

KANSAI GAIDAI UNIVERSITY

Phase and Phase Collapse : A Study of Topicalization and Focusing (Part 1)

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 関西外国語大学・関西外国語大学短期大学部 公開日: 2016-09-05 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 大島, 新 メールアドレス: 所属: 関西外国語大学
URL	https://doi.org/10.18956/00006351

Phase and Phase Collapse:

A Study of Topicalization and Focusing (PART I)*

Shin Oshima

1. Introduction

This paper attempts to bring to light some facts about topicalization and focusing in Japanese in light of the recent findings about these phenomena in other languages like English, German, Italian, Spanish, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Basque, Somali, Greek, etc., and especially Korean. It then proposes a crosslinguistic account of topic and focus preposing in terms of Topic and Focus Projection, although the Hindi-Urdu type may need a separate treatment (Kidwai 1999).¹

This account takes a new approach to the issues at hand, dealing with the contrastive behavior of topics and foci with regard to further extraction, claiming that Topic Phrase (TopP) constitutes a “strong phase” in the sense of Chomsky (2000b). Apparent counterexamples to this are due to a strategy dubbed “Phase Collapse,” I claim. This account naturally extends to P-stranding, etc.

It has been known since Culicover (1992) that focus preposing must be distinguished from topicalization proper, even though the old confusion of the two still persists. Crosslinguistically, preposed topical phrases typically represent topics which have already been established (Rodman 1974), carry no accent (as opposed to a newly introduced topic, which does carry an accent (Lambrecht 1994), form intonational phrases by themselves (Frascarelli 2000, etc.), and create an island for extraction from within. In contrast, preposed focal elements constitute “the informative part” (Casielles-Suárez (henceforth, C-S) 1997), carry high pitch and stress (cf. recent instrumental research such as Hayes & Lahiri 1991, Féry 1992, Gussenhoven 1992, etc.), and most importantly, do not create an island. This preposed focus invariably represents “contrastive focus.”

Furthermore, focus fronting unlike topicalization serves a function similar to other forms of focalization such as in situ focus with high pitch and stress, focus particles (e.g., only, even in

English, nur ‘only,’ sogar ‘even,’ in German (Bayer 1996, 1999), csak ‘only’ in Hungarian (Kiss 1998), solo, soltanto ‘only’ in Italian (Frascarelli 2000), etc.), –hi cliticization in Hindi-Urdu (Kidwai 1999), and clefts/pseudoclefts. Although I use pre-Minimalist devices of description for expository convenience in this paper, my theoretical framework is that of the Minimalist Program, particularly the one currently evolving around Chomsky (2000a, b).

2. The Basic Facts about Topicalization and Focalization

Let us see the findings in the literature about the distinctions between topicalization and focusing, restricting our attention to topic and focus preposing. It seems that topicalization typically requires preposing of the topic in clear contrast to focusing. Focalization may take other forms in some languages at least, as noted above.

Consider the following cases of topicalization, which involves obligatory topic fronting: an in situ topic is unacceptable as in (1’).

- (1) a. Robin, I really dislike. To Robin, I gave a book.
 On the table, Lee put books. (Culicover 1992)
- b. Zanaeh Ivan [ce ste hodi na kino]
 knew-1s Topic that will go-3s into movie-theater
 ‘I knew that Ivan will go to the movie.’ (Bulgarian, Rudin 1986)
- c. (Ich glaube) seine Steuern hat Hans noch nicht bezahlt.
 I believe his taxes has H. yet not paid
 ‘(I believe) his taxes, John hasn’t paid yet.’
 (German, adapted from Rohrbacher’s (1999:16) (9g))
- d. Gianni, lo ho visto.
 Gianni him saw
 ‘Gianni, I saw.’ (Italian CLLD, Cinque 1990)²
- e. A Juan lo vi ayer.
 PREP John him saw-1sg yesterday
 ‘John, I saw yesterday.’ (Spanish CLLD, C-S 1997)
- f. Cette fille-la, je la deteste.
 that girl-there I her hate (French CLLD, Ruetw 1982)
 [The glosses are mine; I take this to be a case of CLLD in French.]
- g. to vivlio to-edhose i Maria sto Yani.
 the-acc book it-gave-3s the-nom Maria to-the-acc Yani

- 'In the SPRING John visited Leningrad.' (Spanish, C-S 1997)
- c. Ein BUCH habe ich Maria geschenkt.
a book have I Mary given (German)
- d. CHAEK-un Cheolsu-ga Mary-ege suessda.
BOOK-FOC NOM DAT gave (Korean, Park 1998)
- e. JONEK uste dut [t' esan du-ela Mikelek [t idatzi du-ela eskutitza
JON think AUX say AUX-that Mikel write AUX-that letter
(Basque, Ortiz de Urbina 1999)
- f. MIYUKI-NI-WA Ken-ga hon-o ageta.
DAT-FOC NOM book-ACC gave (Japanese)
- g. A MARIA beijou o Pedro
Mary kissed Peter (Portuguese, Ambar 1999)
- h. To VIVLIO edhose i Maria sto Yani.
the-acc book gave-3s the-nom Maria to-the-acc Yani
'It is the book that Maria gave to Yani.'
(Modan Greek, Tsimpli 1995)

Topicalization gives rise to comma intonation in English (1a), Korean (1i), Japanese (1j), Italian CLLD (1d), Spanish CLLD (1e), and French CLLD (1f), Basque (1k), unlike focus preposing. In German topicalization does not induce comma intonation, presumably due to the V2 nature of the constructions, in which a topic (or a focus) moves to the clause-initial position (see § 4.1). Topics typically do not carry high pitch and stress. See Frascarelli (2000) for an in-depth study of phonology of focus and topic.

It seems that (English-style) topicalization involves movement, for it is subject to island conditions. This is shown by Chomsky (1977) for English, and by Webelhuth (1989) for German: they demonstrate that topicalization and scrambling observe island conditions. It may be that (this type of) topicalization does not involve the movement of a topic phrase itself. The phrase may well be base-generated in topic position (perhaps the outer SpecTopP), and it is the associated null operator that moves to the position immediately following the topic phrase (perhaps the inner SpecTopP), basically Chomsky's (1977) analysis. For some evidence for this view, see Barbosa (1999), who observes that in a sentence like "Some students I could not introduce to every teacher," the initial topic cannot be interpreted with narrow scope with respect to the universal quantifier phrase every teacher. She goes on to say that this suggests that the topic is base-generated in initial position, because if it were moved there, reconstruction

of the topic would give rise to the narrow scope reading of the topic. The null operator movement then will be subject to island conditions. I will abstract away from the distinction between these two views of (English-style) topicalization in the rest of this paper, and I will adopt for expository convenience the view that the topic itself moves, because the distinction does not affect our main point about topicalization creating an island for extraction.

In Korean, a topic cannot be extracted out of a conditional clause nor from a relative clause, as Park (1998) shows, and the same facts obtain in Japanese. This presumably indicates that TWGs (see note 3) involve movement, subject to island conditions in Korean and Japanese too:

- (3) a. [Bom-i o-meyonun], kkodd-i pinda.
 spring-NOM come-Cond flower-NOM bloom
 ‘If spring comes, flowers will bloom.’ [my translation]
 b. *Bom_i-un [_{t_i} o-meyon], kkodd-i pinda.
 TOP COND (Korean, Park 1998:34) [ditto]
- (3') a. [Haru-ga ku-reba], hana-ga saku. (= (3a))
 spring-NOM come-if(COND) flower-NOM bloom
 b. *Haru_i wa [_{t_i} ku-reba], hana-ga saku (= (3b)) (Japanese)
- (4) a. [Mok-i gi-n] simsung
 neck-NOM long-REL animal
 ‘an animal whose neck is long’ [my translation]
 b. *Mok_i-un [_{t_i} gi-n] simsung
 TOP REL (Korean, Park 1998:35) [ditto]
- (4) a. [Kubi-ga nagai] doobutu (= (4a))
 neck-NOM long animal
 b. *[Kubi]_i-wa [_{t_i} nagai]] doobutu (= (4b)) (Japanese)

The relativization data about Japanese confirms the above conclusion about TWGs involving movement: topicalization out of relativization is banned:

- (5) a. Ken-ga [_{DP} [_{CP} Miki-ga _{t_j} aisiteiru OP_j] otoko-o_i] sitteiru.
 NOM NOM love REL man-ACC know
 ‘Ken knows the man Miyuki loves.’
 b. *Miki_i-wa [Ken-ga [_{DP} [_{CP} _{t_i} _{t_j} aisiteiru OP_j] otoko-o_j] sitteiru].

By contrast, CLLD in Italian and Spanish is assumed to be base-generated, as observed in note 2. Somali CLLD is claimed to be so generated (Svolacchia et al. 1995), and so is Modern Greek (Tsimpli 1995). We will return to this issue later.

Unlike focus preposing, topicalization creates an island for further extraction in English, as shown by Culicover (1992):

- (6) a. *This book_i, to Robin_j I gave t_i t_j.
 b. *Which books_i did Lee say that to Robin_j, she will give t_i t_j?
 c. *This is the book which_i, to Robin_j, I gave t_i t_j.
 (6') a. This book_i, to ROBIN_j I gave t_i t_j.
 b. Which book_i did Lee say that to ROBIN_j she gave t_i t_j?
 c. This is the book which_i, to ROBIN_j, I gave t_i t_j.

In (6), topicalization of to Robin blocks further extraction: topicalization in (6a), wh-question operator movement in (6b), wh-relative operator movement in (6c). In contrast, focus preposing of to ROBIN in (6') does not prevent comparable extraction in (6'a)-(6'c). (6'a) shows that a topic and a preposed focus may cooccur in this order. See § 3. Spanish behaves in the same way in this regard (C-S 1997). Cf. (20a) below.

TWGs in Korean also show the same properties, inducing the topic island effect, again as opposed to focus fronting.

- (7) Mary-eg-e, [John-i [gu *chaek-un/CHAEK-un, Youngsu-ga t_i t_j
 DAT NOM that book-TOP/BOOK-FOC NOM
 suessda-go] saenggakhanda].
 gave-COMP believes
 'To Mary, John believes that that book/BOOK Youngsu gave.'
 (Park 1998:65) [my translation]

Note that Korean has an affix particle -(n)un, which serves either as a focus marker when it is associated with high pitch and stress or as a topic marker when it is not, as Park points out. Incidentally, both a preposed focus and an in-situ one are marked with the focus marker (like in Japanese and unlike in Berber, in which only the preposed one is so marked (Ouhalla 1991)).

I take it that the Japanese particle -wa behaves similarly: it may be either a focus marker or a topic marker depending on the presence of high pitch and stress.⁴ The distinction between these uses of -wa is not often made in Japanese linguistics, but it is crucial to understanding of possibilities of further extraction.

Consider (8a), containing two TWGs, and (8b, c), containing one TWG plus one focus.

- (8) a. ??Sono hon-wa Miki-ni-wa, Ken-ga t_i t_j ageta. 'That book, to Miki,
 that book-TOP DAT-TOP NOM gave Ken gave.'
 b. *SONO HANA-WA Miki-ni-wa, Ken-ga t_i t_j ageta. 'That FLOWER

THAT FLOWER-FOC DAT-TOP NOM gave to Miki, Ken gave.'

- c. Sono hon_F-wa, MIKI-NI_J-WA Ken-ga t_j t_i ageta.

that book-TOP DAT-FOC NOM gave

'That book, to MIKI Ken gave.'

Most of the native speakers I asked say that (8a) is less than perfect, concurring with me in judgement. There is a clear contrast in status between (8a) and (8c): the high pitch plus stress removes deviancy in (8a). Those who accept (8a) agree that Miki-ni-wa is to be understood as contrastively focused, not topical, regardless of the presence or absence of high pitch and stress. So it seems that focus preposing, but not topicalization (of the TWG-type), allows subsequent extraction in Japanese too.

In this context, it is important to note that TWOGs in Japanese (see note 3) can be iterated, since they are "base-generated," not moved, so the topic island is irrelevant, as far as topic-topical interaction is concerned. Italian, Spanish, and Modern Greek CLLD, if the topic is indeed base-generated in place, may fall together with Japanese TWOGs in this regard, allowing multiple topics (see Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997, Frascarelli 2000, C-S 1997, and Tsimplici 1995, for acceptability of multiple topics in these languages). These considerations lead us to believe that topicalization in languages like English involves movement (at least, of a null operator, if not of a topic itself – see our discussion above), as we have been assuming all along, for otherwise multiple topicalization would be licensed, contrary to fact, in these languages as well.

The same ban on extraction holds of German topicalization, which induces V2, as shown by Müller & Sternefeld (henceforth, M&S) (1993:481):⁵

- (9) a. *Ich weiß wen_j du sagtest [_{CP} Ede_j habe_k [_{IP} t_j t_i getroffen t_k]].

I know whom you said Ede has_{SUBJ} met

- b. *Den Hans_i sagte sie [_{CP} Ede_j habe_k [_{IP} t_j t_i getroffen t_k]].

ART_{ACC} Hans said she Ede has_{SUBJ} met

They observe in note 18 that the topic island effect holds in Icelandic (Zaenen 1980), in Frisian (de Haan & Weerman 1986), in Swedish (Platzack 1986, Engdahl 1986), and in Yiddish (Travis 1984, etc.).

In German, however, not only topicalization but focus preposing gives rise to island effects, as observed by Park (1998:154). In order to understand why this is so, we must take note of the fact that in German preposed foci and topics both occupy the same sentence-initial position ("Vorfeldposition") and trigger inversion (V2), so they cannot cooccur in the same clause unlike in English, etc.

In German, the sole property that distinguishes topicalization from preposed foci in cases like (10a) and (10b) is phonological: high pitch plus stress on the focus and its absence on the topic. They cannot cooccur in the same sentence and both ban any further extraction, as illustrated in (11).

- (10) a. Das Buch habe ich gelesen. (Park 1998:154)
 that book have I read 'That book, I read.' [my translation]
 b. EIN BUCH habe ich gelesen. (Park 1998: 154)
 A BOOK have I read 'A BOOK I read.' [ditto]
- (11) a. *Was_i glaubst du gestern_j hat der Fritz t_j t_j repariert?
 what believe you yesterday has the Fritz repaired
 'What do you think Fritz repaired yesterday?' (Park 1998:154) [ditto]
 b. *Was_i glaubst du GESTERN_j hat der Fritz t_j t_j repariert?
 'What do you think Fritz repaired YESTERDAY?' (Park 1998:154) [ditto]

We will return to these issues in §§ 4.1.; 4.3.

Notice that in Japanese, while nominals and PPs can be topicalized, finite clauses cannot, unless they are nominalized by a nominalizer koto/no. Clauses can be freely scrambled, however.

- (12) a. [Mary ga kita to]_i (*-wa) Ken-ga t_j itta.
 NOM came COMP (-TOP) NOM said
 'That Mary came, Ken said.' [Scrambling, without wa, is fine.]
 b. [Mary-ga kita]-koto/no_i-wa Ken-ga t_j sitteita.
 NOM came-NOMINAL-TOP NOM knew
 'The fact that Mary came, Ken knew.'

Nonfinite clauses cannot be nominalized, so they fail to be topicalized. They cannot be scrambled either.

- (13) a. Ken-ga [Mary-ni ik](*koto/*no)-aseta.
 NOM DAT go(NOMINAL)-made 'Ken made Mary go.'
 b. *[Mary-ni ik](-koto/no)_i-wa Ken-ga t_j saseta.

Similar facts obtain in Korean: the nominalizer gud enables finite clauses to undergo Move to SpecTopP, but not nonfinite ones. See Park (1998, §§ 3.1.3; 3.1.4).

It seems that these facts generalize to English.

- (14) a. That Mary came, Ken knew t. b. *Mary go, Ken made t.

Apparently the English complementizer that is a nominalizer in this sense. We will return to

these issues in § 4.0.

Multiple foci are only marginally licensed in Japanese unlike in Korean, which licenses them (Choe 1995:280, Park 1998, § 4.2).

- (15) a. ?UMI-NI-WA Ken-ga t_j TOKI-DOKI-WA iku.
SEA-DAT-FOC NOM SOMETIMES-FOC go
- b. ?MIYUKI-NI-WA Ken-ga t_j HANA-WA ageta.
DAT-FOC NOM FLOWER-FOC gave

One focus is preposed to the focus position and the other remains in situ in (15a) and (15b). Thus, it seems that Japanese patterns with other languages such as English, Italian, Spanish, Modern Greek, etc., in that it licenses only a single focus per clause.⁶

Note also that surprisingly the focus position (SpecFocP, as I claim later) might look like an A-position in Japanese (as opposed to Hungarian, etc., in which it is an A'-position (Farkas 1986, Horvath 1986)) in view of the possibility of A-binding from there. But binding facts are inconclusive for the A/A'-status, as shown in detail by Deprez 1991. As is well known, focus behaves as an operator, i.e., moves to an A'-position (a proposal originally made by Chomsky 1976). As for the topic position (SpecTopP), A-binding from it is disallowed, for many people:

- (16) a. KARERA-WA [otagai-no_i sensei-ga sibasiba t_j hihansita].
THEM-FOC each-other's teacher-NOM often criticized
'THEM each other's teacher often criticized.'
- b. *Karera-wa [otagai-no_i sensei-ga sibasiba t_j hihansita].

A further distinction between topicalization and focalization (at least) in English concerns weak crossover (WCO): Lasnik & Stowell (1991) show that focused phrases, but not topicalized ones, behave like true quantifiers, exhibiting WCO effects.

3. Topicalization and Focus Projection

It is well-known that as opposed to languages of the type represented by English, there are "discourse configurational" languages, in which topic and/or focus forms a key constituent, often placed in a designated position (topic position and focus position) in clause structure. The latter type of languages are found in all the continents of the world. To name just a few, we may cite languages like Basque, Catalan, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Modern Greek, Romanian, Turkish, Armenian, Hindi, Nepali, Korean, Japanese, Chinese, Somali, the Chadic languages, the Bantu Aghem and Kikuyu, Yoruba, Berber, Haida, Omaha, Quetchua, Ilonggo, etc. See Kiss (1995, Introduction). Cf. also § 2 above. This fact suggests that topic and focus may each have a

projection of its own.

Lasnik & Saito (1992, Ch.3) propose, following Baltin (1982) among others, that English and Japanese (TWG) topicalization involves adjunction of the topic to IP. As M&S (1993) point out, this analysis is problematical in that while topicalization in English, Japanese, etc., creates an island for extraction, scrambling in German, Japanese, and Russian (Zemakaja 1973), which involves adjunction to IP (among other targets), does not yield island effects.

Consider a German example (17) from M&S (1993:480).

- (17) ...daß dem Fritz, die Geschichte_i [_{IP} niemand _{t_i} _{t_j} glaubt]
 that ART_{DAT} Fritz the story_{ACC} nobody_{NOM} believes
 ‘...that nobody believes Fritz’s story’

Similarly for scrambling in Korean (18a) (taken from Park 1998) and Japanese (18b).

- (18) a. Gu chaek-ul_i Younghi-ege_i [Cheolsu-ga _{t_i} _{t_j} suessda].
 that book-ACC DAT NOM gave [double scrambling]
 ‘That book, to Younghi, Cheolsu gave.’ [my translation]
 b. Sono hon-o_i Miyuki-ni_i [Ken-ga _{t_i} _{t_j} ageta] [double scrambling]
 that book-ACC DAT NOM gave

Another problem with an adjunction analysis of topicalization (of the TWG-type) is that it entails recursivity of topicalization and runs counter to its nonrecursivity. As noted above, topicalization (of this type) crosslinguistically creates an island for further extraction, precluding multiple (TWG-type) topics.

We must then abandon the IP-adjunction analysis of topicalization for English, German, Korean, Japanese, etc. as argued by Grimshaw (1993) for English, by M&S (1993) for German, and by Park (1998) for Korean. I depart from M&S’s position that topics occupy the SpecCP position and propose that the topic position is SpecTopP in view of mounting evidence for the split CP analysis (see Oshima 1994 for English, Rizzi 1997 for Italian, and Park 1998 for Korean). For a different view on this, see Barbosa (1999), who claims that a topic is base-generated in IP-adjoined position. I suggest then that the head Top(ic), realized as wa in Japanese, nun in Korean, etc. but null in languages like English, projects to TopP, merged below the highest clausal projection ForceP of Rizzi (1997), which is responsible for clause typing. I claim then that the topic occupies SpecTopP.

For focus preposing, Farkas (1986), Rochemont & Culicover (1990), Lasnik & Saito (1992), etc. have proposed an analysis in terms of adjunction. However, an analysis of this type runs into a problem of how to license the focus operator, i.e., a preposed focus. An in-

dependent projection of a head Foc(us) will solve the problem. We have reason to believe that such a head is available in language, because some languages at least have overt focus markers. For example, -WA in Japanese, -NUN in Korean, etc. can be taken to be realizations of the head Foc. See note 4 for further examples of overt markers. We need a separate projection for focus, for it positions differently than topic, and also behaves differently with regard to island effects among others. Let us adopt FocP, merged below TopP, following Horvath (1986), Brody (1990, 1995), Oshima (1994), Tsimpli (1995), Rizzi (1997), Park (1998), Frascarelli (2000), etc., where the preposed focus occurs in SpecFocP. I propose (19) then as clause structure.

(19) [_{ForceP} Force [_{TopP} Top [_{FocP} Foc (...) [_{TP} ...]]]]

Top in (19) can be iterated for Japanese TWOGs and Romance CLLD (Rizzi 1997). Cf. our discussion in § 2.

In our terms then, focalization in Hungarian involves raising of a focus to SpecFocP and of a verb (or some other lexical X, if V is absent) to Foc, resulting in the left adjacency of the focus to the verb (or lexical X), a well-known constraint on foci in Hungarian (e.g. (20d) below; cf. Horvath (1986), Kiss (1987, 1998), etc.). For a somewhat different approach to this issue, see Horvath (1995). The right adjacency of a focus to the verb in Aghem (Horvath 1995), in *lu-Ganda* and *lu-Haya* (Hyman 1999), etc. might be captured by further raising of V to an immediately higher head position. No doubt this line of approach must be worked out for these languages, perhaps in terms of parametrized ordering of FocP with respect to other XPs in (19). Clearly this take on word ordering is not innocent. I will put these thorny issues aside.

The hierarchical order of Top relative to Foc in (19) is supported not only by Basque (Ik), English (6'a), Japanese (8c), Korean (Park 1998), but also languages like Spanish, Ewe, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Somali, Italian (Frascarelli 2000:98f., despite Rizzi 1997), Romanian, etc.:

- (20) a. Al jefe, BROCCOL le compraron sus empleados.
to the boss, BROCCOLI cl bought his employees
'His employees bought the boss BROCCOLI.' [my translation]
(Spanish, C-S 1997:182)
- b. kofi lá, núfiálá-(é) wó nyé.
K.TOP teacher a (FOC) 3sg be
'Kofi is a TEACHER.' (Ewe, Ameka 1992, ex. (77))
- c. Ivan dali na vás da se obadi?
Ivan(topic) if to you(focus) to Refl call-3s

(Bulgarian, Rudin 1986:21, ex. (14a))

- d. János [_{VP} Évát várta a mozi előtt].
 John(topic) Eve-ACC(focus) waited the cinema in-front-of
 ‘John wanted for EVE in front of the cinema.’
 (Hungarian, Kiss 1995, ex. (2b))
- e. Shalay Cali warqad buu qoray. (=1h)
 yesterday(topic) C.(topic) letter(focus) FM-he wrote
 ‘Yesterday, Cali wrote A LETTER.’ [FM=focus marker or Foc]
 (Somali, Svolacchia et al. 1995, ex. (38))
- f. Al bambino, UN ROBOT gli devi regalare.
 to-the child a robot to-him must-2SG give as a present
 ‘As for the child, A ROBOT you must give him as a present.’
 (Italian, Frascarelli 2000:98, ex. (34a))
- g. Spunea că, scrisorile, IERI le-a primit, (nu azi)
 said that letters-the YESTERDAY them has received (not today)
 (Romanian, Barbosa (1999), ex. (60a))

4. An Analysis of Topicalization and Focus Preposing

4.0. The Preliminary Remarks

I suggest that the topic features [_{Th(eme)}, _{Top}] (italicization indicates that the feature in question is -Interpretable, otherwise +Interpretable) are freely and optionally assigned to nouns, but not to Force nor to T, as they enter Array. The head Top is filled by a lexical marker (in Japanese, etc.) or an abstract marker (in English, etc.), which bears [_{Top}] in either case. [_{Top}] on a topic phrase is an activating feature in the sense of Chomsky (2000a). An EPP feature on Top triggers movement of a topic to SpecTopP.

This analysis accounts for the fact that DP (or KP, on the theory of Oshima 1999, 2000) and PP (via percolation of the features [_{Th}, _{Top}] up to PP from nouns) may be Pure-merged in SpecTopP as a TWOG or moved there as a TWG, while clauses may not be topicalized, lacking [_{Th}, _{Top}], unless they are nominalized by a nominalizer noun like *koto/no*, with [_{Th}, _{Top}]. See (12)-(13). The same holds for Korean with nominalizers *gud* and *gi* (Park 1998: 48f.). However, finite clauses can be scrambled since no feature Agree/matching is involved in scrambling at least in Japanese.

By contrast, the focus features [_{Foc}] (an activating feature) and [_{±Cont(rast)}] are op-

tionally assigned to any lexical item (or its part even) as it enters Array except inherently focal elements, *wh*-question words, which are specified as bearing [+Foc] among other features in their lexical entries. Assume that a contrastive focus carries [+Foc] and [+Cont], while an informational focus bears [+Foc] and [-Cont]. For motivation for this view, see § 4.2. Focus markers, lexical or abstract, then carry a feature [+Foc].

4.1. An Account of Topic Island Effects

TWGs in the languages we have looked at, invariably have island effects. This can be captured by assuming that along with ForceP, TopP constitutes a “strong Phase (PH)” in the sense of Chomsky (2000b). That is, we split Chomsky’s “CP,” a strong PH, into two separate strong phases, ForceP and TopP.

This proposal has as a consequence that nothing can be extracted from the (c-command) domain of Top under the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC):

- (21) The domain of H is not accessible to operations at ZP, but only H and its edge, in $[_{ZP} Z...[_{HP} \alpha [H YP]]]$, where HP is a strong phase and ZP is the next higher strong phase. (Chomsky 2000b, (8) and (11))

Since ForceP is the next higher strong phase above TopP, Force can access only Top and its Spec, not the domain of Top under the PIC (21), so neither Agree nor Move can operate on anything contained in the domain of Top. SpecTopP then will be an escape hatch like Spec of ForceP. Note that TopP can be embedded only in finite clauses, not in nonfinite ones including raising and ECM infinitivals, so ForceP always sits immediately above TopP. This proposal of TopP as a strong phase thus accounts for topic island effects.

On this view, FocP never creates an island, since it is not a strong phase by assumption. Yet, FocP exceptionally gives rise to island effects in German, as we saw earlier (see (11b)). Notice that German is a V2 language, and does not license cooccurrence of a topic and a focus in a clause. I would like to suggest that in German the head Force always contains both a null affix, which drives “I-to-C” raising, and an EPP feature which can be satisfied by any raised XP. This double movement is responsible for V2.

The “I-to-C” raising is reflected in the fact that some of the Germanic V2 languages display overt complementizer inflection in agreement with the subject of the clause introduced by the complementizer: e.g., West Flemish (Bennis & Haegeman 1983), Bavarian, a dialect of German (Bayer 1984), and Frisian (Zwart 1997). See also a sentence like “Wenn-st du kumm-st?” in Bavarian (Bayer 1984), where the *wh*-word *wenn-st* in SpecForceP has subject inflection -*st*, as

does the finite verb kumm-st. The wh-word with inflection can be taken to arise from I-to-C raising, i.e., agreement of I is raised to C to be encliticized to wenn in Spec of C (cf. Rizzi 1990: 56f.). The INFL which contains V raises to “C,” which is in our terms Force (potentially plus Top and Foc). Assume that German (like its Bavarian dialect, etc.) has a null affixal Top and a null affixal Foc as well as a null affixal Force. The finite verb (the V-I complex) then raises to Force (via Foc/Top) so that it may satisfy Lasnik’s (1981) “Stranded Affix Constraint” (see also Baker 1988).

Our account predicts correctly that either the topic or the focus may sit in SpecForceP, but not both simultaneously – the above mentioned cooccurrence restriction on topics and foci in V2 languages. See (10). It also predicts that focus preposing creates an island in German and other V2 languages. This prediction is borne out by German, at least.

For example, both the topic gestern in (11a) and the focus GESTERN in (11b) raise to the embedded SpecForceP, knocking an EPP feature off Force. So it appears that the wh-question operator cannot move to the embedded SpecForceP. However, the picture is more complicated. So we will return to this point in § 4.3.

Notes

- * This paper has been presented to the audience at the Conference of Okayama *Eibun Gakkai* or The English Literary Society of Okayama (English Linguistics Section) on September 23, 2000. I am grateful to them for their useful comments, especially Michio Wada, who also later read the draft of this paper and gave valuable comments.

I have modified the format of some of the citations from the literature to facilitate understanding by making glosses somewhat uniform in style. For the examples cited from Park (1998) and Czepluch (1996), both German texts, which are not provided with English glosses nor translation, I have supplied them myself throughout the present paper. The same applies to an example from the French texts. In general, when it is helpful, I added my own glosses and translation in other cases as well, duly noted in the text or notes.

1. In this study I will be concerned with contrastive focus, and furthermore, mainly with focus preposing. There is much controversy as to what constitutes the linguistically relevant notion of focus. See Casielles-Suárez (henceforth, C-S) (1997, § 5.3) for a detailed discussion and careful evaluation of a wide range of views on this thorny issue. It seems fair to me to conclude that narrow focus in the sense of C-S (1997: 172f.) is a linguistically relevant notion of focus. C-S characterizes focus as what forms the informative part of the sentence that answers a wh-question.

She divides focus into wide (or broad) and narrow focus: the focus that “projects,” i.e. spreads, and the one that does not, respectively. For example, in “John kicked MARY” with high pitch and stress on MARY, focus “Mary” can project: not only MARY but also kicked MARY or John kicked MARY may constitute focus (see Chomsky 1971). The “projected” focus represents wide focus. In contrast, in “JOHN kicked Mary,” a focus phrase “JOHN” may not project: only “JOHN” can represent focus. This is a case of narrow focus, and so is the “non-projected” focus of the former

example “John kicked MARY.”

Narrow foci come in contrastive and non-contrastive (i.e., informational) varieties. The former type of foci invariably carry high pitch and stress regardless of whether they occur preposed or remain in situ. In contrast, informational foci do not carry such pitch and stress. Wh-question words belong here, hence lack emphatic pitch and stress (Rochemont 1986, etc.). Thus, wh-questions like “What are you writing to Luigi?” ask for answers containing information focus, say, “I’m writing him a letter.” A question “What are you doing?” instead requires a wide focus sentence as an answer: “I am writing a letter to Luigi.” In this answer the verb phrase writing a letter to Luigi containing default stress on Luigi represents focus, i.e., a wide focus. So wh-question words may serve either as informational narrow foci or as wide foci. In contrast, a yes-no question like “Are you writing a fax to Luigi?” may elicit a contrastive focus sentence in response: “No, I’m writing A LETTER to Luigi.” See Frascarelli (2000:104f.).

2. See Cinque (1990, Ch.2) for the properties of “CLLD” (Clitic Left Dislocation) constructions, including violation of Subadjacency. He claims with regard to Italian that the topic in CLLD (i.e., the leftmost constituent in CLLD) (e.g., Gianni in (1d) in the text) is base-generated in this initial position, accompanied by a resumptive clitic (e.g., lo in (1d)). And yet the topic in CLLD is sensitive to island conditions, he contends. Spanish and Modern Greek CLLD apparently shares the same set of properties, as shown by C-S (1997) and Tsimpli (1995), respectively. (In contrast, Frascarelli 2000 shows that some acceptable Italian CLLD sentences do not exhibit WCO nor topic island effects and argues for a base-generation analysis of Italian CLLD.) If this is correct, island effects alone do not establish the movement status of topicalization. But Subadjacency and LF reconstruction effects support a movement analysis of topicalization, at least in languages like English (Cecchetto 1999), though not in languages like Italian with CLLD or Japanese with TWOG (see next note). Note also that Romance CLLD corresponds to topicalization, not Left Dislocation, in English (Rizzi 1997, C-S 1997).
3. Topicalization in Korean comes in two varieties, much as in Japanese: topic either has a gap associated with it (topic with a gap or TWG) or lack such a gap (topic without a gap or TWOG), as Park (1998) shows in detail. TWG and TWOG are illustrated in (i) and (ii) respectively, adapted from Park (1998:55).

(i) gu chaek-un_i [John-i Mary-ege t_j su-ess-da].
the book-TOP NOM DAT gave
‘The book John gave Mary.’ [my translation]

(ii) ssaengsseon [yeone-ga madiss-da].
fish-TOP salmon-NOM is delicious
‘As for fish, salmon tastes good.’
[my translation]

Japanese counterparts are given in (iii) and (iv) below.

(iii) Sono hon-wa_i [John-ga Mary-ni t_j ageta].
the book-TOP NOM DAT gave
‘The book John gave Mary.’

(iv) Sakana-wa [sake-ga oisii].
fish-TOP salmon-NOM is delicious ‘AS for fish, salmon tastes good.’

TWG involves movement, while TWOG is base-generated in place, i.e., merged to TopP to become a Spec of TopP (SpecTopP). This holds for Korean, as Park convincingly shows, as well as for Japanese. As for Japanese, the distinction at hand is well established in Japanese linguistics. Note that the English-type topicalization is TWG, while CLLD is more like TWOG. Cf. note 2.

4. Some languages have neither topic nor focus markers (e.g., English, French, Spanish, Italian, German, Modern Greek, etc.). In contrast other languages do have such markers. Besides Japanese and Korean, quite a few languages employ topic and/or focus particles or affixes, which I take to be realiza-

tions of the heads Top and Foc.

For example, Ewe, a Kwa language, has a topic marker *lá* and a focus marker *é* (Ameka 1992), Akan a topic marker *no* (Ameka 1992), and Quechua a topic marker *-qa*. In Kikuyu, a Bantu language, a single focused constituent occurs immediately following the head of "CP," marked by a focus particle *né* (Clements 1984, Horvath 1995). In Somali every main, declarative clause must have one focused element: a nominal is marked by a nominal focus particle *baa* and a verb by a verbal focus particle *waa* (Lecarme 1991, Svolacchia et al. 1995). Berber has an overt focus marker, a prefix which surfaces as a constituent of the verbal complex: *ay-* (Ouhalla 1991). English-type languages, which lack such overt topic and focus markers, then, have phonologically null topic and focus markers.

5. Czepluch (1996, § 5.3.3) gives the following example as a case of topicalization in German. However, it is more like the left dislocation construction with a resumptive *d*-pronoun.

- (i) *Dieser Kerl*_{NOM}, mid *dem*_{DAT} will ich nichts zu tun haben.
 this fellow with him will I nothing to do have
 'This fellow, with him I will have nothing to do.'
 [The glosses and translation are mine.]

In fact, Riemsdijk (1978:166f.) already identified this construction as Left Dislocation.

6. Multiple foci are marginally allowed in Italian as in other languages, subject to stringent conditions (see Frascarelli 2000:91-93). It is important to note that there are also clear exceptions to the single-focus-per-clause generalization in English as in other languages: they have two foci per clause.

- (i) a. *To ROBIN*_i I gave a *BOOK* *t*_j
 b. *On the TABLE*_i Lee put *the BOOKS* *t*_j (Culicover 1992)

However, these sentences seem to be acceptable only as answers to the corresponding multiple questions:

- (ii) a. *To whom* did you give *what*?
 b. *Where* did Lee put *what*?

Multiple questions require "absorption" as part of their interpretive process, so it seems that this type of multiple focus also requires "absorption" in the course of interpretation. Hence the pragmatic constraint of a single focus per clause is observed in these cases of apparent violation as well, despite appearances.

References

- Allen, C. 1977. *Topics in Diachronic English Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Ambar, M. 1999. "Aspects of the Syntax of Focus in Portuguese." In G. Rebuschi, and L. Tuller (eds.).
- Ameka, F. 1992. "Focus Constructions in Ewe and Akan: A Comparative Perspective." *MITWPL* 17.
- Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baltin, M.R. 1982. "A Landing Site Theory of Movement Rules." *Linguistic Inquiry* 13. 1-38.
- Barbosa, P. 1999. "On Inversion in *Wh*-questions in Romance." Ms., Universidade do Minho, Portugal.
- Bayer, J. 1984. "COMP in Bavarian." *The Linguistic Review* 3. 209-274.
- Bayer, J. 1996. *Directionality and Logical Form: On the Scope of Focussing Particles and wh-in-situ*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Bayer, J. 1999. "Bound Focus or How can Association with Focus be Achieved without Going Semantically Astray?" In G. Rebuschi, and L. Tuller (eds.).
- Bennis, H., and L. Haegeman. 1983. "On the Status of Agreement and Relative Clauses in West Flemish." In W. de Geest, and Y. Putseys (eds.), *Sentential Complementation*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Brody, M. 1990. "Remarks on the Order of Elements in the Hungarian Focus Field." In I. Kenesei (ed.),

- Approaches to Hungarian* 3. 95-121. Szeged: JATE.
- Brody, M. 1995. "Focus and Checking Theory." In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian* 5. 30-43. Szeged: JATE.
- Casielles-Suárez, E. 1997. *Topic, Focus and Bare Nominals in Spanish*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Cecchetto, C. 1999. "A Comparative Analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance." *Studia Linguistica* 53. 40-67.
- Choe, H.S. 1995. "Focus and Topic Movement in Korean and Licensing." In Kiss (ed.).
- Chomsky, N. 1971. "Deep Structure, Surface Structure and Semantic Interpretation." In D. Steinberg, and L. Jakobovits (eds.), *Semantics: An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1976. "Conditions on Rules of Grammar." *Linguistic Analysis* 2. 303-351.
- Chomsky, N. 1977. "On Wh-Movement." In P.W. Culicover, T. Wasow, and A. Akmajian (eds.), *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2000a. "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework." In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds.), *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2000b. "Derivation by Phase." In *Researching and Verifying an Advanced Theory of Human Language: Explanation of the Human Faculty for Constructing and Computing Sentences on the Basis of Lexical Conceptual Features*. Kanda University of International Studies.
- Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of \bar{A} -Dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Clements, G.N. 1984. "Binding Domains in Kikuyu." *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 14.2.
- Culicover, P. 1992. "Topicalization, Inversion and Complementizers in English." In D. Delfitto et al. (eds.), *Going Romance and Beyond*, OTS Working Papers. Utrecht: University of Utrecht.
- Czepluch, H. 1996. *Kasus im Deutschen und Englischen*. Tübingen: Max Niewmeyer.
- Deprez, Viviane. 1991. "Parameters of Object Movement." In *Proceedings of the Tilburg Workshop on Scrambling*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Engdahl, E. 1986. *Constituent Questions*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Farkas, D. 1986. "On the Syntactic Position of Focus in Hungarian." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4. 77-96.
- Féry, C. 1992. "Focus, Topic and Intonation in German." *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs* 340, 20.
- Frascarelli, M. 2000. *The Syntax-Phonology Interface in Focus and Topic Constructions in Italian*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Grimshaw, J. 1993. "Minimal Projection, Heads, and Optimality." Ms., Rutgers University.
- Gussenhoven, C. 1992. "Sentence Accents and Argument Structure." In I. Roca (ed.), *Thematic Structure: Its Role in Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- De Haan, G., and E. Weerman. 1986. "Finiteness and Verb Fronting in Frisian." In H. Haider, and M. Prinzhorn (eds.), *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hayes, B., and A. Lahiri. 1991. "Phonology." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9. 47-96.
- Horvath, J. 1986. *Focus in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Horvath, J. 1995. "Structural Focus, Structural Case, and the Notion of Feature-Assignment." In Kiss (ed.).
- Hyman, L. 1999. "The Interaction between Focus and Tone in Bantu." In G. Rebuschi, and L. Tuller (eds.).
- Kidwai, A. 1999. "Word Order and Focus Positions in Universal Grammar." In G. Rebuschi, and L. Tuller (eds.).
- Kiss, K.É. 1987. *Configurationality in Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

- Kiss, K.É. (ed.). 1995. *Discourse Configurational Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiss, K.É. 1998. "Identificational Focus Versus Information Focus." *Language* 74. 245-273.
- Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lasnik, H. 1981. "Restricting the Theory of Transformations: A Case Study." In N. Hornstein, and D. Lightfoot (eds.), *Explanation in Linguistics: The Logical Problem of Language Acquisition*. London: Longman.
- Lasnik, H., and M. Saito. 1992. *Move α* . Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lasnik, H., and T. Stowell. 1991. "Weakest Crossover." *Linguistic Inquiry* 22. 687-720.
- Lecarme, J. 1991. "Focus en Somali: syntaxe et interpretation." *Linguistique Africaine* 7.
- Müller, G., and W. Sternefeld. 1993. "Improper Movement and Unambiguous Binding." *Linguistic Inquiry* 24. 461-507.
- Ortiz de Urbina, J. 1995. "Residual Verb Second and Verb First in Basque." In K.É. Kiss (ed.).
- Ortiz de Urbina, J. 1999. "Focus in Basque." In G. Rebuschi, and L. Tuller (eds.)
- Oshima, S. 1994. "English Imperatives and the Minimalist Framework." *Research Reports of Kochi University, Humanities* 43. 1-42.
- Oshima, S. 1999. "The KP Analysis of Nominal Phrases." In M. Muraki, and E. Iwamoto (eds.), *Linguistics: In Search of the Human Mind*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Oshima, S. 2000. "The Specificity Condition Revisited." *Journal of Inquiry and Research (Kansai Gaidai University)* 71. 1-18.
- Ouhalla, J. (1991) *Focussing in Berber and Circassian and the V2 Phenomenon*. Ms., University College London.
- Park, Y-M. 1998. *Zur Theorie der A'-Bewegung*. Tübingen: Maz Niemeyer.
- Platzack, C. 1986. "COMP, INFL, and Germanic Word Order." In L. Hellen, and K.K. Christensen (eds.), *Topics in Scandinavian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Rebuschi, G., and L. Tuller (eds.). 1999. *The Grammar of Focus*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rizzi, L. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rizzi, L. 1987. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery." In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rochemont, M. 1986. *Focus in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rochemont, M., and P. Culicover. 1990. *English Focus Constructions and the Theory of Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rodman, R. 1974. "On Left-Dislocation." *Papers in Linguistics* 7. 437-466.
- Rohrbacher, B.W. 1999. *Morphology-Driven Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rudin, C. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax*. Doctoral dissertation. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.
- Ruwet, N. 1982. *Grammaire des insultes*. Paris: Édition du Seuil.
- Svolacchia, M., L. Mereu, and A. Puglielli. 1995. "Aspects of Discourse Configurationality in Somali." In Kiss (ed.).
- Tsimpli, I.M. 1995. "Focusing in Modern Greek." In Kiss (ed.).
- Travis, L. 1984. *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Vallduví, E. 1992. "A Preverbal Landing Site for Quantificational Operators." *CTWPL*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Webelhuth, G. 1989. *Syntactic Saturation Phenomena and the Modern Germanic Languages*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Zaenen, A. 1980. *Extraction Rules in Icelandic*. Doctoral dissertation. Harvard University.
- Zemakaja, E.A. 1973. *Russkaja razgovornaja rec'*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Zwart, J.W. 1997. *Morphosyntax of Verb Movement*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.