

## ***Contrastive Focalization: Challenges and Solutions***

Current cartographic analyses of contrastive focalization maintain that in root clauses contrastive foci move to the specifier of a unique left-peripheral FocusP projection, a position also targeted by wh-phrases. This movement is claimed to be required for interpretative reasons, and, therefore, it is obligatory, albeit covert rather than overt wherever necessary (Rizzi 1997, 2017:335-336; Rizzi & Cinque 2016; Rizzi & Bocci 2017).

These theoretical tenets make several substantial predictions. Some have been widely discussed, such as the availability of at most one contrastive focus per clause, due to the uniqueness of FocusP, or the complementary distribution of wh-phrases and foci, due to the impossibility of hosting both in SpecFocusP at once (Bocci et al 2018). But many other equally significant and potentially highly informative predictions are seldom addressed, or not discussed in relation to FocusP. Some of them are described below.

- Focus size – Only phrasal constituents can move to a specifier. Therefore, contrastively focused heads cannot move to SpecFocusP, leaving their focalization unaccounted for. Intuitively promising solutions, such as movement to the head of FocusP, dissolve on closer inspection. For example, in “I have (only) SPOKEN<sub>F</sub> to Mary (not HIRED her)”, ‘have’ blocks head-movement to FocusP. How should we analyse focused heads, then?  
The overall size of phrasal foci is also restricted. Anything larger than FocusP, such as a ‘why’ question, should be unable to contrastively focalize. Is this the case?
- Focus multiplicity – The uniqueness of FocusP places an upper bound to the number of foci, yet research shows that clauses may host more than one focus (Krifka 1991, 2008; Beck & Vasishth 2009; Wagner 2009, 2020). A related challenge comes from the existence of foci nested inside other foci (Neeleman & Szendrői 2004). The containing focus may move to SpecFocusP and be interpreted there, but where is the contained focus supposed to be interpreted?
- Positional restrictions – Phrases generated higher than FocusP, such as hanging topics (Benincà 2001; Benincà & Poletto 2004; Giorgi 2015), or generated in a separate clause, as CLLD-topics in ellipsis-based analyses (Ott 2015; Fernandez-Sanchez 2016), should be unable to focus, as downward and trans-clausal movement is banned. Yet contrastive topics are often analysed as involving focalization (Büring 1997; Krifka 2008; Rooth 2016) and focalized hanging topics have been claimed to exist (Samek-Lodovici, to appear). How should we account for them?

These predictions, and the challenges they pose, are all the more compelling when considering that the most widely accepted model for the interpretation of focused phrases, namely Rooth (1985, 1992), assumes interpretation in-situ, rather than movement to a specific position (Rooth 1992, 2016; Wagner 2020: section 3.16). This makes it all the more necessary for linguists to examine whether our current analysis properly accounts for the full distribution of contrastive focalization and what adjustments, if any, might be necessary.

This workshop aims at addressing these issues and, by so doing, strengthening our analysis of contrastive focalization, and widening its empirical scope. Welcome contributions may describe focalization phenomena that challenge current assumptions on FocusP, or, conversely, explain how those assumptions, with or without minimal adjustments, do account for phenomena that might at first appear to challenge them.

Contact Vieri Samek-Lodovici ([v.samek-lodovici@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:v.samek-lodovici@ucl.ac.uk)) with any questions.