

CURRENT ISSUES IN  
LINGUISTIC THEORY 174

**Theoretical Analyses  
in Romance Linguistics**

Edited by Christiane Laeuffer  
and Terrell A. Morgan

Offprint

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

## Focus constructions in Catalan\*

Enric Vallduví  
*University of Pennsylvania*

### 1. Introduction

The informational structure of the sentence has been the subject matter of an important amount of research in several traditions of linguistic study. From the Functional Sentence Perspective approach of the Prague School, from early work by Akmajian (1979 (1970)), Chomsky (1971), and Jackendoff (1972), and from current analyses of the interaction of informational notions like "focus" and "topic" with other elements of grammar (Reinhart 1982, Davison 1984, Horvath 1986, and Rochemont 1986, among others), we have gained insight into the relationship between surface structure and informational meaning, and into the mappings between particular discourse functions and particular syntactic constructions.

This paper is concerned with two such syntactic constructions, focus-preposing and right-dislocation, as they occur in Catalan. First, I will briefly characterize these constructions and, after introducing some technical notions, will lay out a description of their informational load as focus constructions. Then, I will show that focus-preposing and right-dislocation are in complementary distribution with respect to their informational meaning and will argue, in the light of further evidence from the linear order of the right-dislocated constituents, that these constructions are one and the same syntactic phenomenon. Finally, I will discuss some advantages of this approach in accounting for some characteristics of the surface structure of these constructions, and, most importantly, for the analysis of the syntax of focus in Catalan.

This is an offprint from:

CHRISTIANE LAEUFER & TERRELL A. MORGAN (eds)

*Theoretical Analyses in Romance Linguistics*

John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia

1992

(Published as Vol. 74 of the series

CURRENT ISSUES IN LINGUISTIC THEORY)

ISSN 0304-0763

ISBN 90 272 3572 4 (Eur.)/1-55619-130-8 (US)

© Copyright 1992 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

## 2. The constructions

Focus-preposing is a left-detachment construction where the detached phrase (henceforth XP) binds a gap in the clause to its right. This XP can be any complement and/or argument of the verb, and it bears the pitch maximum in the utterance, as is typical of the focused constituent in any sentence. Examples appear in (1):<sup>1</sup>

- (1) a. [S<sub>1</sub> is addressing S<sub>3</sub>. S<sub>2</sub> is present]  
 S<sub>1</sub>. *Hòstia! S'hem acabat la botella, eh! Que som... que som...*  
 S<sub>2</sub>. *Les dues botelles ja!*  
 S<sub>1</sub>. *DUES-BOTELLES<sub>p</sub>, s'hem polit [e]<sub>f</sub>.*  
 "S<sub>1</sub>. My god! We finished the bottle! We are... we are...  
 S<sub>2</sub>. The two bottles already!  
 S<sub>1</sub>. TWO-BOTTLES<sub>i</sub>, we polished off [e]<sub>i</sub>." [QM 10-85]

- b. S<sub>1</sub>. *Xec, avui vaig perdut.*  
 S<sub>2</sub>. *Com sempre...*  
 S<sub>3</sub>. *CERDO<sub>p</sub>, ha-anat [e]<sub>i</sub>, tots aquests dies! CERDO<sub>p</sub>, va [e]<sub>f</sub>!*  
 "S<sub>1</sub>. Boy, I'm really drunk today.  
 S<sub>2</sub>. As usual...  
 S<sub>3</sub>. WASTED<sub>i</sub>, he's been [e]<sub>i</sub> lately! WASTED<sub>i</sub>, he is [e]<sub>i</sub>!" [PC 10-85]

Focus-preposing is also known as Yiddish-Movement or Y-movement (Hankamer 1971, Jackendoff 1972), Focus Topicalization (Gundel 1974), Rhematization (Hernanz & Brucart 1987), and Focus-Movement (Prince 1981).<sup>2</sup> It is important to distinguish this construction from non-focal topicalization-like or thematizing preposing, which is more common in English, and where the preposed XP does not contain the pitch maximum. In Catalan, there is one further structural difference between focus-preposing and non-focal thematizing preposing: in the former, as I said, the XP always binds a gap in the clause to its right, while in the latter the XP is always coreferential with a pronominal clitic instead.<sup>3</sup> Before moving on to right-dislocation, consider (2) as an example of non-focal preposing, the type of preposings we are not dealing with here:

- (2) [written on an aerogramme; first line on the extra space overleaf]  
*Amb-aquest-tros-de-paperet<sub>p</sub>, ja no hi<sub>i</sub> COMPTAVA.*  
 with-this-little-piece-of-paper<sub>i</sub>, anymore not on-it<sub>i</sub> 1s.counted  
 "This-little piece-of-paper<sub>i</sub>, I wasn't COUNTING on it<sub>i</sub>." [PC 02-87]

In contrast to the XP in focus-preposing, the XP in right-dislocation is detached to the right and is realized with a low pitch, right after the unmarked clause-final pitch maximum of the non-dislocated part. Also, the dislocated XP must be coreferential with a pronominal clitic attached to V<sup>0</sup> in the clause (like in non-focal preposing, as we saw above).<sup>4</sup> Examples are found in (3a<sub>ii</sub>), a dislocated subject, and (3b<sub>ii</sub>), a dislocated sentential complement, contrasted with their corresponding canonical equivalents ((3a<sub>i</sub>) and (3b<sub>i</sub>)). And, as can be seen in (3c) and (3d), multiple right-dislocation is possible, with the linear order of the detached elements being free, contrasting again with focus-preposing, where only one XP is allowed:<sup>5</sup>

- (3) a. i. *El Lluc va-veure el gos.*  
 "Luke saw the DOG."  
 ii. *(pro<sub>p</sub>) va-veure el gos, el-Lluc<sub>i</sub>.*  
 "(He<sub>i</sub>) saw the DOG, Luke<sub>i</sub>."  
 b. i. *(pro) no crec que PLOGUI.*  
 "(I) don't believe that (it)'ll RAIN."  
 b. ii. *(pro) no ho<sub>i</sub> CREC, que-plogui<sub>f</sub>.*  
 "(I) don't BELIEVE it<sub>i</sub>, that-(it)'ll-rain<sub>f</sub>."  
 c. *(pro) l'<sub>i</sub>hi<sub>j</sub> VAIG-DUR, el-gos<sub>p</sub>, a-Eivissa<sub>f</sub>.*  
*(pro) l'<sub>i</sub>hi<sub>j</sub> VAIG-DUR, a-Eivissa<sub>p</sub>, el-gos<sub>f</sub>.*  
 "(I) TOOK it<sub>i</sub> to-it<sub>j</sub>, the-dog<sub>i</sub>, to-Ibiza<sub>j</sub>."  
 d. *(pro<sub>p</sub>) no ho<sub>i</sub> VOL, que-plogui<sub>f</sub>, el-Lluc<sub>f</sub>.*  
*(pro<sub>p</sub>) no ho<sub>i</sub> VOL, el-Lluc<sub>p</sub>, que-plogui<sub>f</sub>.*  
 "(He<sub>i</sub>) doesn't WANT it<sub>i</sub>, that-(it)'ll-rain<sub>f</sub>, Luke<sub>f</sub>."

With respect to syntactic distribution, we notice that any constituent but the matrix tensed verb can be focus-preposed or right-dislocated. In other words, the constructions are defined in terms of the position of the matrix tensed verb, since we talk about right- or left-detachments from the point of view of the pivotal [+TNS] element in the clause. Finally, with respect to prosody, both constructions are intonationally homophonous: a pitch-maximum peak on the left-hand side of the sentence, followed by a flat contour. In focus-preposing the constituent that bears the pitch

maximum is the lefthand focus XP, which is followed by the intonationally flatter clause. In right-dislocation, the constituent that bears the pitch maximum is generally  $V^0$  or some projection of  $V^0$  (i.e.  $V^n$ ), which is followed by the intonationally flatter right-dislocated XPs. This is illustrated by (4):

- (4) a. Focus-preposing:  
*MOLTS-AMICS<sub>i</sub>, (pro) té [e]<sub>i</sub>.*  
 "MANY FRIENDS<sub>i</sub>, (s/he) has [e]<sub>i</sub>."
- b. Right-dislocation:  
 (pro) els<sub>i</sub> té, molts-amics<sub>i</sub>.  
 "(S/he) HAS them<sub>i</sub>, many friends<sub>i</sub>."

Summarizing, we see that focus-preposing and right-dislocation differ in some aspects, but coincide in some others. They differ in: (a) the directionality of the detachment, (b) the stressability of the detached phrases (crucially stressed in focus-preposing, necessarily unstressed in right-dislocation), and (c) possibility of multiple detachment (impossible for focus-preposing, allowed in right-dislocation). And they are similar because, (a) except for [+TNS], any constituent can undergo either process, and (b) they are intonationally homophonous: a pitch maximum followed by a flat contour.

### 3. Informational meaning

#### 3.1 Focus/open-proposition structure

Let us now consider the informational properties of such constructions. As Prince (1986:208) points out, "information in a discourse does not correspond simply to an unstructured set of propositions; rather speakers seem to form their utterances so as to structure the information they are attempting to convey". This "structuring" or "packaging" of propositional meaning, known as non-truth-conditional meaning, contributes to the understanding of the sentence as well. As mentioned in the introduction, a great deal of research has been carried out to find correlations between particular syntactic constructions and particular non-truth-conditional understandings (Bolinger 1954, Hatcher 1956, Firbas 1964, Halliday 1967, Kuno 1972, 1987, Gundel 1974, 1988, Green 1980, *inter alia*).

One type of packaging structure that has been identified and discussed in the literature is focus/open-proposition structure (cf. Chomsky 1971, Jackendoff 1972, Rochemont 1978, 1986, Wilson & Sperber 1979, Williams 1981, Prince 1981, 1984, 1986, Selkirk 1984, and Ward 1985). This structure could be defined as follows (from Vallduví 1988b): a given sentence  $S_p$ , representing a certain proposition  $p$ , is structured into a (F)ocus and an (O)pen-(P)roposition, the latter being an expression derived from  $S_p$  by replacing [F] with a variable  $x$ . Furthermore, the open-proposition is marked as already being known to the hearer, and the only new information in  $S_p$  is the instantiation by [F] of the variable in the otherwise known open-proposition. Therefore,  $S_p = [F, OP]$ , where different [F, OP] pairs provide different "packaging" interpretations, while the truth value of  $p$  remains constant. As an example consider (5) (from Prince 1986, ex.1):

- (5) a. *She gave the-SHIRT to Harry.*  
 b. *It is the-SHIRT<sub>i</sub> that she gave [e]<sub>i</sub> to Harry.*  
 c. OP: she gave  $x$  to Harry  
 F: the-shirt

In (5a) and (5b) *the shirt* is the focus. The fact that the variable in the open-proposition is instantiated by *the shirt* ( $x = \text{the shirt}$ ) is what constitutes new information, while the open-proposition is assumed to be known at the time of the utterance. While focus/open-proposition structure in English may be marked by intonation alone (5a) or by both intonation and syntactic form (5b), in Catalan only the second alternative is available, as we will see in the following section.

#### 3.2 Focus/open-proposition marking in Catalan

The focus-marking nature of focus-preposing has long been recognized, as the very name of the construction suggests. In focus-preposing, the lefthand XP represents the instantiation of the variable in the open-proposition represented by the sentence as a whole. In this respect, focus-preposing is closely related to it-clefts, since they seem to perform a very similar informational task. In (6a) and (6b), we have the focus/open-proposition structure of the focus-preposing constructions that we saw in (1a) and (1b), respectively:

- (6) a. "TWO-BOTTLES<sub>i</sub>, we polished off [e]<sub>i</sub>."  
 OP: we polished off x-amount-of-bottles  
 F: two
- b. "WASTED<sub>i</sub>, he's been [e]<sub>i</sub> lately."  
 OP: he's been x lately  
 F: wasted

Notice that, as the following examples from Ward (1985) show, focus-preposing is not felicitous if the necessary discourse conditions on the informational status of the open-proposition are not met (in (7b) *I ordered x* cannot be treated as known to the hearer at the time of utterance):

- (7) a. Waitress: *Did you want tea?*  
 Customer: *COFFEE, I ordered, I think.*  
 (Ward 1985, ex. 206)
- b. #*I was at this restaurant and, COFFEE, I ordered.*  
 (Ward 1985, ex. 209)

As far as right-dislocation is concerned, I have shown elsewhere (Vallduví 1988b) that it is a focus/open-proposition-marking construction as well.<sup>6</sup> While the task of focus-preposing is to focus an argument and/or a complement of V<sup>0</sup>, the job of right-dislocation is precisely to represent focus/open-proposition relationships when the focus is not a complement or an argument of V<sup>0</sup>, but V<sup>0</sup> itself or a projection of V<sup>0</sup> (i.e. V<sup>n</sup>). The following illustrate this point:

- (8) [basketball game on TV: Penn vs. a non-Cornell Ivy League team; the previous week Penn had played Cornell]  
*Diu que (pro) els-hi<sub>i</sub> VAN FOTRE UNA PALLISSA, als-de-Cornell<sub>i</sub>.*  
 "They say (Penn) BEAT-THE-HELL-OUT-of them<sub>i</sub>, Cornell<sub>i</sub>."  
 [EV 02-87]

OP: they say Penn x-V<sup>0</sup> Cornell  
 F: beat-the-hell-out-of

- (9) [the narrator explains how he met a giant and they became friends; at a given point in the story, he watches the giant leave]  
*Vaig fixar-m'hi bé i, allà al fons, a la boca de la cala immensa, encara el veia, el caparrot del gegant.*  
*(pro) ho<sub>i</sub> ERA, un gegant<sub>i</sub>.*  
 "I looked intently, and, down there, at the mouth of the huge cove, I was still able to see it, the giant's big head.

- He WAS a giant." (lit.: "(He) WAS it<sub>i</sub>, a giant<sub>i</sub>."  
 [Pau Faner, *La primera oració*, AVUI 1-25-87]  
 OP: he x a giant  
 F: is (= [=])

Again, as with focus-preposing, right-dislocation is not felicitous if the appropriate discourse conditions are not met. See for example (9'), where the non-dislocated counterpart of (9) is infelicitous:

- (9') "I looked intently, and, down there, at the mouth of the huge cove, I was still able to see it, the giant's big head..."  
 # ... *(pro) era un GEGANT.*  
 "(He) was a GIANT."

In English, as we noticed above, it is possible to mark [F,OP]-structure at the surface exclusively by suprasegmental means. When the focus is V<sup>0</sup>, the unmarked sentence-final intonation peak is shifted to a marked sentence-medial position, thus signaling the special informational standing of V<sup>0</sup>.<sup>7</sup> Example (10) carries the same focus understanding as (8) above:

- (10) [ *Penn* [[<sub>V</sub> *beat-the-HELL-out* ] of *Cornell* ]].

Notice that, in Catalan, the intonation contour seems to be fixed here, with the pitch maximum in clause-final position. It is the "disturbing" non-focal elements that are demoted to a clause-external position, so that V<sup>0</sup> becomes clause-final, and, consequently, receives the pitch maximum that marks it as focus. It is also well-known that, in English, sentences like (11),

- (11) [<sub>IP</sub> *Penn* [<sub>VP</sub> *beat-the-hell-out* [<sub>PP</sub> of *CORNELL* ]]]].

with sentence-final stress, are focally ambiguous between a reading where the focus is the entire sentence (or, equivalently, where the sentence does not represent an open-proposition) and a reading where only the VP is meant as focus, given that both constituents contain the focus-marking pitch maximum (PP is also a possible focus, but this focus assignment is irrelevant here). Contrary to what we saw in (10), where the focus is unambiguously *beat-the-hell-out*, in (11) we cannot determine the focus without further contextual information. This particular focal ambiguity found in English is absent in Catalan. In Catalan, when the entire sentence is the focus, a canonical sentence occurs, but when the focus is only the VP, the subject is dislocated, allowing unambiguous focus/VP association, as shown in example (12):

- (12) *De totes formes, espero que*  
 (pro)<sub>i</sub> l'haurà anat molt bé, el-viatge-per-Florida.<sub>i</sub>  
 "Anyway, I hope that  
 (it)<sub>i</sub> went really WELL, your-trip-through-Florida.<sub>i</sub>"

[JP 3-87]

OP: your-trip-through-Florida x-VP  
 F: went really well

### 3.3 Focus-preposing and right-dislocation in complementary distribution

Once the informational task of focus-preposing and right-dislocation as focus constructions is clear, it becomes obvious that they stand in complementary distribution. This complementarity is most clearly seen from the examples in (13) to (15) (from Vallduví 1988b, exs. 20-23), where (13) is the canonical sentence, (14) shows focus understandings represented through right-dislocation, and (15) illustrates the focus-marking nature of focus-preposing.<sup>8</sup>

- (13) [non-OP-marking sentence (or F=CP)]

*La Núria té molts AMICS.*  
 "Núria has many FRIENDS."

- (14) a. [F=V<sup>0</sup> or [TNS] or [yes/no]]

(pro)<sub>i</sub> els<sub>i</sub> té, molts-amics<sub>i</sub>, la-Núria<sub>j</sub>.  
 "(She)<sub>i</sub> HAS them<sub>i</sub>, many-friends<sub>i</sub>, Núria<sub>j</sub>."  
 OP: Núria {x-V<sup>0</sup> or x-TNS-have or x-yes/no-have} many  
 friends  
 F: {have or [+present] or [yes]}

- b. [F=VP]

(pro)<sub>i</sub> té molts AMICS, la Núria<sub>i</sub>.  
 "(She)<sub>i</sub> has many FRIENDS, Núria<sub>i</sub>."  
 OP: Núria x-VP  
 F: has many friends

- (15) a. [F=[NP,VP]]

MOLTS-AMICS<sub>i</sub>, la Núria té [e]<sub>i</sub>.  
 "MANY FRIENDS<sub>i</sub>, Núria has [e]<sub>i</sub>."  
 OP: Núria has x  
 F: many friends

- b. [F=[NP,IP]]  
*La-NÚRIA<sub>i</sub>, [e]<sub>i</sub> té molts amics.*  
 "NÚRIA<sub>i</sub>, [e]<sub>i</sub> has many friends."  
 OP: x has many friends  
 F: Núria

Focus-preposing takes care of the instances where the focus is non-verbal, and right-dislocation takes care of the cases where the focus is V<sup>n</sup>. Apparently, then, the full range of focus/open-proposition interpretations is represented at surface structure by the constructions discussed here.

The situation so far is the following: (a) two syntactic constructions stand in complementary distribution with respect to the informational meaning attached to them; (b) both constructions are prosodically homophonous, with a pitch maximum on the focus, and an ensuing flatter contour over the non-focal material; and (c) yet these constructions are thought of as radically different in strict syntactic terms, due to the pivotal nature attributed to the [+TNS] verb cluster.

In principle, there is nothing wrong with this situation; linguists interested in describing the mapping between surface structure and focus structure could take note of the mismatch and incorporate it into their theory. But, of course, there is a very attractive alternative: exploring the possibility that focus-preposing and right-dislocation are identical in strict syntactic terms as well. If there is evidence for it, this move is highly desirable, not only because of the spirit of the structuralist method, but also because it provides us with a much more elegant account of the syntax of focus, as I will show in Section 5. First, though, let us look closely at the syntactic facts about focus-preposing and right-dislocation.

## 4. Syntactic structure

### 4.1 The traditional analysis

Traditionally, focus-preposing has been viewed as a wh-movement operation, totally parallel to wh-question formation. This is the approach followed by Bonet & Solà (1986:138f.) for Catalan, and Hernanz & Brucart (1987:96ff.) for Spanish, among others. The structure of a sentence like (4a), repeated here as (16a), would be identical, then, to the structure of a wh-question such as (16b), with the focus-preposed phrase in [Spec,CP]:<sup>9</sup>

- (16) a. FP:  $[_{CP} \text{MOLTS AMICS}_i [(\text{pro}) \text{té} [e]_i ]]$ .  
 "MANY FRIENDS, (she) has."  
 b. WH:  $[_{CP} \text{Què}_i [(\text{pro}) \text{té} [e]_i ]]$ ?  
 "What does (she) have?"

This analysis certainly captures the generalization that both focus-preposed XPs and wh-phrases bind an empty category in the clause to their right, contrary to non-focal topicalization-like preposing (TOP), which, as we saw in Section 2, must bind a pronominal clitic, and which could have the structure in (17), involving a detachment to a higher slot in the structure, not involving CP in any way:<sup>10</sup>

- (17) TOP:  $[_{XP} \text{Molts amics}_i [_{CP} [(\text{pro}) \text{els}_i \text{té}]]]$ .  
 "Many friends (she) HAS."

In order to capture this generalization in this fashion, it has to be assumed that the wh-phrase in a wh-question is interpreted as the focus of the sentence in which it occurs (see, for instance, Rochemont (1986:19), Horvath (1986:118), or Hernanz & Brucart (1987:97ff.)). If wh-phrases are focused constituents, it makes perfect sense that both are structurally the same. However, this is a problematic assumption; in a paper on the informational role of gap-containing constructions in English, Prince (1986:215) suggests that wh-questions have a "special story", and that they are very different from [F,OP]-marking constructions. Kuno (1980, 1982) has argued that, in Japanese, the focus of a question must contain the wh-phrase, but never that the focus of a question is *only* the wh-phrase. Erteschik-Shir (1986) offers a number of arguments against considering that wh-phrases in wh-questions are interpreted as syntactic foci. Moreover, Wunderlich (1981) describes wh-questions where the wh-phrase is the focus, but also wh-questions where it is not. Finally, if we take into account the prosodic characteristics of questions, we will notice that the pitch maximum does not fall on the wh-word, even though focus is always marked by the pitch maximum in any other focus construction (cf. (16), for example).<sup>11</sup>

Perhaps the fact that both wh-questions and focus-preposing involve the binding of a gap can be captured in some other way. In fact, the main piece of evidence in support of the wh-like behavior of the focused XP in focus-preposing is that both focus-preposing and wh-questions, at least in Spanish, trigger subject-verb inversion (cf. Torrego (1984) for Spanish and Picallo (1984) for wh-questions in Catalan). Hernanz & Brucart (1987:96f.) present an analysis of Spanish focus-preposing (their *rematización*) along

these lines. Unfortunately, in Catalan, while it is true that the uninverted order is impossible in wh-questions, focus-preposing does not require subject-verb inversion. In other words, Catalan (18a) and Spanish (18b), wh-questions without inversion, are both ungrammatical, but when it comes to focus-preposing without inversion, Catalan (19a) is perfect, whereas Spanish (19b) is out:

- (18) a. Catalan WH:  $*[_{CP} \text{Què}_i [(\text{pro}) \text{té} [e]_i ]]$ ?  
 "What does Núria have?"  
 b. Spanish WH:  $*[_{CP} \text{Qué}_i [(\text{pro}) \text{tiene} [e]_i ]]$ ?  
 "What does María have?"  
 (19) a. Catalan FP:  $[_{CP} \text{MOLTS AMICS}_i [(\text{pro}) \text{té} [e]_i ]]$ .  
 "MANY FRIENDS, Nuria has."  
 b. Spanish FP:  $*[_{CP} \text{MUCHOS AMIGOS}_i [(\text{pro}) \text{tiene} [e]_i ]]$ .  
 "MANY FRIENDS, María has."

The facts concerning subject-verb inversion, then, cannot be used to structurally equate wh-questions and focus-preposing in Catalan in the way they seem to support this equation in Spanish. This suggests that perhaps there exists an important difference in the way these two languages represent [F,OP]-structure at the surface.<sup>12</sup>

#### 4.2 One single syntactic construction

As I said above, the distribution of these constructions with regard to the different parts of the sentence that they respectively signal as focus seems natural if we assume that we have a fixed undetachable [+TNS] verbal core. However, another possible approach becomes obvious if we assume that the [+TNS] element in the clause is indeed detachable.

A first hypothesis from this point of view would suggest that apparent right-dislocation of the arguments of  $V^0$  could actually be the focus-preposing of  $V^0$  itself (assuming clitics attach to  $V^0$ ). So, in a sentence like (20b) ((20a) is the corresponding canonical), one could argue that the focused  $V^0$  has been preposed to [Spec, CP] from its clausal slot between the subject and the object (S=subject, V=verb, O=direct object, I=indirect object):

- (20) a.  $[\text{La Núria}_S \text{ donarà}_V \text{ les claus}_O \text{ al fuster}_I]$ .  
 "Núria will-give the keys to-the carpenter."

- b.  $(pro)_S$   $les_O$   $hi_I$   $DONARÀ$ ,  $la$   $Núria_S$ ,  $les$   $claus_O$ ,  $al$   $fuster_I$   
 “(She) WILL-GIVE them to him, Núria, the keys, to-the car-  
 penter.”
- c.  $(pro)_S$   $les_O$   $hi_I$   $DONARÀ$ ,  
 $\{S, O, I; S, I, O; O, I, S; O, S, I; I, S, O; I, O, S\}$ .

Unfortunately, the fact that the elements to the right of the focus can be freely ordered, as represented by (20c), does not support this approach. One could, if anything, postulate free scrambling of constituents, without any functional purpose, in the clause following the focused  $V^0$ . However, there is no independent motivation to support this move, since canonical (i.e. non-focus-preposing) sentences in Catalan do not accept free scrambling at all. Moreover, if (20c) is in fact a right-dislocation construction, the linear order variation that its postfocal constituents present is not a problem: one of the characteristics of right-dislocation is that, when multiple detachment occurs, the dislocated phrases end up in any possible linear order (cf. (3c) and (3d) above). The range of linear order possibilities in (20c) is just what one should expect.<sup>13</sup>

Taking these facts into account, and still assuming that the [+TNS] element in the clause is detachable, there is yet a second possibility. If from the canonical sentence in (20a) we derive a sentence where the focus is unambiguously assigned to the indirect object PP, we obtain (21):

- (21) *AL FUSTER, la Núria donarà les claus.*  
 “To-the CARPENTER, Núria will-give the keys.”

Example (21), according to the traditional analysis, is a focus-preposing. But if we observe the behavior of the phrases to the right of the focus with respect to linear order, we see that they behave exactly like the right-dislocated phrases in (20b-c): here, again, any order among the phrases to the right of focus is grammatical:

- (22) a. *AL FUSTER, la Núria\_S donarà\_V, les claus\_O.*  
 “To-the CARPENTER, Núria will-give the keys.”
- b. *AL FUSTER, \{S, V, O; S, O, V; V, S, O; V, O, S; O, S, V; O, V, S\}*.

If we view (22b) as a focus-preposing, the free linear order among the phrases to the right of the focus remains unexplained, unless we are willing to postulate free scrambling, which is not a desirable approach, as we said above. If, on the other hand, we view (22b) as a right-dislocation, where the  $V^0$  has been detached to the right along with the subject and object

NPs, parallel to (20b-c), the problem automatically disappears, given that we know that right-dislocated phrases can stand in any linear order with respect to each other. The structure of our “focus-preposing-turned-right-dislocation” should be, then, as in (23), allowing free linear order among the dislocated phrases:

- (23) a.  $[_{IP} (pro)_i [e]_v$  *MOLTS AMICS*], *té\_v, la-Núria\_i*.  
 b.  $[_{IP} (pro)_i [e]_v$  *MOLTS AMICS*], *la-Núria\_i, té\_v*.  
 “MANY FRIENDS, Núria has.”

#### 4.3 The traditional and the right-dislocation approaches

We have already seen that considering focus-preposing to be an actual right-dislocation, we can account for the otherwise problematic free linear order among the postfocal phrases. We also see that there is no reason now for “focus-preposing” to trigger subject-verb inversion, since it does not involve fronting, let alone movement into [Spec,CP], unlike wh-question formation. The linear order of the subject and the verb in (19a) or (23), for instance, is free because we are dealing with individually dislocated phrases.

Furthermore, consider an example like (24a), for which (24b) is the corresponding canonical:

- (24) a. *TENIR-ne\_i MOLTS, vol d'amics\_i la-Núria.*  
 HAVE of-them\_i MANY wants of-friends\_i Núria  
 Approx.: “Friends, it is HAVING MANY that Núria wants.”
- b. *[La Núria vol [(PRO) tenir molts AMICS]].*  
 “Núria wants to-have many FRIENDS.”

If we assume for (24a) the structure in (25), the traditional focus-preposing analysis, where the focused embedded infinitival clause has been moved to [Spec,CP],

- (25)  $[_{CP} (PRO) TENIR-NE_i$  *MOLTS*  $[_{IP} vol d'amics_i$  *la-Núria]].*

we run into trouble when trying to account for the position of *d'amics* “of-friends”, a complement of the embedded verb *tenir* “to have”. We would have to say, then, that part of this embedded clause, namely the N' in the object QP, has been lowered back inside IP leaving a clitic copy behind, *ne*. This derivation, involving a downgrading movement, has no parallel in the language and is extremely hard to justify. In contrast, accepting (26),



(26) [<sub>IP</sub> (*pro*<sub>i</sub>) [*e*]<sub>v</sub> [(*PRO*)<sub>TENIR-NE<sub>i</sub></sub> *MOLTS*]] *vol<sub>v</sub>*, *d'amics<sub>i</sub>*, *la-Núria<sub>i</sub>*.

the structure presupposed by this proposal — where the embedded clause remains *in situ*, and where the matrix  $V^0$ , the matrix subject, and the object of the embedded clause are right-dislocated — this sentence is just one more unproblematic example of right-dislocation. It is interesting to note here that, once more, the linear order among the postfocal phrases in (24a) (= (26)) is free.

Notice, furthermore, that from this standpoint we can also account for the fact that, while non-focal topicalization-like preposing and right-dislocation require a pronominal clitic in the clause coreferential with the XP, “focus-preposed” XPs must bind a gap in the same situation. XPs in non-focal topicalization-like preposing and in right-dislocation bind a clitic in IP because they are detached away from their head,  $V^0$ , and  $V^0$  requires the presence of the clitics as government/case absorbers (Jaeggli 1982) or theta-role absorbers (Zubizarreta 1982) when its arguments are not present in the clause. But XPs in the alleged “focus-preposing” construction are not detached XPs anymore. They remain *in situ*, and it is the  $V^0$  head now which is detached, subject to right-dislocation, leaving its original slot in the clause empty. Therefore, no clitic coreferential with the focus appears with  $V^0$ , since the focus remains in its canonical argument position in the clause, and, therefore, does not license the presence of a clitic.<sup>14</sup> Both our proposal and the traditional approach, then, account for the clitic-versus-gap distribution.

The evidence analyzed so far suggests that, in Catalan, a construction that very much looks like a left-detachment at first glance is much better understood, under close inspection, if thought of as a right-dislocating construction. The apparent “focus-preposing” of Catalan is not a “preposing” at all, and what has been traditionally considered a detached XP is actually an XP *in situ*. It is perhaps surprising that such a difference should underlie the apparently similar “focus-preposing” configurations of Catalan and Spanish. The facts, though, seem clear: in Catalan the order of the postfocal phrases, the verb and the subject, in the apparent “focus-preposing” of an object is free (cf. (23)) (as it should be if they are right-dislocated). In Spanish, in contrast, it is not, given that sentences like (19b) are out, since the verb and the subject must be inverted. In Catalan, “extraction” of a “focus-preposed” phrase from within islands is possible (given that there is actually no extraction, since the focused phrase remains *in situ*); in Spanish it is not (cf. fn. 12). It follows, then, that Spanish should not allow the free

arrangement in the linear order of the postfocal phrases that Catalan presents in sentences like (22b). And, in fact, it does not, as shown by (28), from Contreras (1976:106, ex. 10.12) ((27) is the canonical):

- (27) *Don Fermín sacó sus espuelas de la sala.*  
 “Don Fermín took his spurs out of the room.”
- (28) a. *De-la-SALA, sacó don Fermín sus espuelas.*  
 b. *De-la-SALA, sacó sus espuelas don Fermín.*  
 c. \**De-la-SALA, sus espuelas don Fermín sacó.*  
 d. \**De-la-SALA, don Fermín sus espuelas sacó.*  
 e. \**De-la-SALA, don Fermín sacó sus espuelas.*  
 f. \**De-la-SALA, sus espuelas sacó don Fermín.*

In Catalan, as pointed out above, all the linear orders to the right of the focus are grammatically generated:

- (29) a. *Del-CALAIX, la Núria<sub>s</sub> va-treure<sub>v</sub> els esperons<sub>o</sub>.*  
 “The DRAWER, Núria took the spurs out of.”  
 b. *Del-CALAIX, {S,V,O;S,O,V;V,S,O;V,O,S;O,S,V;O,V,S}.*

A consequence of this proposal, then, is that the representation of focus at surface structure is crucially different in Catalan and Spanish, despite the apparent similarity between “focus-preposing” configurations in both languages.<sup>15</sup>

### 5. Consequences for the syntax of focus

The attractiveness of the proposal presented in this paper does not lie only in the fact that it accounts for both the clitic-versus-gap facts and the freedom of linear word order of the postfocal phrases in Catalan, but also in what it represents for the nature of the mapping between surface syntactic structure and focus structure in this language. As suggested above, it appears that the interpretation of focus in Catalan is guaranteed through the syntactic processes of right-dislocation and non-focal thematizing preposing.

The conspiracy that these detachments carry out invariably leaves the focus of the sentence in clause-final position, where it bears the pitch maximum that is normally associated with that position. It is actually the IP-slot which is associated with focus interpretation in Catalan. All the overt material within IP at surface structure (with the exception of clitics) is

interpreted as the focus of the sentence, and all the non-focal constituents, therefore, must be removed and detached from IP.<sup>16</sup> We know that it is the entire IP, and not just the sentence-final slot, which is associated with focus, thanks to the existence of subject right-dislocation for the cases in which the focus is only the VP (e.g. (12) above). In such cases, since the subject is non-focal, it must be right-dislocated away from the IP-slot. The only overt material within the IP-slot, then, is the VP, which is correctly interpreted as the focus. Had the subject remained *in situ*, the whole sentence would have been interpreted as the focus, since the whole sentence would have been overt within the IP at surface structure.

If the analysis put forward here is correct, Catalan surface structure shows the following mapping to focus structure:

(30) [<sub>XP</sub> [<sub>XP</sub> OP-material [<sub>IP</sub> FOCUS]] OP-material]

In (30), the Open-Proposition material lies on both sides of the focus, while the latter is invariably associated with IP as just described. The lefthand XP position in the structure in (30) is meant to take care of the existence of non-focal topicalization-like preposing. The thematized preposed material in such constructions is part of the open-proposition represented by the sentence. I have not addressed in this paper the issue of why a non-focal phrase is right-dislocated versus non-focally preposed, a research project in and of itself. Suffice it to say that the elements that are non-focally preposed perform some further functional task, which requires their being left-detached as opposed to right-detached.<sup>17</sup>

Given the mapping in (30), the rule for focus representation in Catalan could be stated along the lines of (31):

(31) Focus Representation in Catalan:

In a given sentence  $S_p = [F, OP]$ , all and only the overt non-clitic material in the IP-slot is [F].

And the "propositional packaging" instructions that it conveys could be informally stated as: "Recover from the current discourse-model proposition-stack the open-proposition expressed by  $S_p$ , and instantiate its variable with all and only the non-clitic material expressed in IP;" or, alternatively: "Appropriately add [F] to the current discourse model."

Notice that, if we had kept focus-preposing and right-dislocation as separate constructions in strict syntactic terms, the surface representation of [F,OP]-structure for Catalan could not have been described as in (30) and (31), since we would have had two positions relevant to focus interpre-

tation: [Spec,CP], on the one hand, and the IP-slot on the other. A potential rule of focus interpretation in this situation should include specific information about the fact that [F] in a given sentence  $S_p$  would be represented by the material in [Spec,CP] if  $[F] \neq V^n$ , and by the material in the IP-slot if  $[F] = V^n$ . Obviously, our proposal provides a much simpler and less arbitrary representation of [F,OP]-structure at the surface.<sup>18</sup>

## 6. Conclusion

Summing up, we have argued that, in Catalan, what looks like a focus-preposing construction is actually a right-dislocation, paralleling other long-recognized right-dislocation structures in the language, and mirroring the prosodic and informational identity of both constructions. All that is needed is to accept that the [+TNS] element in the clause does not have the pivotal nature that it is generally assigned in the traditional approach, and that it can be detached along with the other parts of the sentence.

Under this "focus-preposing-as-right-dislocation" approach we account for the same facts that were used to marshall the traditional movement-into-[Spec,CP] analysis of focus-preposing in Catalan and we provide an explanation for other phenomena, like the free linear order of the postfocal phrases and the lack of subject-verb inversion in the alleged "focus-preposing" construction. And, finally, we have seen that, by adopting this proposal, we obtain an extremely simple and direct rule of focus representation at surface structure, where all and only the focus is mapped onto the IP-slot, while the elements of the open-proposition are represented by the phrases in the detachment slots that flank IP.

In an article about Hungarian surface string order, Kiss (1981) argues that "the functions of the distinguished structural positions of [...] sentences are independent of the case structure [...]; that is, it need not be shown by structural position. Hungarian sentence structure marks constituents from a communicative point of view" (1981:185). Apparently, Catalan is closer to Hungarian and distinct from English in having a surface sentence structure that closely reflects informational notions instead of case structure or thematic structure, the representation of which is attained at the surface by a combination of fully indexed pronominal clitics and null categories.

## Notes

- \* I am indebted to Jack Hoeksema, Anthony Kroch, Ellen Prince, and Raffaella Zanuttini, as well as to many other people at the University of Pennsylvania, for helpful and suggestive ideas and comments on previous drafts. I am fully responsible, however, for all the errors and oversights in this paper.
- In the cited data throughout the paper, the intonationally prominent element is capitalized, and the dislocated phrases are set apart from the clause by a comma. The dislocated phrases and their corresponding coreferring elements in the clause are coindexed. Also, the naturally-occurring examples in the text are appropriately labeled for source (those in my own corpus with the speaker's initials and date).
  - Prince (1981) further argues for a functional distinction between Focus-Movement and Yiddish-Movement, while pointing out that Yiddish-Movement is restricted to certain varieties of English.
  - In other words, in Catalan, focus-preposing looks like a structural topicalization ( $[XP_i [... e_i ...]]$ ), and non-focal topicalization-like or thematizing preposing is structurally a left-dislocation ( $[XP_i [... cl_i ...]]$ , where  $cl$ =clitic pronominal). Some confusion arises from the use of the term "topicalization" to describe both a surface structural pattern and a functional construction. In this paper, "topicalization-like" and "thematizing" are used to describe functional constructions. See Prince (1981) and Ward (1985) for a complete taxonomy and thorough analysis of both types of preposing in English; from the latter I take the name "focus-preposing". See Vallduví (1988a) for a discussion of focal versus non-focal preposing in Catalan and Spanish.
  - This is not so in the case of dislocated subjects, of course, since Catalan is a null-subject language, but clitics are, in general, required for other parts of the sentence. Right-dislocation, then, follows the schema  $[... cl_i ...] XP_i$ .
  - For the sake of exposition and transparency, I generally translate Catalan right-dislocations into English right-dislocations, even though I am aware of their marginal status.
  - Previous analyses of right-dislocation consider the right-dislocated element to be some sort of "afterthought" (a processing account) or a topic in a comment-topic structure (cf. Gundel 1988). Exceptions are Antinucci & Cinque (1977) and Calabrese (1982), with a position similar to the one in Vallduví (1988b).
  - In both English and Catalan the focus/verb association can also be attained by non-focal preposing of the post-verbal complements (as in example (2) above), leaving the focus in the intonationally prominent sentence-final position. We will return to this below in Section 5.
  - Notice that in the case of focused subjects (15b) one cannot determine from string order whether they are *in situ* or in an  $A'$ -position. For the moment, I will assume that they are focus-preposed, following the overt structure of parallel object focus-preposings (cf. (15a)). Notice, also, that when the focused constituent is a [+TNS] verbal element (e.g. (14a)) the actual focus could be the lexical category  $V+0$ , the functional category [TNS], or even the affirmation/negation scale [yes/no].

- Bonet & Solà's (1986) account actually base-generates the XP in topic position and posits a null-operator movement into [Spec,CP] (i.e.  $[XP_i [O_i [... e_i ...]]]$ ). Both approaches, though, crucially involve a wh-movement into CP.
- The location of the topic slot in some Romance languages is actually problematic, and the structure in (17) must be taken with a grain of salt: non-focal thematized preposed XPs go to the left of fronted wh-phrases, but to the right of [-WH] complementizers (cf. Plann (1982) and Hernanz & Brucart (1987:84f.)). I will not attempt to go into this issue here.
- Actually, Catalan presents different intonation contours for different types of wh-questions, along the lines of the division made by Wunderlich (1981). Unmarked wh-questions have clause-final intonational prominence, like (16b) above or (i) here. Marked wh-questions are also allowed, as in (ii), with intonational prominence on the wh-phrase (and they are not echo questions):
  - Qui<sub>i</sub> [e]<sub>i</sub> vindrà?*  
"Who<sub>i</sub> [e]<sub>i</sub> will-come?"
  - QUI<sub>i</sub> [e]<sub>i</sub> vindrà?*  
"WHO<sub>i</sub> [e]<sub>i</sub> will-come?"
 The focus in (ii) is the wh-phrase, but maybe not so in (i). The phrases to the right of the wh-phrase in (ii) do behave as if they had been right-dislocated (see Section 4.2).
- That "focus-preposing" is not a wh-movement operation in Catalan is further confirmed by the fact that it does not obey the island constraints. Compare the grammatical Catalan sentence in (i) to the ungrammatical Spanish sentence in (ii) (from Hernanz & Brucart (1987:97, ex. 72)), where extraction from within an island apparently results in ungrammaticality:
  - Els CALÉS, la Núria no sap qui té.*  
"The MONEY, Núria doesn't know who has."
  - \**El DINERO, ignora María quién tiene.*  
"The MONEY, María doesn't know who has."
- It is true that some orders, in (20c) and below, are more natural than others, while still being grammatical. I will assume that the difference is due to parsing difficulties and will not attempt to study it here.
- Positing the detachment of the [+TNS] verbal element to a clause-peripheral right-dislocation position might strike one as an unusual proposal. It is usually assumed that when  $V^0$  moves beyond  $C^0$  it must leave a resumptive pro-verbal form behind to bear the [+TNS] morphology. Such configurations are discussed in Koopman (1984) for the Kru languages, and in Davis & Prince (1986) for Yiddish. However, it is not clear that the dislocated phrases adjoin to a position higher than  $C^0$ ; they may adjoin to IP (see fn. 10), and, if they do so, the dislocated [+TNS]-carrying verb can properly govern the trace in  $I^0$  position, a necessary condition to license verbal empty categories, according to Koopman (1984:70ff.). Also, this proposal runs counter to the Head Movement Constraint as posited by Travis (1984:131): "An  $X^0$  may only move into the  $Y^0$  which properly governs it". The detachment slots we are considering in this paper are not  $Y^0$  positions, but see Torrego (1984:106) for an adjunction-to-S analysis of V-preposing (subject-verb inversion) in Spanish. These issues need further consideration.

15. Italian seems to pattern like Catalan in this respect: both (i) and (ii) are grammatical strings ((i) is from Antinucci & Cinque (1977:123, ex. 17)):

- (i) UN'AUTOMOBILE, Giorgio, ha-comprato.  
 (ii) UN'AUTOMOBILE, ha-comprato, Giorgio.  
 "A CAR, Giorgio bought."

But in wh-questions only one order is possible:

- (iii) Che cosa ha comprato Giorgio?  
 (iv) \*Che cosa Giorgio ha comprato?  
 "What did Giorgio buy?"

If Italian "focus-preposing" were really a focus-preposing, i.e. with movement into [Spec,CP] of the focused phrase, (ii) should be ruled out for the same reasons for which (iv) is ruled out.

16. Whether the relevant structural category is IP or CP is not totally clear and needs further research. Careful analysis of [F,OP]-structure in wh-questions might suggest that the relevant category is CP. I leave this question for future research, and settle on IP for the purposes of this paper.
17. The non-focally preposed phrases act as "link-ups" with the previous discourse, and they stand in a salient partially ordered set (poset) relation to an element in the previous context (cf. Hirschberg 1985, Ward & Prince 1986). They correspond, more or less, to what many scholars call "sentential topic" (e.g. Reinhart 1982). See Vallduví (1988b) for further details.
18. These facts raise many interesting questions: the applicability of this particular [F,OP] representation to other languages, the existence of non-syntactic (i.e. discourse) reasons for the order of the elements in this representation, the nature of the link between [F,OP]-structure and surface structure, and others. These constitute a broad avenue of research that must be explored in future work.

## References

- Akmajian, Adrian. 1979(1970). *Aspects of the Grammar of Focus in English*. New York: Garland.
- Antinucci, Francesco & Guglielmo Cinque. 1977. "Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano: L'emarginazione". *Studi di grammatica italiana* 6.121-46.
- Bolinger, Dwight L. 1954. "English Prosodic Stress and Spanish Sentence Order". *Hispania* 37.152-6.
- Bonet, Sebastià & Joan Solà. 1986. *Sintaxi generativa catalana*. Barcelona: Enciclopèdia Catalana.

- Calabrese, Andrea. 1982. "Alcune ipotesi sulla struttura informazionale della frase in italiano e sul suo rapporto con la struttura fonologica". *Rivista di grammatica generativa* 7.3-78.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1971. "Deep Structure, Surface Structure, and Semantic Interpretation". *Semantics* ed. by Danny Steinberg and Leon Jacobovits, 183-216. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Contreras, Heles. 1976. *A Theory of Word Order with Special Reference to Spanish*. Amsterdam: North-Holland. (Spanish translation (1978): *El orden de palabras en español*. Madrid: Cátedra.)
- Davis, Lori J. & Ellen F. Prince. 1986. "Yiddish Verb-Topicalization and the Notion 'Lexical Integrity'". *Papers from the 22nd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* ed. by Anne M. Farley et al., 90-7. Chicago: CLS.
- Davison, Alice. 1984. "Syntactic Markedness and the Definition of Sentence Topic". *Language* 60.797-846.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1986. "Wh-Questions and Focus". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 9.117-49.
- Firbas, Jan. 1964. "On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Perspective". *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 1.267-80.
- Green, Georgia M. 1980. "Some Wherefores of English Inversions". *Language* 56.582-601.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. 1974. *The Role of Topic and Comment in Linguistic Theory*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. 1988. "Universals of Topic-Comment Structure". *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. ed. by Michael Hammond, Edith Moravcsik & Jessica R. Wirth, 209-39. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English (Part II)". *Journal of Linguistics* 3.199-244.
- Hankamer, Jorge. 1971. *Constraints on Deletion in Syntax*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University.
- Hatcher, Anna G. 1956. "Theme and Underlying Question: Two studies in Spanish word order". *Word* 12, Monograph no.3.
- Hernanz, M. Lluïsa & José M. Brucart. 1987. *La Sintaxis*. Barcelona: Crítica.
- Hirschberg, Julia. 1985. *A Theory of Scalar Implicature*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Horvath, Julia. 1986. *FOCUS in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo. 1982. *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kiss, Katalin É. 1981. "Structural Relations in Hungarian, a 'Free' Word Order Language". *Linguistic Inquiry* 12.185-213.
- Koopman, Hilda. 1984. *The Syntax of Verbs*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1972. "Functional Sentence Perspective". *Linguistic Inquiry* 3.269-320.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1980. "The Scope of the Question and Negation in Some Verb-Final Languages". *Papers from the 16th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* ed. by Jody Kreiman & Almerindo E. Ojeda, 155-69. Chicago: CLS.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1982. "The Focus of the Question and the Focus of the Answer". *Papers from the Parasession on Nondeclaratives at the 18th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* ed. by Kevin Tuite et al., 134-57. Chicago: CLS.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1987. *Functional Syntax*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Picallo, M. Carme. 1984. "The Infl Node and the Null Subject Parameter". *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.75-102.
- Plann, Susan. 1982. "Indirect Questions in Spanish". *Linguistic Inquiry* 13.297-313.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1981. "Topicalization, Focus-Movement, and Yiddish-Movement: A pragmatic differentiation". *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* ed. by Dan Alford et al., 249-64. Berkeley: BLS.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1984. "Topicalization and Left-dislocation: A functional analysis". *Discourses in Reading and Linguistics* (= *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* v. 433) ed. by Sheila J. White and Virginia Teller, 213-25. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1986. "On the Syntactic Marking of Presupposed Open Propositions". *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory at the 22nd Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* ed. by Anne M. Farley et al., 208-22. Chicago: CLS.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1982. "Pragmatics and Linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics". *Philosophica* 27.53-94.
- Rochemont, Michael. 1978. *A Theory of Stylistic Rules in English*. New York: Garland.

- Rochemont, Michael. 1986. *Focus in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Torrego, Esther. 1984. "On Inversion in Spanish and Some of Its Effects". *Linguistic Inquiry* 15.103-29.
- Travis, Lisa. 1984. *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Vallduví, Enric. 1988a. "Functional Load, Prosody, and Syntax: Left-detachment in Catalan and Spanish". *Papers from the 24th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* ed. by Lynn Macleod et al., 391-404. Chicago: CLS.
- Vallduví, Enric. 1988b. "Constituent Focusing and Catalan Right-dislocation". Paper presented at the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, New Orleans, December 27-30, 1988.
- Ward, Gregory. 1985. *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Preposing*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Ward, Gregory & Ellen F. Prince. 1986. "On the Topicalization of Indefinite NPs". Paper presented at the 60th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, New York, December 27-30, 1986.
- Williams, Edwin. 1981. "Remarks on Stress and Anaphora". *Journal of Linguistic Research* 1.1-16.
- Wilson, Deirdre & Dan Sperber. 1979. "Ordered Entailments: An alternative to presuppositional theories". *Presupposition* (= *Syntax and Semantics* 11) ed. by Choon-Kyu Oh & David A. Dinneen, 299-323. New York: Academic Press.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1981. "Questions about Questions". *Crossing the Boundaries in Linguistics* ed. by Wolfgang Klein & Willem Levelt, 131-58. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Zubizarreta, M. Luisa. 1982. *On the Relationship of the Lexicon to Syntax*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Titles published recently or scheduled for publication in 1992 in the series CURRENT ISSUES IN LINGUISTIC THEORY:

75. DROSTE, Flip G. and John E. JOSEPH (eds): *Linguistic Theory and Grammatical Description*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
76. WICKENS, Mark A.: *Grammatical Number in English Nouns*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
77. BOLTZ, William G. and Michael C. SHAPIRO (eds): *Studies in the Historical Phonology of Asian Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
78. KAC, Michael: *Grammars and Grammaticality*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
79. ANTONSEN, Elmer H. and Hans Henrich HOCK (eds): *STÆFCRÆFT: Studies in Germanic Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
80. COMRIE, Bernard and Mushira EID (eds): *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics III*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
81. LEHMANN, Winfred P. & H.J. HEWITT (eds): *Language Typology 1988. Typological Models in Reconstruction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
82. VAN VALIN, Robert D. (ed.): *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
83. FIFE, James & Erich POPPE (eds): *Studies in Brythonic Word Order*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991.
84. DAVIS, Garry W. & Gregory K. IVERSON (eds): *Explanation in Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
85. BROSELOW, Ellen, Mushira EID & John McCARTHY (eds): *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics IV*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
86. KESS, Joseph L.: *Psycholinguistics. Psychology, Linguistics, and the Study of Natural Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
87. BROGYANYI, Bela and Reiner LIPP (eds): *Historical Philology: Greek, Latin, and Romance. Papers in honor of Oswald Szemerényi II*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
88. SHIELDS, Kenneth.: *A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
89. BURRIDGE, Kate: *Syntactic Change in Germanic. A study of some aspects of language change in Germanic with particular reference to Middle Dutch*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
90. KING, Larry D.: *The Semantic Structure of Spanish. Meaning and grammatical form*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
91. HIRSCHBÜHLER, Paul and Konrad KOERNER (eds): *Romance Languages and Modern Linguistic Theory. Selected papers from the XX Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
92. POYATOS, Fernando: *Paralanguage: A linguistic and interdisciplinary approach to interactive speech and sounds*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
93. LIPPI-GREEN, Rosina (ed.): *Recent Developments in Germanic Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1992.
94. HAGÈGE, Claude: *The Language Builder. An essay on the human signature in linguistic morphogenesis*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
95. MILLER, D. Gary: *Complex Verb Formation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
96. LIEB, Hans-Heinrich (ed.): *Prospects for a New Structuralism*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
97. BROGYANYI, Bela and Reiner LIPP (eds): *Comparative-Historical Linguistics: Indo-European and Finno-Ugric. Papers in honor of Oswald Szemerényi III*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
98. EID, Mushira and Gregory K. IVERSON: *Issues in Language and Grammar. Papers in honor of Gerald Sanders*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
99. JENSEN, John T.: *English Phonology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.
101. EID, Mushira and Clive HOLES (eds): *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics V. Papers from the Fifth Annual Symposium on Arabic Linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, n.y.p.