conditions of the sentence, a behaviour that it shares with all other information structural aspects of utterances (see Hinterwimmer 2011). Focus is thus analysed as a pragmatic phenomenon, indicating that the asserted proposition stands in a relationship with other alternative propositions. This has to do with how information is presented and packaged in the discourse, that is, with information structure. However, the well-studied phenomenon of ‘association with focus’, including focus-sensitive particles like *only*, *also*, *even*, is known to affect the truth conditions and the content of the expressed proposition (Rooth 1985, 1992, König 1991, Krifka 2006):

- (44) a. Marta sólo invitó a sus padres [a la obra]_{Focus}, no a la cena de después. (Sp.)
 Marta only invited ACC her parents to the opera not to the dinner of after
- b. Marta sólo invitó [a sus padres]_{Focus} a la obra, no a sus hermanos.
 Marta only invited ACC her parents to the opera not ACC her brothers
- c. Marta sólo [invitó a sus padres a la obra]_{Focus}, no hizo nada más.
 Marta only invited ACC her parents to the opera not did nothing more.
 (Gutiérrez-González 2011: 47)

The sentences in (44) are true under different conditions, precisely because of the difference with respect to the constituent that counts as focal and with which the particle *only* is associated, as explicitly indicated by the respective following continuation.

A variety of formal approaches and theories on focus particles exists, but they all resort to the notion of alternatives and thus share the view that these elements are sensitive to the focus-background

dichotomy of the sentence and semantically act as focus-binding operators. The different focus particles are defined according to how they interact with the set of alternatives generated by focus. We can, for instance, distinguish between *additive* particles such as *also* and *restrictive* or *exclusive* particles like *only* (45a,b). Other focus particles such as *even* and its equivalent forms in Romance additionally perform a contrast on a scale of likelihood, hence the label scalar particles (45c,d):

- (45) a. Stella aime aussi / seulement les serpents. (Fr.)
 b. Stella ama anche / solo i serpenti. (It.)
 Stella loves also only the snakes
 ‘Stella also/only likes snakes.’
 c. Stella aime même les serpents. (Fr.)
 d. Stella ama perfino/addirittura i serpenti. (It.)
 Stella loves even the snakes
 ‘Stella even likes snakes.’
 (De Cesare 2015: 63)

The range of elements that could be considered as part of the category *focus particles* is rather large, also including quantificational adverbs, negation, and modal verbs that interact with focus, and different labels have been used in the literature to refer to some of them: *focusing adjuncts*, *focus adverbs*, *focusing modifiers* or *focalizers* (see De Cesare 2015 for detailed inventories). The association with focus, however, is not always the same. Beaver and Clark (2008) assume that there are three degrees of association between focus with semantic operators: quasi-association with focus (e.g. negation and other non-veridical operators), free association with focus (e.g. with operators such as *always* which perform quantification over an implicit domain), and conventional associations with focus, which include exclusive, additive, and scalar particles. Only the latter type instantiates a real association with focus, that is, a semantically grammaticalized and conventionalized dependency.

Crosslinguistic differences between focus particles have already been pointed out in the literature, in particular in Germanic languages (starting from König 1991). As for Romance, the fine-grained properties of focus particles have not yet been investigated systematically on a comparative level. It has been shown that significant differences emerge syntactically, with respect to the position of these particles within the sentence and to their adjacency to the associate. These differences depend not only on the given language, but also on the individual focus particle.

In general, focus particles, like adverbs, can occur in different positions of the clause, but not all positions are possible, and in some positions – especially at the start of the clause – the same elements may no longer function as focus particles, but rather as discourse connectives (see Andorno 2000, De Cesare 2015, Charolles and Lamiroy 2007). In French, for example, the additive focus particle *aussi* can appear in five different positions of a SVO sentence (examples from Leray 2009: 209–210):

- (46) [Pierre]_{Focus} aussi boit un café. (Fr.)
 Peter also drinks a coffee
 ‘Also Pierre drinks a coffee.’
- (47) a. Pierre boit aussi [un café]_{Focus}.
 Pierre drinks also a coffee
 ‘Pierre drinks also a coffee.’
 b. [Pierre]_{Focus} boit aussi un café.
 Pierre drinks also a coffee
 ‘Also Pierre drinks a coffee.’
- (48) a. [Pierre]_{Focus} boit un café aussi.
 Pierre drinks a coffee also
 ‘Also Pierre drinks a coffee.’
 b. Pierre boit [un café]_{Focus} aussi.
 Pierre drinks a coffee also
 ‘Pierre drinks also a coffee.’

- (49) [Pierre]_{Focus} aussi, il boit un café.
 Pierre also he drinks a coffee
 ‘Also Pierre drinks a coffee.’
- (50) Il boit un café, [Pierre]_{Focus} aussi.
 he drinks a coffee Pierre also
 ‘Also Pierre drinks a coffee.’

Only the subject can be the associate of the focus particle in (46), while in (47) and in (48) the focalized associate can be either the subject or the direct object. The focus particle can also be left- or right-dislocated together with its associate, as shown in (49) and (50), respectively, but in this case only the dislocated constituent can be interpreted as focalized.

Just like in English, in several Romance languages, certain focus particles need not be adjacent to the focus associate and typically occur in the same positions as adverbs. This is the case of *persino* in Italian:

- (51) You could even leave her car at the airport for a week.
- (52) Potresti persino lasciare la sua macchina all’aeroporto per una settimana.
 can.COND.2SG even leave the her car at-the airport for a week

The English example (51) (discussed in König 1991: 18) and its Italian equivalent in (52) are ambiguous in that the focus particle *even/persino* can have scope over any phrase (the DP *her car*, the first PP *at the airport*, the second PP *for a week*, the entire VP, or even the single verb). In cases of ambiguity like this, the prosody of the sentence, and in particular the position of the NPA (the nuclear pitch accent), will help to disambiguate the scope relation between the focus particle and its associate in the spoken language (Avesani et al. 1995, Avesani 1999, Hirschberg and Avesani 2000, Frascarelli 2004 for Italian). The behaviour of *even* can however be different in other Romance varieties, where focus particles can only occur in a position adjacent to their focus, such as Sicilian. In order to obtain different scope readings available in the Italian example (52), in Sicilian the focus particle is most naturally fronted together with the associate constituent (see Cruschina 2012a: 66 for the corresponding examples). Romanian exhibits a strong adjacency between *doar/numai* ‘only’ and its associate (Sava 2014: 74). Similarly, the focus particle *solo* ‘only’ must be adjacent to its associate in Italian, but this requirement it is not always shared by the Spanish counterpart *sólo* (cf. (44) above).

Another syntactic difference is the relative order between the focus particle and its associate. When adjacent to the focus, the particle typically precedes the focus associate, but may also follow it, especially if the focus constituent is fronted. Once again, this difference must be examined with respect to the single focus particles and across the individual languages, but variation may also be found in relation to the same particle in closely-related Romance varieties, such as the Italian dialects investigated by Munaro (2013) (cf. also the French examples (46)-(50) above). Since they represent instances of narrow focus, focus particles and their associates commonly undergo FF, especially when connected with unexpected information (Brunetti 2009: § 4, Cruschina 2012a: 65–66, 123).

Further Reading

- Ambar, Manuela (1999). Aspects of focus in Portuguese. In Laurice Tuller and Georges Rebuschi (eds), *The Grammar of Focus*, 23–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Belletti, Adriana (2004). Aspects of the Low IP Area. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 2*, 16–51. Oxford: Oxford University of Press.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci and Silvio Cruschina (2015). Focus fronting and its implicatures. In Enoch Aboh, Jeannette Schaeffer and Petra Sleeman (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013: Selected Papers from Going Romance, Amsterdam 2013*, 1–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Brunetti, Lisa (2009). Discourse Functions of Fronted Foci in Italian and Spanish. In Andreas Dufter and Daniel Jacob (eds), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 43–81.
- Costa, João, and Martins, Ana Maria (2011). ‘On Focus Movement in European Portuguese’, *Probus* 23: 217–45.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2012). *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2021). The greater the contrast, the greater the potential: On the effects of focus in syntax. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 6(1): 3: 1–30.
- Cruschina, Silvio and Eva-Maria Remberger (2017). Focus Fronting. In Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 502–535. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Gabriel, Christoph (2010). On focus, prosody, and word order in Argentinean Spanish: A minimalist OT account. *Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem* 4: 183–222.
- Giurgea, Ion (2016). On the interpretation of focus fronting in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 18(2): 37–61.
- Fábregas, Antonio (2016). Information structure and its syntactic manifestation in Spanish: facts and proposals. *Borealis. An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 5 (2): 1–109.
- Hoot, Bradley (2016). Narrow presentational focus in Mexican Spanish. *Probus* 28 (2): 335–365.
- Jiménez Fernández, Ángel (2015b). When focus goes wild: An empirical study of two syntactic positions for information focus. *Linguistics Beyond and Within* 1: 119–133.
- Jones, Michael A. (2013). Fronting, Focus and Illocutionary Force in Sardinian. *Lingua* 134: 75-101.
- Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud (2002). Topic, Focus and Secondary Predication. The French Presentational Relative Construction. In Claire Beyssade, Reineke Bok-Bennema, Frank Drijkoningen, and Paola Monachesi (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000: Selected papers from ‘Going Romance’ 2000, Utrecht, 30 November–2 December*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 171–212.
- Leonetti, Manuel (2017). Basic constituent orders. In Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark (eds.), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 887–932. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Marandin Jean-Marie (2010). Subject inversion and discourse in Romance. In Danièle Godard (ed.), *Fundamental Issues in the Romance Languages*. Stanford: CSLI, 319–367.
- Poletto, Cecilia and Giuliano Bocci (2016). Syntactic and prosodic effects of information structure in Romance. In Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 642–662.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). ‘The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery’, in Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.
- Vallduví, Enric (1992). *The Information Component*. New York: Garland.
- Zubizarreta, María-Luisa (1998). *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

References

- Abeillé, Anne, Danièle Godard, and Frédéric Sabio, (2008). ‘Two Types of NP Preposing in French’, in Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 15th HPSG Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 306–324.
- Abeillé, Anne, Danièle Godard and Frédéric Sabio (2009). The dramatic extraction construction in spoken French. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 11: 135–148.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Anagnostopoulou, Elena (1998). ‘Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, Verb-movement and EPP Checking’, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16: 491–539.
- Ambar, Manuela (1992). *Para uma sintaxe da inversão sujeito-verbo em português*. Lisboa: Edições Colibri.
- Ambar, Manuela (1999). Aspects of focus in Portuguese. In Laurice Tuller and Georges Rebuschi (eds), *The Grammar of Focus*, 23–53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ambar, Manuela and Rita Veloso (2001). On the nature of wh-phrases – word order and wh-in-situ: Evidence from Portuguese, French, Hungarian and Tetum. In Y. D’Hulst, J. Rooryck and J. Schroten (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 1999: Selected papers from “Going Romance” 1999, Leiden, 9–11 December 1999*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–38.
- Andorno, Cecilia (2000). *Focalizzatori fra connessione e messa a fuoco. Il punto di vista delle varietà di apprendimento*. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Andueza, Patricia (2011). *Rhetorical Exclamatives in Spanish*. Ohio State University, PhD dissertation.
- Authier, J.-Marc & Liliane Haegeman 2019. The syntax of mirative focus fronting: evidence from French. In Deborah L. Arteaga (ed.), *Contributions of Romance languages to current linguistic theory*, 39–63. Cham: Springer.
- Avesani, Cinzia (1999). Quantificatori, negazione e costituenza sintattica. Costruzioni potenzialmente ambigue e il ruolo della prosodia. In *Fonologia e Morfologia dell’Italiano e dei Dialetti d’Italia. Atti del XXXI Congresso della Società di Linguistica Italiana, Padova 25-27 settembre 1997*, Paola Benincà, Alberto Mioni and Laura Vanelli (eds), 153–200. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Avesani, Cinzia, Julia Hirschberg and Pilar Prieto (1995). The intonational disambiguation of potentially ambiguous utterances in English, Italian, and Spanish. *Proceedings of the 13th ICPHS* (Stockholm), vol. 1, 174–177.
- Barbosa, Pilar (1995). *Null Subjects*. Unpublished doctoral thesis: MIT.
- Beaver, David and Brady Clark (2008). *Sense and Sensitivity: How Focus Determines Meaning*. Chichester/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Belletti, Adriana (2001). ‘Inversion as Focalization’, in Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 60–90.
- Belletti, Adriana (2004). Aspects of the Low IP Area. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 2*, 16–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belletti, Adriana (2009). Answering strategies: New information subjects and the nature of clefts. In *Structures and Strategies*, Chapter 10. London: Routledge.
- Belletti, Adriana, and Shlonsky, Ur (1995). ‘The Order of Verbal Complements: A Comparative Study’, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 13: 489–526.
- Benincà, Paola (1988). ‘L’ordine degli elementi della frase. Costruzioni con ordine marcato degli elementi’, in Lorenzo Renzi (ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione. Volume 1: La frase. I sintagmi nominale e preposizionale*. Bologna: il Mulino, 129–194.
- Benincà, Paola (2006). ‘A Detailed Map of the Left Periphery of Medieval Romance’, in Raffaella Zanuttini, Hector Campos, Elena Herberger, and Paul Portner (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 53–86.
- Bentley, Delia (2008). ‘The Interplay of Focus Structure and Syntax. Evidence from two Sister Languages’, in Robert Jr. van Valin (ed.), *Investigations of the Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 263–284.
- Bentley, Delia and Silvio Cruschina (2018). The silent argument of broad focus: typology and predictions. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3(1), 118. 1–37.

- Bentley, Delia, Francesco Maria Ciconte and Silvio Cruschina (2015). *Existentials and Locatives in Romance Dialects of Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beysade, Claire, Elisabeth Delais-Roussarie, Jenny Doetjes, Jean-Marie Marandin and Annie Rialland (2004). Prosody and Information in French. In Francis Corblin and Henriëtte de Swart (eds), *Handbook of French Semantics*, 477–499, Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Bianchi, Valentina (1993). Subject positions and e-positions. *Quaderni del laboratorio di linguistica* 7. 51–69. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 2019. Spelling out focus chains and wh-chains: The case of Italian. *Syntax* 22: 146–161.
- Bianchi, Valentina, and Bocci, Giuliano (2012). ‘Should I Stay or Should I Go? Optional Focus Movement in Italian’, in Christopher Piñón (ed.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 9: 1–18 (<http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss9/>).
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci and Silvio Cruschina (2015). Focus fronting and its implicatures. In Enoch Aboh, Jeannette Schaeffer and Petra Sleeman (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013: Selected Papers from Going Romance, Amsterdam 2013*, 1–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci and Silvio Cruschina (2016). Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 9 (3): 1–54.
- Bianchi, Valentina, Giuliano Bocci and Silvio Cruschina (2017). Two types of subject inversion in Italian wh-questions. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 62(3): 233–252.
- Bocci, Giuliano (2013). *The Syntax–Prosody Interface. A Cartographic Perspective with Evidence from Italian*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Bocci, Giuliano and Lucia Pozzan (2014). Questions (and experimental answers) about Italian subjects. Subject positions in main and indirect question in L1 and attrition. In Carla Contemori and Lena Dal Pozzo (eds.), *Inquiries into Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition. Papers offered to Adriana Belletti*, 28–44. Siena: CISCL Press.
- Bocci, Giuliano and Silvio Cruschina (2018). ‘Postverbal subjects and nuclear pitch accent in Italian wh-questions’. In *From Sounds to Structures. Beyond the Veil of Maya*, Roberto Petrosino, Pietro Cerrone and Harry van der Hulst (eds), 471–498. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bocci, Giuliano, Silvio Cruschina & Luigi Rizzi (2021). On some special properties of *why* in syntax and prosody. In *Why is ‘why’ Unique? Its syntactic and semantic properties*, Gabriela Soare (ed.), 293–316. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bonami, Olivier, Godard, Danièle, and Marandin, Jean-Marie (1999). ‘Constituency and Word Order in French Subject Inversion’, in Gosse Bouma, Erhard Hinrichs, Geert-Jan M. Kruijff and Richard Oehrle (eds.) *Constraints and Resources in Natural Language Syntax and Semantics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 21–40.
- Brunetti, Lisa (2004). *A Unification of Focus*. Padua: Unipress.
- Brunetti, Lisa (2009). ‘Discourse Functions of Fronted Foci in Italian and Spanish’, in Andreas Dufter and Daniel Jacob (eds.), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 43–81.
- Büring, Daniel (2004). ‘Focus suppositions’, *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 65–76.
- Büring, Daniel (2010). ‘Towards a Typology of Focus Realization’, in Malte Zimmermann and Caroline Féry (eds), *Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 177–205.
- Büring, Daniel (2016). *Intonation and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calabrese, Andrea (1992). ‘Some Remarks on Focus and Logical Structures in Italian’, *Harvard Working Paper in Linguistics* 1: 91–127.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2004). ‘Toward a Cartography of Subject Positions’, in Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 115–165.
- Casalichio, Jan and Federica Cognola (2018). Verb-Second and (micro)variation in two Rhaeto-Romance varieties of Northern Italy. In *Advances in Italian Dialectology: Sketches of Italo-Romance grammars*, Roberta D’Alessandro and Diego Pescarini (eds), 72–105. Leiden: Brill.
- Chafe, Wallace L. (1976). ‘Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View’, in Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 25–55.
- Chafe, Wallace (1987). *Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow*, in R.S. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia, Benjamins, 21–51.

- Chafe, Wallace (1994). *Language and the Flow of Thought*, in *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure*, Tomasello, M. (ed.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New Jersey, 93–111.
- Charolles, Michel and Lamiroy, Beatrice (2007). Du lexique à la grammaire: *Uniquement, seulement et simplement*. *Cahiers de lexicologie* 90(1): 1–24.
- Cheng, Lisa and Johan Rooryck (2000). Licensing wh-in-situ. *Syntax* 3: 1–19.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990). *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Contreras, Heles (1976). *A Theory of Word Order with Special Reference to Spanish*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Contreras, Heles (1991). 'On the Position of Subjects', in Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*. San Diego: Academic Press, 63–79.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra (1997). The double subject construction in Romanian. Notes on the syntax of the subject. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 42(3-4): 101–147.
- Corr, Alice (2016). Wide-focus subject-verb inversion in Ibero-Romance: a locative account. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 1(11). 1–33.
- Costa, João (1998). *Word Order Variation. A Constraint-Based Approach*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Costa, João (2004). *Subject Positions and the Interfaces: The Case of European Portuguese*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Costa, João, and Duarte, Inês (2002). 'Preverbal Subjects in Null-subject Languages are not Necessarily Left-dislocated', *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 2: 159–76.
- Costa, João, and Martins, Ana Maria (2011). 'On Focus Movement in European Portuguese', *Probus* 23: 217–45.
- Cresti E. (2000). *Corpus di italiano parlato*, Firenze, Accademia della Crusca.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2010). 'Syntactic Extraposition and Clitic Resumption in Italian', *Lingua* 120 (1): 50–73.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2012a). *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2012b). 'Focus in Existential Sentences', in Valentina Bianchi and Cristiano Chesi (eds.), *Enjoy Linguistics! Papers Offered to Luigi Rizzi on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*. Siena: CISCL Press, 77–107.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2015). Some notes on clefting and fronting. In *Structures, Strategies and Beyond. Studies in honour of Adriana Belletti*, Elisa Di Domenico, Cornelia Hamann and Simona Matteini (eds), 181–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2016). Information and discourse structure. In Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 596–608. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2019). Focus Fronting in Spanish: Mirative implicature and information structure. *Probus* 31(1): 119–146.
- Cruschina, Silvio (2021). The greater the contrast, the greater the potential: On the effects of focus in syntax. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 6(1): 3: 1–30.
- Cruschina, Silvio and Eva-Maria Remberger (2017). Focus Fronting. In Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 502–535. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Cruschina, Silvio, Ion Giurgea and Eva-Maria Remberger. 2015. Focus fronting between declaratives and exclamatives. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60: 257–275.
- De Cat, Cécile (2007). *French Dislocation: Interpretation, Syntax, Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria (2007). Sul cosiddetto 'c'è presentativo'. Forme e funzioni. In Anna-Maria De Cesare and Angela Ferrari (eds.). *Lessico, grammatica e testualità, tra italiano scritto e parlato*. University of Basel: *Acta Romanica Basiliensia* 18: 127–153.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria (2015). Defining Focusing Modifiers in a cross-linguistic perspective. A discussion based on English, German, French and Italian. In *Adverbs. Functional and Diachronic Aspects*, Karin Pittner, Daniela Elsner, Fabian Barteld (eds.), 47–81. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- De Cesare, Anna-Maria (2017). Cleft constructions. In Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 536–568. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- DeLancey, Scott (1997). Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic*

- Typology* 1: 33–52.
- Devine, Andrew, and Stephens, Laurence (2006). *Latin Word Order. Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dik, Simon C. (1989). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1994). *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Domínguez, Laura (2002). Analyzing unambiguous narrow focus in Catalan. In Tania Ionin, Heejeong Ko and Andrew Nevins (eds), *Proceedings of the 2nd HUMIT Student Conference in Language Research (HUMIT 2001)*, vol. 43. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 17–34.
- Drijkoningen, Frank and Brigitte Kammers-Manhe (2012). Word order in French and the influence of topic and focus. *Linguistics* 50(1): 65–104.
- Duarte, Inês (1987). *A construção de topicalização na gramática do português: Regência, ligação e condições sobre movimento*. University of Lisbon, unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Duarte, Inês (2003). ‘Algumas reflexões sobre orden de palavras em línguas românicas de sujeito nulo’, in Fernanda Irene Fonseca, Ana Maria Brito, Isabel Margarida Duarte, and Maria Joana Guimarães (eds.), *Língua portuguesa: estruturas, usos e contrastes*. Porto: Centro de Linguística da Universidade do Porto, 133–46.
- Dufter, Andreas and Christoph Gabriel (2016). Information structure, prosody, and word order. In Susann Fischer and Christoph Gabriel (eds), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance*, 419–455. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Dufter, Andreas and Daniel Jacob (2009). Introduction, in Andreas Dufter and Daniel Jacob (eds), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1–18.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (1998). Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74: 245–273.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. Victoria and Leonetti, Manuel (2011). *Bastantes problemas (*no) tenemos*, in: M. Victoria Escandell-Vidal/Manuel Leonetti/Cristina Sánchez (eds), *60 problemas de gramática*. Madrid, Akal, 253–260.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. Victoria and Leonetti, Manuel (2014). *Fronting and irony in Spanish*, in: Andreas Dufter/Álvaro S. Octavio de Toledo (eds), *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 383–418.
- Fábregas, Antonio (2016). Information structure and its syntactic manifestation in Spanish: facts and proposals. *Borealis. An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 5 (2): 1–109.
- Feldhausen, I. (2014). Intonation and preverbal subjects in Italian. In S. Fuchs, M. Grice, A. Hermes, L. Lancia, & D. Mücke (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Seminar on Speech Production (ISSP), Cologne, Germany, 5–8 May, 2014* (pp. 118–121).
- Féry, Caroline (2007). Information structural notions and the fallacy of invariant correlates. In *The Notions of Information Structure*, Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow and Manfred Krifka (eds), 161–184. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Féry, Caroline and Manfred Krifka (2008). Information structure. Notional distinctions, ways of expression. In Piet van Sterkenburg (ed.), *Unity and diversity of languages*, 123–136. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Féry, Caroline and Shinichiro Ishihara (eds) (2016). *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frascarelli, Mara (2000). *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Frascarelli, Mara (2004). L’interpretazione del Focus e la portata degli operatori sintattici. In *Il Parlato Italiano. Atti del Convegno Nazionale* (13–15 February 2003), Federico Albano Leoni, Francesco Cutugno, Massimo Pettorino, and Renata Savy (eds). Naples: M. d’Auria Editore-CIRASS.
- Gabriel, Christoph (2010). On focus, prosody, and word order in Argentinean Spanish: A minimalist OT account. *Revista Virtual de Estudos da Linguagem* 4: 183–222.
- Geurts, Bart and Rob van der Sandt (2004). Interpreting Focus. *Theoretical Linguistics* 3: 1–44.
- Giurgea, Ion (2016). On the interpretation of focus fronting in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 18(2): 37–61.
- Giurgea, Ion (2017). Preverbal subjects and topic marking in Romanian. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 63(3). 279–322.

- Giurgea, Ion and Eva-Maria Remberger (2012a). ‘Zur informationsstrukturellen Konfiguration und Variation postverbaler Subjekte in den romanischen Null-Subjekt-Sprachen’, *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 31 (1): 43–99.
- Giurgea, Ion and Eva-Maria Remberger (2012b). ‘Verum Focus and Polar Questions’, *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics XIV* (2): 21–40.
- Givón, Talmy (2001). *Syntax: An Introduction, Vol. 2*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. (1988). *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Garland.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. and Thorstein Fretheim (2004). ‘Topic and Focus’, in Laurence R. Horn and Gregory L. Ward (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 175–96.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Hedberg, Nancy, and Zacharski, Ron (1993). ‘Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse’, *Language* 69 (2): 274–307.
- Gutiérrez-Bravo, Rodrigo (2005). *Structural Markedness and Syntactic Structure*. New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis.
- Gutiérrez-Bravo, Rodrigo (2007). ‘Prominence Scales and Unmarked Word Order in Spanish’, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 25: 235–71.
- Gutiérrez-Bravo, Rodrigo (2008). La identificación de los tópicos y los focos. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 56 (2): 363–401.
- Gutiérrez-Bravo, Rodrigo, Carlos Martín Sobrino and Melanie Uth (2019). Contrastive focus in Yucatecan Spanish. In Ángel Gallego (ed.), *The Syntactic Variation of Spanish Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 275–296.
- Gutiérrez-González, Yurena M. (2011). ¿Operadores focales exhaustivos nomás?. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 3: 42–50.
- Haegeman, Liliane (2012). *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 8*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, Michael (1967). ‘Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English, Part II’, *Journal of Linguistics* 3: 199–244.
- Heidinger, Steffen (2015). Optionality and preferences in Spanish postverbal constituent order. An OT account without basic constituent order. *Lingua* 162: 102–127.
- Heidinger, Steffen (2018). Acceptability and frequency in Spanish focus marking. In *Focus Realization in Romance and Beyond*, Marco García García and Melanie Uth (eds), 99–128. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hernanz, Maria Llúisa (2001). ‘¡En bonito lío me he metido!: Notas sobre la afectividad en español’, *Moenia* 7: 93–109.
- Hernanz, Maria Llúisa (2007). From polarity to modality: Some (a)symmetries between *bien* and *sí* in Spanish. In: L. Eguren and O. Fernández Soriano (eds.), *Coreference, modality, and focus: Studies on the syntax-semantics interface*, 133–169. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hernanz, Maria Llúisa and José M. Brucart (1987). *La Sintaxis. Principios teóricos. La oración simple*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Hill, Virginia (2002). ‘Adhering Focus’, *Linguistic Inquiry* 33 (1): 164–72.
- Hinterwimmer, Stefan (2011). Information structure and truth-conditional semantics. In Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn and Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning, Vol. 2*, 1875–1908. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hirschberg Julia and Cinzia Avesani (2000). *Prosodic Disambiguation in English and Italian*, in Antonis Botinis (ed.), *Intonation: Analysis, Modelling and Technology*, 87–95. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Hoot, Bradley (2016). Narrow presentational focus in Mexican Spanish. *Probus* 28 (2): 335–365.
- Horvath, Julia (2010). “Discourse-features”, syntactic displacement and the status of Contrast. *Lingua* 120: 1346–1369
- Jackendoff, Ray (1972). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jiménez Fernández, Ángel (2015a). Towards a typology of focus: Subject position and microvariation at the discourse-syntax interface. *Ampersand* 2: 49–60.
- Jiménez Fernández, Ángel (2015b). When focus goes wild: An empirical study of two syntactic positions for information focus. *Linguistics Beyond and Within* 1: 119–133.
- Jones, Michael A. (1993). *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.

- Jones, Michael A. (2013). Fronting, Focus and Illocutionary Force in Sardinian. *Lingua* 134: 75-101.
- Kato, Mary A. (2013). 'Deriving "Wh-In-Situ" through Movement in Brazilian Portuguese', Victoria Camacho-Taboada, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández, Javier Martín-González, and Mariano Reyes-Tejedor (eds.), *Information Structure and Agreement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 175–92.
- Kato, Mary A. and Ana Maria Martins (2016). European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese: an overview on word order. In: Leo Wetzels, Sergio Menuzzi and João Costa (eds.), *The Handbook of Portuguese Linguistics*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 15–40.
- Kato, Mary A. and Eduardo Raposo (1996). 'European and Brazilian Portuguese Word Order: Questions, Focus and Topic Constructions', in Claudia Parodi, Carlos Quicoli, Mario Saltarelli, and María-Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Aspects of Romance Linguistics. Selected papers from the LSRL XXVI*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 267–78.
- Kato, Mary A. and Ilza Ribeiro (2009). Cleft sentences from Old Portuguese to Modern Brazilian Portuguese. In A. Dufter and D. Jacob (eds.), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 123–154.
- König, Ekkehard (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Kratzer, Angelika (2004). Interpreting focus: Presupposed or expressive meanings? A comment on Geurts and van der Sandt. *Theoretical Linguistics* 30: 123–136.
- Krifka, Manfred (1995). The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. *Linguistic Analysis* 25: 209–257.
- Krifka, Manfred (2006). Association with focus phrases. In *The Architecture of Focus*, Valerie Molnár and Susanne Winkler (eds.), 105–136. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Krifka, Manfred (2007). 'Basic Notions of Information Structure', in Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow and Manfred Krifka (eds.), *The Notions of Information Structure*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag, 13–55.
- Ladd, D. Robert (1996). *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lahousse, Karen (2006). NP subject inversion in French: two types, two configurations. *Lingua* 116(4): 424–461.
- Lahousse, Karen (2011). *Quand passent les cigognes. Le sujet nominal postverbal en français moderne*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Lahousse, Karen and Beatrice Lamiroy (2012). Word order in French, Spanish and Italian: a grammaticalization account. *Folia Linguistica* 2: 387–415.
- Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representation of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lambrecht, Knud (2000). 'When Subjects Behave like Objects: An Analysis of the Merging of S and O in Sentence Focus Constructions across Languages', *Studies in Language* 24 (3): 611–82.
- Lambrecht, Knud (2001). 'A Framework for the Analysis of Cleft Constructions', *Linguistics* 39 (3):463–516.
- Lambrecht, Knud (2002). Topic, Focus and Secondary Predication. The French Presentational Relative Construction. In Claire Beyssade, Reineke Bok-Bennema, Frank Drijkoningen, and Paola Monachesi (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 2000, Utrecht, 30 November–2 December*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 171–212.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2009a). *Grammatica Storica del Dialetto Napoletano*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2009b). Aspetti della sintassi della periferia sinistra del cosentino. In Diego Pescarini (ed.), *Studi sui dialetti della Calabria* (Quaderni ASIIt n.9). Padua: Unipress, 3–24.
- Ledgeway, Adam (2012). *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leonetti, Manuel (2008). 'Definiteness Effects and the Role of the Coda in Existential Constructions', in Henrik Høeg Müller and Alex Klinge (eds.), *Essays on Nominal Determination*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 131–62.
- Leonetti, Manuel (2010). 'La expresión de la estructura informativa en la sintaxis: un parámetro de variación en las lenguas románicas', *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 61: 338–55.
- Leonetti, Manuel (2014). Gramática y pragmática en el orden de palabras. *Linguística en la Red* 12: 1–25.
- Leonetti, Manuel (2017). Basic constituent orders. In Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark (eds.), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 887–932. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Leonetti, Manuel (2018). Two types of postverbal subjects. In Delia Bentley and Silvio Cruschina (eds), *Non-Canonical Postverbal Subjects*. Special issue of *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 30.2: 11–36.
- Leonetti, Manuel, and Escandell Vidal, Maria Victoria (2009). ‘Fronting and Verum-Focus in Romance’, in Andreas Dufter and Daniel Jacob (eds.), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 155–204.
- Leray, Estelle (2009). Additive focus particles in bilingual language acquisition. In Andreas Dufter and Daniel Jacob (eds.), *Focus and Background in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 205–238.
- Lobo, Maria and Ana Maria Martins (2017). Subjects. In Andreas Dufter and Elisabeth Stark (eds), *Manual of Romance Morphosyntax and Syntax*, 27–88. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lombardi Vallauri, E. 2001. *La teoria come separatrice di fatti di livello diverso. L’esempio della struttura informativa dell’enunciato*. In in Federico Albano Leoni, Rosanna Sornicola, Eleonora Stenta Krosbakken & Carolina Stromboli (eds). *Dati empirici e teorie linguistiche*, Atti del XXXIII Congresso SLI (Napoli 1999). Rome: Bulzoni, 151-173.
- Lombardi Vallauri, E. 2009. *La struttura informativa. Forma e funzione negli enunciati linguistici*. Rome: Carocci.
- Longa, Víctor M., Guillermo Lorenzo and Gemma Rigau (1998). Subject clitics and clitic recycling: locative sentences in some Iberian Romance languages. *Journal of Linguistics* 34: 125–164.
- López, Luís (2009). *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marandin, Jean-Marie (2001). ‘Unaccusative Inversion in French’, in Yves D’hulst, Johan Rooryck, and Jan Schroten (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 1999*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 195–222.
- Marandin, Jean-Marie (2010). Subject inversion and discourse in Romance. In Danièle Godard (ed.), *Fundamental Issues in the Romance Languages*. Stanford: CSLI, 319–367.
- Marandin, Jean-Marie (2011). Subject Inversion in French. The Limits of Information Structure. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, University of Washington, 327–347. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Mensching, Guido, and Remberger, Eva-Maria (2010). ‘Focus Fronting and the Left Periphery in Sardinian’, in Roberta D’Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway, and Ian Roberts (eds), *Syntactic Variation: The dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 261–76.
- Mioto, Carlos (2003). ‘Focalização e quantificação’, *Revista Letras, Curitiba* 61: 169–89.
- Molnár, Valeria (2002). Contrast in a contrastive perspective. In *Information Structure in a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Hilde Hasselgard, Stig K. A. Johansson, Bergljot Behrens, and Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds), 147–161. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.
- Motapanyane, Virginia (1994). On preverbal positions in Romanian. *Revue Canadienne de Linguistique / Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 39: 15–36.
- Munaro, Nicola (2013). *On the syntax of focalizers in some Italo-Romance dialects*, in S. Baauw, F. Drijkoningen, L. Meroni, and M. Pinto (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2011*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 157–174.
- Neeleman, Ad and Hans van de Koot (2008). Dutch scrambling and the nature of discourse templates. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11 (2): 137–189.
- Ordóñez, Francisco (2000). *The Clausal Structure of Spanish*. New York: Garland.
- Ordóñez, Francisco (2007). ‘Cartography of Postverbal Subjects in Spanish and Catalan’, in Sergio Baauw, Frank Drijkoningen, and Manuela Pinto (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2005: Selected papers from ‘Going Romance’, Utrecht, 8–10 December 2005*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 259–80.
- Paoli, Sandra (2003). *COMP and the Left-Periphery: Comparative Evidence from Romance*. Unpublished thesis, University of Manchester.
- Paoli, Sandra (2010). ‘In Focus: An Investigation of Information and Contrastive Constructions’, in Roberta D’Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway, and Ian Roberts (eds.), *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 277–91.
- Pinto, Manuela (1997). *Licensing and Interpretation of inverted subjects in Italian*. Utrecht: UiL OTS Dissertation series.
- Poletto, Cecilia (2014). *Word Order in Old Italian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Poletto, Cecilia and Giuliano Bocci (2016). 'Syntactic and prosodic effects of information structure in Romance', in Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 642–662.
- Poletto, Cecilia and Raffaella Zanuttini (2013). Emphasis as reduplication: Evidence from *sì che/no che* sentences. *Lingua* 128, 124–141.
- Prince, Ellen (1981). 'Towards a Taxonomy of Given-New Information', in Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*, New York: Academy Press, 223–55.
- Prince, Ellen (1986). 'On the Syntactic Marking of Presupposed Open Propositions', in A. M. Farley (ed.), *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory, 22nd Regional Meeting*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 208–222.
- Quer, Josep (2002). 'Edging Quantifiers: On QP-Fronting in Western Romance', in Claire Beyssade, Reineke Bok-Bennema, Frank Drijkoningen, and Paola Monachesi (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' 2000, Utrecht, 30 November–2 December*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 253–270.
- Reinhart, Tanya (1982). 'Pragmatics and linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics', *Philosophica* 27: 53–94.
- Reinhart, Tanya (2006). *Interface strategies: optimal and costly computations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Remberger, Eva-Maria (2010). 'Left Peripheral Interactions in Sardinian', in Kleanthes K. Grohmann and Ianthi-Maria Tsimpli (eds.), *Exploring the Left Periphery*. Special issue of *Lingua* 120: 555–581.
- Rett, Jessica (2011). Exclamatives, degrees, and speech acts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 34: 411–442.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). 'The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery', in Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281–337.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2001). 'On the Position "Int(errogative)" in the Left Periphery of the Clause', in Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds), *Current studies in Italian syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 287–296.
- Rizzi, Luigi (2005). 'On Some Properties of Subjects and Topics', in Laura Bruge, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro, Walter Schweikert, and Giuseppina Turano (eds.), *Proceedings of the XXX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*. Venice: Cafoscarina, 203–24.
- Rooth, Mats (1985). *Association with Focus*. Unpublished doctoral thesis: University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA.
- Rooth, Mats (1992). 'A Theory of Focus Interpretation', *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 75–116.
- Rowlett, Paul (2007). *The Syntax of French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salvi, Giampaolo (2004). *La formazione della strutture di frase romanza. Ordine delle parole e clitics dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Samek-Lodovici, Vieri (2015). *The Interaction of Focus, Givenness, and Prosody. A Study of Italian Clause Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sánchez Alvarado, Covadonga (2018). The realization of focus in Asturian Spanish. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 17: 1–28.
- Sava, Nicoleta (2014). *Only an Adverb? On the syntax and interpretation of restrictive focus adverbial particles in English and Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universitară.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth (1995). Sentence prosody: Intonation, stress and phrasing. In *Handbook of Phonological Theory*, John Goldsmith (ed.), 550–569. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Sgall, Peter, Eva Hajičová and Eva Benešová (1973). *Topic, Focus and Generative Semantics*. Kronberg: Scriptor.
- Sgall, Petr, Eva Hajičová and Jarmila Panenova (1986). *The Meaning of the Sentence and its Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Sheehan, Michelle (2006). *The EPP and Null Subjects in Romance*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Newcastle.
- Sheehan, Michelle (2010). "'Free" Inversion in Romance and the Null Subject Parameter', in Theresa Biberauer, Anders Holmberg, Ian Roberts, and Michelle Sheehan, *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 231–62.

- Sheehan, Michelle (2016). Subjects, null subjects and expletives in Romance. In Susann Fischer and Christoph Gabriel (eds.), *Manual of Grammatical Interfaces in Romance*, 329–362. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shlonsky, Ur and Gabriela Soare (2011). Where's 'why?'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(4): 651–669.
- Soare, Gabriela (1999). *The Syntax-Information Structure Interface: A Comparative View from Romanian*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.
- Stempel, Wolf-Dieter (1981). *L'amour elle appelle ça – L'amour tu connais pas*, in: Christian Rohrer (ed.), *Logos Semantikos. Studia linguistica in honorem Eugenio Coseriu*, vol. 4, *Grammatik*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 351–367.
- Szabolcsi, Anna (1981). Compositionality in Focus. *Folia Linguistica* 15: 141–162.
- Szendrői, Kriszta (2001). Focus and the syntax-phonology interface. Doctoral dissertation, University College London.
- Szendrői, Kriszta (2003). A stress-based approach to the syntax of Hungarian focus. *Linguistic Review* 20(1): 37–78.
- Tirado Camarena, Irene (2016). *Vaya como cuantificador en expresiones nominales*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Michela Cennamo/Guido Mensching (eds), *Actes du XXVIIe Congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes (Nancy, 15–20 juillet 2013)*. Nancy, ATILF.
- Tortora, Christina (1997). *The Syntax and Semantics of the Weak Locative*. Unpublished doctoral thesis: University of Delaware.
- Tortora, Christina (2001). 'Evidence for a Null Locative in Italian', in Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 313–26.
- Truckenbrodt, Hubert (1995). *Phonological Phrases: Their relation to syntax, focus, and prominence*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Uth, Melanie (2014). Spanish preverbal subjects in contexts of narrow information focus: Non-contrastive focalization or epistemic-evidential marking? *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 81: 87–104.
- Vallduví, Enric (1992a). *The Information Component*. New York: Garland.
- Vallduví, Enric (1992b). 'A Preverbal Landing Site for Quantificational Operators', *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 2: 319–343.
- Vallduví, Enric and Maria Vilkuna (1998). 'On Rheme and Kontrast', in Peter Culicover and Louise McNally (eds), *Syntax and Semantics 29: The Limits of Syntax*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 79–108.
- Vanelli, Laura (1999). 'Ordine delle parole e articolazione pragmatica nell'italiano antico: La "prominenza" pragmatica della prima posizione nella frase', *Medioevo romanzo* 23: 229–46.
- Vanrell, Maria del Mar and Fernández-Soriano, Olga (2013). Variation at the Interfaces in Ibero-Romance. Catalan and Spanish Prosody and Word Order. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 12: 253–282.
- Vanrell, Maria del Mar and Olga Fernández-Soriano (2018). Language variation at the prosody-syntax interface. Focus in European Spanish. In *Focus Realization in Romance and Beyond*, Marco García García and Melanie Uth (eds), 33–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Villalba, Xavier (2013). 'Eventive existentials in Catalan and the Topic-Focus Articulation', *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 25: 147–173.
- Zafiu, Rodica (2013). 'Information Structure', in Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 568–575.
- Zagona, Karen (2002). *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zubizarreta, María-Luisa (1998). *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Zubizarreta, María-Luisa (1999). 'Las funciones informativas: tema y foco', in Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Real Academia Española–Espasa, 4215–4244.
- Zubizarreta, Maria-Luisa (2016). 'Nuclear stress and information structure', in Caroline Féry and Shinichiro Ishihara (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 165–184.