

ITALIAN FOCUS AND ELLIPTIC EFFECTS

Lisa BRUNETTI

1 Introduction

A preverbal Focus in Italian is acceptable in a contrastive exchange, but it is not acceptable as an answer to a wh-question:

- | | | |
|--------|--|--|
| (1) a. | Che cosa ha vinto Gianni? | ??[La maglietta] _F ha vinto, Gianni. |
| | what has won Gianni | the T-shirt has won Gianni |
| | b. La felpa, l'ha vinta Gianni. | No, [la maglietta] _F ha vinto Gianni. |
| | the sweatshirt it _{cl} has won Gianni | no the T-shirt has won Gianni |

Focus in (1a) expresses new information, Focus in (1b) expresses contrast. According to several studies (É. Kiss 1998, Zubizarreta 1998, Belletti 2002, etc.) the impossibility for a Focus expressing new information to move to the left is the main syntactic piece of evidence that two distinct grammatical objects called 'Focus' exist.

Semantic and prosodic differences are also assumed by these studies. In Brunetti (2003, in press), on the contrary, I provide several pieces of evidence that there are no interface differences between the two Foci in (1a) and (1b). In this paper my aim is to show that there are no syntactic differences either. Therefore, I intend to show that in a context like that in (1a) Focus can move to the left periphery. I will also explain *why*, being Focus movement possible, the answer in (1a) is marginal.

2 Focus movement and ellipsis

An answer like (1a) above is not ungrammatical, and since it gives a proper answer to the question, it is not even pragmatically incongruent. It though sounds heavy, redundant. In fact, a short answer with the focused item alone would be much preferable, as illustrated by the exchange below:

- (2) Che cosa ha vinto Gianni? [La maglietta]_F.

The proposal I make is to derive the answer in (2) from the answer in (1a). The focused constituent moves to the left periphery to a position higher than the IP, and

then ellipsis of the non-focused part of the sentence applies. The structure I propose is the following:

(3) $[_{DP} \text{La maglietta}]_j [_{IP} \text{ha} [_{VP} \text{vinto} [_{DP} \text{Gianni}] t_j]]$

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

(4) * $[_{IP} \text{ha} [_{VP} \text{vinto} [_{DP} \text{Gianni}] [_{DP} \text{la maglietta}]]]$

Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni (to appear) present a similar proposal for n-word fragment answers in Italian. In Italian, an n-word in post-verbal position is licensed by an above negation that binds it, as in (5a). When the n-word stays in preverbal position, no negative marker is needed for licensing, as in (5b).

- (5) a. Non ho visto nessuno. b. Nessuno ho visto.
 (I) not have seen nobody nobody (I) have seen
 ‘I didn’t see anyone’ ‘I saw nobody’

Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni propose an explanation for these data without assuming two different types of n-words, one that behaves like a Negative Polarity Item (NPI) and one that is a negative quantifier. They propose that Italian n-words are always NPIs, but are different from other NPIs in that they carry a negative feature that must be checked. The presence of the negative feature is due to their negative morphology. In (5a), the negative feature is checked by the negative marker *non*. Feature-checking in (5b), instead, takes place via movement to the specifier of a Focus head (Rizzi 1997). There, the n-word is licensed by an abstract negation. The representation of (5b) is therefore the one in (6).¹

(6) $[_{FocP} \text{Nessuno}_{+neg} [_{Foc} \emptyset_{+neg} [_{IP} \text{ho visto } t]]]$

In this way, the authors give a uniform account for postverbal and preverbal n-words. Importantly, the representation in (6) can account for n-words in isolation as well. The authors propose that in the fragment answer in (7a) the same movement for checking purposes takes place, and then ‘bare argument ellipsis’ applies, as shown in (7b):

¹ An account for negation where the negative element moves to spec,FocP is also given by Frascarelli (2000).

(7) a. Chi hai visto? Nessuno.

‘Who did you see?’ ‘Nobody’

b. [_{FocP} Nessuno_j [_{Foc} \emptyset _{+neg} [_{IP} ~~ho visto~~ _{t_j}]]]

Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni’s proposal is very similar to mine. The only difference is that, in my proposal, movement to the left occurs in all cases, not just with n-words, so movement is not related to the negative morphology of the moved item, but to the fact that the n-word is focused.

Another similar account is the one that Donati (2000) proposes for ellipsis in coordinate sentences.

Donati considers English and Italian. In English, the presence of the auxiliary *do* in the elided sentence clearly shows that VP-ellipsis has occurred. In fact, in English the verb does not move to I, but remains in V², so the verb occupies an autonomous projection with respect to the subject, which is in spec,IP. As a consequence, VP-ellipsis deletes the verb but leaves the subject untouched.

(8) a. Bill eats, and Paul does, too

b. [_{IP} Bill [_{VP} t eats]] [and [_{IP} Paul [_I does [_{VP} t eat]]]].

Consider now the Italian counterpart in (9). In Italian, the verb moves to I, so “no constituent exists which contains the verb without containing the subject” (Donati 2000:179). The verb is not in an autonomous projection with respect to the subject; thus, ellipsis cannot apply to the constituent containing the verb without eliding also the subject. This explains why VP-ellipsis is not possible in Italian, and this is also confirmed by the fact that no auxiliary is present in (9a). Donati’s proposal is then that the subject must move higher than spec,IP in order for IP-ellipsis to apply. She suggests that the subject moves to a Focus position (see 9b).

(9) a. Bill mangia, e Paolo anche.

Bill eats and Paolo too.

b. [_{FocP} Bill [_{IP} _{t_{subj}} [_I mangia [_{VP} _{t_{subj}} _{t_v}]]]] [e [_{FocP} Paolo [_{IP} _{t_{subj}} [_I mangia [_{VP} _{t_{subj}} _{t_v}]]]]].

Donati’s assumption that the two subjects are focused is wrong though. With a ‘normal’ intonation, namely with an accent falling on the verb in the first sentence and on *anche* ‘too’ in the second sentence, the subject cannot be the Focus. However, a movement and ellipsis approach can be maintained: the only change we must make is that the subject moves to a different position, for example a Topic one, given the well known background properties of preverbal subjects.

² Cf. Pollock (1989).

2.1 Evidence for a movement-and-ellipsis analysis of short answers

Another account where fragments are treated in terms of movement and ellipsis is Merchant (2003). Merchant remains agnostic on the position filled by the fragment; however, he suspects that it is a Focus position. He presents several pieces of evidence for a movement-and-ellipsis approach to fragment answers. I will report the main ones below.

He observes that in languages with morphological Case there is matching between the Case of the fragment and that of the corresponding DP (or PP) in the full sentence. One of his several examples (from Greek) is reported below.

- (10) a. Pjon idhe i Maria?
‘Who did Maria see?’
b. * O Giannis. / Ton Giannis.
c. * I Maria idhe o Giannis. / I Maria idhe ton Gianni.
the Maria saw the Giannis_{nom} / the Maria saw the Giannis_{acc}

Italian data are in line with Merchant’s data. In Italian, only personal pronouns display morphological Case. In (11), the first person reflexive pronoun is accusative both in the fragment and in the pronoun in the full sentence.

- (11) a. Chi vedi allo specchio?
‘Who do you see in the mirror?’
b. * Io / Me stessa.
c. Allo specchio vedo *io / me stessa
at the mirror (I) see I / me self

A strong piece of evidence for movement in fragments given by Merchant (2003) is island sensitivity. Island sensitivity in an answer to a wh-question is difficult to test, because also the corresponding wh-question is subject to island constraints. In order to avoid this problem, Merchant adopts two strategies. One is to consider multiple wh-questions, where one wh-element is within the island (cf. 12); the other is to ask yes/no questions with stress on a certain constituent, like in (13): the question becomes an implicit wh-question where the wh-phrase replaces the stressed constituent. Since the constituent does not move to the left, the question is not subject to island effects.

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

- (13) a. Did Ben leave the party because *Abby*³ wouldn't dance with him?
b. No, he left the party because *Beth* wouldn't dance with him.
c. *No, Beth.

The ungrammaticality of the short answers in (12c) and (13c) is predicted by a movement analysis, since movement occurs across islands.

Italian does not admit multiple wh-questions, so the first strategy adopted by Merchant is not available for this language. However, the second strategy gives the same results as those given by Merchant's data:

- (14) a. Gianni ha lasciato la festa perché *Mia* non voleva ballare con lui?
'Did Gianni leave the party because *Mia* didn't want to dance with him?'
b. No, ha lasciato la festa perché *Isa* non voleva ballare con lui.
no (he) has left the party because *Isa* not wanted to-dance with him
c. * No, *Isa*.

Concluding, Merchant (2003) provides strong evidence for a movement-and-ellipsis approach to fragment answers. His evidence is clearly supported by Italian data.

Consequently, we have evidence for movement to the left of information Focus. The problem with this movement is that it is usually hidden by ellipsis, so the moved focused element always appears in isolation, not in the left periphery. This fact explains why it is usually not believed that such a movement exists.

3 Contextual constraints on ellipsis

It remains to explain why the answer in (1a) is marginal. Marginality seems to be related to lack of ellipsis. Why should it be so? Before giving an explanation, I would like to consider pre-verbal subject omission.

Lambrecht (1994) observes that the occurrence of a subject pronoun in a coordinate clause in English depends on the information structure of the two clauses. If the antecedent of the pronoun is not focused, omission of the pronoun is possible; if the antecedent is focused, the pronoun cannot be omitted.

- (15) a. John married *Rosa*, but didn't really *love* her.
b. Who married *Rosa*? *John* married her, but *(he) didn't really *love* her.

Preverbal subjects in a sentence with a normal intonation have properties of Topics. Therefore, the generalization made by Lambrecht can be reformulated as follows:

³ Italics indicate that the word is stressed.

- (16) A subject Topic is omitted whenever it has an antecedent which is also a Topic.

I would like to extend such a generalization to all background material that undergoes ellipsis:

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

Such a generalization is meant to explain why a short answer is preferable than a full answer with a preverbal Focus.

To see how, consider *wh*-Question-Answer pairs. I assume that the *wh*-phrase of a question, which corresponds to the focused constituent in the answer, is always the Focus of the question. In other words, a *wh*-question and its answer have corresponding Foci. Then, also the *background* part in a *wh*-question will correspond to that of the answer. Therefore, given the generalization in (17), the background part of the answer can always be elided. In fact, it has an antecedent in the question with the same discourse status.

- (18) a. [Che cosa]_F ha vinto Gianni?
b. [La maglietta]_F ~~ha vinto Gianni~~.

The background of *both* sentences is made of the verb and the subject. The background of (18b), then, has an antecedent in (18a), and given (17), it is elided.

Consider now contrastive exchanges. The informational partition of a contrasting sentence can be either the same or different from that of the preceding sentence. If the background part of the contrasting sentence has no antecedent in the preceding sentence, then ellipsis is not allowed. This is the case of the second clause in (1b) (repeated below), where Focus is visible in a high position. In fact, the fragment sentence is unacceptable in this context.

- (19) a. La felpa, l'ha vinta [Gianni]_F.
 'Gianni won the sweatshirt'
b. # No, [la maglietta]_F.
c. No, [la maglietta]_F ha vinto Gianni.

While in the *wh*-Q-A context the short answer is preferred, and movement to the left is not visible, in this context it is the full sentence to be preferred, so movement to the left is visible.

It is also possible that the background of a contrasting sentence *has* an antecedent with the same discourse status. In such a case, given (17), the prediction is that ellipsis preferably applies, like in *wh*-Q-A pairs. This is born out by the example below, where the background of the first sentence is the same as that of the second sentence, which therefore does not require ellipsis.

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

When the elided predicate is not made by a verb and its argument but by the verb alone, the contrast between sentences with ellipsis and sentences without ellipsis in contexts where ellipsis is preferable is less strong. This is consistent with my proposal, since the burden of the background part is much smaller in these sentences, and therefore the redundancy effect is weaker.

- (21) a. [Che cosa]_F hai vinto alla gara? [La maglietta]_F.^(?) ho vinto).
 ‘What did you win at the race?’ he T-shirt (I) have won
 b. [La felpa]_F hai vinto, vero? No, [la maglietta]_F.^(?) ho vinto).
 ‘You won the *sweatshirt*, right?’ No the T-shirt (I) have won

Anyway, in the contrastive context where ellipsis is dispreferred, the sentence with ellipsis is still very marginal (see 22). In fact, the absence of the predicate makes the sentence ambiguous: since the elided background of that sentence clearly cannot be the same as that of the previous sentence, the background must be recovered by the hearer without any pragmatic clue.

- (22) La felpa, almeno, [l’hai vinta]_F! No, [la maglietta]_F.[#] (ho vinto).
 ‘At least, you *won* the *sweatshirt*!’ no the T-shirt (I) have won

Concluding, the difference between wh-Q-A contexts and contrastive contexts is that the former always provide the same pragmatic context, favouring ellipsis; the latter, instead, provide both pragmatic contexts that favour ellipsis and pragmatic contexts that don’t; so movement of the focused constituent to the left can overtly be seen.

3.1 Focus in situ

A full sentence with an in situ Focus is acceptable in contexts which would require ellipsis, as it is shown in the examples below:

- (23) a. Che cosa ha vinto Gianni? (Gianni) ha vinto [la maglietta]_F.
 what has won Gianni Gianni has won the T-shirt
 b. Gianni ha vinto la *felpa*. No, (Gianni) ha vinto [la maglietta]_F.
 Gianni has won the *sweatshirt* No Gianni has won the T-shirt

Why is it so? Consider the predicate alone first. Ellipsis of the predicate is not allowed if the focused object remains in situ, because ellipsis would be forced to apply to a chunk of the IP (cf. 4). I argue that the impossibility of having ellipsis of the IP explains why the pronunciation of the predicate is tolerated.

As for the subject, in fact it *can* be omitted, in the sense that it simply can be absent from the derivation (cf. also 15). The same would happen if the non-focused argument is the object, with the only difference that a resumptive object clitic would be required:

- (24) a. Chi ha vinto la maglietta? L'ha vinta [Gianni]_F.
 who has won the T-shirt it_{cl} has won Gianni
 b. La maglietta, l'ha vinta *Pietro*. No, l'ha vinta [Gianni]_F.

3.2 English

English data support the claim that conditions on ellipsis are related to discourse factors. Consider the sentences with focused subjects in (25). Most of my informants gave judgements that pattern with the corresponding Italian ones. They prefer to elide in wh-Q-A pairs and in contexts where the contrasting sentence and the previous one have corresponding information structures, and not to elide in contexts where the two sentences have non-corresponding information structures:

- (25) a. [Who]_F won the T-shirt? [John]_F did. / ^{??}[John]_F won the T-shirt.
 b. Did [Peter]_F win the T-shirt? No, [John]_F did. / ^{??}No, [John]_F won the T-shirt.
 c. Did Peter win [the T-shirt]_F? ^{??}No, [John]_F did. / No, [John]_F won the T-shirt.

The only difference between English and Italian is that English short answers require the auxiliary *do*. In fact, as we have already seen, English does VP-ellipsis, while Italian does IP-ellipsis.

Consider now English focused objects:

- (26) a. [What]_F did John win? [The T-shirt]_F. / * [The T-shirt]_F John won
 {t{obj}}
 b. Did John win [the sweatshirt]_F? No, [the T-shirt]_F / *No, [the T-shirt]_F
 John won _{t_{obj}}
 c. Did [John]_F win the sweatshirt? ^{??}No, [the T-shirt]_F. / *No, [the T-shirt]_F
 John won _{t_{obj}}.

The fragments are fine in the contexts predicted by the generalization in (17) (cf. 26a,b). I propose that they derive from movement of the object to the left and then ellipsis of the remnant IP, like in Italian. Note in fact that the elided objects are not accompanied by the auxiliary *do*. The structure is then the following:

- (27) [_{DP} The T-shirt]_j [_{IP} he [_{VP} won _{t_j}]].

The full sentences with preverbal focused object are all ungrammatical. Why, if object movement is allowed in (27), is it not in the full sentence? I argue that the difference between fragment and full sentence can be explained by the fact that ellipsis can rescue an otherwise ungrammatical construction, as it has been observed

by several studies and for several types of ellipsis, such as Lasnik to appear, Merchant 2001, Kennedy and Merchant 2000, Kennedy and Lidz 2001, a.o.

In conclusion, although English is different from Italian in some respects, pragmatic conditions that determine the presence or absence of ellipsis are the same in both languages.

3.3 Answers to d-linked wh-questions

É. Kiss (1998) presents certain Italian data that according to her bring evidence for the existence of two semantically different Foci in that language: a Focus that expresses non presupposed information ('Information Focus') and a Focus that expresses exhaustive identification ('Identificational Focus'). She says that in Italian "the use of an Identificational Focus is possible only if the domain of identification is a closed set of individuals known to the participants of the discourse". She argues for that conclusion by showing that a d-linked wh-question requires an answer with an Identificational Focus.

- (28) Chi di voi due ha rotto il vaso? [Maria]_F ha rotto il vaso.
 'Who of you two broke the vase?' Maria has broken the vase

First, I think that the omission of *ha rotto il vaso* is still the preferred option, although less strongly preferable than in other examples. Anyway, a difference between normal wh-questions and d-linked-wh-questions is present, and we have to account for it. I argue that it can be explained without assuming the existence of two distinct Foci.

In § 3 I have assumed that the wh-phrase always corresponds to the focused part, and the rest of the question corresponds to the background part of its answer. I suggest that this informational partition changes if the wh-phrase of the question is d-linked. In fact, d-linking requires familiarity, givenness of the possible referents from which an answer is chosen. These properties are typical properties of background material, not of Focus.

If this is true, then it is no surprise that an answer where Focus is preverbal and, more importantly, where post-focal material is not elided is given to a question with a d-linked wh-phrase. The informational partition of the question is reversed (or at least, partially reversed, since the wh-phrase maintains a part of newness, because it introduces a variable that has to be identified; this explains the 'weak' acceptability of the full answer, mentioned above). Therefore, the background part of the answer does not have a discourse antecedent in the question, and given (17), ellipsis does not apply.

4 Against two FocPs

Belletti (2002) proposes that there are two positions dedicated to Focus in the clause, a structurally low one and a structurally high one. The latter is Rizzi's (1997) left peripheral FocP, and it is filled by contrastive Focus; the former is a low FocP hosting information Focus. She also claims that the low *contrastive* Focus in fact fills the high FocP.

It is well known that a postverbal subject in Italian, if in the same intonational contour as the verb, is focused (cf. Calabrese 1992). Belletti argues that the spec of the low FocP is the landing site for it.

(29) [_I Verb [_{TopP} [_{FocP} Subj [_{TopP} [_{VP} t_{subj}

As for the low contrastive Focus, Belletti proposes that it moves overtly to the spec of the high FocP, and then remnant IP-movement to a higher TopP applies:

(30) [_{TopP} [_{IP} Verb [_{VP} t_{subj}]] [_{FocP} Subj t_{IP}

In the following paragraphs I will show that a low Focus does not fill any specific position, but it always stays in situ.

4.1 Information Focus

The only argument Belletti brings in favour of a low FocP is that the position of the focused postverbal subject is not a felicitous extraction domain, thus it does not occupy an argument position. The examples she brings involve *ne*-cliticization and *wh*-extraction. She only takes into account subjects of unergative verbs, since she assumes with Belletti (1999) that (indefinite) subjects of unaccusative verbs stay in situ. In (31) some examples from Belletti (2002) are given.

- (31) a. Ha telefonato il direttore del giornale al presidente.
has phoned the director of-the newspaper to-the president
b. ?? Il giornale di cui ha telefonato il direttore al presidente.
the newspaper of which has phoned the director to-the president
c. ?? Ne ha telefonato il direttore al presidente.
of-it has phoned the director to the president
d. ?? Ne hanno telefonato molti al presidente
of-them have phoned many to the president

Consider *ne*-extraction. First of all, we must distinguish between genitive *ne* and partitive *ne*. The former (cf. 31c) is harder to accept even when extraction occurs from an object of a transitive verb (a regular extraction domain), and from an indefinite subject of an unaccusative verb:

- (32) a. Ho presentato il direttore del giornale al presidente.
(I) have introduced the director of-the newspaper to-the president

- b. ?? Ne ho presentato il direttore al presidente.
of-it have introduced the director to-the president
- (33) a. È arrivato un giornalista della *Repubblica*.
is arrived a journalist of the *Repubblica*
- b. ?? Ne è arrivato un giornalista.
of-it is arrived a journalist

As for partitive *ne*, its extractability from a postverbal subject of unergative verbs has been already pointed out by several authors. Saccon (1993), for instance, reports several counterexamples, two of which are reported below:

- (34) a. Ne telefonano, di tifosi, la domenica!
of-them phone of fans on Sundays
'(Lots) of fans call on Sundays'
- b. Ne funzionano solo due (di orologi).
of-them worked only two (of the watches)
'Only two of them worked'

As for wh-extraction, note that if the tense of the verb is not present perfect, the acceptability improves, as observed also for *ne*-extraction by Saccon (see 34):

- (35) Il giornale di cui ci telefona sempre il direttore è l'*Atracittà*.
the newspaper of which to-us calls always the director is the *Altracittà*

Thus, also the acceptability of wh-extraction varies according to parameters that are independent from the extraction site.

In conclusion, there is no strong evidence that a low Focus does not occupy its argument position.

4.2 Contrastive Focus

4.2.1 Against Belletti's analysis

Consider now the postverbal contrastive Focus. Belletti's claim that it occupies the spec of the high FocP is based on the minimal pair below, from Cardinaletti (2002):

- (36) a. Chi ha comprato il giornale ?
'Who bought the newspaper ?'
- b. L' ha comprato [Maria]_F, il giornale.
it_{ci} has bought Maria the newspaper
- c. Ha comprato [Maria]_F, il giornale.

Cardinaletti argues that the unacceptability of (36c) is due to the fact that the focused subject is contrastive. Following Cardinaletti, Belletti gives an account for

the relation between contrastive Focus and the absence of object clitic and between information Focus and the presence of the clitic.

She says that when the clitic is present, it moves to a Case-assigning position to receive accusative Case. The lexical object can then fill a non-Case-assigning, low position. The postverbal subject is lower than the clitic, therefore, it must fill the *low* FocP.

(37) [_{CIP} L' [_{IP} ha comprato [_{FocP} Maria [_{TopP} il giornale [_{VP}

When the clitic is not present, the lexical object must move to a Case-assigning position. Since the lexical object follows the postverbal subject, the latter must be even higher, namely in the *high* FocP.

(38) [_{TopP} [_{IP} t_{subj} ha comprato [_{VP} t_{subj} t_{obj}]] [_{FocP} Maria [il giornale t_{IP}

Belletti's argumentation loses its strength if we assume a Case Theory like the one proposed recently by Chomsky (2000, 2001), where Case can be checked in situ via Agree. Consider (39):

(39) [_T Ha comprato [_{VP} Maria _{+nom} [_v t_{verb} [_{VP} [_v t_{verb} [_{DP} il giornale _{+acc}]]]].

When *v* is merged in the derivation, it looks for a DP whose phi-features match its uninterpretable phi-features. Since there is no DP intervening between *v* and the object, the object is the perfect candidate to enter a feature-checking relation with *v*. During the same feature-matching, the uninterpretable accusative Case feature of the DP is also checked. Then, the subject is merged in spec,vP. Its nominative Case is checked in a parallel fashion by the verb in T.

4.2.2 A different analysis based on ellipsis

I propose that the difference between the two sentences can instead be accounted for in terms of the proposal made in this paper.

First of all, following Cardinaletti (2002), I assume that the two structures differ with respect to the position of the post-focal object, not of the focused subject. Cardinaletti calls the structure in (40a) 'right-dislocation', the structure in (40b) 'marginalization' (Antinucci and Cinque 1977).

(40) a. Lo compra Maria, il giornale. b. Compra Maria il giornale.
 it_{cl} buys Maria the newspaper buys Maria the newspaper
 'The newspaper, Maria buys it' 'Maria buys the newspaper'

Cardinaletti follows Kayne's (1994:78) analysis and proposes that the right-dislocated object is in the complement position of a head whose specifier is occupied by the rest of the sentence. The marginalized object, instead, stays in situ.

(41) a. [_{XP} [_{IP} Lo compra [_{VP} [_{DP} Maria]]]]] X° [_{DP} il giornale]
 b. [_{IP} Compra [_{VP} [_{DP} Maria] [_{DP} il giornale]]].

Secondly, note that while the sentence with resumptive clitic is perfectly acceptable when the lexical object is omitted, the sentence without the clitic is not:

(42) a. Lo compra Maria. b. *Compra Maria.

If we compare (42a) and (42b) in a wh-Q-A pair, given the generalization in (17), the preference goes to (42b), where the object is omitted:

(43) [Chi]_F compra il giornale? Lo compra [Maria]_F/ ?Compra [Maria]_F il giornale.
who buys the newspaper it_{cl} buys Maria buys Maria the newspaper

Thus, a topicalized object in situ behaves like a full IP with Focus on the left: it is admitted only if it does not have an antecedent with the same pragmatic status. When the topicalized object is preferably deleted, a construction like (42a) with resumptive clitic is chosen, since the sentence in (42b) is not grammatical.

As for the possibility of having an answer with both the clitic and the object, as (40a), I argue that it does not have to do with conditions on ellipsis. Assuming Kayne's structure in (41a), and interpreting it as two clauses in coordination where X is the coordinating head, the right dislocated object turns out to be in a different clause than the IP containing the Focus. Thus, its presence is not due to lack of ellipsis in the IP containing the Focus, but can be interpreted as a purely stylistic redundancy.

References

- Alonso-Ovalle, L. and E. Guerzoni (to appear) 'Double negation, negative concord and metalinguistic negation', *Proceedings of CLS Meeting 38*.
- Antinucci, F. and G. Cinque (1977) 'Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano: l'emarginazione', *Studi di Grammatica Italiana* VI: 121-146.
- Belletti, A. (1999) 'Inversion' as focalization and related questions', *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 9-45.
- Belletti, A. (2002) 'Aspects of the low IP area', in: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of IP and CP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures 2*, Oxford: OUP.
- Brunetti, L. (2003) *A unification of Focus*, Doctoral Dissertation, Università di Firenze.
- Brunetti, L. (in press) 'Is there any difference between contrastive focus and information focus?' *Proceedings of SuB 7*.
- Calabrese, A. (1992) 'Some Remarks on Focus and Logical Structures in Italian', *Harvard WPL* 1: 19-27.
- Cardinaletti, A. (2002) 'Against optional and null clitics. Right dislocation vs. marginalization', *Studia Linguistica* 56.1: 29-58.
- Chomsky, N. (2000) 'Minimalist inquiries: the framework', in: R. Martin, D. Michaels, J. Uriagereka (eds.) *Step by Step. Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, N. (2001) 'Derivation by phase', in: M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: a life in language*. Cambridge: MIT Press: 1-52.
- Donati, C. (2000) *La sintassi della comparazione*, Padova: Unipress.
- É. Kiss, K. (1998) 'Identificational focus versus information focus', *Language* 74.2: 45-273.
- Frascarelli, M. (2000) *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kayne, R. (1994) *The antisymmetry of syntax*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kennedy, C. and J. Merchant (2000) 'Attributive Comparative Deletion', *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 89-146.
- Kennedy, C. and J. Lidz (2001) 'A (covert) long-distance anaphor in English', *WCCFL* 20.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994) *Information structure and sentence form. Topic focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Lasnik, H. (to appear) 'When can you save a structure by destroying it?' *Proceedings of NELS 31*.
- Merchant, J. (2001) *The syntax of silence: Sluicing, islands, and the theory of ellipsis*, Oxford: OUP.
- Merchant, J. (2003) 'Fragments and ellipsis', ms.
- Pollock, J.Y. (1989) 'Verb movement, UG and the Structure of IP', *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365-424.
- Rizzi, L. (1997) 'The fine structure of the left periphery', in: L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*: 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Saccon, G. (1993) *Post-verbal Subjects. A Study Based on Italian and its Dialects*, PhD Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. (1998) *Topic, Focus and Word Order*, Cambridge: MIT Press.