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Under Rizzi (1997, 2004), contrastive foci may always front left-peripherally. Unfrontable contrastive foci should not exist. Under Samek-Lodovici (2015), contrastive foci remain in‑situ. They only front when the clause containing them is discourse-given and, as such, allowed to right-dislocate into rightmost position. Which analysis is empirically supported?

Bianchi et al.’s (2015) data favor the right-dislocation analysis. Sentences (1B-1D) are replies to (1A) focusing ‘MILANO’. Fronting is possible in (1B), where focus is followed by a discourse-given clause. If the new information *fisica* (physics) is present, focus occurs in-situ (1C) but cannot be fronted (1D).

1. A: Gianni studia a Roma. C: No. Studia fisica a MILANOF.

 *John studies in Rome. No. (He) studies physics in Milan.*

 B: No. A MILANOF, studia. D: \* No. A MILANOF, studia fisica.

 *No. In Milan, (he) studies. No. In Milan, (he) studies physics.*

The right-dislocation analysis accounts for these data. In (1B), right-dislocation of ‘*pro*studia’ (he studies) is licensed because the corresponding proposition ‘John studies somewhere’ is entailed by (1A) and hence discourse-given. Its right-dislocation determines focus-fronting in (1B). In (1D) right-dislocation of ‘*pro* studia fisica’ is unlicensed because ‘he studies physics somewhere’ is not entailed by (1A) and hence not discourse-given. Consequently, focus-fronting cannot occur. Rizzi’s analysis, instead, incorrectly predicts focus-fronting in (1D) to remain possible.

Bianchi (2013) and Bianchi and Bocci (2012) rescue Rizzi’s analysis by proposing that (1B) involves *corrective* focus and (1C) *contrastive* focus, and that only *corrective* foci front. They also maintain that the clause following *corrective* focus is always discourse-given because correcting propositions must match the corrected ones but for focus. Only *contrastive* foci, with no match requirement, can add new material.

My talk shows that their analysis is not tenable. If corrections require a match, then (1C), with its unmatched new material, should lack a corrective interpretation, contrary to observation. Furthermore, new data show that alternation (1) extends to confirmative foci, which lack a corrective import. Consider (2), where replies (2B)-(2D) focus ‘ROMA’. As before, focus fronts in (2B) where the rest of the clause is discourse-given, but not in (2D) where new information is added and right-dislocation blocked. Since focus is confirmative, the semantics of correction cannot account for this paradigm.

1. A: Gianni studia a Roma. C: Sì. Studia fisica a ROMAF.

 *John studies in Rome. Yes. (He) studies physics in Rome.*

 B: Sì. A ROMAF, studia. D: \* Sì. A ROMAF, studia fisica.

 *Yes. In Rome, (he) studies. Yes. In Rome, (he) studies physics.*

The key factor across (1)&(2) is the discourse-given status of the clause following focus. Fronting is possible in (1B&2B) because the clause is discourse-given, thus licensing its right-dislocation. In (1D&2D), instead, the added material leaves right-dislocation unlicensed, preventing fronting.

The above observations will be extended to additive focus alternations, enabling a unified analysis across corrective, confirmative, and additive foci. I will also show that the optionality of focus fronting follows from the optionality of right-dislocation.
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