Focus Marking, Focus Interpretation & Focus Sensitivity

Malte Zimmermann & Daniel Hole

ESSLI 2009, Bordeaux

Session III: 22-07-09
The meaning of marked focus-constructions

Malte Zimmermann & Daniel Hole

mazimmer@rz.uni-potsdam.de

holedan@googlemail.com

- **Schedule:**

i.   The formal representation of focus

ii.   The discourse-anaphoric nature of focus

iii. The meaning of marked focus constructions

iv.   Association with Focus:
      FOC-particles and Q-Adverbs

v.   Extensions and case studies

- **Plan for today:**

i.   Introduction: Focus and Exhaustiveness

ii. Hungarian Focus and Exhaustiveness

iii. The interpretation of *it*-Clefts

- **Observations:**

i. Focus marked by pitch accent does not introduce existence presuppositions, nor exhaustiveness effects.

$\Rightarrow$ *last session*

- ## **Observations:**

ii. Hungarian preverbal foci (FocHun) and English *it*-clefts encode additional meaning components:
existence & *exhaustiveness*

- ## Krifka (2008): Exhaustiveness

„É. Kiss (1998) has pointed out that focus movement in Hungarian triggers this specific meaning, and it appears that cleft constructions in English trigger it as well:

This example [1] says that nobody else but John and Bill stole a cookie. Consequently, exhaustive focus is not compatible with additive particles, like *too*."

- **Krifka (2008): Exhaustiveness**

(1) It's [John and Bill]$_F$ that stole a cookie.
  → Nobody else stole a cookie.

(2) **[Péter és Paul]$_F$** aludt   a padlón (Szabolcsi 1981)
  Peter and Paul   slept.on the floor
  → Nobody else slept on the floor.

- ## **Questions:**

Q1: Are the observed exhaustiveness effects with Hungarian preverbal foci and *it*-Clefts

truth-conditional   OR
presuppositions/conventional implicatures   OR
conversational implicatures   ?

- ## **Questions:**

Q2: Is exhaustiveness a structurally coded meaning component of Hungarian foci and *it*-Clefts?

⇒ Are exhaustivene interpretations obligatory or not?

- ## **Claims:**

➢ Hungarian preverbal focus encodes exhaustiveness in form of a presupposition (Kenesei 1986, Szabolcsi 1994)

➢ *It*-it-Clefts do not structurally encode exhaustiveness. Exhaustiveness effects with *it*-clefts come about as the result of generalized conversational implicatures (Horn 1981)

- **Basic Observation** (É. Kiss 1998)

➢ Hungarian has two focus positions that come with different interpretations:

   i. postverbal: plain information focus

   ii. preverbal: exhaustive/identification focus

- **Basic Observation** (É. Kiss 1998)

(3) Q: Where have you been over the summer?

   a. Járta-m **Olaszirszág-ban**.   *information focus*
      went-I Italy-to
      'I went to Italy (possibly among other places).'

   b. **Olaszirszág-ban** járta-m.   *identification fokus*
      Italy-to   went-I
      'It was to Italy that I went.'

- ## **Basic Observation** (É. Kiss 1998)

➤ The assumption of a strict 1:1-correlation between different grammatical realizations of focus (***focus marking***) and different semantic interpretations (*new/ presentational* focus vs. ***exhaustive/contrastive/ identificational focus***) is generally accepted; see e.g.

Rochement (1986), Vallduví & Vilkuna (1998) on Finnish, Kratzer & Selkirk (2007), van der Wal (2009) on Makhuwa (Bantu)

- **Preverbal Foci in Hungarian**

➢ *Syntax*:

Focus constituent A'-moves into preverbal functional projection: FocP (Brody 1990)

(4) $[_{TopP}$ ZP $[_{FocP}$ **XP**$_F$ [V $[_{VP}$ PV t_V YP t_{XP}]]]]

- **Preverbal Foci in Hungarian**

➢ *Semantics* (Szabolcsi 1981: 144, 148):

„The placement of certain arguments into F [Spec,FocP, MZ] always effects the **asserted meaning (i.e. the truth-or denotation conditions)** of the sentence." [144]

„Focusing expresses exhaustive listing" [148]

- **Testing for exhaustiveness** (Szabolcsi 1981)

Test 1: Failing Entailments

(5) a. **[Péter és Paul]**$_F$ aludt t_{FOC} a padlón
        Peter and Paul   slept.on   the floor

   b. **[Péter]**$_F$ aludt t_{FOC} a padlón
        Peter   slept.on   the floor

➢ **(5a) does not entail (5b) with *Peter* in F !**

- **Testing for exhaustiveness** (Szabolcsi 1981)

Test 1: Failing Entailments

(5) a. **[Péter és Paul]$_F$** aludt   **t$_{FOC}$** a padlón

     Peter and Paul   slept.on   the floor

   c. Aludt   **Péter** a padlón

     slept.on   Peter the floor

➢ **(5a) DOES entail (5c) with *Peter* not in F !**

- **Testing for exhaustiveness** (Szabolcsi 1981)

Compare: Failing Entailments with *only*

(6) a. Only Peter and Paul slept on the floor.

//⇒// b. Only Peter slept on the floor.

⇒ c. Peter slept on the floor.

➤ **(6a) entails (6c), but not (6b) !**

- **Testing for exhaustiveness** (Szabolcsi 1981)

Test 2: Focus Negation

(5) a. **[Péter és Paul]**$_F$ aludt t_{FOC} a padlón
        Peter and Paul   slept.on   the floor

      d. Nem **[Péter]**$_F$ aludt t_{FOC} a padlón
        NEG Peter   slept.on   the floor

➢ **(5a) and (5d) are compatible !**

- **Testing for exhaustiveness** (Szabolcsi 1981)

   Comparison: Focus Negation in English

(7) a. **Only Peter and Paul** slept on the floor.

   b. **Not only Peter** slept on the floor.

➢   **(5a) and (5d) are compatible !**

- **Testing for exhaustiveness** (Szabolcsi 1981)

Test 3: Focused Numerals

(8) a. **[Három fiú]$_F$**   alszik
        three boys   are sleeping

    b. **[Két fiú]$_F$**   alszik
        two boys   are sleeping

➢   **(8b) does not follow from (8a) !**

- **Testing for exhaustiveness** (Szabolcsi 1981)

  Comparison: *Exactly*+Num in English

(9) a. **Exactly three boys** are sleeping.

   b. **Exactly two boys** are sleeping.

➢ **(9b) does not follow from (9a) !**

- **Szabolcsi (1981): Conclusion**

Syntactic fronting to the preverbal FOC-position leads to an exhaustive interpretation of the focus constituent *as part of the truth conditions*.

- ## Szabolcsi (1981): Conclusion

  Syntactic fronting to the preverbal FOC-position leads to an exhaustive interpretation of the focus constituent *as part of the truth conditions*.

  ➢ XP_F + syntactic marking = exhaustiveness

  ➢ exhaustiveness structurally encoded

- **Szabolcsi (1981): Conclusion**

  TCs of sentences with preverbal focus:

  (5) b. **[Péter]$_F$** aludt **t$_{FOC}$** a padlón

  is true iff for every x, x slept on the floor if and only if x is Peter

- **More recent implemenentations**

➢ É. Kiss (1998,2006):

Preverbal focus is predicative and identified with the VP-denotation: exhaustiveness

➢ Horvath (2007): ‚Focus' movement triggered by a covert EXH-operator in preverbal position.

- **Presuppositional analyses**
  (Kenesei 1986, 2006; Szabolcsi 1994)

Exhaustiveness is the indirect result of a uniqueness presupposition.

- **Presuppositional analyses
  (Kenesei 1986, 2006; Szabolcsi 1994)**

(10) **[Mari]**$_F$ alszik
     Mari   sleeps

➢ (10) *presupposes* that there is a unique individual that sleeps.

➢ (10) *asserts* that this individual is Mari.

- **Presuppositional analyses**
  (Kenesei 1986, 2006; Szabolcsi 1994)

(10) **[Mari]$_F$** alszik

     Mari   sleeps

(11) $\lambda z_e.\lambda P_{<e,t>}.\ [z = \iota x\ [P(x)\ \&\ \forall y\ [P(y) \rightarrow y \subseteq x\ ]]]$

- ## **Presuppositional analyses**
  (Kenesei 1986, 2006; Szabolcsi 1994)

(10) **[Mari]$_F$** alszik

  Mari   sleeps

(11) $\lambda z_e.\lambda P_{<e,t>}. [z = \iota x [P(x) \,\&\, \forall y [P(y) \rightarrow y \subseteq x]]]$

  $(mary) ([\lambda x. x \text{ sleeps}])$

$\Leftrightarrow$ $mary = \iota x [x \text{ sleeps} \,\&\, \forall y [y \text{ sleeps} \rightarrow y \subseteq x]]$

- ## **Presuppositional analyses**
  (Kenesei 1986, 2006; Szabolcsi 1994)

(10) **[Mari]**$_F$ alszik
     Mari   sleeps

(12) *[The one that sleeps]* is **Mary**.

$\Leftrightarrow$ **mary = ιx** *[x sleeps & $\forall y$ [y sleeps $\rightarrow y \subseteq x$]]]*

- **Presuppositional analyses**
  (Kenesei 1986, 2006; Szabolcsi 1994)

(10) **[Mari]$_F$** alszik

Mari sleeps

(11) $\lambda z_e.\lambda P_{<e,t>}. [z = \iota x [P(x) \& \forall y [P(y) \rightarrow y \subseteq x]]]$

- **Evidence for Presuppositions**

Differences [XP$_F$ V] vs. [*csak* XP$_F$ V]: I

(13) a. **Én**$_F$ kaptam a könyvet   (Szabolcsi 1984)

     1sg   got   the book-acc

    ‚It was me that got the book.'

  b. ***Csak én**$_F$ kaptam a könyvet

     only 1sg got   the book-acc

- **Evidence for Presuppositions**

Differences [XP$_F$ V] vs. [*csak* XP$_F$ V]: II

(14) a. nem **[Mari]$_F$** ment el,　　　hanem Kati (*is)

not　Mari　went away　　but　Kati too

‚It is not Mari that left, but Kati (*too).‘

b. nem-csak **[Mari]$_F$** ment el,　hanem Kati *(is)

not　　　Mari　went awaybut　Kati too

‚It is not only Mari that left, but Kati *(too).‘

- **Evidence for Presuppositions**

Differences [XP$_F$ V] vs. [*csak* XP$_F$ V]: II

(14) a. nem **[Mari]**$_F$ ment el,   hanem Kati (*is)
     PRÄS: A unique individual left; *ASS:* It's Mari.

   b. nem-csak **[Mari]**$_F$ ment el,   hanem Kati *(is)
     PRÄS: Mari left;   *ASS:* Nobody but Mari left.

- **Evidence for Presuppositions**

Differences [XP$_F$ V] vs. [*csak* XP$_F$ V]: II

(14) a. nem **[Mari]$_F$** ment el,   hanem Kati (*is)
       PRÄS: A unique individual left; *ASS:* It's Mari.

➢ *Exhaustiveness inaccessible to negation !*

     b. nem-csak **[Mari]$_F$** ment el,   hanem Kati *(is)
        PRÄS: Mari left;   *ASS:* Nobody but Mari left.

- ## Evidence for Presuppositions

Differences [XP$_F$ V] vs. [*csak* XP$_F$ V]: III

(15) a. János azt bánta, hogy **Péter$_F$** jött el.
Janos that regretted that Peter came pv
'Janos regretted that it was Peter who came.'

b. János azt bánta, hogy **csak Péter$_F$** jött el.
Janos that regretted that only Peter came pv
'Janos regretted that only Peter came.' (A. Lipták, p.c.)

- **Evidence for Presuppositions**

Differences [XP$_F$ V] vs. [*csak* XP$_F$ V]: III

(15) a. János azt bánta,   hogy   **Péter$_F$** jött   el.
➢   Janos regrets *identity*, not *exclusiveness* !

      b. János azt bánta,   hogy   **csak Péter$_F$** jött   el.
➢   Janos regrets *exclusiveness*, not *identity* !

- ## **Hungarian Focus: Conclusion**

  The observable exhaustivity effects with preverbal foci in Hungarian are due to a presupposition that there is a unique (maximal) individual satisfying the background predicate.

- ➢ This presupposition seems to be ‚hard-wired' into the preverbal focus configuration, i.e. structurally coded.

- ## **but...**

i.   Exhaustiveness effects are not as strong when the focus constituent does not denote in $D_{<e>}$, but in other domains, such as, e.g, in $D_{<et>}$ or $D_{<s,t>}$

➤   contextualization: *relevant properties* (Szabolcsi 1983)

ii.   Sometimes, even individual-denoting phrases are not exhaustively interpreted.

     (Wedgwood 2005, Wedgwood et al. 2006)

- ## but...

(16) ***Context***: In the delegation, Javier Solan will be included
in addition to Chris Patten, [...]

akiket útjukra **többek között** [Anna Lindh svéd
whom way-on others among Anna Lindh Swedish

külügyminiszter] kísér   majd el.
Foreign minister accompany FUT VM

,And they will also be accompanied, among others, by
the Swedish foreign minister Anna Lindh'

- ## **Wedgwood (2005, 2006)**

  Exhaustiveness not structurally coded, but the result of general pragmatic inferencing procedures

➢ Dynamic semantic interpretation

  OR:

➢ Generalized conversational implicatures (Levinson 2000) ?

- ## **Wedgwood (2005, 2006)**

Exhaustiveness not structurally coded, but the result of general pragmatic inferencing procedures

➢ *More research required on focused QPs, PREDs, Adjuncts, complex NPs etc.*

- ## **The Meaning of *it*-Clefts**

Q: Does the exhaustiveness effect arise from

i. truth conditions ?
    (Atlas & Levinson 1981, É. Kiss 1998, 1999)

ii. a presupposition/ conventional implicature ?
    (Wedgwood et al. 2006, Delin & Oberlander 1995, Percus 1997)

iii. a conversational implicature ?
     (Horn 1981, Zimmermann & Drenhaus 2009)

- **Observation I**

  Exhaustiveness not part of truth-conditions
  (Horn 1981: 130)

(17) a. **#**I know Mary ate a pizza, but I have just discovered
         that it was a pizza that she ate.

  b. I know Mary ate a pizza, but I have just discovered
     that it was only a pizza that she ate.

- **Observation I**

  Exhaustiveness not part of truth-conditions
  (Horn 1981: 130)

(17) a.#I know Mary ate a pizza, but I have just discovered
        that it was a pizza that she ate.
        = truth conditions identical !

      b. I know Mary ate a pizza, but I have just discovered
        that it was only a pizza that she ate.
        = truth conditions differ !

- ## **Observation I**

    Exhaustiveness not part of truth-conditions
    (Horn 1981: 130)

(18) a. **#**I know Mary ate a pizza, but it wasn't a pizza that
        she ate.
        = *truth conditions identical: contradiction*

    b. I know Mary ate a pizza, but it was not only a pizza
        that she ate.
        = *truth conditions differ: no contradiction*

- **Presuppositions ?**

➢ A presuppositional account of exhaustiveness in *it*-clefts would not only

- account for the similarity of *it*-clefts and Hungarian preverbal foci; but also

- be in line with prominent syntactic analyses of *it*-clefts as involving covert definite determiners
(Percus 1997)

- **Presuppositions ?**

(18) a. It was Peter that slept on the floor.

b. [it [was [Peter]] [$_{DP}$ $\varnothing_{+def}$ that slept on the floor]]

≈ ‚The one that slept on the floor was Peter.'

- **Observation II**

  The projection behaviour of exhaustiveness effect differs from that of presuppositions/ conventional implicatures (Horn 1981)

- ## Observation II

Exhaustiveness effect $\neq$ presupposition
(Horn 1981)

(19) a. It was a pizza that Mary ate

$\Rightarrow$ Mary ate something   Existence

Mary ate nothing else   EXH

- ## **Observation II**

Exhaustiveness effect ≠ presupposition
(Horn 1981)

(19) b. It was**n't** a pizza that Mary ate NEG

⇒ Mary ate something   Existence

not: Mary ate nothing else   EXH

- **Observation II**

Exhaustiveness effect ≠ presupposition
(Horn 1981)

(19) c. Was it a pizza that Mary ate ? Q

    ⇒ Mary ate something   Existence

    not: Mary ate nothing else   EXH

- **Observation II**

  Exhaustiveness effect ≠ presupposition
  (Horn 1981)

➢ Exhaustiveness not constant under negation or Yes/No-question formation

- ## **Observation III**

    Exhaustiveness effect possible without clefting
    (Kuno 1972: 269, Horn 1981)

(20) a. John$_F$ kissed Mary.

b. John (and only John) kissed Mary; among those under discussion, it was John who kissed Mary.   EXH(austive listing)

- **Observation III**

  Exhaustiveness effect possible without clefting
  (Kuno 1972: 269, Horn 1981)

  ➤ Exhaustiveness not tied to a specific structure even though frequently occurring with clefts.

- **Observation IV**

Exhaustiveness effects with *it*-clefts not mandatory (Prince 1978, Horn 1981, Hedberg & Fadden 2007)

- **Observation IV**

  Exhaustiveness effects with *it*-clefts not mandatory (Prince 1978, Horn 1981, Hedberg & Fadden 2007)

(21) Perhaps it was Hitler's granite will and determination and certainly it was the fortitude of the German soldier that saved the armies of the Third Reich from a complete debacle. [Shirer, *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*] (Horn 1981:131, quoting Ellen Prince)

- **Observation IV**

  Exhaustiveness effects with *it*-clefts not mandatory (Prince 1978, Horn 1981, Hedberg & Fadden 2007)

(22) Es ist **auch** ihr politischer Standort, *der* Sabine Leutheusser-Schnarrenberger in kritische Situationen bringt. (German, *Frankfurter Rundschau*)

‚It is *also* her political position that gets SLS into critical situations.'

- **Observation IV**

  Exhaustiveness effects with *it*-clefts not mandatory (Prince 1978, Horn 1981, Hedberg & Fadden 2007)

➢ Exhaustiveness *not* structurally encoded in *it*-cleft-structure !

- **Summing up so far...**

➢ Exhaustiveness not part of truth conditions

➢ Exhaustiveness not a presupposition/ conventional impl.

➢ Exhaustive interpretation possible without clefting

➢ Exhaustive interpretation with *it*-clefts not mandatory

- **Generalized Conversational Implicature**
(Horn (1981:132)

„I suggest that it is instead a generalized conversational implicature, a pragmatic assumption naturally (as opposed to conventionally) arising from focussing or exhaustive listing constructions in the absence of a specific contextual trigger or block."

- **Generalized Conversational Implicature**
  (Horn (1981:132)

➢ See pragmatic/implicature-based accounts of
  exhaustivity in answers to wh-questions:

  Schulz & van Rooij (2006), Spector (2005)

- **Generalized Conversational Implicature**
  (Horn (1981:132)

(23) It was a pizza that Mary ate.

PRES:	Mary ate something.	EXIS
ASS:	That something is a pizza.	IDEN
CGI:	She ate nothing else.	EXH

- **Generalized Conversational Implicature**

Q1: Why does it look as if exhaustiveness were negated in some cases?

(24) It wasn't a pizza that Mary ate, she ate a pizza, a calzone, and an order of ziti.

$\Rightarrow$　Pizza is not the only thing she ate ...

- **Generalized Conversational Implicature**

Q1: Why does it look as if exhaustiveness were negated in some cases?

➢ Negation can target both the truth or the appropriateness/ linguistic form of an utterance (*meta-linguistic negation*)

- **Generalized Conversational Implicature**

Q2: Why is the exhaustiveness implicature so difficult to cancel?

(25) a. Max has three children. Indeed, he has four.
     scalar implicature easily cancellable

    b. ?It was a pizza that Maty ate. Indeed, it was a pizza and a calzone.

- **Generalized Conversational Implicature**

➢ Horn (1981:133): ***Structural Markedness***

„But perhaps cancellability is also reduced because a speaker who uses a cleft has *gone out of her way* to employ a construction which introduces the existential and hence the exhaustiveness implicatures.“

⇒ *Maxim of Manner*

- **Final Question**

Q: How difficult is it really to cancel the EXH-implicature?

(26) It's Mary that can play the piano, and/but Sue and Ellen can play it, too.

- **Final Question**

Q: How difficult is it really to cancel the EXH-implicature?

(26) It's Mary that can play the piano, and/but Sue and Ellen can play it, too.

➢ **More experimental work required,**

  e.g., EKP-study in Zimmermann & Drenhaus (2009)

- **Conclusion: Semantics of *it*-clefts**

i. *Exhaustiveness* is not structurally encoded in *it*-clefts, but is pragmatically derived as a (possibly generalized) conversational implicature.

- **Conclusion: Semantics of *it*-clefts**

ii. The only structural meaning component of *it*-clefts is an ***existence presupposition*** that postulates the existence of an individual satisfying the background predicate.

$\Rightarrow$ see last session, Rooth (1996)

- ## **Clefts & Information Structure**

  The rejection of a special exhaustive (focus) semantics for the clefted constituent in *it*-clefts is beneficial, for ...

i. In many languages, overt focus movement does not give rise to obligatory exhaustiveness effects

   (e.g. Hartmann & Zimmermann 2007b on Hausa)

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

(27) **Hàwwa**$_1$ mu-kà   ganii **t**$_1$.
Hawwa   1pl-rel.perf see

Kuma mu-n   ga   **Hàliimà dà Dèelu**.
also   1pl-perf   see   H.   and D.

'We saw Hawwa, and we also saw Halima and Delu.'
(Hartmann & Zimmermann 2007b)

- ## **Clefts & Information Structure**

    The rejection of a special exhaustive (focus) semantics for the clefted constituent *it*-clefts is beneficial, for ...

ii.   Clefts can be used to induce other partitions than ***focus-background*** (Prince 1978, Delin 1992, Lambrecht 2001, Huber 2006, a.o.)

- ## **Clefts & Information Structure**

  Informative-presupposition clefts (Prince 1978)

  (28) It was **in 1886** that . . . Lewin published the first systematic study of the CACtus.

  $\Rightarrow$ non-clefted information new to the hearer, main stress in non-clefted part

- ## **Clefts & Information Structure**

All-new clefts (Lambrecht 1994, 2001)

(29) Q: What happened?

A: C'est ***ma mére*** qui est venue.   [French]

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

= All-new focus movement (Hausa)

(30) Q: What happened?

A: **B'àràayii** nèe su-kà yi mîn saatàa!
robbers prt 3pl-rel.perf do to.me theft
'It's robbers that have stolen from me.'
[Hausa] (Hartmann & Zimmermann 2007a)

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

➢ What all these clefts have in common is that the non-clefted material is presented as if it were known/old information to speaker and hearer.

- ## **Clefts & Information Structure**

„presupposed information is in general NON-NEGOTIABLE. I suggest that non-negotiability arises from anaphoricity because anaphora implies the existence of prior references to the same informarion. Using such a device, a speaker can persuade a hearer that the time for negotiation of the informarion is past, since it has been conversationally 'on the table' at some prior time" (Delin 1992: 295)

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

➢ Presenting the non-clefted information as given or known to the hearer

(i.) encourages the hearer to accomodate the relevant information in case the information is in fact new to her.

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

➢ Presenting the non-clefted information as given or known to the hearer

(ii.) Precludes the possibility for the hearer to reject that part of the information.

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

(31) A: It's **Dr Jonson** that went to Mary's party.
     B: #No, Mary's party is only next week, so he couldn't have gone there.

(32) A: **Dr Jonson** went to Mary's party.
     B: No, Mary's party is only next week, so he couldn't have gone there.

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

➢ Clefting of a topic or focus constituent increases the *saliency* of the discourse referent denoted by the clefted constituent, which can be exploited for various discourse-semantic means:

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

(i.) Easier retrieval and anaphoric back-reference in subsequent discourse (Vasishth et al. ???)

- ## **Clefts & Information Structure**

(ii.) The establishment of a ***contrastive relation*** between the topic/focus referent and contextually relevant alternatives.

= topicalization: movement of topics or foci to sentence-initial position in Finnish & German.
(Vilkuna & Vallduví 1998)

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

(iii.) The marking of unexpectedness or relative unlikelihood of the cleft denotation in the discourse context.

(Zimmermann 2008, Skopeteas & Fanselow 2009; but see also Gundel 1988, Givon 1988, Ward & Birner, in press)

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

(33) Q: What did the fisherman catch?

A1: #Einen **Fisch** hat er geangelt. [German]
   a   fish   has he caught
   ‚A **fish**, he caught.'   *expected* $\Rightarrow$ **#**

A2: Einen **Schuh** hat er geangelt! [German]
   a   Schuh has he caught
   ‚A **shoe**, he caught!'   *unexpected* $\Rightarrow$ ✔

- **Clefts & Information Structure**

  Clefts are frequently attested in languages with rigid word order (English, French, Norwegian):

  $\Rightarrow$ Compensatory grammatical mechanism for making left-peripheral positions available for discourse semantic reasons.

  (Jespersen 1937, Lambrecht 2001)

- **Conclusion:**

    Marked grammatical strategies of focus realization (clefting, focus movement, heavy focus accent) can be exploited for various discourse-semantic effects (saliency, contrast, surprise) beyond truth conditions and classic presuppositions, ...

- **Conclusion:**

... without these effects being intrinsically tied to focushood per se.

Literature

Atlas, J. & S. Levinson (1981). It-clefts, Informativeness, and Logical Form. In P. Cole (ed.), Radical Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.

Delin, J. (1992). Properties of *it*-cleft presupposition. *Journal of Semantics* 9: 289-306

Delin, J. & J. Oberlander (1995). Syntactic Constraints on Discourse Structure: the case of it-clefts. *Linguistics* 33(3).

É. Kiss, K. (1998). Identificational focus vs. information focus. *Language* 74(2): 245-273.

É. Kiss, K. (1999). The English cleft-construction as a focus phrase. In L. Mereu (ed.), *Boundaries of Morphology and Syntax*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 217-229.

É. Kiss, K. (2006). Focus as Predication. In V.Molnar and S. Winkler, (eds.), *Architecture of Focus*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 169-193.

Givón, T. (1988). The Pragmatics of Word Order: Predictability, Importance and Attention". In M. Hammond et al. (eds), *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 243-284.

Literature

Gundel, J. (1988). Universals of Topic-Comment Structure. In M. Hammond et al. (eds), *Studies in Syntactic Typology.* Amsterdam: Benjamins. 209-239.

Hartmann, K. & M. Zimmermann (2007a). In Place – Out of Place. Focus in Hausa. In K. Schwabe & S. Winkler (eds.), *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form: Generalizing Across Languages*. Benjamins, Amsterdam: 365-403.

Hartmann, K. & M. Zimmermann (2007b). Exhaustivity Marking in Hausa: A Re-Evaluation of the Particle *nee/cee*. In E. Aboh, K. Hartmann & M. Zimmermann (eds.), *Focus Strategies in Niger-Congo and Afro-Asiatic.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 241-263.

Hedberg, N. (2000). The referential status of clefts. *Language* 76: 891-920.

Horn, Laurence R. (1969). A presuppositional analysis of *only* and *even*. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistics Society* 5. 98-108.

Literature

Horn, L. (1981). Exhaustiveness and the semantics of clefts. In V. Burke & J. Pustejovsky (ed.), Papers from the 11th Annual Meeting of NELS. Amherst, GLSA. 124-142.

Huber, S. (2006). The complex function of *it*-clefts. In V. Molnár & S. Winkler (eds.), The Architecture of focus. Berlin: de Gruyter. 549-578.

Kenesei, I. (1986). On the logic of word order in Hungarian. In W. Abraham & S. de Meij (eds.), Topic, Focus and Configurationality. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 143-159.

Kenesei, I. (2006). Focus as Identification. In In V.Molnar and S. Winkler, (eds.), *Architecture of Focus*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 137-168.

Krifka, M. (2008). Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55.

Kuno, S. (1972). Functional sentence Perspective. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3: 269-320.

Lambrecht, K. (2001). A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 39: 463-516.

Literature

Percus, O. (1997). Prying open the cleft. Proceedings of *NELS 27*: 337–351

Prince, Ellen F. 1978. A comparison of *wh*-clefts and *it*-clefts in discourse. *Language* 54. 883-906.

Schulz, K. & R. van Rooij (2006). Pragmatic meaning and non-monotonic reasoning: The case of exhaustive interpretation. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 29: 205–250.

Skopeteas, S. & G. Fanselow (2009). Exhaustive identification of focused referents and contextual conditions. Paper presented at the 31st Annual Meeting of DGfS, Universität Osnabrück, 6 Match 2009.

Spector, Benjamin (2005). Scalar Implicatures: Exhaustivity and Gricean Reasoning. In M. Aloni, A. Butler & P. Dekker (eds.), *Questions in Dynamic Semantics*. 229-253.

Szabolcsi, A. (1981). Compositionality in focus. *Folia Linguistica Societatis Linguisticae Europeae* 15: 141-162.

Szabolcsi, A. (1983). Focussing properties, or the trap of the first order. Theoretical Linguistics 10: 125-145.

Literature

Szabolcsi, A. (1994). All quantifiers are not equal: The case of focus. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 42: 171-187.

Ward, G. & B. J. Birner (in press). Discourse Effects of Word Order Variation. To appear in P. Portner et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Semantics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wedgwood, D. (2005). *Shifting the focus. From static structures to the dynamics of interpretation.* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Wedgwood, D., G. Pethö and R. Cann (2006). Hungarian 'focus position' and English *it*-clefts: the semantic underspecification of 'focus' readings. To appear in *Journal of Semantics.*

Zimmermann, M. (2008) Contrastive focus and emphasis. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55: 347-360.

Zimmermann, M. & H. Drenhaus (2009). How exhaustive are you? An ERP study on *it*-Clefts, *only*-Foci, and Scalar Implicature. Presentation at CSSP, Sorbonne, Paris.