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In this paper I present some data concerning focalization in Perugino, a Central Italian dialect, and I discuss them in relation to a debated issue in the literature concerning focalization: the idea that clause structure is endowed with two focus positions where constituents carrying different kinds of focus move in order to be focalized. In Perugino, all focalized constituents appear low in clause structure, and may be followed by the focus marker ‘nco’. I will argue that they are focalized in the low, clause internal focus position proposed by Belletti (2001; 2004). Two exceptions to this generalized pattern will also be considered, their relevance lying in the fact that they show that under particular circumstances the left peripheral focus position (Rizzi, 1997) can be activated in Perugino. The data are then interpreted in relation to the more general frame of a clause structure endowed with two focus positions.

A Luigi,
che fa sembrare il lavoro linguistico un’impresa agile, leggera ed elegante come l’andatura di due lepri che giocano a rincorrersi

1. Introduction

Languages use different syntactic and prosodic means to encode focalization. In Standard Italian, according to Rizzi (1997), the focus – presupposition articulation can be expressed by preposing the focal element and assigning it special focal stress. The focus interpretation of the focalized constituent is the direct consequence of its movement to the specifier of a dedicated projection in the left periphery of the clause. In compliance with the Focus Criterion, a constituent endowed with focus features must end up in a Spec/Head configuration

* An earlier version of this work was presented at the CISDID Inaugural Conference /CISM in Italy (Pescara, 4th-6th July 2008) and a version in Italian can be found in the Rivista Italiana di Linguistica e Dialettologia, (14/2012) whose editors I thank for letting me cast the relevant data and the analysis in the present framework. I also thank Valentina Bianchi and Cristiano Chesi who have conceived and accomplished the enterprise that eventually led to this volume: it’s a joy for me to take part in it. I am grateful to Adriana Belletti, Valentina Bianchi, Giuliano Bocci, Anna Cardinaletti, Silvio Cruschina, Roberta D’Alessandro, Maria Rita Manzini, Sandra Paoli and Leonardo Savoia for fruitful discussion and helpful comments. Special thanks are due to Maurizio Bellini. All errors and shortcomings are of course my own.

with a Focus head. This focus projection is located in the left periphery, at the edge of the C-phase. This structural option, according to the author, is restricted to Contrastive Focus:

(1) IL TUO LIBRO ho letto (, non il suo)  
‘Your book I read (, not his)’  (Rizzi 1997)

As for New Information Focus, Belletti (2001; 2004) argues in favour of the existence of a focus projection in the low periphery of the clause, at the edge of the v-phase, where the focalized constituents are moved. The difference between the focus position in the left periphery and the one in the low periphery is that the first is specialized for Contrastive Focus, the latter for New Information Focus. The exact location of the two focus positions is given in (3) and (4):

(3) Force (Top*) Int (Top*) Foc Mod*(Top*) Fin IP  (Rizzi 2004b)

(4) [CP……[TP….[TopP Top [FocP Foc [TopP Top Top…..VP]]]]]]  
(Belletti 2006)

Furthermore, Standard Italian also allows a lower contrastive focalization, described as in situ focalization, as shown in (5), taken from Rizzi (1997):

(5) Ho letto IL TUO LIBRO (, non il suo)  
‘I read YOUR BOOK, not his’

Belletti (2004) assumes that the Contrastive Focus interpretation is available only in the left peripheral focus position. She discusses the impossibility of VSO in Italian, as exemplified in (6).

(6) *Ha comprato Maria il giornale  
‘Maria bought the newspaper’

Belletti explains the impossibility of (6) arguing that the subject intervenes between the object and its case-assigning head (v + acc) located higher than the focus projection hosting the postverbal subject.

---

2 The same analysis is given to topicalization and to other ‘criterial’ features (question, topic, focus, relatives etc). The format of the Criteria is the following: XP and X must be in a Spec-head configuration, for F=Q, Top, Foc, R…. (Rizzi 2004a)

3 In the examples, I’ll use capital letters to indicate CONTRASTIVE FOCUS, and italics to indicate New Information Focus.

4 Rizzi (1997), following a tradition that goes back to Chomsky (1976), assumes for in situ focalization, an LF movement of the focalized constituent to the dedicated focus position in the left periphery of the clause. In other words, the satisfaction of the Focus Criterion can be delayed to LF, so focus constituents may appear in their base position.
The situation changes if a pause intervenes between S and O (VS#O) and the object is pronounced with a downgrading intonation. Two possible structures are attested in Standard Italian:

(7) a. L’ha comprato Maria, il giornale
   it(cl.) bought Maria, the newspaper
b. Ha comprato Maria, il giornale
   has bought Maria, the newspaper

The two sentence types in (7) are different: (7a) is an instance of Right Dislocation, (7b) is an instance of *emarginazione* (Antinucci and Cinque 1977). As pointed out by Cardinaletti (2001; 2002), the difference between these two sentence types cannot be accounted for merely in terms of presence vs. absence of the clitic.

Furthermore, as noted by Cardinaletti (2001) and Belletti (2004), while (7a) can be a felicitous reply to a question like (8), (7b) cannot:

(8) Chi ha comprato il giornale?

In other words, the postverbal subject in (7b) is necessarily contrastively focalized, so we can rewrite (7b) as (9):

(9) Ha comprato MARIA, il giornale

As far as (7a) is concerned, Belletti (2004), following Cecchetto (1999), assumes that the right dislocated phrase (*il giornale*) fills a clause internal low topic position, in her analysis the low topic position below the clause internal focus position, which is in turn filled by the postverbal subject. This is consistent with the fact that (7a) can be a felicitous reply to (8).

The contrast between (6) and (7a) is accounted for by Belletti (2004) assuming that in (7a) the Case requirements are fulfilled by the clitic, which ends up in a position higher than the position occupied by S, that in this way does not interfere.

Let us now consider the contrast between (6) and (7b=9). In (7b=9) no clitic mediates the relation between the object and its Case assigning/(checking) head, and still the sentence is well formed contrary to (6). The presence of a pause (VS#0) should not make any difference, Belletti argues. The grammatical status of (7.b=9) is to be connected to the interpretation of the subject as Contrastive focus. This in turn means, according to Belletti (2004) that the subject in (7.b=9) is in the high, left peripheral, focus position. As for the rest of the derivation of (7.b=9), the object is topicalized in the left-peripheral topic position below the focus position, and the remaining part of the clause undergoes remnant topicalization to the left of S and O, as shown in (10) (Belletti (2004): (27)):

(10) ….[ IP_k e_i, ha comprato e_j] Top [[MARIA] Foc] [[il giornale] Top]….IP_k

The next step would be to extend this analysis to other cases of low contrastive focalization. In this way we would have a perfect matching between

---

5 A different analysis of *emarginazione* and Right Dislocation is proposed by Cardinaletti (2001-2002). For ease of exposition we’ll detail and discuss this analysis in Section 3.

6 Against a remnant-movement derivation of low contrastive focalization see Cardinaletti.
two features (Contrastive Focus and New Information Focus) and two positions (the focus position in the left periphery and the focus position in the clause internal periphery).

In what follows I present some data concerning focalization in Perugino, a Central Italian Dialect spoken in North-Western Umbria, that support the idea that clause structure is endowed with two focus positions, but not the idea of a one-to-one correspondence between each position and one focus interpretation. In Section 2 I present the data that will be discussed in Section 3 in relation to the theoretical framework outlined above. In Section 4 I’ll draw the conclusions.

2. Focalization in Perugino

Differently from what can be observed in Standard Italian, in Perugino all focalized constituents appear in a postverbal position, both in the case of Contrastive Focus and in the case of New Information Focus. The clause containing the focalized constituent may be preceded by a chunk consisting in the focalized element alone. Here are some examples:

(11) A  E’ partit’ Paolo.
    is left P.
    ‘Paolo has left’
    B1 (GIANNI). E’ partit’ GIANNI, no Paolo.
    (GIANNI). is left GIANNI, no P.
    B2 *GIANNI è partito, no Paolo.
    GIANNI is left , no P.
    ‘Gianni left, not Paolo’

(12) A Sicchè ha parlat’ Mario
    so has spoken Mario
    ‘So, Mario spoke’
    B1 (GIANNI). Ha parlat’ GIANNI, no Mario
    (GIANNI). has spoken GIANNI, no Mario
    B2 * GIANNI ha parlato, no Mario
    GIANNI has spoken, no Mario
    ‘Gianni spoke, not Mario’

(13) A Sicchè e magnato ’l pollo.
    So have eaten the chicken
    ‘So, you ate chicken’
    B1 (*L PESCE). Ho magnato’L PESCE, no ’l pollo.
    (THE FISH). have eaten THE FISH, no the chicken
    B2 *’L PESCE ho magnato, no ’l pollo.


7 Perugino is the dialect spoken in Perugia (Umbria, Italy) and in 15 surrounding districts (Tuoro, Passignano, Magione, Lisciano Niccone, Corciano, Deruta, Torgiano and parts of the territories of Castiglione del Lago, Panicale, Piegara, Marsciano, Bettona, Valfafranca and Bastia). The reader is referred to Pellegrini (1977) for a general frame of the dialects spoken in Umbria, and to Ugolini (1970) and Moretti (1987) for a description of Perugino. Moretti (1987), in particular, differentiates three registers of Perugino: Register 1 (or rural register) spoken in the countryside mostly by old people; Register 2, spoken in small towns and in the outskirts of Perugia, and Register 3, or the local variety of Standard Italian. In this work we’ll be concerned with Register 2.
THE FISH have eaten, no the chicken
‘It is fish that I ate, not chicken’

(14) A. Chi è partito?
who is left?
‘Who left?’
(Gianni). Is left Gianni.
B2. * Gianni è partito
Gianni is left
‘Gianni left’

(15) A. Chi ha parlato?
who has spoken?
‘Who spoke?’
B1. (Gianni). Ha parlat’Gianni
(Gianni). Has spoken Gianni
Gianni has spoken
‘Gianni spoke’

(16) A. Ch’ e magnato?
what have2S eaten
‘What did you eat?’
B1 (’L pesce). Ho magnato ’l pesce.
(The fish). Have1S eaten the fish
B2 * ’L pesce ho magnato
the fish have1S eaten
‘I ate fish’

The situation of Perugino is summarized in Table 1, while Table 2 adapts the same frame to Standard Italian, for ease of comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1 : PERUGINO</th>
<th>I. High Focus</th>
<th>II. Low Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Contrastive subject</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Contrastive object</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) New Information subj.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) New Information object</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I.a) * GIANNI è partito, no Paolo (I.c) * Gianni è partito
(I.b) * ’L PESCE ho magnato, no ’l pollo (I.d) * ’L pesce ho magnato

(II.a) (GIANNI). E’ partit’ GIANNI, no Paolo (II.c) (Gianni). E’ partit’ Gianni
(II.b) (’L PESCE). Ho magnato ’L PESCE (II.d) (’L pesce).Ho magnato ’l pesce
no ’l pollo
no ’l pollo
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TABLE 2. STANDARD ITALIAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I. High Focus</th>
<th>II. Low Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Contrastive subject</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Contrastive object</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) New Information subj</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) New Information object</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I.a) GIANNI è arrivato, non Paolo</td>
<td>GIANNI is arrived, not Paolo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I.b) IL TUO LIBRO ho letto, non il suo</td>
<td>THE YOUR BOOK have1S read, not the his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II.a) Ha parlato GIANNI, non Paolo</td>
<td>has spoken GIANNI, not Paolo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II.b) Ho scritto UN ARTICOLO, non un libro</td>
<td>have1S written A PAPER, not a book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An exception to the pattern summarized in Table 1 is constituted by subjects of transitive verbs with overt object:

(17) A. La Carla ha magnato ‘l pollo
    the Carla has eaten the chicken
    ‘Carla ate chicken’

    B1 L’ha magnat’LA MARIA, ’l pollo, no la Carla
    It has eaten THE MARIA the chicken, no the Carla

    B2 ?LA MARIA ha magnato’l pollo, no la Carla
    THE MARIA has eaten the chicken, no the Carla

    B3 *Ha magnato’l pollo LA MARIA, no la Carla
    Has eaten THE MARIA the chicken, no the Carla

    B4 *Ha magnat’LA MARIA ‘l pollo, no la Carla
    Has eaten THE MARIA the chicken, no the Carla

    B5 *Ha magnat’LA MARIA, ‘l pollo, no la Carla
    Has eaten THE MARIA, the chicken, no the Carla
    ‘ Maria ate chicken, not Carla’

As shown in (17), while the preferred reply to (17.A) is (17.B1), i.e. with a clitic doubling the direct object (Right Dislocation), the only other (marginally) acceptable option is (17.B2), with the subject in a high position. The same holds for New Information Focus, as shown in (18):

(18) A. Chi ha magnato ’l pollo?
    who has eaten the chicken?
    ‘Who ate chicken?’

    B1. L’ha magnat’ la Maria ’l pollo
    It has eaten the Maria the chicken

    B2. ?? La Maria ha magnato ’l pollo
    The Maria has eaten the chicken
B3. * Ha magnato ’l pollo la Maria
   Has eaten the chicken the Maria
B4. *Ha magnat’ la Maria ’l pollo
   Has eaten the Maria the chicken
B5. *Ha magnat’ la Maria, ’l pollo
   Has eaten the Maria, the chicken
   ‘Maria ate chicken’

Contrary to Foci, Topics may (and generally do) appear in preverbal position.\(^8\)

(19) ’L tu libro, l’ho lett’anno
   the your book, it have1S read last year
   ‘I read your book last year’

3. Some questions, some answers and some further data (’nco focalization)

So far we have seen that in Perugino all focalized constituents (both Contrastive and New Information) appear low in clause structure, with the only exception of subjects of transitive verbs with overt objects.

Some questions come to mind:
- Is the postverbal position in which focalized constituents appear in Perugino, the focus position in the low periphery proposed by Belletti (2001, 2004) for New Information Focus in Standard Italian?
- Is this position one and the same for both kinds of focus?

In the following parts of this section, we’ll look for an answer to these questions.

3.1. One and the same position, low in clause structure

Belletti (2004), along the lines of Cardinaletti (2001, 2002), argues that in Standard Italian the postverbal subject is low in clause structure, since it must follow low adverbs:

(20) a. ? Capirà / Spiegherà bene Maria (al direttore)
   understandFUT3S/explainFUT3S well Maria (to the director)
   b. * Capirà/ spiegherà Maria bene (al direttore)

The same holds in Perugino, for subjects with a Contrastive as well as with a New Information interpretation:

(21) a. ? Capirà ben’ la Maria/ LA MARIA
   understandFUT3S well the Maria
   b. * Capirà la Maria / LA MARIA bene

A widely considered argument (Cardinaletti, 2001,2002; Belletti 2004; Samek-Lodovici 2006; Bianchi (to appear)) concerns Negative Polarity Items such as Standard Italian nessuno, which, in order to be licensed, must be c-commanded by the negative marker non. I think this argument works straightforwardly in Perugino. Consider (22), with the Perugino equivalent of nessuno:

---

\(^8\) As shown, for instance, in (16), Perugino has overt \textit{wh}-movement. (16) also shows that Perugino is a null- subject language.
(22) a. * nissuno/NISSUNO
    ho    vist’
    not have1S seen

b. nissuno/NISSUNO
    ha    parlat’
    not has spoken

c. * nissuno/NISSUNO
    ha    parlato
    nobody not has spoken

In (22.b) the postverbal subject behaves like the direct object in (22.a) and
differently from the preverbal subject in (22.c). This suggests that the necessary c-
command relation is established in (22.a) and (22.b), and in the end that (22.b)
cannot be analyzed as involving a subject focalized through movement to the
high, left peripheral focus position and a higher remnant IP.

Notice, by the way, that (22.b) is felicitous both as a reply to a genuine
information question and as a reply involving contrast. From this we can conclude
that the focus position in Perugino is not the high, left peripheral focus position
identified by Rizzi (1997) neither for New Information nor for Contrastive Focus.
In order to maintain that it is the low focus position of Belletti (2001, 2004),
however, we still have to exclude in situ focalization.

3. 2. Focalization with ‘nco

In addition to structural strategies, languages may use focalizing adverbs
(also called ‘ focus particles’, König 1991), such as the Italian perfino or the
English even:

(23) a. Perfino Gianni è arrivato
    even Gianni is arrived
    ‘Even Gianni arrived’

b. Gianni ha perfino mangiato le ciliegie
    Gianni has even eaten the cherries

c. Gianni ha mangiato perfino le ciliegie
    Gianni has eaten even the cherries

Focusing adverbs are considered a class of particles that display common
properties different from those of regular adverbs (Cinque 1999). They do not
have a fixed position in clause structure, but must attach to a complement
constituent ( an XP able to bear stress (Bayer 1996) and together they form a
constituent: they are therefore considered ‘minor heads’. As ‘minor heads’ they do
not project category features or modify their syntactic domain, but their features
percolate up to the maximal projection of the XP they subcategorize for. The XP
will inherit this information without modifying its syntactic status (Bayer 1996).

9 In Standard Italian a focalized nessuno can appear clause initially, without the negative marker
‘non’:
(i) NESSUNO, ho visto (Rizzi 1997)
    nobody have1S seen

On the other hand, this is impossible in Perugino:
(ii) * nissuno/NISSUNO ha parlato
    nobody has spoken

10 And in some cases must. (e.g. Japanese, Somali). See a.o. Frascarelli (2000)
According to den Dikken (2006), focus particles serve to establish the relationship between focus and presupposition.

As for the meaning of focus particles, consider the particle even:

(24) The Dean invited even Bill.  (Giannakidou 2007)

Assertion: The Dean invited Bill
Presuppositions (or ‘conventional implicatures’ in Karttunen and Peters 1979):

i. there is a set of alternatives to the even phrase that the context makes salient (existential implicature)
ii. these alternatives are ranked on a scale导游
(scalar implicature)

The existence of alternatives is the contribution of Focus (Rooth 1985) and it is what even has in common with others focus particles like too and also. The scalar presupposition is the specific contribution of even.

The value of the even phrase is to be placed at the lowest or near-lowest end of the scale, which means that the even phrase picks out the least likely (or near-least likely) individual(s) from the given set of alternatives.

The interpretation of even sketched above is generally valid for perfino. There is an interaction between the Focus stress and the position of perfino in the identification of its scope in the sentence (Lonzi 1991). Perfino must c-command the constituent which contains the focalized element.

Perugino has an equivalent of perfino/even: 'nco. Its meaning can be described in the same terms as perfino/even i.e. entailing both an existential and a scalar implicature, but its syntactic distribution is peculiar and cannot be assimilated to that of perfino/even. Here are some relevant examples:

(25) a. E’ venut’ Mario 'nco
    is come Mario even
b. * E’ venuto 'nco Mario
    is come even Mario
c. ?? Mario 'nco è venuto
    Mario even is come
    ‘Even Mario came’

(26) a. Ho letto 'l tu libro 'nco
    have read the your book even
b. *Ho letto 'nco 'l tu libro
    have read even the your book
c. ??’L tu libro 'nco ho letto
    The your book even have read
    I even read your book/ I read even your book

As we can see, 'nco cannot precede the focalized constituent, but must follow it. Furthermore, its position is fixed in clause structure, contrary to perfino/even and focus particles in general. Finally, it is 'nco that bears the focal stress. An analysis of 'nco as a minor head is thus untenable.

---

A quite natural way to analyze ‘nco’ is as a Focus head in the low Focus position, with the focalized constituent moving to the specifier of this position:

(27)                      Low FocP
    Mario
    ‘l tu libro
    ‘nco

I assume that focalization with ‘nco’ is a kind of contrastive focalization: a ‘nco’ focalized constituent is indeed a subset of the objects which the predicate sentence refers to (or that are presupposed by speaker and hearer, due to previous discourse or given context). Namely, it represents the least likely (or near-least likely) subset in the given or presupposed set of alternatives.

I conclude therefore that Perugino makes use of the low Focus position proposed by Belletti (2001, 2004) both for New Information Focus and for Contrastive Focus. The focus marker ‘nco’ lexicalizes the head of this projection.

3.3 When the position can’t be low

As we have seen in (17) and (18), here repeated for convenience as (28) and (29), the only case in Perugino in which the focalized constituent can appear (although marginally) preverbally, is when the focalized constituent is the subject of transitive verbs, as the B2 items show:

(28)A. La Carla ha magnato ‘l pollo
    the Carla has eaten the chicken
    ‘Carla ate chicken’

B1  L’ha magnat’LA MARIA, ‘l pollo, no la Carla
    It has eaten THE MARIA the chicken, no the Carla
B2  ? LA MARIA ha magnato ‘l pollo, no la Carla
    THE MARIA has eaten the chicken, no the Carla
B3  * Ha magnato ‘l pollo LA MARIA, no la Carla
    Has eaten the chicken THE MARIA, no the Carla
B4  * Ha magnat’LA MARIA ‘l pollo, no la Carla
    Has eaten THE MARIA the chicken, no the Carla
B5  * Ha magnat’LA MARIA, ‘l pollo, no la Carla
    Has eaten THE MARIA, the chicken, no the Carla
    ‘Maria ate chicken, not Carla’

(29)A. Chi ha magnato ‘l pollo?
    who has eaten the chicken?
    ‘Who ate chicken?’

B1  L’ha magnat’ la Maria ‘l pollo
    It has eaten the Maria the chicken
B2  ??  La Maria ha magnato ‘l pollo
    The Maria has eaten the chicken
B3  * Ha magnato ‘l pollo la Maria
    Has eaten the chicken the Maria
B4  *Ha magnat’ la Maria ‘l pollo
Has eaten the Maria the chicken  
B5. *Ha magnat’ la Maria, ’l pollo
Has eaten the Maria, the chicken
‘Maria ate chicken’

We assume that B2 are possible (although marginally) because B4 are impossible: VSO is ungrammatical in Perugino as it is in Standard Italian\(^\text{12}\), because the subject intervenes between the object and its Case assignment/checking head.\(^\text{13}\) In order to avoid *VSO, we can have a preverbal focalized subject. Indeed, this is so for a subject, but not for an object, as shown in (30.B3) and (31.B3):

(30)A. Sicchè Mario ha magnato ‘l pollo
Thus Mario has eaten the chicken
‘So Mario ate chicken’
B1. Ha magnato ‘L PESCE, Mario, no’l pollo
Has eaten THE FISH Mario, no the chicken
B2. (Mario) ha magnato ‘L PESCE, no ‘l pollo
Mario has eaten THE FISH, no the chicken
B3 * ‘L PESCE ha magnato (Mario), no ‘l pollo
THE FISH has eaten Mario, no the chicken
‘Mario ate fish, not chicken’

(31)A. Ch’ha magnato Mario?  
What has eaten Mario
B1. Ha magnato ‘l pesce, Mario
Has eaten the fish, Mario
B2 (Mario) ha magnato ‘l pesce
Mario has eaten the fish
B3 * ‘l pesce ha magnato Mario
The fish has eaten Mario

So we can say that in Perugino a focalized constituent may (marginally) appear preverbally if and only if it is the subject of a transitive verb, to avoid *VSO. We’ll come back later to the issue of which position is occupied by the subject in (28.B4) and (29.B4).

Let’s now concentrate on the (only) fully acceptable reply to (28.A) and (29.A), i.e. the B1 items. The B1 items in (28) and (29) are instances of Right Dislocation.

As we saw in Section 1, according to Belletti (2004), in Right Dislocation the subject is in the low focus position, but it does not interfere with Case assignment/checking of the object, since this requirement is fulfilled by the clitic moved to a position higher than the low focus position occupied by the subject.

No wonder that in Perugino Right Dislocation is the only fully acceptable option to avoid *VSO both for Contrastive and New Information foci.\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{12}\) But not in other Romance languages such as Spanish (Zubizarreta 1998) and Romanian (Motapanyane 1995).

\(^{13}\) See Section 1 above.

\(^{14}\) One might wonder why in Standard Italian Right Dislocation is possible in case of Contrastive Focus
Another fact that deserves our attention is instantiated by the B5 items in (28) and (29), both instances of *emarginazione* (VS#O). As it is widely assumed, in Standard Italian this structure is fully acceptable with a Contrastive Focus subject, but not with a New Information Focus subject as we have seen in Section 1. In Perugino VS#O is ungrammatical in both cases.

If Belletti’s (2004) analysis of *emarginazione* in Standard Italian is correct (see Section 1), we are dealing with a subject in the left peripheral focus position plus remnant movement of the remaining part of the clause to a topic, left peripheral position. This coherently excludes *emarginazione* in Perugino, given that the left peripheral focus position is not normally used in this language for focalization. Cardinaletti (2001, 2002) assumes a different derivation for the Standard Italian equivalent of (28.B5) and (29.B5). In her analysis, in these *emarginazione* structures both the subject and the object are *in situ*. It is not clear to me, under this analysis, how to account for the ungrammaticality of (28.B5) and (29.B5) in Perugino.

Another interesting contrast to be discussed is that between (28.B5) and (29.B5) on one side and (30.B1) and (31.B1) on the other. Their Standard Italian equivalents have been studied by Cardinaletti (2001, 2002), who has first underlined the difference between the two structures, despite *prima facie* similarity. In her account, in (30.B1) and (31.B1) the subject is right dislocated and the object focalized *in situ*. In Perugino the two sentence pairs are in sharp contrast, in that while (28.B5) and (29.B5) are ungrammatical, (30.B1) and (31.B1) are well formed. I think this contrast receives a natural explanation if we assume that, while (28.B5) and (29.B5), as we said, require activation of the left peripheral focus position (an option dispreferred in Perugino), in (30.B1) and (31.B1) the object is focalized in the low focus position (the position generally used in Perugino) and the subject is moved to the topic position below it, hence they are grammatical.

One final point concerns the ungrammaticality of (28.B3) e (29.B3). On this I have nothing to say except that they recall the strong marginality of VOS in Standard Italian.16

### 3.4 On the position of preverbal focalized subjects

Let’s now go back to the examples in (28.B4) and (29.B4), i.e. the case in which a preverbal focalized subject is allowed in Perugino. The question that we left open concerns the position it occupies: Can this be taken as an evidence that the high, left peripheral Focus position is activated in Perugino? Or could it be a case of *in situ* focalization? There is independent evidence that the high Focus position is activated in Perugino. This in turn may favour an analysis in which the preverbal subject is in the high Focus position and not an instance of *in situ* focalization.

---

15 Cardinaletti’s (2001,2002) analysis of Right Dislocation is different from the analysis of Cecchetto (1999). In Cardinaletti’s analysis, the right-dislocated constituent is base-generated as the complement of a functional projection whose specifier hosts the whole clause, while for Cecchetto it is moved to a low topic position. It is beyond the scope of the present article a discussion of this part of Cardinaletti’s analysis, the most relevant part of it being for us the idea that the non-marginalized and non-right-dislocated constituents (i.e. the focalized constituents) are *in situ*.

16 See Belletti (2004) for a proposal to account for such marginality in Standard Italian.
In Perugino we have a construction which, following Bocci (2007), I’ll call Contrastively Focalized Left Dislocation:

(32) A. Ha ditt’che ‘l divano l’ha comprat’anno
   has said that the sofa it has bought last year
   ‘S/he said that s/he bought the sofa last year’

   B1 No, te sbajji, ha ditt’che LA POLTRONA l’ha comprata anno, no ‘l divano
   No you’re wrong, has said that THE ARMCHAIR it has bought last
   year, no the sofa

   B2* No, te sbajji, ha ditt’che LA POLTRONA ha comprat’ anno, no ‘l divano
   No you’re wrong, has said that THE ARMCHAIR has bought last year,
   not the sofa

According to Bocci (2007)\(^1\) in this construction which mixes topic and focus properties (i.e. resumptive clitic, a typical feature of topicalization, and contrastive intonation), the high Focus position is involved. One of the arguments proposed by the author to support his analysis is that CFLDs are ungrammatical in the same cases where Contrastive Focus is ungrammatical, i.e. in certain subordinate clauses, described by Haegeman (2004), which are characterized by reduced left peripheries where the (high) focus projection is not structurally available, but the topic position is. One case in point is control infinitival clauses:

(33) a. Gli sembra, il tappeto, di averlo venduto
   To him seems, the carpet, to have it sold

   b. ?? Gli sembra LE SEDIE di aver venduto, non il tappeto
   to him seems THE CHAIRS to have sold, not the carpet

   c. Gli sembra, il tappeto, di averlo venduto ieri
   to him seems, the carpet, toh ave it sold yesterday

   d. ?? Gli sembra LE SEDIE di averle vendute ieri, non il tappeto
   to him seems THE CHAIRS toh ave them sold yesterday, not the carpet

If Bocci’s analysis is on the right track, the fact that Contrastively Focalized Left Dislocation is attested in Perugino is a sign of the activation of the high left peripheral focus position in this language. If this is position is active, we might assume that the preverbal subject in (28.B4) and (29.B4) is moved to it and not focalized through a different mechanism, i.e. in situ focalization.

4. Conclusions

The data I have presented show that in Perugino focalized constituents appear low in clause structure.

I have adapted to Perugino some of the arguments used in the analysis of Standard Italian. These arguments show that in Perugino focalized constituents cannot be analyzed as moved to a high focus position with subsequent remnant movement of the rest of the clause, and this happens both in the case of Contrastive Focus and in the case of New Information Focus. I have shown that focalized constituents in Perugino are rather moved to the low IP internal focus

\(^1\) But see Benincà and Poletto (2004) for a different view.
position identified by Belletti (2001; 2004) both in the case of New Information Focus and in the case of Contrastive Focus. The focus marker *nco* lexicalizes the head of this position. I have also shown that the high, left peripheral focus position is active in Perugino, since CFLD constructions are attested in this language, and I have argued that this position can (marginally) be used when low focalization would give rise to ungrammaticality, i.e. for subjects of transitive verbs.

These data and their analysis on one side support Belletti’s proposal of a low focus position in clause structure, on the other disconfirm the idea that different focus positions are specialized for different focus interpretations.18

Furthermore, the data I have presented show that the position which is not used as a rule (in Perugino, the left peripheral focus position) can be activated in particular cases.19

In order to account for this picture, I’ll sketch the following considerations.

Suppose that there are two positions in clause structure where focalized constituents are licensed across languages, one at the edge of the C-phase and one at the edge of the v-phase, and suppose that their existence is simply a consequence of the fact that clause structure consists of two phases, and each phase contains a focus position.20

As clearly brought to light by some literature on focus (Brunetti 2004, 2009; Bianchi (to appear) a. o.) there are more than two kinds of focus. But the positions are only two.

---

18 In this latter respect Perugino goes together with other languages. Siciliano for instance, as described by Cruschina (2003-2004; 2011), seems to mirror Perugino in that all focalized constituents are moved to the left –peripheral focus position:

(i) **NA LUCERTULA vitti, no un surci**
A LIZARD saw not a mouse

(ii) **A. Chi scrivisti ari?**
what wrote yesterday

B. *n’articolo* scrissi
a paper wrote (Cruschina, 2003-2004)

19 Another language in which a focus position is activated under particular circumstances seems to be Mandarin Chinese. According to Badan (2007) there is a particular construction, the *lian…dou* construction, which involves the low focus position of Belletti (2001; 2004) not normally active in Mandarin Chinese:

(i) Zhangsan *lian* zhe ben shu *dou*ye mai le
Z. even this CL book all/also buy FP

(ii) A. *Bu shi, PUTAOJIU (Zhangsan) he le* not be, WINE (Z.) drink FP

B. No, Z. drank WINE

B1. *Bu shi, (Zhangsan) he PUTAOJIU le* not be, (Z.) drink WINE FP

According to Badan (2007) the existential and scalar presuppositions of focus particles (See Section 3.2 above) are split in two different lexical items in the *lian…dou* construction with *lian* giving the existential implicature and *dou* the scalar one, while the focal stress is on the XP following *lian*.

20 I am abstracting away now from the issue of a DP internal focus position, but a focus position at the edge of the D-phase is perfectly coherent with the line of reasoning I am pursuing here.
Languages are thus forced to take their options within this restricted frame, consistently with their own specific properties. Some languages, such as Standard Italian, may use the two positions to differentiate two kinds of focus. In other languages this option might be impossible. As pointed out by Belletti (2004, 2006), for instance, the non-Null-Subject nature of a language has a direct consequence on the availability of the VP periphery.

With respect to this issue, it is not clear to me, by now, which properties of Perugino, if any, are to be connected with the choice of the low focus position for focalization.

Within the same language, however, specific clausal types may force the activation of the dispreferred position/option.

In Imperative Clauses of Standard Italian, for instance, focalized constituents (both Contrastive and New Information) seem to occupy only the low focus position, contrary to the general trend in this language that differentiates the two foci:

(33) a1. Porta la valigia
    takeImp the suitcase
a2. No, portala TU
    no, takeImp-it YOU
a3. * No, TU portala
    no, YOU takeImp-it

(34) a1. Chi vuoi che telefoni?
    Who want2S that telephonesSubj
a2. Telefona tu
    telephoneImp you

I interpret this in relation to the fact that Imperative Clauses are reduced clausal types, so the left peripheral focus position cannot be activated. Similarly, the low focus position is activated in French (reduced) clefts (Belletti, 2006, 2009). The presence of the focus marker dou in the lian..dou construction of Mandarine Chinese (see fn.19) activates the low focus position in this language (Badan, 2007). Contrastively Focalized Left Dislocations, on the contrary, require the activation of the left periphery (Haegeman 2004, Bocci 2007), and (at least) within this clausal type the left peripheral focus position is activated in Perugino.

The fact that particular clausal types induce the activation of the dispreferred position/option for focalization in a given language suggests that the two positions are at disposal in each language, being part of clause structure.
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