

# Polarity Fronting

## I. Introduction

Cross-linguistically as well as intra-linguistically, languages possess different strategies to ensure that a sentence is interpreted as having a narrow polarity focus. In this article, I am specifically concerned with one such strategy, to which I will refer as *polarity fronting*. Polarity fronting dislocates one or more constituents to the left periphery of a sentence, a move which results in the sentence being interpreted as featuring a narrow polarity focus. Three examples of polarity fronting are given in (1) to (3). The relevant portions –i.e., where the fronting occurs– are marked in bold:

- (1) *Certo, uno stinco di santo* (Italian)  
Of.course, **an angel** (lit. “a saint’s shin”)  
*Corona non è.*  
**Corona not he-is.**

(From the *Paisà* Corpus)

- (2) *Distinto sí. Gratificante en otras formas,* (Spanish)  
Different yes. Gratifying in other ways,  
*claro. Pero fácil, no. Fácil no es.*  
of.course. But easy, no. **Easy not it-is.**

(From *El corpus del Español*)

- (3) *Comunque qualcosa i consumatori fanno* (Italian)  
 Anyway something the consumers do

(From the *Paisà* Corpus)

In all of the structures above, it is the fronting operation which makes it possible for the sentence to be associated with a polarity focus interpretation. Consider example (3), where an existential quantifier has been fronted to a position preceding the subject. Had the QP not fronted (as illustrated in (4)), the sentence would have only been compatible with a broad focus reading, or a narrow focus reading on the quantifier itself.

- (4) *Comunque i consumatori fanno qualcosa*  
 Anyway the consumers do something

A first goal of this article is to account for why this is so: we want to know how changes in word order may result in the emergence of a polarity focus interpretation. A second goal is to account for the formal properties of this process: in this article, I will be specifically interested in accounting for the effect of sentential negation on the grammaticality of the fronting operation, and the lack of clitic resumption.

I will argue that polarity fronting is prosodically motivated: in sentences where the polarity of the proposition is in focus, main stress must fall on the finite verb. Polarity fronting ensures that this state of affairs is obtained: it removes constituents other than the finite verb from a main stress position. I will contend that polarity fronting applies mandatorily in Romance languages as these must rigidly assign main stress to the rightmost constituent in the main intonational phrase. I will also argue that polarity fronting is not accompanied by clitic resumption because the fronting operation takes place at PF. Evidence of the PF nature of polarity fronting comes from its reconstruction properties, and by the locality of

the movement operation. I will then account for the repairing effect negation has on some instances of cliticless fronting (cf. Cinque 1990) by invoking Büring's (1999) generalization on the required non-exhaustivity of contrastive topics. In particular, I will show that negation salvages extraction by ensuring that a fronted contrastive topic is not interpreted exhaustively.

This article is structured as follows: in section II, I discuss the notion of polarity focus in a more formal fashion. I argue that, just as nominal expressions can encode different types of focus, so can polarity focus. I argue in particular that a verum focus reading may arise whenever the polarity focus is miratively or correctively marked, in which case the added emphasis arises from the rejection of an expectation concerning the focus itself. In section III, I discuss three types of polarity fronting: *Simple Preposing*, *Bare Neg Fronting* and *Quantifier Fronting*. These are compared to *CLitic Left Dislocation* (CLLD, Cinque 1990), which may also associate with a polarity focus interpretation but is crucially always accompanied by clitic resumption. In section IV, I discuss a second strategy used in Romance languages to mark the presence of a narrow polarity focus: through the insertion of polarity particles. I also show how different polarity focus strategies correlate with the presence of different types of polarity focus. In section V, I present my analysis of polarity fronting as prosodically driven; I argue in particular that the fronting operation is part of a strategy to realign an otherwise prosodically marked configuration. In this respect, fronting strategies differ from operations such particle strategies, in that the latter perform the exact opposite function: they give rise to a prosodically marked structure, which goes to match the pragmatic markedness of the types of foci they associate with. Section VI focuses on the formal properties of the polarity fronting. I focus in particular on

accounting for the absence of a resumptive clitic, the interaction with sentential negation, and the locality of the movement operation. In section VII, I present my conclusions.

## II. Polarity Focus, Verum Focus and Focus Types

By *polarity focus* (*PolFoc*), I will here and throughout the article refer to the presence of a narrow focus on the polarity of a proposition.

Not all foci are identical. Even when it is a nominal expression which is in focus, there are several different pragmatic imports such constituent may be associated with. In this article, I take the same to hold for *PolFoc*, and distinguish among different pragmatic types of polarity focus. I assume in particular that while the semantics of a focused expression always remains constant –with the introduction of a set of alternatives to the constituent in focus (Rooth 1985, 1992)–, the relation between such set and the asserted focus alternative may differ. I take the specific relation existing between the focus and such set of alternatives to be what licenses a specific pragmatic reading of the focus.

Note that *PolFoc* is a special type of focus in that the associated focus value only features two elements, positive polarity and negative polarity. Unlike other types of foci, the composition of the focus value associated with a polarity focus is thus always fully predictable.

At least four different types of focus can be distinguished. In the pragmatically most neutral case, the asserted focus alternative will simply be interpreted as the most appropriate, truth-conditionally adequate alternative given a specific world and context; this type of focus is standardly known as *information focus* or *Ifoc* (È. Kiss 1998). A typical environment which licenses the presence of *Ifoc* is the answer to a question (Halliday

1967; Schwarzschild 1999; Krifka 2001; Reich 2002). In the case of Information PolFoc, this will be a polarity question:

(5) A: Did Usman buy The Financial Times?

B: He did.

A constituent in focus may also be interpreted as an overt correction to a previously uttered alternative. In this case, a *corrective* focus (van Leusen 2004; Bianchi & Bocci 2012) will obtain:

(6) A: Espen did not marry Tom

B: He *DID*!

The focus might also be contrasted with some other (generally explicitly stated) alternative: in this case, we will have a *contrastive* focus. This is illustrated in (7) for nominal expressions, and in (8) for PolFoc.

(7) A: When did you see Tom?

B: I saw him *yesterday*, but I only talked to him *today*

(8) A: Are the twins coming?

B: Jake *is*, but Kate is *not*.

Arguably, all corrective foci are contrastive, but the opposite entailment does not hold.

In their (2012) paper, Bianchi and Bocci adopt a minimal definition of ‘contrastive focus’: they define as such all types of foci which imply the existence of a second focus alternative which must be salient in the context. The downside of this otherwise very elegant characterization of ‘contrastive focus’ is the fact that saliency is a slippery notion, in that it is also a function of the *size* of the focus value. If the focus value associated with

the asserted focus is limited in size, as is the case for polarity foci, the rejected alternative automatically acquires special prominence by virtue of being a member of a limited set. This would render all types of polarity foci inherently contrastive, as the rejected focus alternative is always very salient in the context. We can then slightly modify Bianchi and Bocci's definition and take foci to be contrastive only whenever at least one of the rejected focus alternatives is asserted for some other topic, or given an identical topic but for a different speaker/possible world. In the former case, we will obtain a contrastive topic structure: contrast will apply both at the level of the focus and at the level of the topic. Note that the mention to possible worlds is rendered necessary by the existence, as will be discussed in section III.I, of types of PolFoc which mark the presence of a contrast in veridicality.

This type of definition of 'contrastive focus' has the advantage of excluding the possibility of analyzing *all* types of foci as being contrastive. Technically speaking, all foci are indeed evaluated with respect to a contrast set; such is the nature of focalization in Roothian semantics. However, there is also a sense in which the foci in (7-8) are intuitively more contrastive than (5). Defining what counts as 'contrastive focus' based on whether any of the rejected focus alternatives are asserted for some other linguistic object helps us capture this intuitive difference.

A focal constituent may also be *miratively* focused (Cruschina 2012; Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina 2015, 2016). A focus is mirative if the asserted focus alternative is deemed surprising, or anyway unexpected given the speaker's knowledge of the world, or given the situation at hand. In (9), the DP "a giraffe" is miratively focused by virtue of giraffes representing an extremely unlikely pet to be purchased:

(9) Annemieke just bought A GIRAFFE! Can you believe it?!

Example (10) illustrates the mirative import as applied to PolFoc:

(10) A: So, is Katy really pregnant?

B: Apparently she IS! And to think she didn't want any.

In this paper, I follow Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina (2015) in taking a mirative interpretation of a focus to be licensed if there exists at least one focus alternative proposition which is deemed more likely to result in a true sentence than the actual asserted focus proposition, with respect to a contextually relevant modal base and a stereotypical ordering source.

It is no new observation that nominal expressions which are in narrow focus may be specified with different prosodic contours depending on their specific pragmatic type of focus they are associated with. According to Bocci (2013), for instance, in Senese Italian<sup>1</sup> information foci are generally associated with an H+L\* contour, whereas corrective foci feature the exact opposite pitch direction, L+H\*. Similar results have been replicated for Portuguese (Frota 2002), Spanish (Face 2001), as well as for other varieties of Italian (see for instance Avesani & Varya (2003) for Florentine).

Different types of foci also present diverging syntactic behaviors. In several languages, for instance, a constituent in narrow focus may only front to the left periphery if corrective or mirative; information and purely contrastive foci must remain in situ. According to Cruschina (2016), this is case for Italian, Brazilian Portuguese, French, Spanish, Romanian and Catalan. This contrast is exemplified below for French. We see that mirative foci may front (11), but information foci may not (12):

---

<sup>1</sup> Senese Italian is spoken in Siena, Tuscany.

- (11) TROIS HEURES il avait de retard, le train!  
 THREE HOURS it had of delay, the train!

Abeillé et al. (2008: 312)

- (12) A: *Qu'avez-vous mangé à la fête?*

‘What did you eat at the party?’

B: #LE POISSON j'ai mangé.

#THE FISH I-have eaten.

Now that we are familiar with some of the different pragmatic functions a focus may be specified with, let us focus on the specific relation existing between the asserted focus alternative, and the other alternatives in its focus value. Out of the four pragmatic types of focus just discussed, Ifoc is the basic, pragmatically neutral type: it minimally states that the asserted focus alternative will result in a true proposition given a specific world and context. Ifoci, and indeed foci in general (Büring 2016), are also generally associated with an exhaustiveness conversational implicature<sup>2</sup>.

To the extent to which we define as Ifoc any focus which presents these two features, then mirative, corrective and contrastive foci are also instances of Ifoc. This is because in mirative, corrective and contrastive environments, the asserted focus alternative is also interpreted as resulting in a true sentence, and as doing so exhaustively. What sets these latter types of foci apart from pure Ifoc is the fact that the former types also generate some implicature concerning the rejected focus alternative(s). This additional information

---

<sup>2</sup> *Mention-some* foci (Cable 2008, 2017) are an obvious exception to this exhaustiveness implicature.

Note however that the possibility of a mention-some reading is not a concern with polarity foci: going back to example (5), Usman either bought *The Financial Times*, or he did not.



is also why IFoc is pragmatically neutral, whereas all other types of focus are marked, and hence only licensed in specific contexts.

In the case of mirative foci, this extra information reflects a psychological attitude: the rejected focus alternative<sup>3</sup> is marked as deemed more likely to be true than the actual asserted content. A corrective focus also encodes the presence of a psychological attitude: that of the speaker, who, by rejecting a statement by their interlocutor, shows how they deem this to be incorrect.

In the case of contrastive PolFocus, the extra information is not attitude-oriented: it states that the rejected focus alternative may hold given some other topic, for a different speaker or in a different possible world. Note that corrective foci also perform this function: the presence of a corrective conversational move implies that the corrected statement was asserted –and thus argued to be true- by some other speaker.

Table (13) provides a summary of the different functions performed by the various types of foci. Each type of focus in (13) is coded for the following properties: (a) whether or not the focus gives rise to an exhaustiveness implicature; (b) whether or not the focus correlates with the presence of a psychological attitude towards what the speaker is asserting; (c) whether there is a conventional implicature that the rejected focus alternative may hold for some other topic/speaker/world.

---

<sup>3</sup> Or, in the case of foci which are not PolFoc, at least one among the rejected focus alternative propositions; see again the definition of ‘mirative focus’ by Bianchi, Bocci & Cruschina (2015) on page 7.

(13)

Type	Exhaustiveness	Psychological attitude	Rejected alternative holds for some other topic/world/speaker
Information	✓		
Contrastive	✓		✓
Corrective	✓	✓	✓
Mirative	✓	✓	

We see that only corrective foci are positively specified for all the three properties. (13) also shows that contrastive and corrective foci partially overlap in terms of their properties, and so do mirative and corrective foci. The latter pair overlaps with respect to the encoding of a psychological attitude, the former with respect to the existence of a linguistic object for which one of the rejected focus alternatives holds.

Corrective and mirative instances of PolFoc (examples (6) and (10)) are somewhat special: they are, I will argue, instances of *verum focus*. Ever since Höhle (1992), it has been noted that the polarity of a proposition may receive special emphasis. Höhle coined the term *verum focus* (VF) to refer to a specific intonational contour which, in German at least, consists of a high pitch accent followed by a low tone (H\*L). This contour is generally assigned to the verb:

- (14) A: *Hat Karl den Hund gefüttert?* (German)  
 Has Karl the dog fed?  
 B: *Karl HAT den Hund gefüttert, natürlich*  
*Karl HAS the dog fed, of.course.*

Höhle's observation is that stressing the auxiliary *hat* in sentences like (14) results in a conversational strategy which consists in emphasizing the truth of the proposition at hand: in this case, that Karl has indeed fed the dog.

The idea that some polarity foci might be interpreted as emphatic is correct, but I believe that this claim can be made more precise, and that the focus typology I have detailed above can help us do so. Unlike contrastive and purely information PolFoci, mirative and corrective polarity foci are inherently emphatic: corrective polarity foci are emphatic in that they bring about a polarity reversal in a proposition in the immediate context<sup>4</sup>, proposition which would have otherwise been added to the common ground (Stalnaker 1978) had a second speaker not corrected it. Mirative foci are emphatic because they signal that is surprising or anyway unexpected that a given polarity value may be set in the direction it is set, a conversational move which is inherently emphatic. Note that the added emphasis has a common source: the rejection of an expectation concerning the polarity setting of the proposition at hand. In the case of corrective PolFoc, this expectation is interlocutor-oriented: it is the expectation of whoever uttered the sentence that the speaker is trying to rectify with their corrective statement. In the case of mirative

---

<sup>4</sup> I follow follow Farkas & Bruce (2010) in assuming that a given proposition only becomes part of the common ground if both speakers agree it is true. A proposition uttered by a speaker simply remains in the immediate context until the second speaker tacitly or explicitly agrees with it.

PolFoc, it may be both speaker- and interlocutor-oriented, as in the pregnancy example in (10), or simply speaker-oriented, as in (15) below:

(15) Apparently Mary does NOT have a car, you were right! I was *so* sure she did.

In the next two sections, we will explore what strategies there are to mark the polarity of a sentence as being in narrow focus. We will see in particular that different strategies correlate with different types of PolFoc, with some strategies being specialized for the expression of verum focus.

### III. Types of Polarity fronting

In this section, we are going to investigate what possibilities there are to achieve a polarity focus interpretation through changes in word order. In particular, we are going to review three different types of polarity fronting operations: *Simple Preposing*, *Bare Neg Fronting* and *Quantifier Fronting*. We will be comparing these to CLLD, which may also be associated with PolFoc but is crucially not restricted to it. The discussion is mostly based on Spanish and Italian.

We will start by discussing the formal properties of each of the four movement configurations I have just listed. The main properties on which we are going to focus are in particular (i) the presence versus absence of reconstruction, (ii) the presence versus absence of clitic resumption, and (iii) the type of PolFoc marked.

#### III. I Simple Preposing

Simple Preposing (henceforth, *SP*) was first discussed in Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009) for Spanish, who take it to be part of a more general phenomenon to which they refer as ‘verum focus fronting’ (VFF). This VFF operation includes instances of Simple

Preposing, as well as Quantifier Fronting, which I tackle in subsection III.III. I follow Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal (2009) in treating these two types of movement as specific instances of a more general phenomenon, in my case that of polarity fronting. As we will see in III.III, however, even though some overlapping definitely exists, these two operations exhibit different properties, which lead me to treat them separately. Moreover, unlike Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal, I do not believe that SP and Quantifier Fronting mark the presence of an emphatic polarity focus; they are, I will argue, associated with *contrastive* PolFoc. At the source of Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal’s mislabeling is perhaps a more general tendency in the literature to assume that the polarity of a proposition is only focused when it is emphatically so, i.e., whenever a verum focus accent is present. As discussed in section II, however, this view of polarity focus is reductive: PolFoc can be specified with different focus accents, only some of which are emphatic in nature.

In (16) is an example of what I consider an instance of SP, as taken from from Leonetti and Escandell-Vidal’s paper. In (17), I provide an example of SP for Italian:

- (16) *Había que leerse el Quijote,* (Spanish)  
 S/he-had to read.REFL the Quijote,  
*y el Quijote se leyó*  
 and the Quijote REFL. read  
 ‘S/he had to read the Quijote, and read the Quijote s/he did’

(Leonetti & Escandell-Vidal 2009: 171)

- (17) *Volevo mangiare un panino, e un* (Italian)  
 I-wanted to-eat a sandwich, and a  
*panino ho mangiato*

sandwich I-have eaten

SP structures are always biclausal. They require identity between the clause where the fronting occurs, to which I will refer as ‘parasitic’, and a preceding clause which functions as its syntactic antecedent, to which I will refer as ‘host’.

In SP structures, the host always features a non-finite clausal complement, usually the complement of a volitional or modal verb. This clausal complement is rendered finite in the parasitic SP structure, resulting in the expression of a contrast in veridicality: in the host clause, a possible course of action is suggested. In the parasitic clause, this event is rendered perfective, thereby ceasing to represent a simply hypothetical scenario.

In SP, the fronted constituent is not clitic-resumed, nor can it ever be. This is illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (18), where the SP-ed direct object has been clitic-resumed:

- (18) \**Volevo mangiare un panino, e un* (Italian)  
 \*I-wanted to-eat a sandwich, and a  
*panino l’ho mangiato*  
 sandwich it(cl)-I-have eaten

The fronted constituent in SP structures reconstructs for both binding and scope. Reconstruction for binding is exemplified in (19) for principle A:

- (19) *Filippo<sub>i</sub> voleva riscoprire se stesso<sub>p</sub>, e* (Italian)  
 Filippo<sub>i</sub> wanted to-rediscover him self<sub>p</sub>, and  
*se stesso<sub>i</sub> Filippo<sub>i</sub> ha riscoperto.*  
 him self<sub>i</sub> Filippo<sub>i</sub> has rediscovered.

In the host clause in (19), *Filippo* can bind the reflexive *se stesso* by virtue of c-commanding it. This binding relationship is maintained in the parasitic clause, showing that the fronted DP must have reconstructed in its base position. That the fronted constituent must reconstruct at LF is also shown by scopal properties. In this respect, consider (20):

(20) *Lucia non voleva dire tutto,* (Italian)

Lucia not wanted to-say everything,

*e tutto non ha detto*

and everything not has said

‘Lucia didn’t want to tell the whole story, so she didn’t’

(a)  $*\forall > \neg$  = Everything was not said (hence: Lucia said nothing)

(b)  $\checkmark \neg > \forall$  = it is not the case that Lucia said *everything* (hence: she said

something, ..., she said a lot)

With (20), the speaker is asserting that it is not the case that Lucia said *everything*: Lucia might have shared only part of the story, or might have even told almost every detail of it. Crucially, however, she did not reveal *everything*: she kept at least something to herself. This reading can only be obtained if the universal reconstructs in its base position, where it scopes below the negation (reading 20b). If the universal does not reconstruct (20a), we obtain a reading by which we are stating that Lucia said nothing at all, which is not the reading we are after in (20).

SP is remarkably flexible in terms of what constituents can be the target of the fronting operation. Virtually any type of constituent can be dislocated through SP: in (21), we see that SP has targeted an adjective. In (22), it has targeted an adverb. In (23), it is a full IP which gets fronted:

(21) *Volevo diventare bravissimo,* (Italian)  
 I-wanted to-become super-good,  
*e bravissimo sono diventato*  
 and super-good I-am become

(22) *Volevo andare piano, e piano sono andato* (Italian)  
 I-wanted to-go slowly, and slowly I-am gone

(23) *Volevo mettermi a scrivere* (Italian)  
 I-wanted to-start-REFL. to write  
*in spiaggia, e a scrivere in spiaggia*  
 in beach, and to write in beach  
*mi sono messa.*  
 REFL. I-am started

‘I wanted to start writing while at the beach, and writing while at the beach I have started’

Note that SP has a fixed structure: the parasitic clause only ever consists of the material found in the non-finite complement clause of its host. In the parasitic clause, then, it is always all material following the finite verb which is fronted to the left periphery, regardless of the type and the length of such material.

What type of PolFoc can SP mark? Above, I suggested that SP structures realize a contrast in veridicality: the non-finite clausal complement in the host is marked as being non-veridical, its finite counterpart in the parasite clause as being veridical. It can be concluded that SP structures mark the presence of *contrastive* PolFoc.



What SP cannot mark are mirative and corrective polarity foci: a corrective reading of the focused polarity in SP is out because a correction would imply the lack of identity between host and parasitic clause, which we saw to be a requirement for SP to go through. A mirative polarity accent is incompatible with SP because the polarity value associated with the parasitic clause is in no way unexpected: that the event described in the parasitic clause might be associated with a positive polarity setting is an expectation created by the volitional verb in the host clause.

### III. II Bare Neg Fronting

Bare Neg Fronting (henceforth, *BNF*) is a movement operation that fronts several different types of constituents to the left periphery of a *negated* clause. I provide some examples of BNF below; these are taken from the *Paisà* corpus, a collection of Italian web texts. The portion where the fronting occurs is marked in bold:

- (24) *Il paese fa 13.000 abitanti. Quindi tanto piccolo non è.*  
 This town makes 13.000 inhabitants. So **very small not it-is.**  
 ‘This town has 13.000 inhabitants, so it’s not exactly small’

- (25) *Trattarlo con un farmaco lo etichetta come  
 Treating-him(cl) with a prescription him(cl) labels as  
 malato anche se **malato non è.**  
 ill, even though **ill not he-is.**  
 ‘Treating him with drugs means labeling him as ill, even though ill he is not’*

The pragmatics of a BNF construction can be that of litotes (van der Wouden 1996), as can be observed in (24), where we observe the understatement effect typical of these

structures: by claiming that the town “isn’t that small”, the speaker is actually stating that the town is fairly large. This understatement effect can also be appreciated in structures like (26) below, where it is used as part of a communicative strategy through which the speaker shows weak agreement with what stated by their interlocutor.

- (26) A: *Raj è scortese* (Italian)  
           Raj is impolite  
       B: *Gentile non è*  
           Polite not he-is  
           ‘Well, he is surely not *polite*’

A weak-agreement effect is obtained in (26) because B, rather than fully agreeing with A, simply states that the opposite of what asserted by A is false.

That of litotes is not the only pragmatic effect performed by BNF: this type of fronting operation can also perform a much more general function, which could be described as simply *contrastive*. We already saw an example of this purely contrastive function in (25). In (25), “ill” is first introduced as focus and then fronted through BNF in the concessive clausal adjunct. The first mention of “ill” –the focused one– occurs in a positive polarity structure, even though the statement itself is a non-veridical one. The clause where the fronting occurs then takes this same adjective and assigns it a negative polarity value, hence a contrast in polarity ensues. This type of BNF in fact partially resembles instances of SP, in that, in both cases, the fronting operation is parasitic on existing structure. In the case of SP, this is the host clause, whereas in the case of BNF, this is whatever adjective or nominal expression is provided in a previous utterance and then assigned a different polarity specification in the clause where BNF occurs.

The expression of understatement/litotes is on the other hand a function which is exclusive of BNF, in that it is not shared by SP. Note that litotes structures like (26) are also contrastive, and in fact are doubly so: in (26), the fronted adjective is contrasted with the opposite term on its entailment scale, namely that “impolite” in A’s utterance. The negative polarity is then contrasted with the positive polarity associated with “impolite” in A’s statement. The litotes structure in (26) is then contrastive at two different levels, whereas in (25), a contrast is present only at the level of the polarity. As it was already the case for SP, we can then conclude that BNF associates with *contrastive* PolFoc.

The more general contrastive function which we observed in (25) seems to have a higher incidence than the litotes one, at least in the Paisà corpus. The corpus contains 140 instances of BNF; out of these 140 cases, only 37 have the understatement quality typical of litotes.

The fronted constituent in BNF structures reconstructs for binding. This is shown in (27) for Principle A:

(27) *Se stesso<sub>i</sub>, Luigi<sub>i</sub> non ha visto di certo* (Italian)  
 Himself<sub>i</sub>, Luigi<sub>i</sub> not has seen for sure

The fronted reflexive in (27) must be bound in its local domain because of Principle A. Since (27) is grammatical, we can conclude that “*se stesso*” must have reconstructed in its base position at LF, where it can be bound by the coindexed subject “*Luigi*”.

It is difficult to determine whether BNF also reconstructs for scope without resorting to the presence of a quantified element. To assess the scopal behavior of the fronted element in BNF, the reader is then referred to subsection III.III, where I investigate Quantifier Fronting. We will see that some instances of Quantifier Fronting exhibit both the

pragmatics and the syntax of BNF; these crucially reconstructs for scope. I will then use those cases to prove that BNF reconstructs for scope *as well as* for binding.

Note that BNF is extremely local: the fronted constituent can only be displaced up to the first available left periphery, and not any further. Compare in particular (28), where the fronted constituent is moved locally to the first (and only) available left periphery, to (29), where it is not. (30) then shows how the only way to rescue (29) is to clitic-resume the fronted adjective<sup>5</sup>.

- (28) *Vuole essere gentile, ma gentile non è*  
 He-wants to-be kind, but kind not he-is
- (29) *\*Vuole essere gentile, ma gentile non credo che sia*  
 \*He-wants to-be kind, but kind not I-believe that he-is
- (30) *Vuole essere gentile, ma gentile non credo che lo sia*  
 He-wants to-be kind, but kind not I-believe that it(cl) he-is

### III. III Quantifier Fronting

Quantifier fronting (henceforth, *QF*) was first discussed for Italian in Benincà (1998) and later in Cinque (1990), who provided the first full-fledged analysis of the phenomenon. In *QF* structures, a bare quantifier is fronted to the left periphery of a clause, crucially without being clitic-resumed:

- (31) ***Qualcosa*** ***farò,*** *non preoccuparti* (Italian)  
**Something** **I-will-do,** not you-worry

(Cinque 1990:74)

---

<sup>5</sup> More on the locality of CLLD will be said in subsection VI.IV.

Unlike SP, where clitic resumption is always outright impossible, the resumption of the fronted quantifier is in fact possible for at least some types of quantifiers. It is however clear that structures where clitic resumption has occurred have little in common with those where resumption is absent: the two differ systematically with respect to a number of properties. Consider the case of “*qualcosa*” (=something). As already noted in Cinque (1990), if “*qualcosa*” is clitic-resumed, the gender agreement<sup>6</sup> on the past participle must be feminine ((32)). If “*qualcosa*” is not clitic-resumed (33), on the other hand, the past participle exhibits the standard masculine ending *-o*:

- (32) *Qualcosa l'ha mangiata* (Italian)  
 Something it(cl)-s/he-has eaten(fem)
- (33) *Qualcosa ha mangiato*  
 Something s/he-has eaten(masc)

Two types of QF can be distinguished: fronting of a QP occurring in negative polarity environments, and fronting of a QP occurring in positive polarity environments. This is because the polarity specification of the clause affects not only the type of quantifier which may be fronted, but also the overall interpretation of the construction.

Formally, negative polarity QF is yet another instance of BNF, as evidenced by the fact that it shares both the pragmatics and the syntax of BNF constructions. In (34), negative QF results in the same understatement flavor which is typical of litotes constructions:

- (34) A: *Luisa ha mangiato poco* (Italian)  
 Luisa has eaten little

---

<sup>6</sup> The past participle agrees in gender and number with the direct object, in this case the fronted existential.

B: *Tanto non ha mangiato di certo*  
 A-lot not she-has eaten for sure

It is impossible to determine whether negative polarity QF reconstructs for binding, given that quantifiers are not anaphors and hence need not be bound. What can however be shown is that the fronted QP reconstructs for scope. Consider the following:

(35) A: *Luca non ha mangiato nulla* (Italian)

Luca not he-has eaten nothing

‘Luca ate nothing’

B: *Tutto non ha mangiato di certo*

Everything not he-has eaten for sure

‘He surely didn’t eat *everything*’

In (35), B expresses their weak agreement with A by negating the opposite of what A has just stated: B states that it is *not* the case that Luca ate *everything*. For the exchange in (35) to make sense, and for the weak-agreement effect to be obtained, the quantifier must scope under the negation. This is illustrated in (36), which details the two logically possible scopal interpretations of B’s reply in (35):

(36) Possible scopal relations for (35):

(a)  $\neg > \forall$  = it is not the case that he ate *everything* (hence: he ate a little, ..., he ate a lot)

(b)  $*\forall > \neg$  = Everything was *not* eaten = He ate nothing (= A’s utterance)

The only way for the weak agreement interpretation to be obtained in (35) is to have the universal quantifier reconstruct, and hence be outscoped by the negation. If the negation scopes lower than the universal, the reading we obtain is one by which B is stating that

Luca ate nothing at all, which is exactly what A also asserted (see also description of the reading in 36b). If (36b) were the correct derivation for (35), then, the weak-agreement pragmatics would be lost, as both speakers would be asserting the same thing.

Not all instances of negative QF reconstruct, however. Consider in particular the following example, where an existential is fronted across the sentential negation:

- (37) A: *Mario ha mangiato tutto* (Italian)  
 Mario has eaten everything
- B: *Qualcosa non ha mangiato*  
 Something not he-has eaten
- (a)  $*\neg > \exists$
- (b)  $\checkmark \exists > \neg$

The only reading B's reply can be associated with is one where the existential scopes over the negation, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (37a). In (37), then, only the surface reading is available. That (37) can only display the surface reading is however expected, as it is a result of the positive polarity nature of the existential *qualcosa* in Italian: this element cannot occur in downward-entailing environments, hence it is prevented from reconstructing in its argumental position<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> In negated environments, "*qualcosa*" may only scope over the negation ( $\exists > \neg$ ). If the opposite reading is warranted, namely the reading according to which it is *not* the case that something was eaten (i.e., nothing was eaten,  $\neg > \exists$ ), the negative quantity expression "*nulla*" (*nothing*) is used instead.

Positive polarity QF can only front existential quantifiers such as *someone/somebody*, and accordingly has a marked existential function; this can be appreciated in (38). In (38), the fronting of the quantifier is used to convey that the set of people seen by Luisa is minimally not empty:

- (38) A: *Luisa non ha visto nessuno* (Italian)  
 Luisa not has seen anyone
- B: *Qualcuno deve aver visto, dai*  
 Someone she-must have seen, come-on
- =It definitely *is* the case that Luisa saw at least someone

Just like in negative QF, the fronted existential in positive QF reconstructs for scope. This is illustrated in (39), where we see that the universal can only take scope over the existential. Accordingly, only a non-specific reading of “*qualcosa*” is available:

- (39) *Qualcosa hanno mangiato tutti* (Italian)  
 Something they-have eaten all
- (a)  $\forall > \exists$
- (b)  $*\exists > \forall$

Like BNF, QF is extremely local: the fronted QP may only be moved up to the first available left periphery. In this respect, compare the ungrammaticality of (40a), where the fronted quantifier has been dislocated to the matrix left periphery, with the grammaticality of (40b), where fronting is local:

- (40) (a) *\*Qualcosa credo che ~~qualcosa~~ abbia*  
 \*Something I-believe that ~~something~~ he-has



	<i>mangiato</i>		<del><i>qualcosa</i></del>			
	eaten		<del>something</del>			
(b)	Credo	che	qualcosa	abbia	mangiato	<del>qualcosa</del>
	<i>I-believe</i>	<i>that</i>	<i>something</i>	<i>he-has</i>	<i>eaten</i>	<del><i>something</i></del>

As it was already the case for BNF, the only way to salvage a non-local QF structure is to turn it into a CLLD one by clitic-resuming the fronted quantifier. This is shown in (41) below. Note in particular the *-a* feminine ending on the past participle, caused by the presence of clitic resumption (see again (32)):

(41)	Qualcosa	credo	che	l'abbia		mangiata/*o
	<i>Something</i>	<i>I-believe</i>	<i>that</i>	<i>it(cl)-he-has(subv)</i>		<i>eaten.fem/*masc</i>

We saw above that negative polarity QF is essentially a quantified version of BNF; we can then conclude that, exactly like BNF, this associates with *contrastive* PolFoc. As far as positive QF is concerned, I will be following Giurgea (2015) in analyzing QF structures as contrastive topic structures. Giurgea provides a characterization of sentences like (38,B) in terms of *degree of confidence* in the asserted content. The idea is that, with (38,B), the speaker is asserting that she is only sure that *at least someone* was seen. It might also be the case that quite a few people were in fact seen, but the speaker feels she is unable to assert any stronger statement –and hence use any stronger quantifier- with a sufficient degree of confidence. In structures like (38,B), the fronted existential is thus evaluated in relation to the other generalized quantifiers in the set. If this analysis is correct, the fronted quantifier is thus interpreted contrastively and acts as the sentence's topic, i.e., the constituent about which something is asserted. The associated polarity specification then represents the asserted content, i.e. the focus to the topic.

### III. IV Clitic Left Dislocation

What all the fronting operations reviewed so far have in common is the possibility of fronting a constituent without accompanying clitic resumption. This contrasts with CLitic Left Dislocation (CLLD). In CLLD structures, the fronted constituent, which is often referred to as the clitic-resumed *topic*<sup>8</sup>, is obligatorily resumed by a coindexed clitic<sup>9</sup>. CLLD will be the focus of this subsection.

Comparing SP, BNF and QF to CLLD is worthwhile not only with a view to better understand what makes the lack of clitic resumption possible in the former types of operation, but also since CLLD itself can associate with the expression of PolFoc. Consider in particular the following exchange, from Trevigiano<sup>10</sup>:

(42) A: *Sì ma i ze grandetti tuti do par decidar!* (Trevigiano)

Yes but both of them are old enough to decide!

B: *Sì beh, sicuramente sì,*

Yes well, certainly yes,

---

<sup>8</sup> In accordance with Rizzi (1997) and subsequent works by the same author, I will be referring to constituents fronted through CLLD as ‘topics’, even though arguably not all CLLDed expressions are topical in a pragmatic sense. CLLD constituents do not always describe ‘what the sentence is about’ in the sense of Reinhart (1981), nor do they always represent the ‘filecard’ currently been updated in the sense of Heim (1982). See [Author, submitted] for related discussion.

<sup>9</sup> For DPs at least. Resumption of PPs is optional, see Cruschina (2010).

<sup>10</sup> Trevigiano is a dialect spoken in Treviso, a city in Northern Italy. The exchange in (42) was extracted from an actual conversation between native speakers of Trevigiano, recorded as part of a separate project on the nature of subject clitics.

<i>l'età</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>ga...</i>
the age	they	it(cl)	have

B's remark in (42) features a narrow polarity focus: the speaker wants to highlight how 'they' *are* old enough to make their own decisions. Had "*l'età*" not fronted in (42) –see (43) –, this reading would have been lost in favor of a broad focus one. This is clearly reminiscent of polarity fronting (compare in particular (42-43) with (3-4)):

(43)    *I*            *ga*        *l'età*  
           They        have    the'age

We already saw in subsections III.II and III.III how CLLD may be used to salvage non-local applications of both BNF and QF. This shows that another way in which CLLD differs from cliticless instances of fronting is in being potentially non-local: a clitic-resumed constituent may be fronted to a left periphery higher than the closest available one. As we will see in this section, a third way in which CLLD differs from cliticless fronting concerns the possibility for the fronted element not to reconstruct in its base position.

Abundant literature exists on whether CLLD reconstructs or not. According to Frascarelli (2004) (see also Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2007), CLLD does not reconstruct for binding nor for scope. Cecchetto (2001), however, argues that the clitic-left dislocation of a DP is always accompanied by reconstruction for binding, and may or may not be accompanied by reconstruction for scope. I follow Frascarelli (2004) in taking clitic-resumed constituents to not reconstruct for binding. Evidence of the lack of reconstruction is provided in (44), which I take from Frascarelli (2004). In (44), the null subject *pro* is coindexed with Leo, a R-expression which appears within the CLLD topic:

- (44) *Il libro che mi ha dato Leo<sub>i</sub> pro<sub>i</sub>* (Italian)  
 The book that to-me(cl) has given Leo<sub>i</sub> pro<sub>i</sub>  
*lo ha scritto da giovane*  
 it(cl) has written when young  
 ‘The book that Leo<sub>i</sub> has given to me, he<sub>i</sub> wrote it when he was young’

(Frascarelli 2004:105)

If *the book* were to reconstruct in its base position, the R-expression would no longer be free in its local domain, violating principle C of binding theory.

I follow Cecchetto (2001), however, in taking both the surface and the inverse scope readings to be available for CLLDed constituents. Overall, the surface reading seems to be the preferred one when the fronted constituent is clitic-resumed, but the reconstructed – inverse– reading is by all means possible, especially if the fronted element is an existential quantifier. This can be seen in (45), where the fronted existential can scope both under and over the universal subject:

- (45) *Qualcuno lo amano tutti*  
 Someone him(cl) love everyone

(a)  $\checkmark \forall > \exists$  (= everybody loves someone different)  $\rightarrow$  reconstruction

(b)  $\checkmark \exists > \forall$  (= someone specific is loved by everyone)  $\rightarrow$  no reconstruction

If CLLD can also associate with PolFoc, a relevant question to ask is what types of PolFoc it can associate with. As I argued in [Author, submitted], CLLD constituents are always compatible with a contrastive topic interpretation, meaning that if a reasonable contrast set can be thought up for the fronted constituent, a contrastive topic

interpretation is always licensed<sup>11</sup>. If CLLD always licenses a contrastive interpretation of the fronted constituent, we can then conclude that CLLD can minimally associate with contrastive PolFoc.

Can CLLD associate with mirative and corrective polarity foci? Yes and no. Unlike BNF, QF and SP, CLLD is certainly compatible with both mirative and corrective statements. This however does not mean that it is the fronting operation itself which triggers the presence of these specific readings. Consider for example the construction below, a biclausal “*sì che*” construction also featuring a CLLD topic. As we will see in section IV, this kind of construction is used in Italian as well as in Spanish to mark the presence of verum focus.

- (46) *Sì che il pane l'ho comprato!* (Italian)  
 Yes that the bread it(cl)-I-have bought!  
 ‘I HAVE bought the bread!’

The CLLD operation has no effect on the availability of the verum focus reading, given that, if no fronting occurs, the emphatic focus on the polarity is still present:

- (47) *Sì che ho comprato il pane!* (Italian)  
 Yes that I-have bought the bread!  
 ‘I HAVE bought the bread!’

---

<sup>11</sup> A contrastive interpretation of CLLD is so salient that Arregi (2003) even goes as far as claiming that CLLDed topics are *always* interpreted as contrastive. See however [Author, submitted] for some counterexamples to the claim that CLLD topics are always contrastive, as well as for an explanation of why some instances of CLLD topics may not receive a contrastive interpretation.

### III.V Different Types of Fronting: Formal Properties Compared

Below is a table summarizing the formal properties of the four types of fronting reviewed in this section. It captures the following three properties: (a) presence vs. absence of clitic resumption, (b) locality of movement, and (c) (lack of) reconstruction:

(48)

Type of Fronting	Clitic-Resumption	Movement Obligatorily Local?	Reconstruction for Binding	Reconstruction for Scope
<i>Simple Preposing</i>	No	Yes-Structure is fixed	Yes	Yes
<i>Bare Neg Fronting</i>	No	Yes	Yes	Yes (see Negative QF)
<i>QF – Negative Polarity Type</i>	No	Yes	Untestable	Yes ( <i>qualcosa</i> being an exception)
<i>QF – Positive Polarity Type</i>	No	Yes	Untestable	Yes
<i>Clitic-Left Dislocation</i>	Yes	No	No	Both reconstructed and non-reconstructed readings possible, at least with existentials

Note that SP is marked as “structure is fixed” under locality behavior, in that the parasitic clause in SP environments only ever features a single verb phrase –the non-finite VP copied from the host clause–, and hence a single left periphery. Technically, then, SP can *only* be local.

What emerges from (48) is that those types of movement operations which are not accompanied by clitic resumption are also those which are inherently local and which always reconstruct for binding and scope. Note that BNF, SP and QF are also movement operations which can only associate with polarity focus: these types of movement are only possible if it is the polarity of the proposition which is interpreted as being in focus. In this respect, consider what happens if we take an environment which we know to license cliticlessness, such as the litotes-BNF structure in (26), but modify it so as to force a focus interpretation of a constituent other than the polarity. In (49) below, this is the DP “*il lunedì*”. We see that clitic resumption is now mandatory:

- (49) A: *Raj è scortese*  
       Raj is impolite
- B: *Gentile non \*(lo) è il lunedì,*  
    Polite not \*(it(cl)) he-is on Mondays,  
    *ma gli altri giorni è ok.*  
    but the other days he-is fine

#### IV. Polarity Particles

Other than polarity fronting, a second strategy to mark PolFoc which is found in Romance languages consists in the insertion of specific polarity morphemes. In this section, we briefly discuss the use of this strategy in Spanish and Italian.

Spanish “*sí*” can be used to emphatically mark the *positive* polarity of a proposition<sup>12</sup>. Polarity “*sí*” is always inserted preverbally, as we can see in (50). In (50), “*sí*” is used to emphatically reassert the polarity of an existing statement, for instance in cases when such polarity is deemed surprising or unexpected (*mirative* PolFoc):

- (50) A: *Hoy ha llovido*  
Today has rained  
B: *Hoy **sí** ha llovido*  
Today **yes** has rained  
‘Indeed it rained today.’<sup>13</sup>

Polarity particles may also be used in combination with a non-standard syntactic structure, as exemplified in (51). In this example from Italian, a bi-clausal structure headed by the polarity particle itself is used as a marker of corrective PolFoc:

---

<sup>12</sup> *Sí* is the morpheme for *yes* in Spanish.

<sup>13</sup> Italian also has the option of inserting the particle “*sí*” IP-internally, but unlike Spanish “*sí*”, Italian “*sí*” is post-verbal. Italian IP-internal “*sí*” also seems to perform an entirely different function: it can only feature in combination with a concessive structure. An example is (i):

- (i) Context: A: “Your mom is always eating pasta”  
B: *Mia madre mangia **si** sempre pasta, ma mai quella integrale*  
B: My mother eats **yes** always pasta, but never that wholemeal  
‘True, my mom is indeed always eating pasta, but she never eats the wholemeal kind’



(51) A: *Maria non è in grado di guidare fino a Roma*  
 ‘Mary not is capable of driving till Rome’

B: **Si** **che** *lo* *è!*

**Yes** **that** *it* *she-is!*

The same structure can also be used in answers to *wh*-questions to mark the fact that the answer to the question is perceived as obvious, and thus that it should have not been uttered in the first place. Consider (52), where A uses the “*sì che*” construction to provide an answer to the question he himself has formulated, thereby showing he believes the answer to be obvious:

(52) A: *Lo sai che ti amo, vero?*

‘You know that I love you, right?’

Also A: **Si** **che** *lo* *sai.*

**Yes** **that** *it(cl)* *you-know*

Spanish also possesses a biclausal “*sí que*” polarity focus strategy. In this language, this is often interchangeable with simple “*sí*” constructions, which, as we saw in (50), also marks polarity focus. Overall, Spanish “*sí (que)*” seems to be more flexible than Italian “*sì che*”: Spanish “*sí (que)*” can either correct or restate the polarity of an existing proposition, whereas Italian “*sì che*” cannot restate an existing PolFoc. In this respect, compare in particular (53) with (54):

(53) A: *Hoy ha llovido* (Spanish)

Today *it-has* *rained*

B: *Hoy sí que ha llovido*

Today **yes** **that** *it-has* *rained*

'Today has rained indeed'

- (54) A: Oggi ha piovuto (Italian)  
Today it-has rained  
B: \**Si* **che** ha piovuto!  
\*Yes **that** it-has rained!  
B': *No* **che** non ha piovuto!  
**No** **that** not it-has rained!

In the Italian example, an emphatic polarity reply is only grammatical if it goes to correct A's statement. Given that A's assertion in (54) is specified with a positive polarity, B's reply must take the form of the negative "*no che*". Different languages thus appear to be more flexible than others in the specific type of emphasis polarity particle strategies can encode: whereas Spanish "*sí (que)*" can be used to simply reassert the polarity specification of existing propositional content, this function is precluded to the Italian "*sì che*" equivalent.

#### IV.I Overview of PolFoc Strategies

Below is a table summarizing the type of polarity focus each of the PolFoc strategies reviewed so far can associate with. These are the three types of polarity fronting, CLLD, and the two polarity particle strategies:

(55)

	Strategy	Function
Particle	Spanish “ <i>si que</i> ”	Emphatic focus, including corrective and mirative
	Italian “ <i>si che</i> ”	Emphatic focus, such as corrective
	Spanish IP-internal “ <i>si</i> ”	Emphatic focus, including corrective and mirative
Fronting	Simple Preposing	Contrastive
	Bare Neg Fronting	Contrastive
	QF – Positive Type	Contrastive
	QF – Negative Type	Contrastive
	CLLD	Contrastive (but compatible with other types of PolFoc)

A clear divide emerges from (55): whereas fronting operations associate with contrastive PolFoc, polarity particle strategies correlate with the presence of emphatic PolFoc. We can conclude that the mechanism underlying polarity fronting must be different from the one resulting in the application of polarity particle strategies.

An important thing to note concerning the application of polarity particle strategies is that these always result in prosodically misaligned structures. In both Spanish and Italian, main

stress is assigned by default to the rightmost constituent in the main intonational phrase<sup>14</sup>. Particle strategies impede this specific prosodic configuration from being achieved in that they result in main stress being assigned to a constituent –the polarity particle– other than the rightmost one.

Another interesting correlation pertains to the specific types of PolFoc which license particle strategies. Recall from section II that not all types of nominal constituents in narrow focus can front to the left periphery; in most Romance languages -Italian and Spanish included-, only mirative and corrective foci can. We see that these are exactly the same types of focus which license the use of a particle strategy as opposed to a fronting one.

## V. The *Whys* and *Hows* of Polarity Fronting

In this section, we will be concerned with understanding how the polarity focus interpretation associated with polarity fronting comes about. I will argue in particular that polarity fronting in Romance languages arises from the need to remove from a main stress position a constituent which is not focused, and must thus not be assigned main stress. I will refer to this mechanism as ‘escape main stress’.

The idea that prosodic requirements may be responsible for at least CLLD has been suggested by several authors (see for instance Vallduví & Enghdal 1996; Zubizarreta 1998; Costa 1998; Szendrői 2001, 2002, 2003, 2017; Samek-Lodovici 2006, 2015). The way this article differs is in extending such a prosodic explanation to instances of cliticless fronting,

---

<sup>14</sup> See Hamlaoui & Szendrői (2015), and Szendrői (2017) on how intonational phrases should be calculated.

and rejecting it for CLLD instead. Unlike other authors, I will also establish a specific link between pragmatic type of focus and type of PolFoc strategy used to express it.

What BNF, SP and QF have in common is that the application of fronting results in the finite verb appearing sentence-finally. Assume we want the verb to be in focus, and hence to receive main stress (Reinhart 1995, 2006). We will explore in detail why focus on the finite verb should correlate with a polarity focus interpretation in the next subsection; for now, we will simply focus on the mechanics of the process. If we are to have the verb in focus, main stress will then be assigned to the rightmost constituent in the verbal complex<sup>15</sup>. This is because both Italian and Spanish are prosodically right-aligned languages. In cases where the verb either takes a complement or is followed by an adjunct, simply assigning main stress to the rightmost constituent in the verbal phrase without any accompanying reordering operation would however result in a violation of the prosodic rules characterizing these two languages: Italian and Spanish must assign stress to the rightmost constituent *in the main intonational phrase*. Following Hamlaoui & Szendrői (2015) and Szendrői (2017), I take this to correspond to the IP in Romance languages. The fronting operation can be seen as a way to reconcile two opposing forces: by fronting any material which would have otherwise appeared in a post-verbal position, fronting ensures that it is the verb which is assigned main stress, and that main stress is assigned to the rightmost constituent in the main intonational phrase.

---

<sup>15</sup> This is to mean that, if both an auxiliary and a past participle are present, it is the past participle which is going to be stressed, even though it is technically the auxiliary which bears the [+finite] specification. This is because it is the past participle which is the verbal element appearing rightmost in the verbal domain.

Consider how this process works in the first QF example discussed in this paper, namely the Italian example in (3). I repeat it below:

- (3) *Comunque*                    ***qualcosa***    *i*        ***consumatori fanno***        (Italian)  
       Anyway                    something    the       consumers    do

Already in the introduction, we saw that the fronting of the direct object is essential in order for (3) to be interpreted as a PolFoc structure. If no fronting occurs, (3) will be interpreted as a broad focus construction, or as featuring a narrow focus on the direct object. How does *escape main stress* account for the presence of a narrow polarity focus in constructions like (3)? Consider (56), where I provide the derivation for (3):

- (56)    [<sub>CP</sub> *Qualcosa*                    [<sub>IP</sub> *i consumatori*        *fa*NNO        ~~*qualcosa*~~]]  
           [<sub>CP</sub> Something                    [<sub>IP</sub> the consumers        dO                ~~something~~]]

In (56), the bare quantifier *qualcosa*, being the direct object, is generated below the verb. The verb itself bears a narrow focus accent, given that the speaker is here trying to convey that the consumers *are* doing something. If the object does not front, the constituent which is in focus, the finite verb, would not occur sentence-finally, violating the prosodic rules of Italian, which assigns main stress to the rightmost constituent in the main intonational phrase. In order for the structure to converge at PF, fronting of the offending constituent occurs. This explains why the fronting of the direct object in (3) is essential to achieve a PolFoc reading. If (3) featured no fronting, the direct object would occur in sentence-final position, where it would be assigned main stress and interpreted as focal.

QF is but one possible strategy available in Romance languages to ensure that the finite verb in PolFoc constructions appears rightmost in the main intonational phrase, and is thus in a position to be assigned main stress. Crucially, BNF, QF and SP all work in the

exact same fashion: they remove any constituent(s) which would have otherwise appeared post-verbally, preventing the verb from appearing rightmost and thus from being assigned main stress. This is why the fronting operations we reviewed in section III, despite displaying formal differences, can all associate with an identical focus interpretation, PolFoc. It is in this sense that an umbrella definition of *polarity fronting* makes sense: regardless of the formal differences we observe among different types of polarity fronting, as long as the fronting operation results in the possibility of assigning main stress to an identical constituent –in our case, the finite verb-, these will all associate with an identical focus interpretation. Additional evidence in favor of the idea of *escape main stress* as a triggering mechanism for polarity fronting, as well as for the idea itself of polarity fronting as an umbrella term, comes from SP. Recall from subsection III.I that pretty much anything can be fronted through SP. I repeat the relevant examples below:

(21) *Volevo diventare bravissimo,* (Italian)

I-wanted to-become super-good,

*e bravissimo sono diventato*

and super-good I-am become

(22) *Volevo andare piano, e piano sono andato* (Italian)

I-wanted to-go slowly, and slowly I-am gone

(23) *Volevo mettermi a scrivere* (Italian)

I-wanted to-start-REFL. to write

*in spiaggia, e a scrivere in spiaggia*

in beach, and to write in beach

*mi*            *sono*    *messa.*

REFL.        I-am    started

'I wanted to start writing while at the beach, and writing while at the beach I have started'

The examples in (21-23) show how SP can front an AP (21), an adverbial phrase (22) and even a full IP (23). If we were to analyze the examples in (21-23) in terms of the constituent which is fronted, they would appear to have nothing in common, given that the target of the SP operation differs every time. If we analyze these examples with respect to the *foot* of the movement chain, however, what they have in common is obvious: in each of these sentences, whatever material stands in between the finite verb and the sentence-final position is fronted, resulting in the finite verb occurring rightmost in the parasitic clause. In this respect, (23) is particularly interesting: in the parasitic clause, the purpose clause is fronted in its entirety, to ensure that it is only the tensed verb which appears sentence-finally.

How to reconcile the claim that polarity fronting occurs to repair an otherwise prosodically misaligned structure with the existence of polarity particle strategies, which also express PolFoc and yet give rise precisely to misaligned structures?

The key notion lies here in the *type* of focus these different operations correlate with. In section IV, we saw how particle strategies correlate with the presence of emphatic types of polarity focus such as corrective and mirative ones. Polarity fronting, on the other hand, fronts constituents in contrastive polarity environments. The former type of operation thus matches a prosodically marked structure to a pragmatically marked one: the choice of a prosodically marked configuration can be seen as a strategy to highlight the fact that the asserted content is to be interpreted as emphatic. The latter type of operation, on the



other hand, is not associated with any kind of pragmatic markedness, hence a marked prosodic structure is simply not licensed<sup>16</sup>.

### V.I Simple Preposing: Why Polarity and Finiteness are Linked

SP is a particularly interesting instance of fronting because it sheds some light on one possible reason for why stress on the finite verb should correlate with stress on the polarity of a proposition.

If *escape main stress* is responsible for the movement of the fronted constituent in SP structures, then it must be the case that the constituent which is rendered sentence-final, the finite verb, is in focus. But why exactly is the finite verb which is in focus in SP structures?

---

<sup>16</sup> Main stress is arguably right-aligned in Germanic languages as well, and yet the fronting of non-focused material in Germanic is clearly less frequent -and more pragmatically marked- than it is in Romance. If fronting indeed occurs as a result of *escape main stress*, then, why are various instances of fronting of non-focused material considerably less frequent in Germanic languages? Concerning this difference, it is important to note that, even though both Germanic and Romance languages do indeed normally assign main stress to the rightmost constituent in the main intonational phrase, languages like Italian and Spanish are stress-rigid, meaning they rarely allow stress to be assigned in a position other than on the rightmost constituent in the intonational phrase (Szendrői 2002, 2017; Samek-Lodovici 2015; Ortega-Santos 2016). Germanic languages, on the other hand, are stress-flexible, meaning they do allow stress to be shifted to a position other than rightmost constituent in the intonational phrase, or at least they do so in more environments than Romance languages admit (Szendrői 2017). The different incidence of the fronting of non-focused material in the two language groups then follows.

Constituents in focus generally correspond to that portion of the sentence which represents new information (Halliday 1967, Chomsky 1970, Jackendoff 1972). We have already seen that SP requires strict identity between the parasitic SP clause and its syntactic host, which means that every constituent in the parasitic SP clause is technically old information. The verb is old information as well, given that it is identical to the verb in the host, as we saw in (17):

- (17) *Volevo mangiare un panino, e un* (Italian)  
 I-wanted to-eat a sandwich, and a  
*panino ho mangiato*  
 sandwich I-have eaten

Does the parasitic clause contain any piece of information which might be legitimately considered as “new”? It does: it is the tense specification on the parasitic verb. This was [-finite] in the host clause, and it becomes [+finite] in the parasitic clause. Note that this is all there is to it: the number specification of the verb, for example, is also known, as the referent of the subject in the host is the same as that of the parasitic clause (in this case, 1<sup>st</sup> person singular). Why is the finite tense specification so important in giving rise to PolFoc?

SP takes the non-finite clausal complement of the host’s verb and turns it into a proposition which is asserted. The host clause expresses the intention of the subject to complete a specific activity, in (17) that of eating a sandwich; the parasitic clause takes this event and assigns it a past tense specification, showing how the intention of the subject to complete such activity has been fulfilled. The contrast in finiteness is also how the contrast in veridicality typical of these structures is realized.

If we take polarity focus to be the equivalent of stressing whether a given proposition is true or false –and consequently, whether it has taken place or not–, it makes perfect sense that a way of creating a PolFoc structure would be through marking the past tense specification of a predicate as being in focus. In syntactic environments where a strong antecedent is present, as is the case for SP, it is then the past tense specification of the parasitic clause which conveys how the subject’s wish has been fulfilled, and hence has a truth value of 1.

Note that this also explains the specific nature of the Leonetti and Escandel-Vidal’s (2009) examples. As already pointed out in III.I, SP was first discussed in Leonetti and Escandel-Vidal’s (2009) paper, where the two authors analyze the application of this phenomenon in Spanish. The authors correctly identify this type of fronting as having to do with polarity focus (although they incorrectly label it as an instance of *verum focus*, see III.I), but fail to truly account for how the narrow polarity focus reading arises through fronting. They also fail to notice a pattern with all the examples which license SP: they are all verb-final.

## **VI. Explaining the Formal Properties of the Different Types of Fronting**

In section V, I have argued that an identical mechanism underlies SP, BNF and QF: the need to remove from a main-stress position any material which is not to be assigned main stress. In section IV, however, I have also shown that CLLD may be used for an identical purpose -the expression of PolFoc- and may do so by resorting to a mechanism which is remarkably similar to the one exploited by polarity fronting: the fronting of a constituent which would have otherwise appeared to the right of the finite verb. Should we then

conclude that CLLD is yet another instance of polarity fronting? And if the answer is affirmative, why does it differ from SP, BNF and QF concerning its reconstruction properties, and with respect to the presence of clitic resumption? In this section, I will focus on answering these questions as well as other more general questions concerning the formal properties of the various types of polarity fronting.

## VI.I Existing Literature on (the lack of) Clitic Resumption

As far as I am aware, this is the first paper which discusses BNF as a separate phenomenon, so no literature exists on why this type of fronting must *not* be accompanied by clitic resumption. No literature exists on why SP structures are cliticless either. What we do have abundant literature for, on the other hand, is why quantifiers may be fronted without being clitic-resumed. In this section, we briefly discuss two such accounts, that of Cinque (1990) and that of Arregi (2003).

According to Cinque (1990), the reasons why QPs may be fronted without accompanying clitic-resumption lies in the nature of the fronted element itself: being operators, quantifiers can exploit the same mechanism foci and *wh*-elements –which are also operators, and which are never clitic-resumed– resort to when fronted. When foci and *wh*-elements appear in the left periphery, Cinque suggests, it is because they were moved from their base position and then connected to their trace through an operator-variable relation. According to Cinque, the mechanism responsible for the fronted position of clitic-resumed constituents is completely different from that responsible for the fronting of foci and *wh*-elements: clitic-resumed constituents are base-generated directly in their left-peripheral position, and then simply linked through a mechanism of mere coreference to a co-indexed pronominal element (the clitic). When a quantifier appears in the left periphery without being clitic-resumed, Cinque argues, it is because it was *moved* to the left periphery,

as opposed to when it *is* clitic-resumed, in which case it was base-generated directly there. As we saw in subsection III.I, however, an analysis in terms of operator movement cannot be correct: SP, which never features clitic resumption, can target constituents which are not quantifiers. Clearly, then, the lack of clitic resumption is not determined by the operator-like nature of the fronted element.

Arregi (2003) discusses QF in Spanish and provides a multi-faceted answer to the puzzle of clitic resumption. First, he suggests that CLLD is inherently contrastive, and thus that all constituents which are fronted by means of clitic resumption are interpreted as contrastive topics. In order for an element to be contrasted with some salient alternative, Arregi notes, such element needs to refer to an individual or a set of individuals. This is precisely what rules out quantifiers from being targeted by CLLD: a quantifier like ‘something’ cannot be used to refer to an individual. Arregi then discusses the following example, where the QP is apparently interpreted contrastively but still resists clitic resumption:

- (57) A: *Juan no comió nada* (Spanish)  
 Juan not ate nothing  
 ‘Juan ate nothing’
- B: *No, algo, Juan sí (\*lo) comió, pero no mucho*  
 NO, something, Juan yes (\*it(cl))ate, but not much  
 ‘You’re wrong, he DID eat something, but not a lot’

(Arregi 2003:4)

Arregi argues that constituents which are fronted without clitic resumption reconstruct for scope, but they do not reconstruct for binding. Following Lechner (1998), he takes the

lack of reconstruction for binding as evidence that these constituents only reconstruct *semantically*. In the case at hand, semantic reconstruction would arise whenever the fronted quantifier (a generalized quantifier, and hence of type  $\langle et \rangle t$ ) binds a variable of the same type as the fronted element, something which, according to Cresti (1995) and Rullmann (1995), has the effect of undoing -semantically speaking- the movement operation itself. Whenever the fronted constituent binds a variable of a lower type (such as  $e$ ), on the other hand, the movement is semantically persistent and no reconstruction occurs. Arregi then speculates that the clitic itself is interpreted as a variable ranging over individuals (type  $e$ ); since a quantifier like *algo* in (57) is not interpreted as singling out any specific individual, clitic resumption is barred.

Arregi's account of (the lack) of clitic resumption cannot work either. First of all, it is simply not true that cliticless instances of fronting do not reconstruct for binding: see in particular subsections III.I and III.II, where I showed that both BNF and SP reconstructs for binding (as well as for scope). From subsection III.IV, we also know that CLLD, whose distinctive trait is precisely clitic resumption, may sometimes not reconstruct the dislocated element for interpretation. This shows that Arregi's (2003) analysis of clitic resumption as forcing the absence of reconstruction of the fronted constituent cannot be correct.

## VI.II PF Movement and Reconstruction

Recall from section III that instances of cliticless movement reconstruct for both binding and scope<sup>17</sup>. Cliticless fronting thus exhibit the property of *total reconstruction* (Saito 1989):

---

<sup>17</sup> The only exception to this generalization being instances of existentials like "*qualcosa*" in negated sentences, where the lack of reconstruction is however forced by the PPI nature of the quantifier itself.

the movement operation has a visible effect on the surface structure, but syntactically as well as semantically, it is almost as if movement had never taken place.

I will use the total reconstruction nature of BNF, SP and QF to argue for a PF analysis of their derivation. Specifically, following Sauerland & Elbourne (2002), I argue that movement of the fronted constituent in cliticless instances of movement takes place at phonological form. The fronting operation thus only has an effect on the prosodic make-up of the clause, not on its syntax nor on its semantics. This explains why constituents which would normally be clitic-resumed are not: their movement does not take place in the syntax.

Other than the lack of reconstruction for both binding and scope, two main pieces of evidence support a PF analysis for BNF, QF and SP.

A first piece of evidence comes from the locality of the movement operation. The parasitic clause in SP environments can only ever feature *one* left periphery, hence SP fronting is always inherently local. A more interesting configuration is represented by BNF and QF environments, whose structure is not fixed the way SP is. For these two types of fronting, we saw that the fronted constituent can only be moved up to the first available left periphery, and not any further. This supports an analysis of the movement operation as prosodically driven: under our prosodic-trigger analysis, fronting applies as a strategy to repair a prosodically misaligned configuration. Movement is licit only insofar as it serves to remove a non-focused constituent from a main stress position, hence any further movement is disallowed in that unnecessary.

A second piece of supporting evidence in favor of a PF analysis of cliticless movement comes from the heterogeneous nature of the target of polarity fronting. Again, the perfect example is represented by SP structures. As we saw in subsection III.I, and then again in

IV.II, SP can front nominal expressions, APs, adverbials, and in fact even entire non-finite clauses. I repeat the relevant example for the latter type below:

- (23) *Volevo mettermi a scrivere* (Italian)  
 I-wanted to-start-REFL. to write  
*in spiaggia, e a scrivere in spiaggia*  
 in beach, and to write in beach  
*mi sono messa.*  
 REFL. I-am started

An alternative line of analysis for (23) would be to look at the *head* of the movement chain -the fronted constituent- rather than at its foot. Accordingly, we may want to argue that fronting occurs in order for the fronted constituent to be interpreted in its displaced position, not for it to evacuate the position it is removed from. Following an approach argued for in cartographic analyses of the left periphery (see Rizzi 1997), a possible analysis may then be to suggest that the fronted purpose clause in (23) is endowed with a [+ topic] feature, which is probed by a corresponding head in the left periphery, triggering its fronting and crucially its interpretation as the *topic* of the clause. Defining what exactly should count as ‘topic’ is a notoriously irksome problem<sup>18</sup>; even without delving into the issue, however, the fronted clause in (23) feels intuitively less of a topic than a constituent like “gentile” in (30) -the relevant part of which I repeat below-, which is dislocated through CLLD:

- (58) (...) *ma gentile non credo che lo sia*  
 (...) but kind not I-believe that it(cl) he-is(subv)

<sup>18</sup> See van Bergen and de Hoop (2009).



The fronted adjective is a property about which something is being predicated: in (58), the fact that it does not hold of the grammatical subject of the most embedded clause. As this property is singled out through fronting, a contrastive interpretation also becomes particularly favored. Neither of these attributes holds for (23): the fronted clause is neither an entity nor a property. It is also not interpreted in opposition to some other event which might not have taken place, so fronting obviously does not occur to sanction a contrastive interpretation of the purpose clause. If we are to assume that all instances of left dislocation which do not displace a constituent in focus must be instances of topicalization (i.e., must occur because a constituent marked as +topic has been probed by a corresponding left-peripheral head), we then run into the problem of having to justify why some of such cases feel more topic-like than others. If we postulate that fronting in (23) occurs to realign an otherwise prosodically misaligned structure, on the other hand, there is no need to find a semantic or syntactic justification for the fronting operation. The fact that the various constituents which are dislocated through polarity fronting do not form a homogeneous class in semantic or pragmatic terms then follows<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>19</sup> Note that claiming that polarity fronting does not occur as a result of a left-peripheral Topic head probing for a matching constituent does not mean that constituents which are dislocated through polarity fronting can never be interpreted as topical (see for instance section VI.III, where I suggests that in the litotes kind of BNF, the fronted expression is interpreted as a contrastive topic). Polarity fronting is a process through which non-focused material is dislocated to the left periphery of a sentence; if a contrast set is available for such non-focused expression, its interpretation as (contrastive) topic is not only possible but in fact quite natural. Crucially, this does not mean that fronting occurs to license such an interpretation, but rather that such an interpretation is available for the fronted constituent as a result of the presence of a contrast set,



which entails that neither the property of being polite, nor the property of being neither polite nor impolite, holds of him. Speaker B replies by asserting that the property of being polite does *not* hold of Raj, thus implying that it is either the property of being impolite, or that of being neither impolite nor polite, which does:

(60)	Impolite	Neither polite nor impolite	Polite
Speaker A	✓(asserted)	× (entailed)	× (entailed)
Speaker B	(left open)	(left open)	× (asserted)

B's assertion thus resolves the question of whether Raj is polite (by stating that he is not), but not the question of whether Raj is impolite or simply average-mannered. The existence of a question which has yet to be resolved once B has uttered her piece is how the contrastive topic semantics of the fronted AP is maintained. From Büring (1997, 1999, 2003), we know that, for a contrastive topic to be licit, at least one of the questions in the topic value must remain open after the sentence featuring the topic has been uttered. This is because contrastive topics must not be interpreted exhaustively; this is an implicature triggered by the CT. Now, if the BNF structure in (59) were *not* to be negated, this generalization concerning the felicitous usage of contrastive topics would not be met, and the implicature would be violated. Consider (61):

- (61) \**Gentile*      è      (Italian)  
       \*Polite      he-is

The statement in (61) asserts that the property of being polite holds of Raj, and hence entails that neither the property of being impolite, nor that of being neither polite nor

impolite, holds of him. This resolves all questions in the entailment scale, violating the condition on the usage of contrastive topics put forth by Büring (1999).

What can salvage the structure in (61) is clitic resumption, as shown in (62):

(62) *Gentile lo è* (Italian)  
 Polite it(cl) he-is

The insertion of a clitic salvages the structure in (61) because it makes it possible for the fronted adjective to be contrasted with other APs outside of the entailment scale detailed in (60). A possible contrastive-pair structure for (62) is for instance (63):

(63) *Gentile lo è, ma simpatico non lo è* (Italian)  
 Polite it(cl) he-is, but nice not it(cl) he-is

Note that it would not be possible for the BNF adjective in (26) to be contrasted with “nice”, as shown in (64):

(64) A: *E' simpatico*  
 He-is nice  
 B: #*Gentile non è*  
 #Polite not he-is  
 #‘Well, he is not *polite*’

Note also that if configurations of the likes of (61) are inserted in a structure which makes it clear that the fronted adjective is not to be interpreted as contrastive, they are grammatical as it is, i.e., without any negation. This is the case in (65), a SP structure:

(65) *Vuole essere gentile, e gentile è* (Italian)  
 He-wants to-be kind, and kind he-is

The fact that the parasitic clause in (65) is grammatical even though it is string-identical to (61) shows us that it is the contrastive interpretation of “*gentile*” which renders the presence of negation mandatory in (59).

A similar explanation extends to examples like (66) below, which I take from Cinque (1990:79):

- (66) *In modo scortese, Carlo di solito \*(non) si comporta*  
 In manner rude, Carlo of usual \*(non) REFL. behaves  
 ‘Carlo \*(doesn’t) usually behave rudely’

The most immediate reading (although not the only available one, as we will see below) of verb-final structures like (66) is a polarity focus reading. Accordingly, we might expect that what the speaker is trying to say with the ungrammatical version of (66) –the positive-polarity one– is essentially something along the lines of “it *is* the case that Carlo generally acts in a rude manner”. In (66), the fronted element is not clitic-resumed: it could not, as Italian has no corresponding clitic for this type of element. The lack of clitic resumption entails that the fronted element must be interpreted within its entailment scale, namely something along the lines of *in a rude manner*  $\Rightarrow$  *in a slightly rude manner*  $\Rightarrow$  *not in a polite manner*. (66) is then infelicitous because stating that Carlo has acted impolitely already resolves the questions of whether or not he has acted politely, and that of whether or not Carlo has acted like the average human being on a normal day: we know he has not.

As no corresponding clitic is available for the fronted prepositional modifier in (66), we cannot use clitic resumption to salvage the structure like we did in (62). We can however insert a post-verbal lexical element to ensure that the sentence is not interpreted as featuring a polarity focus, as I have done in (67). This is because removing the focus from

the polarity has a salvaging effect which is similar to the one clitic resumption has: stating that Carlo acts rudely when he is dealing with Paolo leaves open the question of how he behaves with other people. Note that, in (67), the extraction of “*in modo scortese*” is now grammatical even if the sentence has a positive polarity:

- (67) *In modo scortese, Carlo di solito si comporta con Paolo*  
 In manner rude, Carlo of usual REFL. behaves with Paolo  
 ‘It is with Paolo that Carlo usually behaves in a rude way’

To the extent to which a salient alternative for the VP can be thought of, one does not even need to add any post-verbal lexical element to ensure that a polarity focus reading is absent. This is particularly challenging in (66), because of the present tense specification on the verb, and the fact that the verb itself is a rather generic term, so it is hard to find other verbs with which this could be contrasted. Consider then (68), where I use the more specific “introduced himself”:

- (68) *In modo scortese, Carlo si è (solo) presentato.*  
 In manner rude, Carlo REFL. is (only) introduced.  
*Per il resto della serata, è-stato un perfetto gentleman.*  
 For the remainder of-the evening, he-was a perfect gentleman.  
 ‘When he introduced himself, Carlo was rude. For the rest of the evening, he was a perfect gentleman’

Again, the fact that (68) is syntactically identical to (66) shows that there is nothing intrinsically ungrammatical in the derivation of (66). The grammaticality of (68) is thus additional evidence that it is not negation *per se* which salvages extraction, but rather

whether or not the fronted element is to be interpreted contrastively, and the nature of what is in focus<sup>20</sup>.

#### VI.IV Locality, CLLD and *Last Resort* Operations

In subsection IV.II, I used the local nature of cliticless instances of fronting to argue for a PF analysis of the operation itself: movement takes place uniquely to ensure that the surface structure is prosodically aligned, and as such it is locally constrained. This is clearly not the case for CLLD, as the fronted, clitic-resumed topic can land in a position other than the first one immediately outside of a main stress position. The potentially non-local nature of CLLD is optimally illustrated in example (30), which I repeat below. (30) was used to illustrate the salvaging effect of clitic resumption on non-local instances of what would otherwise be SP:

---

<sup>20</sup> Note that a contrastive-interpretation explanation of the obligatoriness of negation still does not explain why quantity phrases like “much” or “little” cannot be fronted in positive polarity environments:

- (i)    \**Poco*     *ha*                 *detto. In effetti, non*  
           \*Little   (s)he-has         said. In         fact, not  
           *ha*         *detto niente.*  
           (s)he-has   said     nothing.

Assume that “*poco*” in (i) is interpreted as contrasted to other quantity expressions such as “nothing”, as the continuation in (i) suggests. The statement in (i) still leaves it open -at least assuming a purely logical, non-pragmatic interpretation of “little”- whether he or she has said at least something, or has said nothing at all. Yet fronting results in ungrammaticality. Clearly, some additional factor must be at play in (i). I leave the issue of what this factor may be to future research.

- (30) *Vuole essere gentile, ma gentile non credo che lo sia*  
 He-wants to-be kind, but kind not I-believe that it(cl) he-is

Does the non-local nature of CLLD mean that prosodic factors play no role in determining the surface position of the topic? Yes and no. On the one hand, we have to assume that the prosodic rule which requires main stress to be right-aligned is inescapable, in the sense that it applies regardless of how any possible offending constituent may be removed from the position where main stress is assigned. All CLLD structures will then be compliant with such prosodic rule, exactly like those movement operations for which a purely prosodic derivation has been suggested. On the other hand, if the fronted adjective in (30) were dislocated because of prosody alone, we would expect it to be stuck in the intermediate CP. Clearly, some other mechanism must be responsible for the fact that “*gentile*” in (30) performs an additional movement step, landing in the matrix left periphery of the concessive clause.

In [Author, submitted], I presented an analysis of CLLD as an operation taking place in order to evacuate a constituent out of a given focal domain. The modifier ‘focal’ is here to be interpreted semantically in the sense of Rooth (1985, 1992): with ‘focal domain’, I am referring to any portion of the sentence whose interpretation is dependent on a set of alternative propositions. The CLLD topic must evacuate a domain marked as focal in order not to be interpreted as being part of a portion of the sentence for which alternatives must be calculated. How this works is illustrated for (69,B), a *because*-clause featuring a CLLD topic:



(69) Context: Maurizio and Mirela are a couple (Italian)

A: *Perchè a Maurizio gli hai regalato un cavatappi?*

Why to Maurizio to-him(cl) you-have given a corkscrew?

B: *(Gli ho regalato un cavatappi) perché a*

(To-him(cl) I-have given a corkscrew) because to

Mirela *le avevo regalato UNA BOTTIGLIA DI VINO*

Mirela to-her(cl) I-had given A BOTTLE OF WINE

The relevant notion to capture the surface position of the topic in (69,B) is that of *nested* focal levels. If we adopt a semantic definition of what counts as ‘focal’, B’s reply in (69) features two focal levels: a first, outer level, which comprises everything to the right of “because” (CLLD topic included), and which gives rise to a set of alternative because-propositions, i.e., a set of alternative answers to the *why* question as a whole. A second level of focalization is then present at the level of the direct object; focalization at this level gives rise to a series of alternative propositions where only the referent of the direct object varies. These two levels are shown in (70):

(70) *Perché* [<sub>FOC2</sub> a Mirela *le avevo regalato* [<sub>FOC1</sub> *UNA*  
 Because [<sub>FOC2</sub> to Mirela to-her(cl) I-had given [<sub>FOC1</sub> A  
*BOTTIGLIA DI VINO*]]  
 BOTTLE OF WINE]]

**Focus value of Foc2:**

{ {because I had given Mirela a knife, ..., because I had given Mirela two bottles of pinot grigio}, {because he likes wine, ..., because he needed one} }

**Focus value of Foc1:**

{because I had given Mirela a knife, ..., because I had given Mirela two bottles of pinot grigio}

The PP “*a Mirela*” fronts to a position *following* the *wh*-element, rather than landing *above* it (also a grammatical possibility for CLLD topics, see Rizzi & Bocci 2017), because this constituent is part of each of the propositions which are computed for the inner focus level (Foc1, the focus value associated with the narrow focus on the direct object), but may not be part of the propositions which are calculated at the outer focus level, Foc2. This is because possible answers to the question of why Maurizio was given a corkscrew might not include any mention to Mirela at all, as one can see from the composition of the focus value of Foc2<sup>21</sup>.

---

<sup>21</sup> Had the PP “*a Mirela*” fronted to a position preceding “because”, this constituent would have been interpreted as featuring in each of the alternative propositions computed as possible answers to whatever “why” question would warrant the presence of a “because” answer. This type of structure would have not made much sense given (69,A), but would be compatible with a scenario like (i) below:

(i) A: *Perché hai regalato dei cavatappi a Maurizio e a Mirela?*

‘Why did you give corkscrews to Maurizio and Mirela?’

B: <u>A Mirela</u> ,	<i>perché</i>	<i>ha</i>	<i>perso</i>	<i>il</i>	<i>suo</i> .
<u>To Mirela</u> ,	because	she-has	lost	the	hers.
<u>A Maurizio</u> ,	<i>perchè</i>	<u>a Giovanna</u>	<i>le</i>	<i>ho</i>	
<u>To Maurizio</u> ,	because	<u>to Giovanna</u>	to-her	I-have	
<i>regalato</i>	<i>una</i>	<i>bottiglia di</i>	<i>Pinot Grigio</i>		
given	a	bottle of	Pinot Grigio.		

A focal domain can be quite extended: alternatives may be calculated for the entire sentence, as evidenced by the existence of broad focus environments. On the assumption that a CLLD topic must evacuate any focal domain whose associated alternatives propositions must all feature such topic, the non-local nature of CLLD is accounted for: the clitic-resumed topic will move as far as it is necessary for it to sit outside of such a focal domain.

If the above analysis is on the right track, there are thus different possible triggers behind the fronting of non-focused material. One such trigger is prosodic in nature: it is the need for a constituent to evacuate a position where main stress is assigned. Another one is the need to evacuate a focal domain; we may refer to it as ‘semantic’. Out of the two types of triggers, only the latter one has an effect on the syntax<sup>22</sup> of the construction where fronting occurs.

As noted above, these two triggers partially overlap with respect to their end results: all instances of CLLD, which are arguably the result of the semantic type of trigger, are still compatible with the application of the prosodic one. How does one regulate the application of partially overlapping triggers? Although it might in principle be possible to argue that, in configurations like (30) above, both triggers apply, this does not appear to be a feasible solution. If the semantic trigger were to apply first (landing “*gentile*” in its matrix CP position), the prosodic trigger would apply vacuously; this would be excluded on grounds of economy. If prosody were to apply first and the semantic trigger last, we would obtain the correct surface structure, but at the price of suggesting that prosodic transformations take place first, and operations which have an effect on the syntax apply last. This would go against not only the general gist of this article, where I have suggested

---

<sup>22</sup> See again the absence of reconstruction for binding exhibited by CLLD, subsection III.IV.

that some fronting operations do not affect the syntax of a sentence precisely because they only apply at a later stage, PF. It would also go against the idea, variously presented by a number of different authors (see in particular Chomsky & Lasnik 1977; Chomsky 1981, 1986, 1995), that transformations affecting the prosodic make-up of an utterance take place after transformations affecting the syntax have taken place. A more reasonable analysis is then to argue that fronting as a result of a prosodic trigger is a *last-resort* operation, applying only if no other operation has taken place which would have likewise resulted in non-focused constituents no longer appearing in a main-stress position. Under this line of analysis, a clitic-resumed topic would then always move in order to escape a *semantic* focal domain, even in those instances of CLLD in which fronting is local and hence where prosodic and semantic factors are confounded.

## VII. Conclusion

In this article, I have provided an overview of two different strategies used in Romance languages to mark the presence of a narrow polarity focus: through the fronting of non-focused material and through the insertion of polarity particles.

Different polarity focus strategies correlate with different pragmatic types of PolFoc: I have shown in particular that particle strategies associate with the presence of *emphatic* focus, whereas polarity fronting strategies correlate with *contrastive* PolFoc. I have then argued that polarity fronting strategies arise as an attempt to repair a prosodically misaligned structure: to obtain the desired PolFoc interpretation, main stress must be assigned to the finite verb. Any constituent intervening between the finite verb and the sentence-final position, where main stress is by default assigned, must therefore evacuate this position. This is because Romance languages are stress-rigid, and therefore deviations

from prosodically right-aligned structures are only tolerated in pragmatically marked contexts. Particle strategies, which encode *verum PolFoc*, perform the exact opposite function: a particle which is assigned main stress is merged in a position other than the rightmost one, thereby generating a prosodically marked structure which goes to match the markedness on the pragmatic dimension. In this respect, it is telling that those instances of *PolFoc* which license a prosodically misaligned structure are also the same types of focus which, when applied to a nominal expression, license its fronting to the left periphery even in stress-rigid languages like Italian and Spanish.

Unlike CLLD, polarity fronting is never accompanied by clitic resumption. I have argued that the absence of clitic resumption correlates with the absence of reconstruction of the fronted element: cliticless instances of fronting reconstruct for both binding and scope. I have then used the total reconstruction nature of polarity fronting, as well as its local nature, as an argument for its PF nature: whenever the fronted constituent is not clitic-resumed, its movement takes place at prosodic form. As the fronting takes place at PF, the movement has no effect on the syntax, hence the lack of clitic resumption.

Some instances of polarity fronting require negation to be licensed. I have argued that this occurs whenever the fronted expression is interpreted with respect to a contrast set, in which case the absence of negation results in the violation of a conventional implicature (Büring 1999, 2003; Giurgea 2015) requiring contrastive topics not to be interpreted exhaustively. This is because the absence of clitic resumption in *PolFoc* environments forces the identification of the contrast set associated with the contrastive topic with its entailment scale. This results in the infelicitousness of cliticless fronting in positive polarity environments because the contrastive statement leaves none of the questions in the topic value of the CT unresolved.

## VIII. References

- Abeillé, A., Godard, D., & Sabio, F. (2008). Two types of preposed NP in French. *15th HPSG Conference*, 306-324. CSLI on-line Publications.
- Arregi, K. (2003). Clitic left dislocation is contrastive topicalization. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 9(1), 4.
- Avesani, C., & Vayra, M. (2003). Broad, narrow and contrastive focus in Florentine Italian. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* vol. 2, 1803-1806.
- Benincà, P., Salvi, G., & Frison, L. (1988). L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, 1, 115-225.
- van Bergen, G., & de Hoop, H. (2009). Topics cross-linguistically. *The Linguistic Review, Special Issue on Topics Cross-Linguistically* 26, 173-176.
- Bocci, G. (2013). *The Syntax Prosody Interface: A cartographic perspective with evidence from Italian* (Vol. 204). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bianchi, V., & Bocci, G. (2012). Should I stay or should I go? Optional focus movement in Italian. *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics* 9, 1-18.
- Bianchi, V., Bocci, G., & Cruschina, S. (2014). *Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and the evaluative dimension*. Manuscript, available at: < <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/002166>>
- Bianchi, V., Bocci, G., & Cruschina, S. (2015). Focus fronting and its implicatures. *Romance Languages und Linguistic Theory 2013: Selected papers from Going Romance*, Amsterdam 2013, 1-19.

- Bianchi, V., Bocci, G., & Cruschina, S. (2016). Focus fronting, unexpectedness, and evaluative implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 9.3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/sp.9.3>
- Büring, D. (1997). *The meaning of topic and focus: The 59th Street Bridge accent*. London: Routledge.
- Büring, D. (1999). Topic. *Focus – Linguistic Cognitive and Computational Perspectives*, P. Bosch and R.v.der Sand (eds), 142-165. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Büring, D. (2003). On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26, 511-545.
- Büring, D. (2016). (Contrastive) Topic. *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. Oxford University Press.
- Cable, S. (2008). Wh-fronting (in Hungarian) is not focus-fronting. *Manuscript, University of Massachusetts, Amherst & University of British Columbia*.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Barriers* (Vol. 13). MIT press.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). The minimalist program (current studies in linguistics 28). *Cambridge et al.*
- Chomsky, N., & Lasnik, H. (1977). Filters and control. *Linguistic inquiry*, 8(3), 425-504.
- Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of  $\bar{A}$ -dependencies*. MIT press.
- Cecchetto, C. (1999). A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53(1), 40-67.

- Cecchetto, C. (2001). Syntactic or semantic reconstruction? Evidence from pseudoclefts and clitic left dislocation. *Semantic interfaces*, 90-144.
- Costa, J. (1998). *Word order variation: a constrained-based approach* (Doctoral dissertation, LOT Utrecht).
- Cresti, D. (1995). Extraction and reconstruction. *Natural Language Semantics* 3(1), 79-122.
- Cruschina, S. (2010). Syntactic extraposition and clitic resumption in Italian. *Lingua*, 120(1), 50-73.
- Cruschina, S. (2012). *Discourse-related features and functional projections*. Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, S. (2016). *Licensing Focus Movement: Distributional and Interpretive Properties*. Handout, 1<sup>st</sup> SynCart workshop, 11-15 July 2016.
- Dimroth, C., Andorno, C., Benazzo, S. & Verhagen, J. (2010). Given claims about new topics. How Romance and Germanic speakers link changed and maintained information in narrative discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 3328-3344.
- Erteschik-Shir, N. (1997). *The dynamics of focus structure*. Cambridge University Press.
- Engdahl, E. (2006). Information packaging in questions. In Bonami, Olivier and Patricia Cabredo-Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 6, 93–111.
- Face, T. (2001). Focus and early peak alignment in Spanish intonation. *Probus* 13(2), 223-246.
- Farkas, D. F., & Bruce, K. B. (2010). On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of semantics* 27(1), 81-118.



- Fernández Soriano, O. (1993). Sobre el orden de palabras en español. *DICENDA. Cuadernos de filología hispánica*.
- Frascarelli, M. (2004). Dislocation, clitic resumption and minimality: a comparative analysis of left and right topic constructions. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2002: Selected Papers from "Going Romance," Groningen, 28-30 November 2002*, 256-99.
- Frascarelli, M., & Hinterhölzl, R. (2007). Types of topics in German and Italian. *On information structure, meaning and form: Generalizations across languages*, edited by Kerstin Schwabe and Susanne Winkler, 87-116. DOI: 10.1075/la.100.07fra.
- Frota, S. (2002). Nuclear falls and rises in European Portuguese: a phonological analysis of declarative and question intonation. *Probus 14*(1), 113-146.
- Ginzburg, J. (1996). Interrogatives: questions, facts and dialogue. In Lappin, Shalom(ed.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, 385–422. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Giurgea, I. (2015). Bare quantifier Fronting as contrastive topicalization. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics 17*(2), 23-38.
- Gutzmann, D., Hartmann, K., & Matthewson, L. (2017). *Verum focus is verum, not focus*.
- Halliday, M. A. (1967). Notes on transitivity and theme in English Part II. *Journal of linguistics 3*(1), 37-81.
- Hamlaoui, F., & Szendrői, K. (2015). A flexible approach to the mapping of intonational phrases. *Phonology 32*(1), 79-110.
- Heim, I. (1982). *The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst).

- Höhle, T. N. (1992). Über verum-fokus im deutschen. In Jacobs, Joachim (ed.), *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, 112–141. Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Horn, L. (1989). *A natural history of negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Krifka, M. (2001). For a structured meaning account of questions and answers. *Audiatur vox sapientia. a festschrift for Arnim Von Stechow* 52, 287-319.
- Lechner, W. (1998). Two kinds of reconstruction. *Studia Linguistica* 52(3), 276-310.
- van Leusen, N. (2004). Incompatibility in context: A diagnosis of correction. *Journal of Semantics* 21(4), 415-415.
- Leonetti, M., & Escandell-Vidal, V. (2009). Fronting and verum focus in Spanish. *Focus and background in Romance languages*, 155-204.
- Lyding, V., Stemle, E., Borghetti, C., Brunello, M., Castagnoli, S., Dell'Orletta, F., & Pirrelli, V. (2014). The PAISA corpus of italian web texts. *Proceedings of the 9th Web as Corpus Workshop (Wac-9)* (pp. 36-43).
- Ortega-Santos, I. (2016). *Focus-related operations at the right edge in Spanish: Subjects and ellipsis* (Vol. 7). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Poletto, C., & Zanuttini, R. (2013). Emphasis as reduplication: Evidence from sì che/no che sentences. *Lingua* 128, 124-141.
- Reinhart, T. (1981). Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica* 27(1), 53-94.
- Reinhart, T. (1995). Interface strategies. *Uil OTS Working Papers in Theoretical Linguistics*, 95–102.

- Reinhart, T. (2006). Interface strategies. Optimal and Costly Computations. *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs* 45.
- Rizzi, L. & Bocci, G. (2017). The left periphery of the clause. *The Companion to Syntax*, 2nd edition, edited by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer
- Rizzi, L. (2001). On the position “Int(errogative)” in the left periphery of the clause. *Current studies in Italian syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi. Elsevier, Amsterdam: 287-296.
- Rizzi, L. (2004a). Locality and left periphery: Structures and beyond. *The cartography of syntactic structures* 3, 223-251.
- Rizzi, L. (Ed.). (2004b). *The structure of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures, vol. 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 52-75.
- Rizzi, L. (2013). Notes on cartography and further explanation. *International Journal of Latin and Romance Linguistics* 25(1), 197-226.
- Roberts, C. (1996). Information structure: Towards an integrated theory of formal pragmatics. In Yoon, Jae-Hak and Andreas Kathol (eds.), OSU Working Papers in Linguistics, Volume 49: Papers in Semantics, 91–136.
- Rooth, M. (1985). *Association with focus*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst).
- Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural language semantics* 1(1), 75-116.

- Rullmann, H. (1995). *Maximality in the semantics of wh-constructions* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst).
- Saito, M. (1989). Scrambling as semantically vacuous A'-movement. *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure*.
- Samek-Lodovici, V. (2005). Prosody–syntax interaction in the expression of focus. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23(3), 687-755.
- Samek-Lodovici, V. (2006). When right dislocation meets the left-periphery.: A unified analysis of Italian non-final focus. *Lingua* 116(6), 836-873.
- Samek-Lodovici, V. (2015). *The interaction of focus, givenness, and prosody: A study of Italian clause structure*. Oxford University Press.
- Sauerland, U., & Elbourne, P. (2002). Total reconstruction, PF movement, and derivational order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33(2), 283-319.
- Schwarzschild, R. (1999). GIVENness, AvoidF and other constraints on the placement of accent. *Natural language semantics* 7(2), 141-177.
- Stalnaker, R. C. (1978). *Assertion*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Szendrői, K. (2001). *Focus and the syntax-phonology interface*. (Doctoral dissertation, UCL, University College London).
- Szendrői, K. (2002). Stress-focus correspondence in Italian. *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000: Selected Papers from "Going Romance" 2000, Utrecht, 30 November-2 December*, 232 - 287.

Szendrői, K. (2003). A stress-based approach to the syntax of Hungarian focus. *The Linguistic Review* 20, 37–78.

Szendrői, K. (2017). The syntax of information structure and the PF interface. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 2(1).

Vallduví, E., & Engdahl, E. (1996). The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics* 34(3), 459-520.

van der Wouden, T. (1996). Litotes and downward monotonicity. *Negation: a notion in focus* 7, 145.

Zimmermann, M. (2008). Contrastive focus and emphasis. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica*, 55(3-4), 347-360.

Zubizarreta, M. L. (1998). Prosody, Focus, and Word Order. *Linguistic inquiry monographs* 33. MIT Press.