

Focus of correction and remnant movement in Basque

Jon Ortiz de Urbina. *University of Deusto*

Numerous descriptions of Basque (Villasante (1980:259), Osa (1990:114), Hualde et al. (1994:169-170) and Hidalgo (1996) among others) mention a type of structure where an emphasized element occurs to the right of the verb.¹ Thus, Villasante reports (1980:259) that “se oyen frases como *Kostatzen da ikaragarri, Kofesetzen dira maiz* (Ax. 346), *Zure aita zen guarda, Elurraren kolorea da zuria*, etc.² Estos complementos puestos detrás del verbo se pronuncian con una inflexión particular de la voz que denota la voluntad de resaltarlos”. While often restricted to colloquial registers, these constructions present interesting properties worth studying. In this paper, I will examine such apparent post-verbal foci and propose they correspond to (one type of) regular, pre-verbal foci. In section 1, I deal with some phonetic traits that identify postverbal foci. On top of the ‘particular inflection’ Villasante points out, probably an intonational or accentual property of the element itself, such elements are often separated from the rest of the clause to the left by a pause or intonational break, which I will indicate by a sharp sign, as in the following example from Elordieta (2001):

- (1) Ardoa ekarri diot # ANDONIRI.
 wine brought AUX Andoni.to
 ‘I brought the wine to Andoni.’

Section 2 discusses the exact position of such elements relative to the verb and the clause: as I will show, these constituents are not merely postverbal, but also ‘final’, or, more exactly, right peripheral. In section 3, I briefly mention the particular semantics/pragmatics associated with this type of emphasis, showing that, though final, these elements have wide scope over the preceding constituents. Finally, in section 4, I sketch an analysis which claims that such apparently final emphasis is in fact to be identified as regular focalization. Briefly, I will propose that the emphatic element occupies the same position as preverbal foci, perhaps Spec of FocP, and that its appearance to the right is the result of remnant movement of the TP material to a Topic or Ground Phrase above the Focus Phrase.

1. Intonational contour

As indicated above, postverbal emphatic elements are intonationally set apart from the preceding clause by pauses and pitch contours. This is important, since these elements should not be confused with other postverbal elements which lack such phonetic features. Thus, contrast the last constituent in (1) with the same linear element in the following sentence, where *ardoa* ‘wine’ is contrastively focalized:

- (2) ARDOA ekarri diot Andoniri.
 ‘It is the wine that I brought to Andoni.’

¹ The research in this paper was sparked by Prof. de Rijk’s work on related issues. This is just a particular example of what has been a constant effect of Prof. de Rijk in the field of Basque linguistics. Directly or indirectly, we are all greatly indebted to his contributions. It is a great pleasure to acknowledge this debt. I would also like to thank A. Elordieta and M. Uribe-Etxebarria for their comments and discussion on some of the ideas in this paper. This research has been funded by a grant from the Basque Government to the project PI-1998-127

² Literally, *It costs a lot, They go to confession very often, Your father was a guard, The color of the snow is white*, where the final constituent in all is being emphasized.

While both instances of *Andoniri* occur to the right of the verb, the one in (2) is intonationally linked to the clause to its left and does not correspond to the type of final focus we are dealing with in this paper. We will see below that acceptability judgements can be crucially linked to this difference.

As Villasante's quotation above indicates, native speakers perceive the postverbal element in these examples as phonetically emphasized in some way. On top of the intonational facts, it seems that this impression may also be built on accentual patterns. Although most descriptions on Basque are not explicit about suprasegmental information, we can rely on Hualde et al. (1994), who offer detailed phonetic transcriptions with accentual information for the Lekeitio dialect. This variety is particularly interesting in that all sentences must contain a focal peak with peculiar phonological distribution, so that we can check whether final foci also display phonetic traits usually associated with preverbal foci. In fact, a look at the transcribed texts they offer shows that these elements do bear focal stress. This is shown in the following examples, where focal stress is indicated by the circumflex accent:

- (3) a. ... *da gobiernuuk emóten dotzes berróei millô* (pg. 218)
 and government.ERG give.IMPF AUX forty million
 '... and the government gives them forty million'
 b. ... *da botáten dábe, ondorâ* (pg. 219)
 and throw.IMPF AUX bottom.to
 'and they throw it to the bottom'
- (4) *kéndu orretxeri, mandibulía* (pg. 227)
 take.out that.EMP.to jaw.DET
 'take out the jaw to that (very) one'

The items bearing focal stress in (3) are lexically unaccented words which are being uttered with a focalized pattern, even though this possibility is almost always realized in the position immediately before the verb. In the same way, the final element in (4) is marked with the focal stress corresponding to a lexically marked item, falling on the penultimate syllable. The point is that final foci are not only intonationally set apart from the rest of the clause, but are also accentually marked as foci.

2. *Postverbal vs. final position*

Villasante's paragraph mentions *postverbal* constituents, but since all of his examples contain one single constituent after the verb, it is not immediately evident whether the emphasized element can be found just anywhere to the right of the verb, or immediately to its right or even yet, in the clause final position. The example in (4) already shows that something like the latter might be the case, since *mandibulía* 'the jaw' is final. A final pattern is in fact found in many VO languages as a relatively unmarked 'focus' position (cfr. the traditional 'end-focus' principle in Quirk et al. 1985, described in formal terms by Cinque 1993; see also Uribe-Etxebarria 2001), and this might be the source of the prescriptivist dislike for these patterns, often branded as syntactic calques from Spanish.

Further evidence that the relevant 'postverbal' position in question is in fact final may be derived from the following sentences:

- (5) a. *Jonek irakurri du periodikoa ETXEAN.*

Jon.ERG read.PRF AUX newspaper.DET home.at
 ‘Jon read the newspaper at home.’
 b.??Jonek irakurri du ETXEAN periodikoa.

It seems, though, that more than the linear relation with respect to the verb, what is crucial is that the emphasized element immediately follows the intonational break. Such break often follows the verb, but may occur further to the right, as we have just seen. Typically, one single element follows the break, and when more do, the first one bears the emphasis. Much more work remains to be done on this issue in order to establish the exact distributional possibilities of ‘final’ foci in the different subtypes which seem to exist.³

3. The semantics and pragmatics of final foci.

Final foci in Basque may receive the same range of emphatic interpretations as preverbal foci. In particular, they may be both informational or identificational (Kiss 1998). Thus, all of cases I have found in the transcribed texts in Hualde et al. (1994), from which examples (3) and (4) are taken, seem to correspond to non-contrastive, new information foci. At the same time, Elordieta (2001) discusses these structures as instances of contrastive, identificational focus. It may be the case that different interpretations are associated with different dialects and even with registers. Thus, the new information, merely emphatic focus of the transcribed texts corresponds to a very informal, colloquial conversational register, whereas the corrective focalization mentioned in Elordieta (2001) may have a wider register distribution. In this article, I will concentrate on the ‘corrective’ type of contrastive focus, which finds its way more easily into monitored registers than other types of final emphasis.⁴

Corrective foci are more similar to echo-questions than to normal information questions. In the former the request for identification is directed to an element in a previously uttered statement; in corrective focalization sentences, an element in a previously uttered statement is changed to provide a corrected identification. Just like echo-questions often differ in their syntactic realization from *bona fide* questions, corrective foci may also be expressed by alternative syntactic means different from those found with other types of informational or identificational emphasis.

3.1 Corrective focalization

In the type of sentences under consideration here, focalized right peripheral elements are interpreted as corrective foci: somebody’s utterance is corrected in such a way that the information objected to is intonationally highlighted in the right periphery, set apart from the information assumed to be true to its left. There are some similarities between corrective and contrastive foci, (a) and (b), respectively, in the following examples:

(6) a. Ardoa ANDONIRI ekarri diot.
 wine Andoni.to brought AUX
 ‘It is to Andoni that I brought wine.’

³ The break itself seems to be optional in some cases, perhaps depending on the nature of the emphasized constituent and the type of ‘final’ focalization. It is less common, for instance, with foci which follow the copula.

⁴ Another type of final emphasis which is particularly common in the colloquial language but is often weeded out from written registers is that found with copulative verbs, Hualde et al. (1994:169)

b. Ardoa ekarri diot # ANDONIRI

When the focus in (a) is given a contrastive interpretation, we find an existential presupposition (both *ardoa* ‘wine’ and *ekarri diot* ‘brought’ are presupposed material); moreover, we exhaustively identify an element as that about which what is presupposed holds true (*Andoniri* ‘to Andoni’). Similarly, in the corrective focus example (b), *Andoni*, and not some previously mentioned person, is identified as the participant about whom the remaining information holds true. The constituent set apart in (b) has a contrast set defined by the previous discourse statement. That set contains in fact one single element, the constituent which is corrected. This is therefore similar to contrastive foci, where there is a contextually defined contrast set. Elordieta (2001) points out that the corrective interpretation can also be obtained by placing the focus in the more standard preverbal position. It looks then that both informational and identificational interpretations are available in either position.

3.2 Scopal relations

In section 1, we showed that final corrective foci share phonological characteristics with preverbal ones. In this section, I will try to show that the two elements also share some important scopal properties. In particular, I will show that corrective foci have scope over elements in the validated part of the clause, even though they linearly follow them. The arguments in this section all involve the interaction of focalization with negation, and try to show in different ways that corrective foci behave unlike other constituents following negation in having wide scope over it.

Since we will be comparing final foci with emphatic elements in negative clauses, it is important to differentiate negative foci from the apparently similar *quasifoci* also found in negative clauses. Both can be found in the the following examples:

- (7) a. HORREGATIK ez da etorri.
 that.because not AUX come
 ‘He has not come *because of that*.’ (=That is the reason why he did not come)
- b. Ez da horregatik etorri.
 not AUX that.because come
 ‘He has not come *because of that*.’ (=It is not the case that that is the reason)
- (8) a. ANDONIRI ez diot ardoa ekarri.
 Andoni.to not AUX wine brought
 ‘I did not bring wine *to Andoni*.’ (=It is to Andoni that I did not bring wine)
- b. Ez diot ardoa ANDONIRI ekarri.
 not AUX wine *Andoni.to* brought
 ‘I did not bring wine *to Andoni*.’ (=It is not the case that I brought wine to him)

De Rijk (1998) has shown that only the highlighted elements in (a) correspond to preverbal foci in affirmative clauses, while those in (b), which he labels *quasifoci*, do not correspond to foci, even though they may be contrasted. Ortiz de Urbina (to appear) shows that regular foci have scope over negation in these examples, while *quasifoci* take narrow scope with respect to it. Furthermore, *quasifoci* do not occupy any functional projection where focus is checked, while regular foci occur in one, which we might label Focus Phrase. Now, when we check the scopal properties of final corrective foci in negative clauses, it turns out that they correspond fully to those of initial, preauxiliary

foci, rather than those of postauxiliary quasifoci. This can be observed in the following examples:

- (9) Ez da etorri # HORREGATIK.
 not is come because.of.that
 ‘He has not come because of that.’ (=That, and not (the) other, is the reason why he has not arrived)
- (10) Ez diot ekarri ardoa # ANDONIRI.
 not AUX brought wine Andoni.to
 ‘I did not bring the wine to Andoni.’ (=It is to Andoni that I did not bring the wine)

As the translations in the first example show, the adjunct *horregatik* ‘because of that’ has scope over negation, as in (7a), even though it linearly follows the negative particle as in (7b). In the same way, in (10), the identified participant is not interpreted inside the scope of negation, even though it follows it as in (8b).

These scopal relations can also be shown to obtain by comparing the types of contrastive tags that can be added to these sentences. A constituent under the scope of negation can be contrasted with a positive tag (introduced by *baizik* ‘but’), while a constituent which is not negated can be contrasted with a negative tag like *not X*. Contrast then the two examples in (11). In (a), *Andoniri* ‘to Andoni’ follows negation but is neither separated from the preceding constituents by any pause nor marked by any special intonational pattern; both features single out the same constituent in (b) as a contrastive focus:

- (11) a. Ez diot ekarri ardoa Andoniri, *ez Mireni / Mireni baizik.
 not AUX brought wine Andoni.to not Mary.to Mary.to but
 ‘I did not bring wine to Andoni, *not/but to Mary.’
- b. Ez diot ekarri ardoa # ANDONIRI, ez Mireni /??Mireni baizik.
 not AUX brought wine Andoni.to not Mary.to Mary.to but
 ‘I did not bring the wine to Andoni, not/??but to Mary.’

Correspondingly, if at all, only a positive contrast would be acceptable in (a).⁵ This contrasts with (b), where the negative tag is possible (if slightly difficult to interpret, given that this negative phrase overtly rejects a constituent in a validated negative clause *not bringing wine to someone*). Again, this shows that *Andoniri* in (b) is not inside the scope domain of negation even though linearly following it. This scopal relation is also typical of real foci, rather than foci of negation or quasifoci, as indicated above. Thus, while we are dealing in a way with a certain type of contrastive focus, this ‘contrast’ is unrelated to the one found with quasifoci, and should instead be equated, in terms of scope, with what we encounter in the regular, preverbal focus of negatives.⁶

Further evidence that the corrective focus has scope over the validated part of the proposition is provided by examples involving universal quantification. As is well-

⁵ This type of contrast would be more likely expressed by a *quasifocus* type of structure. See de Rijk (1998) and Ortiz de Urbina (to appear). This sentence would also be acceptable with *ez eta* ‘and neither’ rather than *ez* ‘not’ by itself. Since the former is a negative conjunction, this shows that *Andoniri* ‘to Andoni’ is interpreted under the scope of negation.

⁶ This is normal, because corrective foci are not only found in negative sentences, while, as I claim in Ortiz de Urbina (to appear), the type of contrast one finds with quasifoci stems from the presence of negation and requires the presence of the latter.

known, many natural languages dislike universal quantifiers with wide scope over negation (\forall *not*), preferring the equivalent expression with an existential quantifier interpreted with narrow scope with respect to negation (*not* \exists). Accordingly, a universally quantified expression in the focus position is judged deviant (a), while no problem emerges where it occurs inside the scope of negation, in the quasifocus position (b) or any other where it is interpreted as negated (c):⁷

- (12) a. ??IKASLE GUZTIEK ez dute azterketa aprobatu.
 student all.ERG not AUX exam.DET pass.PRF
 ‘All the students did not pass the exam.’
 b. Ez dute azterketa ikasle guztiek aprobatu.
 ‘Not all students passed the exam.’
 c. Ez dute azterketa aprobatu ikasle guztiek.
 ‘Not all students passed the exam.’

However, where *ikasle guztiek* ‘all students’ is assigned corrective intonation, the same deviant status observed above with foci is reproduced:

- (13) ??Ez dute azterketa aprobatu # IKASLE GUZTIEK.
 not AUX exam passed student all.ERG
 ‘ALL THE STUDENTS have not passed the exam.’

Notice the apparently minimal intonational difference between (12c) and (13). This shows again that the corrective quantified focus in (13) is interpreted as having wide scope over the linearly preceding negation.

NPIs further clarify the nature and scopal relationship of final foci with respect to other clausal elements. However, the evidence is here less direct. NPIs are licensed by negation, and are always interpreted within its scope. There is then no difference between pre-negation and post-negation NPIs:

- (14) a. *Ezer* ez diot esango.
 anything not AUX say.FUT
 ‘I will not tell him/her ANYTHING.’
 b. Ez diot *ezer* esango.

Pre-negation NPIs as in (a) are always emphatic. There is a contrast then with regular foci like those in (7a) and (8a), which, as we have seen, take scope *over* negation. While one must find an explanation for how NPIs can be licensed by negation in that position, the fact is that there is no scopal difference between *ezer* and negation in (14a,b). As a result, the existence of sentences like the following, where a final focus is interpreted as having scope under negation, does not provide any counterevidence for the analysis presented in this paper, since the same relation holds also for NPIs in pre-negation position.⁸

⁷ This sentence should be kept apart from another one with the same order where the quantified expression is topicalized. This is acceptable, with a reconstructed interpretation of the operator under the scope of negation. The focus in (a) should therefore be assigned a very emphatic intonation.

⁸ The most normal type of interpretation here would be emphatic, as opposed to contrastive. This is a general property of NPIs (see Herburger 2000).

- (15) Ez, ez dut irakurri # EGUNKARIRIK.
 no not AUX read.PRF newspaper.PRTT
 ‘No, I did not read any newspapers.’
- (16) Ez zuen asmatu (#) IA-IA INORK. (Garzia 1997:197)
 no AUX guess.PRF almost anyone.ERG
 ‘ALMOST NOBODY guessed.’

There is however another property of NPIs which can supply more positive evidence in connection with the status of corrective foci. Although the intuitions are not very sharp, Sánchez (1999) claims that the presence of NPIs blocks the possibility of contrasting other elements. This is shown here with quasifoci:

- (17) ?Ez du inoiz hau egin, hori baizik.
 not AUX ever that make.PRF this but
 ‘He’s never done this, but that.’
- (18) ?Ez dut ezer zuretzat erosi, niretzat baizik
 not AUX anything you.for buy.PRF I.for but
 ‘I did not buy anything for you but for me.’

It seems as if the presence of the NPI often leads to an interpretation where the event is negated as well; since the contrast asserts that the event did take place, albeit with, say, another participant, the sentences are often deviant, according to Sánchez. They are acceptable, however, if the contrast contains an element which asserts that the event did take place:

- (19) Ez du inoiz hau egin, baina hori bai.
 not AUX ever that make.PRF but that yes
 ‘He’s never done this, but that, he has.’

On the other hand, there is no problem if the contrast is established with an element outside of the scope of negation, such as an initial focus. This is seen in the following example, where *ez Peruk* ‘not Peru’ contrasts with *Jon*. Since the latter is not negated, the contrast is expressed with a negative tag:

- (20) JONEK ez du inoiz hori egin, ez Peruk.
 Jon.ERG not AUX ever that make.PRF not Peru
 ‘It is Jon that has never done this, not Peru.’

Exactly the same is observed with final foci, which can be contrasted with an element in a negative tag:

- (21) Ez dut inoiz egin # HAU, ez hori.
 not AUX ever make.PRF this not that
 ‘I have never made this.(=This is what I have never made, not that)’

This shows again that post-negation *hau* ‘this’ is not inside the scope domain of negation.

4. Final foci and remnant movement

4.1 Final foci as initial foci

In the preceding section, I have presented some arguments which indicate that corrective foci have the same scopal properties as left-peripheral foci. In this section I would like to argue that this is so because in fact they *are* left-peripheral foci, that is, they check their focus features in the same functional projection as non-corrective contrastive foci. The similarity of behaviour between the two is not only based on the similar interaction with negation, but extends to other areas. For instance, Etxepare (2002) notes that, just as in Hungarian, negative existential quantifiers like *gutxi* ‘few’ must occur in the focus position in affirmative sentences:

- (22) a. *Oso jende gutxik ikusi du hori.*
 very people few.ERG see.PRF AUX that
 ‘Very few people saw that.’
 b. **Oso jende gutxik hori ikusi du.*
 very people few.ERG that see.PRF AUX
 ‘Very few people saw that.’

If, as claimed here, in fact final foci occupy the same position as foci in declarative affirmative sentences, we would expect phrases quantified with *gutxi* to be able to occur in the final position. As the following example shows, the expectation is met:⁹

- (23) *Ez, modu horretan pentsatzen du # OSO JENDE GUTXIK*
 no way that.in think.IMPF AUX very people few.ERG
 ‘No, VERY FEW PEOPLE think that way.’

We can account for this if *oso jende gutxik* occupies in fact the specifier position of the focus checking phrase, FocP.¹⁰ This analysis is developed in the following section.

4.2 Remnant movement

I would like to capture this link between final foci and initial foci by claiming that we have the type of configuration produced by remnant movement. From this perspective, the corrective focus moves first to the specifier of Focus Phrase. Subsequently, the remainder structure moves higher up, to some left peripheral position, probably to a Topic or Ground Phrase (Poletto & Pollock 2000; see also Uribe-Etxebarria 2001). The result is that the constituent in the focus position will linearly follow what was originally c-commanded by it. The structure can be represented in a

⁹ As usual, it is important to assign the appropriate intonational contour to the corrective phrase, since otherwise the sentence is as unacceptable as (22b).

¹⁰ A further prediction that the identification of final and ‘initial’ foci makes is that we should not be able to find the two of them in the same clause, since there is only one single projection where the contrastive focus feature can be checked. This is shown to be the case in the following example, where the two emphatic elements should be pronounced with contrastive emphasis:

- (i) **JONEK eman dio Mikeli # LIBURUA*
 Jon.ERG give AUX Mikel.to book

This is probably not a very strong argument in the sense that two foci would perhaps be incompatible anyway, but it is certainly what is expected if there is only one position involved.

simplified way as follows, where CP (FinP in Rizzi's (1997) proposal) would contain the original positions for the focalized element XP:¹¹

(24) $_{\text{TopP}}[\text{CP}_i [\text{Top}_{\text{FocP}}[\text{XP} [\text{Foc } t_i]]]]$

Notice that, pragmatically, the remnant phrase is the old information, repeated from the discourse assertion that is being corrected. Its appearance in the left periphery, inside a Topic Phrase or even a Ground Phrase for presupposed material salient in the discourse, seems then justified. The break separating the clause from the corrective focus would also be similar to that separating marked topics from foci. An analysis in terms of remnant movement is therefore not only theoretically appealing in that it eliminates one possible case of rightward movement, but also pragmatically appropriate, since it fits the characteristics of the non-focalized constituents.

Such topicalized material would be reconstructed in the original position. Topic reconstruction is independently observed in other structures. Thus, contrast the interpretation of focalized and topicalized quantifiers in the following examples with respect to negation:

- (25) a. ??IKASLE GUZTIEK ez dute azterketa aprobatu.
 student all.ERG not AUX exam.DET pass.PRF
 'It was all students that did not pass the exam.'
 b. Ikasle guztiek (,) ez dute azterketa aprobatu.
 'As for all students, it is not the case that they passed the exam.'

In (a), repeated from (12a) above, the focalized universal quantifier has scope over negation, resulting in a deviant structure. No deviancy arises in (b), however, where even though the topicalized phrase precedes negation, it is interpreted under its scope. This can be understood if the topicalized phrase is reconstructed inside TP. In the same fashion, the validated material repeated from the discourse utterance is reconstructed to its original, non-topicalized position. The scope relations observed in section 3.2 follow from this reconstruction, since negation is part of the left peripheral material which will be reconstructed to the right of the corrective focus.

There seems to be a difference worth noting with respect to normal focalization in Basque. As is well-known, the latter shows V2-like effects, so that foci occur immediately to the left of 'verbs'. This may follow from head movement of the inflected verb to the Focus head position specified by the focalized constituent. In the structures at hand, however, no verb second effect seems to be found. In the structure sketched in (24), for instance, the head Foc position is not filled by any material, so that the corrective focus stands by itself. Similarly, where the latter originates in an embedded clause, we do not find the preferred 'verb initial' pattern in the clauses. Compare in this respect the position of the verb in the following two examples:

- (26) a. Jonek esan du [bihar etorriko dela] # MIKEL.
 Jon.ERG say.PRF AUX tomorrow come.FUT AUX.COMP
 'Jon said that MIKEL will come tomorrow.'
 b. MIKEL_i esan du Jonek [t_i etorriko dela bihar.]

¹¹ The focalization of corrective foci would then involve what Elordieta (this volume) describes as the 'sentence initial' strategy. This involves movement of the focus to a designated position, and differs from the unmarked in-situ focalization of new information she describes. This is normal, since we are dealing with discourse-related contrastive focalizations (see Cinque 1993).

Mikel say.PRFAUX Jon.ERG come.FUT AUX.COMP tomorrow
 ‘It is Mikel that Jon said will come tomorrow.’

In the focus extraction pattern in (b) both the matrix and embedded verbs are initial with respect to other clause-mate constituents in the preferred order for many speakers, and this can be related to V2 effects in the lower and upper clause. None of this is found in the corresponding corrective focus structure in (a), where the upper verb is more likely to follow its subject, while the embedded verb is more neutrally placed following the temporal adjunct.¹²

A crucial aspect of this analysis of corrective foci structures as involving remnant movement is that the corrective focus does not occupy a position in the clausal material to its left, but has actually been taken out of the CP. All of the examples we have examined so far involve one single clausal structure, so that the focus would have moved to its own FocP. However, if more clauses are merged in the structure, the ‘distance’ between the corrective focus and the immediately preceding material will correspondingly increase, since the focus is hypothesized to occupy the topmost FocP, rather than that of the clause to its left. Two consequences follow from this. On one hand, the preceding clause may be not that where the focus originates, but a more deeply embedded one. Secondly, if the focus originates in the clause to its left, an island effect should arise where the latter is an adjunct, under the assumption that the focus would have had to be extracted out of the clause. We will examine both predictions in turn.

We can test the first prediction by trying to correct the underlined element in a statement like the following:

- (27) Jonek uste du [Mirenek Peruri bakarrik esango diola
 Jon.ERG think AUX Miren.ERG Peru.to only say.FUT AUX.COMP
 [dirua non dagoen.
 money.DET where is.COMP
 ‘Jon thinks that Miren will tell only Peru where the money is.’

If the corrective focus does not occupy some clause internal position to the right in its own clause, but actually moves to the FocP specifier, it could proceed then to a higher Spec,FocP position and eventually get stranded to the right after movement of the remnant material to the left. This is in fact possible, as shown in (28):

- (28) Jonek uste du Mirenek esango diola dirua non dagoen # PERURI BAKARRIK.
 ‘Jon thinks that Miren will tell where the money is ONLY TO PERU.’

The second expectation is that if these structures involve long movement out of the originating clause, we should not find corrective foci corresponding to elements of adjunct clauses, since extraction would create an island violation. In checking this prediction, it is important to make sure that other possible sources of ungrammaticality are discarded, so that the deviancy does indeed result from an island violation caused by extraction from an adjunct clause. Thus, for instance, in an example like the following, with a sentence final temporal adjunct, the prediction only seems to be confirmed:

¹² This might be the case because the verb/inflection does not in fact end up in the FocP head, but in a lower head, say C. Then, it would be part of the remnant structure moved higher up past the focus. Whether this is the case in these structures alone or more generally is left open here.

- (29) ??Hortik joan ginen [t_i etorri zenean] # JON_i
 there.ABL go.PRF AUX come.PRF AUX.when Jon
 ‘We went that way when JON came.’

We might account for the deviant status of this sentence by claiming that *Jon* has been extracted from the adjunct clause on its way to the matrix focus position. However, this is not very compelling, since, while that might indeed be the case, there is an alternative explanation for the unacceptability of this example: postverbal constituents seem slightly marginal (at least in less colloquial registers) in some adjunct clauses. Thus, a sentence like the preceding one would also be marked even if the last constituent were not pronounced with corrective intonation, as in (30):

- (30) ??Hortik joan ginen etorri zenean Jon

Since the order in (29) might also correspond to an adjunct internal scrambling of the lower subject *Jon*, its unacceptability could also be accounted for in an alternative analysis not involving extraction, just like (30).

We can however eliminate this ‘right scrambling’ effect by checking a situation where the adjunct clause is not sentence final as in (29), but occupies a more ‘canonical’ position to the left of the main verb, as in (31):

- (31) *[t_i etorri ondoren] joan ginen # AITA_i
 come.PRF later go.PRF AUX father
 ‘We left when FATHER arrived. (intended)’

The sentence final positioning of *aita* ‘father’ cannot be the result of clause internal scrambling here, since it is not to the right of its clause. The sentence is unacceptable, and we can easily account for this as a result of an island violation resulting from the extraction of the lower subject to the matrix FocP.¹³

There is yet a further prediction that the focalization analysis presented here makes. If final foci occupy the specifier of a FocP and reach that position in the same way as regular preverbal foci, we would expect the whole range of focalization strategies to be available in this structure. In particular, we expect a focalized element to be able to pied-pipe the clause it occurs in; after movement of the remnant structure, the whole pied-piped constituent will appear in the peripheral position. As the following sentences show, this strategy is certainly available for corrective foci.

- (32) Jonek hartu zuen # ANDONIRI ekarri zenion ardoa.
 Jon.ERG take.PRF AUX Andoni.to bring.PRF AUX.COMP wine.DET
 ‘Jon took the wine that you brought to ANDONI.’

The goal argument *Andoniri* ‘to Andoni’ drags along the relative clause and the whole DP containing it.

4.3 Further questions

¹³ In effect, this argument is complementary to that built around sentence (28) above. There, an intermediate clause with a bridge verb serves as origin for the extraction of the focus to the right. Here I show that something similar is not possible if the source clause is an island.

If this approach to corrective focus is on the right track, there are several questions that must be addressed. Beginning with pragmatic considerations, we have seen above that ‘final’ foci are used in the spoken language both with purely informational and also with identificational, contrastive functions.¹⁴ The latter seems not to have the whole range of contrastive uses one may find in pre-verbal foci, but, rather, it may be ‘specialized’ for corrections of previous utterances. If this is so, while corrective foci can also be expressed in the preverbal position, not all preverbal foci will have corresponding ‘final’ alternatives. Similar specialized uses of final expressions are also noted in Jiménez (1997), Uribe-Etxebarria (2001) for apparently in-situ questions in Spanish. In the Basque case, what is forcing a corrective, ‘contrastive’ interpretation is the fact that the remnant part is validated given information, perhaps occupying a topic or ground phrase: when some part of the information is corrected, the remainder is presupposed to be correct. With respect to the focalized item itself, it cannot be normal ‘new’ information in this type of context: the contrast with a discourse utterance means that there will always be a contextually defined contrast set (the corrected element), so the contrastive interpretation is virtually unavoidable.

A second question which must also be discussed is why this strategy is not available for wh-words. A normal question cannot be expressed as in (33):

- (33) *Andoniri ardoa ekarri dio nork?
 Andoni.to wine.DET bring.PRF AUX who.ERG
 ‘Who brought wine to Andoni?’

I will not develop any account of this problem here, merely pointing at some factors which may help understand it better. To begin with, the situation might be related to a similar problem discussed in Kayne (1998) and den Dikken & Giannakidou (to appear). According to Kayne, foci in English do move to a FocP, but do not show up in the left periphery precisely because remnant movement of the TP material obscures this prior movement. Normal focus movement in English would be similar to corrective focus movement. However, remnant TP movement is blocked in English wh-questions, just as in Basque wh-questions and ‘normal’ contrastive focalization. Den Dikken & Giannakidou propose to account for this asymmetry by making it follow from intervention effects: the preposed remnant material would block (LF) movement of the [wh]-feature of the wh-element to the Force Phrase head position. This approach does not seem very promising in Basque, since intervention effects are not found when constituents stand between FocP and ForceP. Thus, contrast the effects triggered in Hungarian by the presence of the quantifier (see Lipták 2001), with the corresponding absence in the Basque example (b):

- (34) a. *Mindig kit hivtál meg?
 always who.ACC invited.2sg.indef PTCL
 ‘Who did you always invite?’
 b. Beti, nor gomitatzen zenuen?
 always who invite.IMPF AUX
 ‘Who did you always invite?’

According to Lipták (2001), the wh-feature of *kit* ‘who’ in FocP cannot move over the quantifier in a functional projection above it, so it cannot be checked against the top

¹⁴ Although this is mere speculation, the latter seem more general and more likely to find their way into the written language.

functional head (ForceP). However, topics in Basque, whether quantificational or not, do not produce any unacceptability, so it is not clear why remnant movement could not apply in wh-questions.

Notice that the previous discussion has centered on the parallelism with normal foci and wh-questions in English, while the final foci constructions studied here correspond to a corrective contrast more akin to echo-questions than to regular information questions. Now, although, as is often the case in Basque, the facts have not been sufficiently studied, it has been noticed (Etxepare & Ortiz de Urbina 2002) that even in echo-questions Basque strongly prefers wh-words which occur in the preverbal position:

- (35) a. Jonek Andoniri ardoa ekarri dio.
 Jon.ERG Andoni.to wine.DET bring.PRF AUX
 ‘Jon brought wine to Andoni.’
 b.??Nork Andoniri ardoa ekarri dio(la)?
 who.ERG AUX(COMP)
 ‘Who brought wine to Andoni?’
 c. Andoniri ardoa nork ekarri dio(la)?

Corresponding to the subject in (a), an echo-question which merely substitutes the wh-word for the subject constituent (b) is less preferred than the (c) pattern, where the wh-word occupies the preverbal position. However, a final positioning of the wh-word seems better than (b):

- (36) ?Andoniri ardoa ekarri dio(la) NORK?

If this is so, it would seem that the remnant movement pattern is available for both foci and wh-words, provided the appropriate pragmatic context is met (contrast with the example in (33), intended to represent a regular information question).

REFERENCES:

- Cinque, G. 1993. "A Null theory of Phrasal and Compound Stress". *LI* 24:2, 239-297
- Den Dikken, M. & A. Giannakidou, to appear. "The syntax of 'aggressively non-D-linked' wh-phrases in Hungarian and English". To appear in *LI*
- de Rijk, R.P.G. 1998. "Focus and Quasifocus in Basque Negative Statements". *De Lingua Vasconum: Selected Writings*, 421-433. Bilbao: UPV/EHU [ASJU Gehigarriak XLIII]
- Elordieta, A. 2001. *Verb Movement and Constituent Permutation in Basque*, Leiden: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap
- Elordieta, A. This volume. "On the (im)possibility of prosodic focus marking in embedded contexts in Northern Bizkaian Basque"
- Etxepare, R. 2002. Negation. In J.I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina, eds., *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin: Mouton
- Etxepare, R. & J. Ortiz de Urbina. 2002. Focalization. In J.I. Hualde & J. Ortiz de Urbina, eds., *A Grammar of Basque*. Berlin: Mouton
- Garzia, J.R. 1997. *Joskera Lantegi*. Gasteiz-Vitoria: IVAP/HAEE
- Hidalgo, V. 1996. "Euskal joskeraren mito kaltegarriak". *Hizpide* 35, 39-51
- Herburger, E. 2000. *What counts: Focus and quantification*. Cambridge: The MIT Press
- Hualde, J.I. et al. 1994. *The Basque Dialect of Lekeitio*. Bilbao: UPV/EHU [ASJU Gehigarriak XXXIV]
- Jiménez, M.L. 1997. *Semantic and Pragmatic Conditions on Word-Order in Spanish*. Georgetown Univ., Ph.D. dissertation
- Kayne, R. 1998. "Overt and Covert Movement". *Syntax* 1.2, 128-191
- Kiss, K. É. (1998). "Identificational focus versus information focus". *Language* 74.2, 245-273
- Lipták, A. 2001. "On the Syntax of Wh-items in Hungarian", Leiden: Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalwetenschap
- Poletto, N. & J.Y. Pollock 2000. "On the left periphery of some Romance wh-questions", unpublished ms., University of Padova & University of Picardie at Amiens
- Ortiz de Urbina, J. (to appear). "Ezezko perpausetako fokoak (Galdegaiak eta ukagaiak)". Proceedings of the XV Euskaltzaindia International Congress, Baiona, September 2001
- Osa, E. 1990. *Euskararen hitzordena komunikazio zereginaren arauera*. Leioa: UPV/EHU
- Quirk, R. et al. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman, London
- Rizzi, L. 1997. "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery". In L. Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337, Dordrecht:Kluwer
- Sánchez, Cristina. 1999. "La negación". In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte, *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. 2, 2561-2634. Madrid: Espasa
- Uribe-Etxebarria, M. 2001. in press. "A review of Jiménez (1997)", *GLOT*.
- Villasante, L. 1980. *Sintaxis de la oración simple*. Oñate: Editorial Franciscana