

SOME NEW OBSERVATIONS ON THE CARTOGRAPHY OF TOPIC AND FOCUS

Anna Cardinaletti
Università Ca' Foscari Venezia

Abstract: *The goal of this paper is to discuss the cartography of Topic and Focus in Italian left periphery, to show that Topics can occur on either side of Focus, as in Rizzi's (1997) original proposal. The data provided by Benincà and Poletto (2004) to argue against this possibility are shown to raise both empirical and theoretical questions. Additional evidence is provided to support the view that Foci can be followed by Familiar Topics, as in Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's (2007) typology of Topics. The discourse contribution of left- and right-dislocated Familiar Topics is also discussed.*

Keywords: *Cartography, Left Periphery, Focus, Familiar Topics, Right Dislocation*

1. Introduction¹

In the cartographic approach to the left periphery of the clause, the relative order of the Topic and Focus projections in Italian is debated. While Rizzi (1997) suggested that Topics can freely occur in the left periphery and, in particular, that they appear both before and after Foci, Benincà and Poletto (2004) suggested that no free occurrence of Topics is possible and that the order is fixed: Topics always precede Foci. When a Topic appears to follow a Focus, it should be analysed as a Focus itself, and although it is not intonationally marked, it enters a Focus Field together with the (intonationally) focused constituent.

In this paper, I put together two apparently unrelated observations by Rizzi (2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2004) to show that Rizzi (1997) was correct in proposing that topicalised elements can both precede and follow focused elements. I will also discuss independent evidence from Italian to show that left-peripheral Foci can be followed by Topics.

My claim is that the previous discussion did not take into due consideration an asymmetry between different types of Topics, namely Aboutness-shift Topics and Familiar Topics in the sense of Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007). Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl refine Rizzi's proposal by suggesting a typology of Topics and showing that different types of Topics occur on either side of Focus. The piece of evidence put forth by Benincà and Poletto (2004) against Rizzi's (1997) proposal indeed contains the "wrong" type of Topic, namely an indefinite expression in the position of a Familiar Topic.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I present the conflicting evidence discussed by Rizzi (1997) and Benincà and Poletto (2004). In section 3, I discuss a number

¹ I thank the audience of the Incontro di Grammatica Generativa held in Perugia on February 2015 and two anonymous reviewers for very helpful and constructive comments on previous versions of the paper.

of empirical and theoretical questions raised by Benincà and Poletto's (2004) proposal. In section 4, the data are analyzed along the lines of Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's (2007) typology of Topics, which raises another crucial question for Benincà and Poletto's (2004) proposal. In section 5, I provide further empirical evidence that Topics can follow Foci in Italian. In section 6, some discourse properties of Familiar Topics are discussed which to my knowledge have gone unnoticed so far. The discussion will allow us to slightly revise Bianchi and Frascarelli's (2010) account of Familiar Topics and will provide additional evidence that right-dislocated topics differ from left-dislocated topics.

2. Rizzi's left periphery and Benincà and Poletto's counterexamples

Basing his proposal on Italian sentences like (1), which contain a focalized accusative object *questo* 'this', a left-dislocated dative object *a Gianni* 'to Gianni' resumed by the clitic pronoun *gli* 'to.him', and a fronted temporal adverb *domani* 'tomorrow', Rizzi (1997:295f) arrived at the cartography of the left periphery in (2), where the category Topic occurs on either side of Focus and differs from other categories in being recursive (signaled by *):

- (1) a. QUESTO, a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire!
THIS to Gianni tomorrow [we] to.him should say
b. A Gianni, QUESTO, domani, gli dovremmo dire!
c. A Gianni, domani, QUESTO, gli dovremmo dire!

- (2) Force Topic* Focus Topic* Fin ...

On the basis of the contrast in (3), Benincà and Poletto (2004:54) instead argued that a left-dislocated topic cannot occur lower than a focused constituent:

- (3) a. *A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, lo regalerete.
b. Un libro di poesie, A GIANNI, lo regalerete.
a book of poems to GIANNI [you] it will.give

This piece of data against the order 'Focus – Topic' is however at odds with Rizzi's original data in (1a,b). Benincà and Poletto reinterpret Rizzi's sentences in (1) as follows.

In spite of the presence of the resumptive clitic pronoun *gli*, the PP *a Gianni* in (1a) is not a Topic, but a Focus, which has the property of not being intonationally marked. They conclude that

“the lower Topic position(s) is not a Topic at all, but an extension of the Focus field”.
(Benincà and Poletto 2004, 54)

They analyse the presence of the resumptive clitic pronoun *gli* in (1a) not as a marker of topicality, but as an instance of clitic doubling, which is possible with

datives in (colloquial) Italian, as shown in (4):²

- (4) Glielo regalerò a Gianni.
[I] to.him-it will.give to Gianni

Benincà and Poletto (2004:57) find independent support for their analysis in the ungrammaticality of the following sentences, which they attribute to a Weak Cross-Over violation:

- (5) a. *A MARIA_i, Giorgio_i, sua_i madre presenterà.
to MARIA Giorgio his mother will.introduce
b. *A MARIA_i, Giorgio_i, sua_i madre presenterà.
to MARIA Giorgio her mother will.introduce

As pointed out by Rizzi (1997:290), Topics and Foci display a different behavior with respect to Weak Cross-Over: While Topics can be coreferent with a possessive inside the subject DP (6a), Foci cannot (6b):

- (6) a. Gianni_i, sua_i madre lo ha sempre apprezzato.
b. ??GIANNI_i, sua_i madre ha sempre apprezzato, non Piero.
GIANNI his mother him has always appreciated, not Piero.

According to Benincà and Poletto (2004:57), the non-intonationally focalized object *Giorgio* in (5a) behaves like the focussed constituents *a Maria* in (5b) and *Gianni* in (6b) in that it cannot be coreferent with the possessive adjective *sua* contained in the subject DP.

3. Some unexpected data

Benincà and Poletto's (2004) proposal raises a number of empirical and theoretical questions. I will present them in the following sections.

3.1. Why is the Focus Field not available to accusative objects?

If *a Gianni* in (1a) were indeed an instance of a non-intonationally marked Focus, we would expect to find the same possibility with accusative objects. Since focussed objects cannot be resumed by clitic pronouns (7a) (Cinque 1990:63, Rizzi 1997:289f), a sentence like (3a) should become grammatical if the accusative clitic is removed. As (7b) shows, however, the absence of the clitic pronoun does not make the sentence grammatical:³

² (4) should be read with sentential stress on *a Gianni*. If stress falls on the verb, *a Gianni* is right-dislocated; this option is irrelevant here.

³ Sentences like (7b) are marginally possible if the two syntactic constituents build a unique phonological constituent, as in (i):

(i) [A GIANNI un libro] ho dato, ieri.
to Gianni a book [I] have given, yesterday

The bracketed sequence in (i) can be analysed as a focalized small clause. The same possibility holds in V2 languages, in which it looks as if the V2 requirement is violated:

(ii) [Dem Hans ein Buch] habe ich gegeben.

- (7) a. A Gianni UN LIBRO DI POESIE (*Io) regalerete, non un disco.
to GIANNI a book of poems [you] (*it) will.give (not a CD)
b. *A GIANNI, un libro di poesie, regalerete (non a Maria).
to GIANNI a book of poems [you] will.give (not to Maria)

This raises the question as to why the accusative DP *un libro di poesie* in (7b) cannot be a Focus, and why in this case, the Focus Field cannot contain two Foci, one intonationally marked (*a Gianni*), and the other without any marked intonation (*un libro di poesie*), similarly to Benincà and Poletto's (2004) analysis of (1a).⁴

3.2. Why can a left-dislocated locative PP follow a Focus?

In (8), the focussed object *questo* 'this' can be followed by the left-dislocated locative PP *sullo scaffale* 'on the shelf', resumed by the locative clitic pronoun *ci* 'there':

- (8) QUESTO, sullo scaffale, ci dovremmo mettere (non quello).
this, on.the shelf, [we] there should put (not that)

Note that differently from what happens with datives (4), clitic doubling is not allowed in (colloquial) Italian in the case of locatives.⁵

- (9) *Ce l'ho messo sullo scaffale.
[I] there it have put on.the shelf

to.DAT Hans a book have I given

⁴ For the order 'indirect object – direct object', Benincà and Poletto (2004:61) provide the following example, which I find ungrammatical or at least very marginal (unless it is pronounced as pointed out in footnote 3):

- (i) A GIORGIO, questo libro, devi dare.
to Giorgio, this book, [you] must give

The sentence becomes perfect if an accusative clitic pronoun is added:

- (ii) A GIORGIO, questo libro, lo devi dare.
to Giorgio, this book, [you] it must give

⁵ (9) should be read with sentential stress on *sullo scaffale* (see footnote 2).

An anonymous reviewer observes that clitic doubling with locatives is not fully ungrammatical to him/her and provides the following example:

- (i) Certo che ce l'ho messo il libro sullo scaffale!
sure that [I] there it have put the book on.the shelf

This is an exclamative sentence where the main prominence falls on the verb. Thus, I would regard the two objects (*il libro* 'the book' and *sullo scaffale* 'on.the shelf') to be both right-dislocated. If this example were indeed an instance of clitic doubling of the locative PP, as suggested by the reviewer, it would also be an instance of clitic doubling of the accusative object *il libro*, something which, as far as I know, has never been claimed for (colloquial) Italian. Sentences (ii) and (iii) are indeed ungrammatical (with main prominence on *il libro* and *sullo scaffale*, respectively):

- (ii) *Ce l'ho messo il libro.
[I] there it have put the book
(iii) *Ce l'ho messo il libro sullo scaffale.
[I] there it have put the book on.the shelf

The grammaticality of (8) is thus a true counterexample to Benincà and Poletto's (2004) proposal. Contrary to what they suggest for (1a), the sentence in (8) cannot be taken to be an instance of clitic doubling. It contains a true instance of Left Dislocation, in the order 'Focus - Topic': the (Familiar) Topic *sullo scaffale* 'on the shelf' follows the Focus *questo* 'this'.

Then, why is (3a) ungrammatical?

3.3. Why is it impossible to contrast the second Focus of the Focus Field, or both Foci in the Focus Field?

While it is possible to contrast the first, intonationally focalized constituent, as in (10a), it is not possible to do the same with the alleged second instance of Focus, which is not intonationally marked, (10b). Notice that it is also impossible to contrast both constituents, as in (10c):⁶

- (10) a. QUESTO, a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire, non quello!
THIS to Gianni tomorrow [we] to.him should say, not that
b. *QUESTO, a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire, non a Maria!
THIS to Gianni tomorrow [we] to.him should say, not to Maria
c. *QUESTO, a Gianni, domani, gli dovremmo dire, non quello a Maria!
THIS to Gianni tomorrow [we] to.him should say, not that to Maria

The contrast in (10) is surprising if, as in Benincà and Poletto's (2004) proposal, the two constituents *questo* and *a Gianni* in (10a) are both Foci. The contrast in (10) can be taken to show that the PP *a Gianni* is not a Focus, and that the Focus Field cannot contain two Foci, one intonationally marked (*questo*), and the other without any marked intonation (*a Gianni*), *pace* Benincà and Poletto (2004).

3.4. Why is sentence (5a) ungrammatical even without coreference?

Note that sentence (5a) is ungrammatical even without coreference between the possessive element *sua* 'his' inside the subject DP and the alleged focussed object *Giorgio*:

- (11) *A MARIA, Giorgio, sua madre presenterà.
to MARIA Giorgio his mother will.introduce

This suggests that the ungrammaticality of (5a) is not due to a Weak Cross-Over violation, *pace* Benincà and Poletto (2004:57).

⁶ Benincà and Poletto (2004:74, n.12) observe this restriction only for the case in which the alleged second Focus is an accusative object (see footnote 4):

- (i) A GIORGIO il tuo libro devi dare (non a Mario / *non il tuo articolo).
to Giorgio the your book [you] must give (not to Mario / not the your article)

Note that in the special construction discussed in footnote 3, both elements inside the focussed small clause can be highlighted as correct through the negation of the small clause:

- (ii) [A GIANNI un libro] ho dato, non [a Maria un disco].
to Gianni a book [I] have given, not to Maria a CD

3.5. Why is the Focus Field ungrammatical in embedded sentences?

Consider the following data from Rizzi (2001:291):

- (12) a. *?Mi domando a chi QUESTO abbiano detto (non qualcos'altro).
I wonder to whom THIS [they] have said (not something else)
b. *?Mi domando QUESTO a chi abbiano detto (non qualcos'altro).
I wonder THIS to whom [they] have said (not something else)
c. Mi domando A GIANNI che cosa abbiano detto (non a Piero).
I wonder to Gianni what [they] have said (not to Piero)
d. *?Mi domando che cosa A GIANNI abbiano detto (non a Piero).
I wonder what to GIANNI [they] have said (not to Piero)

Rizzi suggests that in embedded clauses, a position lower than Focus is available to host wh-elements:

- (13) Force ... Int ... Foc ... Wh

If the order of the relevant functional heads is 'Focus ... Wh', the ungrammaticality of sentences (12a) and (12d), which do not respect this order, is easily accounted for.

According to Rizzi, the contrast between (12b) and (12c) is instead due to the different configurations in which the A' dependency appears, crossed in b. and nested in c.⁷

Notice that the ungrammaticality of (12b) is somehow unexpected under Benincà and Poletto's (2004) proposal of a Focus Field. This sentence looks very much like (1a). It contains a focussed accusative object *questo* 'this' followed by a non-phonologically focussed dative object, *a chi* 'to whom'. The wh-element *a chi* should be able to occur in the Focus Field because of its semantic properties and the fact that it indeed occurs in specFocusP in main clauses (Rizzi 1997).

If the ungrammaticality of (12b) is due to the fact that the two moved elements build a crossed configuration, as Rizzi (2001) suggests, the question arises as to why this configuration is not disallowed in the case of a (non-intonationally focalized) dative object as in (1a) (assuming Benincà and Poletto's 2004 proposal). The data in matrix and embedded questions are somehow conflicting.

Conversely, given the ungrammaticality of (7b), sentence (12c) is unexpectedly grammatical. The object wh-phrase *che cosa* 'what' follows the focussed dative *a Gianni* 'to Gianni', something which is unexpected if accusative objects cannot follow focused datives.

The question arises as to why the data in main and embedded clauses should undergo opposite restrictions. Since we do not see any reason for assuming different order possibilities in the left periphery of main and embedded clauses, we conclude that the piece of data in (3a) does not show that Topics cannot follow Foci. The sentence must be ungrammatical for other reasons.

⁷ This proposal implies that the merge order of arguments is 'accusative - dative'. We will not discuss this issue here. See Cardinaletti (2008) for a different proposal based on the analysis of clitic clusters.

3.6. Interim conclusion

In conclusion, the fact that sentences like (3a) are ungrammatical even in the absence of resumptive clitic pronouns (see (7b)) suggests that the restriction on (3a) is not due to the impossibility for a Focus to be followed by a Topic. Topics can indeed follow Foci, as in (8). The fact that sentence (5a) is ungrammatical even without coreference (see (11)) suggests that the accusative object *Giorgio* that follows the focalized dative object is not a Focus. This is confirmed by the fact that the alleged second Focus of the Focus Field cannot be contrasted (10b,c) and cannot occur in embedded clauses (12b).

In what follows, I first discuss Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's (2007) proposal, which refines Rizzi's account of the left periphery by suggesting a typology of Topics. This proposal will allow us to understand the data discussed so far. I then present additional data to show that Topics can indeed follow Foci, as in Rizzi's original proposal and Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's refinement.

4. Towards a solution of the puzzle: A typology of Topics

Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) refine Rizzi's (1997) proposal in (2) by suggesting that the recursivity of Topics is not as free as it might appear. Different types of Topics should be recognised which occur on either side of Focus. In particular, Aboutness-shift Topics are highest in the structure and precede Focus, while Familiar Topics occur immediately above Fin and below Focus. Their view of the left periphery is summarised in (14):⁸

- (14) Force **Aboutness-shift Topic** Focus **Familiar Topic** Fin

Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's proposal allows us to understand the ungrammaticality of (3a). It is due to the nature of the object *un libro di poesie*, which is a non-specific indefinite nominal expression. Indefinite nominals are disallowed to occur as Familiar topics. Familiar topics are definite (see section 6 for the discussion of the semantic properties of Familiar Topics). If *un libro di poesie* is replaced by a definite nominal expression, as in (15a), or by a demonstrative pronoun, as in (15b), the sentence is indeed grammatical (also see sentence (ii) in footnote 4 and the example reported in Giorgi 2015:237, fn. 11, which contains a definite accusative object – *il libro di poesie* 'the book of poems' - after the focused indirect object):

- (15) a. A GIANNI, questo libro di poesie, lo regalerete, non a Maria.
 to GIANNI this book of poems [you] it will.give, not to Maria
 b. A GIANNI questo, lo dovete dire, non a Maria.
 to GIANNI this [you] it must say, not to Maria

An indefinite object can however occur as an Aboutness-shift Topic. This is why sentence (3b), in which the constituent *un libro di poesie* precedes the Focus, is grammatical (see (14)).

⁸ A third category of Topics, namely Contrastive Topics, is not relevant for the present discussion and is therefore disregarded here. Equally disregarded here are Hanging Topics, which occur clause externally (Cinque 1977, 1983).

In conclusion, the contrast in (3) does not tell us anything about the relative order of the Topic and Focus projections in the left periphery of the clause, *pace* Benincà and Poletto (2004). Rather, it is expected under Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's (2007) typology of Topics and compatible with Rizzi's (1997) original proposals on the cartography of the left periphery.

If this conclusion is correct, we are in a position to answer the questions raised in section 3:

- 1) dative and accusative objects have the same possibilities to occur as Familiar Topics; sentences (1a) and (15) are parallel constructions;
- 2) the Familiar Topic can be any constituent, also a PP. Thus, it is not surprising that a left-dislocated locative PP may follow a Focus, as in (8);
- 3) it is impossible to contrast the constituent after the Focus (10b,c) because it is not a Focus, but a (Familiar) Topic;
- 4) sentence (5a) is ungrammatical even without coreference, as in (11), because the accusative object *Giorgio* is not a Focus, but a Topic, and as such, it should co-occur with a resumptive clitic pronoun (Cinque 1990:71ff, Rizzi 1997). The ungrammaticality of this sentence is thus due to the absence of the resumptive clitic pronoun. If a clitic pronoun is added, the sentence is grammatical, albeit marginal for those speakers who dislike the co-occurrence of Foci and preverbal subjects (see Cardinaletti 2009 for discussion):

- (16) A MARIA, Giorgio, sua madre **lo** presenterà, non ad Anna.
to MARIA Giorgio his mother him will.introduce, not to Anna

As expected, the sentence is also grammatical when the left-dislocated DP *Giorgio* is coreferent with a possessive contained in the subject DP *sua madre*, as topicalized/left-dislocated DPs do not give rise to Weak Cross-Over effects (Rizzi 1997:290).⁹

- (17) A MARIA, Giorgio_i, sua_i madre lo presenterà, non ad Anna.
to MARIA Giorgio his mother him will.introduce, not to Anna

5) In embedded clauses, a focussed accusative cannot precede a dative *wh*-, as in (12b), because the two moved elements build a crossed configuration (Rizzi 2001).

Finally, consider sentence (18), where an Aboutness-shift Topic is followed by two Familiar Topics. The sentence is taken from Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007); many other examples of the same type are provided in Benincà (1988/2001):

⁹ Given that left-dislocated indirect objects are not obligatorily resumed by dative clitic pronouns, *a Gianni* in sentence (i), taken from Giorgi (2015:235), can qualify as left-dislocated. The sentence is expectedly better than (5a) (I agree with the judgment of (i) by the reviewer quoted in Giorgi 2015: 235, fn. 9) and patterns in grammaticality with (ii), where the dative clitic pronoun occurs, and with (17):

- (i) I FIORI, a Gianni_i, la sua_i fidanzata comprerà.
the flowers, to Gianni, the his fiancé will.buy
- (ii) I FIORI, a Gianni_i, la sua_i fidanzata gli comprerà.
the flowers, to Gianni, the his fiancé will.buy

These examples confirm that Topics can follow Foci and that Topics do not give rise to Weak-Cross Over violations.

- (18) [Questo], [io] [ai ragazzi] non l'ho detto direttamente.
this, I to.the boys [I] not it have said directly

Given Benincà and Poletto's (2004) proposal, sequences like (18) are unexpected. If Topics cannot follow Foci, as they suggest, and if Aboutness-shift Topics – the Topics which precede Foci – cannot be reiterated (Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007, Bianchi and Frascarelli 2010), why are multiple Topics possible at all in Italian? This possibility can be accounted for by combining Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's (2007) typology of Topics with Rizzi's (1997) original observation that Topics are recursive. More precisely, the piece of data in (18) suggests that Familiar Topics can be recursive, while Aboutness-shift Topics are unique (see Bianchi and Frascarelli 2010 for the derivation of this restriction from interface requirements). See section 5.5 below for the discussion of the data in (29), which point to the same conclusion.

In what follows, I discuss independent evidence to show that Topics can indeed follow Foci, as in the original proposal by Rizzi (1997) and the refinement by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007).

5. Topics can follow Foci: further evidence

In this section, I discuss evidence coming from a number of Italian constructions to show that Topics can indeed follow Foci. All the data discussed in this section are unexpected under Benincà and Poletto's (2004) hypothesis that Topics cannot follow Foci.

5.1. Embedded *wh*-questions

Consider the embedded *wh*-questions in (19). They differ from those in (12) in that the material which follows the *wh*-phrase is not focalized, but topicalized/left-dislocated (as shown by both the prosodic properties and the occurrence of resumptive clitic pronouns):¹⁰

- (19) a. Mi chiedo a chi questo libro, non lo regalerei proprio mai.
I wonder to whom this book [I] not it would.give never
b. Mi chiedo che cosa a Gianni, non gli regalerei proprio mai.
I wonder what to Gianni [I] not to.him would.give never

The *wh*-phrases *a chi* 'to whom' and *che cosa* 'what' in (19a) and (19b), respectively, can occur either in specFocusP, as suggested by Rizzi (1997) for *wh*-phrases in main clauses, or in the lower *wh*- position proposed by Rizzi (2001) to host *wh*-phrases in subordinate clauses and discussed in section 3.5 above (see (13)). In either analysis, the sentences in (19) show that left-dislocated constituents can occur in positions lower than *wh*-phrases. These sentences can be taken to be further evidence for Rizzi's (1997) proposal and a problematic piece of data for Benincà and Poletto's (2004) Focus Field analysis. Note that their analysis of (1a) as a clitic-doubling configuration could be adopted

¹⁰ Notice that in (19), both orders of direct and indirect objects are grammatical. In other words, the nested vs. crossed contrast seen in (12b vs. c) is not replicated here. This is presumably due to the fact that the two chains have different nature: A' chain in (12) vs. Topic chain in (19) (see Rizzi 2004 for the analysis of different types of features and chains).

to account for (19b), but crucially not for (19a), which contains a clitic-resumed accusative object (see footnote 5).

5.2. *Embedded clauses*

In Italian, Familiar Topics are allowed in all embedded contexts, as in (20a). English Topics, which instantiate the higher Aboutness-shift Topics, instead only occur in root clauses and are ungrammatical in many embedded contexts, (20b) (see Emonds 1970, 2004, Cinque 1990:58, Haegeman 2002, 2006, 2012, Cardinaletti 2009:11-12, Bianchi and Frascarelli 2010 for detailed discussion):

- (20) a. [Se la stessa proposta la fa anche l'altro candidato], non otterrai quel
if the same proposal it makes also the other candidate, [you] not will.get that
posto.
position
b. *[If these exams you don't pass] you won't get the degree.

If no lower Topics were available in Italian, the Italian sentence in (20a) should be ungrammatical on a par with the English sentence in (20b), contrary to fact.¹¹

5.3. *Resumptive preposing*

Resumptive Preposing (RP, Cinque 1990) is a new-information clause with a Topic-Comment articulation, in which the RP constituent is similar to an Aboutness-shift Topic (Cardinaletti 2009:7-8). This is clearly illustrated by the sentence in (21a), which contains a new Topic, as can be shown by the fact that in the same context, the order in (21b) is also felicitous:

- (21) Il ministro propose di votare il disegno di legge.
the minister proposed to vote the bill
a. [La stessa proposta] fece poi il partito di maggioranza.
the same proposal made then the party of majority
b. Il partito di maggioranza fece poi [la stessa proposta].
the party of majority made then the same proposal

The RP constituent can be followed by a left-dislocated constituent with the function of a Familiar Topic, as shown in (22a), from Cardinaletti (2009:13). The opposite order in (22b) is ungrammatical (for the same empirical observation also see Benincà 1988/2001:159):

- (22) a. La stessa proposta a Gianni gli fecero gli studenti spaventati dall'esame.
the same proposal to Gianni to-him made the students frightened by the exam
b. *A Gianni la stessa proposta gli fecero gli studenti spaventati dall'esame.

¹¹ For a recent discussion of the ungrammaticality of sentences like (20b) in English, see Haegeman (2012). Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) derive the root restriction on Aboutness-shift Topics from the fact that they contribute to the conversational dynamics and hence must occur in clauses endowed with illocutive force (also see section 6 below).

The word order seen in (22a) is consistent with the Topic typology proposed by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007). The preposed object *la stessa proposta* ‘the same proposal’, which qualifies as an Aboutness-shift Topic, is followed by the Familiar Topic *a Gianni* ‘to Gianni’ (see Cardinaletti 2009 for extended discussion of the RP construction).¹²

Notice also that (22a) could not be analysed along the same lines as Benincà and Poletto’s (2004) analysis of (1a) as an instance of clitic doubling of the dative *a Gianni*. The same pattern is in fact found with locatives, which do not allow clitic doubling (see (9)):

- (23) Lo stesso peso sulla bilancia ci misero gli studenti iscritti a quell’esame.
the same weight on-the scale there put the students taking that exam

5.4. PP preposing

Dative PPs, like other PPs, can undergo simple preposing, i.e., without the occurrence of resumptive clitic pronouns, as shown in (24) (Cinque 1990:86-94, Rizzi 1990:104-106, Cardinaletti 2009:15-16, Cruschina 2010). The preposed PP can follow a Focus, as shown in (25):

- (24) a. A Gianni dovremmo dire la verità.
to Gianni [we] should say the truth
b. Su quello scaffale potremo mettere solo pochi libri.
on that shelf [we] will.be.able.to put only few books
- (25) a. LA VERITÀ a Gianni dovremmo dire, non queste stupidaggini.
the TRUTH to Gianni [we] should tell, not these silly things
b. POCHI LIBRI su quello scaffale potremo mettere, non un grande peso.
FEW BOOKS on that shelf [we] could put, not much weight

The preposed PP constituents in (24) and (25) can be taken to occur in the Familiar Topic position. Once again, these sentences show that Topics can follow Foci.¹³

5.5. Right Dislocation

Focalization and Right Dislocation can be combined in one and the same sentence, as shown in (26):

¹² The RP constituent can be followed by other constituents which occur in lower positions, such as PPs in the specModP position suggested by Rizzi (2004) and temporal adverbs which build the Frame of the sentence (Cinque 1999). The two cases are given in (ia) and (ib), respectively (from Cardinaletti 2009:16):

- (i) a. La stessa proposta con pari sollecitudine avanzò anche il direttore del museo.
the same proposal with equal promptness made also the director of the museum
b. La stessa proposta domani farà anche il partito di maggioranza.
the same proposal tomorrow will.do also the party of majority

As shown by (22a), (23a), and (i), no adjacency requirement holds between the RP constituent and the verb, *pace* Benincà and Poletto (2004:62).

¹³ PP preposing can also be taken to target Rizzi’s (2004) specModP (Cardinaletti 2009:16). In any case, it involves the preposing of Topic material to a position which follows a Focus.

- (26) QUESTO gli dovremmo dire, a Gianni, non quello.
 this [we] to.him should say, to Gianni, not that

In an antisymmetric, “clause-external” view of Right Dislocation (Kayne 1994, Cardinaletti 2002, Giorgi 2015:245), the right-dislocated constituent *a Gianni* ‘to Gianni’ in (26) occurs in a left-peripheral Topic position, which is itself preceded by the preposed IP (and by the Focus constituent):¹⁴

- (27) [_{FocusP} QUESTO [_{TopicP} [_{IP} *pro* gli dovremmo dire ~~questo a Gianni~~] Topic [_{TopicP} [_{PP} a Gianni] Topic [_{IP} ~~gli dovremmo dire questo a Gianni~~]]]]

Since in (26), both the preposed IP and the right-dislocated constituent follow the Focus *questo*, this piece of data confirms that left-peripheral Foci can be followed by Topics.

This analysis is supported by the discourse properties of right-dislocated elements, which are Familiar Topics and must be present in the immediate linguistic context of the sentence in which they occur (see section 6 below). As pointed out by Benincà (1988/2001:162), in the context of the preparation of a party, if the DPs *il dolce* ‘the dessert’ and *il vino* ‘the wine’ have not been previously mentioned, they are not appropriate as right-dislocated elements, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (28b,c):¹⁵

- (28) a. Il dolce, lo porto io; il vino, lo porti tu.
 the dessert, it bring I; the wine, it bring you
 b. *Il dolce, lo porto io; lo porti tu, il vino.
 c. *Lo porto io, il dolce; lo porti tu, il vino.

Note that since they target the same type of position, left-dislocated Familiar Topics and right-dislocated Topics are predicted to be possible in one and the same language, a correct prediction, as far as I know.

Note also that a Focus can be followed by both a left- and a right-dislocated constituent, as shown in (29):

- (29) a. IERI [a Gianni] [gliel’abbiamo consegnato] [il pacco], non la scorsa settimana.
 yesterday to Gianni [we] to.him it have delivered the packet, not the last week
 b. IERI [il pacco] [gliel’abbiamo consegnato] [a Gianni], non la scorsa settimana.
 yesterday the packet [we] to.him it have delivered to Gianni, not the last week

This possibility can be accounted for by combining Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s (2007) typology of Topics with Rizzi’s (1997) original observation that Topics are recursive. More precisely, the data in (29) confirm that Familiar Topics can be recursive (while Aboutness-shift Topics are unique) (see section 4 above).

¹⁴ A different analysis of Right Dislocation takes the right-dislocated constituent to be “clause-internal”, either *in situ* (Kayne 1994), in a Topic position above VP (Cecchetto 1999), or in a Topic position in the vP periphery (Belletti 2004). See Cardinaletti (2002) for empirical evidence against clause-internal approaches to Italian Right Dislocation.

¹⁵ Cecchetto (1997), (1999) has very convincingly demonstrated that Left Dislocation is not the mirror image of Right Dislocation. The analysis of Right Dislocation suggested by Cardinaletti (2002), although different from his, is coherent with his conclusions. Also see Brunetti (2009).

6. Topics and discourse properties

Let us now consider the discourse properties of the different types of Topics discussed by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007). An Aboutness-shift Topic is defined as follows: “what the sentence is about” (Reinhart 1981, Lambrecht 1994); a constituent that is “newly introduced, newly changed or newly returned to” (Givón 1983), a constituent which is proposed as “a matter of standing and current interest or concern” (Strawson 1964).

Familiar topics are instead “textually given and d-linked with a previously established Aboutness topic” and/or used for topic continuity (Givón 1983). The pragmatic properties of the two types of topics allow us to understand the syntactic difference pointed out above, namely that Aboutness-shift Topics can be either definite or indefinite expressions, while Familiar Topics are definite.

In the framework of Krifka’s (2007) Common Ground Management theory, Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) further distinguish the two types of Topics by suggesting that Aboutness-shift Topics affect the conversational dynamics while Familiar Topics do not.¹⁶ Aboutness-shift Topics are conceived of as instructions to the hearer on how to update the Common Ground, indicating which “file card” (Heim 1982) will be modified by the asserted proposition. Familiar Topics are instead taken to simply involve the retrieval of information already present in the Common Ground content.

I would like to suggest a refinement of Bianchi and Frascarelli’s (2010) proposal, namely that Familiar Topics do not simply involve the retrieval of information already present in the Common Ground content, but contribute to the conversational dynamics by adding the speaker’s perspective on shared knowledge. In the following section, I provide some empirical data from Italian to support the hypothesis.

6.1. Dislocations, Familiarity, and the speaker’s perspective

As shown in the following dialogue, Familiarity can be expressed by the use of Left or Right Dislocation or by the occurrence of a simple sentence containing a clitic pronoun. The given information *Chomsky*, present in the question (Q), is repeated in the answers (A) a. and b. in left- (LD) and right-dislocated (RD) position or is referred to by the clitic pronoun *lo* ‘him’ in answer c.:

(30) Q Conosci Chomsky?

[you] know Chomsky?

- | | | |
|------|--|----------------|
| A a. | Sì, Chomsky, lo conosco.
yes, Chomsky, [I] him know | LD |
| b. | Sì, lo conosco, Chomsky.
yes, [I] him know, Chomsky | RD |
| c. | Sì, lo conosco.
yes, [I] him know | Clitic pronoun |

Note that by using a Dislocation, the speaker not only retrieves the given information, but claims that he/she shares the hearer’s knowledge: “I know who Chomsky is, as you do”.

This is shown by the fact that it is odd to ask about Chomsky’s identity, as in the

¹⁶ Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010:46) define Common Ground as “the set of propositions that are taken to be presupposed, up to that point, by all the participants in the conversation”.

answers a. and b. in (31). The infelicitous status of the sentence in the context is signalled by #. If the speaker wants to ask about Chomsky's identity, he/she can do so after using a sentence containing a simple clitic pronoun, as in answer c.:

- (31) Q Conosci Chomsky?
 [you] know Chomsky?
- | | | | |
|---|----|--|----------------|
| A | a. | No, Chomsky, non lo conosco. #Ma chi è?
no, Chomsky, [I] not him know. But who is [he]? | LD |
| | b. | No, non lo conosco, Chomsky. #Ma chi è?
no, [I] not him know, Chomsky. But who is [he]? | RD |
| | c. | No, non lo conosco. Ma chi è?
no, [I] not him know. But who is [he]? | Clitic pronoun |

The same answering pattern is found when the question contains a Left or a Right Dislocation:

- (32) a. Q Chomsky, lo conosci?
 Chomsky, [you] him know?
 b. Q Lo conosci, Chomsky?
 [you] him know, Chomsky?

The contrast between the a./b. and c. sentences in (31) also suggests that a sentence with a clitic pronoun does not contain a null Topic (*pace* Frascarelli 2007, Belletti 2009), or that null Topics have different discourse properties from overt Topics. This is expected under Economy considerations. If the a./b. and c. answers in (30) and (31) had exactly the same meaning and the same contribution to the conversational dynamics, one should ask why a dislocated element should be pronounced at all.

In conclusion, Familiar Topics do contribute to the conversational dynamics. Although they do not affect the Common Ground management in that they do not introduce a sentence topic (Bianchi and Frascarelli 2010), Familiar Topics do not simply retrieve given information, but also add the speaker's perspective on shared knowledge. In this respect, their presence is not redundant, but has a precise conversational import on the speaker's side.

6.2. Left vs. Right Dislocation

It is well-known that Right Dislocation is more constrained than Left Dislocation (e.g. see (28) above and fn. 15). Consider the fact that the types of Topics that can appear in Left Dislocation are more varied than in Right Dislocation. Aboutness-shift Topics and Contrastive Topics (see footnote 8) only occur at the left periphery of the clause and cannot appear at the end of the clause as right-dislocated constituents. Familiar Topics can instead occur in either periphery. In this section, we discuss further evidence to distinguish Left and Right Dislocation.

Let's consider the situation in which the speaker replies to a question containing a right-dislocated constituent. Given the fact that this can only be a Familiar Topic and given what we observed in section 6.1, the speaker should already know about the hearer's knowledge, namely that the right-dislocated topic is given information for the hearer. It is therefore odd

for him/her to ask whether the hearer has this knowledge, after any of the three constructions:

(33) Q Lo conosci, Chomsky?

[you] him know, Chomsky?

- | | | |
|------|--|----------------|
| A a. | Sì, Chomsky, lo conosco. #E tu sai chi è?
yes, Chomsky, [I] him know. And you know who [he] is? | LD |
| b. | Sì, lo conosco, Chomsky. #E tu sai chi è?
yes, [I] him know, Chomsky. And you know who [he] is? | RD |
| c. | Sì, lo conosco. #E tu sai chi è?
yes, [I] him know. And you know who [he] is? | Clitic pronoun |

This is not the case when replying to a question containing new information or a left-dislocated topic, which is not necessarily familiar and may be an Aboutness-shift Topic, as in (34). As pointed out by Adriana Belletti,¹⁷ the occurrence of a demonstrative with a proper name may underline the non-familiarity of the constituent. As above, it is odd for the speaker to ask about the hearer's knowledge after using a Right Dislocation, as in answer b. in (34). If the speaker is not sure whether the hearer shares his/her knowledge, and wants to ask about this, he/she can do so after using a Left Dislocation or a simple clitic pronoun, as in answer a. and c. in (34), respectively:

(34) Q Conosci (questo) Chomsky? / (Questo) Chomsky, lo conosci?

[you] know (this) Chomsky? / (this) Chomsky, [you] him know?

- | | | |
|------|---|----------------|
| A a. | Sì, Chomsky, lo conosco. E tu sai chi è?
yes, Chomsky, [I] him know. And you who [he] is? | LD |
| b. | Sì, lo conosco, Chomsky. #E tu sai chi è?
yes, [I] him know, Chomsky. And you who [he] is? | RD |
| c. | Sì, lo conosco. E tu sai chi è?
yes, [I] him know. And you who [he] is? | Clitic pronoun |

Note that, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the left-dislocated constituent in (34Aa) is a Familiar Topic, since it retrieves given information from the context and can only be definite:

(35) Q Conosci un / questo libro di Chomsky?

[you] know a / this book by Chomsky?

- | | | |
|---|--|----|
| A | No, *un / questo libro di Chomsky, non lo conosco.
no, a / this book by Chomsky [I] not it know | LD |
|---|--|----|

This is confirmed by the fact that the occurrence of the demonstrative as a marker of non-familiarity is infelicitous in left-dislocated position in the answer to the question in (34).¹⁸

¹⁷ I thank Adriana Belletti for this comment during the discussion time of the IGG conference.

¹⁸ As expected, a DP modified by the "non-familiar" demonstrative is also infelicitous in right-dislocated position:

- (36) A Sì, (#questo) Chomsky, lo conosco. LD
 yes, (this) Chomsky, [I] him know

Thus, what we observe in (34) is a subtle difference between left- and right-dislocated Familiar Topics.

To sum up this section: Left and Right Dislocation involve slightly different types of Familiar Topics. This is another dimension in which Left and Right Dislocation differ. While the use of a right-dislocated constituent implies for the speaker that speaker and hearer share the same knowledge, this is not implied by the use of Left Dislocation. This difference might be related to the cartography of Topics and the fact that right-dislocated topics occur lowest in the left-peripheral Topic hierarchy (see section 5.5 above and Cardinaletti 2002), hence presumably lower than all the functional heads encoding the participants to the speech event. We leave the issue for future research.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, I have provided evidence that the cartography of the Left Periphery is as articulated as in Rizzi's (1997) original proposal.

I have discussed Benincà and Poletto's (2004) apparent counterexamples to Rizzi's (1997) proposal, as well as evidence coming from a number of independent constructions in Italian which show that Topics can indeed follow Foci.

A way of understanding Benincà and Poletto's evidence is to adopt the typology of Topics proposed by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and a distributional asymmetry among the different types of Topics. While Aboutness-shift Topics, which precede Foci, can be either definite or indefinite expressions, Familiar Topics, which follows Foci, can only be definite. This is the reason of the contrast in (3) and the ungrammaticality of (3a), which displays an indefinite expression in the position of a Familiar Topic.

Finally, I have discussed some discourse properties of Familiar Topics. Differently from Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010), I suggest that Familiar Topics do not simply retrieve information already present in the Common Ground. I have shown that (left- and right-dislocated) Familiar Topics contribute to the conversational dynamics by adding the speaker's perspective on what should be considered shared knowledge. In this respect, I have also shown that Right Dislocation differs from Left Dislocation. By using a right-dislocated Familiar Topic, the speaker assumes that the hearer shares his/her knowledge.

He/She cannot further ask about the hearer's knowledge.

-
- (i) A Sì, lo conosco, (#questo) Chomsky. RD
 yes, [I] him know, (this) Chomsky

References

- Belletti, Adriana. 2004. "Aspects of the low IP area". In *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*, ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 16-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2009. "Pronouns and the edge of the clause". In *Structures and Strategies*, Chapter 11. London: Routledge.
- Benincà, Paola. 1988/2001. "L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate". In *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, ed. by Lorenzo Renzi, Giampaolo Salvi and Anna Cardinaletti, Vol. 1, 129-208. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Benincà, Paola, and Cecilia Poletto. 2004. "Topic, Focus, and V2: Defining the CP Sublayers". In *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 2*, ed. by Luigi Rizzi, 52-75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bianchi, Valentina, and Mara Frascarelli. 2010. "Is topic a root phenomenon?". *Iberia* 2.1: 43-88.
- Brunetti, Lisa. 2009. "On links and tails in Italian". *Lingua* 119: 756-781.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2002. "Against optional and zero clitics. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization". *Studia Linguistica* 56: 29-57.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2008. "On different types of clitic clusters". In *The Bantu - Romance Connection. A Comparative Investigation of Verbal Agreement, DPs, and Information Structure*, ed. by Cécile De Cat and Katherine Demuth, 41-82. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2009. "On a (wh-)moved Topic in Italian, compared to Germanic". In *Advances in Comparative Germanic Syntax*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Jorge Hankamer, Thomas McFadden, Justin Nuger and Florian Schäfer, 3-40. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cecchetto, Carlo. 1997. "Clitic Right Dislocation is not the Mirror Image of Clitic Left Dislocation". Ms., DIPSCO, Milan.
- Cecchetto, Carlo. 1999. "A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance". *Studia Linguistica* 53 (1): 40-67.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1977. The movement nature of Left Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 397-412.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1983. "'Topic' constructions in some European languages and 'Connectedness'". In *Connectedness in Sentence, Discourse and Text*, ed. by Konrad Ehlich and Henk van Riemsdijk, 7-41. Tilburg: Katholieke Hogeschool (reprinted in 1997, *Materials on Left Dislocation*, ed. by Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwarts, 93-118. Benjamins).
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A' Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2010. "Syntactic Extraposition and clitic resumption in Italian". *Lingua* 120 (1): 50-73.

- Emonds, Joseph E. 1970. *Root and Structure-Preserving Transformations*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Emonds, Joseph E. 2004. "Unspecified categories as the key to root constructions". In *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and their Effects*, ed. by David Adger, Cécile De Cat and George Tsoulas, 75-120. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2007. "Subjects, Topics and the interpretation of Referential pro. An interface approach to the linking of (null) pronouns". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 691-734.
- Frascarelli, Mara, and Roland Hinterhölzl. 2007. "Types of Topics in German and Italian". In *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*, ed. by Susanne Winkler and Kerstin Schwabe, 87-116. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Giorgi, Alessandra. 2015. "Discourse and the syntax of the left-periphery: Clitic Left Dislocation and Hanging Topic". In *Discourse-oriented Syntax*, ed. by Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl and Andreas Trotzke, 229-250. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Givón, Talmy. 1983. "Topic Continuity in Discourse: An Introduction". In *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Crosslanguage Study*, ed. by Talmy Givón, 5-41, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2002. "Anchoring to speaker, adverbial clauses and the structure of CP". *Georgetown University Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics* 2: 117-180.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2006. "Argument Fronting in English, Romance CLLD, and the left Periphery". In *Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture: Cross-Linguistic Investigations*, ed. by Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger and Paul H. Portner, 27-52. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery, The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 8*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heim, Irene. 1982. *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2007. "Basic notions of information structure". In *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure. Vol. 6*, ed. by Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow and Manfred Krifka. ISIS, Working Papers of the SFB 632, University of Potsdam.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1981. "Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics". *Philosophica* 27: 53-94.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery". In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. "On the position "Int(errogative)" in the left periphery of the clause". In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, ed. by Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi, 287-296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2004. "Locality and Left Periphery". In *Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3*, ed. by Adriana Belletti, 223-251.

Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Strawson, Peter F. 1964. "Identifying reference and truth values". *Theoria* 30: 96-118.