Synthesis—Where we were last time

É. Kiss (1998):
Identificational focus: syntactic movement of XP to FP, always [+exhaustive].
+contrastive (Italian, Greek, …), English, Hungarian allow [–contrastive].
Information focus: marks non-presupposèdness.
Doesn’t address topics (except to note that they can be contrastive in Finnish)

Vallduví & Vilkuna (1998):
Themes (old, [–Rheme]) and Rhemes (new, [+Rheme]).
Each can involve a contrast set [+Kontrast] or not [–Kontrast].
Vallduví solo: [–Rheme] must be split into link and tail (see Catalan).

Choi (1996):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[–New]</th>
<th>[+New]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+Prom]</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[–Prom]</td>
<td>Tail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aissen (1992):
Topics: new/shifted topic (CP-external), continuing topic (CP-internal) (roughly).

Tsimpli (1995):
Topicalization: nearly movement-free, base-generated.
Focus: Movement (SAI, no resumptive, subject to strong islands).

Echepare (1998):
"EF": operator movement, 3-implicature can be cancelled.
"CF": not operator movement, 3-implicature can’t be cancelled.
But I think: “CF” = contrastive topic, “EF” = identificational focus.

Where we our chart last time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+Rheme</th>
<th>–Rheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+Kontrast]</td>
<td>Identiﬁcational focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[–Kontrast]</td>
<td>contrastive topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>–Prominent</th>
<th>+Prominent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>informational focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distinctions we believe in?

There is a “topic vs. focus” distinction:
Follow Vallduví & Vilkuna: Theme (their [–Rheme], contains topic and tail) and Rheme (their [+Rheme]).
• Presumed: This can subsume “old” (Theme, [–Rheme]) vs. “new” (Rheme).

“Old” elements can be distinguished into “topic” (link) and non-topic.
Syntactically relevant in Catalan (topics dislocate left, tails dislocate right).
Follow Vallduví: there is a Topic (his “link”) and a Tail.

Topics can either be shifted (new) or continuing:
At least: Shifted Topic and Continuing Topic.
(There is at least a tendency for syntactic differentiation in the Mayan languages)
• Does: “shifted tail” vs. “continuing tail” make sense?
  (i.e. does this split theme [topic & link] or does it just split topic [link]?)

Topics can be contrastive or not contrastive:
At least: Contrastive Topic and Noncontrastive Topic.
(How does John get to school? [He], usually [walks].
How do the students get to school? [John], usually [walks].)
• But does “contrastive tail” vs. “noncontrastive tail” make sense?
• Is this a different distinction from shifted topic vs. continuing topic?
• Is contrastive topic really something like […] [John]…?"

There is a presentational vs. identificational distinction in foci:
Follow É. Kiss: Presentational focus (her “information focus”) vs. Identificational focus. (Word order effects in Hungarian at least).
• Does identificational focus have to be exhaustive?
  (É. Kiss: yes, Vallduví: no.
  V’s examples: I’ve been to the CITIES in Brazil, seems exhaustive, but
  I knew the Amazon quite well, and I’ve also been to the CITIES in Brazil.)
  Tempting to follow Vallduví and leave exhaustivity to the pragmatics.

Foci can be contrastive or not contrastive:
According to É. Kiss, identificational focus can be contrastive focus (all languages allow this) or noncontrastive focus (some languages—English, Hungarian—allow this). Basically hinges on whether the contrast set is “open” or “closed” (enumerable?).
• Can presentational (information) focus be contrastive vs. noncontrastive?
  (i.e. does this split rheme or only identificational focus?)
Some decisions?

[±Rheme]: [+Rheme] is “non-presupposed”, “new”
[–Rheme] is “presupposed”, “old”

For [+Rheme], we have identificational and presentational focus.
For [–Rheme], we have link and tail.
In both cases, the second one seems like a “default”
identificational focus involves operator movement, a contrast set
presentational focus is just “non-presupposed.”
link connects to the prior discourse, locates “update position”.
tail is just “old”.

Question: Can we find any unifying property between link and IdF?
(cf. Choi’s “prominence”)

For now, let’s see what happens if we say “no”:
Let’s try: [Focus] for identificational focus, [Topic] for link.
(So identificational focus is [Focus, +Rheme], presentational focus is [+Rheme],
link is [Topic, –Rheme], tail is [–Rheme]).

Contrastive topics: Some (possibly improper) subpart is new, contrastive.

Question: Is that a little [+Rheme] part inside a [–Rheme] part? Or is “[–Rheme]” not really the same thing as “New”…?

Let’s guess the latter for now, and suppose that it’s really contrast we’re marking. No evidence that [–Contrast] plays any role, so it can be privative.

[Contrast]: [Contrast] is associated with a set of (salient) alternatives.
☞ [Contrast] elements front in Finnish.
• So far, no evidence against a privative [Contrast].

Problem? [Contrast] seems to depend on the presence of [Topic] and/or [Focus].

So: Contrastive identificational focus [Contrast, Focus, +Rheme]
Noncontrastive identificational focus [Focus, +Rheme]
Presentational focus [+Rheme]
Contrastive topic [Topic, Contrast, –Rheme]
Contrastive topic [Topic, Contrast, –Rheme]
Regular old topic [Topic, –Rheme]
Tail [–Rheme].

• We still have to deal with shifted vs. continuing topics.
• We have no explanation of why we don’t see:
  — [Contrast, +Rheme]: “contrastive tail”
  — [Contrast, –Rheme]: “contrastive presentational focus”
• Doesn’t look like those two problems are related.

Shifted topic:
So, yesterday, this guy, he tells me that he wants to work for me. Doesn’t feel contrastive.
(John went to the lake a half hour after eating). He jumped into the cold water. Doesn’t feel contrastive.

Chart we’re currently playing with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+Rheme</th>
<th>–Rheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Topic]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>presentational focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Focus]</td>
<td>contrastive (identificational) focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The follow table might look better, if (a) we could figure out what [TopFoc] is and (b) if we can figure out how to add the “continuing vs. shifted topic” dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+Rheme</th>
<th>–Rheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[TopFoc]</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrastive focus | noncontrastive focus | contrastive topic | noncontrastive topic | tail