Two kinds of focus: IDENTIFICATIONAL FOCUS and INFORMATION FOCUS.

IDENTIFICATIONAL FOCUS: An identificational focus represents a subset of the set of contextually or situationally given elements for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold; it is identified as the exhaustive subset of this set for which the predicate phrase actually holds. (my emphasis —PH)

IDENTIFICATIONAL FOCUS: Expresses exhaustive identification.
Involves syntactic movement to FP.
Must be a constituent, probably has to denote individual(s).

INFORMATION FOCUS: Marks the non-presupposed nature of the information.
Present in every sentence, not associated with movement.
Need not be an XP constituent (It was JOHN’s car that…)

Testing:

**Tests:** Exhaustiveness in answer

**IDENTIFICATIONAL:** Where did you go for the summer?
Italy is where I went.

**INFORMATION:** Well, I went to ITALY (among other places).

Implication to a subset

It was a *hat and a coat* that Mary bought → It was a *hat* that Mary bought.
Mary bought A HAT AND A COAT → Mary bought A HAT.

It was a *hat* that Mary bought. No, she bought a coat too.
Mary bought A HAT. % No, she bought a coat too.

Quantifiers, also, even can’t be identificationally focused

*It was every *hat* that Mary picked for herself.
*It was also a *hat* that Mary picked for herself.
*It was even a *hat* that Mary picked for herself.
Mary picked EVERY HAT for herself.
Mary also picked A HAT for herself.
Mary (even) picked (even) A HAT for herself.

**English:**
Cleft is a realization of Identificational Focus. (IP>FP>CP>IP>VP)
“Topicalization” (A HAT, Mary picked for herself) is information focus.
English WCO counterexample? and wiggle:
??It was to a boy that his, mother spoke t.
??His, mother spoke TO A BOY. Explanation: conflict: pronoun his must be old, but information focus must be new.

English only can “mark” an identificational focus meaning it need not move overtly.
Identificational focus can be [+contrastive] (operating on a closed set—complement derivable) or [–contrastive] (operating on an open set). It is [+exhaustive].

**Hungarian:**
Identificational focus has the structure: TopP>FP>VP.
few persons (negative quantifiers) and things modified by *only* have an inherent identificational focus feature, must move.
If you have two, one can stay postverbal. Claim: it didn’t stay, it moved, and so did the verb. (So we can strictly tie identificational semantics with SpecFP syntax).
Identificational focus can be [+contrastive] (operating on a closed set—complement derivable) or [–contrastive] (operating on an open set). It is [+exhaustive].

**Rumanian, Italian, Catalan, Greek, Arabic:**
Identificational focus (always [+exhaustive]) must also be [+contrastive].
(It is only John I invited can respond to I heard you invited John and Mary, but not to I heard you had many guests.)

**Finnish:**
Looks like [+contrastive] has to move, whether its identification focus [+exhaustive] or a contrastive topic (potentially [–exhaustive]).

**Problems:**
The role of the [±contrastive] and [±exhaustive] features was not made very clear. It appears that identificational focus must be [+exhaustive] and always can be [+contrastive]. Some languages also allow it to be [–contrastive] (English, Hungarian, Finnish?). What differentiates foci and topics is left completely unclear, although we have a hint that topics can be [-contrastive].

**Arguments against people:**
Assume both fronted and in situ foci end up in SpecFP/SpecCP. Identical LFs.
Any difference (e.g., exhaustive interpretation) is accidental.

Vallduví (1992):
Assumes focus is left in VP, though there is a fronted variant. (É. Kiss 1998:245).
Claims the fronted variant is really VP-extraposition, exhaustivity due to pragmatic inference.
Krifka (1992):  
Posits a set of alternatives for both types (including information focus).  
Does not accord with Hungarian speakers’ intuitions about information focus.


Rheme:  
The new information of the sentence (“update potential”)  
What is asserted rather than presupposed.  
cf. Theme  
Tells you where to make the “update”

Kontrast:  
An “operator-like” element. If $a$ is kontrastive, a MEMBERSHIP SET $M = \{\ldots, a, \ldots\}$ “is generated” and “becomes available to semantic computation as some sort of quantificational domain.”  
Not inherently exhaustive although conversational implicatures can fool you.

Interrogative (wh) words are kontrasts.

English:  
only requires a kontrast to associate with.

Finnish:  
[±K] takes priority over [±Rh]; only [–K, –Rh] elements are found “in between”.

Hungarian:  
[–Rh] takes priority over [+K], so only [+K, +Rh] elements are found in FP.

Catalan:  
[–Rh] forces things out of IP (links left, tails right).  
[+K] things move to SpecIP (but that’s still inside IP).


Topics and contrastive foci seem to pattern together, crosslinguistically.  
(They land in “prominent” syntactic slots or are morphologically marked)  
⇒ They should share a feature: [+Prom] (prominent).

Old and new information seems to act differently, so split that too ((±New)).
**Tzotzil and Jakaltek:**
Topics & foci move to preverbal position, topics precede foci, topics are definite-marked. Topics precede C°-like elements (negation, question particle). Phonological evidence suggests that topics are outside CP, foci are inside.

**Overt topics are always shifted topics.**
Embedded topics are not allowed. Where a “link” exists to an internal element, it knows no bounds.

**Tz’utujil:**
Embedded topics are allowed.

**Overt topics need not be shifted topics.**
Analyzed as in “SpecCP” (Géraldine points out that it’s more consisted with “adjoined to IP” or “in the specifier of a complementizer projection below the highest”).

|---|

Modern Greek is like Mohawk wrt subjects.  
**Topicalization:** Typically involves a resumptive pronoun, in a non-operator posn. Maybe even base-generated? Topicalized object can show Nom instead of Acc. Multiple topics are allowed. Does not trigger subject-aux inversion. But subject to strong islands. (Proposal: LF movement of the resumptive pronoun or clitic to the topicalized phrase)

**Focusing:** Prohibits a resumptive pronoun, in an operator position. Moved there (overtly). Focused object can’t show Nom instead of Acc. Only one focus is allowed. Triggers subject-aux inversion. Subject to strong islands.

**Analysing focus fronting:**
- The F-Criterion (requires movement of F-operators to specifiers of [+f] heads). C° and F° are both specified for [f] and [wh] features. Not fully clear.

**Greek:**
F-Criterion can apply overtly or not (in which case focus is in situ).  
Note: E. Kiss (1998) complained about that—claimed 2 kinds of focus. Wh-phrase and focus cannot co-occur in the same clause taking the same scope.  
If they’re both overtly in embedded clause and fronted, focus precedes wh-word (analysis: wh-word is in FP, focus is in CP; other order bad because ECP messes up the trace of focus movement).  
Matrix clauses don’t have a CP, so there’s only one position for focus & wh-words.

**Hungarian:**
F-Criterion applies overtly

**Berber:**
Has an “F” morpheme—attaches to preposed foci, ungrammatical on in situ foci. Proposes: where F morpheme is present, so is [f] and so movement is required.

Note: Sounds like [f] is not a semantic feature at all….?

|---|

**Empathetic:** Movement to an A’-position conversationally implicates ∃.  
**Contrastive:** Movement to an A-position conventionally implicates ∃.

Canceling the ∃ presupposition:  
JOHN invited Bill, if anyone really did. (EF, *CF)

Keep an eye on what correlates with what, maybe we can come up with another explanation?