Abstract

Following a feature-based approach to information structure and a new approach to the definition of topics, a structure for different kinds of topics is proposed, showing that the Finnish and Hungarian left peripheries are more similar than previously thought, in line with cartographic models. The most popular definition of topics in terms of aboutness is reanalysed as a consequence of the relationship between the comment of the utterance and support entities: processing effort minimisers, thanks to the application of a principle inspired by Relevance Theory, where comments are expected to be relevant contributions to the discourse. The contrastive feature is proposed to project a head which encodes a true mathematical function, which applies to non-topics, as well. Furthermore, an interface mechanism is proposed for nanosyntax, the feature-based approach being employed.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

This dissertation sets itself the goal of revealing some of the commonalities languages have in the realisation of syntactic topics. In this work, I develop an approach which makes assumptions which derive from outside the realms of narrow syntax. In particular, this account argues that certain principles of cognition proposed in the domain of pragmatics, Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986; 1987; 2002; Wilson & Sperber, 2002; 2004), in particular, are syntactically relevant and that the syntax, but also that information structure, i.e., the manner in which the discourse status of constituents is represented in sentence, relies on syntactic features and mechanisms. This dissertation hopes to shed light on how syntax encodes information structure by proposing distinct, atomic features which encode specific information-structural concepts.

Anybody who has studied grammar at school knows that languages have subjects and objects: in English, knowing what the subject of a sentence is tells you a great deal about how that sentence will be structured. In other languages, however, it is not so simple. Besides these “grammatical” subjects and objects, there are also what have sometimes been called logical subjects: these logical subjects are also known as topics. For example, if we consider a sentence such as the one in (1a), there is a grammatical subject, John, a verb, ate, and an object, the apple. But the same proposition can be expressed with the verb in the passive form, as seen in (1b), where the grammatical subject and object are now the apple and by John, respectively. We can also call the verb and the object as a whole the predicate of the sentence.

(1) a. John ate the apple.
   S V O
   Subject - Predicate

   b. The apple was eaten by John.
   S V O
   Subject - Predicate

Using a passive form of the verb has the general effect of changing the order in which information is presented and changing the information status of the constituents of the sentence. In other words, passivisation is a way of expressing the information structure of the sentence. Typically, the grammatical subject in English tends to be the entity which is being discussed, and the predicate is what is being said about it. But the word order in English is rather inflexible if we compare it to the word order found in languages such as Japanese (2a-b) or Hungarian (2c-d), where one can simply swap subjects and objects to present the information in another order.

(2) Japanese
      John-WA apple.ACC ate
      ‘John ate the apple.’
b.  Ringo-wo John-wa tabeta.
    apple.ACC John-WA ate
    ‘The apple was eaten by John.’

Hungarian

c.  János megette az almát.
    John VP ate apple.ACC
    ‘John ate the apple.’

d.  Az almát megette János.
    the apple.ACC VP ate John
    ‘The apple was eaten by John.’

Typically, languages which allow these kinds of configurations without the use of a
passive have ways of marking case, which allows one to keep track of how the arguments relate
to the verb. In both Japanese and Hungarian, nominative arguments and accusative arguments
are distinguished thanks to case markers: in Japanese, the particle wo marks accusative case;
in Hungarian the accusative case is marked by a case suffix, in this case, it is the –t ending on
the noun almá (apple). Nominative case is not marked on nouns in Hungarian, but it is in
Japanese, where a ga particle is employed, e.g. John-ga. In our example, however, a different
particle replaces this, the wa particle, which is traditionally considered to be the topic marker.

What this work aims to explain is what topics actually are, what they are for, and what
are the differences between the different types of topics discussed in the literature. It is with
this goal in mind that I have turned to two languages, Finnish and Hungarian, two “genetically”
related languages, which are both discourse configural in the sense that their word orders
are at least partially determined by the discourse situation in which they are uttered. In fact,
discourse configurational languages pay heed to the information status of the sentential
constituents in determining the word order in any given sentence. This is precisely what we
observed in (2), where it is actually the discourse context which determines whether I will
present the direct object or the subject as the topic of the sentence.

The reason why Finnish and Hungarian are interesting to examine is that despite their
membership to the same language family and their discourse configurality, there are clear
differences in the way information structural notions are represented in the syntax in these
languages.

In this dissertation, I employ a feature-based account, employing notions from
Cartography, Nanosyntax, Relevance Theory and Autosegmental Phonology, in order to
describe individual features which realise the syntactic projections on constituents. These
features trigger the syntactic movements observed and are also used to spellout information-
structurally relevant morphology and intonational patterns which expresses the information
status of constituents. With regard to the intonational patterns triggered by information
structure, I propose a rule which constitutes a spellout rule bordering between information
structure, morphological spellout in the nanosyntactic approach and supersegmental phonology.
Based on the adoption of assumptions drawn from Relevance Theory, namely an expectation
of the informativeness of contributions in a discourse, I propose a distinct function for the
comment in an utterance, which replaces some of the basic properties which have been
attributed to foci.

Chapter 1 consists of this introduction. In Chapter 2 explains what is meant by
information structure and the discourse, also describing the notions employed in the accounts
for these two phenomena. Chapter 3, I introduce the frameworks I rely on for my account of
topics. Chapter 4 first reviews the literature on the most important aspects of referentiality and
their bearing on topichood (section 4.1), then presents the properties which have been employed in the literature to define topics (section 4.2). Next, it describes a basic topic typology (section 4.3) and then formulates a critique of the features presented in relation to the different kinds of topics described (section 4.4). Chapter 5 presents the proposed features accounting for the different kinds of topics and the predictions made by this approach. Chapter 6 explains how the features proposed in this dissertation relate to Finnish and Hungarian data and also presents a pilot survey which was carried out with Finnish and Hungarian participants. Chapter 7 concludes this dissertation.
Chapter 2. Information structure

The concept of information structure (IS) is crucial to understanding the syntax of natural languages. Even languages which are not considered to be discourse configurational, such as English, have constructions in their grammars which express IS notions.

2.1 What is Information Structure?

*Information structure* (IS), a term first used by Halliday (1967), expresses how an utterance relates to the linguistic and non-linguistic context, as well as what it contributes to the discourse. One observation to be made is that IS need not determine the truth conditions of an utterance, in that the same proposition can be expressed using different structures, the goal of which is not to create a semantic distinction, but to achieve something else which has more to do with the current mental states of the participants in the conversation and communicative intent which goes beyond the proposition.

Perhaps some of the earliest examination of the principles of IS was carried out in the 19th century, by Sámuel Brassai (1860) and George von der Gabelentz (1869), who made a distinctions in terms of psychological subjects (i.e., logical subjects) and predicates, in contrast to grammatical subjects and predicates. This distinction is essential to explaining the common interpretive value of the subject of a passive verb in English and the topic constituent in topic prominent languages, such Japanese and Hungarian, as we will see below.

Mathesius (1939), later, continued working on IS over half a century later, and described a distinction in terms of the *theme* and the *rheme*, translated from the Czech téma/základ and jádro (Daneš, 1974); on Mathesius’ view, the former is what “is being spoken about”, while the latter is what is being said about it. These distinctions reiterate the distinction originally made by Brassai and von der Gabelentz, such that the theme, or téma/základ, is the psychological subject and the rheme, or jádro, is the psychological predicate. A second distinction Mathesius makes is between a so-called starting point of the utterance, which is something which is known or obvious, and what is being said about the starting point. Mathesius did not consider these to be black/white distinctions in the sense that he deemed constituents to vary by degrees in their thematicity or rhematicity, or their knownness or evidentiality.

The Prague School, e.g. Firbas (1975; 1964), Sgall et al (1986; 1993) have also produced a significant amount of IS-related literature. Firbas (1964; 1975) built on Mathesius’ work to develop the notion of *communicative dynamism* (CD), where the *theme* has the lowest level of CD and is, therefore, the least informative element in the utterance. In contrast, the *rheme* contributes the most information and has the highest CD level. Firbas, on his part, referred to IS as the *functional sentence perspective*. More recently, such as in Sgall et al (1986), the terms *theme* and *rheme* have been abandoned in favour of *topic* and *focus*.

Outside of the Prague school, Chafe (1974; 1976), who used the term *information packaging*, described IS as a tool used to “accomodate” the utterance “to temporary states of the addressee’s mind, rather than the long-term knowledge of the addressee” (Chafe, 1976, p. 28). Vallduví (1990) has argued that the utterance should not be divided into two parts as was standard in the Prague School, but three: the first division is between the *focus* and the *ground*, where the former is unelidable and the second acts as a guarantee that the information expressed
in the *focus* is received correctly by the hearer. The *ground* is also divided into two parts: the *link* and the *tail*. The *link* indicates which *knowledge-store* the information must be entered into, while the *tail* expresses in what way the information must be entered into the *knowledge-store* (Vallduví, 1990, pp. 58-61). Knowledge stores are repositories for non-linguistic conceptual structures: propositions which are contributed to the knowledge store need to be converted into non-linguistic form.

IS can be expressed through the syntax, morphology, or phonological marking in the form of intonational patterns, and its realisation varies across languages. IS-marking does not necessarily change the truth conditions of a sentence. For example, the sentences in (3) have the same truth conditions, even though they clearly have different word orders.

(3)  
a. John gave his favourite book to Mary.  
b. To Mary, John gave his favourite book.

Assuming co-reference between the possessive *his* and *John*, the truth conditions of both (3a) and (3b) are met if and only if a specific individual *John* has given an object *x* to a specific individual *Mary*, where *x* is a book and *x* is the book which *John* likes the most. As for the word orders of the two sentences, in (3b), the indirect object of *gave* has been fronted to the beginning of the clause. As a consequence of this, the main news of the sentence is now *his favourite book*. The constituent *to Mary* is not left unchanged, however, as it also gains a special intonational contour. In the next section, I will discuss the concept of the main news, or *focus*, in more detail. Topics on the other hand have been defined as expressing what the sentence is about. For example, in (3a), *John* is a likely topic, and in (3b) *to Mary* and *John* are possible topics.

Despite both sentences having the same truth conditions, they cannot be used interchangeably in a conversation. In particular, the felicitous interpretation of the utterance requires there to be a relevant set of individuals (or, possibly, communicates this), to whom *John* may have given other things, to which the Speaker is making implicit reference through the topicalisation of *to Mary*. When the speaker utters (3b), the hearer must be able to evoke a relevant set of possible goals with which to contrast *to Mary*. Once such a set has been evoked, the proposition “*John gave his favourite book [to x]***” is interpreted as applying at least to the entity *Mary*. In some cases, such a proposition might be interpreted as applying solely to the topicalised entity, but this is not always the case.

### 2.2 Background on Foci

The main news of a sentence is often called the focus of the sentence. Foci typically constitute *new information* or *answers* to questions (Büring, 2005, p. 4). In (4a), *Bruce Willis* might be new information and, thus, a focus. In (4b), *a new bicycle* is the answer to the question asked by speaker A and is therefore also a focus.

(4)  
a. I met BRUCE WILLIS.  
b. A: What did he buy?  
   B: He bought A NEW BICYCLE.

One of the most influential approaches to foci is that proposed in Rooth’s (1985; 1992) alternative semantics framework. Essentially, on Rooth’s view, foci give rise to alternatives by generating a *focus semantic value* in addition to its ordinary semantic value. The focus semantic value is a set of alternative propositions which differ from the ordinary semantic value...
minimally, where the focus is being replaced by alternatives. Another related concept to that of focus is the concept of *background*. Put simply, anything in the sentence which is not part of the Focus is part of the background.

Krifka (2007) notes that Rooth’s approach does not specify how foci should be marked, only that constructions or marking of foci should only be referred to in the sense that they indicate that the interpretation requires the notion of alternatives. According to Krifka, different ways of realising foci can bring about differences in the way the alternatives are employed, resulting in different interpretations. For example, the foci in cleft sentences, e.g. (5a), have an exhaustive interpretation which is not observed with foci which remain in situ (5b). That the focus should be exhaustive indicates that the proposition is false for all the alternatives involved in the interpretation. In the example at hand, this means that the buyer purchased nothing but a new bicycle.

(5) a. It is a new bicycle, that he bought.
   b. He bought a new bicycle.

Krifka (2007) formulates a more refined definition of Rooth’s focus in order to account for the different kinds of alternatives which are possible for foci (6). In particular, this definition distinguishes between foci which give alternatives for the expression employed (*expression foci*) and foci which involve alternatives to their denotation (*denotation foci*).

(6) Krifka’s (2007) definition of foci
   A property $F$ of an expression $\alpha$ is a Focus property iff $F$ signals
   (a) that alternatives of (parts of) the expression $\alpha$ or
   (b) alternatives of the denotation of (parts of) $\alpha$
   are relevant for the interpretation of $\alpha$.

These two types of alternatives are illustrated in (7a-b), and concern the linguistic expression or aspects of it, e.g., terminology, pronunciation, which do not necessarily involve alternatives in terms of different denotations.

(7) a. Grandpa didn’t [kick the *BUCKET*]$_F$, he [passed aWAY]$_F$.
      B: They live in [BerLIN]$_F$.
      (Krifka, 2007)

In (7a), the speaker is employing an expression focus to make a terminological correction {*kick the bucket* vs. *pass away*}, where the denotation of the two expressions is the same. In (7b), on the other hand, speaker B is correctly an error in stress placement on the word *Berlin*, i.e., {*Berlin, BerLIN*} where the denotation of *Berlin* as pronounced by A is not at issue. Krifka observes that expression foci are generally not involved in syntactic constructions expressing focus, e.g. clefts or movement, instead, he suggests that an expression focus contrasts strings where the substring marked by the focus is different in the relevant alternative(s).

In the case of denotation foci, on the other hand, the alternatives involved in the interpretation of the focus are expressions with *comparable* alternative denotations to the focussed constituent, i.e., of the same type. In other words, expression foci select between alternatives which have the same denotation, while the alternatives involved in the use of denotation foci have different denotations.
The availability of a focus interpretation of in-situ constituents is dependent on stress: Büring (2005) argues that accenting constituents, as with *butcher* in response A’ of (8), prevents them from being interpreted anaphorically, meaning it has to be interpreted as being discourse-new, to some extent, at least. In this case, *butcher* is barred from being interpreted as referring to *Dr Cremer*, something which is perfectly possible if *butcher* is not accented, as is the case in response A.

(8) Q:  (Did you see Dr Cremer to get your root canal?)
A:  (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the butcher.
A’:  #(Don’t remind me.) I’d like to strANgle the BUTcher.

(Büring, 2005, p. 4)

In the above case, *butcher* is R(eferentially)-given in the context, in that the expression is understood as having the same referent as *Dr Cremer*, its antecedent. But the effect of accentation is also present when the expression is L(exically)-Given, that is to say, where it does not have the same referent but is lexically similar, which is not a case of anaphoricity as it is normally understood, but does tie in with the notion of identifiability as described in Lambrecht (1994) and reported in section 4.2.5 This case and the example below in (9), where, again, anaphoricity does not apply, push Büring (2005) to remark that the givenness of a lexical expression cannot be simply due to having a familiar discourse referent. Instead, he suggests that the informativeness of the lexical expression could be more useful.

(9) a. Q:  (Why do you study Italian?)
A:  I’m MArried to an Italian.

b.  (Don’t jump!) – But I WANT to jump.

(Büring, 2005, p. 4)

2.3 The common ground

Stalnaker (1978; 1974), Karttunen (1974), Lewis (1979), Roberts (1996; 2004) and Krifka (2007) develop a theory to map how IS-elements interact with the discourse. According to these approaches, speakers construct a model of the conversation space, known as the *common ground* (CG), where propositions which are deemed to be mutually shared are represented, as well as any questions needing resolution, known as *questions under discussion* (QUD). Effectively, this means that the speaker must keep track of what information they believe the hearer has, what information has already been shared in the conversation, as well as what has been said most recently. The CG is also a useful construct for drawing a distinction between information which is presupposed in the discourse, i.e., *presuppositions*, and information which is being proposed as being true during the course of the conversation, i.e., *preferred content*. This distinction provided a way of accounting for the oddness of sentences such as that in (10b), where the second clause asserts information which has already been introduced to the CG by the first clause, i.e., that the speaker has a cat, which is not the case in (10a).

(10) a.  I have a cat, and I had to bring my cat to the vet.

b.  #I had to bring my cat to the vet, and I have a cat.

(Krifka, 2007)
But information is not only added to the CG by way of assertions: some kinds of information can be accommodated in the CG, as long as they are considered to be plausible and not unusual. Krifka (2007) provides the pair of sentences in (11) to illustrate the difference. In (11a), the information that the speaker has a cat is easily accommodated since it is not unusual for people to have pets such as cats. In contrast, the information in (11b) is difficult to accommodate, since gorillas are unusual pets in normal circumstances.

(11) a. I had to bring my cat to the vet because it was sick.
    b. I had to bring my gorilla to the vet because it was sick.

The CG is also related to a context set, which represents all the possible worlds in which the propositions contained in the CG are true. Stalnaker’s (1978) proposes that the purpose of conversation is to pursue communal inquiry, so, in conjunction with the notion of the context set, conversations are geared toward reducing the number of worlds in the context set to one (Roberts, 2004, p. 208). This is an ideal aim, but it means that all potential QUDs are to be answered. Roberts (1996) and Ginzburg (1996), in fact, propose that QUDs represent the conversation participants’ goals and intentions with respect to the discourse.

For example, let us assume that two individuals, John and Mary, are having a conversation. Each participant in the conversation, of which there are two in this case, mentally creates an abstract representation of this conversation, the CG. Let us assume that, in this conversation, John has been discussing a party scheduled for 4 p.m. the following day, the 2nd of June 2016 in Hyde Park. At this stage, John and Mary have a proposition \( p \) (or a set of propositions) in the CG which represents the fact that all the participants in the conversation hold the proposition (or set thereof) to be true. The proposition could be the one in (12).

(12) \( p = \) A party is scheduled in Hyde Park at 4 p.m. on the 2nd of June 2016.

Propositions which are held to be true by one of the participants but which are not considered to be mutually shared will not be represented. For example a proposition \( q \), which John deems true but does not believe Mary to be aware of, will not be represented. Proposition \( q \) in this case is that John already has a doctor’s appointment scheduled half an hour before the start of the party.

(13) \( q = \) John has a doctor’s appointment scheduled at 3:30 p.m. on the 2nd of June 2016.

According to Roberts (2004), the CG should also contain all the knowledge which participants assume strangers would also know, including world knowledge, such as how to accomplish basic actions in the world. A Question Under Discussion, or QUD, is a question which has to be answered with the context of the conversation. In this case, we will take an unresolved question \( w \) to be that represented in (14), i.e., whether John and Mary should go to the party together.

(14) \( w = \) Should John and Mary go together to the party?

In addition to the QUDs and propositions, there is also a set of discourse referents, represented in the CG. This abstract representation of entities and issues resembles somewhat Heim’s (1982; 1983) discussion of updating file cards, where abstract file cards are represented in the CG, which are updated with respect to the propositions made on them.

Krifka (2007) argues that, besides the truth conditional content of the CG, i.e., the propositions which are mutually held to be true in the conversation, which he calls CG content,
we also need a further component, *CG management*. This is a mutually shared component of the CG which, Krifka proposes, indicates the direction of development of CG content. He illustrates this difference by making a distinction between two different uses of foci: *pragmatic* uses and *semantic* uses.

Pragmatic uses of foci can be illustrated with constituent questions and answers, where the focus corresponds to the *wh*-constituent in the question. Krifka employs Hamblin’s (1973) approach to questions to model how questions affect the CG, to communicate the *communicative goal* of the participant asking the question. Under this approach, a question consists of a set of propositions, where each proposition is a denotation of a possible answer to said question.

(15) A: Who stole the cookie?
   Hamblin meaning: \( \{ \text{STOLE}(%COOKIE)(x) \mid x \in \text{PERSON} \} \)  
   (Krifka, 2007)

The answer to the constituent question provides a proposition which fits the set generated by the question, and, as an assertion, is added to the CG content. Krifka assigns this responsibility to the *ordinary meaning* of the answer. The focus forms a set of alternatives which match the Hambling meaning of questions. Observe that the form of the alternatives induced in (15) and the Hamblin meaning in (16) is the same, with the exception that the focus-induced alternatives do not restrict the focus to people, unlike *who* in the question did.

(16) B: [Peter] stole the cookie.
   Ordinary meaning of the answer: \( \text{STOLE}(%COOKIE)(\text{PETER}) \)
   Focus-induced alternatives: \( \{ \text{STOLE}(%COOKIE)(x) \mid x \in \text{ENTITY} \} \)  
   (Krifka, 2007)

Krifka argues that this use of focus pertains to CG management: the question affects the direction in which the CG content is to be expanded, while the focus in the answer makes a connection between the assertion being made and the question preceding it. The use of foci can also accommodate unspoken questions into the CG. Thus, foci can cause a question to appear in the CG without it having to be pronounced before and also answer it.

(17) I built a St Martin’s lantern with my kids. First, I [built the *body* of the lantern with some *card*board paper].
   (Krifka, 2007)

According to Krifka, in (17) above, the focus in the second sentence accommodates the question *what did you do first?* This is done by creating a set of alternatives which would match the set of propositions which would have been generated by the relative question (which remains implicit). In this case, the set of alternatives would be a set of plausible propositions which constitute alternative activities the speaker could have engaged in as a first step to building the St Martin’s lantern.

But where exactly are the IS properties of constituents in sentences represented? According to Jackendoff (1972) and Büring (2005), foci, topics and other IS-categories are (prative) features in syntactic nodes, pertaining to syntax, albeit it seems that this method of marking, e.g., foci, may have been devised with an eye to expediency and economy, as it is more economical to assume a new type of feature than to posit a whole new module of language to take care of a given task, *ceteris paribus*. But there are other approaches which propose that
IS is, indeed, managed outside of syntax, by separate modules and/or levels of abstract representation.

Vallduví (1990) argues that IS acts as an intermediary between informatics and the surface syntactic structure (S-structure) of sentences, in the same way that LF (Logical Form) does between the logical-semantic module and S-structure. Vallduví proposes that a separate linguistic module, that of informatics, has the task of generating and interpreting the IS data, which is represented in parallel with propositional content. Thus, the S-structure of a given sentence has one intermediary level of abstract representation, LF, which passes on propositional data to the logical-semantics module, and another intermediary level of abstract representation, IS, which passes on informational data to the informatics module.

Erteschik-Shir (1997) proposes that topic and focus constituents are marked through structural descriptions which are realised with what she calls focus structure (f-structure). On her view, f-structure interfaces with both the PF (Phonological Form) module, for the realisation of intonational patterns, and the semantics module (thereby replacing LF). F-structure makes full use of the file card metaphor proposed by Heim (1982; 1983), such that the accessibility of referents as potential topics depends on their position on the abstract stack of file cards, where file cards at the top of the stack are potential topics.

### 2.4 Preliminaries on the realisation of IS categories

IS categories, such as foci and topics, can be realised in a number of different ways: syntactically, phonologically, or morphologically. This section will now give a few examples to give an idea of the different ways in which IS categories are implemented.

In (18b-d), we can see three transformations of the sentence in (18a). These are, respectively, topic- or focus-fronting without a resumptive pronoun, topic-fronting with a resumptive pronoun, and a hanging topic (also with a resumptive pronoun). In each case, the DP his favourite book has a special IS-status, which describes either a reaction to the discourse or an attempt to modify the discourse. Furthermore, the prosodic properties of the first constituents in (18b-d) differ from those of the first constituent in (18a).

(18) a. John lent his favourite book to Mary.
   c. *His favourite book*, John lent it to Mary.
   d. As for his favourite book, John lent it to Mary.

One mode of realisation which seems to be very commonly used in the realisation of IS-relevant constituents is the phonological realisation of intonational contours. The sentence in (18b), for example, if taken as a string, could have two distinct interpretations based on the intonation used. In one case, his favourite book could feature a sharp drop in pitch, with the rest of the sentence being destressed: we are then dealing with a fronted focus, possibly correcting an assumption in the discourse. If, on the other hand, his favourite book features a fall-rise contour, what Jackendoff (1972) calls a B-accent, and a falling tone (or A-accent, using Jackendoff’s terminology) on, e.g., *Mary*, we are dealing with a contrastive topic, his favourite book, followed by a focus, Mary. Furthermore, even in a sentence with a canonical word order, stress can be given to certain words or syllables which modify what part of the sentence is the most important contribution, focussing it. For example, (18a) could be modified as in (19) to focus different constituents, where small capitals indicate stress.

(19) a. *lent* is stressed, evoking alternatives such as sold or gave; in (19b), *his* is stressed, evoking alternatives such as
Bill’s or John’s mother’s, as possible alternative owners; in (19c), stressing favourite evokes alternative books owned by John which could otherwise have been the object of the loan.

    b. John lent HIS favourite book to Mary.
    c. John lent his FAVOURITE book to Mary.

Other languages, such as Japanese and Korean, use special morphological particles which mark topics. This can also coincide with a special intonation, depending on the nature of the topic. In (20), for example, the constituent ano hon (‘that book’) is realised with a wa particle, which has been claimed to mark topics (or themes, in other terms), since Kuno (1972).

(20) a. Ano hon-wa John-ga katta.
    that book-wa John-NOM bought
    ‘That book, John BOUGHT.’

    b. Ano hon-wa John-ga katta.
    that book-wa John-NOM bought
    ‘Speaking of that book, John bought it.’

(Vermeulen, 2013)

Information Structure constitutes an interface area between syntax, semantics, pragmatics and phonology. The ways in which these concepts are realised in various languages range from purely phonological marking, such as the A- or B- accents described by Jackendoff (1972) in English, to realising specific functional morphemes which mark the relevant constituents, such as the wa particle in Japanese (Kuno, 1973). Another way in which information structure is expressed is through the syntactic position of the IS-marked constituents. This is typically accompanied by intonational marking. For example (18b) features both movement of the constituent and intonational marking, where the constituent is realised with a particular intonational contour.
Chapter 3. Framework

In this chapter, I will present the frameworks I draw from in my account of topics, as well as some of the background concepts which are assumed in these frameworks. Section 3.1 explains how features are understood within the context of this dissertation, with reference to their role in movement and their semantic import. Section 3.2 introduces the research programme of Cartography, which I will employ to make reference to the structures and projections encountered in the left peripheries of languages. Section 3.3 discusses the framework of Nanosyntax, which I will use to examine some of the morpho-phonological properties of topics. Section 3.4 introduces the pragmatic framework of Relevance Theory, from which I adopt some overarching cognitive principles which I use to motivate the distinction between topic and comment.

3.1 Syntactic features

Since the development of Chomsky’s (1995) *Minimalist Program* (MP), syntactic features have gained an ever greater role in the establishment of relation between positions in a syntactic tree. Previously developed linguistic frameworks, e.g. HPSG (Head-drive phrase structure grammar) conceived features as objects in a description language which specify values describing or representing something else\(^1\), thereby having the function of providing (partial) information about it, while not themselves being objects of syntactic theory (Pollard & Sag, 1987). In MP, features become properties of syntactic atoms and, hence, are directly involved in determining what syntactic processes and relations are possible between these atoms. (Adger & Svevonius, 2011) Allowing syntactic movement to target features permits rules to apply to lexical items which, under simply phrase structure (PS) rules, would be impossible, as relations between different branches of a PS tree would not be able to be described. Another notion to keep in mind is the *cost* of movement: Chomsky (1993) introduces an economy condition known as *Procrastinate*, according to which movement is delayed until it is forced, meaning that it is more economical for movement to take place after the sentence has already been sent to PF, i.e., the movement will be covert, or unheard. Overt movement is observed when something has forced movement to occur before the sentence is sent to PF.

Features can be organised into classes, such as CATEGORY (N, V, A, D, P, etc.), PERSON (*speaker, participant, plural*) or CASE (*NOM, ACC, DAT, GEN, etc*.). These classes can themselves be conceived as features. The features belonging to this category can be targeted by rules in the grammar as a whole, or they can participate in the syntax individually. Just as class features are properties of the individual features, there are other attributes which, similarly, determine the characteristics of features. These are *second order features*. Second order features can be parametrised, or they can be fixed (Adger & Svevonius, 2011).

Syntactic dependencies in MP are driven by the concept of *interpretability* (Chomsky, 1995), which is a second order feature, i.e., a feature of features. Features which are *uninterpretable* must undergo feature matching in order to prevent crashing. Feature matching takes place when the uninterpretable feature searches for its sister, *interpretable*, feature, but

\(^1\) Unfortunately, this is left quite vague, possibly because of the heterogeneity of the described or represented entities.
this search can be blocked by certain barriers, which can cause the search to fail. These barriers constitute islands which prevent the extraction of constituents from said domain. For example, complex DPs with relative clauses constitute barriers to extraction. In (21a) below, we have a complex DP with a relative clause, the man who read Moby Dick. If we substitute Moby Dick with a wh-element and attempt to extract it, however, the sentence becomes ungrammatical, as can be seen in (21b).

(21) a. John saw the man who read Moby Dick.
    b. *Which book did John see the man who read t?

Interpretable features, on the other hand, do not need to undergo feature matching and can interface with other modules, such as the cognitive/intentional module, or whatever module is used for semantic interpretation. Typical examples of interpretable features on, e.g., DPs are number and person. Number, for example, is realised on the noun and modifies the meaning of the expression, such that toy and toys. Uninterpretable features, in contrast, may appear on a V and require movement of a DP bearing a matching feature to its complement position, for example, so that the uninterpretable feature may be checked. This feature matching is also meant to account for the phenomenon of agreement witnessed between different categories in the sentence. For example, verbs bear uninterpretable number and person features, which are visible thanks to agreement morphology. These features need to match the interpretable features on the DP. This agreement is especially noticeable in a language with rich agreement morphology, such as Italian, as can be seen in (22a-b), where the verbal morphology agrees with its (nominative) argument.

(22) Italian
    a. Tu leggi.
       2SG.NOM read.2SG
    b. Gli studenti leggono.
       the.PL student.PL read.3PL

It is problematic to assume that syntactic movement can be attributed to interpretability alone, however, since there is evidence of feature matching without any apparent movement (Pesetsky, 2000). This would mean that some other property of features determines movement, although Kayne (1998) proposes an alternative where movement always takes place, but is not always noticeable, as other movements occur to hide this. The strength of a feature (Chomsky, 1993; 1995) is another motivation claimed to be responsible for movement. In other words, features can be strong or weak. Briefly, strong features give rise to overt movement, as they are “visible” at PF and must therefore be checked when the structure is sent to PF, i.e., when it is pronounced. Weak features, on the other hand, are invisible at PF and will trigger covert movement, which is not pronounced. The EPP (Extended Projection Principle)\(^2\) property (Chomsky, 1981; Chomsky, 2001) also constitutes another motivation for movement, which was proposed to account for the requirement that all clauses have subjects, giving rise to the phenomena of expletive subjects. It is an attribute of a feature, such as I, which is an instruction requiring a constituent, such as DP, to be merged with the category feature. In (23), the EPP property of the clause requires the subject position to be filled, but it is impossible to raise one of the DPs out of the tensed clause to fulfill this requirement, thus the sentence in (23a) is ungrammatical. An expletive pronoun it can be generated in the subject position to satisfy the

\(^2\) What the acronym EPP stands for is no longer deemed significant nowadays. (Bošković, 2002)
EPP property, as is seen in (23b). If, however, we were dealing with an untensed clause, as in (23c), the subject of the lower clause could raise to satisfy the EPP, resulting in raising.

(23) a. *Is likely that Peter likes Mary.
   b. It is likely that Peter likes Mary. (Bošković, 2002, pp. 167-168)
   c. Peter is likely Peter to like Mary.

When a constituent which was already present in the sentence is reinserted in a higher position in the sentence structure, it is known as internal merge, while the insertion of new constituents is known as external merge. Chomsky (1995) argues that all movement is the movement of features and the movement of the word itself is a result of pied-piping, which means that material accompanies the moving element, rather than being itself, strictly speaking, target of the movement.

According to Pesetsky (2000), however, it is important to distinguish feature movement from phrasal movement. Prior to Chomsky (1995), it had been assumed that all movement was phrasal, in the sense that a word, or a phrase, would constitute what was being moved. With Chomsky’s proposal of feature movement, however, this changed. In particular, Chomsky proposed that only overt movement is phrasal, due to PF considerations, while covert movement would only involve the features necessary to prevent a crash of the sentence derivation. Pesetsky notes that this proposal has significant consequences for the syntactic process, such that all movement takes place within a “single syntactic cycle”: the phonological differences would therefore be accounted for solely in terms of what material was copied; either a phrase is copied, resulting in overt movement, or only the features, resulting in covert movement. Pesetsky argues that covert movement can also be phrasal, based on evidence from Antecedent-Contained Deletion (ACD) constructions, which was examined by Bouton (1970), Sag (1976), May (1985), and Larson and May (1990). For example, elided VP in (24a) is interpreted to be invited t as shown in (24b), where t stands for the trace of the DP which contains the relative clause.

(24) a. Mary [VP invited [DP everyone that I did [VP Δ]]].
   b. Mary [VP invited [DP everyone that I [VP invited t]]].

Unlike pronouns, elided VPs require a pronounced VP antecedent (Hankamer & Sag, 1976). Pesetsky argues that, given this, the elided VP must have an antecedent invited t in the linguistic context, which it does not have without covert movement. Without covert movement, the VP antecedent is not of the form invited t but rather invited everyone that I did. If, on the other hand, everyone that I did moves as a phrase, covertly, to a position outside the VP, we can obtain the desired VP antecedent in the correct format. This result is shown in (25), where the antecedent of the elided VP is underlined and interpreted in the position of the elided VP.

(25) [DP everyone that I [VP invited t]] [Mary [VP invited t]].

3.2 Cartography: feature-driven syntax

Cartography is a research programme which aims to describe and account for possible syntactic configurations in natural languages. In particular, its stated goal is to “draw maps as precise and detailed as possible of syntactic configurations” (Rizzi, 2013, p. 1). This approach
to grammar developed as a consequence of the attempts to apply Principles and Parameters cross-linguistically, which revealed that the syntactic units required to account for linguistic phenomena are finer and more articulated than previously believed: there was suddenly reason to believe that what were previously thought to be atomic elements, such as the syntactic projections of C, I and even V and N, were actually more complex and articulated. For example, Pollock (1989) compares various syntactic phenomena in French and English such as interrogative structures, negation, quantifiers and adverbs, in a sally aimed at showing how the Principles and Parameters could give a cohesive account of what seemed at the time to be unrelated phenomena. Pollock proposes that the syntactic differences observed between French and English, with respect to the abovementioned phenomena, could be resolved by assuming the presence of a function projection Agr(eement)P, a complement of I and above the VP.

(26)

While moves toward breaking down functional syntactic categories into smaller parts had been made in the past, such as Pollock (1989), some of the most important work in establishing the Cartography research programme was carried out by Rizzi (1997) and Cinque (1999).

Cinque (1999) proposes a universal hierarchy of adverbs, based originally on empirical data from Italian, where he investigates the possible relative orders of different types of adverbs, where the type of adverb corresponds to the semantic function of the adverb. The methodology used by Cinque can be illustrated with some of his simpler examples, which compare the relative positions of mica ‘not/hardly/at all’ and più ‘any more/longer’. The examples in (27) show how the adverbs can occur before, after or on either side the past participle mangiato ‘eaten’ in the sequence mica - più.

(27)  

a. Non hanno mica più mangiato.  
    ‘They haven’t eaten any longer.’  
    (Cinque, 1999, p. 47)  

b. Non hanno mangiato mica più.  

c. Non hanno mica mangiato più.  

However, they cannot surface in any of these positions if their order is reversed (28).

(28)  

a. *Non hanno più mica mangiato.
b. *Non hanno **mangiato** più mica.
c. *Non hanno **più mangiato** mica.

NEG have.3PL any.longer eaten not
‘They haven’t eaten (any longer).’

(Cinque, 1999, p. 47)

By systematically applying this manner of tests to different pairs of adverbs, Cinque (1999) develops a rigid functional sequence for adverbs, which has since been expanded to the sequence in (29), which he proposes to be cross-linguistically valid.

(29) [frankly MoodSpeechAct] > [surprisingly MoodMirative] > [luckily MoodEvaluative] > [allegedly MoodEvidential] > [probably MoodEpistemic] > [once TPast] > [then TFuture] > [perhaps MoodIrrealis] > [necessarily ModNecessity] > [possibly ModPossibility] > [usually AspHabitual] > [finally AspDelayed] > [tendentially AspPredpositional] > [again AspRepetitive] > [often AspFrequentative] > [intentionally ModVolition] > [quickly AspCelerative] > [already TAnterior] > [no longer AspTerminative] > [still AspContinuous] > [always AspContinuous] > [just AspRetrospective] > [soon AspProximate] > [briefly AspDurative] > [characteristically AspGeneric/Progressive] > [almost AspProximate] > [suddenly AspInceptive] > [obligatorily ModObligation] > [in vain AspFrustrative] > [(?] AspConative] > [completely AspSgComplete] > [tutto AspComplete] > [well Voice] > [early AspCelerative] > [(?] AspInceptive] > [again AspRepetitive] > [often AspFrequentative] > ...

(Cinque, 1999, p. 106; Cinque, 2006)

Rizzi (1997), building on work by Benincà (1988) and Cinque (1990), proposes that the Left Periphery is articulated, with specific projections of Topics and Focus heads hosting fronted topical and focal constituents. In particular, Rizzi argues that the Left Periphery features a Focus projection, sandwiched between Topic projections. Two arguments he uses to demonstrate the need to split the CP into smaller parts stem from the comparison of the complementisers used for embedded clauses in Italian, as well as the position of relative wh-words with respect to topics and foci. A brief illustration of the complementiser evidence is provided below (Rizzi, 1997, pp. 288-289). The two complementisers in Italian, *che* ‘that’, and *di* ‘of’, behave differently with respect to left-dislocated topics. In (30), we can see how *che* introduces a finite embedded clause, while *di* introduces a non-finite embedded clause.

(30) a. Credo **che** loro apprezzerebbero molto il tuo libro.
believe.1SG that they appreciate.COND.3PL a-lot the your book
‘I believe that they would appreciate your book very much.’
b. Credo **di** apprezzare molto il tuo libro.
believe.1SG of appreciate.INF a-lot the your book
‘I believe “of” to appreciate your book very much.’

In the examples in (31), *che* is only grammatical if positioned before a topic, represented here with *il tuo libro*, ‘your book’.

(31) a. Credo **che** il tuo libro, loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.
that the your book
‘I believe that your book, they would appreciate it a lot.’
b. *Credo, il tuo libro, **che** loro lo apprezzerebbero molto.

---

3 The question marks represent uncertainties with regard to the exact position of the adverb.
the your book that
‘I believe, your book, that they would appreciate it a lot.’

In (32), *di* behaves in the opposite way, in that it is grammatical only when the topic follows it.

(32) a. *Credo di il tuo libro, apprezzarlo molto.
   of the your book
   ‘I believe “of”, your book, to appreciate it a lot.’

b. Credo, il tuo libro, di apprezzarlo molto.
   the your book of
   ‘I believer, your book, “of” to appreciate it a lot.’

This data suggests that, assuming the position of the topic has not changed, there is a projection, ForceP preceding it, hosting che, and a projection, Fin(ite)P, hosting *di*, following it, producing the sequence ForceP – TopP – FinP. This sequence takes place entirely within the space traditionally reserved for a single CP projection.

The position of right-dislocated topics is proposed by Cecchetto (1999) and Belletti (2001) to be sandwiched between IP and VP. Rizzi’s evidence for the articulation of the CP comes from the mapping out of the possible relative positions of constituents dislocated to the left periphery in Italian, where they are categorised based on their discourse interpretation. The structure of the CP developed based on Rizzi’s work is shown below, in (33).
With respect to the left periphery of the sentence, the Cartographic approach has shown that elements found in the periphery are not free of constraints and are realised in positions which are not random, but systematic. While the postulation of more structure in the left periphery brings more complexity to our model of grammar, Cartographic accounts try to keep the basic form of projections the same, which ensures that the machinery employed in Cartographic accounts remains simple in form. Cartographic approaches have adopted Chomsky’s (1970) X-bar theory, which proposes that syntactic projections have the form shown in (34), where X constitutes a syntactic head.

(34) \[ \text{XP} \]
    \[ \text{Spec} \quad \text{X}' \]
    \[ X \quad \text{Compl} \]
Furthermore, they have also adopted Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA), which means that the default surface order of all phrases is Specifier – Head – Complement, which, if we assume that constituents may only move to c-commanding (Reinhart, 1979) positions, has the consequence that all movement in syntactic structures is leftward.

3.3 Nanosyntax

The Nanosyntactic approach (Starke, 2009; 2011; Caha, 2009; 2010; Lander, 2015) is a variant of the Principles and Parameters (P&P) framework (Chomsky, 1981), but with several properties which set it apart from traditional P&P approaches. Nanosyntax assumes that the terminal nodes of a syntactic tree are submorphemic, with each terminal node corresponding to a syntactic feature. This is in contrast with prior approaches which assume that it is morphemes which are the basic building blocks of syntactic trees, where features would be contained within the morpheme as an unstructured bundle. Instead, Nanosyntax assumes that the features are hierarchically organised into a strict order: in this sense, Nanosyntax can be argued to be a Cartographic approach which extends to the submorphemic level.

\[(35)\]

(a) \[
\text{XP} \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{Y} \quad \text{XP} \\
\text{m}_2 \quad \text{X} \\
[\ell_3] \quad \text{m}_1 \\
[\ell_1, \ell_2]
\]

(b) \[
\text{f}_3 \quad \text{f}_2 \quad \text{f}_1 \\
\text{f}_3 \quad \text{f}_2 \quad \text{f}_1 \\
\text{f}_2 \quad \text{f}_1 \\
\text{f}_3
\]

Also unlike most traditional P&P approaches, Nanosyntax does not insert lexical items into the terminal nodes in order to spell out the syntactic tree. Instead, spell out is phrasal, as it targets phrasal nodes, with each lexical item being associated with a constituent dominating a specific structural configuration of syntactic features. The structures associated with lexical items are known as L-trees.

\[(36)\]

Lexical item A =

\[
\text{f}_2 \quad \text{f}_1 \\
\text{f}_2 \quad \text{f}_1 \\
\text{f}_1
\]

Lexical item B =

\[
\text{f}_3 \\
\text{f}_3
\]
Effectively, this means that the terminal nodes in a syntactic tree need not be spelled out individually: the lexicon may spell out chunks of structure. The terminal nodes themselves are actually submorphemic features, which are syntactically active. To look at it in another way, syntax precedes lexical insertion. This approach is often compared to that of Distributed Morphology (Halle & Marantz, 1993; 1994), as both involve the breaking down of nodes into features, though they diverge significantly from that point onwards.

In addition to being able to target chunks of tree structure, the Nanosyntactic approach allows the same lexical item to spell out different chunks of tree structure, as long as these sections constitute subsets of the lexical item in question sharing the same, lowest terminal node. A consequence of this is that the same lexical item can be used to spell out tree structures which are then interpreted differently, containing different features: this means that the lexical items are multifunctional and a consequence of this is syncretism in the phonological forms observed. The rule which allows lexical items to behave this way is known as the Superset Principle (37), since the lexical item is a superset of the tree structure being spelled out. The name of the Superset Principle is inspired by that of the Subset Principle from the Distributed Morphology framework⁴.

(37) The Superset Principle: A lexical item A is inserted into a node α if α is a (sub-) constituent in lexical entry of A, ignoring traces.

(Starke, 2009)

To illustrate this, in (38) below, the lexical item A (a) can spell out (b-d), which are subconstituents of the L-tree associated with A. It can also spell out (e), which matches the lexically stored tree exactly. It cannot spell out the entirety of (f), however, leaving the topmost f₅ projection for another lexical item to spell out.

(38) a. Lexical Item A =

```
                               f₅
                             /   \
                          f₄    f₃
                        /       \
                     f₂    f₁
                    /       \     
                 f₀P    f₃P
```

b. $f₃P$

```
     f₄
  /   \     
f₀P f₃P
```

c. $f₃P$

```
     f₃
  /   \     
f₀P f₃P
```

---

⁴ This Subset Principle is distinct from the Elsewhere Condition (Kiparsky, 1973), which has also sometimes been called the Subset Principle.
Since the trees in (b-f) contain different features, they will have different interpretations. In this case, the lexical item A stands as a syncretic form for the interpretations (b-e), while the interpretation of (f) could not be realised with the lexical item A.

Let us suppose, however, that there is another lexical item which could be used, lexical item B (39).

(39) Lexical Item B = 

In this case, B would spell out (b-d), but not (e-f). Lexical item A, not B, would then only be used to spell out (e).

All the features in the syntactic tree must be spelt out, meaning that even though B spells out a part of (e), since A spells out more of the features, only A can be used. A cannot be used for (b-d) in the presence of B due to a further rule, effectively a version of Kiparsky’s (1973) Elsewhere Condition, known as Minimise Junk, which stipulates that between two competing lexically stored trees, the tree which would have least unused material will be chosen.
The Nanosyntactic approach assumes that Spell Out occurs at each new merge in the derivation, cyclically. This allows the syntax to receive feedback from Spell Out, potentially affecting the computation. This occurs thanks to spellout occurring multiple times, cyclically. Thus, supposing Lexical Item A was not available, but another lexical item, C was, the structure of which is given below in (40), which could spell out features \( f_4 \) and \( f_5 \). Note that Spell Out driven movement is considered to leave no trace.

(40) Lexical Item C =

```
       f_5p
       /    |
  f_5   f_4p
      /    |
  f_3  f_4
    /    |
  f_2  f_1
    /     |
  f_1
```

As feature \( f_4 \) is merged, given that no lexical item (A being absent) is available to spell out the structure, shown in (41a), the section of the tree spelt out by lexical item B would be moved to a higher position, and the structure is once again compared to see if a lexical item is available which can spell it out. At this stage, C may spell out \( f_4 \). This is shown in (41b), below. Once \( f_3 \) is merged, however, this solution is no longer possible, as the newly merged features are incontiguous with respect to the L-tree spelt out by C.

(41) a. B cannot spell out entire structure, as its L-tree does not contain \( f_4 \).

```
       f_5p
       /    |
  f_4   f_5p
      /    |
  f_3  f_5
    /    |
  f_2  f_1
    /     |
  f_1
```

b. Structure can be spelt out as B – C, as C is a superset of \( f_4p \)

```
       f_5p
       /    |
  f_5   f_4p
      /    |
  f_3  f_5
    /    |
  f_2  f_1p
    /     |
  f_1
```
c. The structure can no longer be spelt out as B – C, as $f_5$ cannot be spelt out as C. $f_4$ and $f_5$ must be contiguous in order to match the L-tree of C.

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{f}_3\text{P} \\
\text{f}_5 \\
\text{f}_3\text{P} \quad \text{f}_4\text{P} \\
\text{f}_3 \quad \text{f}_2\text{P} \quad \text{f}_4 \\
\text{f}_2 \quad \text{f}_1\text{P} \\
\text{f}_1 \\
\end{array}
$$

The cyclic movement implemented for (41b) is undone and constituent spelt out by B is moved again, to a position above $f_5$. This is shown below, in (41d-e).

(41) d. Previously moved constituent is moved back.

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{f}_3\text{P} \\
\text{f}_5 \quad \text{f}_4\text{P} \\
\text{f}_4 \quad \text{f}_3\text{P} \\
\text{f}_3 \quad \text{f}_2\text{P} \\
\text{f}_2 \quad \text{f}_1\text{P} \\
\text{f}_1 \\
\end{array}
$$
Tree section spelt out by $B$ is moved again, this time past $f_3$. The entire tree may now be spelt out as $B - C$.

It is also possible that a language has more than one possible candidate which could spell out a tree section. In this case, the principle of Minimise Junk is applied, in that the lexical item with the fewest superfluous material is used. The Minimise Junk rule and the Superset Principle work together to provide a best fit process, whereby as many features in the syntactic tree are spelt out while minimising the number of unnecessary features added by lexical items.

In a situation where a lexical item $A$ had spelt out a lower part of the tree, and the lowest node of a lexical item $B$ matched the next terminal node still to be spelt out, movement would be triggered to create a new constituent with the same lowest terminal node as that of lexical item $B$. Caha (2009) argues for a more relaxed form of matching where the lexical item ignores already spelt out sections of the syntactic tree, which would not, therefore trigger movement.

3.4 Relevance Theory

Relevance Theory (RT) is a post-Gricean theory of pragmatics, which aims to account for the inferential process from the utterance to the speaker’s meaning, on the basis of cognitive principles (Sperber & Wilson, 1986; 1987; 2002; Wilson & Sperber, 2002). Grice had previously proposed an inferential model of communication (Grice, 1961; 1989). This was an important move away from the earlier code model, where speakers and hearers understood one another thanks only to their possession of a common code, by which messages were encoded or decoded. Grice’s approach highlighted that communication was not purely dependent on the linguistic meaning of the speaker’s words, instead drawing from various other kinds of evidence, not necessarily linguistic. Essentially, Grice assumes that participants in a conversation adhere to the Co-operative Principle. This principle states that participants in the conversation have a mutual expectation that contributions to the conversation will be made appropriately with respect to a common goal or direction shared by all participants. Furthermore, participants all adhere as much as possible to conversational maxims which state the different ways in which contributions are appropriate. In particular, they should be truthful (Maxim of Quality); informative (Maxim of Quantity); relevant (Maxim of Relation) and clear (Maxim of Manner). When faced with multiple possible interpretations, the hearer will pick the one which is most in line with the expectations (in the context of the talk exchange).

A key notion introduced by Grice was that of the implicature, i.e., the implications of an utterance intended by the speaker. Implicatures can be very specific and strong, in the sense that a clear, distinct message is conveyed, or they can be broad and vague, expressing a general attitude, for example.
In Relevance Theory, it is also assumed that the contributions, or utterances, made by participants are subject to certain expectations. In RT, these expectations are with respect to relevance, that is to say, the utterances should be relevant, e.g., to the direction of the exchange. However, RT supporters reject the specific mechanisms, that is to say, the principle and maxims proposed by Grice. RT argues that the expectations of relevance are so precise that they can allow the hearer to comprehend the speaker’s meaning on their own. Instead of being subject to a Co-operative Principle, individuals are naturally driven to search for relevance, a trait which is employed in indirect communication. This is a human property RT assumes to extend beyond communication and is constantly present in normal cognitive behaviour. Therefore it is not only linguistic input which is considered in terms of its relevance, but any external stimuli. In addition to the expectations of relevance mentioned above, RT proponents assume that every utterance can be interpreted in a variety of ways and that interpretations can be more or less difficult to obtain, which influences which interpretations are considered first and which later.

For an input to be considered relevant, in the sense employed in RT, it must be able to combine with available background information known to the speaker, which will cause the hearer to draw subjectively significant conclusions. Success in this could involve: answering a query held by the hearer; improving the hearer’s knowledge on something; resolving doubts or suspicions; or correcting mistakenly held assumptions (Wilson & Sperber, 2002, p. 251). More specifically, RT states that an input is relevant to the hearer when the processing of the input, in combination with the available background assumptions, results in a positive cognitive/contextual effect, i.e., a “worthwhile” change in the representation of the world held by the individual. Worthwhile is used here to exclude false conclusions or other possible conclusions of no interest to the individual. Positive cognitive effects can consist in strengthening, revising or abandoning available assumptions. Positive cognitive effects which require both input and contextual assumptions in order to be obtained are known as contextual implications.

Stimuli may be relevant to different degrees and individuals pay attention to stimuli which are most relevant to them at the time. From an RT point of view, the magnitude of positive cognitive effects yielded by the processing of an input is directly proportional to the magnitude of its relevance. While positive cognitive effects increase the relevance of stimuli, the salience of stimuli, the degree of accessibility of contextual assumptions held by the individual, the ease of deriving positive cognitive effects are all affected by the circumstances of the moment (Wilson & Sperber, 2002, p. 252). If the new information considered by the individual does not yield any cognitive effects in a given context, it is not relevant in that context.

The notion of processing effort is employed by RT as an economy condition. With respect to the inferential process, it is quantified as the number of accessible interpretations which must be considered before optimal relevance is achieved. These interpretations, as we have already said, are queued in order of accessibility: the most easily accessible will be considered first, the second most accessible second, etc. Thus, processing effort increases the more interpretations need to be considered following the order of the queue. More generally, however, processing effort is a way of preventing models of grammar from disregarding resource economy. In this dissertation, our notion of processing effort will need to account for more than the inferential process and we will not be able to order interpretations as is done in RT when computing the speaker’s meaning.
Chapter 4. Topics

This chapter will first discuss some preliminary diagnostics which can help to rule out constituents which cannot be topics. For this purpose, some basic concepts will be introduced which are not exclusively applicable to topics, but which are instrumental in identifying what can and what cannot be a topic. In order to avoid circularity, every attempt will be made to clarify, as much as possible, what the diagnostic tests are sensitive to, given that one of our goals is to identify which properties are useful in defining topics as they are employed in natural language.

Our next step will be to examine the various properties attributed to topics and the definitions which have been given for them. In this endeavour, we are not interested in providing a philosophically pleasing evaluation of topics, favouring rather a more “pragmatic” approach where we will pay attention to which properties are relevant for the linguistic marking of topics as well as their interpretation as topics.

After reviewing the various claims and assumptions in the literature on topics, we must examine the various types of topics which have been proposed and identify the differences between them, both interpretive and syntactic.

4.1 Referential properties of topics

In this section, we will examine the two concepts of definiteness and specificity, both of which are taken to concern the referential properties of constituents.

4.1.1 Definiteness

Generally, the rule of thumb for identifying definite constituents is to check for a definite article (42).

(42) a. The boy arrives. \hspace{1em} \textit{English}
    b. Le garçon arrive. \hspace{1em} \textit{French}
        the boy arrive.3s
    c. Il bambino arriva. \hspace{1em} \textit{Italian}
        the boy arrive.3s
    d. Der Junge kommt an. \hspace{1em} \textit{German}
        the boy arrive.3s AN

But elements not associated with a definite article can also be definite. E.g., pronouns, proper nouns, etc. To make things even more complicated, some languages do not even have any definite articles, but it would be hasty to say that definiteness should be absent in these languages.

(43) a. Poika saapuu. \hspace{1em} \textit{Finnish}
    \hspace{1em} boy arrive.3s
    b. Pesar miâd. \hspace{1em} \textit{Persian}
    \hspace{1em} boy arrive.3s
But what does definiteness encode? The definition of definiteness has been much discussed since Russell’s (1905) first account of definite descriptions. A brief history of the main accounts is given in Section 2 of Hawkins (1978). Russell’s account of definite descriptions argued that definite phrases express uniqueness, but also constitute an assertion of existence. For example, the student expresses that there is only one student (in the case of singular nouns) and that there is a student. Hawkins (1978) later argued that definiteness also encodes inclusiveness: this means that the denotation of the phrase is extended to all of its possible referents. This draws a parallel between definite phrases and universally quantified phrases (Abbott, 2004, p. 126).

Further conditions have been attributed to definite descriptions, however. Strawson (1950) argues that definite phrases presuppose the existence of their referents; Gundel and Fretheim (2004) point out that the presuppositionality or definiteness of a phrase is affected by its topicality. They point out that the Japanese wa marker, which is used for topics, has been observed by Kuno (1972) and Kuroda (1965), among others, to correlate with a definite or a generic interpretation. For example, in (44a), the nominative marker ga allows the subject phrase to be interpreted as either definite or indefinite. In contrast, in (44b), the presence of the wa marker prevents an indefinite interpretation.

(44) a. Neko ga kingyo o ijit -te ...
cat NOM goldfish OBJ play.with-and
‘The/a cat is playing with the/a goldfish, and...’

b. Neko wa kingyo o ijit -te ...
cat TOP goldfish OBJ play.with-and
‘The/*a cat is playing with the/a goldfish, and...’

(Gundel & Fretheim, 2004, p. 179)

Donnellan (1966) claimed that there are two distinct uses of definite descriptions: the referential and the attributive. In the referential use, the speaker is using the definite description to indicate a real-world referent, while in the attributive use, the speaker of the definite description may not be aware of the real-world referent of the phrase used. Thus, in the attributive use, a speaker could also successfully refer to a real-world referent though the definite description might not actually fit the intended referent.

Kripke (1977) argued that Donnellan’s account should be refined as semantic reference and speaker’s reference, where the referential use is pragmatically resolved, through accomodation on the part of the hearer. To illustrate this, we can envisage a scenario where a definite description is erroneously used, but where a valid proposition is still asserted involving its intended referent. For example, in (45), the speaker could use the definite description the English guy to make an assertion concerning an individual x, if she mistakenly assumes the individual is English, when he may actually be Australian, for example. On Donnellan’s view, this attributive use would be distinct from the referential use. In contrast, Kripke would say that these are not two different uses on the part of the speaker: the hearer, realising that the speaker has made a mistake, would accomodate accordingly, in order to successfully interpret the proposition with the intended referent.
Another issue which has been much discussed, with respect to definite descriptions, is that of incomplete descriptions. (Strawson, 1950; Peacocke, 1975; Wettstein, 1981; Blackburn, 1988). In fact, the incompleteness of referring descriptions is an issue which extends also to other phrases, such as universally quantified phrases (Neale, 1990). There are several types of accounts for this issue. The incomplete description could be a case where parts of a complete expression have been elided (Sellars, 1954; Quine, 1940; Neale, 1990). A number of alternative approaches restrict the domain of evaluation of the descriptions in order to ensure non-ambiguity (Barwise & Perry, 1983; Hawkins, 1984; 1991; Westerståhl, 1985; Stanley & Szabó, 2000; Roberts, 2003). McCawley (1979) and Lewis (1979) move one step further and argue that restricting the domain of interpretation is not enough: the discourse prominence of the candidates must be taken into account, where only the most salient candidate is referred to. Bach (1994; 2000), on the other hand argues that the reference assignment in this case is wholly carried out through conversational implicature (not implicature), which is halfway between an implicature and literal expression.

Distinct from incomplete descriptions are non-unique descriptions, where a definite article can be used to refer to a non-unique referent, even when the domain is restricted. (Birner & Ward, 1994; Du Bois, 1980) In (46), for example, the leg can have more than one candidate as its referent. This is a case which poses a challenge to the reliability of definite articles as a diagnostic of definiteness.

The cat scratched Mary on the leg.

Also closely related to some of the solutions to the issue of incomplete descriptions is the notion of familiarity, whereby the definite description must indicate something which is familiar to the speaker and the hearer. The concept of familiarity also stretches to information which is permanently available, thus never truly new. (Christophersen, 1939; Kuno, 1972; Bolinger, 1977; Clark & Marshall, 1981; Prince, 1992; Heim, 1982). Heim used the familiarity condition, but also the novelty condition, to express the distinction between definite and indefinite DPs. On her view, indefinite DPs must introduce a new variable to the discourse, while definite DPs are bound to a previously introduced variable. Heim’s approach uses file cards to represent discourse entities and store information about them. In Heim’s approach, indefinite DPs introduce new file cards to the discourse, while definite DPs must refer to an existing file card. Competing with the notion of familiarity is that of identifiability (Chafe, 1976; Lambrecht, 1994). Employing this concept instead of that of familiarity means that the referent does not need to be known to the speaker and the hearer. Instead, the hearer must be able to readily select the referent intended by the speaker out of all the possible candidates to which the linguistic expression might apply.

While prior discussions on definite descriptions and reference were concerned with whether a given referent exists in the real world, Lambrecht (1994, p. 78) argues that, for the purposes of information structure, it is not the actual existence of the referent which is relevant. Instead, identifiable referents are employed whenever the speaker assumes the hearer can evoke a mental representation of the individual from the given discourse. In this way, the use of a definite is not dependent on the physical existence of the referent. Lambrecht observes that identifiability does not directly correlate with the use of definite determiners, pointing out that the conditions licensing the use of determiners varies cross-linguistically. Even in languages with both definite and indefinite determiners, the conditions licensing the non-use of a determiner can vary significantly. Lambrecht (1994, p. 80) demonstrates this by comparing the use of zero articles in English, German and French. English allows three way contrasts with
man (the man, a man, man), but German does not allow zero articles with Mensch, the German counterpart of man (der Mensch, ein Mensch, *Mensch). On the other hand, German does allow zero articles with Grammatik (die Grammatik, eine Grammatik, Grammatik).

(47) a. Man is a dangerous animal.
    b. Grammatik ist nicht seine Stärke
       ‘Grammar isn’t his forte’

   (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 80)

In contrast to English and German, French does not allow zero a articles in such cases (48a-b), reserving them for (non-referential) predicative use (48c).

(48) a. *Homme est un animal dangereux.
    ‘Man is a dangerous animal.’
    b. *Grammaire n’est pas son fort.
    ‘Grammar isn’t his forte.’
    c. Il est medecin.
    ‘He is a doctor.’

Hence, Lambrecht argues that definiteness is best understood as a binary-value language specific phenomenon which correlates imperfectly with the universal notion of identifiability, the values of which are non-binary, varying by degrees. Each language must establish where, along this scale, the boundary between definite and indefinite is. In other words, languages vary in their use of definite/indefinite marking by establishing a “cut-off point” somewhere along the identifiability scale (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 84).

Lambrecht (1994, p. 83) also observes that demonstratives, such as this in English, are sometimes employed in order to refer to individuals which are indefinite, in the sense that they are not identifiable by the hearer. The difference between using this and a in the colloquial sentence in (49) consists in the expectations evoked in the hearer: unlike a, using this raises the expectation that something is about to be said about the guy, meaning that it has a high cataphoric potential. In other words, there is an expectation that guy will be the topic in the ensuing discourse. This use of the determiner has been called the “indefinite this” (Prince, 1981). Ihssane and Puskás (2001, p. 52) note that, in French, indefinite demonstratives must be followed by a relative clause.

(49) I met {this/a guy} from Heidelberg on the train.

Another way of expressing the same contrast as this and a is by way of employing or leaving out a numeral expression. Lambrecht observes that these are often accompanied by markers indicating the noun phrase will be a new topic in the discourse in languages with numeral classifiers, as is the case for Japanese (Downing, 1984), Malay (Hopper, 1986) and Chinese (Sun, 1988), while other languages express the same distinction by employing or leaving out the numeral one, which is what happens in Latin (Wehr, 1984), Turkish (Comrie, 1981, p. 128) and Hebrew (Givón, 1983, p. 26).

Another instance of the blurring of the line between definiteness and indefiniteness is the phenomenon Prince (1981) calls anchoring. An anchored DP is linked to a discourse entity by way of another DP. In (50a), a bus is unanchored, while, in (50b), a guy I work with is anchored. In both cases, the DP is brand new, but in the latter sentence, the DP in question contains I, which anchors the DP containing it to the discourse.
(50) a. I got on a bus yesterday and the driver was drunk.
b. A guy I work with says he knows your sister.

(Prince, 1981, p. 236)

The phenomenon of anchoring will be discussed further in section 4.2.5.

4.1.2 Specificity

4.1.2.1 What is specificity?

In addition to the notion of definiteness, we must also examine that of specificity, which makes a distinction definite and indefinite articles do not appear to make. For example, in (51), the indefinite description *a book* can be interpreted in two different ways. In the first, the non-specific interpretation, the speaker would be satisfied with any book. In the second, the specific interpretation, the speaker’s search will only be complete upon finding a specific book and no other book will be accepted. There is a slight complication in this example, in that more than one level of specificity can be envisaged, meaning that even a specific use might have more than one referent in the real world. *A book* could refer to i) any book; ii) any copy of a given publication; iii) a specific copy of a given publication.

(51) I’m looking for a book.

A test one can use to distinguish among these uses is to follow up (51) with (52a) or (52b) (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 80): (52a) is only felicitous with the specific use, while (52b) is only possible with the non-specific use.

(52) a. I found it/the book I was looking for.
b. I found one/a book.

One should also note that the use described in (52b), where any copy of a given publication is being sought, patterns with the specific use, as it can be followed up with (52a) felicitously. Lambrecht also points out here that the speaker does not assume the real world existence of a referent when using a non-specific expression: on the non-specific reading of *a book* in (51), the speaker does not need to assume that there is a book somewhere (in the relevant domain) to be found.

These different levels of specificity could indicate that are subtypes of specificity, which could be mapped out as in (53) below.

(53)

```
  non-specific
    specific
      item
      token
```

Alternatively, this is a problem due to a lexical ambiguity in the word *book* employed in the example. In a different context, for example, it is impossible to interpret *book* as referring
to tokens. On this view, the word book is ambiguous, meaning either the physical object (i.e., the copy) or the content of the book. For example, hundreds of books in (54a) is difficult to interpret as referring to the physical objects. In contrast, (54b) is most easily interpreted as referring to physical objects, which may or may have the same content.

(54) a. I have published hundreds of books.
    b. I have bound hundreds of books.

This ambiguity is not present if we employ a term such as article. In (55), for example, articles cannot be used to refer to multiple copies of the same article.

(55) I left some articles on your desk.

Specificity has been discussed by many and has been defined in slightly different ways. Many accounts deal with the concept in terms of what a specific phrase accepts as its referent. According to Ioup (1977) and, later, Hellan (1981), a speaker uses a specific DP when they intend to refer to a certain individual. On Partee’s (1972) view, specific (indefinite) phrases are referential, while non-specific phrases are attributive, adopting Donellan’s (1966) account of definite phrases. In the same vein, Saarinen (1981) argues that specific interpretations of phrases are equivalent to de re interpretations.

4.1.2.2 Discourse-oriented approaches to specificity

While the approaches in the above paragraph tend to view specificity in terms of its real world referent, the discourse can also provide a domain for reference assignment. Pesetsky (1987) discusses discourse-linking (D-linking): in an account for the interpretation of wh-words, he makes a distinction between expressions which must find their referent in the discourse to be felicitous, hence D-linked, and expressions which are not thus restricted (not D-linked). For example, the wh-word which in (56a) below requests that the speaker provide an answer limited to a certain set of books relevant in the discourse to the speaker and the hearer. This limitation does not hold for wh-phrases such as what or how many books, as in (56b-c).

(56) a. Which book did you read?
    b. What did you read?
    c. How many books did you read?

Pesetsky argues that the difference between D-linked and non-D-linked phrases consists in their quantificational properties: D-linked phrases do not behave as quantifiers, while non-D-linked phrases do, meaning that they behave like operators. In particular, this means that only non-D-linked wh-elements are move in LF, as operators have been argued to do.

(57) a. *I don’t remember what, [s who read e_i]
    b. ?I don’t remember what, [s which people read e_i]

(Cinque, 1995, p. 120)

(58) a. *Who, did you introduce who to e_i?
    b. Who, did you introduce which people to e_i?

(Cinque, 1995, p. 120)
In English, *wh* elements have been argued to move up at LF, resulting in the configuration seen in Slavic languages such as Polish and Bulgarian, where all the *wh* elements in a multiple *wh* question are found to be fronted. (59) illustrates this for Bulgarian.

(59) **Bulgarian**
Koj kakvo na kogo dade?
Who what to whom gave?
‘Who gave what to whome?’

(Pesetsky, 2000)

Furthermore, D-linked phrases do not exhibit Superiority effects. In (60) and (61), the order in which *wh*-elements may appear is restricted.

(60) a. Who _ bought what?
b. *What did who buy _ ?

(Pesetsky, 2000)

(61) a. Who did you persuade _ to read what?
b. ??What did you persuade whom to read _ ?

(Pesetsky, 2000)

Kuno and Robinson (1972) describe this phenomenon as follows:

(62) A *wh* word cannot be preposed crossing over another *wh*.

Pesetsky observed that D-linked *wh*-phrases do not exhibit such effects. This is shown in (63) and (64) below, where *which book* can be preposed, crossing the *wh*-element *which person*, without causing ungrammaticality.

(63) a. Which person _ bought which book?
b. Which book did which person buy _ ?

(Pesetsky, 2000)

(64) a. Which person did John talk to _ about which topic?
b. Which topic did John talk to which person about _ ?

(Pesetsky, 2000)

Enç’s (1991) account for specific phrases argues that the link to referents previously established in the discourse can be strong or weak. These two link strengths, in Enç’s view, describe definite phrases and indefinite phrases, respectively. The way this is implemented is through two indices, situated on the DP. The first index, which carries a definiteness feature, represents the referent in question and determines the definiteness of the DP. The other index, which also carries a definiteness feature, establishes a relation between said referent and the other discourse referents: the definiteness feature actually links to a discourse referent, expressing its familiarity or novelty, with regard to which the referent of the DP carrying the index stands in a subset relation to a discourse referent. The definiteness of this second index
determines the specificity of the DP. It should be noted that, in Enç’s system, definiteness entails specificity, meaning that we would not find any non-specific definite noun phrases, this is because the feature on each of the indices is a definiteness feature.

Ihsane and Puskás (2001) argue that definite DPs like those in (65) are ambiguous, being specific or non-specific.

(65) a. J’ai pris le train
I have taken the train
‘I took the train.’

b. Jean a raté le bus.
John has missed the bus
‘John missed the bus.’

(Ihsane & Puskás, 2001, p. 40)

The definitions in (66) as used for Definiteness and Specificity in their approach, mostly based on Heim (1982) for the former and following the approach described in Enç (1991) for the latter.

(66) a. **Definiteness:** selects one object in the class of possible objects

b. **Specificity:** relates to pre-established elements in the discourse.

(Ihsane & Puskás, 2001, p. 40)

They argue that, in addition to being interpretable as referring to a unique referent pre-established in the discourse, the definite DP in (65a) could also be interpreted as not referring to a specific train at all, meaning that the event described in the sentence would be that of “a taking of train”, where what is meant by *le train* is any train. If this is the case, all the possible permutations of specificity x definiteness become possible, as shown in (67), compared to definiteness being a subinstance of specificity (since all definite DPs would then be specific). They give the examples in (68), where I have underlined the relevant expressions, as instantiations of each of the feature combinations.

(67) | +definite | -definite |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+specific</td>
<td>[def, +spec]</td>
<td>[def, -spec]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-specific</td>
<td>[def, non-spec]</td>
<td>[def, non-spec]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ihsane & Puskás, 2001, p. 43)

(68) a. L’étudiant est venu voir la professeur.
the student is come to-see the professor
‘The student came to see the professor.’

b. Jean a raté le train.
John has missed the train
‘John missed the train.’

c. Un étudiant est venu voir la professeur.
a student is come to-see the professor
‘A student came to see the professor.’

d. L’étudiant a acheté un livre.
the student has bought a book
‘The student bought a book.’

(Ihsane & Puskás, 2001, p. 43)
In the approach proposed by Ihsane and Puskás (2001), there are two scenarios which distinguish a specific definite DP from a non-specific definite DP: in (69a), which takes the definite article ‘l’ in (68a), the French definite article le (‘the’) is generated in Def0 and has the features [+definite, +specific]. [+definite] is locally checked, but this is not possible for [+specific], so the article must move to Top0, so that the feature can be checked in TopP. In the second scenario, shown in (69b), which refers to the definite article in (68b), le is generated without the [+specific] feature and does not need to move to TopP to have anything checked. Thus, DPs with specific and non-specific interpretations have different structures.

\[(69)\]

\[\text{a.} \quad \text{b.}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TopP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Top} \\
\downarrow [\text{+spec}] \\
\text{DefP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Def} \\
\downarrow [\text{+def}] \\
\text{t} \quad \text{étudiant}
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{TopP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Top} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DefP} \\
\downarrow [\text{+def}] \\
\le \quad \text{train}
\end{array}
\]

(Von Heusinger & Puskás, 2001, p. 44)

Von Heusinger (2002) argues, like Ihsane and Puskas (2001), that specificity and definiteness are not interdependent semantic categories, providing his own cross-classification which includes all four possibilities, as seen in (70). He adopts the view that definiteness expresses whether a constituent is familiar within the discourse, while specificity reflects its referential structure, in the sense that specific constituents are referentially anchored to another discourse object.

\[(70)\]

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Referentially anchored to discourse referents & Discourse old & Discourse new \\
Referential or Specific definite DP & Specific indefinite DP \\
Referentially bound by operators & Attributive or non-specific definite DP & Non-specific indefinite DP
\end{tabular}

Von Heusinger points to Prince’s (1981) observation that both definites and indefinites refer in multiple ways, shown in (71) and (72). According to Prince, all the italicised expressions in (71), with the exception of a body in a) are interpreted as being non-specific. Von Heusinger specifies that he uses the term “non-specific” to be synonymous with Prince’s “attributive”, shown in the (d) sentences in (71) and (72).
Different ways of referring of indefinite DPs

a. A body was found in the river yesterday.  
   specific
b. A tiger has stripes.  
   generic
c. John is a plumber.  
   predicative
d. I never saw a two-headed man.  
   attributive
e. He won’t say a word.  
   negative polarity idiom piece

(Prince, 1981, p. 231)

Different ways of referring of definite DPs

a. The body was found in the river yesterday.  
   specific
b. The tiger has stripes.  
   generic
c. Ronald is the president.  
   predicative
d. They’ll never find the man that will please them.  
   attributive
e. He doesn’t mean the slightest thing to me.  
   negative polarity idiom piece

(Prince, 1981, p. 231)

Generics are a class of DPs which constitute a problematic area for specificity. In (74a), the expressions a book and a doctor do not refer to an individual book or doctor, but rather refer to the class of books and the class of doctors. Lambrecht argues that these are clearly identifiable, since one need only identify the class of books and the class of doctors in order to find a referent. In contrast to the use of indefinites in (51), repeated below as (73), where specific expressions may only be antecedents for, e.g., definite pronouns, and non-specific expressions may only be antecedents for indefinite expressions, e.g., one, generic expressions, such as a book in (74a), can be followed by an identical expression, as in (74b) or by definite pronouns, such as it in (74c).

I’m looking for a book.

(74)  

a. A book is a useful thing to have in a doctor’s waiting room.  
   (possible follow up to (74a))
b. A book is also something easy to carry around.  
   (possible follow up to (74a))
c. It is also something easy to carry round.  
   (possible follow up to (74a))
   (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 82)

Genericity can also be expressed employing definite articles, referring to the class described by the linguistic expression as a whole. The whale in (75) is ambiguous between referring to a specific individual whale identifiable by conversation participants, and referring to the entire class of whales.

She is now studying the whale.

(Lambrecht, 1994, p. 83)

It is worth noting that both generic DPs with definite articles and those with indefinite articles can be replaced with a plural without an article in English, with only a slight difference in interpretation, where the presence of the article adds a layer of detail where the bare plural is underspecified. While this is very slight indeed in the contrast between (74a) and (76a), the presence of the definite article in (75) seems to add an interpretation of exhaustiveness to whale, such that the bare plural in (76b) allows an (optional) interpretation where it is not the entire class of whales which is being studied.
(76)  a. Books are useful things to have in doctors’ waiting rooms.
    b. She is now studying whales.

Von Heusinger (2002) builds on Farkas’s (1995) classification of specifics: (i) scopal specific indefinites; (ii) epistemic specific indefinites; (iii) partitive specific indefinites; and (iv) relative specific indefinites. Group (iv) constitutes an addition on Von Heusinger’s part to Farkas’s classification.

The first group, that of *scopal specific indefinites*, reflects the classical view on definite specifics, involving a difference in scope. The sentence in (77) is ambiguous between two readings, which are paraphrased in (77a) and (77b), representing the specific and the non-specific reading of a Norwegian. For the pronoun *her* in (77a’) to have access to a Norwegian, the latter constituent must be outside the scope of want. This is only the case in the case of (77a), so the follow-up sentence (77b’), von Heusinger states, represents the only way to continue, containing no pronoun attempting to refer to a Norwegian.

(77)  John wants to marry a Norwegian.
    a. There is a Norwegian1, and John wants to marry her1.
    a’. He met her1 last year.
    b. John wants that there is a Norwegian1 and he marries her1.
    b’. He will move to Norway to try to achieve this goal.

(von Heusinger, 2002)

The indefinite also interacts with other operators, such as negation, universal quantifiers, or multiple operators. Von Heusinger cites Karttunen’s (1976) methodology of using anaphoric linkage, as above, to disambiguate cases which could be either specific or not, as only the specific interpretation is compatible with the use of anaphors.

Von Heusinger (2002) cites Kasher and Gabbay’s (1976) description of the second type of specificity, *epistemic specificity*, according to which, indefinites are ambiguous between a referential reading of the constituent and a non-referential quantified reading of the same: specific indefinites have a unique referent, while non-specific indefinites rely on the interpretation of other expressions or the context to determine what they refer to. An example of this is given in (78), where the continuation in (78a) is compatible with the specific reading and the one in (78b) is compatible with the non-specific reading.

(78)  A student in Syntax 1 cheated on the exam.
    a. His name is John.
    b. We are all trying to figure out who it was.

(von Heusinger, 2002)

The third group is that of partitive specific indefinite DPs. Here, von Heusinger (2002) refers back to Milsark (1974), who describes the distinction between specific and non-specific in terms of a presuppositional (strong) or an existential (weak) interpretation. This type of specificity is also discussed by Enç (1991) and is reflected in the morphological marking of Turkish indefinite direct objects. These partitives involve picking an entity from a given set. The set is considered to be definite, while the chosen entity, which is indefinite, can be specific, non-specific or a negated entity. Due to the complexity of partitives, which do not have to be specific, von Heusinger drops them from his investigation.

The last group, proposed by von Heusinger (2002) is that of *relative specificity*. This includes indefinites which cannot be categorised as having wide scope or being referential. These kinds of constituents were argued to be specific by Higginbotham (1987), and involve
cases where the speaker is not directly aware of the identity of the referent of the DP, knowing only that such a referent exists. The underlined constituent in (79b) below is an example of a relative specific indefinite, where the identity of the student is not known to James. He still knows, however, that there is a specific referent whom George met, having been told so by George himself in a sentence such as (79a).

(79) a. George: I met a certain student of mine.
   b. James: George met a certain student of his.

This type of specific indefinite has also been discussed by Hintikka (1986) and Enç (1991), the latter of whom calls them relational specifics. Enç (1991) links these DPs to another discourse item with some contextually salient relation, which may vary from case to case. Hintikka points out that this type of DP can have both narrow scope and be specific. This, he shows with the example in (80). According to Hintikka, a Skolem function (80a) allows the specific indefinite to assign each man’s mother to him. Another approach, where the reference of the man and the woman are determined together, is proposed by Farkas (1997). The reference assignment, which Farkas calls co-variation, permits the value of woman to be fixed each time the value of man is determined. This is illustrated in (80b), following the informal notation by von Heusinger (2002) where the variable x is co-indexed with the indefinite DP.

(80) According to Freud, every man unconsciously wants to marry a certain woman – his mother.

   a. ∀x [Man(x) → Wants(x marry (x, f(x)))]
      with f: Skolem function from men onto their mothers
   b. ∀x [Man(x) → Wants(x marry (x, [a woman],))]

       (von Heusinger, 2002)

Von Heusinger’s (2002) account of specificity is that specific DPs are referentially “anchored” to another entity in the discourse, in the sense that the referent of a specific DP depends on the referent of this other entity. Von Heusinger assumes that this relation is sentence bound, meaning that specific DPs must be anchored to explicitly mentioned discourse items in the same sentence. Von Heusinger does allow anchoring to the speaker, however. Von Heusinger proposes a Specificity Condition (82), built on Heim’s Familiarity Condition (81).

(81) Heim’s Familiarity Condition

   An NP, in a sentence φ with respect to a file F and the Domain of filenames Dom(F) is
   (i) [+definite] if i ∈ Dom(F), and it is
   (ii) [-definite] if i ∉ Dom(F).

       (Heim, 1982, p. 369f)

(82) Specificity Condition

   An NP, in a sentence φ with respect to a file F and the Domain of filenames Dom(φ) is
   [+specific] if there is a contextual salient function f such that i = f(j) and j ∈ Dom(φ).

       (von Heusinger, 2002, p. 31)

Informally, the Specificity Condition would be applied for three possible interpretations of a specific indefinite as shown in (83). In (83a), the specific indefinite is anchored to the speaker; in (83b), it is anchored to a third person (in this case, Bill); in (83c), the referent of the specific indefinite will vary from student to student.
(83) Bill gave each student a (certain) task to work on
   a. Bill gave each student a (certain) task_{Speaker} to work on
      b. $i_1 \rightarrow j$
      b. $i_2 \rightarrow j$
      b. $i_3 \rightarrow j$
      etc. with $j = f(speaker)$
   b. Bill gave each student a (certain) task_{Bill} to work on
      b. $i_1 \rightarrow j$
      b. $i_2 \rightarrow j$
      b. $i_3 \rightarrow j$
      etc. with $j = f(b)$
   c. Bill gave each student ($x$) a (certain) task_{x} to work on
      b. $i_1 \rightarrow j_1$
      b. $i_2 \rightarrow j_2$
      b. $i_3 \rightarrow j_3$
      etc. with $j_n = f(i_n)$

Both Ihsane and Puskas’s and von Heusinger’s definitions of specificity require some referring entity upon which the specific DP is functionally dependent.

Lambrecht (1994, pp. 81-82) points out that there are a number of ways in which specificity can be tested for in various languages. In addition to the test demonstrated with (51) and (52), modifying the modality of the predicate containing the argument can help to detect specificity.

(84) a. I have to go to a meeting now. It starts in five minutes.
   b. ?I’d better go to a meeting now. It starts in five minutes.

It is unnatural to interpret a meeting in (84b) as being specific: the expression ‘d better (had better) forces a non-specific reading where the speaker does not have a specific referent in mind for a meeting. This test is reminiscent of von Heusinger’s (2002) example of scopal specific indefinites, as seen in (77), so we can assume that it relies on embedding the indefinite into the scope of an operator.

In French, the mood of restrictive relative clauses on the argument correlates with its specificity. In (85), a specific un livre (a) has a restrictive relative clause with the indicative mood, while a non-specific un livre (b) must use the subjunctive mood.

(85) a. Je cherche un livre qui est rouge.
    ‘I’m looking for a book that’s red.’
   b. Je cherche un livre qui soit rouge.
    ‘I’m looking for a book that’s red.’

   (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 81)

The indicative mood (85a) is used when the property of redness is attributed with certainty to the referent of the linguistic expression. The same mood cannot be used for a non-specific referent (85b), as it is difficult to attribute a property to a referent whose existence is uncertain.
What French expresses using mood, (colloquial) German can express with word order. The variant in (86a), which has the typical verb final order in the embedded clause, is ambiguous and *ein Buch* can be interpreted as either specific or non-specific. In contrast, the colloquial variant in (86b), where the main clause V2 order is found in the embedded clause, does not allow a non-specific *ein Buch*. Lambrecht argues that this is due to the link between main clause status and assertions, which means that the embedded clause is interpreted as being an assertion, the interpretation of which requires the argument to be taken for granted, forcing the specific interpretation.

(86) a. Ich suche ein Buch, das Rot *ist.*
   ‘I’m looking for a book that’s red.’

   b. Ich suche ein Buch, das *ist* Rot.
   ‘I’m looking for a book that’s red.’

   (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 82)

Demonstratives and possessives can, in some languages, restrict the interpretation of DPs to *definite AND specific* (except in the case of indefinite *this* and generics). In (87), the compatibility of definite articles and demonstratives is illustrated for English, French, German and Hungarian. *That train*, in (87a), must be both definite and specific, in English. It cannot be used to refer to any, non-specific train. Moreover, the demonstrative indicates a unique entity which is present in the context (linguistic or non-linguistic), which makes an indefinite interpretation impossible under any of the definitions examined for definiteness. The German case stands out as a bit of an exception among the languages which do not allow the definite article to co-occur with the demonstrative, as the demonstrative *dienen* “that” is becoming rarer and rarer. Instead, the demonstrative *diesen*, which can act as an indefinite *this*, is used as a demonstrative for referent both near and far. In contrast, Hungarian allows the definite article to occur after the demonstrative, though the indefinite article is not similarly compatible (Ihsane & Puskás, 2001, p. 46). The demonstrative does, however, mark specificity, as it has the function of pointing out a referent in the discourse or the non-linguistic context.

(87) a. I took that train.
   b. Ho preso quel treno.  
   
   Italian

c. J’ai pris *ce* train là.  
   
   French

d. Ich habe *diesen/jenen* Zug genommen.  
   
   German

e. Elkaptam *ezi* a vonatot.  
   
   Hungarian

   caught.1SG that the train.ACC

Possessives can also express both definiteness and specificity, in English, French and German, but not in Italian. This possibility correlates with whether the language allows the possessive and the determiner to be realised with the same DP (without a PP). In fact, realising the possessive without an article is ungrammatical in Italian (with exceptions, e.g. *mio fratello*, ‘my brother’).

(88) a. I lost *a/*the my book.
   b. Ho perso *(un/ìl) mio libro.  
   
   Italian

c. J’ai perdu *un/*le mon livre.  
   
   French

d. Ich habe *ein/*das mein(e) Buch verloren.  
   
   German
Languages may also have adjectives which can force a specific reading, such as *certain*, as in (89). Note that this adjective is incompatible with the definite article.

(89) a. I am looking for a/*the certain book.
    b. Sto cercando un/*il certo libro.  
    c. Je cherches un/*le certain livre.  
    d. Ich suche ein bestimmtes/*das bestimmte Buch.

    German

In some cases, it is possible to force a non-specific reading with a lexical item (90), such as the English *any*, Italian *qualsiasi*/*qualunque*, French *n'importe quel*/*quelconque*, German *irgendein*.

(90) a. Pick any card.
    b. Scegli una carta qualsiasi.
    c. Choisis une carte quelconque.
    d. Zieh irgendeine Karte.

Another way to check for the availability of non-specific readings is with a follow up sentence (91), in the vein of Lambrecht’s test illustrated earlier in (51) and (52), repeated below as (92) and (93) for the reader’s convenience.

(91) a. A man stole your bag. But I don’t know who.
    b. Un uomo t’ha rubato la borsa. Ma non so chi.
    c. Un homme a volé ton sac. Mais je ne sais pas qui.

(92) I’m looking for a book.

(93) a. I found it/the book I was looking for.
    b. I found one/a book.

Furthermore, some quantifiers may also force specificity, such as *most* and *few* (94). The equivalents in Italian (*la maggior parte*, *pochi*), French (*la plupart*, *peu*) and German (*die Meisten*, *wenige*) are shown below (94b-d’)

(94) a. Most/few students have read that book.
    b. La maggior parte degli studenti hanno letto quel libro.
    c. La plupart des etudiants a lit ce livre.
    d. Die Meisten Studenten hat dieses Buch gelesen.

    Italian
    French
    German

4.1.2.3 Referentiality, definiteness and specificity in Topics

The referentiality of expressions, as we have seen, concerns whether and/or how expressions find their referents. Definiteness is expressed in different ways and to different degrees cross-linguistically, as Lambrecht (1994) has pointed out and not all languages seem to express it. Specificity, on the other hand, provides a more solid basis for determining the
referential properties of expression, though different kinds of specificity have been argued for. For our purposes, it is significant that specificity can depend on the discourse, rather than the actual real-world existence of a referent. Another important kind of expression is that of generics, such that entire classes can be referred to by specific expressions.

Having now introduced the notions of definiteness and specificity, it is worth briefly examining how these properties relate to topics. I will therefore now examine what referential properties have been attributed specifically to topics.

Chafe (1976, p. 50) asserts that topics must be referential, since they “limit the applicability of the main predication to a certain restricted domain”. This precondition bans non-referring expressions from being topics, such as negated DPs (e.g., no car).

It has been proposed that definiteness is a prerequisite for topichood. Lambrecht’s observations that the realisation of definites across languages is not uniform, however, makes it difficult to use as a standard for ascertaining what can or cannot be a topic. Erteschik-Shir (2013) points out that indefinite expressions such the indefinite plural dogs in (95a) are topics. This is not possible with singular indefinites such as a dog in (95b), however, though this is possible if the topic is contrastive, as in (95c).

(95) a. Dogs are intelligent.  
    (Erteschik-Shir, 2013)  
    b. #A dog is intelligent.  
    c. A dog is intelligent, a cat is not.  
    (Erteschik-Shir, 2013)

The oddness of contrast between (95b) and (95c) shows that there are different types of topics, which differ in the kinds of constituents they allow.

Specificity, on the other hand, appears to be a more reliable property which may serve as a pre-requisite for topichood. This is not to say that all specific DPs are topics, of course. Non-specific expressions should therefore be unsuitable for topichood. As we collect tests for topichood, we can verify whether this hypothesis holds cross-linguistically.

While there is no controversy that there are specific definites and non-specific indefinites, Ihsane and Puskás (2001), as well as von Heusinger (2002), have provided evidence supporting the existence of specific indefinites and non-specific definites. Therefore, we will follow these accounts in assuming all four possible combinations exist and checking which of these combinations are compatible with topichood.

We will also assume that expressions are specific when they are discourse anaphoric, which seems to be relatively uncontroversial. What is more controversial is the case when an expression is argued to be specific without a direct discourse antecedent. In order to better understand these types of specifics (or non-specifics) we will need to have a closer look at discourse prominence, which will be examined in section 4.2.5. It is clear, however, that non-specific expressions such as negated and quantified expressions do not perform well as topics. As a preliminary test for topichood, we will use the about X hanging topic construction. In (96a), the negated DP nobody is ungrammatical in the topic construction, as are the quantified expressions less than half of the guests, everybody and two guests, in (96b), (96c), and (96d).

(96) a. *About nobody, he has arrived.  
    b. *About less than half of the guests, they have arrived.  
    c. *About everybody, they have arrived.  
    d. *About two guests, they have arrived.

These are also degraded or ungrammatical as contrastive topics, as can be seen in (97).
Based on the data we have examined, specificity must be a prerequisite of topics. This is clear, due to the fact that non-specific quantified expressions are not suitable topics. Contrastive topics seem to allow expressions which may not themselves be specific, but Lambrecht (1994) convincingly shows that they are still understood to stand in a subset relation to a discourse referent, which seems to be a sufficient condition and is similar to the property of D-linking as described by Pesetsky (1987). Topics which are new to the discourse, clearly, may not have a discourse referent, but they are still subject to restrictions: they must be anchored with some modifying expression which can restrict their interpretation and, therefore, provide a meaningful entity to be commented on for the purposes of the utterance. This last condition seems to be unrelated to D-linking, so linking to the discourse cannot be a basic requirement for topics.

4.2 Properties which define topics

In this section, I will discuss the properties which have been argued to represent sufficient criteria for topichood. I will consider each property in turn and evaluate their appropriateness and efficacy as conditions for topichood.

4.2.1 Topic as the clause-initial constituent

Within the Prague School, there is a structural definition of a topic which was adopted by Halliday (1967) and Fries (1983), where the topic (or theme) is defined as being the first element in the sentence. This definition is not easily applied cross-linguistically if we wish to view topics as being constituents, as the first element in a sentence could easily be a fronted focussed element, as in (98a), where a stressed Mary is a fronted Focus, which contrasts or corrects a prior claim or assumption where it is Jane who was met by the speaker on the train. (98b), on the other hand, has a fronted adverbial, which also may not be a topic.

(98)  a. Mary, I met on the train. (Not Jane.)
     b. With the utmost care, he cut the wires.

Instead, the Praguian approach would be considered to be something closer to what we have called the background: the sentence minus the Focus (Hajičová, et al., 1998, p. 30). Even in this case, however, the first element in (98) is not a topic: the definition could only be considered to be valid in the case of default order sentences, without any A’-movement. Given that we already have the term background for this concept, we will attempt to avoid confusion by using this term, rather than calling them topics.

Lambrecht (1994, p. 200) gives further evidence against the universality of the “topic-first” principle. Firstly, the existence of VOS and VSO languages, where the verb occupies the first position in the sentence by default, are a strong argument against the hypothesis that there be a universal requirement for topic DPs to be represented first in the sentence. This, Lambrecht
argues, irrespective of whether there are topicalisation mechanisms for DPs in these languages, as the verb-initial configuration constitutes their least marked word order, which is in contrast with the notion that topic-first is a principle based on natural, cognitively motivated grounds, as had been proposed for the SVO word order of French, by Rivarol in his (1784) *Discours sur l’universalité de la langue française* (Grevisse, 1959).

### 4.2.2 Aboutness and Informativeness

Reinhart (1981) makes a distinction between two types of topics: *sentence topics* and *discourse topics* (van Dijk, 1977). Both are characterised by her as expressing *aboutness*, a definition also embraced by Lambrecht (1994). That is to say, topics are what the rest of the sentence is about. This view originally derives from a definition of the logical subject. In (99a), *my car* is a focussed constituent, attracting the main stress in the utterance, and must be the main news in the sentence. It therefore cannot be a topic. In (99b), *the sandwich* is a topicalised object, while *for lunch* constitutes the main news of the sentence. In this case, *the sandwich* is a topic while not being the subject, which is *John*.

(99) a. My *car* broke down.  

(99) b. The *sandwich*, John ate *for lunch*.

The difference between syntactic topics and discourse topics is shown in (100)-(102) below, where the statements in (101) and (102) refer to a syntactic topic and a discourse topic, respectively.

(100) Mr Morgan is a careful researcher and a knowledgeable semiticist, but his originality leaves something to be desired.

(101) (100) is about Mr Morgan.

(102) (100) is about Mr Morgan’s scholarly ability.

Both (101) and (102) are true, but (100) makes no explicit mention of *Mr Morgan’s scholarly ability*, which is referred to in (102), in contrast, the DP *Mr Morgan* is clearly present. On Reinhart’s (1981) view, *sentence topics* express aboutness in the way (101) does, but not (102). Hence, sentence topics are expressed in the sentence; discourse topics may remain abstract and implicit. While both are topics in the sense that they describe what the sentence is about, only sentence topics are linguistically realised, while discourse topics, due to their not being realised linguistically, are unconstrained, multiple and hard to pin down exhaustively. Therefore, the notion of Topic for the remainder of this work will be referring only to linguistically represented constituents.

Lambrecht (1994, p. 119) makes reference to Strawson’s (1964) description of topichood, according to which human communication is rarely random and disjointed. Instead, humans overwhelmingly make their contributions toward a “matter of standing current interest or concern”. This principle is what Strawson calls the Principle of Relevance, though we will be referring to this brand of relevance as *informativeness*, in order to avoid confusion with the Relevance Theoretic definition of *relevance*. According to this principle, the sentence is about
a given topic in the sense that it provides information informative\(^5\) to it. In practice, failing to provide an informative contribution on a topic makes the utterance sound pragmatically infelicitous: the hearer will be perplexed, to some degree, upon failing to connect the utterance to the exchange in progress (or, in my view, accommodate the utterance by constructing some relation to the exchange, potentially giving rise to false assumptions). Lambrecht highlights that the vagueness with which Strawson describes topichood is advantageous with respect to describing how topics are realised across languages. In particular, on Lambrecht’s view, constituents may have varying degrees of topicality: for any given sentence, there may be multiple candidates which qualify, to a greater or a lesser extent, as topics. It is this vagueness, or flexibility, which, in Lambrecht’s view, explains why no clear-cut formal topic marking has been found crosslinguistically. Furthermore, the formal topic markers found in the languages which have them do not consistently account for the varying degrees of topicality (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 119).

Lambrecht (1994) proposes the use of allosentences in order to identify the topichood of a constituent in a given context. Consider the sentence in (103): this sentence has an unmarked SVO structure, with the children as the subject and can also be said to have a topic-comment structure. This is the most unmarked Information-Structural configuration, according to Lambrecht (p. 122), by which he means that this structural configuration can be pragmatically interpreted in different ways, including construals where the subject is not the topic.

Lambrecht forms the allosentences in (104) to show that said topic-comment structure is represented, albeit not syntactically. Only in the case of (104a) can we identify that the children has an aboutness relation with the rest of the sentence. In (104b-c), in contrast, the children is either the answer to a question or part of an answer, whereby it is the focus of the sentence, as in the case of (104b), or part of it, as in the case of (104c). In (104d), the children is not in an aboutness relation with the sentence, either, according to Lambrecht. The small capitals in the examples below indicate that expression is focal and receives stress.

(103) The children went to school.

(104) a. (What did the children do next?) The children went to SCHOOL.
   b. (Who went to school?) The CHILDREN went to school.
   c. (What happened?) The CHILDREN went to SCHOOL!
   d. (John was very busy that morning.) After the children went to school, he had to clean the house and go shopping for the party.

4.2.3 Discourse or conversational move

In addition to the aboutness relation between topics and their comments, Givón (1983) proposes that topics are constituents which the speaker is (newly) introducing, changing to or returning to. This way of describing topics gives them a more active role in the development of the conversation.

A peculiarity of topics is that they do not appear to influence the truth conditions of a declarative clause as a virtue of their topichood. In (105a-b), the proposition expressed does not change, regardless of which argument is a topic: the sentences are true in any world where the speaker gives a specific book to the individual denoted by the DP Mary.

\(^5\) Or, in Strawson’s terms, relevant.
Instead of changing the truth conditions, the topic can be used to control the direction of the conversation by proposing something new to be discussed or to be commented on. It is not excluded that the topic being discussed may be changed without using special IS-related mechanisms, such that the hearer would accept a new topic through accommodation, but the IS-related mechanisms make these explicit, or overt.

Referring back to the Krifka’s (2007) notion of the common ground (CG), discussed in section 2.3, where a distinction a distinction between CG content and CG management, Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) argue that topics which are new to the discourse are effectively introducing a new file card, which constitutes a conversational move and therefore pertain to CG management. This, they argue, constitutes a speech act, which requires a syntactic projection ForceP (a similar point was also argued for in Haegeman (2004)), which encodes illocutionary force. But not all topics implement conversational moves: we will examine this point in greater detail in section 4.3, when we tackle the differences between the various types of topics.

4.2.4 Discourse Participants

Furthermore, Givón considers any participant in the discourse to be a topic. Lambrecht (1994, p. 117) argues against this conflation, highlighting the importance of distinguishing topical and non-topical discourse participants. The latter term appears to refer to entities involved in a narrative, such as the agent, or entities affected by actions, such as entities with dative or patient thematic roles, for example. For the purposes of this work, adopting this use of the term participant would be counterproductive: firstly due to the confusion it could give rise to between the abovementioned entities and participants in the conversation, i.e., the hearer(s) and the speaker; a second issue which arises from conflating the terms topic and participant crops up when participants in this sense coincide with narrow foci, where it would be misleading to talk about a focussed topic, even in cases where some topics could be argued to be associated with foci.

4.2.5 Identifiability, givenness, activeness or familiarity

Another property which has been attributed to topics has been described using different terms: givenness, activeness (or state of activation), and familiarity. The degree of activeness of a linguistic expression or its referent refers to the prominence it has in the discourse. Chafe (1987) describes three possible degrees of activation (or activation states): active, semi-active, and inactive. The difference between the active state and the semi-active state consists in whether the discourse participant has the referent or concept in question in “focus” in his consciousness, or if the participant has merely a background awareness of the concept.

Consider a conversation where a speaker, Sheila, has been describing to a hearer, Harry, the professional life of her husband, a plumber called Sam. Let us say Sheila says the following within the context of the conversation:

(106) Sheila: Sam always brings his toolbelt with him on jobs, and he even carries a miniature wrench with him when he’s not working.
At this stage, we can say that a number of concepts are in the active state, including: Sam, Sam’s toolbelt, Sam’s miniature wrench. The contents of his toolbelt are not in the active state, but they are semi-active, as they can be inferred from the toolbelt. Furthermore, people Sam is associated with are also semi-active. A referent such as the policeman, on the other hand, is inactive. Even though the hearer and the speaker could identify a policeman, no such referent would have been mentioned in the Discourse and there would not appear to be any referent from which the policeman could be inferred.

Lambrecht (1994) subsumes Chafe’s activeness under his notion of identifiability, which consists of a 7-point scale (107) from brand-new to active. Identifiability correlates only imperfectly with definiteness, which he deems not to be a universal category.

(107)

```
IDENTIFIABILITY

    unidentifiable  identifiable
    /                \
  unanchored (1)  anchored (2)

ACTIVATION

  inactive (3)  accessible  active (7)

  textually (4)  situationally (5)  inferentially (6)
```

(Lambrecht, 1994, p. 109)

Lambrecht argues that elements ranked (1) on the identifiability scale are not suitable as topics. These elements are those he calls brand-new. These are entities with referents which the hearer cannot identify upon hearing them. This unacceptability is expected according to Keenan’s (1974) Functional Principle, which Lambrecht reinterprets in IS terms. Keenan originally applies this principle to subjects, from a sentence semantics point of view. According to this principle, in order to be able to evaluate whether a proposition is true or false, the hearer must first be able to mentally identify the entity or entities being predicated. Only after having identified the entity, can the hearer then judge whether the predicate holds of the entity, whereby the proposition is accepted as being true, or not, in which case the proposition would be false. Lambrecht recasts this in IS-terms, stating that the information value and the relevance of the comment to a topic cannot be assessed unless the hearer can identify what the topic is. For example, the sentence in (108a), which Lambrecht borrows from Perlmutter (1970) is bad because the hearer cannot identify the brand-new (identifiability scale 1) constituent a boy. The sentence is improved by anchoring said constituent with the adverbial in my class, as shown in (108b). In the second case, the identifiability of the topic is now 2 on Lambrecht’s scale.

(108) a.   *A boy is tall.  
          (Perlmutter, 1970)

b.   A boy in my class is real tall.  
     (Lambrecht, 1994)

On the opposite side of the scale are active referents, which constitute the type of topic known as given or continued. Therefore, if Lambrecht’s scale is used, we would expect topics, perhaps of different types, to vary from 2 to 7 on the identifiability scale, while constituents ranked 1 on the scale would not be suitable as a topic of any kind.
Büring (2005) argues against equating givenness with having a familiar discourse referent. He shows this by examining the effect of prosoding accenting on anaphoricity. In (109), the answer A allows the butcher to refer to Dr Cremer, a familiar discourse referent. In this case, the butcher is clearly part of the background and not the focus. Prosodically accenting and, thus, focussing this constituent, however, prevents us from interpreting this expression as referring to the familiar discourse referent.

(109) Q:  (Did you see Dr. Cremer to get your root canal?)  
A:  (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the butcher.  
A’: # (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the BUTcher.

(Büring, 2005, p. 4)

Büring (2005) states that the effect caused by prosodic accenting also manifests in cases which do not involve familiar discourse referents. In (110a), an Italian in B’s answer does not refer anaphorically to Italian in A’s question, as an Italian refers to an individual of a given nationality, while Italian, as meant in the question, refers to a language. In (110b), the verb jump cannot be said to anaphorically refer to the verb jump in A’s utterance. In both (110a) and (b), prosodic accenting makes the sentences sound unnatural in the context.

(110)  
a. A:  (Why do you study Italian?)  
B:  I’m MARried to an Italian.  
b. A:  (Don’t jump!)  
B:  But I WANT to jump.

(Büring, 2005, p. 4)

Büring (2005) argues that this shows the relevant concept is not the familiarity of discourse referents, but rather the notion of information, whereby focussed expressions are interpreted as being informative, while expressions in the background are, instead, interpreted as being uninformative. Büring points out that this gives rise to a semantic issue, as individual parts of the sentence cannot be informative, since information is expressed in terms of propositions. Büring refers to Schwarzschild’s (1999) existential closure (∃C), which allows variables to be inserted into a non-propositional expression until it becomes propositional, after which, the variables are existentially quantified. In other words, a non-propositional expression is interpreted as an existential proposition. Büring gives the following examples in (111):

(111)  
Non-propositional expression  ∃C of expression  
giraffe  There is a giraffe.  
blue  There is something blue.  
resemble  Someone (or something) resembles someone (or something).

(Büring, 2005, p. 5)

Given this mechanism, Schwarzschild’s (1999) definition of Givenness is such that an expression E is given if the ∃C of E is entailed by the ∃C of a previously uttered constituent, which could be a sentence, but also a constituent smaller than a sentence (Büring, 2005, pp. 5-6). In the example in (112), extraterrestrials is given when uttered in B, because its ∃C there are extraterrestrials is entailed by the ∃C of A’s an extraterrestrial (There is an extraterrestrial). This definition of Givenness allows expressions to be given without needing direct anaphoric
reference and without requiring the participants to commit to the truth of the $\exists C$’s of the expressions they utter.

(112) A: Did you ever see an extraterrestrial?  
    B: I don’t think there ARE extraterrestrials.  

(Büring, 2005, p. 5)

4.2.6 Summary of topic properties

In summary, it is not the case that topics need to be clause initial, especially when languages have multiple topics. Furthermore, clause initiality is clearly not a sufficient condition for topichood. It does seem to be the case that topics are what the rest of the sentence is about, but the the condition of aboutness is too vague to be a reliable diagnostic for topichood. The notion of relevance (Strawson, 1964), in terms of being informative about an entity, however, seems to have a slightly more targeted meaning, which I will employ in my alternative to the aboutness property. We will discard the condition of being participant in the discourse, a concept on loan from discourse analytic literature. The scale of identifiability proposed by Lambrecht (1994) provides us with a clear way of assessing the suitability of topic candidates with respect to the discourse and their anchoring.

4.3 Different types of topics

Having discussed the properties of topics as a class, we will now look at how topics differ from one another, by examining three types of topics which have been described in the literature.

The account of the left periphery developed by Rizzi (1997), argues that there are multiple, iterated positions for topics in the left periphery. Rizzi’s proposed model for the positions of topics predicts two fields in the left periphery: the first just above the focus (located in FocP) and the second just below it. Building on this approach, Cecchetto (1999) and Belletti (2001) provide evidence for a lower topic position situated between IP and VP, which is then realised as a right-dislocated constituent. The general structure of these positions is shown in (113), where the asterisk indicates that the phrase recurs freely in that position, e.g., an asterisk marked topic above focus indicates multiple topics can be realised before the focus (topic* - focus → topic – topic – focus).
Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) argue, however, that there are differences in the interpretation of topics, proposing that there should be a minimum of three different kinds of topics, based on data from Italian and German.

In Italian, in particular, all three Topic types are realised through what appears to be the same process: dislocation to the left and the realisation of the relevant clitic (when available). In standard Italian, clitics are available for direct objects (accusative) and indirect objects (dative), with respect to arguments. Furthermore Italian uses a clitic *si* which has a reflexive use, as well as an impersonal use. Other clitics in Italian include the *ne*-clitic (a similar clitic is realised in French as *en*) as well as locative clitics, such as *vi* and *ci*. (114) shows how accusative and dative clitics must agree in case and gender with the constituent they are associated with. In this case, *il latte* is masculine and represents the direct object of the verb *compro* (*I buy*): the clitic must therefore be accusative and masculine.

\[(114) \quad \text{Il latte, la/lo/gli compro domani.} \]

\text{the milk (M), CL.ACC.M/CL.ACC.F/CL.DAT.M buy.1SG tomorrow}

\text{‘The milk, I’m buying tomorrow.’}

The example above is an instance of \textit{clitic left-dislocation}, where a constituent appears dislocated to the left periphery and a resumptive clitic appears associated with the verb. The constituent thus dislocated is interpreted as a topic.

Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) highlight the differences in interpretation between these topics and argue that it is not the case that topics can all undergo free recursion, that some types of topics may only appear once in a sentence, and that there is a correlation between their function and their position. They propose that topics be organised in the following hierarchy:

Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) argue, however, that there are differences in the interpretation of topics, proposing that there should be a minimum of three different kinds of topics, based on data from Italian and German.

In Italian, in particular, all three Topic types are realised through what appears to be the same process: dislocation to the left and the realisation of the relevant clitic (when available). In standard Italian, clitics are available for direct objects (accusative) and indirect objects (dative), with respect to arguments. Furthermore Italian uses a clitic *si* which has a reflexive use, as well as an impersonal use. Other clitics in Italian include the *ne*-clitic (a similar clitic is realised in French as *en*) as well as locative clitics, such as *vi* and *ci*. (114) shows how accusative and dative clitics must agree in case and gender with the constituent they are associated with. In this case, *il latte* is masculine and represents the direct object of the verb *compro* (*I buy*): the clitic must therefore be accusative and masculine.

\[(114) \quad \text{Il latte, la/lo/gli compro domani.} \]

\text{the milk (M), CL.ACC.M/CL.ACC.F/CL.DAT.M buy.1SG tomorrow}

\text{‘The milk, I’m buying tomorrow.’}

The example above is an instance of \textit{clitic left-dislocation}, where a constituent appears dislocated to the left periphery and a resumptive clitic appears associated with the verb. The constituent thus dislocated is interpreted as a topic.

Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) highlight the differences in interpretation between these topics and argue that it is not the case that topics can all undergo free recursion, that some types of topics may only appear once in a sentence, and that there is a correlation between their function and their position. They propose that topics be organised in the following hierarchy:
In the diagram above, the specifiers of ShiftP, ContrP and FamP host the aboutness shift topic, the contrastive topic and familiar topics, respectively.

The first described will be aboutness shift topics (Reinhart, 1981; Lambrecht, 1994; Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007; Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010). Closely related in interpretation to this is the hanging topic. The next type of topic is the familiar, given, (Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007; Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010) or continuing topic. The last kind of topic to be examined is the contrastive topic (Kuno, 1976; Büring, 2003; Büring, 2005; Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007; Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010).

4.3.1 Aboutness shift topics and root restriction

(115) Topic hierarchy

(116) and (117) below give two instances of aboutness shift topics in context, from Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s (2007) Italian and German corpora, respectively. In (116), the underlined sentence features a clitic left dislocated constituent l’ultima unit (‘the last unit’), resumed by the feminine accusative clitic la. In (117), der Nationalstolz in (a) and Putin in (b) are also aboutness shift topics.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) I have modified the translations of the examples from the Italian and German corpora in order to more closely reflect the originals and to improve their legibility. The original Italian and German texts I have left untouched. Furthermore, in some cases, the full sentence the topics appear in is not provided by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl.
Il materiale era tantissimo quindi all’inizio l’ho fatto tutto di corsa cercando di impiegarci il tempo che dicevate voi magari facendolo un po’ superficialmente pur di prendere tutto- l’ultima unit la sto facendo l’ho lasciata un po’ da parte perché ho ricominciato il ripasso...

‘The material was quite a lot, so at the beginning I did it in a rush, trying to do it all in the time that you had set, maybe a little superficially, so as to cover everything- the last unit, I’m doing it now, I set it aside before because I had started to go over the program again...’

L’ultima unit la sto facendo.

‘The last unit, I’m doing it now.’

(Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007, p. 4)

(117) C: Ich mein’ nich’ unbedingt dass es Putin schadet- das muss nicht dasselbe sein aber ich glaube dass das- dass der Nationalstolz also das viel beschworene äh-Zusammengehörigkeitsgefühl [...] das ja aus der Zarenzeit mehr oder weniger heraufbeschworen wird von- von den Medien [...]  

‘C: I do not necessarily mean that it harms Putin. This doesn’t have to be the same. But I believe that the- that the national pride in fact the much talked about sentiment of belonging together [...] which is more or less conjured up from tsarist times by the media. [...]  
A: Putin realized ehm I did the wrong thing there.’

(Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007, p. 104)

Aboutness shift topics, also known as shifting topics or aboutness topics, are topics employed to change the subject in the conversation. According to Givon, they are topics which are either being introduced for the first time or being returned to (after not having been the topic for some amount of time, presumably). In Reinhart’s (1981) and Heim’s (1982) terms, they introduce a new defining entry, or file card, to which future propositions may be added. In this sense it can trigger a discourse/conversational move and, thus, is involved in CG management in the sense of Krifka (2007).

In English, aboutness shift topics can be realised using left dislocation, where a constituent is dislocated to the left periphery and then resumed with a resumptive pronoun (118).

(118) The Beatles, I love them.

This kind of topic could constitute a candidate for being the quintessential “vanilla” topic, in that much of the literature has used aboutness shift topics as examples for topichood. It is also the clearest example of a topic which establishes what the comment is about, in the sense of Reinhart (1981).
Topics have been generally been supposed to be restricted to root (or root-like) contexts and being main clause phenomena (Emonds, 1970; 1976; 2004; Maki, et al., 1999; Haegeman, 2002; Heycock, 2006). Aboutness shift topics constitute prime examples of topics which are restricted to main clauses, as shown in Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s (2007) examination of German and Italian data. Aboutness shift topics seem to adhere closely to the properties of root restriction as described above. According to Hooper and Thompson (1973), the realisation of topics in embedded clauses is possible when these clauses constitute the main assertion of the utterance. The sentence in (119a) below is ungrammatical in English, as fronting is not permitted in a conditional clause. Its Italian counterpart, in (119b), on the other hand, is ungrammatical if *la nuova playstation* is being interpreted as being new in the discourse, but is grammatical if it is discourse anaphoric.

(119) English
   a. *If the new playstation you want it, you’d better finish all your homework.

   Italian
   b. Se *la nuova playstation* la vuoi, devi prima finire tutti i tuoi compiti.

   if the new playstation want.2SG must.2SG first to finish all your homework

In terms of the syntax of aboutness shift topics, these topics appear as the topics most on the left of the sentence. In contrast to the account of topics as being freely recursive in every position proposed by Rizzi (1997), Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) argue that aboutness topics are not, in fact, recursive, but can only be realised once. Bianchi and Frascarelli reason that this is a consequence of their involvement in CG management: due to their function as tools for the identification of the entry to which propositions will be stored in the propositional CG, there can only be one aboutness shift topic in the left periphery.

Since main clause phenomena have been proposed to be linked to assertive force (Hooper & Thompson, 1973), Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) follow Krifka (2001) in arguing that aboutness shift topics constitute an independent speech act and propose that, syntactically, they could be positioned outside the left periphery, in the specifier of a projection πP acting as a speech act conjunction. Below, in (120), is their proposed syntactic position for aboutness shift topics.

(120)

(Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010, p. 78)

Their reasons for this argument involve the scopal properties of aboutness shift topics, as well as their alleged independence from illocutionary force and their violation of the Complex NP Constraint. Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010, p. 75) claim that aboutness shift topics are difficult to interpret as having narrow scope, as shown in (121).
Every mechanic said [that one of the motorbikes, he can fix it in one day].

\[ \forall \exists = 4/25 \]

(Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010, p. 75)

Evidence for their independence from illocutionary force is provided by evidence with sentences differing in their illocutionary force, shown below in (122).

(122) a. This book, leave it on the table! (imperative)
    b. Those petunias, did John plant them? (interrogative)
    c. Those petunias, when did John plant them? (Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010, p. 77)

It should be noted, however, that the validity of the examples in (122) is not clear, as the constituents this book in (122a) and those petunias in (122b-c) may not necessarily qualify as topics and could be syntactically unrelated to the sentences which follow them. In spite of this evidence, it is not clear that these constituents which seem independent of illocutionary force are indeed acting as topics. For example, there appears to be a noticeable break between these constituents and the following clause. Bianchi and Frascarelli do not provide felicitous contexts to support their claim that these do indeed carry out the discourse functions they impute to topics, so it could equally be claimed that these are sentence fragments, pragmatically associated with the following clause, or that they are elliptical sentences with their antecedents in the prior discourse. These could, in fact, be free topics, which may not be topics at all and which I will discuss briefly with reference to Nolda (2004).

Bianchi and Frascarelli also cite Chomsky’s observation that left dislocated constituents can escape complex NPs, violating the Complex NP Constraint, as shown in (123).

(123) a. This book, I accept the argument that John should read *(it).

As an alternative to this proposal, where aboutness shift topics would be situated outside the left periphery entirely, Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) also propose a second possibility, which could account for the lack of scopal interaction observed with aboutness shift topics. They propose implementing Meinunger’s (2004) approach, where embedded clauses which have root-like properties move and adjoin to higher position where they are closest in scope to the main assertion operator and become speaker assertions. Their proposal is illustrated in (124) below, where the projection SAP is the Speech Act Phrase and the SA head constitutes the assertion operator.

(124)
According to Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl, these topics feature a rising intonational contour (L*+H contour). The pitch accents described are based on Pierrehumbert’s (1980) work on intonation. Lambrecht also refers to these kinds of topics as being accented, as opposed to other, unaccented topics (Familiar/Given topics, for example). (116) and (117), repeated below as (125) and (126), constitute two examples in context of aboutness shifting topics from Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl’s Italian and German corpora, respectively.

(125) Il materiale era tantissimo quindi all’inizio l’ho fatto tutto di corsa cercando di impiegare il tempo che dicevate voi magari facendolo un po’ superficialmente pur di prendere tutto- l’ultima unit la sto facendo l’ho lasciata un po’ da parte perché ho ricominciato il ripasso...’

‘The material was quite a lot, so at the beginning I did it in a rush, trying to do it all in the time that you had set, maybe a little superficially, so as to cover everything- the last unit, I’m doing it now, I set it aside before because I had started to go over the program again.’

L’ultima unit la sto facendo.
the last unit it CL be.1SG do.GER
‘The last unit, I’m doing it now.’

(Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007, p. 4)

(126) C: Ich mein’ nich’ unbedingt dass es Putin schadet- das muss nicht dasselbe sein aber ich glaube dass das- dass der Nationalstolz also das viel beschworene äh-Zusammengehörigkeitsgefühl [...] das ja aus der Zarenzeit mehr oder weniger heraufbeschworen wird von- von den Medien [...] 

‘C: I do not necessarily mean that it harms Putin. This doesn’t have to be the same. But I believe that the- that the national pride in fact the much talked about sentiment of belonging together [...] which is more or less conjured up from tsarist times by the media. [...] 
A: Putin realized ehm I did the wrong thing there.’

(a) dass der Nationalstolz that the national pride
‘that the national pride’
(b) Putin hat gemerkt ... Putin have.3SG noticed ...
‘Putin has realized...’

(Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007, p. 104)

A construction which is often lumped together with topics is that of hanging topics. Hanging topics are also generally interpreted as being new, as opposed to referring to the topic already under discussion. Typically, these are realised as PPs such as about X, as can be seen in (127). Unlike most topics, hanging topics do not need to be resumed in the rest of the sentence (although they can), the example also shows this in that John can be resumed by the pronoun him, but can also simply be the antecedent to the determiner his in the DP his sister.

(127) About John, I happened to bump into his sister/him last week.
This behaviour is similar to that seen in Japanese topics, as in the famous example in (128).

(128) a. Zoo -wa hana-ga nagai.
elephant-WA trunk-NOM long
‘As for an elephant, (its) trunk is long.’

(Mikami, 1960)

Li and Thompson (1976) argue that hanging topics are fully integrated into the grammar of topic prominent languages such as Japanese, Chinese and Korean.

(129) a. Pihengi-nin 747-ka khi-ta.
airplane-TOP 747-SBJ big-STAT
‘Airplanes, the 747 is big.’

(Li & Thompson, 1976, p. 468)

b. Haixian, wo zui ai chi longxia.
seafood I most love eat lobster
‘As for seafood, I like lobster most.’

(Chen, 1996, p. 402)

In languages such as English or German, hanging topics seem less closely integrated into the sentence proper.

Nolda (2004) distinguishes (left-)hanging topics from free topics in German, in that free topics have their own sentence intonation and constitute independent sentential units. He provides these two examples of hanging topics (130a) and free topics (130b). Nolda also argues that so-called free topics do not have a topic function, unlike hanging topics.

(130) a. Der Hans, den kenne ich seit langem.
the.NOM.SG.M Hans.M this/that.ACC.SG.M know I for a long time
‘As for Hans, I’ve known him for a long time.’

(Nolda, 2004, p. 424)

the.nom.SG.M Hans.M I know this guy for a long time
Hans? I’ve known this guy for a long time.’

(Nolda, 2004, p. 425)

Although Nolda does not specify what tests of topichood he relied on to determine whether or not the constituents in question have a “topic function”, he motivates the distinction on the basis of the intonation of these constituents. Unlike hanging topics and other, more cohesive kinds of topic in German, free topics have their own sentence intonation and should be considered to be nominal sentential units, other examples of which are vocatives (Hans!) and exclamations (Achtung! ‘Attention!’). Furthermore, while hanging topics and other topic constituents must appear in nominative case when not agreeing with the expression resuming the referent. Note that the free topic in (130b) is in the dative case, while the expression in the following clause is in the accusative case.

The free topics mentioned by Nolda could very well be the kind of “topics” which Bianchi and Frascarelli assume to be aboutness shift topics in the sentences in (122), repeated as (131) below.
4.3.2 Familiar, given, or continued topics and right dislocation

Familiar, given or continued topics are stressed topics which are interpreted as acting somewhat like discourse anaphora, referring back to a prominent topic in the discourse. In fact, these kinds of topics can generally refer to any discourse prominent constituent. Chafe (1974) defines these as constituents which are simply given or accessible. This may also be the same kind of Topic which Givón (1983) calls *continuing Topics*, when these refer to a pre-established A-Topic.

Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) state that they are characterised by a low intonation and that they are the only kind of Topic which can be dislocated to the right in Italian. Given topics also have the least restricted distribution. They are associated with a low tone (L*), which could refer to destressing, as Lambrecht (1994) describes these as being unaccented topics. Like the aboutness shift topic, Italian realises given topics using clitic left dislocation, but it has also been claimed that this type of topic also appears in the right periphery, by way of clitic right dislocation. (132) and (133) below show examples of clitic right dislocation and clitic left dislocation, respectively. In the first case, *la conferma* is right dislocated, with the resume clitic *la* appearing on the infinitive verb *dare* after the dative clitic *mi*, which is here realised as *me* due to the presence of the object clitic; in the second case, *inglese* is left dislocated and resumed by the clitic *l’* (contracted form of *lo*).7

(132) B: io dovevo studiare le regole qui e lì fare solo esercizio, invece mi aspettavo di trovare dei punti a cui far riferimento ogni volta per vedere la regola, questo mi è mancato praticamente per avere *la conferma* di ricordare tutto insomma; A: comunque quelle domande ti davano *la conferma* che avevi capito; B: ma... magari non me la non riesco a darmela da sola *la conferma*.

‘B: I was supposed to study rules here and do only the exercises there, actually I had expected to find some reference points, at any stage, to review the rule, basically, I was missing this to verify that I remembered everything; A: Anyways, those questions gave you the chance to verify you understood everything B: well, maybe I cannot do [verify] this on my own.’

non riesco a darmela da sola la conferma.
not can.1SG to give-to.me(CL)-it(CL) alone the confirmation
‘I cannot do [verify] this on my own.’

(133) Era tutto molto nuovo nel senso che comunque la lingua *inglese* attraverso i programmi sul computer diciamo [...] comunque l’*inglese* risultava anche facendolo da solo più interessante [...] io, l’*inglese* non- premetto non l’avevo mai fatto.

---

7 The closest approximation of a familiar topic in English is the pronoun, so I have modified the translations in Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl to reflect this, indicating the intended referent in brackets.
‘It was all very new to me in the sense that, anyway, I had never studied the English language using computer programmes, so to speak […] and anyways, it [English] was, even studying it on your own, more interesting [to me] […] [personally], [English] I must say that I had never studied it before.’

Io, inglese […] non l’avevo mai fatto.
I English not it(CL) have.PAST.1SG never done
‘Personally, I must say that I had never studied it [English] before.’

(Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl, 2007)

The fact that these topics are unaccented is reminiscent of the observation made by Büring (2005), that accented constituents cannot act as discourse anaphora, as shown by the contrast in (109), repeated below as (134), where the accented constituent butcher in A’ cannot refer to the discourse prominent Dr Cremer, while it can if it is not accented, as shown in the A response.

(134) Q:  (Did you see Dr. Cremer to get your root canal?)
A:  (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the butcher.
   A’: # (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the BUTcher.

(Büring, 2005, p. 4)

Given topics are also responsible for the extreme number of topics which can be realised in Italian. Multiple such topics can be realised, while aboutness shift topics and contrastive topics (which we will examine in the next section) can only be realised once. Furthermore, Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) note that given topics can be realised in all kinds of embedded clauses which do not tolerate other kinds of topics. For example, they can appear in untensed embedded clauses, as shown in (135)8.

(135) a.  A:  Here is the pack of rice. Will you take care of it?

   B:  Si, senti che idea: ho deciso, il riso, di cuocerlo
        yes listen.2SG what idea   have.1SG decided the rice of cook.INF-CL.ACC
        by steam
        a vapore
   ‘Yes. I have an idea. I’ve decided [the rice] to steam it.’

b.  A:  The rice is ready.

   B:  Vabbé: se il riso l’ hai già cotto, apparecchia la tavola.
       okay if the rice CL.ACC have.2SG already cooked lay.IMP the table
   ‘All right, if [the rice] you’ve already cooked it, lay the table.’

---

8 I have reduced and modified the examples, leaving the key sentences intact, in order to improve their legibility.
c.  A: Should I watch the cake, too?

B: Si, te l’ho detto: resta in cucina finché la torta non la vedi pronta da sfornare.

‘Yes, I told you: stay in the kitchen until [the cake] you see it’s ready to take out of the oven.’

4.3.3 Contrastive topics

Contrastive topics are a type of topic in that they appear to share all the properties of the basic topics examined so far, yet they also have some properties which set them apart from a “vanilla” topic. Contrastive topics are typically pronounced with a different intonation than other topics. Crucially, their interpretation is systematically different, hence their featural composition cannot be identical to that of normal topics.

An important property characterising contrastive topics is that they appear to be comparing, or contrasting, themselves with some other entity or quantity. Kuno (1976) and Büring (Büring, 2003; 2005) both state that these kinds of topics express aboutness in some way while still implying the existence of at least one relevant alternative. Hence, it is important to understand what mechanisms might allow this to be communicated. To this end, it is useful to examine the concept of Focus in a little more detail, as this is one of the key phenomena which are characterised as choosing between alternatives.

4.3.3.1 Intonation and discourse strategy

Büring (1997; 2003) draws attention to differences in intonation used in English described by Jackendoff (1972), who called them A-accents and B-accents. Jackendoff gives the following example (136), where Fred bears a fall-rise B-accent and beans a falling A-accent. Swapping the accents between the two constituents would be perceived as being unnatural in the context, showing that there is a relation between the positioning of the accents and the context in which the sentence is uttered.

(136) A: Well, what about FRED? What did HE eat?

B: FRED ate the BEANS.

Jackendoff (1972, p. 261) via Büring (2003, p. 511)

In contrast, (137) features a A-accent on Fred and a B-accent on beans. Once again, the sentence would sound unnatural in this context were the accents swapped.

(137) A: Well, what about the BEANS? Who ate THEM?

B: FRED ate BEANS.
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Büring (1997) also points out that contrastive topics appear to necessarily precede foci, which he ascribes, following Féry (1993) to the fact that the phonological configuration would be incorrect, as it should be L* H, followed by H* L and would be reversed if the contrastive topic were to follow the topic.

According to Büring (2003), a sentence with a contrastive topic (at least partially) answers a complex question, composed of multiple subquestions. Such a question might be that in (138a), which could be split up into subquestions such as those in (138b) or (138c).

(138) a. Who ate what?
   b. Who ate the beans?
      Who ate the carrots?
      ...
   c. What did Fred eat?
      What did Jonna eat?
      ...

(Büring, 2003, p. 513)

Büring (2003) follows Roberts (1996) in attributing such questions and subquestions to a strategy⁹. Büring points out that prior approaches fail to formally distinguish contrastive topic interpretations from focus interpretations, with the result that sentences which differ in intonation such as those in (136) B and (137) B are predicted to be appropriate in the same conditions without regard for what accent manifests. In particular, approaches including that in Roberts (1996) treat all accents as foci.

The term strategy is used in the context of discourse trees (van Kuppevelt, 1991; 1996; Roberts, 1996), which consists in the structure of a given discourse. For example, (139) represents a discourse and its structure is more abstractly represented in (140)

(139) a. How was the concert?
   Was the sound good? No, it was awful.
   How was the audience? They were enthusiastic.
   How was the band?
   How was the drummer? Just fantastic.
   And what about the singer? Better than ever.
   Did they play old songs? Not a single one.
   So what did you do after the concert?...

(Büring, 2003, p. 515)

---

a. Question
   sub-question
   answer
   sub-question
   answer
   sub-question
   subsub-question
   answer
   sub-sub-question
   answer
   sub-question
   answer
   question...

(Büring, 2003, p. 515)

This discourse can be represented in a tree form, or d(iscourse)-tree, as in (141)

(141)

The nodes, known as *moves* (Carlson, 1983), represent either statements or questions in the Discourse. The d-tree’s structure reflects the wellformedness of question-answer pairs and question-question sequences. Question-answer pairs are wellformed when the question-answer are found in the relation of immediate dominance, in the form of (142a), in the d-tree. Similarly, question-question sequences are wellformed if they can be found in such a relation (142b) in the d-tree.

(142) a. Q
    |   b. Q1
    |     |
    A

(Büring, 2003, p. 516)

With the d-trees now in mind, Büring provides the definition of a strategy in (143):

(143) Any sub-tree of a d-tree which is rooted in an interrogative move is a *strategy*.

Büring (2003) argues that sentences with Contrastive Topics constitute a strategy, in this sense. He implements this by using a function $\langle \rangle^{ct}$, which obtains a set of question meanings, known as the CT-value. These questions are formed (in English) by replacing the Focus of the sentence with the appropriate *wh*-word, fronting it, and then forming a set of questions based
on this transformed sentence, replacing the Contrastive Topic, in each instance, with a different alternative (the original transformed sentence is also kept in the list.

For example, the CT-value of the answer in (136) is shown in (144), where subscript CT and F express the contrastive topic and the focus, respectively.

(144) \( \text{FRED}_{CT} \text{ ate the BEANS}_F. \)

a. CT-value formation:
   step 1: What did Fred eat?
   step 2: What did Fred eat?
             What did Mary eat?
             What did ... eat?

b. \([\text{FRED}_{CT} \text{ ate the BEANS}_F]^{ct} = \{ x \text{ ate } y \mid y \in D_e \} \mid x \in D_e \) 

(Büring, 2003, p. 519)

According to Büring (2003), mapping sequences of utterances to a d-tree requires said utterances to be congruent (Roberts, 1996). For a sentence with a CT to be congruent and map onto the d-tree, it must indicate a strategy around the target move (or node) in the d-tree. Indicating a strategy is defined by Büring in (145). 

(145) \( U \) indicates a strategy around \( M_U \) in \( D \) iff there is a non-singleton set \( Q' \) of questions such that for each \( Q \in Q' \), (i) \( Q \) is identical to or a sister of the question that immediately dominates \( M_U \), and (ii) \( \left[ Q \right]^{ct} \in \left[ U \right]^{ct} \) 

(Büring, 2003, p. 520)

Roughly, this means that the CT-value of the CT-marked sentence, i.e., the set of questions generated through CT-value formation, must be represented in a tree as sister moves under some superquestion. This is shown to be the case in the d-tree in (146), where the generated questions are represented as sister moves in the middle row.

(146) 

(Büring, 2003, p. 520)

Büring points out that this approach distinguishes between the B-A sentences (the sentences beginning with a Contrastive Topic and ending with a Focus) and their inverse, the A-B sentences, as the CT-value formation generates a different set of questions from A-B sentences, as seen in (147).

(147) \( \text{FRED}_F \text{ ate the BEANS}_{CT}. \)

   step 1: Who ate the beans?
   step 2: Who ate the beans?
             Who ate the eggplant?
             Who ate ...?

These map onto the d-tree below:
Büring’s (2003) definition of strategy indication (145) states the set of questions is a non-singleton set, as this communicates that there are other questions in the d-tree of a similar form, where the CT-marked constituent is different. In the case of \textit{FRED\textsubscript{CT} ate the BEANS\textsubscript{F}}, this means that the hearer understands that there is more than one question of the form \textit{What did X eat?} in the d-tree. Büring states that, by standard conversational implicature, the hearer would then understand that other people, i.e., alternatives to \textit{Fred}, ate other things. This implicature can be cancelled, however, by following up the CT-marked sentence with a statement to the effect that the speakers is unaware of what others ate or that an alternative also \textit{ate beans}. (Büring, 2003, p. 523)

The approach above is for what Büring calls \textit{explicit moves}, but he points out that this approach cannot be applied directly to discourses where there appears to be a missing node in the d-tree in order for the Q-A pair to be mapped onto the tree. In the case in (149), for example, the Q and A are not in a relation of immediate dominance, with the \textit{What did the female pop stars wear?} subquestion intervening between them, as shown in the d-tree in (150).

(149) What did the pop stars wear? – The FEMALE\textsubscript{CT} pop stars wore CAFTANS\textsubscript{F}.  
(Büring, 2003, p. 525)

(150)  
\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node {What did the pop stars wear?} [grow=down, sibling distance=2cm, every node/.style={draw}]
    child {node {What did the female pop stars wear?} child {node {The FEMALE pop stars wore CAFTANS ...}}
    child {node {What did the male pop stars wear?}}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{figure}

This problem of incongruence obliges Büring to loosen the conditions on a sequence of utterances to be well-formed in a Discourse where they must be able to “be mapped onto the explicit moves of some (possibly improper) part of [a well-formed Discourse tree]”. (Büring, 2003, p. 525)

According to Büring (2003), the issue of implicit moves also highlights the fact that it is only in the case of implicit moves such as that illustrated above that CT-marking becomes compulsory. In fact, making said intermediary move explicit allows the CT-marking to become optional.
(151) What did the pop stars wear?
   What did the female pop stars wear?
   a. The FEMALE_{CT} pop stars wore CAFTANS_{F}.
   b. The female pop stars wore CAFTANS_{F}.
   c. They wore CAFTANS_{F}.

Büring ascribes this to Schwarzschild’s (1999) assumption in (152).

(152) Givenness:
   Every constituent which is not Given needs to be marked.

   This assumption predicts that the expressions female and caftans should be marked, while pop stars and wore should not, since the former are not Given, while the latter are. This works if this marking rule only applies to explicit moves and not implicit moves. Furthermore, Büring states that Givenness is understood here to be attributed to constituents in the preceding discourse which are either identical, instantiations/hyponyms, coreferents or even semantically vacuous, where the last instance refers to words such as something. It should also be noted that the marking requirement expressed in (152) does not necessarily refer to CT-marking or even F-marking alone: it allows other forms of marking on non-Given constituents.

4.3.3.2 Contrastiveness as nested focus operators

Wagner (2009; 2012) builds on Büring (1997; 2003) but proposes that, due to affinities between the syntactical properties of contrastive topics and that of nested focus operators, contrastive topics are actually associates of a wider scope operator. A similar position has previously been taken by Williams (1997) and Sauerland (2005).

Wagner (2012) compares the obligatory precedence of contrastive topics with respect to foci with the similar behaviour of focus-sensitive modifiers, using sogar (‘even’) and nur (‘only’) in German. (153) shows how a contrastive topic cannot felicitously follow a focus (153a), but is perfectly natural when preceding it (153b).

   Hans has spinach eaten
   B: Und die Bohnen? Wer hat die gegessen?
   and the beans who has those eaten
   a. FOC < CT:
      A: #Fred had die Bohnen gegessen.
      Fred has the beans eaten
   b. CT < FOC:
      A: Die Bohnen hat Fred gegessen.
      the beans has Fred eaten
      ‘Fred ate the beans.’

(Wagner, 2012, pp. 8-9)

Sogar (‘even’) and nur (‘only’) also show restrictions on precedence, where sogar (‘even’) must precede nur (‘only’), without regard for the argument type of the constituent it is associated with, as seen in (154) and (155).
(154) *sogar > nur, so gar attaches to the subject
   a. Sogar der beste Student hat nur das einfachste Problem gelöst.
      even the best student has only the easiest problem solved
   b. #Nur das einfachste Problem hat sogar der beste Student gelöst.
      only the easiest problem has even the best student solved
      ‘Even the best student only solved the easiest problem.’
      (Wagner, 2012, p. 9)

(155) *sogar > nur, so gar attaches to the object
   a. #Nur der beste Student hat sogar das einfachste Problem gelöst.
     only the best student has even the easiest problem solved
   b. Sogar das einfachste Problem hat nur der beste Student gelöst.
     ‘Only the best student solved even the easiest problem.’
     (Wagner, 2012, p. 10)

   In contrast, in (156) and (157), *nur (‘only’) must precede *sogar (‘even’).

(156) *nur > sogar, so gar attaches to the subject
   a. nur der beste Student hat sogar das schwierigste Problem gelöst.
      only the best student has even the most difficult problem solved
   b. #sogar das schwierigste Problem hat nur der beste Student gelöst.
      even the most difficult problem has only the best student solved
      ‘Only the best student solved even the most difficult problem.’
      (Wagner, 2012, pp. 10-11)

(157) *nur > sogar, so gar attaches to the object
   a. #Sogar der schlechtest Student hat nur das einfachste Problem gelöst.
      even the worst student has only the easiest problem solved
   b. Nur das einfachste Problem hat sogar der schlechtest Student gelöst.
      ‘Even the worst student solved only the easiest problem.’
      (Wagner, 2012, p. 11)

   According to Wagner (2012), Büring’s account of the precedence restriction on contrastive topics and foci cannot apply to the case of *sogar and *nur above, since the L* H – H* L intonational contour need not apply in this case. Instead of appealing to a phonological restriction, Wagner argues that a compositional account of contrastive topics can account for the precedence restrictions while also drawing a parallel with the two focus operators, proposing that both constructions have the focus operators nested in the same configuration.

   Wagner (2012) proposes that two unpronounced (covert) focus operators are involved in sentences with contrastive topics. The focus operator employed uses Rooth’s (1985; 1992) alternative semantics in employing the focus semantic value of the arguments and an ordinary semantic value. Unlike other focus operators, which take focus alternatives within their scope, this focus operator is able to feed these alternatives to a higher focus operator by making use of its focus semantic value. In contrast, overt focus operators cannot “pass up” their associates to a higher position.
At this costume part, everyone came dressed up as a clichéd representative of their country.

a. #Even the Germans wore lederhosen.

b. The Germans even wore lederhosen.

‘It was even the case that Germans wore Lederhosen.’

Unlike contrastive topics, which can associate with either constituent in a sentence such as (159), Wagner argues that the example in (158a) cannot obtain the desired interpretation, as it is considering alternatives for the form \( x \) wore lederhosen, and not \( x \) wore \( y \), as would be expected with contrastive topics as in (159). In contrast, the focus in (158b) can associate the entire sentence, obtaining the desired interpretation. This, Wagner ascribes to the impossibility of overt focus operators to move up their alternatives to a higher position.

(159) (Who ate what?)

Fred ate the beans.

Wagner’s account argues that a covert focus operator should have more options available to it than an overt one: only covert focus operators have access to their higher associate. Wagner’s data depends on the use of two lexical items, \( \text{sogar} \) (‘even’) and \( \text{nur} \) (‘only’), which make their own semantic contributions, even though they are admittedly focus-sensitive. I will take the cautious route and leave aside this justification for the restrictions in the order of contrastive topics and foci. Instead, my approach will provide an independent motivation based on the sentence structures contrastive topics and foci are attracted to, as will be seen in section 5.2.

4.3.3.3 Contrastiveness as an independent feature

Neeleman et al (2007) argue, on the basis of cross-linguistic evidence, that syntactic mechanisms can specifically target contrastive elements and, hence, propose a topic/contrast/focus tripartite system. In contrast to Cartographic approaches, Neeleman et al (2007) argue that there are no fixed landing sites for topics and foci. Furthermore, they argue that contrastive interpretations are reached by enriching topics and foci, and that generalisations may hold over contrastive elements irrespective of their being topics or foci. There has been some prior work which has suggested, in some form or other, that contrastive topics and foci involve the application of contrastiveness on aboutness topics and information foci, e.g. Vallduví and Vilkuna (1998), Molnár (2002), McCoy (2003), and Giusti (2006). They propose the four-way typology seen below in (160).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(160)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contrastive</td>
<td>Aboutness Topic [Topic]</td>
<td>New Information Focus [Focus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrastive</td>
<td>Contrastive Topic [Topic, Contrast]</td>
<td>Contrastive Focus [Focus, Contrast]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 1)

Neeleman et al’s (2007) typology predicts that, assuming grammatical mechanisms target specific features, we should only find rules which generalise over constituents which share a feature, e.g., [topic], [contrast] or [focus]. Hence, there should be no rules which apply only to
Aboutness Topics and New Information Foci, as the former pair do not share any features. Similarly, rules affecting only Aboutness Topics and Contrastive Foci, or affecting only New Information Foci and Contrastive Topics, are also out. They argue, based on Dutch, Japanese and Russian data, that syntactic mechanisms target constituents which share features according to the schema in (160), supporting their claim. With respect to Contrastiveness, they show that, in all three languages examined, the feature [Contrast] licenses A’-movement, which they point out is not surprising if we adopt a notion from and É. Kiss (1998), that contrastiveness is inherently quantificational and quantificational structures often make use of A’-movement, which has also been observed by Rizzi (1997).

4.3.3.4 Contrastiveness in Dutch and Japanese

Neeleman et al.’s (2007) present evidence from Dutch which shows that Contrastiveness licenses A’-scrambling. They point out that, while Dutch does also have A-scrambling, there are several differences between A-scrambling and A’-scrambling. While A-scrambling interacts with binding and secondary predication, A’-scrambling does not. Furthermore, A-scrambling is clause-bounded, unlike A’-scrambling. A-scrambling also does not give rise to weak crossover effects, while A’-scrambling does. Lastly, A-scrambling does not give rise to scope-reconstruction, while A’-scrambling always does.

Neeleman et al. (2007) state that the easiest way to distinguish A’-scrambling from A-scrambling in Dutch is that only the former change the default argument order: subject – indirect object – direct object.10 In (161)-(163), the contrastive focus (a)s and the contrastive topic (b)s can be seen in three different positions: between the complementiser and the subject (161); between the subject and the indirect object (162); or in the first position in main clauses (163). In the examples below, double underlining indicates Topics, small capitalisation indicates Foci and italics indicate Contrastiveness.

(161) a. Ik geloof dat [alleen DIT boek] Jan Marie t gegeven heeft.  
I believe that only this book John Mary given has  
‘I believe that John has given only this book to Mary.’

b. Ik geloof dat [zo’n boek] alleen JAN Marie t gegeven heeft.  
I believe that such-a book only John Mary given has  
‘I believe that only John has given such a book to Mary.’

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 6)

I believe that John only this book Mary given has  
‘I believe that John has given only this book to Mary.’

b. Ik geloof dat Jan [zo’n boek] alleen MARIE t gegeven heeft.  
I believe that such-a book only John Mary given has  
‘I believe that only John has given such a book to Mary.’

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 6)

10 Neeleman et al. (2007) also mention that A-scrambled DPs are usually marked as discourse-anaphoric, which is reminiscent of G-Topics, topics which refer to discourse prominent, i.e., highly activated, topics.
On the view presented by Neeleman et al. (2007), the movement of Contrastive constituents marks the Domain of Contrast (DoC), which constitutes the material to be used to establish the relevant alternatives for drawing the comparison effected. When the Contrastive element does not move and remains in situ, the DoC is not explicitly specified syntactically and must be understood relying on contextual clues. In (164) below, the in-situ contrastive element XP has a discontinuous DoC, as can be seen in (a), such that the hearer must interpret the DoC on the basis of the context. In (b), on the other hand, the XP has moved, forming a continuous DoC, which allows the hearer to have an additional, syntactic cue to the DoC.

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 7)

Neeleman et al. (2007) assume that the sentence is partitioned twice: firstly, the Topic and the Comment are partitioned, after which, the Comment is further subdivided into the Background and the Focus. This partitioning should be considered to be an Information Structure, not a syntactic configuration, i.e., it need not affect permitted orders between Topics and Foci. The DoC of Contrastive Topics and Contrastive Foci must, therefore, be construed from the Comment and from the Background, respectively. This partitioning, Neeleman et al. reason, means that Topics cannot be part of the Background and predict that Focus movement out of a constituent containing a Topic will not be allowed. This restriction does not apply to Topics moving out of constituents containing Foci. They employ the data in (165) to argue that Foci cannot move out of constituents containing Topics regardless of the Topic’s relative position in the constituent. Neeleman et al. justify their identification of the indirect object as a Focus based on the fact that it answers the wh-question, and of the direct object as a topic, as it changes the topic of discourse from the sideboard to the clock.

Hoe zit het met het dressoir? Wie heeft grootvader dat nagelaten?
‘How about the sideboard? To whom has granddad bequeathed that?’
Nou, dat week ik niet, maar ik geloof
‘Well, I don’t know that, but I believe...’

(165) a. dat grootpapa zijn buren de klok heeft willen nalaten.
that granddad his neighbours the clock has want bequeath
b. #dat zijn BUREN grootpapa t de klok heeft willen nalaten.
   that his neighbours granddad the klok has want bequeath
   ‘that granddad wanted to bequeath the clock to his neighbours.’
   (Neeleman, et al., 2007, pp. 12-13)

In contrast, Topics can move unimpeded out of a constituent containing a Focus, as is shown in (166)

(166) Hoe zit het met tante Jo? Wat heeft grootpapa haar nagelaten?
   ‘How about auntie Jo? What has granddad bequeathed to her?’
   Nou, dat weet ik niet, maar ik geloof
   ‘Well, I don’t know, but I believe...’
   a. dat grootpapa zijn buryen de KLOK heeft willen nalaten.
      that granddad his neighbours the clock has want bequeath
   b. dat [tPP zijn buryen] grootpapa tPP de KLOK heeft willen nalaten
      that his neighbours granddad the clock has want bequeath
   ‘that granddad wanted to bequeath the clock to his neighbours.’
   (Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 13)

The last prediction Neeleman et al. make on the basis of the Dutch data concerns a restriction on the position of the moved Contrastive Topic: the movement must target a position above the Contrastive Focus. This is illustrated in (167), where the subject is the Contrastive Focus and the direct object is the Contrastive Topic. In (a), the contrastive topic is in situ and the DoC can be freely interpreted. In (b), however, the constituent has moved, marking a DoC which does not include the subject, which causes a degradation of the sentence. Neeleman et al. state that the DoC contains two open positions, in this case, and must undergo existential closure, which produces $\lambda x \exists y [y \text{ has wanted to ask John for } x]$. This means that the referent of the existentially bound variable $y$ must be determined based on the context, resulting in ‘his fellow workers’. This provides us with the wrong agent for the situation, as the intended agent is the Contrastively focussed subject, Piet (Peter). (c), in contrast, is unproblematic, since Piet is contained within the DoC.

(167) Hoe zit het met de nietmachine? Wie heeft Jan daarom gevraagd?
   ‘What about the stapler? Who has asked John for that?’
   Nou, dat weet ik niet, maar...
   ‘Well, I don’t know, but...’
   a. ik geloof dat PIET Jan om de liniaal heeft willen vragen.
      I believe that Peter John for the ruler has want ask
   b. #ik geloof dat PIET [tPP om de liniaal] Jan tPP heeft willen vragen.
      I believe that Peter for the ruler John has want ask
   c. ik geloof dat [tPP om de liniaal] PIET Jan tPP heeft willen vragen.
      I believe that for the ruler Peter John has want ask
   ‘I believe that Peter has wanted to ask John for the ruler.’
   (Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 14)

Contra the standard analysis of the –wa marker, e.g., the approach proposed by Kuno (1973), where its use is divided into the clause-initial thematic use (an Aboutness Topic) and its non-clause-initial Contrastive use (analysed as a Contrastive Topic), Neeleman et al. (2007) argue that, in fact, clause-initial –wa marked constituents may be either Aboutness Topics or Contrastive Topics, and that non-clause-initial –wa marked constituents are not Topics at all.
When –wa marked constituents appear in non-clause-initial position, they are either discourse anaphora or Contrastive Foci.

Neeleman et al. (2007) propose the following rule for Japanese:

(168) [Topic] is licensed in clause-initial position.  

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 16)

This predicts that only clause-initial –wa marked constituents should behave as Topics, while non-clause-initial ones should fail to do so.

In order to establish whether clause-initial –wa marked constituents are indeed Topics, Neeleman et al. (2007) adopt a test proposed by Reinhart (1981), where a question such as tell me about X induces X to be an Aboutness Topic in the answer to said question. Applying the test to Japanese, Neeleman et al. show that non-clause-initial –wa marked constituents are infelicitous where X should be the –wa marked constituent. In (169) and (170), this is demonstrated with a subject and a direct object, respectively.

(169) Tell me about that dog.
   a. Sono inu-wa kinoo John-o kande-simatta.  
      that dog-WA yesterday John-ACC bite-closed
   b. #John-o sono inu-wa kinoo t_i kande-simatta. 
      John-ACC that dog-WA yesterday bite-closed
      ‘That dog bit John yesterday.’

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 18)

(170) Tell me about this hat.
   a. Sono boosi-wa John-ga kinoo et_i kaimasita.  
      that hat-WA John-NOM yesterday bought
   b. #John-ga sono boosi-wa kinoo kaimasita.  
      John-NOM that hat-WA yesterday bought
      ‘John bought that hat.’

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 18)

Neeleman et al. also show that a clause-initial position is necessary for Contrastive Topics, shown below for subjects (171) and objects (172), and note a prosodic difference between a –wa marked Aboutness Topic and a similarly marked Contrastive Topic, in that the latter bears a special stress.

(171) What did John eat at the party yesterday?
   Hmm, John-wa doo-ka sira-nai-kedo,  
   ‘Well, I don’t know about John, but...’
   a. Bill-wa 8-zi-goro MAME-o tabeteita (yo).  
      Bill-wa 8 o’clock-around beans-acc eating (prt)
   b. #MAME-i-o Bill-wa 8-zi-goro t_i tabeteita (yo)  
      beans-acc Bill-wa 8 o’clock-around eating (prt)
      ‘As for Bill, he was eating beans around 8 o’clock.’

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 18)
Who ate the pasta at the party yesterday?

Hmm, pasta-wa doo-ka sira-nai-kedo,
‘Well, I don’t know about the pasta, but...’

a. #Bill-GA mame-wa 8-zi-goro tabeteita (yo)
   Bill-nom beans-wa 8 o’clock-around eating (prt)

b. Mame-wa Bill-GA 8-zi-goro t; tabeteita (yo)
   beans-wa Bill-nom 8 o’clock-around eating (prt)
   ‘As for the beans, Bill was eating them around 8 o’clock.’

(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 19)

Neeleman et al. (2007) point out that Hoji (1985) had previously argued that there are differences in behaviour between Contrastive Topics and Aboutness Topics, which could be accounted for by assuming that Contrastive Topics bind an A’-trace, while Aboutness Topics are associated with a resumptive pronoun, the latter being base-generated in a position in the Left Periphery, a view also proposed in Saito (1985). Hoji shows that only Aboutness Topics can be associated with a phonologically null or overtly realised resumptive pronoun within relative clauses while appearing in a non-thematic position in the matrix clause. Contrastive Topics, on the hand, cannot be associated with a resumptive pronoun. This is shown for Aboutness Topics in (173) and for Contrastive Topics in (174).

(173) Sono boosî-wa [TP John-ga [NP [TP e; sore-o kabutteita] that hat-WA John-NOM it-ACC was.wearing
   hito-o] o yoku sitteiru].
   person-ACC well know
   ‘As for that hat, John knows well the person who was wearing it.’

Hoji (1985), via Neeleman et al. (2007, p. 19)

(174) *(Susan zya nakute) Mary-wa [TP John-ga [NP [TP e; kanozo-o hito-o] o sagasite-iru]
   (not Susan, but) Mary-WA John-NOM she-ACC
   hit person-ACC looking.for
   Lit.: ‘(Not Susan, but) Mary, John is looking for a person who hit (her).’

Hoji (1985), via Neeleman et al. (2007, pp. 19-20)

The non-initial –wa marked constituents can be either stressed or unstressed. The unstressed constituents, Neeleman et al. (2007) argue, are discourse anaphora, functioning as a pronoun might. They rely on two arguments to support this claim. The first argument depends on the assumption that a question in the form of Tell me about X induces the response to open a new unit of discourse, whereupon the new Topic needs to be established. In contrast, a question such as that in (175), would not make this same requirement. Neeleman et al. note that (175b) requires a mention of the dog in the question in order to be felicitious: if the original question were more general, such as What happened?, (175b) would not be felicitous.

(175) Who did the dog bite?

a. Sono inu-wa JOHN-O kinok kande-simatta.
   that dog-WA John-ACC yesterday bite-closed
b. \textit{JOHN-\textsc{o} sono inu-wa kinoo t\textsubscript{i} kande-simatta.}
\begin{quote}
\textsc{John-acc} that dog-\textsc{wa} yesterday bite-closed
\textquote{The dog bit John yesterday.}
\end{quote}
(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 20)

Furthermore, unstressed non-clause-initial \textit{wa} phrases fail to be associated with empty pronouns in a relative clause. The examples in (176) show that unstressed \textit{wa} phrases fail to be associated with a position in a relative clause no matter if they are clause-initial or not. In (176a), \textit{sono kodomo-wa} (‘that child’) is an unstressed \textit{wa} phrase in initial position; in (176b), the same \textit{wa} phrase is in a non-initial position. The fact that the unstressed \textit{wa} phrases below cannot be associated with a pronoun in a relative clause felicitously shows that they differ from \textit{wa} phrases which are Aboutness Topics. Hence, Neeleman et al. conclude that only Aboutness Topics are base-generated.

(176) Who did the dog that the child bought yesterday bite?
\begin{itemize}
\item a. \textit{#sono kodomo\textsubscript{3}-wa kooen-de [NP\textsubscript{TP} pro\textsubscript{i} e\textsubscript{j} kinoo that child-wa park-at yesterday katta] inu\textsubscript{i}\textsubscript{j}-ga John-o kande-simatta. bought dog-NOM John-ACC bite-closed}
\item b. \textit{#JOHN-o sono kodomo\textsubscript{3}-wa kooen-de [NP\textsubscript{TP} pro\textsubscript{i} e\textsubscript{j} kinoo John-ACC that child-wa park-at yesterday katta] inu\textsubscript{i}\textsubscript{j}-ga t\textsubscript{k} kande-simatta. bought dog-NOM bite-closed}
\end{itemize}

\begin{quote}
\textquote{The dog that this child bought yesterday bit John in the park.}
\end{quote}
(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 21)

As for stressed in-situ \textit{wa} phrases, Neeleman et al. (2007) argue against their analysis as Contrastive Topics, noting that they do not qualify as Topics in numerous ways. For example, they refer to Hara (2006), who characterises stressed \textit{wa} phrases as giving rise to the presupposition that a scalar alternative stronger than the assertion made exists, with the added implicature that this stronger alternative is (possibly) false. In (177), the English translation at \textit{least} conveys the possibility that more than 3 people where helped by John, and also conveys an implicature such as the one proposed by Hara.

(177) Who was being helpful at the accident scene?
\begin{quote}
\textit{JOHN-GA 3-nin-wa tasuketa.}
\textsc{John-nom} 3-\textsc{cl}-\textsc{wa helped}
\textquote{John helped at least three people.}
\end{quote}
(Neeleman, et al., 2007, p. 22)

Neeleman et al. (2007) argue that Hara’s (2006) account does not provide evidence of topicalhood for these \textit{wa} phrases. Furthermore, Hara mentions that these stressed \textit{wa} phrases do not require foci present in the sentence, while Contrastive Topics do. Furthermore, the description of the interpretation of \textit{wa} phrases shows that they are not specific, which has been argued to be incompatible with topicalhood. 3-nin (‘3-classifier’) above in (177) is a quantified nominal phrase which is non-specific, ruling it out as a topic. This is corroborated by the fact that the sentence becomes infelicitous if 3-nin-wa is fronted.
Molnár (2006) also argues that contrast is an independent information-structural notion that is distinct from topics and foci. She highlights the ongoing debate on the types of sets to be employed for contrast. One possibility is that contrastiveness generates an open set of alternatives, which is the view adopted, by Jackendoff (1972) and Rooth (1985). In Vallduví and Vilkuna (1998), the CONTRAST criterion involves the generation of a membership set to be used by the semantic module as a quantificational domain. In contrast, others argue that an open set is not sufficient and that a closed set, with a limited number of individuals needs to be evoked, albeit not explicitly. Such is the view argued for by Halliday (1967), Chafe (1976) and Rooth (1992). Frey (2006) proposes that contrastive constituents in the German left-periphery can be contrasted with entities in the CG or entities which can be accommodated to be in the CG.

Molnár (2006) argues for the necessity of distinguishing the pragmatic level of contrast from the semantic level, on the basis of empirical data. She also reasons that since contrastive constituents are not bound to specific discourse interpretations and can therefore combine with foci and topics, although the type of contrast influences the preferred relations (p. 227). Molnár claims that contrast is a feature which must be superimposed on topics and foci and should be accepted as a proper IS category.

Two distinct types of contrast are described: I-Contrast and S-Kontrast. I-Contrast is the kind of contrastiveness which is phonologically realised, and Molnár illustrates them with examples in German (Büring, 1997) and English (Steedman, 1991; Williams, 1997). Molnár contrasts two pairs of examples (179)-(182) which are assumed in Büring (1997) to involve topics. While she accepts that the initial constituents in New Mexico in (179) and alle Grass-Romane in (180) may be topics, the constituents musst in (181) and not in (182) cannot be said to be topics.

Molnár examines what Steedman (1991) and Williams (1997), following Jackendoff (1972), assume to be contrastive topics in non-initial position in English.
(183) A: Well, what about Fred? What did he eat?
   B: Fred ate the BEANS.

(184) A: Well, what about the BEANS? Who ate THEM?
   B: Fred ate the BEANS.

The last case she presents with respect to I-Contrast is that in (185), the accented constituent of which is claimed by Steedman to be the theme (or topic) of the sentence. Consequently, the sentence has no comment.

(185) A: Does Marcel love operas?
   B: Marcel likes MUSICALS.
       L + H*   L H%

(Steedman, 1991)

Molnár proposes that these cases, which all bear a fall-rise intonation, are all cases of I-contrast, which gives rise to alternatives and leaves behind an open question.

Molnár (2006) also describes S-Kontrast, with reference to work on Finnish by Vilkuna (1995) and Vallduví and Vilkuna (1998). While the realisation of contrastive topics and contrastive foci in Finnish will be covered in section 6.4.1, we will briefly report Molnár’s take on the issue. Vilkuna (1995) describes two sentence patterns in Finnish: the FOCTOP pattern (186) and the TOP pattern (187). The FOCTOP sentence pattern involves a sentence with a contrastive focus as the first constituent and a topic as the second constituent. In (186), the contrastive focus is Reykjavikiin (‘to Reykjavik’) and the topic is Pekka. The TOP pattern, on the other hand, involves a contrastive topic in the first position, some other constituent in the second position and a focus after the verb. In (187), Tukholmaan (‘to Stockholm’) and Reykjavikiin (‘to Reykjavik’) are contrastive topics and Finnairilla (‘by Finnair’) and Icelandairilla (‘by Icelandair’) are foci.

(186) FOCTOP-sentence:
   A: Pekka lensi Tukholmaan.
       Pekka flew Stockholm-to
       ‘Pekka flew to STOCKHOLM.’
   B: [KONTR Reykjavikiin] Pekka lensi.
       ‘Pekka flew to REYKJAVIK.’

(187) TOP-sentence:
   a. [KONTR Tukholmaan] Pekka lensi [F Finnairilla],
      ‘To STOCKHOLM, Pekka flew by FINNAIR.’
   b. [KONTR Reykjavikiin] (Pekka lensi) [F Icelandairilla].
      to REYKJAVIK, Pekka flew by ICELANDAIR.’

The evidence suggests that the same position, the Kontrast position hosts both contrastive foci, as in (186) and contrastive topics, as in (187). Molnár observes that the constituents hosted in the left-peripheral position for contrast in Finnish must refer to alternatives with a closed set mentioned or “contextually salient” in the CG. She also compares the Finnish Kontrast position with the Hungarian pre-verbal focus position, noting that the former differs from the latter in that the position is not related to the verb. Molnár also notes that the Kontrast position allows only one constituent, while Hungarian topics can be multiple.
Molnár (2006) proposes a modification to the cartography of the left periphery as described by Rizzi (1997), in that a KontrastP projection should be introduced between ForceP and the highest TopP, as illustrated in (188).

(188)

```
ForceP
  \--- KontrP
     \--- Kontr
        \--- TopP*
             \--- Top
                \--- FocP
                   \--- Foc
                      \--- Top
                         \--- FinP
                             \--- Fin
```

(Molnár, 2006, p. 226)

4.3.3.6 Proposition-dependent contrastive topics

While Büring (2003) proposed that contrastive topics break down a complex superquestion into more manageable subquestions as part of a conversation strategy, Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) argue that they should be dependent on the propositional status of the clause they are associated with. Therefore, instead of breaking down a complex superquestion, they break down a complex proposition into more manageable propositions. This account relies on the observation that contrastive topics have been found to be ungrammatical in central adverbial clauses, in the sense of Haegeman (2004; 2010). Under the assumption that these kinds of subordinate clauses lack propositional status, they would then be unable to host contrastive topics.

Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) note that contrastive topics do not appear to have their own illocutionary force, as they argued aboutness shift topics to have, due to the fact that they are ungrammatical in sentences with different types of illocutionary force. Their test for this is shown below in (189).

(189) a. *This book, leave on the table! (imperative)
    b. *Those petunias, did John plant? (interrogative)
    c. *Those petunias, when did John plant?

(Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010, p. 77)

Furthermore, contrastive topics are subject to the complex NP constraint, which aboutness shift topics were able to violate, as shown in (123), repeated here for the reader’s convenience.

(123) a. This book, I accept the argument that John should read *(it).
    b. This book, I wonder who read *(it).

(Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010, p. 77)
At the same time, contrastive topics cannot occur freely, as given topics could and cannot appear in central adverbial clauses, which was also shown by Haegeman (2004). The two sentences in (190) feature central adverbial clauses as their subordinate clauses.

(190) a. *If these exams you don’t pass, you won’t get the degree.
   b. *While her book Mary was writing this time last year, her children were staying with her mother.

   (Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010, p. 52)

Bianchi and Frascarelli reason that, due to these reasons, it must not require illocutionary force, but must still be restricted to clauses which denote propositions, since they assume central adverbial clauses not to be fully propositional. They do note that contrastive topics still seem to affect CG management while not being associated with an assertion operator, in order to maintain this apparent effect, however, they argue that breaking down propositions does not involve management of the CG.

Haegeman’s (2010) account, in contrast, relies on a movement analysis, building on Bhatt and Pancheva’s (2006) and Arsentievich’s (2009) work on the high modal field. Haegeman argues that central adverbial clauses differ from peripheral adverbial clauses in that only the first involves a world operator operator which Bhatt and Pancheva (2006) use in their derivation of conditional clauses. In fact, peripheral adverbial clauses, examples of which are shown below in (191), do not pose any conditions on the main clause and only provide privileged background to the main clause. According to Haegeman, contrastive topics are blocked due to interference by the high modal field, which interferes with the world operator moving from the specifier position of Mood.irrealis past the field, due to Relativised Minimality (RM) effects (Rizzi, 1997; 2004).

(191) a. If I’m no longer going to be arrested for possessing cannabis for my own consumption (‘Cannabis laws eased in drugs policy shake-up’, October 24), shouldn’t I be able to grow my own? (Jason Cundy, Letter to the editor Guardian, 25.11.1, page 9, col. 8)
   b. We are seeing a fall in the incidence of crime, particularly serious crime, and I think we’re right to say ‘What’s going on?’ If crime is falling, why are we seeing a continuing rise in the prison population. (Guardian, 1.11.1, page 2, col.6)

   (Haegeman, 2010, p. 37)

Jokilehto (2015) argues that contrastive topics cannot be semantically dependent on the propositional status of clauses, citing examples from Finnish contrastive topics, which are found to be felicitous even within central adverbial clauses. In order to account for the greater mobility of contrastive topics in Finnish, he proposes that the constituents in Finnish are featurally more complex and can move past the high modal field thanks to a revised version of RM effects (Starke, 2001).

(192) Jos näitä tenttejä et läpäise, (niin) saat vain suoritusmerkinnän.
   If these.PART exams.PART NEG.2SG pass then get.2SG only passing-grade.ACC
   (Jos noita et läpäise, et saa merkintää ollenkaan.)
   if those.PART NEG.2SG pass NEG.2SG get.CONEG grade.PART at-all

   (Jokilehto, 2015, p. 92)

4.4 The features of topics
Now that we have examined what kinds of properties topics have been associated with and what kinds of topics have been described in the literature, we can review and assess which of these properties are truly necessary or sufficient for topichood and where some properties apply only to some kinds of topics. The property of being a discourse participant will not be followed up on, as I have discarded it due to its irrelevance for syntactic topics. Clause initiality will not be directly commented on, though movement will be a component of the approach I will adopt in Chapter 5. We will see that while some properties, such as aboutness and specificity, are relevant for all topics, other properties, including discourse prominence and conversational moves are not applicable to all topics.

4.4.1 Referentiality: definiteness and specificity

Both definiteness and specificity are properties which can be found in constituents which are clearly non-topics, so they are not specific to topics. Definiteness has been argued to vary significantly from language to language, so one must be cautious in necessarily attributing this property to topics. Definite constituents can readily be found as new information foci (193a) or contrastive foci (193b).

(193) a. John spilled his coffee.
b. *Il suo caffè, ha versato. (Non lo zucchero).*

the his coffee has spilled not the sugar

‘It is his coffee that he/she spilled. (Not the sugar.)’

Furthermore, both aboutness topics (194a), contrastive topics (194b) can be indefinite and Frascarelli (2007) points out that familiar topics also can be indefinite (194c). In the last case, it should be noted that despite the indefinite article, the expression is referring to someone prominent in the discourse, so the familiar topic is still discourse anaphoric. We can therefore conclude that definiteness is not a relevant property of topics.

(194) a. A boy in my class is real tall.

b. *A real classic wouldn’t have such a cop-out ending.*

c. [Una persona così gentile], non la trovi

a person so kind not her find.2SG

più al giorno d’oggi!

anymore nowadays

‘You will not find a nice person like that, nowadays!’

(Frascarelli, 2007)

Specificity, like definiteness, is also a concept which need not apply only to topics. In (195), specific indefinites are shown as new information foci and as contrastive foci.

(195) a. I’m going to see a film. It’s a comedy.
b. *Un film, vado a vedere. È una commedia.*

Unlike definiteness, however, specificity may be a necessary pre-requisite for topichood, albeit not a sufficient criterion. Lambrecht (1994) uses a follow-up sentence such as the one in
(195a) to force a specific reading on a focal indefinite in a preceding sentence. In (196a), the indefinite *a meeting* is readily interpreted as being specific, thanks to the follow-up assertion where the pronoun *it* refers back to the indefinite DP. In (196b), the non-assertive (but more polite) version using *I'd better*, however, causes the two utterances to be infelicitous together.

(196)

a. I have to go to a meeting now. It starts in five minutes.
   b. *I'd better* go to a meeting now. It starts in five minutes.

(Lambrecht, 1994, p. 81)

Lambrecht links this to the assertiveness of the context, pointing out that in languages such as French, the mood of a restrictive relative clause can affect the specificity of the noun it is associated with. In (197a), the indicative allows a specific reading of *un livre* (‘a book’), such that the speaker knows of the existence of said red book. While in (197b), the subjunctive mood makes *un livre* unambiguously non-specific, such that the speaker is not necessarily certain that such a red book can be found and it may not even exist.

(197)

a. Je cherche un livre qui *est* rouge.
   b. Je cherche un livre qui *soit* rouge.
   ‘I’m looking for a book that’s red.’

The above shows that the non-indicative moods are incompatible with specific entities. We can therefore check whether topics can be non-specific. Below in (198a-c), *un libro che sia decente* (‘a book which is decent’) features a relative clause with the subjunctive mood, which forces a non-specific reading for the DP, which is unfelicitous as any kind of topic.

(198)

a. #Un libro che sia decente, l’ho *letto.*  
   ‘A book which is decent, I’ve read.’
   
   b. #Un libro che sia decente, l’ho letto *volentieri.*  
   ‘A book which is decent, I’ve read with pleasure.’
   
   c. #Gianni, oggi, un libro che sia decente, lo sta leggendo.  
   ‘John, today, is reading a book which is decent.’

All topics have been shown to be necessarily specific. We will therefore assume that specificity is a necessary property of topics.

4.4.2 Aboutness and relevance

Aboutness has been both criticised and praised for the vagueness of its definition. Unlike the other properties discussed, however, aboutness is not a property which can be ascribed to a single constituent in isolation, given that it describes a relation between the topic and its comment.

In section 5.1, I argue that aboutness is not a property of topics *per se*, but rather a necessarily arising relation due to the communicative purpose of the comment, in view of the cognitive assumptions Relevance Theory (RT) argues drive human cognitive behaviour, the constant search for information relevant to us. I will not, therefore, assume aboutness to be a constituent feature of topics. Instead, on my view, topics, or rather, PEMs (processing effort minimisers) are constituents which are marked by a feature *m*, which allows them to be distinguished and extracted (or elided) from the comment of the sentence. The perceived
relation of aboutness is the connection between the informative nucleus of the sentence and constituents which reduce its processing cost.

When talking about topics, I will be employing the term relevance in the sense used by Strawson (1964) and Lambrecht (1994). This relevance does not refer to contextual effects or processing effort and is more generally a more precise version of the concept of informativeness, which I take to replace the concept of newness in the sense traditionally for foci. Note that there is no requirement for foci to be new to the discourse. This can be clearly observed in daily conversations, whenever a speaker makes a contribution which concerns entities which are known by both the speaker and the hearer and present in the discourse. In (199) before, pizza is the focus in B’s utterance, but it is not new, as it was explicitly mentioned in A’s question.

(199) A: Are you having pizza or pasta?
B: I’m having pizza.

But it is not only foci which are informative in this sense: the entire comment constitutes the part of the utterance designated as being informative (i.e., relevant). In this case, the comment constitutes the parts of the utterance which are not marked with the m feature. Therefore, an all comment sentence, such as that in a), is Instead, it is informative, in the sense that it is contributing information to the discourse. Furthermore, this information is assumed by the participants to be relevant to the purposes of the conversation.

4.4.3 Topics implementing conversational moves

Conversational moves and, therefore, association with speech acts, have been proposed to be implemented by aboutness shift topics. By doing this, aboutness shift topics pertain to CG management, in the sense of Krifka (2007), rather than simply contributing to CG content. Contrastive topics are a contentious point in this regard, as it appears to be able to enact conversational moves without being directly associated with speech acts (Bianchi & Frascarelli, 2010). Given topics, on the other hand, clearly do not affect the CG as they do not introduce or modify anything in it themselves, functioning mainly as discourse anaphora.

Since contrastive topics have also been argued to specifically require a contextually given superset, we will not assume that association with a speech act is one of its constituent features. Instead, implementing conversational moves and association with speech acts will be assumed to be solely a feature of aboutness shift topics, which require no link to the preceding discourse. Given topics, being discourse anaphoric, cannot possibly be considered to make conversational moves, as they introduce nothing new to the discourse.

The role of the feature associated with the speech act for aboutness shift topic will be discussed in section 5.3.

4.4.4 Discourse prominence and identifiability

Discourse prominence, in the sense of realising an entity which is already prominent in the discourse, seems to be a property which is only directly ascribable to given topics, given their function as discourse anaphora. Aboutness shift topics, on the other hand, cannot be argued to possess this topic, due to their introducing entities which may not have been referred to before. Contrastive topics, however, are more complex in this regard, since they need not themselves be given in the discourse, while their superset must be recoverable from the context and therefore at least indirectly related to the discourse.
The concept of identifiability seems to be an important property of topics. Lambrecht proposes that topics are more easily acceptable the more identifiable they are. Consequently, it is extremely difficult to interpret a brand-new, unanchored constituent as a topic. If the brand-new constituent is anchored, however, as in (200b), the acceptability of the sentence improves considerably, thus topics must be mentally representable, which is enabled by restricting the domain from which the referent must be identified.

(200) a. *A boy is tall.  
    b. A boy in my class is real tall.  

While given topics must be active in the discourse, contrastive topics must be at least indirectly recoverable from the discourse, by belonging to a set which can be inferred from the CG.

The ban on non-identifiability will be linked to the prerequisites of processing effort minimisers in section 5.1, which cannot appeal to brand-new entities to execute their function.

4.4.5 Quantificational component for contrastive topics

A quantificational component has been proposed in various forms as a component, especially in compositional approaches, for contrastive topics. The motivation for this has been due to the focus-like effects which prompted Büring (1997; 2003; 2005) and Wagner (2009; 2012) to suppose a focus operator may be involved, also due to their interpretation of being an element in a set. Haegeman (2010) makes use of the intervention effects caused by the world operator proposed by Bhatt and Pancheva (2006) to reside in the high adverbial field in her account of why contrastive topics are ungrammatical with central adverbial clauses in the languages she examined.

The quantificational aspects of contrastive topics will be linked to the contrast function in section 5.2.

4.4.6 The property of clause-initiality

This property only truly applies to aboutness shift topics, if we leave aside certain left-dislocated epistemic adverbials or other exceptionally high adverbials, since contrastive topics are immediately second once both an aboutness shift topic and a contrastive topic are realised in the same sentence. What seems to be certainly the case is that topics have a tendency to be moved leftward to some degree.

One possibility that has been suggested, is that their link with the CG is somehow responsible for their movement to the highest part of the clause, in order to somehow interface with the preceding discourse. What is likely is that there is a high position, e.g. RefP (Beghelli, 1995; Beghelli & Stowell, 1997) which permits aboutness shift topics to refer to entities outside the discourse as topics.
Chapter 5. Featural hierarchy of topics

This chapter presents the proposed features involved in the realisation of topics. First, in section 5.1, after presenting some general assumptions adopted from Relevance Theoretic approaches, the feature \((m)\) involved in the realisation of basic topichood will be introduced and its wider significance will be proposed as a marker for processing effort minimisers. In section 5.2, the feature realising contrastiveness will be discussed, simplifying its functionality and accounting for differences in interpretation between contrastive elements inside and outside the comment. Subsequently, in section 5.3, the feature involved in realising aboutness shift topics will be introduced, and its role redefined to better account for incongruences in its distribution. The last section (5.4) in this chapter will discuss some of the major predictions this approach makes.

5.1 Processing effort minimiser feature \(m\)

It is proposed that all topics share a common feature, \(m\), which projects a head and marks constituents as processing effort minimisers (PEMs). The constituents thus marked can be targeted by syntactic mechanisms which allow them to be distinguished from the main contribution of the sentence. Furthermore, it is not only topics which are thus marked, but all material which is dislocated to the left periphery which shares intonational and syntactic properties of topics.

5.1.1 Processing effort in the inferential process

The approach being adopted here follows, at least in spirit, the assumptions of Relevance Theory (RT) with respect to human communication and human cognition, the Cognitive Principle of Relevance and the Communicative Principle of Relevance, repeated here as (201) and (202), respectively.

(201) Cognitive Principle of Relevance

Human cognition tends to be geared to the maximisation of relevance.

(Sperber & Wilson, 1986)

(202) Communicative Principle of Relevance

Every ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance.

(Wilson & Sperber, 2004)

While these two principles are employed in RT in the framework of the inferential process, i.e., how the hearer moves from the speaker’s utterance to the speaker’s meaning, it seems natural to assume that the information structures of contributions may be determined with the goal of optimising relevance in mind. In other words, the speaker’s choice of topics and foci must be compatible with optimising the relevance of the utterance to the hearer.

In what follows, I will discuss how processing effort in RT affects the how the hearer obtains a given interpretations (the speaker’s meaning). RT concerns itself with the inferential process which takes place as the hearer attempts to interpret the meaning each utterance is
meant to communicate, but we must remember utterances vary with respect to the extent of inference required to obtain the speaker’s meaning. For example, the sentences in (203) could all be understood as being requests for a certain spoon, which the speaker needs to feed a baby, but the amount of pragmatic inference required on the part of the hearer to interpret the speaker’s meaning varies due to the amount of relevant information being provided in each case. In (203a), an explicit order or request is made, the purpose of which is clearly expressed to the hearer, with minimal inferences required on the part of the hearer. In (203b), the hearer needs to infer that a request is being made and the utterance must be interpreted as an indirect speech act. In the case in (203c), the hearer must employ a number of contextual assumptions in order to compute the speaker’s meaning, so this utterance might be suitable where the imminent need to feed the baby is assumed to be highly accessible to the hearer, for example. The extent to which the request and the speaker’s intentions are made explicit affect the magnitude of the inferential process the hearer needs to carry out in order to correctly interpret the speaker’s meaning. Apparently non-optimally relevant utterances, such as using (203a) when the need to feed the baby is particularly prominent and did not require mentioning, induce the hearer to search for more candidate interpretations in order to achieve optimal relevance.

(203) a. Give me that spoon. I need it to feed the baby.
    b. That spoon, I need it to feed the baby.
    c. The baby’s hungry.

If the speaker reduces the amount of information explicit in the utterance, more candidate interpretations may need to be evaluated, the order of which is determined by their accessibility. Keep in mind that each interpretation considered costs additional processing effort. It follows that there are two ways in which the processing effort can be reduced in this system: (i) by reducing the total number of interpretations; (ii) by increasing the accessibility of the desired interpretation. The first option may reduce processing effort by ruling out candidate interpretations which may precede the desired interpretation. The second option would promote the desired interpretation in the queue of interpretations to be considered. Both options have the function of reducing the number of interpretations to be considered before the desired interpretation is encountered.

In (204), an example of how these two options decrease processing effort is shown. To keep things simple, let us quantify processing effort as increasing by one for each interpretation being considered, such that order of the interpretation in the queue equals the processing effort required to evaluate it. In both cases, \( t \), the desired interpretation, is at first the 5th interpretation to be considered, so we can say that the processing effort is 5. In (204a), we rule out a subset of interpretations, some of which are more accessible than \( t \), some of which are less accessible. Since two of the interpretations are less accessible, \( t \)’s accessibility rank improves by 2. Interpretations which are less accessible have no effect on \( t \)’s accessibility rank. The result is such that \( t \) is now the 3rd interpretation to be considered, and the processing effort required to evaluate it is now 3 and no longer 5. In (204b), instead of ruling out interpretations, we simply improve the accessibility of \( t \), by modifying other factors, thereby improving its position in the queue by 2. The result is, once more, a decrease in processing effort on the part of the hearer.
(204) where $t$ is the desired interpretation

$p_1, q_2, r_3, s_4, t_5, u_6, v_7$

$t$ is 5th interpretation to be considered

a. rule out q, s, u.

$p_1, q_2, r_3, s_4, t_5, u_6, v_7$

$\rightarrow p_1, r_2, t_3, v_4$

$t$ is 3rd interpretation to be considered

b. increase accessibility of $t$ by 2

$p_1, q_2, r_3, s_4, t_5, u_6, v_7$

$\rightarrow p_1, q_2, t_3, r_4, s_5, t, u_6, v_7$

$t$ is 3rd interpretation to be considered

How then can explicit information affect the inferential process? Increasing the amount of explicit information in an utterance can rule out candidate interpretations, by, e.g., modifying the truth conditions of a proposition by making it more specific. Many factors can, however, affect the accessibility rank of a given interpretation, as was discussed in section 3.4.

5.1.2 Processing effort in discourse

Let us now move on to what informativeness can account for with respect to information structure. Apart from relevance in the sense specific to RT, its same basic principles can be applied to establishing what overt parts of a sentence are most relevant (in the naïve sense) in the context of a given discourse. This is what interests us, so I will endeavour to distinguish the concept of relevance as defined in RT, which is employed in the inferential process therein described, and the concept of relevance in the sense as understood by Lambrecht (1994) and Strawson (1964), where being relevant means being informative about a given entity. In order to keep separate Lambrecht and Strawson’s relevance from that described in RT, I will employ Lambrecht’s (1994) term informativeness, mentioned in section 4.2.2, for the former (Lambrecht and Strawson’s concept).

I will not adopt a new term to distinguish processing effort in information structure from processing effort in the RT sense, as this expression has a significant history in cognitive sciences which predates RT, but it should be kept in mind that the processing effort for IS in this approach is nonetheless related in principle to processing effort in RT in the sense of Sperber and Wilson (1986).

Let us consider a model of the discourse as described in section 2.3, comments are made such that, by default, they update file cards on referents which are discourse prominent. This is implemented by using discourse anaphors, such as pronouns, to refer back to previously introduced entities (or permanently prominent referents, such as the speaker and the hearer).

The utterance in (205a) communicates a proposition, that the hearer’s bag was found by the speaker at the station. In this case, the sentence could be all comment, with no discourse prominent material (except references to the speaker and the hearer, which I assume to be always prominent). It is also possible for elements in the sentence to be prominent in the discourse, but this is not explicitly marked. In (205b), the same proposition is communicated, but the constituent la tua borsa (‘your bag’) is clitic-left-dislocated (CLLD). This creates a more restricted comment l’ho trovata alla stazione, compared to that in (205a). The CLLD constituent la tua borsa could be interpreted as an aboutness shift topic, a contrastive topic or a familiar topic, depending on the intonation, but, crucially, the information is presented differently.
(205) a. Ho trovato la tua borsa alla stazione. 
\textit{Italian} 
have.1SG found the your.F bag at-the station 
‘I found your bag at the station.’

b. La tua borsa, l’ho trovata alla stazione. 
\textit{Italian} 
the your.F bag, CL.ACC-have.1SG found.F at-the station 
‘Your bag, I found it at the station.’

Why should we have two different ways of expressing the same proposition? Truth-conditionally, nothing has changed. Even were we to consider anaphoric reference to be less costly than normal reference, nothing is gained, since both methods are employed in (205b). It is only if we assume that there is a distinction being made which separates the comment as being the informative core of the utterance from non-core parts do we see some reason for the separation.

The comment would therefore consist of the part of the utterance which the speaker deems \textit{informative to the discourse}. The parts of the utterance which are marked as standing out of the comment, such as in the case of the CLLD \textit{la tua borsa} (‘your bag’), have a different function. In the process described above, the CLLD constituent, a topic, is not part of the comment and is instead \textit{supporting} it, by facilitating the identification of the referent. The comment (in this case, a proposition) can be said to apply to a domain in the discourse which is restricted by the topic. In (206), a topic would restrict the domain of application of a proposition $p$ from $D$ to $D’$.

(206)
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Note that the truth conditions of $p$ have not been affected by the domain restriction in this case. This is expected when we are discussing IS-configurations which have no bearing on the truth conditions of the utterance, though this may not hold for IS-relevant notions in the focal domain, which may give rise to exhaustivity effects which do affect the truth conditions of an utterance. Restricting the domain of application is useful in that it reduces the domain of application of the proposition $p$, so that it can be more quickly identified and evaluated. This constitutes a reduction in processing effort, which was previously proposed by Jacobs (2001), who described their function to be that of \textit{pragmatic restrictors}, optimally restricting the domain for which the main predication holds, in order to attract the hearer’s attention to something. In this sense, topics reduce the processing effort on the part of the hearer by restricting the domain of interpretation of their comment. Hence, the following principle of Economy of Domain Reduction is proposed in (207):
Economy of Domain Reduction:
The processing effort of a contribution \( q \) to the discourse decreases if the domain of application \( q \) of is reduced.

The fact that the same proposition is being made, with more syntactic movement, which we assume to be costly, means this principle is necessary and that the cost of the syntactic movement and any extra mechanisms employed to carry this out are offset by the communicative advantages gained thanks to implementing the appropriate information structure. Since topics have the function of reducing the domain of application of their comments, which reduces the processing effort for the hearer, we can call these *processing effort minimisers* or PEMs.

Drawing an analogy with the RT inferential process, which balances contextual effects gained with processing effort in order to compute optimal relevance, we argue that the processing effort reduction by PEMs is balanced with the informativeness of the comment in order to compute optimal IS-relevance. Informativeness is not calculated through the evaluation of \( n \) interpretations, but by balancing the informativeness of the utterance with the processing effort required to evaluate its relation and contribution to the discourse. There is a significant overlap in these two concepts, which is expected, given that communication relies to a significant degree on pragmatic inferential processes. The crucial point to be made is that similar considerations go into the information structure of an utterance as those which are used to evaluate the speaker’s meaning.

In addition to topics, I propose that referential adverbials, e.g. time or place adverbials, and embedded clauses, e.g. peripheral adverbial clauses, are also PEMs, in that they share the same function as topics: minimising processing effort by facilitating the identification and evaluation of contributions to the discourse. This accounts for their appearance in the left periphery among topics, although there may be some restrictions on the type of topics they can be depending on their nature. For example, non-argumental DPs can be left-dislocated to the same positions as CLLDs in Italian, exhibiting the same intonations. In (208) below, only one of the three underlined CLLD constituents is argumental.


‘John, at the office, this morning, I saw that he seemed very tired.’

The constituents *all’ufficio* (‘at the office’) and *stamattina* (‘this morning’) can have the same intonations as argumental CLLDs. That they should be considered to be anything other than CLLDs themselves due to their not being associated with a clitic in the sentence proper can be argued against on the basis of two arguments. The first argument concerns the realisation of CLLDs associated with nominative subjects, which, in Standard Italian, are not associated with a clitic, as there is no such clitic in Standard Italian. The example in (209) is meant to show that there is no subject clitic to associate with the subject *Mario*.

(209) Mario, (?) *ha già parlato con Gianni.*

‘Mario, he has already spoken with John.’
It should be noted that other varieties of Italian do have subject clitics which are obligatory, as is the case in Venetian, as seen in (210).

(210) La magna
    CL.NOM.F eat.3SG
    ‘She eats.’

(Poletto, 2000, p. 14)

The second argument in favour of non-arguments being CLLDs without clitics could be made based on the behaviour of the locative clitic in Italian, which shows evidence that, at least in my variety (Rome), clitics are only obligatory when the locative constituent is an argument of the verb. In (211) below, the locative clitic *ci* is obligatory when the dislocated constituent is an argument of the verb. In (211a), *ci* refers to the goal *allo stadio* (‘at/to the stadium’), but in (211b), the same constituents play a different role, where the locative clitic and its associated constituent are not the goal of the verb and are therefore non-argumental. Despite the difference in argumenthood, however, the constituents can have the exact same intonation.

    to-the stadium CL.LOC go.1SG every week
    ‘To the stadium, I go (there) every week.’

    to-the stadium CL.LOC have.1SG met John
    ‘At the stadium, I met John.’

The optionality of the locative clitic when the dislocated constituent is non-argumental suggests that only verbal arguments need to be associated with a clitic (if one is available). Referential adverbials could be CLLDs either lacking a clitic in the lexicon or simply due to their being non-argumental.

With respect to the PEM status of peripheral adverbial clauses, my argument in this case is not based on syntactic or phonological grounds, but rather on the function these adverbials carry out in the discourse. Peripheral adverbial clauses or peripheral conditional clauses (Haegeman, 2010) are embedded clauses which refer to (often discourse-old) assumptions or presuppositions which Haegeman (2010, p. 37) states provide “the privileged background for the processing of the associated main clause”. In (212) below, the embedded clause *if crime is falling*, (my underlining in the example) is a peripheral adverbial clause which refers back to the proposition that crime is falling, expressed in the previous sentence (“We are seeing a fall in the incidence of crime [...]”).

(212) We are seeing a fall in the incidence of crime, particularly serious crime, and I think we’re right to say ‘What’s going on?’ *If crime is falling*, why are we seeing a continuing rise in the prison population. (Guardian, 1.11.1, page 2, col. 6)

(Haegeman, 2010, p. 37)

This characterisation of peripheral adverbial clauses is very much in line with the proposed function of PEMs, as it can be seen as restricting the domain of application for the comment. Indeed, it could be said that the case in ) above behaves very much as a discourse anaphor in the way a familiar topic would.
5.1.3 Accounting for aboutness, specificity and identifiability

We now turn to the question of aboutness. The phenomenon of aboutness with respect to topics falls out without the need of postulating a special feature or property, if we assume that comments are informative and that topics reduce the processing effort of the comments.

Aboutness, as we saw in section 4.2.2, is described such that the comment is about the topic. What should be noted immediately is that this is quite different from a property such as plurality or gender, which only consider one argument. In fact, aboutness describes a relation between two arguments: the topic and the comment. So it is possible that aboutness is reducible to the properties and functions of the arguments in question. Specificity, on the other hand, which was discussed in section 4.1.2, is the property of all expressions which have a referent such that the speaker knows of its existence. The term referential will follow Lambrecht (1994) in including mentally represented referents (which need not exist in the real world) as potential referents.

Consider the example in (213), where the CLLD constituent la falciatrice (‘the lawn mower’) is a topic and the rest of the sentence is the comment.

(213) La falciatrice, l’ho prestata a Gianni. 
    the lawn mower CL.ACC have.1SG lent.F to John
    ‘The lawnmower, I lent it to John.’

In (213), we can easily state that the comment l’ho prestata a Gianni (‘I lent it to John’) is about its topic la falciatrice (‘the lawnmower’). At the same time, however, there are constituents in the utterance which could also be described as having an aboutness relation to the rest of the sentence: a Gianni (‘to John’), despite being interpretable as a focus, would have the property of aboutness with respect to the rest of the sentence such that the lawnmower, I lent it [to him] would be about it. If we suppose that the comments are informative and PEMs have the function of reducing the processing effort required to process them, it follows that only PEMs with some relation to the comment can reduce its processing effort. That is to say, PEMs with no relation to the comment cannot be employed to reduce processing effort: such PEMs would be obfuscatory and deceptive. In (214a), attempting to interpret the constituent Mary as being a topic without any relation to the content in the comment gives rise to an utterance which is either ungrammatical or very odd indeed. In (214b), the temporal adverbial last week fails to restrict the domain of application of the comment as it is not referring to the temporal period within which the event of the speaker meeting Mary takes place (indicated by the different indices).

(214) a. ??/*Mary, i met her, last week.
    b. ??/*Last week, [I met Mary].

It appears, therefore, that a comment and a PEM must bear some relation with each other in order for the PEM to be able to reduce the domain of application of the comment. Therefore, the phenomenon of aboutness can be computed based on the function of PEMs and the assumption that comments must be informative.

---

11 I assume the preposition to play no role in establishing what file card would be updated by a topic a Gianni, “to John”.

12 I find this a difficult distinction to make in this case.
This aboutness relation is not observed when the argument of the verb is non-referential. This is shown in (215a) by the ungrammaticality of *una falciatrice*, a CLLD element which is not referring to any specific lawnmower. The sentence is only grammatical (albeit, very marked), when the CLLD is referring to a specific lawnmower, where it would be referential. It should be kept in mind that the lack of relativised minimality effects is expected with CLLDs. In fact, if a definite (specific) DP is substituted for *una falciatrice* (‘a lawnmower’), the sentence is perfectly grammatical, as can be seen in (215b). These effects are, in contrast, present in focus fronting, which is realised without a resumptive clitic in Italian, as can be seen in (215c).

(215) a. *Una falciatrice, non l’ho comprata.*
    a lawnmower NEG CL.ACC have.1SG bought.F
    ‘A lawnmower, I didn’t buy it.’

b. La falciatrice, non l’ho comprata.
    the lawnmower NEG CL.ACC have.1SG bought.F
    ‘The lawnmower, I didn’t buy it.’

c. *Una FALCIATRICE, non ho comprato.*
    a lawnmower NEG have.1SG bought
    ‘A LAWNMOWER, I didn’t buy.’

Assuming that topics have the function of reducing processing effort, non-referential CLLDs would not meaningfully restrict the domain of application of the comment, thereby would not be useful in reducing processing effort. In fact, it could be argued that a set with no referents would reduce the domain to the empty set, which may explain the ungrammaticality. This is different in the case of class-specificity, where comments refer to a natural set described by the topic expression. In this case, too, the set is referential. This is the case in (216), where *una falciatrice* (‘a lawnmower’) constitutes any member of the set of all lawnmowers. Note that this topic is most naturally interpreted as a contrastive topic, where a superset is implied wherein the lawnmower is being compared with other alternative possible presents.

(216) Una falciatrice, a Gianni, non gliela regalerei mai.
    a lawnmower to John NEG CL.DAT-CL.ACC gift.COND.1SG never
    approx. ‘A lawnmower, I would never give him [to John] as a present.’

The referentiality of topics is necessary for domain restriction to take place, as a set with no referents would reduce the domain to the empty set, Ø. The reason why contrastive topics are the preferred interpretation of the CLLD element in the example in (216) will be examined in greater detail in section 5.2, when we turn to contrastiveness.

It should be noted that this approach predicts all PEMs to be bad when they are non-referential. In (217), a non-argumental locative adverbial *da nessuna parte* (‘in no place’) is ungrammatical as a PEM, regardless of clitic realisation, as it is non-referential. Please note the sentence is acceptable if the locative constituent is interpreted and pronounced as a fronted focus (without the clitic).

(217) Da nessuna parte, (*ci) ho incontrato Gianni.
    at no-one.F part CL.LOC have.1SG met John
    ‘Nowhere, I met John (there).’
This prerequisite of referentiality means that all PEMs must be specific (or class-specific, at least), in order to successfully reduce the domain of application of the comment. This provides a functional motivation for the specificity requirement. It has also been shown that it is not possible to express a comment which is about anything non-referential, which rules out non-specific constituents as PEMs. In the case of peripheral adverbial clauses, I assume these to be referential in virtue of being anaphoric with respect to propositions in the discourse. In any case, they are able to restrict the domain of application of the comment through discourse anaphoricity, like familiar topics do.

5.1.4 The syntactic marking of PEMs

The \textit{m} feature being proposed is the way the syntax module marks PEMs, appearing on all constituents traditionally considered to be topics, but also on all frames and scene-setting constituents, which share the same common function, in this account. In opposition to PEMs is the part of the sentence which constitutes the informative component of the utterance, the comment (or the focus, broadly construed). For the purposes of this dissertation, I will assume that no syntactic marking of the comment occurs, and that constituents pertaining to the comment will simply lack \textit{m}-marking.

In the current approach, the simplest category of \textit{m}-marked constituents are familiar topics, which are more generally, discourse anaphoric PEMs. These kinds of PEMs are characterised by possessing an \textit{m}-feature but with no further IS-relevant features. Contrastive topics and aboutness shift topics will be examined in sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively. The basic function of the \textit{m}-feature is to distinguish these from the comment, indicating that these constituents are not part of the informative content of the comment. This distinction can be implemented syntactically, through movement, morphologically, by employing special morphemes, and phonologically, through destressing or special intonation.

An instance of syntactic marking of \textit{m}-marked constituents can be observed in Italian, where these constituents are moved to the left periphery of the clause and are destressed. This is illustrated in (218), where \textit{Gianni} (‘John’), \textit{ieri} (‘yesterday’) and \textit{alla festa} (‘at the party’) are familiar topics which have been clitic-left-dislocated to the left periphery of the embedded clause and are destressed, which distinguishes them from the comment \textit{non l’ho visto} (‘I didn’t see him’).

\begin{exe}
\begin{exe}
(218) Mi dispiace che, Gianni, ieri, alla festa, non l’ho visto.
\end{exe}
\end{exe}

\begin{exe}
\begin{exe}
\text{CL.1SG displease.3SG that John yesterday at-the party NEG CL.ACC have.1SG seen}
\end{exe}
\end{exe}

‘I’m sorry that I didn’t see John at the party yesterday.’

A case of morphological \textit{m}-marking can be found in Japanese (219), where the different kinds of topics are realised with the \textit{wa} morpheme, but a constituent with an unstressed \textit{wa} may be interpreted either as a discourse-anaphoric item, or as a new topic. An alternative strategy employed for highly discourse prominent discourse anaphors is for them to be null, as is the case also in Italian and other clitic-dislocating languages, which is indicated by the parentheses in (219b).
(219) a. Q: ano inu-wa dare-o kande-simatta no? 
that dog-WA who-ACC bite-ended.up Q
‘Who did the dog bite?’
A: ano inu-wa kinoo kooen-de John-o kande-simatta.
that dog-WA yesterday part-at John-ACC bite-ended.up
‘The dog bit John in the park yesterday.’

(Vermeulen, 2013)

b. Q: What happened to your car?
A: (kuruma-wa) koshoo-shi-ta.
car-WA break.down-PAST
‘[My] car broke down.’

(Lambrecht, 1994, p. 223)

Purely phonological marking may be the case for English, where pronouns are not employed to refer to discourse prominent referents. In (220a) below, the constituents John and about the party can be destressed if the relevant contribution to the discourse is yesterday (possibly also told). In (220b), only a destressed butcher can be interpreted to refer to the discourse prominent Dr Cremer.

(220) a. I told John about the party YESTERDAY.

b. Q: (Did you see Dr Cremer to get your root canal?)
A: (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the butcher.
A’: #(Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the BUTcher.

(Büring, 2005)

The m-feature merges with constituents which can then be targeted by heads merged later in the syntax, enabling IS-related syntactic movement (A’-movement), such as dislocation or low-level scrambling. In other cases, the m-feature can be employed in the spell-out of morphology expressing topic-hood. The low-level movement of what Koskinen (1998) calls presupposed DPs is evidence that m-marked constituents can be scrambled out of the VP, which I take to constitute the comment. Thus, the m-feature is the feature which is attracted by projections which make up the m-field. In this respect, I adopt and adapt Rizzi’s (1997; 2004; 2013) Topic projections, which I will be referring to as PEM projections, due to their more expanded role in this approach. Like Rizzi’s Topic projections, PEM projections are recursive. The constituent bearing the m-feature is attracted to Spec-PEMP, after which further movement may still take place, see the following sections 5.2-5.3 for how this takes place. The tree in (221) gives a basic illustration of this movement. As Rizzi described for topics, this type of movement is referential and does not give rise to intervention effects, in contrast to quantificational A’-movement, e.g. of contrastive foci.
From the phonological point of view, I will not argue that the \( m \)-head itself should trigger any cue to the phonological module, but these constituents must still be phonologically marked in some way. It may, however, be that the \( m \)-field as a whole could be marked in some way to realise the characteristic flat or low pitch discourse anaphoric constituents have, e.g. in Italian. This characteristic was noted by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) for familiar topics.

On a side note, the order in which these constituents end up in may not be random: \( m \)-marked constituents could be ranked such that the order reflects their relative processing effort minimisation potential. The evaluation of this potential would likely be handled in the conceptual/intentional module or whatever module takes care of pragmatic considerations, but the order in which these are extracted would locate the most effective PEM in the highest position. For example, in (218), repeated below as (222), the PEM Gianni would be ranked as the PEM with the highest potential of reducing processing effort.

\[
\text{(222) } \text{Mi dispiace che, Gianni, ieri, alla festa, non l’ho visto.}
\]

\[
\text{CL.1SG displease.3SG that John yesterday at-the party NEG CL.ACC have.1SG seen ‘I’m sorry that I didn’t see John at the party yesterday.’}
\]

\[
\text{(223) PEM potential ranking}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gianni} & > \text{ieri} \quad > \text{alla festa} \\
\text{John} & > \text{yesterday} \quad > \text{at the party}
\end{align*}
\]

This ranking would allow further syntactic mechanisms to attract the highest PEM.

The approach to topics and topic-like constituents, i.e., PEMs, in terms of \( m \)-marked constituents allows the modelling of topics compositionally. In the sections 5.2-5.3 below, I will present two more projections, ContrP and gapP, which I employ to model the behaviour of more complex kinds of topics, namely contrastive topics and aboutness shift topics, which I call contrastive PEMs and gap PEMs. In section 6.3, I will explore the common behaviour of basic PEMs in Finnish and Hungarian.

5.2 The contrast function

In this approach, I simplify the properties of contrastive elements and propose that the most basic function of contrast is to express the existence of a contextual set. It is proposed that contrastiveness is realised by a [contrast] feature, which projects a head, Contr, and is associated with an emphatic operator, as has been proposed for Hungarian (Lipták, 2001), which is minimally a second Contr head in the comment. This [contrast] feature is realised twice
in a typical sentence with a contrastive topic: once on the contrastive topic itself and once on the focussed component of the comment. I will not assume there to be a separate focus feature in contrastive foci: focus heads expressing more complex and subtle kinds of foci are still assumed to be merged, but the difference between a broad focus and a narrow focus, which I take to be contrastive, is proposed to consist of the default comment in the former case and a contrast head within the comment in the latter case. Furthermore, exhaustiveness is proposed to result from the combination of the default properties of comments and the expression of a contextual set on the part of the contrast function. In other words, contrastive foci are here assumed to be contrastive constituents which are not m-marked. The structures proposed for contrastive elements are shown in (224) below.

(224) a. Contrastive PEM

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ContrP} \\
\text{m} \\
\text{Contr}\circ \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

b. Contrastive “focus”

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ContrP} \\
\text{Contr}\circ \\
\text{XP}
\end{array}
\]

There are two motivations for the structures being proposed for contrastive elements. The first motivation concerns the versatile applicability of contrastiveness and the shared aspects of contrastive topics and contrastive foci. The second relates to the default properties of the comment in the context of an RT-styled expectation of informativeness, which I take to account for the clear differences in interpretation between topical contrastive elements and non-topical (i.e., “focal”) contrastive elements.

The presence of the m-feature distinguishes contrastive topics (and PEMs in general) and contrastive foci due to the extraction of PEMs from the comment field, which does not occur for contrastive foci. Namely, while contrastive PEMs are cleared out of the comment into the m-field, contrastive foci are not. I propose that where a single L-tree (see section 3.3 on this nanosyntactic concept) is employed to spell out the projections in (224a), movement triggered by Contr will move together with the m projection and no feature “stripping” will take place, as these will be bound together in cases such as Japanese, where a grammatical particle spells out both projections, as we will see in section 5.2.4.

5.2.1 The function-nature of contrast

As far as topics are concerned, contrastiveness is a property which is only applicable to contrastive topics: neither familiar topics nor aboutness shift topics show any of the contrastive properties witnessed for contrastive topics. Yet it has been argued to be applicable in multiple domains, most notably in accounts which argue for commonality between contrastive/corrective foci (Neeleman, et al., 2007; Molnár, 2006), which were examined in sections 4.3.3.3 to 4.3.3.5. Alternatively, some accounts have analysed the contrastiveness of these topics as being due to a nested focus (Büring, 2005; Wagner, 2012), as was discussed in section 4.3.3.2. The information-structural neutrality exhibited due to its versatile applicability to two opposed information-structural fields suggests that contrast is not a subinstance of topics or foci, but a distinct IS-relevant notion which applies to both m-marked constituents and non-m-marked constituents. In particular, contrastive elements, whether they are topics or not, make reference to a set of which the contrastive element is a member. This is a key contribution to the interpretation of contrastive elements which is agreed upon by most accounts. I therefore
propose that the reference to a superset is the main contribution of contrastiveness. This main contribution is implemented through the use of a function, which is applied to the complement of Contr°, the head hosting the [contrast] feature. with the function (225), where \( x \) refers to the complement of the Contr° head and \( S_i \) indicates an identifiable set.

\[
\text{(225) Contrast function:}
\]

For a given complement \( x, x \subseteq S_i \).

The claim that contrast is a function means that it is of the same class as negation, which would, in this approach, also be merged as a head, applying its associated function to its complement. Thus, the contrast head Contr° and the negation head Neg° belong to a class which is functional in the real sense that they apply mathematical functions to their complements, the case of negation the function applied is, of course, the negation function (\( \neg \)). In both cases, the function takes a single argument.

Despite the disagreements with respect to the exact nature and function of contrast seen in the literature, the property of belonging to a superset which is proposed here to be the core contribution of contrastivity is entailed. In a sentence such as (226), the contrastive topic coffee must be interpreted to belong to a contextual set.

\[
\text{(226) Coffee, I DO like.}
\]

It is challenging to show precisely why this might be the case, as the supersets evoked in these cases can be heterogeneous and context-dependent and it is therefore difficult to negate the membership of a contrastive topic to an entity which is created ad hoc from the context.

One last key point to be made is that contrastive PEMs must also be recoverable from the context, but it is not the contrastive element which counts for this condition, but the superset it is a member of. This does not mean that the \( m \) feature must be merged after the contrast feature, but that the contrast feature provides the link to the discourse employed by the \( m \)-marked constituent. Without the superset evoked by the contrast feature, the \( m \)-marked constituent will, by default, search for a referent in the discourse. In other words, the contextual set evoked by the contrast function finds its referent in the discourse and allows the contrastive constituent to count as a referential entity, even though the set member itself may not be referential per se. Note, however, that the contextual set does not transmit plurality or any other property to the contrastive constituent in the sentence.

5.2.2 Why there is no exhaustivity in contrastive topics

Büring’s (1997; 2003; 2005) and Wagner’s (2009; 2012) approaches rely on the use of complex conversational strategies to account for the effect of contrast, where the same mechanism used for foci is employed to form what are essentially questions within questions, such that there are two variables to be computed. This can be seen in (144), which is repeated below as (227).
(227) \( \text{FRED}_{CT} \) ate the BEANS\(_F\).

a. CT-value formation:
   step 1: What did Fred eat?
   step 2: What did Fred eat?
   What did Mary eat?
   What did ... eat?

b. \([\text{FRED}_{CT} \text{ ate the BEANS}_F]\)^{ct} = \{ \{ x \text{ ate } y | y \in D_\varepsilon \} | x \in D_\varepsilon \}  
   (Büring, 2003, p. 519)

One of the advantages which Büring’s approach has is that it can model the asymmetric relationship between the contrastive topic and the focus in these sentences, as the type of questions raised will vary in each case. In (227) above, we can see how the variables for the contrastive topic are filled first, forming questions which vary by topic and request the value for the focus.

Another aspect of this asymmetry is the asymmetry which has been noticed by, for example Molnár (2002), where contrastive foci are interpreted as [+exhaustive], while contrastive topics are [-exhaustive]. In (228a), for example the contrastive focus John is interpreted as being exhaustive: the speaker saw no other (relevant) person at the fair and following up the sentence with (228c) is infelicitous. In (228b), on the other hand, it is possible that multiple relevant people were seen by the speaker at the fair and the sentence could be felicitously followed by (228c).

(228) a. John, I saw at the fair.
   b. John, I saw at the FAIR.
   c. Mary, too.

One aspect of contrastive topics which was claimed by Molnár (1998) is the property of exclusivity, which she adopts in response to the Kenesei’s (1989) claim that contrastive topics are a type of exclusive focus. On her view, contrastive topics are [+exclusive, -exhaustive], by which she means that for at least ONE member of the contextually evoked superset the predication or proposition being made does not hold, that is to say, the proposition or predication is false for at least one member of the set. I deem this condition to be too strict. Instead, it must be true that for at least one member of said set, the comment cannot be made (with any certainty). Indeed, the inability to make the comment for the entire set is the main motivation for the use of a contrastive topic. That Molnár’s condition is too strict is evident from the fact that a sentence with a contrastive topic such as that in (228b) could be followed by (228d), shown below, assuming the contextual set to be composed of only 2 members [John, Mary]. In (228d), it is not clear whether the proposition that she was seen by the speaker at the fair will hold or not. Crucially, however, the speaker cannot make the same comment for Mary.

(228) d. Mary, I’m sure I saw SOMEWHERE, but... was she at the fair, too? I’m not sure.

The asymmetry captured by the different question trees employed by Büring and the exhaustivity effects noted by Molnár can be accounted for if we adopt the assumption made in this approach, inspired by RT, according to which utterances are assumed to be relevant (or informative). In the context of information structure, this means that comments are understood as being informative. In contrast, \(m\)-marked constituents, i.e., PEMs, play a support role, by reducing processing effort. The exhaustivity effects are, I would argue, dependent on whether the constituent in question is \(m\)-marked or not. In other words, contrastive constituents in the
comment are exhaustive, while contrastive constituents which are PEMs are not and cannot be. The only way to create a one-to-one correlation between the comment and its topic is to make the comment exhaustive. This impossibility of interpreting topics as (strictly) exhaustive pertains not only to contrastive topics, but to all topics. In (229a), only I cannot be interpreted as a topic. A one-to-one correlation is nonetheless possible if the predicate is exhaustive, as in (229b).

(229) a. #Only I/Only I won a prize at the fair. (unless only I is a contrastive focus)
   b. I was the only one who won a prize at the fair.

The exhaustivity witnessed in the lower contrastive element in a sentence with a contrastive topic is not absolute, but only applied to the contextual set the contrastive function on it evokes. In (230). John is a contrastive topic and a bicycle is the lower contrastive constituent.

(230) John bought a bicycle.
   i. John $\subseteq S_T$
   ii. a bicycle $\subseteq S_F$

John is interpreted to be a member of a relevant contextual set, $S_T$ {John, Mary, Peter}, by way of the contrast function. The lower contrastive constituent, the bicycle, on the other hand, belongs to a second contextually given set $S_F$ {a bicycle, a bicycle, a bicycle, a scooter}, consisting of three bicycles and a scooter.

In English, the sentence in (230) is still ambiguous. We can turn to Hungarian data to show this difference more clearly, as Hungarian has two separate positions for exhaustive and non-exhaustive foci (É. Kiss, 1998). In (231a), the DP egy biciklit (‘a bicycle’) is fronted to a position in front of the verb, the Focus position, which indicates that John only bought one bicycle. This is what É. Kiss (1998) refers to as identificational focus. In (231b), on the other hand, egy biciklit is post-verbal, constituting what É. Kiss refers to as information focus. Only in the first case is the DP considered to be exhaustive.

(231) a. János egy biciklit vett.
   John bought a bicycle
   ‘John bought only one bicycle.’

   b. János vett ’egy biciklit.
   John bought a bicycle
   ‘John bought a bicycle.’

The exhaustiveness of egy biciklit in (231a), however, relates only to the contextual set $S_F$, referred to using the contrast function. This claim goes against the position traditionally taken in the Hungarian literature, including É. Kiss: I propose that the exhaustiveness of a bicycle does not entail that John bought nothing else, only that he did not buy anything else from $S_F$. In other words, the contrastive focus (or identificational focus) forms a contextual set, just like contrastive PEMs do. What this means is that the exhaustiveness of foci is not unbounded: it relates directly to the discourse and applies only within the contextual set which is evoked in the discourse. Were the exhaustiveness to extend beyond the contextual set, the propositions made by these contrastive elements would be decidedly extreme. It is quite rare for a person to only make one purchase in his or her lifetime.
If we consider the contextual set $S_T$ of which John is a member, however, this exhaustiveness is encoded even within this set. The sentence does not entail that the other members of $S_T$ did not buy a bicycle themselves: minimally, however, the speaker cannot make the same comment for one member of $S_T$, perhaps due to not remembering or not knowing what one or more of the members purchased from $S_F$. Thus, the sentence in (230) where John is claimed to have bought a bicycle can be felicitously followed up by the sentence in (232), where the speaker can make no claim as to what the other members in John’s set $S_T$.

(232) That much I know. I have no idea what the others in his group bought.

Exhaustivity, I would argue, is a result of the combination of the intrinsic properties of comments and the evocation of a contextual set. These comment properties also mean that the function of “vanilla” focus is automatically assumed in the context, meaning that material in the comment is always assumed to be selectional. The emergence of exhaustivity is a consequence of the evocation of a contextual set, which induces the hearer to interpret the other members of the set to be excluded in an informative manner, i.e., specifically not selected. The positing of a contextual set without this function would not be informative.

In contrast, the superset evoked for $m$-marked constituents are interpreted as potential PEMs for subsequent comments: since PEMs are not subject to the expectation of informativeness due to $m$-marking, no exhaustivity is assumed.

### 5.2.3 Contrastive topics never appear alone

Whenever a contrastive topic evokes a contextual set, it must be associated with a quantificational operator in the comment. Minimally, this will be a contrastive focus, which I assume to be simply a non-$m$-marked Contr head.

In the case of contrastive “foci”, the head associated with the feature Contr° merges with a constituent which is in the comment of the sentence (I do not rule out that it should be able to merge with the comment as a whole), due to its not being $m$-marked. In the case of contrastive topics, Contr° is situated in an $m$-marked constituent. In (233), the same head merges with the contrastive topic la bicicletta (“the bicycle”) and the focus Gianni (“John”). The comment, in this case, is constituted by the IP, though I take the comment to be whatever (minimal) domain the language in question moves $m$-marked constituents out of.

(233) $[m [\text{ContrP Contr° La bicicletta}], [\text{IP I’ ha comprata the bicycle CL.ACC have.3SG bought.f}]$

$[\text{COMMENT. John}]$

‘The bicycle, John bought.’

The $m$-marked contrastive constituent is realised, whether moved or base generated with coindexation\textsuperscript{13}, in a position as described in the cartographic literature. The lower focussed constituent, on the other hand, has a second Contr° head which marks a constituent which is interpreted as being exhaustive with respect to a second, contextually given set. (234) below shows a more detailed syntactic tree for the sentence given in (233).

\textsuperscript{13} This is an option argued for by Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) which I will not argue against in the case of Italian. I do not take this to be cross-linguistically the case, however, as languages which do not tolerate object drop, such as Finnish, must rely on movement for the realisation of topics.
The tree above is simplified in order to improve its legibility. Only the remnant movement of the non-contrastive comment is marked. There are two Contr heads in the tree above. One has merged with the DP *la bicicletta* (‘the bicycle’) and is hosted in the position designated for contrastive topics argued for by Frascareli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010). This contrastive element is also merged with the $m$ head, which marks it as a PEM. The second Contr head has merged with *Gianni* (‘John’), which has raised through movement to the lower focus position argued for by Belletti (2001).

At the same time as the contrastive feature on the topic evokes its contextual set, the contrast feature on the lower constituent also evokes a second contextual set, though this second set, in the context of the informative function of the comment, is interpreted to be exhaustive with respect to the second contextual set, as was argued in section 5.2.2 above.

The perceived interpretation proposed in some accounts (Molnár, 2002) where the proposition relating to the topic is seen as being false for at least one member of a set evoked for contrastive topics I propose to be an effect of having a focus which is [+specific], which is not necessary for foci and the use of a verb such as *buy*, which is difficult to interpret with multiple agents and a unique theme, unless the agents act in unison or the actions are perceived as being subsequent to each other. In (235), where *the bicycle* presupposes a unique, specific referent, following up (235a) with (235b) is odd, since the interpretation that John and Bill bought the same bicycle in concert is not easily accessible, although it is a possible interpretation. Another possible interpretation is that Bill bought the same bicycle at a different time, possibly from John, but the discourse context that would make this interpretation accessible is quite complex.

(235) a. *John* bought THE BICYCLE.
   b. *Bill* bought the bicycle, TOO.
I take the exhaustiveness of the “foci” in sentences with contrastive topics to be always present cross-linguistically. Syntactic evidence of this can be shown in Hungarian, where contrastive topics which co-occur with a narrower “focus” require this focus to be fronted. Hungarian contrastive topics will be covered in more detail in Chapter 6. Hungarian has been argued to have two distinct positions for foci, one “in situ”, another in the left periphery. The latter position for foci only hosts exhaustive foci. In sentences with contrastive topics, the focus must always be fronted or the sentence is ungrammatical.

(236) a. [Péter]_{CT} [LUNDBAN jár egyetemre]_{F}.  
Peter Lund-at go.3SG university.to  
‘As for Peter, he is studying in Lund.’  
(Molnár, 2002, p. 108)

b. *?Péter jár egyetemre LUNDBAN.  
Peter go.3SG university.to Lund-at

In (236a) above, the contrastive topic, Péter, requires the lower “focus” Lundban (‘at Lund’) to be raised to the Hungarian left-peripheral position reserved for exhaustive foci. In other words, the sentence in (236a) can only be interpreted such that Péter goes to university only in Lund. This is evident when, if we attempt to leave the “focus” in situ, the grammaticality of the sentence deteriorates significantly. This can be seen in (236b), where Lundban (‘at Lund’) remains in a lower position, where it would be interpreted non-exhaustively.

The above examples from Italian and Hungarian also indicate another characteristic of the contrastive elements in the comment: they must raise to a (low) focus position, when this is available. I will assume that if no available position is available, the contrastive element may remain in situ. In particular, constituents merged with a Contr head will be attracted to a quantificational position above, if this position is available. See section 6.4 on Finnish and Hungarian contrastive PEMs to see how Finnish and Hungarian both move contrastive foci to the left edge of their respective comment fields.

But contrastive PEMs can also be associated with other heads, such as a negation. In (237) below, John can be a contrastive topic, but its associate is not a contrastive focus, but a negation.

(237) John did NOT eat the beans.

In this case, once again, the operator is exhaustive. The set of alternatives in this case is binary and for an alternative predicate from the set to hold for John would be a contradiction: John cannot both eat the beans and not eat the beans.

5.2.4 Contrast feeds phonology

The last claim to be made with respect to contrast is that the contrast feature feeds an intonational cue to the phonology module, which is then realised as the relevant intonational marking in the language in question. The precise nature of the realisation of the contrastive intonation will vary from language to language depending on an intonational lexicon and I will not speculate here as to whether the “spell-out” of these intonational patterns, if that is what they can be called, is arbitrary or determined by the prosodic properties of the relevant language.

In particular, the contrast feature marks an intonational cue which it assigns to the smallest domain containing itself and its complement. This intonational cue is spelled out in PF, but need not be associated with a particular phonemic representation. This mechanism of
association between segmental phonology and supra-segmental phonology is adopted from Goldsmith’s (1979) work which concerns the late association of tones to segments.

When it is thus unassociated, the head will not give rise to spellout driven movement. If its L-tree is associated with a phonemic representation, it will induce spellout driven movement. In a structure such as that in (238a), contrast assigns an intonational cue which is interpreted for the entire string constituent ContrP, which includes XP and YP. In the case shown in (238b), however, the intonational cue will not apply to the constituent which has moved to a higher position, since, after linearisation, YP will no longer be part of the element to the constituent ContrP. YP must therefore be spelled out separately. This spellout driven movement leaves no traces and takes place when an adequate spellout configuration cannot be found to spellout every phrase.

(238) a. ContrP
    /   \\
  Contr  XP
    /   \\
  X     YP

b. YP ContrP
    /   \\
  Contr  XP

[ContrP – XP -YP]marked    YP [Contr° XP]marked

When ContrP is not associated with a phonemic representation and is only associated with an intonational cue, spellout driven movement is not induced. The intonational cue is associated with the existing spellout.

This difference can be seen when comparing the contrastive intonation in, say, English, and that encountered in Japanese. Let us consider contrastive intonation on nouns in both of these languages. While in English, the contrastive intonation appears on the whole noun, in Japanese, contrastive intonation is perceived on the grammatical particles which appear at the ends of words. On the view proposed here, the English ContrP is purely an intonational cue and does not give rise to spellout driven movement. The Japanese ContrP, however, is not realised independently of phonemic representations. The grammatical particles wa, ga, wo, ni, etc. appearing at the ends of nouns are all spelled out with L-trees which contain the ContrP. The intonational cue is therefore bound to these phonemic representations and will give rise to spellout driven movement.

In the case of topics, the particle in question is generally –wa, which I propose has the following spellout rule in the lexicon, shown in (239), where the KP projections from 1 to n represent the case projections following Caha (2009), with the lowest projection, K1P, being nominative case.

(239) wa <=> ContrP mP KnP... K1P

In the case of “foci”, the particles depend on the case of the noun. This is shown in (240a) for English, where John is a contrastive topic and apple is a contrastive “focus” in the comment, and in (240b) for Japanese, where John-wa is a contrastive topic and ringo-wo (‘apple’) is the contrastive “focus”. The spellout rule for wo is given in (241), where K2P represents the accusative case.
(240)  

*English*

a. *John* ate an *APPLE*.

*Japanese*

b. John-*wa*, ringo-*WO* tabe-*ta*.
John-*WA*  apple-*ACC* eat-*PAST*

(241) *wo <=> ContrP K₂P K₁P*

In this case, the grammatical particle on the contrastive “focus” is the accusative particle *wo*. The italics on the *wa* and the small capitals on *wo* indicate that it is the grammatical particles which are made prominent and bears the particular intonations of contrastive topic and contrastive “focus”, respectively.

The above evidence suggests that, unlike in English, where the contrast head is able to assign the intonational cue for the whole word, the Japanese DP has raised out past it, escaping the scope of the intonational cue. Thus, only the particle appears to bear the stress. This is illustrated in (242) below for the sake of clarity, the case projections are subsumed under *mP*.

(242)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexicon:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP &lt;=*&gt; John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ContrP mP &lt;=*&gt; <em>wa</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a. DP |
| Δ |

| b. mP |
| m DP |
| Δ |

| Spellout rule for DP successfully applied: |
| DP <=*> John |

| Spellout rule for mP cannot apply as DP is not part of the constituent to be spelled out. |
| mP DP <=*> * |

| Spellout driven movement triggered, DP moves past mP. Both spellout rules can now apply: |
| DP <=*> John |
| mP <=*> *wa* |

| ContrP merged. No spellout rule for ContrP alone. |
| ContrP <=*> * |
e.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ConstrP} \\
\text{Contr} \quad \text{mP}
\end{array}
\]

Previous movement cancelled. DP moves back to starting position. See section 3.3 on Nanosyntax for more information on cyclic spellout.

f.  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\Delta \\
\text{Constr} \quad \text{mP}
\end{array}
\]

DP now moves past both ContrP and mP. All spellout rules can now apply: 

- DP $\leftrightarrow$ John 
- ConstrP mP $\leftrightarrow$ wa

PF Result = John [wa]marked

In the tree above, I assume $wa$ spells out the $m$ head, marking topics and discourse anaphors, but that it can also spell out the contrast feature. The DP $John$ prevents spelling out either mP or ConstrP without moving the DP out of the constituent: this is observed at step (b) and, later, at step (d). Without a spellout rule for ConstrP alone, the DP $John$ is forced to backtrack and move again, this time past both the $m$ feature and the contrast feature. Once this is accomplished, in (f), both John and $wa$ can be spelled out.

5.3 The gap projection

The difference between new topics (aboutness shift topics) and other topics consists in the realisation of a gap head, which is projected by a feature which expresses a discontinuity of discourse. This feature can then be attracted by a probe in RefP, in the sense of Beghelli (1995), Beghelli and Stowell (1997), and Szabolcsi (1997). Essentially, RefP and the gap feature have the function of allowing extra-discursive reference: they terminates $m$-marked constituents’ search for a referent in the discourse and allow discourse-new referents to be referred to, although these referents must be identifiable in the sense of Lambrecht (1994) to be successful PEMs.

New topics have been argued to introduce new topics to the discourse and have therefore been argued to be associated with a separate speech act, as was argued by Krifka (2001, p. 44). Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010, p. 78) proposed two solutions, one sentence internal, the other sentence external, under the assumption that a new conversational move needs to be made.

I will claim that aboutness shift topics are not defined by their newness: instead, their function is similar to that of other PEMs: it minimises processing effort for the hearer. The special property of aboutness shift topics is, instead, that they mark a gap in the continuity of the discourse and allow extra-discursive reference. The feature which realises this is necessarily the closest PEM to ForceP: indeed, the highest PEM is ranked as the most effective processing effort minimiser, as it makes the most significant contribution to domain reduction. A probe close to or at ForceP attracts a feature which indicates the discourse discontinuity. The feature is merged relatively late, i.e., only after the PEMs have already evacuated (or basegenerated) outside the comment region. Note that there is only one RefP in a clause, which is clear from the fact that only one aboutness shift topic is permitted per clause. There is no a priori reason why this is the case, and this cannot be easily derived by appealing to a conjunction with a speech act, especially since conjunctions can be recursive.
The distinction between newness and extra-discursive reference I motivate on the basis that only PEMs can be marked as gap PEMs. That is to say, the gap feature merges with the m-head namely because it interfaces with the PEM’s referring process. By default, PEMs search for referents anaphorically in the discourse, as this is the least costly kind of search, requiring minimal domain extension. Gap PEMs are permitted, by moving to RefP, to extend this search beyond the domains of the discourse.

New topics can arise naturally in the course of a conversation. People can move from topic to topic following a natural flow in the discourse, without necessarily employing expressions to indicate that the conversation has moved to a new subject matter.

(243) A: I met John earlier at the library. We had the chance to catch up a little and he told me about some new project he’s starting.
B: That’s brilliant! He always has something brewing in his little grey cells, doesn’t he?
A: Absolutely. In any case, it’s pretty interesting. It’s something about promoting new ecological values. I think he’s won some funding for it, too.

In the short (fictional) conversation above, the topic has been changed from John to John’s project, without the need for an aboutness shift topic. That such changes in topic should be uncomplicated without employing linguistic expressions with the purpose of changing the topic of conversation is surprising: why are they then needed?

And yet, aboutness shift topics are observed even when they refer to an entity already present in the discourse. For example, the question in (244) is answered using an aboutness shift topic, even though the referent of the topic has just been introduced to the discourse.

(244) Q: Have you heard anything from John?
A: Gianni, gli ho parlato ieri riguardo al suo progetto.
John, I spoke to him yesterday concerning to-the his project

In the Italian example (244) above, the topic Gianni is not introducing a new entity to the discourse: it is marking a discontinuity, or gap, in the discourse. Note that aboutness shift topics are licensed in this case, even though Gianni/John was mentioned in the question to the speaker, this suggests that the gap, at least in this case, is not with respect to the new information contained in the question, but rather what precedes it. The utility of this is evident if we consider that a greater discontinuity will require greater effort in processing and that PEMs will therefore have to do more work to meet the expectations of informativeness of the hearer. The gap feature is necessarily high in the structure in order to allow interface with the highest parts of the clause, so that it can be visible to, e.g., an assertion or a speech act operator.

A comparison between the PEMs bearing a gap feature and other types of PEMs shows that the former kind of PEM allows expressions which are not in the discourse. This is a crucial point, as both contrastive PEMs and discourse anaphoric PEMs are linked to the discourse, either through a contextual set or by direct association with a referent or expression in the previous discourse. The type of PEM being discussed here, however, is able to make reference to discourse-new referents, but, as Lambrecht (1994) points out, they must be identifiable, as was discussed in section 4.4.4. This means that completely brand-new referents make for bad PEMs. An example of this was given as (200), repeated here as (245).

(245) a. *A boy is tall. (Perlmutter, 1970)
b. A boy in my class is real tall. (Lambrecht, 1994)
Lambrecht (1994, p. 167) argues that this ungrammaticality is caused by the unidentifiability of the referent a boy in (245a). This argument finds support from our approach, as PEMs can only reduce processing effort if the domain of application of the comment can be successfully reduced: a practical reduction in the number of (at least theoretical) referents must be enacted in order to reduce the hearer’s processing effort.

Another effect of marking this discontinuity in the discourse is that this stops the PEMs search for a referent in the discourse. While a simple m-marked constituent would search for its referent within the discourse by default, the gap head terminates this search.

### 5.4 Predictions

Let us now combine the components of topics as proposed in the preceding sections. What have been known as familiar topics are, in fact, the most basic kind of processing effort minimiser (PEM), the function of which is to minimise the processing effort for the speaker. All PEMs are marked with a feature m, which is syntactically active and is used to distinguish m-marked constituents from the informative part of the utterance: the comment. Contrastive topics are also PEMs, with the same basic properties, except that they are merged with a contrast feature, which applies a function to the constituent such that a contextual set is evoked. Lastly, aboutness shift topics are also PEMs, but which mark a discontinuity in the discourse and need not refer to the discourse to find their referent.

The three types of topics are realised by the following heads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(246)</th>
<th>Type of PEM</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discourse anaphoric PEM</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contrastive PEM</td>
<td>Contr, m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gap PEM</td>
<td>gap, m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This approach makes a number of predictions which concern the ordering of PEMs, in that the constituents most effective in this will precede those which are least effective. The precise way of measuring the utility of a PEM could be measured using experimental methods, such that effective use of PEMs should reduce the time in which utterances are processed by hearers. The vague notion of aboutness has been done away with, in favour of a more precise relation between the comment and its PEMs, geared toward optimising informativeness.

With respect to the treatment of contrastive constituents, this approach makes similar predictions to the approaches to contrastivity described in Neeleman et al (2007) and Molnár (1998; 2002; 2006) in that rules in the syntax may generalise over contrastive elements regardless of their topichood. An important new prediction in this approach is that there is no real basic focus in language. Broad focus is accounted for by commenthood and narrow focus is a case of the evoking of a contextual set of which the “focussed” constituent is a member. No predictions are made for more complex types of foci at this stage. Rules which have been observed to apply to contrastive “foci” and basic “foci” are therefore rules applying to constituents in the comment.

Furthermore, the proposed account for contrastivity makes new predictions on the interface between syntax and the phonological interface, where spellout movement can be left untriggered whenever a merged head which realises an intonational cue does not link this to a phonemic representation. On the other hand, whenever the intonational cue is associated with a phonemic representation, spellout movement will be triggered. This approach makes a link...
between nanosyntax and approaches in autosegmental phonology, where features can “float” and be linked to other linguistic elements at a later stage, or be linked from the very start.

The contrast head is proposed to form a class with negation heads. These two heads contrast with other heads in that they are not referential, instead implementing functions on their complements. This class is therefore composed of heads which are functional in a true sense (Genoveva Puskás, p.c.). This class may well include quantificational heads, which have been observed to behave in a manner different to referential heads, particularly in the characteristics of the A’-dependencies they are involved in (Rizzi, 1997).

As for aboutness shift topics, the approach argued for here revises their interpretation as PEMs which indicate a gap in discourse continuity, rather than marking the introduction of a new topic. This affects the distribution of these kinds of constituents such that they will be employed whenever the natural flow of the discourse is interrupted or is otherwise discontinuous. This accounts for the use of aboutness shift topics in response to questions which have already introduced the referent of said topic to the discourse.

A key prediction made in this approach is that, contrary to most approaches to topichood, the information-structural properties and functions of topics generalise to non-argument DPs, adverbials (although not necessarily any adverbial), and even embedded clauses. This predicts that some of the intonational patterns observed on topics may also be observed on constituents which have not traditionally been considered to be topics.
Chapter 6. Finnish vs. Hungarian

This section will present some basic information about Finnish and Hungarian and then proceed to discuss how the different types of PEMs are represented in these two languages. Data from a survey carried out on Finnish and Hungarian comparing aboutness shift topics, contrastive topics and contrastive foci will also be presented. These two languages have been chosen for investigation for a number of reasons. Both languages have been argued to be discourse configurational and topic prominent, with their word order reflecting (at least partially) the information structure of the utterance. Despite this, there are clear syntactic differences which are unexpected from a cartographic point of view, particularly the relative positions of their topics and foci, which appear to be inverted.

I propose that the $m$-marked constituents behave similarly in both Finnish and Hungarian: both languages extract $m$-marked constituents from a comment field; and both languages obey the same constraints on the order of PEMs as that described for Italian topics by Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010); furthermore, both languages may only realise a single contrastive PEM. These differences become evident when the different position of the verb in each language is left aside. The two most important differences between the two languages are: the presence of a dedicated syntactic position for gap PEMs, which is present in Hungarian but absent in Finnish; the position of the verb.

Finnish and Hungarian are both languages belonging to the Uralic language family. Finnish belongs to the Finnic branch, while Hungarian belongs to the Ugric branch group of the Uralic language family. Finnish is the official language of Finland, with approximately 5.4 million L1 speakers around the world (Lewis, et al., 2016) though native speakers of Finnish varieties are also found in Sweden, Norway and Russia, besides various expat communities around the world. Hungarian is the national language of Hungary and is spoken by almost 10 million people in Hungary and approximately 12.5 million people worldwide (Lewis, et al., 2016).

6.1 Word order in Finnish and Hungarian

Both Finnish (FI) and Hungarian (HU) are deemed to have the same default word order: Subject – Verb – Object, or SVO, but the word order in sentences is not as rigid as in English. Finnish and Hungarian have relatively rich case systems: Finnish has 15 cases; Hungarian has 18 cases. In both languages, under the appropriate information-structural conditions, all word order permutations of the subject, verb and object are possible. In this sense, both Finnish and Hungarian are discourse configurational languages. (Karttunen & Kay, 1985). In (247) below, a possible interpretation is given for each of the word orders for both Hungarian (HU) and Finnish (FI).
The syntax of a discourse configurational language is (at least partially) determined by discourse-related concerns, i.e., by information structure. In other words, the word order will vary depending on what the main news in the sentence is, or whether an argument is being contrasted with another entity, or if the speaker means to contradict a previously communicated proposition.
It should be noted, at this stage, that Finnish and Hungarian interpretations for a given word order do not always match. This clearly shows that there is some variation in the way either language expresses the information structure of the sentence.

Despite the default word order in Standard Finnish generally being regarded to be SVO, there are some cases in which an OVS order has, however, been argued to be acceptable as the least marked word order (248) (Vilkuna, 1989). In a case such as that below, the canonical word order places the agent after the verb and the patient before it, with the reversed word order favouring a marked, contrastive interpretation of the agent. In these cases, the SVO order can also be interpreted as a mirative focus construction, where the event is reported as being something particularly remarkable. It should be noted that this apparent change in the default order of arguments is also found in Hungarian in the same contexts.

(248) a. Lasta pisti mehiläinen.
   child.PAR sting.PAST.3SG bee
   The child was stung by a/the bee.

   b. Mehiläinen pisti lasta.
      bee sting.PAST.3SG child.PAR
      ‘A/the bee stung the child.’

6.2 Introduction to the Left Periphery of Finnish and Hungarian

As mentioned in the previous subsection, the different word orders found in Hungarian and Finnish are not mutually interchangeable and communicate differences in IS. In what follows, I will illustrate how the left periphery of Finnish and Hungarian vary with respect to one another.

Work on Hungarian since the 1980s has argued for an articulated left periphery which is separated into a topic field and a quantificational field (Horvath, 1986; Kenesei, 1986; É. Kiss, 1987; 1992; Brody, 1995; Szabolcsi, 1997; Puskás, 2000; Lipták, 2011).

(249) [CP [TopP* [DistP* [FocP [...]]]]]

   Topic field   Quantificational field

   (Lipták, 2011, p. 165)

The Hungarian left periphery is especially articulated and active. The leftmost position in the left periphery has been described as the topic position. É. Kiss (1998; 2002) provides two diagnostic tests with the aim of identifying the topics in this position. The first diagnostic is based on the argument that topics must precede the main stress in the sentence, which she claims must fall on the first major constituent in the sentence’s predicate, where this boundary is meant to indicate the right edge of the topic domain. To illustrate this, she offers the examples in (250), where (250a) has the main stress fall on rajzolt (‘drew’), after János (‘John’), while in (250b), the main stress falls on the constituent minden fiú (‘every boy’). É. Kiss argues this rules out the subject in (250b) as a topic. Please note that the topic marked in the example below is situated in the TopP projection indicated in (249)
(250) a.  \[\text{Topic János} \quad \text{Predicate RAjzolt egy autót.}\]
John        drew a car.acc
‘John drew a car.’

(É. Kiss, 1998, p. 22)

b.  \[\text{Predicate MiNden fiú focizni akart.}\]
every boy football.play-INF wanted

(É. Kiss, 1998, p. 23)

Varga (2002) argues against this definition on the basis that É. Kiss’s characterisation of the main sentential stress is inaccurate, as all lexical constituents in Hungarian sentences conveying new information have main stress, and destressing may occur before a pre-verbal focus. Building on Varga’s argument, Gyuris (2009) proposes that É. Kiss’s rule should be changed such that topics “must precede the constituent whose major stress or pitch accent is not reducible due to syntactic or semantic/prosodic reasons”, explaining that in the examples in (251a) below, the main stress (indicated by ‘ˈ’) occurs not on the first constituent marking the predicate, mindig (‘always’), but on a büfében (‘in the snack bar’), the second constituent. Secondary stress is marked with ‘ˌ’. This satisfies the modified criterion but does not fit É. Kiss’s original formulation. In any case, Gyuris concludes that É. Kiss’s prosodic test is not reliable in identifying the right edge of the topic domain.

(251) a.  János ˈmindig a ˈbüfében ˌiszik ˌkávét.
John     always the cafeteria-in drinks coffee
‘John always drinks coffee in the cafeteria.’

b.  ˈJános ‘mindig a ˈbüfében ˌiszik ˌkávét.

(Varga, 2002, p. 143)

The second test É. Kiss proposes depends on the argument that sentence adverbials can appear anywhere from one position before the topic to one position after the topic. Hence, the topic domain should be situated between the leftmost and the rightmost position available to sentence adverbials. Gyuris (2009) points out a further assumption this claim makes, which is that sentence adverbials are not themselves hosted in the topic position. The sentences in (252) illustrate sentence adverbials to the left (a), between (b) and on the right (c) of topics az új autónak (‘the new car.DAT’ and Péter (‘Peter’).

(252) a.  Sajnos [NP az új autónak] [NP Péter] [AspP megnyomta az elejét].
sadly the new car.DAT Peter  VM.hit the front.its.ACC
‘Unfortunately, Peter hit the front of the new car.’

b.  [NP Az új autónak] állítólag [NP Péter] [AspP megnyomta az elejét].
the new car.DAT allegedly Peter  VM.hit the front.its.ACC
‘Allegedly, Peter hit the front of the new car.’

c.  [NP Az új autónak] [NP Péter] feltehetőleg [AspP megnyomta az elejét].
the new car.DAT Peter supposedly  VM.hit the front.its.ACC
‘Supposedly, Peter hit the front of the new car.’

(É. Kiss, 1998, p. 27)
É. Kiss (2002) argues that the Hungarian left periphery is composed of a TopP, the specifier of which hosts topics, a DistP, hosting distributive quantifiers and either an AspP, when the sentence does not have a pre-verbal focus, or an FP, when it does. In (253) and (254), János (‘John’) and minden lányt (‘every girl,ACC’) are hosted in Spec-TopP and Spec-DistP respectively. The two examples show the structural differences in Hungarian sentences, on É. Kiss’s view, when a pre-verbal focus is realised. In (253) moziba is (‘to the cinema too’) is in Spec-DistP, while in (254), it is in the pre-verbal focus position, Spec-FP. The presence of the constituent in the pre-verbal focus also entails that AspP is not realised and the verb remains lower down, in the VP, with the verbal marker meg obligatorily following it, rather that preceding it, as it had in (253).\footnote{The flat structure of the VP in these two trees is a property attributed by É. Kiss to Hungarian VPs, but which we will not ourselves adopt in this approach.}

\begin{center}
(253)
\end{center}

\begin{figure}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{tree.png}
\end{figure}

Janós minden lányt moziba is meg hívott
John every girl,ACC cinema.into too VM invited
‘John invited every girl to the cinema as well.’
from (Gyuris, 2009, p. 29) based on (É. Kiss, 2002, p. 112)
Janós minden lányt moziba hívott meg
John every girl ACC cinema into invited VM
‘John invited every girl to the cinema.’
from (Gyuris, 2009, p. 29) based on (É. Kiss, 2002, p. 113)

Puskás (2000) argues that Hungarian topics, as a whole, behave like “referential” A'-binders: in particular, they show Strong Crossover effects and cannot escape Strong Islands, which are properties characteristic of A’-movement, but fail to show Weak Crossover effects or license parasitic gaps, which suggests that they are referential, as opposed to quantificational. Contra approaches which proposed that Hungarian topics were merged through adjunction, Puskás follows Rizzi’s (1997) proposal that they are, in fact, hosted in the specifiers of numerous TopP projections, due to their sharing properties with Italian fronted CLLD constituents: they can appear in infinitives and are recursive.

Finnish contrasts with Hungarian in that the Finnish topic position does not precede the Focus position. Instead Vilkuna (1989) proposes that the Finnish Left Periphery (what she calls the initial field) has two positions preceding a V-field: a K-position and a T-position. The names of these positions are meant to be reminiscent of the terms contrast (K) and theme or topic (T), though Vilkuna makes it explicit that she is not thereby committing herself wholly to the concepts these words describe.
(255)  K    T    V-field
a.  Mikko  pesee  usein astioita.  
    Mikko  wash-3SG often dish-PL-PAR
    “Mikko often washes the dishes.”

b.  Mitä  sinä  teet?
    what.PAR  you  do-2SG
    ‘What are you doing?’

c.  pro  astioita.  
    wash-1SG dish-PL-PAR
    ‘I’m doing the dishes.’

d.  pro  Hauska  tavata.  
    be-PAST.3SG nice meet-INF
    'It was nice to meet you.’

e.  Illalla  Mikko  rupesi  harmittamaan.  
    evening-ADE  Mikko-PAR  begin-PAST.3SG annoy-INF3-ILL
    ‘In the evening, Mikko began feeling annoyed.’

f.  Ei  täällä  ketään  ole.  
    neg.3sg  here.ADE  anybody.PAR  be
    ‘No, there’s no one there.’

g.  Minä  siitä  ennenkin  olen  päättänyt.  
    I  it-ELA  before-too  be-1SG  decide.PSAP
    ‘It is me who has always decided it.’

h.  Olisihan  siitä  poiskin  voinut  lähteä.  
    had-CON-  it-PAR  away-too  can.PSAP  leave-INF
    ‘One could have gone away, too.’

i.  Tulee  hän.  
    come-3SG  s/he
    ‘Oh yes, s/he will come.’

(Vilkuna, 1989, p. 37)

The T-position may host a subject or a topic, including over expletive pronouns, such as sitä (Holmberg & Nikanne, 2002), but not constituents such as manner adverbials. The K-position may host either a fronted focus, a contrastive topic, a wh-word or a –kO marked constituent.

In the case of (255a), the subject occurs in T. In (255b), K hosts a wh-element in a content question. In (255c), the T position is filled by pro, which stands for the 1st person singular pronoun. In (255d), the K position is filled by an impersonal pro, which triggers 3rd person singular agreement on the verb. In (255e), an adverbial (arguably a “setting adverbial” is hosted in K. (255f) features a negative auxiliary verb in K. In (255g), the subject pronoun minä, ‘I’, is
in K, as a corrective/contrastive focus, and the expletive pronoun *sitä* ‘it’, is in T. *Ennen-kin* precedes the verb due to it being discourse old, perhaps, in this case, even echoic. (255h) shows a V-initial order where the verb has moved to K and has the clitic –*hAn* adjoined to it. This clitic seems only to adjoin to constituents in K. The partitive pronoun *sitä*, ‘it’ functions as an expletive. The sentence is a case of a 3rd person impersonal construction, which requires no subject. Lastly, (255i) shows another case of a V-initial sentence, where the verb is in K and the subject pronoun is in T.

The left periphery of Finnish is shown in (256), taken from Kaiser (2006), who bases the structure on Mitchell (1991), Holmberg et al., (1993) and Holmberg and Nikanne (2002).

(256)

```
    CP
     /
    /   \
FP (FiniteP)  NegP
     /       /
   /     TP (TenseP)
  /   /
/     /     AuxP
\   /   /     PtCP
  \ /   /   /
   \ /   VP
```

Koskinen argues that, if one takes into account the positions of foci and topics in Finnish sentences, the following syntactic structure is obtained.

(257)

```
    CP
     /
    /   \
C    FocusP
     /       /
   /     Topic/AgrP
  /   /
/     /     Topic/Agr   NegP
\   /   /   /
  \ /   Neg   TP
   \   /
    \  T   vP
     \  /
      \ VP
```
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6.3 Basic PEMs

In this section, I argue that both Finnish and Hungarian mark PEMs syntactically through movement. In particular, both languages evacuate PEMs from the comment of the utterance. This lays the groundwork for a comparative analysis of the PEMs and the realisation of topics in Finnish and Hungarian.

The discussion of basic (discourse anaphoric) PEMs in section 4.3.2, where the term familiar or given topics was employed, following previous literature on the topic, revealed that these kinds of constituents appear in Italian in embedded clauses, it is therefore expected that both Finnish and Hungarian should be able to realise them in embedded clauses as well. Furthermore, these are the only kind of “topic” which had been claimed by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) to be properly recursive, unlike contrastive or aboutness shift topics. Furthermore, these constituents are expected not to have a fixed order, which, on my approach, means that their ordering depends on their relative effectiveness as PEMs.

6.3.1 Finnish PE Ms vacate the vP

Evidence of Finnish moving PEMs out of the comment can be found in the observations made by Koskinen (1998) on what she calls presupposed DPs. Temporal adverbs such as aina (‘always’) or its negative polarity equivalent koskaan (‘ever’), mark the left edge of the vP; DPs which are not discourse anaphoric (non-topic) and are not in narrow focus remain within the vP projection, while “presupposed” DPs must extract out of said domain. I take the latter, “presupposed” DPs to be plain PEMs, i.e, familiar topics, the discourse prominence of which is expressed in terms of presupposition by Koskinen. The example in (258) below, which uses Koskinen’s framework, shows that DPs which are not presupposed, namely Pekalle (‘to Pekka’) and kirjoja (‘books’), remain within the vP. The fronted constituent, viikonloppuna, which Koskinen situates in FocusP, is a contrastive topic. In other words, it is in the K position discussed by Vilkuna (1989).

(258) [FocusP Viikonloppuna [TopicP Tuija ei [NegP t neg [TP osta [vP koskaan Pekalle kirjoja ]]])].
weekend-ESS T.NOM NEG-PL buy-Ø never P-ALL book-PL-PAR
‘On the weekend, Tuija never buys Pekka books.’
(Koskinen, 1998, p. 84)

In the examples in (259) below, Koskinen shows how the information focus in each answer, i.e, the constituent answering the question, is always within vP, the left edge of which is marked by aina (‘always’) or usein (‘often’). Meanwhile, the DPs which were mentioned in the question always appear to the left of aina, having evacuated the vP, these are highlighted with bold type for convenience in the examples in (259). Note that this word order holds regardless of whether the constituents are subjects, objects, or adjuncts; consequently, case plays no role in this.

(259) a. Q: Mitä Tuija ostaa Pekalle tiistaina?
what.PAR T. buy-3SG P.-ALL Tuesday-ESS
‘What does Tuija buy for Pekka on Tuesday?’

A: Tuija ostaa **Pekalle tiistaina** aina kirjoja.
T. buy-3SG P-ALL Tuesday-ESS always book-PL-PAR
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‘Tuija always buys Pekka books on Tuesday.’

b. Q: **Koska** Tuija ostaa Pekalle kirjan?  
when T. buy-3SG P-ALL book-ACC  
‘When will Tuija buy Pekka a book?’

A: **Pekalle kirjoja** aina **tiistaina.**  
T. buy-3SG P-ALL book-PL-PAR always Tuesday-ESS  
‘Tuija always buys Pekka books on Tuesday.’

c. Q: **Koska** Tuija ostaa kukkia?  
when T. buy-3SG flower-PL-PAR  
‘When does Tuija buy flowers?’

A: **Kukkia** ostaa **Tuija** aina **tiistaina.**  
flower-PL-PAR buy-3SG T. always Tuesday-ESS  
‘It is Tuesday that Tuija always buys flowers.’  
(Koskinen, 1998, p. 85)

Furthermore, as is shown in (260a-c) below, this evacuation of the vP is also valid for constituents other than DPs. Koskinen provides examples of this behaviour also from discourse-anaphoric manner adverbs, adjectives and infinitivals, which supports the notion that m heads can merge with a variety of different categories.

(260) a. Q: **Mitä** Hannu laulaa noin mainiosti?  
what.PAR H. sing-3SG so well  
‘What does Hannu sing so well?’

A: Hannu laulaa **mainiosti** aina **iskelmäliirtäksi.**  
H. sing-3SG well always pop.tune-PL-PAR  
(mutta oopperaan hän ei kykene).  
but opera-ILL 3SG NEG.3SG be.capable.of  
‘Hannu always sings pop tunes well, (but he isn’t capable of opera).’

b. Q: **Miksi** Elaine on noin iloinen?  
why E.nom be.3sg so happy  
‘Why is Elaine so happy?’

A: Elaine on **iloinen** aina **päästessään luistelemaan.**  
E. be.3SG happy always get-DE-INE-3POS skate-MA-ILL  
‘Elaine is always happy when she gets (to go) skating.’
c. Q: *Kuka täältä haluaa lähteä Brasiliaan?*  
who.nom here.abl want-3sg leave-ta Brazil-ILL  
‘From here, who wants to go to Brazil?’

A: *Täältä haluamme Brasiliaan lähteä heti me kaikki.*  
here.ABL want-1PL Brazil-ILL leave-TA right.away we all  
‘From here, we all want to go to Brazil right away.’  
(Koskinen, 1998, p. 86)

There is, however, a syntactic constraint which appears to have little to do with IS considerations. Koskinen (1998, pp. 92-93) points out that the base vP cannot be completely vacated. This is illustrated in (261) below, where moving the (discourse prominent) verb *ostaa* (‘buys’) past the temporal adverb *usein* (‘often’), as seen in examples (b) and (d) degrades the grammaticality of the sentence compared to sentences where the verb remains in the vP, as seen in (a) and (c).

(261) a.  
\[
\text{[FocusP Eeva [TopicP meille [vP kukkia [vP usein [vP ostaa t t ]]]]].} \\
\text{E we-ALL flower-PL-PAR often buy-3SG} \\
\text{‘It is Eeva who often buys us flowers.’}
\]

b.  
\[
*\text{[FocusP Eeva [TopicP meille ostaa [vP kukkia [vP usein [vP t t t t ]]]]].} \\
\text{E we-ALL buy-3SG flower-PL-PAR often} \\
\text{‘It is Eeva who often buys us flowers.’}
\]

c.  
\[
\text{[FocusP Kukk-i-a [TopicP Eeva [vP usein [vP t ostaa t t ]]].} \\
\text{flower-PL-PAR E often buy-3SG} \\
\text{‘It is flowers that Eeva often buys.’}
\]

d.  
\[
*\text{[FocusP Kukk-i-a [TopicP Eeva ostaa-a [vP usein [vP t t t t ]]].} \\
\text{flower-PL-PAR E buy-3SG often} \\
\text{‘It is flowers that Eeva often buys.’}
\]

(Koskinen, 1998, p. 93)

Koskinen (for whom movement is an instance of copy-and-merge) accounts for this by proposing that rather than deleting the vP copy of the verb at PF, the higher Topic/AgrP copy is deleted instead, to prevent the vP from becoming phonologically null. This would, therefore, be a phonological constraint. For the purposes of the approach being developed here, we will follow Koskinen in assuming a phonological constraint.

Assuming vP to mark the comment field in Finnish, we can therefore conclude that m-marked constituents, i.e., PEMs, will vacate the vP. According to Koskinen (1998), a condition banning the vP from being completely empty can prevent m-marked constituents, when a contrastive element (a contrastive focus), has been moved to the left peripheral contrastive position. The contrast between (261a) and (261b) is mapped out in the trees below (262a) and (262b), relabeling FocusP as KontrastP.
(262) a.  

KontrastP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ContrP</th>
<th>Kontrast'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contr</td>
<td>DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kontr</td>
<td>TopicP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eeva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DP</th>
<th>Topic'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>vP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>vP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kukkia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DP</th>
<th>vP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>usein</td>
<td>v'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ostaa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eeva meille kukkia usein ostaa.
‘It is Eeva who often buys us flowers.’
b. *Eeva meille kukkia ostaa usein.
‘It is Eeva who often buys us flowers.’

A further diagnostic can be carried out using Büring’s example we saw in (109), repeated here as (263). In the Finnish responses in (264), loosely based on the original example, a contrast is evident between (264a) and (264b): in the first case, *sen teurastajan* (‘that butcher’) is much more easily interpreted as referring to the discourse prominent Dr Cremer, while the latter is more readily interpreted as referring to someone else.

(263) Q: (Did you see Dr. Cremer to get your root canal?)
A: (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the butcher.
A’: # (Don’t remind me.) I’d like to STRANgle the BUTcher.

(264) a. Kyllä minä *sen teurastajan* vielä kuristan!
sure 1SG 3SG.ACC butcher.ACC strangle.1SG yet
‘I’ll strangle that butcher yet!’

b. #Kyllä minä vielä kuristan *sen teurastajan*!
sure 1SG yet strangle.3SG.ACC butcher.ACC

The evidence shown above shows that Finnish constituents which are discourse anaphoric are systematically moved out of the comment (represented here as vP), except when independent factors prevent this from taking place.

Koskinen (1998, p. 89) argues that the movement out of the vP on the part of these constituents is not due to feature-checking. Her grounds for this claim are that, despite the basic syntactic constraints on constituency and that only phrasal constituents may be targeted, the
ordering of these constituents between one another seems to be free and no distinct higher category appears to have been generated. The examples in (265) show how the order of the three constituents moved out of the vP, runoja (‘poems’), lapsilleen (‘to his children’), and ääneen (‘aloud’) is flexible.

(265) a. Virtanen ei runoja lapsilleen ääneen lukisi kyllä
V NEG.3SG poem-PL-PAR child-PL-ALL-3POS voice-ILL read-COND certainly
[vP koskaan julkisesti ].
never publicly
‘Virtanen would certainly never publicly read poems out loud to his children.’

b. Virtanen ei lapsilleen runoja lukisi ääneen kyllä
V NEG.3SG child-PL-ALL-3POS poem-PL-PAR read-COND voice-ILL certainly
[vP koskaan julkisesti ].
never publicly

c. Virtanen ei ääneen lukisi kyllä runoja lapsilleen
V NEG.3SG voice-ILL read-COND certainly poem-PL-PAR child-PL-ALL-3POS
[vP koskaan julkisesti ].
never publicly

(Koskinen, 1998, p. 91)

Instead, she adopts the view that these constituents are adjoined, e.g., to TP/IP. I will not follow Koskinen on this point and will assume that the ordering of the constituents moved out of the vP is determined in the same way as the also freely ordered CLLDs realising basic PEMs are, following Rizzi (1997). In other words, they are hosted in the m-field by individual projections, TopPs, which I will refer to as PEMPs. Koskinen does, however, claim that the movement is motivated by discourse concerns, which does not conflict with my own view, as the feature responsible for the movement, m, is an IS-related feature.

In summary, Finnish moves m-marked constituents out of the comment, probably vP, the boundary of which is marked by temporal adverbs, into a special m-field, where they can be scrambled.

6.3.2 Hungarian PEMs gather in the left periphery

In Hungarian, PEMs move to the left periphery, giving rise to the phenomenon of “multiple topics” encountered in Hungarian. Like Finnish, Hungarian moves discourse-anaphoric constituents out of a given domain. Puskás (2000) argues that topics only occur to the left of the left-peripheral focus projection (referred to therein as FP). This allows an analogy to be drawn with Finnish, though the comment domain does not share the same label. While in Finnish the comment domain was the vP, in Hungarian it may be the projection immediately below FP, where the verb is normally situated. I therefore take the verb to mark the left edge of this comment domain, though I will not propose a formal label for said domain. The example in (266) from Puskás (2000) shows how multiple topics appear to the left of the focussed constituent.15

15 In fact, Büring’s butcher examples give unexpected results in Hungarian, with the butcher being more natural to the right of the verb. This could be due to further verb movement and needs further examining. The Hungarian sentences in question are shown below in this same footnote.
as expected with basic PEMs based on the behaviour of CLLDs in Italian, Hungarian PEMs are licensed in embedded contexts, such as infinitival clauses, as pointed out by Puskás (2000), where she refers to PEMs as topics. In (267), a levelet (‘the letter’) and Emőkének (‘to Emőke’) are in the left periphery of the embedded, infinitival clause.

(267) Zeta meg próbálta a levelet Emőkének HANGOSAN el olvasni.
Zeta PART try-PAST-3SG the letter-ACC Emőke-DAT aloud PART read-INF
‘Zeta tried to read the letter ALOUD to Emőke.’

In summary, Hungarian basic PEMs behave much like they do in Italian (i.e., familiar topics), except that no resumptive clitics are employed. We have seen that, like Finnish did, basic PEMs are evacuated out of the comment, the left boundary of which I assume to be marked by the verb and the operator field.

6.3.3 The m-field and the comment

At this stage, it can be stated that both Finnish and Hungarian move m-marked constituents out of a field, effectively partitioning the sentence into two parts: a field containing m-marked constituents and a field containing no m-marked constituents, which I propose to constitute the comment. The difference between the two languages in this respect constitutes the relative position of the boundary with respect to the verb. In Finnish (268a), the boundary between the comment and the m-marked field is relatively low: the verb is on the left of this field, for the most part and the boundary is marked by a temporal adverb. In Hungarian (268b), on the other hand, the boundary is at the level of the verb and is therefore relatively high.

(268) a. Finnish

K – T – V – m-field – AdvTemp – |Boundary Comment

b. Hungarian

Topic – m-field – Operator field – V – |Boundary Comment

i. Ah! Megfojtanám a mészárost!
ah MEG-strangle.1S the butcher.ACC

ii. #Ah! A mészárost megfojtanám!
ah the butcher.ACC MEG-strangle.1S
At a first glance, the only similarity we might observe is that both languages end the sentence with a comment, but if we ignore the verb position and the material on the left of the m-field, the structures converge significantly, such that the only difference between the two is the position separating the Comment boundary from the m-field. This is illustrated in (269)

(269) a. Finnish

\[ m\text{-field} - \text{Adv}_{\text{Temp}} - |\text{Boundary} \text{ Comment} \]

b. Hungarian

\[ m\text{-field} - \text{Operator field} - |\text{Boundary} \text{ Comment} \]

I propose that the temporal adverb in Finnish, which marks the comment boundary, is located in a quantificational field similar to that found in the Hungarian left periphery, as was illustrated in (249) repeated here as (270).

(270) \[ \text{CP}\left[\text{TopP}\ast\left[\text{DistP}\ast\left[\text{FocP [...]]]}\right]\right]\text{]}\]

\[ \text{Topic field} \quad \text{Quantificational field} \]

(Lipták, 2011, p. 165)

Adopting this view means that, the Kontrast position in Finnish and the position of contrastive topics in Hungarian may also be related. The only differences left would then be the highest topic (gap PEM) position in Hungarian and the position of the verb.

6.4 Contrastive PEMs

In this section, I discuss contrastive PEMs in Finnish (6.4.1) and Hungarian (6.4.2). With respect to Finnish, I present some evidence from Koskinen (1998) which shows that contrastive elements always precede basic PEMs, even in cases where the complementiser is found lower in the sentence structure. I also argue that there can only be one contrastive topic in Finnish. For Hungarian, I argue for a unique contrastive position, following Puskás (2012), situated above the m-field but below the highest topic position (which I also argue to be unique). In the last part of this section (6.4.3), I compare the sentence structures of Finnish and Hungarian and propose some significant parallelisms with respect to the quantificational positions between which the m-field is situated.

6.4.1 Contrastive PEMs in Finnish

As was discussed in sections 6.1 and 6.2, Finnish contrastive constituents are situated in a left peripheral position at the very beginning of the sentence. This is the case both for contrastive foci and contrastive topics. In other words, this is a position which does not distinguish between PEMs and non-PEMs.

Koskinen (1998) provides evidence that what she calls “focussed” constituents may appear higher than normally expected, above the complementisers jos ‘if’, kun ‘when’ and vaikka ‘although/even if’. On Koskinen’s view, the interpretation of these constituents is that
of contrastive foci. Actually, all the examples can also be interpreted as having contrastive topics, as well.

The examples in (271) show how different kinds of constituents can move to this pre-complementiser position: a nominative subject *Roland* in (271a); an indirect object *Taylorille* (‘to Taylor’) in (271b); a manner adverb *kiukkuisesti* (‘angrily’) in (271c); an infinitive *tanssia* (‘to dance’) in (271d).16

(271) a. **Roland kun/jos** kosii Elisabetiä niin hän saa kyllä rukkaset. ‘If/When *Roland* proposes to *Elizabeth*, he is sure to be rejected.’

b. **Taylorille vaikka** Sofia onkin vihainen niin Kippin kanssa hän voi silti
   ‘Although Sofia is angry at *Taylor*, she can still play with *Kip*.’

c. **Kiukkuisesti kun** koiraasi sätit, niin se oppii.
   ‘If you berate your dog *angrily*, it’ll learn.’

d. **Tanssia jos** haluat niin mene Vähtäriin.
   ‘If you want to *dance*, go to Vähtäri.’

(Koskinen, 1998, p. 64)

This does not work with all complementisers: the structure is ungrammatical with *että*, ‘that’, *jotta*, ‘that’, and *koska*, ‘because’.

(272) a. ?No, *Auli että/jotta* lähtee on itsestään selvää!
   ‘Well, it’s self-evident that *Auli* will leave!’

b. *Spagetti että* haluan minä sanoin!
   ‘I said that I want *spaghetti*!’

c. *Taylorille koska* Sofia on vihainen niin hän murjottaa.
   ‘Because Sofia is angry at *Taylor*, she’s sulking.’

(Koskinen, 1998, pp. 64-65)

Since additional “focussed” elements are possible after the complementiser, Koskinen argues that the complementiser is in C, not in the focus position below.

---

16 to *get mittens* is an idiomatic expression meaning to be rejected in Finnish.
a. **Sofia vaikka Kippille** tällä hetkellä onkin vihainen
   although Kippi-ALL this.ADE moment-ADE be.3SG-EMP angry
   niin kyllä hän huomiseksi leppyy.
   then surely 3SG tomorrow-TRAN reconcile-3SG
   ‘Although Sofia is angry at Kipi at this moment, she’ll surely be reconciled by
tomorrow.’

b. **Kippi vaikka Sofia** aamuisin onkin vihainen
   Kippi-ALL although S morning-PL-INS be.3SG-EMP angry
   niin ilta-väiksi hän leppyyy aina.
   then afternoon-TRAN 3SG reconcile-3SG always
   ‘Although Sofia is angry at Kipi in the morning, she is always reconciled by
the afternoon.’

c. **Kiukkuisesti kun koiraasi** joka kerran sätit,
   angrily if dog-PAR-2POS every time berate-2SG
   niin kyllä se siitä oppii.
   then definitely it 3SG.PAR learn-3SG
   ‘If you berate your dog angrily every time, it’ll definitely learn.’
   (Koskinen, 1998, p. 66)

Koskinen also mentions a second option: an optional strong [focus] feature could be
borne by complementisers which might trigger XP-movement to Spec-CP, which distinguishes
between [focus] and [q] features: i.e, only [focus] can raise to the pre-complementiser position.
In (274) below, while “focussed” constituents seem to be allowed in Spec-CP, as can be seen
from the fronted DPs Liisapa (‘Liisa’) in (274a) and Jussi in (274b), interrogative elements are
not permitted in the pre-complementiser position, namely: *kuka* (‘who’) in (274c); *mitä* (‘what’)
in (274d), and -kö (question particle) in (274e).

a. **No, Liisapa vaikka lähteekin, minä en taida.**
   well, L-EMP although leave-3SG-EMP I NEG-1SG think-TA
   ‘Well, although Liisa is leaving, I don’t think I will.’

b. **Jussi kun** astioita alkaa heitellä, niin olemme pulassa.
   J when dish-PL-PAR begin-3SG throw-TA then be-1PL trouble-INE
   ‘When Jussi starts to throw dishes (around), then we’re in trouble.’

c. **Olin jo valmis antamaan periksi kuka kun sieltä tulla**
   be-PAST-1SG already ready give-MA-ILL up who when there come-TA
   tohotti jos ei Kaja.
   rush-PAST.3SG if NEG.3SG K
   ‘I was all ready to give up when who did I see come rushing in if not Kaija.’

d. **Niin luulen mitä(-pä) vaikka minä asiasta tiedän.**
   so think-1SG what-PAR(-EMP) although I matter-ELA know-1SG
   ‘That’s what I think, although I don’t know much about the matter.’
In (275) below, we can see that multiple constituents are allowed before the complementiser. Koskinen takes this as evidence that the constituents are, in fact, adjoined, and have not moved there for feature-checking purposes.

(275) a. Elisabeti-ä Roland huomenna kun/jos kosi niin saa kyllä rukkaset. E-PAR R tomorrow when/if propose-3SG then get.3SG surely mittens

‘If/When Roland proposes to Elizabeth tomorrow, he’s sure to be rejected.’

b. Sofia Taylorille vaikka onkin vihainen niin Kippin kanssa hän voi silti T-ALL although be.3SG-EMP angry then K-GEN with 3SG can.3SG still

play-TA

‘Although Sofia is angry at Taylor, she can still play with Kip.’

c. Koirasiä päivitään kiukkuisesti jos/kun sätit, niin se oppii. dog-PAR-3POS daily angrily if/when berate-3SG then 3SG learn-3SG

‘If you berate your dog angrily every day, it’ll learn.’

(Koskinen, 1998, pp. 67-68, n. 70)

Koskinen’s account for this is that it is not a feature which triggers movement to Spec-CP. Instead XPs adjoin to CP to produce “emphatic focus”. This adjunction targets presupposed DPs. This adjunction is banned, however, from preceding complementisers such as ettää, ‘that’, jotta ‘that’ or koska ‘because’, due to the fact that they introduce factive clauses, while the other complementisers do not (Koskinen, 1998, p. 68).

There are some points, however, that suggest that such an adjunction route need not be the case. First, however, it would be useful to clarify some points with respect to the terminology and the interpretation of the data presented by Koskinen.

It is clear that Koskinen’s (1998) focus position refers to the Kontrast position, or Vilkuna’s (1995) K position, which was presented in section 6.2. It should therefore be kept in mind that the constituents which moved to these positions, which Koskinen describes as being “focussed” can be interpreted as either contrastive topics or contrastive “foci”. The difference being that in the second case, the rest of the sentence is most easily interpreted as being echoic, or presupposed. All the examples with constituents preceding complementisers are, at best, less than perfectly natural, although, with the exception of the complementisers introducing factive clauses, they are still far from being ungrammatical.

Only the first constituent is contrastive or, “focussed”. The contrastiveness of the first position in these cases is evident if we pay attention to which constituent is being compared with which in the sentence. For example, Koskinen’s example (275b) is actually somewhat odd precisely because the constituent Sofia seems to be acting as a contrastive topic. The sentence would be more natural if the indirect object is first, so that it can be contrasted with Kipp in the
following clause, such that Sofia is angry at Taylor, but not at Kipp. Two repairs implementing this are shown below, as (275b’) and (275b”), the difference between these two repairs being the position of the with Kipp constituent in the second clause. In both cases, the indirect object Taylorille (‘at Taylor’), which seems to be implicitly contrasted with Kippin (‘Kipp’) in the second clause, precedes the nominative Sofia, which is realised simply as a basic PEM.

(275) b’. Taylorille Sofia vaikka onkin vihainen,
Taylor-to Sofia although is.EMP angry,
niin hän voi silti leikkiä KIPPIN kanssa.
then 3SG can still play.INF Kipp.GEN with

b’’. Taylorille Sofia vaikka onkin vihainen,
Taylor-to Sofia although is.EMP angry
niin KIPPIN kanssa hän voi silti leikkiä.
then Kipp.GEN with 3SG can still play.INF

(Elsi Kaiser, p.c.)

The improvement in the felicity of these examples supports the hypothesis that the “focussed constituents” are actually a contrastive PEM followed by basic PEMs, as only the first of these can be contrastive. The constituents which follow the contrastive element appear to have the same interpretation as the presupposed DPs appearing to the left of the vP seen in section 6.3.1. It is also notable that the constituents appear in the same order when the complementiser precedes the constituents in question, as is shown in the sentence in (276).

(276) Vaikka Taylorille Sofia onkin vihainen, niin hän voi silti leikkiä KIPPIN kanssa.
although Taylor-to Sofia is.EMP angry then 3SG can still play.INF Kipp.GEN with

This may indicate that the non-factive complementisers actually originate in a lower position and, normally, move up to a position above the contrastive topic, while factive complementisers do not. In fact, the pre-complementiser constituents are still ordered as they would had they followed he complementiser, with the contrastive position at the top. In other words, it is still the same position relative to other elements in the left periphery as it would be if in K, except that the complementiser is no longer on its left.

Finnish contrastive PEMs must be associated with an operator in the comment, which must minimally be a Contr head: consequently, the contrastive focus it is associated with is exhaustive, such that none of the contextual alternative predicates apply to the contrastive PEM. In (277), where a contrastive PEM Juha (‘John’) is in the high K-position and the focus is polkupyörän (‘bicycle’), the most natural position for this narrow focus is directly after the temporal adverb aina (‘always’), as is shown in (277a-b). The example in (277b), where the narrow focus follows the less informative torilta (‘from the market’) is less felicitous.

(277) a. Juha ostaa aina POLKUPYÖRÄN torilta.
John buys always bicycle.ACC market-from
‘John always buys (just) a BICYCLE from the market.’

b. #Juha ostaa aina torilta POLKUPYÖRÄN.
John buys always market-from bicycle.ACC
‘John always buys a bicycle from the market.’
I take the above to be evidence that Finnish does have a lower K-position, which, however, may only be employed when the upper K-position is filled. I propose that Finnish contrastive topics have first moved to the m-field to the specifier of a PEMP projection and then move a further step due to the attraction of the Contr head, bearing the [contrast] feature. This first movement prevents contrastive PEMs from ever appearing at the left edge of the comment field, meaning only the higher K is ever accessible to them, unlike contrastive foci, which will first move to the lower K position. The tree below, in (278), shows how the contrastive PEM, here XP, moves out of the vP to a PEMP projection, after which it moves once more to SpecKP.

\begin{itemize}
\item (278)
\end{itemize}

6.4.2 Contrastive PEMs in Hungarian

Hungarian contrastive PEMs are realised in the left periphery, in a position that is arguably between the topmost topic, or the gap PEM, and other topics, i.e., basic PEMs. Hungarian contrastive topics have been shown to co-occur with a quantificational element later in the sentence (Szabolcsi, 1981; Kenesei, 1989; Molnár, 1998; Gyuris, 2009). Gyuris (2009) provides examples of these in (279) below, arguing that the constituents following the contrastive topics are, in every case, the semantic focus of the sentence, on the basis that they are felicitous answers to yes/no questions (d-f) or constituent questions (a-c, e, f).

(279) a. /János [FP \Mrival találkozott össze.]
John Mary.with met.3SG vm
‘John met MARY.’
Lipták (2001) observes that contrastive topics in Hungarian must always be followed by an emphatic operator, i.e., they must always be followed by a constituent which has moved to a position in the quantifier field, DistP or FP. Normal topics do not need to be followed by emphatic operators. This contrast is illustrated in (280), shows how the constituent Péter is ungrammatical if realised as a contrastive topic without an emphatic operator following it.

(280) Péter/*√Péter kapott ajándékot. (as a neutral VP)  
Péter got-3sg present-acc  
‘As for Péter, he got presents.’  

(Lipták, 2001, p. 21)

Hungarian also has a similar realisation of contrastive constituents, known as (contrastive) left dislocation (Szabolcsi, 1981; É. Kiss, 1987; Lipták, 2001). In this kind of construction, a contrastive element can be associated with a resumptive pronoun. In (281) below, the contrastive DP János can be resumed by either ő (‘he’) or az (‘that’). The interpretation of János is described by Lipták (2001) to be the same as that of a contrastive topic.

(281) √János, ő/az AJÁNDÉKOT kapott.  
János he/that present-ACC got-3SG  
‘As for János, he got a PRESENT (while someone else might have got something else than a present.’  

(Lipták, 2001, p. 12)

Gyuris (2009) argues that multiple contrastive topics can appear in the same clause, on the basis that constituents, such as universally quantified DPs, which cannot normally be a “topic” in the sense traditionally employed in the literature for Hungarian (what I now refer to as gap topics), can be pronounced with a rising pitch (282b-c).
The question to be asked is whether these second contrastive topics are truly contrastive and, if so, whether they have been attracted to a projection specific to contrastive elements or whether they are simply in their normal positions and are being marked in situ. And if we were to accept that the quantified expression minden diákot (‘every student’) is indeed contrastive, we must still ascertain whether the first constituent János is indeed contrastive not not simple a gap PEM.

In Hungarian, contrastive topics can have non-accented PEMs intervene between them and the focussed constituent, as shown in (283).

If normally non-topical universally quantified constituent can be attracted to the position for contrastive topics, then it should be possible for a non-accented topic to intervene between it and the focus. This, however, is not the case, as we can see in (284a). In fact, non-accented topics must precede the quantified expression (284b). This is made even clearer when we have a constituent which clearly occupies the focus position, such as a negation: in this case, a quantified expression, such as minden diákot (‘every student’) cannot precede the non-accented constituent, in this case János, as can be seen in (284c). Lastly, non-quantified expressions, which would otherwise have no trouble being interpreted as topics, cannot be interpreted as additional contrastive topics: i.e., there cannot be more than one contrastive topic. In (284d), it is difficult to interpret both János (‘John’) and Marit (‘Mary’) as contrastive topics.  

(282) a. /János \MIN\nden diákot megdicsért. )János unaccented(  
John every student.ACC VM.met.3SG  
‘John praised every student.’

b. /János /MIN\nden diákot \MEG\ndicsért. )János unaccented(  
John every student.ACC VM.met.3SG  
‘As for John and as for EVERY student, he did praise them/he praised them.’

c. /János minden /\DI\ákot \MEG\ndicsért. )János unaccented(  
John every student.ACC VM.met.3SG  
‘As for John and as for every STUDENT, he did praise them/he praised them.’

(283) A /\LE\ve\st [T János] [AspP \ME\G\Gette] (, de a /HÚ\ST [NegP \N\EM]).  
the soup.ACC John VM.ate but the meat.ACC not  
‘The soup, John did eat (, but the meat he did not).’

(Gyuris, 2009, p. 37)

(284) a. #/MIN\nden diákot \T János [AspP \ME\G\dz\cs\ért]. )János unaccented(  
\every student.ACC John VM.praise  
‘Every student, John did praise.’

b. János /MIN\nden diákot \N\EM dicsért meg. )János unaccented(  
John every student not praise VM  
John didn’t praise every student

c. #/MIN\nden diákot János \N\EM dicsért meg. )János unaccented(  
\every student John not praise VM

18 Many thanks to Genoveva Puskás for the acceptability judgements on the sentences in (284).
It is possible that the contrastive position attracting contrastive PEMs specifically cannot host universally quantified constituents. Another possibility is that the universally quantified constituent has already been attracted to the DistP and cannot move a second time because of that. But the most likely and the simplest solution to the issue at hand is that there can only be one contrastive topic in a given clause, and that only one position is made available to host contrastive topics. The uniqueness of contrastive topics in a given clause was also made explicit in Lipták (2001, p. 20).

Alberti and Medve (2000) discuss the phenomenon of scope inversion observed with contrastive topics in Hungarian, with the aim of supporting the the claim in (285a) as well as Kiss’s (1992) supporting claim in (285b).

   b. Principle (285a) holds in Hungarian (as early as) at Spell-Out.

    (Alberti & Medve, 2000, p. 95)

The case of narrow scope can be seen in the examples in (286) where, the sentence in (a) can be interpreted as (b) but, with a special intonation, the interpretation in (c) arises, where the focus, Marit (‘Mary’) takes scope over the quantified expression mindhárom fiúnak (‘all three boys’), such that the contrastive topic has narrower scope than the focus. This second interpretation is similar to that obtained in (d), where the focus clearly precedes the quantified expression following the verb.

(286) a. Mindhárom fiúnak (csak) Marit mutattam be. all-three boy-DAT only Mary-ACC introduced-1SG PV

    b. [QP Mindhárom fiúnak be]+[FP Marit mutattam be]+[VP be]+[VP t t pro t t ]]]] ‘It is true of each of three boys that I introduced (only) MARY to him.’
        Model A: {M → b1; M→ b2; M → b3} Q > F > VP

c. Model B: {M, Ann → b1; , Susan → b2; M, Ann, Susan → b3} ‘As for the entire set of the three boys, I introduced only Mary to all of them.’

d. [FP Marit mutattam be]+[QP mindhárom fiúnak be]+[VP be]+[VP t t pro t t ]]]] Mari-ACC introduced-1SG all-three boy-DAT PV

    ‘It is (only) Mary that I introduced to all three boys.’ F > Q > VP
        Model: {M, Ann → b1; M, Susan → b2; M, Ann, Susan → b3}

        (Alberti & Medve, 2000, p. 106)

Alberti and Medve (2000) argue that contrastive topics are located in the normal Top position and are thus sentence internal, contra the proposal made by É. Kiss (1992) where the contrastive topic is positioned in a left-dislocated position (E) outside the sentence. In the 1992 model proposed by É. Kiss, the contrastive topic is then coindexed with a representative within the sentence which is used to determine the scope of the dislocated topic. Albert and Medve point out that the representative inside the sentence is not assumed by É. Kiss to be a trace,
since she assumes constituents outside the sentence do not reach their positions via transformation.

According to Alberti and Medve, assuming contrastive topics to be sentence external entails that any constituent preceding them, such as other kinds of topics, would also then be necessarily sentence external, an undesired consequence. This is illustrated in (287a), where Péter, a normal topic, is seen to precede the contrastive topic mindhárom fiúnak (‘all three boys’). Furthermore, Alberti and Medve show that the same word order, interpretation and intonation can be obtained in analogous sentence internal non-finite constructions, which is the case in (287b). There are also issues with the sentence internal representative, which cannot remain in an argument position, which is shown in (287c), since the quantifying expression would thereby not be behaving as an operator, which it should be. With such a low position, said representative would only take scope over V and not V’ or VP. In accordance with the Universal Principle (285a) Alberti and Medve support, they argue that the operator should be structurally situated in a position c-commanding at least V’, as seen in (286d) above.

(287) a. Péter [E?? mindhárom fiúnak] [S [FP csak Marit] all-three boy-DAT only Mari-ACC
               mutattam [VP be] [V' títítí]]]
               introduced PV

‘As for the entire set of the three boys, P. introduced only Mary to all of them.’

b. [AP mindhárom fiúnak] csak Marit be mutató títítí házigazdák
               all-three boy-DAT only Mary-ACC PV introducing hosts
‘the hosts introducing only Mary to all three boys.’

c. [E Mindhárom fiúnak] [S [FP Marit mutattam [VP be] [V' títítí pro títí]]]]
               F > títí; F > VP

With respect to the interpretation of the contrastive topics, Alberti and Medve (2000) claim that the predication of contrastive topics is interpreted as being not true for at least one alternative in the contextual set. This they contrast with the interpretation of contrastive foci, which they characterise as meaning that the predicate is false for all alternatives. Their approach involves the use of powersets. Alberti and Medve also suggest that sentences with contrastive topics make a rhetorical statement about the supersets of the relative contrastive topics. In this sense, the sentences above are interpreted as saying something about the whole set of the three boys. I disagree with Alberti and Medve on this interpretation of contrastive topics, though, since it is not the case that contrastive topics communicate that the predicate should be false for at least one alternative in the contextually given set, as mentioned in section 5.2.2. I would argue that the use of the adverb csak (‘only’) and the use of quantifiers in the contrastive topics Alberti and Medve examine compromise the validity of the examples.

Alberti and Medve (2000) account for the apparent inverse scope of contrastive topics by introducing a projecting operator head opC-Top which they situate in the normal Topic position, i.e., the same position normal topics are hosted in. They argue that such an operator would draw a comparison not only with the members of the contextual set, but also the members of its powerset. I reject the necessity of resorting to power sets for contrastive topics as a whole, even though the quantified constituents Alberti and Medve use are contrastive, the scope of the contrast is only felicitous only over the quantifier, not over the whole expression. Thus, the contextual set formed is not determined based on the discourse, as with contrastive topics, but within the set of boys itself. Alberti and Medve do indeed draw their alternatives form the set of all the boys, but this is not what occurs with normal contrastive topics, where the alternative
members of the contextual set need not bear any relation to the mentioned member besides belonging to this set: they is fully determined by the context. The use of quantifiers, therefore, limits the scope of the contrast head.

From the above, we have ascertained that Hungarian has but one contrastive topic position, which is situated among the other topics, above the quantificational field. I will follow Molnár (1998) and Puskás (2012) and argue that this unique contrastive topic (PEM) position, which she calls CTopP, must be situated between the gap PEM and the other basic PEMS. Puskás argues that CTopP is a position in the left periphery which is situated between DistP and TopP. I will now argue that multiple contrastive topics are not permitted within the same clause and basic PEMS follow contrastive PEMS but not quantified constituents, which are located in DistP. It therefore follows that basic PEMS are situated between DistP and CTopP. Puskás assumes that the head of CTopP contains a focus operator and an uninterpretable feature $\text{iCT-Foc}$, which needs to be matched with an element with its interpretable counterpart $\text{uCT-Foc}$, borne by contrastive topics. In contrast to Puskás’s approach, we will assume that the same feature is being attracted for exhaustive foci and contrastive topics, namely [contrast].

In (288a), we have a sentence with a negation and three non-contrastive constituents are situated in the left periphery. In the three examples following the first example, the second constituent Marit (288b, ‘Mary’), the first constituent János (288c, ‘John’), and the third constituent tegnap (288c, ‘yesterday’), receive a contrastive intonational contour. In (288b), the first constituent János is difficult to interpret discourse anaphorically, indicating that it is a gap PEM: this also shows that basic PEMS may not precede contrastive topics. In (288c), the second and third constituents must be interpreted as discourse anaphoric and are difficult to interpret as gap PEMS. The sentence in the last example, (288d), is somewhat degraded: the reason for this is that the first and second constituents, János and Marit, are trying to be interpreted as gap PEMS, but there may only be one gap PEM per clause.

(288) a. János Marit tegnap \NEM dicsért \NEM dicsерт meg.
John Mary.ACC yesterday not praise.DEF VM
‘John didn’t praise Mary yesterday.’

b. János /Marit tegnap \NEM dicsért \NEM dicsért \NEM dicsért \NEM dicsерт meg.
John Mary.ACC yesterday not praise.DEF VM
‘Mary, John DIDN’T praise yesterday.’

c. /János Marit tegnap \NEM dicsért \NEM dicsért \NEM dicsерт meg.
John Mary.ACC yesterday not praise.DEF VM
‘John DIDN’T praise Mary yesterday.’

d. #János Marit /tegnap \NEM dicsért \NEM dicsертmeg.
John Mary.ACC yesterday not praise.DEF VM
‘Yesterday, John DIDN’T praise Mary.’

We can therefore revise Lipták’s (2011) sketch of the Hungarian left periphery as shown in (289), such that the topic field has two special, unique positions, for one gap PEM and one contrastive PEM, before the rest of the topics, i.e., the basic PEMS. The position hosting gap PEMS I assume to be a RefP, in the sense of Beghelli (1995), Beghelli and Stowell (1997), and Szabolcsi (1997).
In this section, I have argued that Hungarian has but one position available for contrastive topics and that this position is located between RefP, which can host a gap PEM, and the \( m \)-field, which is, in turn, above the Quantificational field represented by DistP and FocP. Contrastive PEMs in Hungarian, as in Finnish, would then first move out of the comment field to the \( m \)-field to the specifier of a PEMP projection. Next, the Contr feature would be attracted to the specifier of CTopP, in the same way as the Finnish contrastive PEM is moved to the specifier of K.

(290)
6.4.3 Functional boundaries

Comparing the sentence structures of Finnish and Hungarian, shown in (291) we can see that, the m-field in both languages, assuming the Finnish “default topic” position to be part of the m-field in Finnish, sits between two positions (underlined in the structures) which can be argued to have quantificational properties. What has not been shown in the structures below is the position of the verb in either language and the highest topic position in Hungarian.

(291) a. Finnish

Kontrast – (Default) Topic – m-field – AdjTemp – |Boundary Comment

b. Hungarian

C-Topic – m-field – Operator field – |Boundary Comment

It is important to remember that both languages tolerate only one contrastive topic and, in both cases, basic PEMs can only follow the contrastive PEM. There is one more significant difference between Finnish and Hungarian which needs to be commented on, which is the relative flexibility of the Finnish position hosting contrastive elements, compared to the strict separation of contrastive PEMs and non-PEMs in Hungarian. That is to say, Finnish seemingly has but one position which attracts both contrastive topics and contrastive foci, while Hungarian hosts contrastive topics and contrastive foci in separate positions.

If we assume, however, that contrastive PEMs must always be followed by an emphatic operator, then it is possible that Finnish has a position which has been overlooked. Let us suppose there is a low focus position in Finnish, akin to that described by Belletti (2001), which is located at the edge of vP, i.e., the comment. This position would therefore be at the boundary between the comment and the temporal adverb position, which would correspond to the focus position in Hungarian, which is also situated between the operator field and the comment. In (292), the structures are compared once more, taking this new position into account.

(292) a. Finnish

Kontrast – (Default) Topic – m-field – AdjTemp – Low Focus – |Boundary Comment

b. Hungarian

C-Topic – m-field – Operator field – Focus – |Boundary Comment

This low focus position may be a position which attracts IS-related functional features, such as the Contr feature or negation, for example. In the case of Finnish, cyclic movement could take place, as with wh-elements, which would move any contrastive element to the higher K-position (Kontrast), whenever this position is available. In Hungarian, on the other hand, the higher position might only be available to PEMs, barring non-PEMs from moving to the higher position.

Another possibility is that Finnish simply lacks the low focus position and that the higher contrast position attracts the highest IS-relevant operator. In both languages, a contrastive PEM would always be closer than a non-PEM, given that the m-field the m-marked constituent will have moved to (or base-generated in) is located above the other operator fields, meaning that
you would never have a configuration where a contrastive focus moves past a contrastive topic. Hungarian non-PEM operators would not move to the contrastive topic position since they would have their features checked either at the Focus position or in the operator field.

6.5 Gap PEMs

In this section, I will first show that Finnish and Hungarian differ with respect to the realisation of gap PEMs. In Finnish, gap PEMs have no dedicated syntactic position, as they do in Hungarian. In both languages, however, gap PEMs must precede contrastive PEMs when these are present. In Hungarian, gap PEMs are realised before all other PEMs, at the far left edge of the left periphery.

6.5.1 Gap PEMs in Finnish

Gap PEMs, or aboutness shift topics, are not targeted by any specific syntactic mechanisms in Finnish, though they do receive some extra phonological prominence. That is to say, they do not appear to raise to a specific position other than that which other PEMs seem to do. Whether there is some non-syntactic marking in Finnish to indicate a discontinuity in discourse will require a careful phonological survey to measure any extra prominence there may be on new topics. In a sentence such as (293), the first constituent may be interpreted as a gap PEM, but could also be interpreted as a basic PEM.

(293) Loukkaantunut merirosvo hiipi veteen.
injured pirate creep.PAST.3SG water.into
‘The injured pirate crept into the water.’

Furthermore, sentences with contrastive PEMs cannot successfully interpret a second constituent as a gap PEM: this is because the Finnish contrastive PEM occupies the highest position and gap PEMs need to be the closest PEM to ForceP. In (294), the underlined constituent cannot be interpreted as a gap topic and can only be a basic PEM. This is also evident due to its being necessarily destressed.

(294) Omenan loukkaantunut merirosvo halkoi TERÄVÄLLÄ MIEKALLA.
apple.ACC injured pirate split.PAST sharp.with sword.with
‘The apple, the/*an injured pirate split with a sharp sword.’

Thus, Finnish gap PEMs do not have a dedicated syntactic position, but are still constrained by the presence of contrastive PEMs, which prevent PEMs following them from being interpreted as gap PEMs. If we assume that gap PEMs are attracted to a RefP projection, it may be that in languages such as Finnish, RefP is somehow occupied when the Kontrast position is filled.

6.5.2 Gap PEMs in Hungarian

The constituents which have generally been referred to as topics in the literature on Hungarian are clearly gap PEMs. These PEMs have a designated position at the very beginning of the clause, in a position known in the literature as TopP. They constitute aboutness shift topics in the sense described by Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and Bianchi and Frascarelli...
(2010), but it is clear that, once again, they are better interpreted as marking discontinuity in discourse.

We can use Lambrecht’s (1994) Identifiability Scale to see if Hungarian gap PEMs behave as aboutness shift topics have been shown to do in section 5.1.3. where an unanchored, discourse inactive constituent, i.e., a brand new constituent, is banned for any kind of topic, on the grounds that in order for the topic to carry out its function, the hearer must be able to identify what entity the comment is being made about. While the sentence in (295a) is mostly acceptable, as the DP is not necessarily interpreted as being situated in TopP, but in DistP just below it. In (295b), fronting the constituent a táskámat (‘a bag’) to the left peripheral focus position tries to force the brand-new unanchored DP egy ember (‘a man’) to be be interpreted as an aboutness shift topic, resulting in an infelicitous sentence.

(295) a. Egy ember ellopta a táskámat.
     a man vm.stole the bag.acc
     ‘A man stole the bag.’

b. #Egy ember a táskámat lopta el.
     a man the bag.acc stole vm
     ‘It was a bag that a man stole.’

Based on the results of the survey discussed in section 6.6, we can state that even gap PEMs can be realised in embedded clauses: in particular, they can be realised in central adverbial clauses.

As we saw in section 6.4.2, the position hosting gap PEMs is unique and must precede any contrastive topic in the sentence. This is illustrated by the examples in (296c-d), repeated here as (296a-b). In (296a), the constituents between the contrastive topic János (‘John’) and the negation nem (‘not’) can only be interpreted as discourse anaphoric basic PEMs: they cannot be gap PEMs. In (296b), the constituents János (‘John’) and Marit (‘Mary’), which precede the contrastive topic tegnap (‘yesterday’), cause the sentence to sound unnatural, as only one gap PEM is allowed in the sentence and only gap PEMs may precede contrastive PEMs.

(296) a. /János Marit tegnap \NEM dicsért meg.
     John     Mary.ACC yesterday not praise VM
     ‘John DIDN’T praise Mary yesterday.’

b. #János Marit /tegnap \NEM dicsért meg.
     John     Mary.ACC yesterday not praise VM
     ‘Yesterday, John DIDN’T praise Mary.’

Thus, Hungarian reserves a syntactic position for gap PEMs, appearing in the same position as they would in, for example, Italian: preceding contrastive PEMs and basic PEMs. Such a position is not available for Finnish, which may only employ a purely phonological cue to identify gap PEMs, though even this is blocked if the candidate PEM is situated below a contrastive PEM. Making a further generalisation, we could assume that the positions hosting Contr heads are similar, albeit in different parts of the structure. Their function is not only to host contrastive constituents, but also other constituents with quantificational features, although a survey of whether there is an internal systematicity in which features are attracted in a given language will require further research. Thus, I propose here that the Finnish K-position is the same position as the Hungarian position hosting contrastive topics, CtopP, and
the same kind of position as the Hungarian Focus position. Furthermore, if we leave aside the position of the verb, there is nothing left to distinguish the Finnish default topic position and the \( m \)-field. The resulting structures for Finnish and Hungarian are visible in (297a-b) below. The relative positions of the verbs in each language are marked in parentheses below the structures.

(297) a.  
\[ \text{Finnish} \]
\[ \text{Gap} - K - m\text{-field} - \text{Adv}_{\text{Temp}} - K - \text{Boundary Comment} \]
\[ (V) \]

b.  
\[ \text{Hungarian} \]
\[ \text{Gap} - K - m\text{-field} - \text{Operators} - K - \text{Boundary Comment} \]
\[ (V) \]

At this stage, we have covered gap PEMs, contrastive PEMs and basic PEMs for both Finnish and Hungarian. I have argued that the behaviour of basic PEMs and contrastive PEMs is essentially the same in Finnish and Hungarian, with the exception that only in Finnish do contrastive foci move up to the same position as contrastive topics do. Only in Hungarian are the two K positions, distinguished in this respect. It is worth noting that in both cases, the K hosting contrastive foci is on the left of the verb. Gap PEMs are clearly present in Hungarian, but this is not so clear in Finnish. It appears that Finnish does not have an independent RefP position available for gap PEMs, which I cannot account for. This issue I will leave for future research.

6.6 Survey comparing Aboutness Shift Topics, Contrastive Topics and Contrastive Foci

In this section, I will describe a pilot survey which was carried out with the aim of comparing the behaviour of the contrastive topics and aboutness-shift topics discussed in Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007) and Bianchi and Frascarelli (2010) in Finnish and Hungarian, comparing them with the behaviour of fronted foci (here referred to as contrastive foci). In particular, I designed this survey to see whether the interpretation of contrastive topics (contrastive PEMs), aboutness shift topics (gap PEMs) and contrastive foci differed in Finnish and Hungarian depending on whether they are in the matrix clause or a central adverbial clause. Though the focus of the survey was on topics, I included contrastive foci due to its being hosted in the same position in Finnish. The questions investigated are shown below:

A. Does the difference in topic position in the languages affect the interpretation of gap PEMs?

B. Are gap PEMs equally acceptable in central adverbial clauses in Finnish and Hungarian?

C. Are contrastive PEMs equally acceptable in central adverbial clauses in Finnish and Hungarian?
D. Are contrastive foci equally acceptable in central adverbial clauses in Finnish and Hungarian?

Before carrying out the survey, I had already gathered some native speaker intuitions on these structures, by discussing similar sentences with informants, which suggested that both contrastive PEMs and contrastive foci should be accepted in Finnish, see also Jokilehto (2015), and Hungarian. In contrast, I was expecting gap PEMs to be degraded in both languages.

The survey collected the data from 2 populations: 96 Hungarian participants and 55 Finnish participants. Two participants from each group were disregarded due to not being mothertongue speakers of the respective languages, leaving 94 Hungarian speakers and 53 Finnish speakers: 147 participants in total. The survey data collected consisted in grammaticality judgements given on a 7 point Likert scale, where 1 is the worst score and 7 the best. The survey consisted of three sections: a participant data form, a practice round of three questions and the survey proper.

The participant data form collected the participant’s name, age, sex, and verified whether the participant was a native speaker of the language in question. A total of 2646 observations were made, consisting of 441 from each test condition, of which 159 were made of FI speakers and 282 of HU speakers.

The practice round allowed participants to familiarise themselves with the features of the survey. The survey proper consisted in (18) trials in random order, witnessing each of the key lexical items in the sentences only once during the entire survey, and producing 3 data points for each of the 6 conditions, from a pool of 54 possible trials, rotated for each participant, each trial was separated by at least one filler (20 fillers in total). The conditions tested were numbered as shown in (298) below.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Condition} & \text{Main Clause} & \text{Embedded Clause} \\
\hline
\text{Contrastive PEM} & 1 & 4 \\
\text{Contrastive focus} & 2 & 5 \\
\text{Gap PEM} & 3 & 6 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

The trials were text-based, with the emphasis marked using italics. The participants were instructed to stress the words thus marked and evaluate whether the sentence sounded natural in the context given. Samples of the some of the different contexts are given below in (299) for Finnish (See Chapter 9 for the full list of questions in Finnish and Hungarian).

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
(299) & \text{Finnish} \\
\hline
\text{Contrastive PEM in matrix clause} & \\
\hline
a. & \text{Anna kysyy Eetulta milloin Mikko tykkää kuunnella musiikkia.} \\
& \text{Eetu: Se riippuu siitä mistä on kysymys... } \text{klassista musiikkia} \\
& \text{hän tykkää kuunnella kun matkustaa junalla.} \\
& \text{Anna asks Eetu when Mikko likes to listen to music.} \\
& \text{Eetu: It depends... } \text{Classical music, Mikko likes to listen to when he travels by train.}
\end{array}
\]
Contrastive Focus in matrix clause


Luukas: Aleksi lopettaa saksan tentit ennen toukokuun loppua.
Santtu hämmästelee ja sanoo: Santtu: Ranskan tentit Aleksi lopettaa ennen toukokuun loppua.

Veera, Santtu and Luukas are talking about Aleksi’s exams. Veera asks Santtu when Aleksi finishes his exams. Luukas tries to answer the question before Santtu can reply.


Luukas: Aleksi lopettaa saksan tentit ennen toukokuun loppua.
Santtu hämmästelee ja sanoo: Santtu: Ranskan tentit Aleksi lopettaa ennen toukokuun loppua.

Aboutness shift topics in matrix clause

c. Hanna on kertomassa Annille millainen Oskar oli lapsena.


Hanna is telling Anni about what Oskar was like when he was a child.

Hanna: He was so sweet. Always friendly and generous. It was so easy for him to make friends in kindergarten and at school. He’d play all kinds of games and was very imaginative. The only thing was that he was rather clumsy. The toy car Oskar broke when it was still brand new. It had been given to him by his uncle as a present a few weeks earlier and had already become his favourite toy.
The range of the answers given varied widely from participant to participant. The trellis charts in (301) below shows the above data with the relevant ranges. Conditions 1-3 represent the matrix clause sentences, in the order contrastive topic (1), contrastive focus (2) and aboutness shift topic (3). Conditions 4-6 represent the same phenomena in central adverbial clauses: contrastive topic (4), contrastive focus (5) and aboutness shift topic (6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>FINNISH</th>
<th>HUNGARIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 MC-CT</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.893082</td>
<td>5.358156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 MC-CF</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.446541</td>
<td>5.925532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MC-AT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.635220</td>
<td>5.404255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 EC-CT</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.232704</td>
<td>5.634752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 EC-CF</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.232704</td>
<td>5.209220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 EC-AT</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.817610</td>
<td>5.489362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(300)
The wide ranges encountered in both Finnish and Hungarian suggest that the medium through which the survey was carried out made it difficult for participants to properly interpret the test sentences or reproduce the appropriate intonations in their heads. Regardless, it appears than a significant number of participants was still able to answer in a consistent manner, with clear differences in the means. In Hungarian, despite the wide range, the means for all of the responses was relatively high, with slightly better responses for contrastive foci in matrix clauses. In contrast, Finnish participants found it significantly more difficult to interpret the embedded clause contexts. With respect to the matrix clause conditions, contrastive topics and contrastive foci were found to be more natural than aboutness shift topics.

The degradation of gap PEMs, or aboutness shift topics, in matrix clauses was unexpected, but a careful examination of the Finnish sentences employed suggests that the reason for this degradation was not because of an unavailability of gap PEMs, but rather the use of an R-expression when a pronoun would have been more natural. This is the case in (302a), where Oskar refers to a discourse prominent entity which did not license a full R-expression. Even then, simply replacing the R-expression with a pronoun is stilted, as can be seen in (302b) since the pronoun seems to be a better candidate for the pre-verbal (non-contrastive) position than the discourse-new leluauton (‘toy car’). The best option in this case is to place the pronoun in the pre-verbal position and leave the discourse new leluauton below the verb, as is shown in (302c).

(302) a. #Leluauton rikkoi Oskar kun se oli vielä ihkauusi. 
   toy-car-ACC broke Oskar when it was still brand-new
   'Oskar broke the toy car when it was still brand new.'

b. #Leluauton rikkoi hän kun se oli vielä ihkauusi. 
   toy-car-ACC broke he when it was still brand-new

c. Hän rikkoi leluauton kun se oli vielä ihkauusi. 
   he broke toy-car-ACC when it was still brand-new

This issue was not noticeable in Hungarian, as the test sentences employed in that case took into account the fact that Hungarian is a full pro-drop language, unlike Finnish, and can realise third person subjects with a null pro.

This is indeed an important difference between Hungarian and Finnish. While Hungarian is fully pro-drop, comparable to pro-drop in Italian or Spanish, Finnish is at best a partial pro-drop language, like Hebrew or Brazilian Portuguese, or a non-pro-drop language, like English, German or French, as will be explained below. This duplicity in pro-drop properties in Finnish seems to correspond to the distinction between “formal” or Standard Finnish (S-Finnish, yleiskieli, “common language”) and Colloquial Finnish (C-Finnish, puhekieli, “spoken language”). Generally speaking, S-Finnish is not only the written language but also the language used in formal situations, such as political speeches, courts, etc. C-Finnish is, on the other hand, used in all less-than-formal occasions. C-Finnish varies, though around Finland, but the most prevalent form of C-Finnish is the variety spoken in the Greater Helsinki area.

A crucial difference between S-Finnish and C-Finnish is that while Standard Finnish drops 1st and 2nd person pronouns, qualifying as a partial pro-drop language, Colloquial Finnish does not do this, realising all pronouns except in the case of the impersonal verb form, which is also used for the 1st person plural in C-Finnish, and in the case of referential pro-drop in embedded clause, when a controller is found the superordinate clause (303), as described by Holmberg (to appear). The phonologically null subject can have either a subject or an object as its controller, though preferably the subject, except when a suitable context facilitates the
object reading (303a). The null subject need not have the same case as its antecedent (303b). Lastly, Holmberg argues that the bigger DP Jussin äiti (‘Jussi’s mother’) prevents co-reference with Jussin due to a locality effect, as can be seen in (303c), intervening between the null subject and the smaller candidate DP Jussin, an effect which disappears if the embedded subject is spelled out, though Holmberg points out that this point concerns mainly S-Finnish.

(303) a. Leila1 muistutti Mattia2 että Ø1/2 oli jo käynyt ullakolla. Matti reminded Matti.PAR that she/he had already visited attic.ADE ‘Laila reminded Matti that she/he had already been in the attic.

b. Marjaa1 harmittaa ettei (hän1) voinut tulla aikaisemmin. Marja.PAR annoys that.NEG she could come earlier ‘It annoys Marja that she couldn’t come earlier.’

c. [Jussin2 äiti]1 sanoo että Ø1/*2 aikoo ostaa uuden auton. Jussi’s mother says that she/he intends to buy a new car ‘Jussi’s mother says that she intends to buy a new car.’

(Holmberg, to appear, pp. 8-9)

In contrast to Finnish, Hungarian is consistently a pro-drop language, like Italian, only realising subject pronouns when they are stressed, e.g., due to contrastivity. Because of this difference, I decided to put the third person referents in the Hungarian test sentences in parentheses, in order to indicate who the intended subject was, while at the same time situating the expression where it would be located had it been pronounced. Such a test sentence is illustrated in (304), where the third person subject, Vili, is indicated between parentheses.

(304) Klasszikus zenét (Vili) szinte állandóan hallgat. classical music-ACC Vili almost constantly listens ‘Classical music, Vili listens to almost constantly.’

Another cause for concern was the degraded acceptability of Finnish contrastive elements in embedded clauses, which has been judged to be acceptable by native speakers outside of the survey. This suggests that Finnish speakers may be more reliant on phonological cues, in addition to the syntactic position, than Hungarian speakers, in interpreting fronted constituents in central adverbial clauses. It would therefore be advisable to set up a new survey which presents the participants with auditory test sentences, such that the phonological cues are available to them, in order to obtain a more accurate result.

The issues with respect to the realisation of gap PEMs, due to complications arising from the partiality of Finnish pro-drop and the preference of pronouns in the topic position make it impossible for the survey to reliably answer questions A and B, namely, whether the difference in topic position in the languages affects the interpretation of gap PEMs, and whether gap PEMs are equally acceptable central adverbial clauses in Finnish and Hungarian. We were able to ascertain that, according to the results, Hungarian gap PEMs can be realised in central adverbial clauses, although a follow up survey which can properly present the phonological properties of the test sentences is advisable. As for questions C and D, Hungarian appears to accept contrastive PEMs and contrastive foci without regard for the clause type, while Finnish speakers were, on average, not very happy with contrastive constituents in central adverbial clauses.
I have no doubt that a proper survey using recorded and carefully manipulated test sentences is highly advisable, due to the significant difference between the survey participants' answers, particularly the Finnish speakers, and the judgements given by native speaker informants. The greatest difficulty in this kind of survey is without a doubt the complexity of the contexts which need to be set up in order, but the workload can be diminished by concentrating on one or two test conditions, rather than the six employed in this pilot survey. Furthermore, the test sentences for gap PEMs would have to be rethought to see if the preference for pronouns in the topic position can somehow be controlled for.

Chapter 7. Conclusion

In this work, I have taken some of the insights from the pragmatic framework of Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1986; 1987; 2002; Wilson & Sperber, 2002) and extended them to Information Structure. In particular, the comment in utterances is by default informative, or relevant in the sense of Strawson (1964) and Lambrecht (1994). I propose that the basic informativeness of comments takes over the most basic semantic properties of foci.

For the structure of the left periphery, I adopt assumptions from cartographic approaches. Topics, I argue, belong to a larger class of entities, processing effort minimisers (PEMs) which are merged with a syntactic feature \( m \), distinguishing them from the comment and allowing their extraction or elision from it. These PEMs have the communicative function of aiding the hearer to identify the relevance of the comment. I impugn the property of aboutness, which has been the mainstay for the characterisation of topics, is an emergent phenomenon due to the relationship between the informative nucleus of the utterance, the comment, and PEMs, which reduce its processing effort. The most basic requirement for topichood is that of identifiability (Lambrecht, 1994), which is achieved through the discourse or via anchoring.

The most basic type of PEM is discourse anaphoric, corresponding to the kind of topics described as being Given, Familiar or Continuing. The feature realising basic PEMs is \( m \), which is attracted to to the specifier of a PEMP projection, analogous to Rizzi’s TopP. Contrastive topics are contrastive PEMs, which are \( m \)-marked constituents that are also merged with a syntactic head Contr, projected by a [contrast] feature, which introduces a function, such that its complement is a member of a set, which is determined on the basis of the discourse. This Contr head I propose to be the same which realises contrastive foci, which I assume not to be merged with the \( m \) feature. The [contrast] feature is in both cases attracted to the specifier of a KP projection, of which there are two: one in the left periphery and one at the edge of the comment, which is likely to be Belletti’s (2001) low Focus position. Both basic PEMs and contrastive PEMs rely on the discourse in order to determine their referent: the former directly, the second via the contextual set it is related to through the contrast function. Aboutness shift topics are gap PEMs which are PEMs merged with a gap feature that allows them to move to a high position, in the specifier of RefP. Their movement to RefP allows these kinds of PEMs to refer outside of the discourse. RefP itself is a projection which allows the PEM to search for a referent outside the discourse.

I also propose that the Contr head is associated with an intonational cue, which is fed to the phonology module. I employ evidence from mainly Japanese to show that, adopting a Nanosyntactic approach to spellout, the fact that contrastive intonation falls on the grammatical particle following the DP can be accounted for if we assume that particles such as those found in Japanese are spelt out by a lexical item which includes the Contr head in its L(exical)-tree. The difference between languages where the contrastive intonation is associated with the entire DP rather than with a particle following it is therefore due to the suprasegmental intonational
cue associating (late) with the DP in the former languages, while in Japanese this cue is bound to the grammatical particles’ segmental representation, which forces Spell-Out driven movement to occur.

Turning to Finnish and Hungarian, I show that despite the surface differences in the realisation of their topics, both languages treat basic PEMs and contrastive PEMs in the same manner. They move all PEMs out of the comment field and front contrastive constituents to their respective KP projections. I equate the Finnish Kontrast position with the Hungarian Contrastive Topic position, but also posit a lower K position in Finnish which corresponds to the Hungarian Focus position. The lower K positions are used for contrastive constituents which are not m-marked in Hungarian, but only used when the upper K position is unavailable in Finnish. With regard to gap PEMs, I conclude that Finnish lacks special position for gap PEMs to move to, as Spec-RefP is unavailable. In contrast, Hungarian does have a position, RefP, available for gap PEMs and can therefore realise them unproblematically.
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Chapter 9. Appendix – Survey questions

9.1 Notes

This appendix contains the survey questions (including fillers) for the surveys carried out for Finnish and Hungarian. The questions are grouped into the item set, each of which consists of six conditions: 1 CT main (contrastive PEM in main clause); 2 CF main (contrastive focus in main clause); 3 AT main (gap PEM in main clause); 4 CT sub (contrastive PEM in central adverbial clause); 5 CF sub (contrastive focus in central adverbial clause); 6 AT sub (gap PEM in central adverbial clause). The fillers are numbered and the expected judgement for each is also noted.

9.2 Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>1 CT main</th>
<th>Anna kysyy Eetulta milloin Mikko tykkää kuunnella musiikkia.</th>
<th>1 CT main</th>
<th>Anna asks Eetu when Mikko likes to listen to music.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eetu: Se riippuu siitä mistä on kysymys: klassista musiikkia hän tykkää kuunnella kun matkustaa junalla.</td>
<td>Eetu: It depends… <em>Classical music</em>, Mikko likes to listen when he travels by train.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 CF main</td>
<td>Anna, Eetu ja Mikko puhuvat Laurasta. Anna kysyy Eetulta milloin Laura tykkää kuunnella musiikkia. Mikko yrittää vastata ennen Eetua.</td>
<td>2 CF main</td>
<td>Anna, Mikko and Eetu are talking about Laura. Anna asks Mikko when Laura likes to listen to music. Eetu tries to answer before Mikko can reply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mikko: Laura tykkää kuunnella rokkia junassa. Eetu hämmästee ja sanoo: Eetu: <em>Klassista musiikkia</em> Laura tykkää kuunnella junassa.</td>
<td>Eetu: Laura likes to listen to Rock music when she travels by train. Mikko rolls his eyes and says: <em>Classical music</em>, Laura likes to listen to when she travels by train.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 A-Topic Main</td>
<td>Mikko on kertomassa Annalle Eetun harrastuksista. Mikko: Eetu on aina ollut kiinnostunut taiteesta. Jopa lapsena, hän oli todella innostunut esittämisestä. Hiljattain hän kirjoittautui draamaopistoon opiskellakseen osa-aikaisesti filmiä ja teatteria, ja nyt hän on valmistelemassa roolia kreikkalaiseen tragediaan, jota hänen luokkansa on tuottamassa. Mutta, kuten tiedät, sitä hän todella rakastaa. Hänestä se siis kannattaa vaikka se vie melkoisesti aikaa hänen työstään. Klassista musiikkia kuuntelee Eetu lähes</td>
<td>3 A-Topic Main</td>
<td>Mikko is telling Anna about Eetu’s hobbies. Mikko: Eetu has always been very interested in the arts. Even as a child, he was really interested in performing. He recently enrolled in a drama college to study film and theatre part-time and is now preparing a role in a Greek tragedy his class is organising. So drama is an important part of his life now. But, you know, that’s what he loves. So he feels it’s worth it even though it takes a lot of time away from his work. <em>Classical music</em>, Eetu listens to almost constantly. He also plays the violin and used to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CT sub</td>
<td>Mikko kertoo Annalle mitä Eetu tuntee, kun kuuntelee musiikkia. <strong>Mikko:</strong> <em>Kun klassista musiikkia Eetu kuuntelee, kuvia vihreistä laitumista tulee hänen mieleensä.</em> play in an orchestra until he graduated from school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CF sub</td>
<td>Eetu, Anna ja Mikko keskustelevat musiikista. Anna kysyy Eetulta mitä Laura tuntee, kun kuuntelee musiikkia. Mikko vastaa kysymykseen ennen kun Eetu ehtii. <strong>Mikko:</strong> <em>Kun Laura kuuntelee räppiä, kuvia vihreistä laitumista tulee hänen mieleensä.</em> Eetu hämmästelee ja sanoo: <strong>Eetu:</strong> <em>Kun klassista musiikkia Laura kuuntelee, kuvia vihreistä laitumista tulee hänen mieleensä.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A-Topic Sub</td>
<td>Mikko on kertomassa Annalle Eetun harrastuksista. <strong>Mikko:</strong> <em>Eetu on aina ollut hyvin kiinnostunut taiteesta. Jopa lapsena, hän oli todella innostunut esittämistä. Hiljattain hän kirjoittautui draamaopistoon opiskellakseen osa-aikaisesti filmiä ja teatteria, ja nyt hän on valmistelemassa roolia kreikkalaiseen tragediaan, jota hänen luokkansa on tuottamassa. Siten, draama on nyt tärkeä osa hänen elämäänsä. Mutta, kuten tiedät, sitä hän todella rakastaa. Hänestä se siis kannattaa vaikka se vie melkoisesti aikaa hänen työstään.</em> Kun klassista musiikkia kuuntelee Eetu, hän ei voi olla samalla hymisemättä koska hän rakastaa sitä niin paljon. Hän soittaa myös viulua ja tapasi soittaa orkesterissa kunnes valmistui koulusta. <strong>Mikko</strong> is telling Anna about Eetu’s hobbies. <strong>Mikko:</strong> <em>Eetu has always been very interested in the arts. Even as a child, he was really interested in performing. He recently enrolled in a drama college to study film and theatre part-time and is now preparing a role in a Greek tragedy his class is organising. So drama is an important part of his life now. But, you know, that’s what he loves. So he feels it’s worth it even though it takes a lot of time away from his work. When Classical music Eetu listens to, he can’t help but hum along because he loves it so much. He also plays the violin and used to play in an orchestra until he graduated from school.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| B | Veera kysyy Santulta, milloin Aleksi lopettaa tentit. **Santtu:** *Se riippuu tenteistä. *Ranskan tentit* Aleksi lopettaa ennen toukokuun loppua.* |
| 2 CF Main | Veera asks Santtu when Aleksi finishes his exams. **Santtu:** *It depends…the French exams, Aleksi finishes before the end of May.* |

**Luukas:** Aleksi lopettaa saksan tentit ennen toukokuun loppua.

Santtu hämästelee ja sanoo:

**Santtu:** **Ranskan tentit** Aleksi lopettaa ennen toukokuun loppua.

---

3 A-Topic Main

Veera on kertomassa Santulle kuinka Aleksipärjää opinnoissaan.

**Veera:** Aleksitodella kovasti töitä opinnoissaan. Koko vuoden hän varmisti käyvänsä joka seminaarin ja luennon. Hän jopa otti ylimääräisiä oppitunteja yksityisesti kaikista aineista joita opiskeli. Ranskan tentit lopettaa Aleksi ennen toukokuun loppua. Ne ovat viimeiset tentit jotka hänen on tehtävä ennen kuin voi mennä lomalle, mutta ne ovat myös kaikkein vaikeimpia hänelle.

---

4 CT sub

Veera selittää Santulle miten Aleksin vanhemmat juhlivat jokaista hänen tentiään erilailailla.

**Veera:** Kun **ranskan tentit** Aleksi lopettaa, hänen vanhempansa järjestävät Pariisilaisen aperitiivin.

---

5 CF sub

Veera ja Santtu selittävät Luukasille miten Aleksin vanhemmat juhlivat jokaista hänen tentiään erilailailla.

**Veera:** Kun Aleksi lopettaa saksan tentit, vanhempansa järjestävät Pariisilaisen aperitiivin.

Santtu hämästeli ja keskeytti:

**Santtu:** Kun **ranskan tentit** Aleksi lopettaa, hänen vanhempansa järjestävät Pariisilaisen aperitiivin.

---

6 A-Topic Sub

Veera on kertoma Santulle kuinka Aleksipärjää opinnoissaan.

**Veera:** Aleksitodella kovasti töitä opinnoissaan. Koko vuoden hän varmisti käyvänsä joka seminaarin ja luennon. Hän jopa otti ylimääräisiä oppitunteja yksityisesti kaikista aineista joita opiskeli.

---


**Luukas:** Aleksi lopettaa saksan tentit ennen toukokuun loppua.

Santtu hämästelee ja sanoo:

**Santtu:** **Ranskan tentit** Aleksi lopettaa ennen toukokuun loppua.

---

3 A-Topic Main

Veera on kertomassa Santulle kuinka Aleksipärjää opinnoissaan.

**Veera:** Aleksitodella kovasti töitä opinnoissaan. Koko vuoden hän varmisti käyvänsä joka seminaarin ja luennon. Hän jopa otti ylimääräisiä oppitunteja yksityisesti kaikista aineista joita opiskeli. Ranskan tentit lopettaa Aleksi ennen toukokuun loppua. Ne ovat viimeiset tentit jotka hänen on tehtävä ennen kuin voi mennä lomalle, mutta ne ovat myös kaikkein vaikeimpia hänelle.

---

4 CT sub

Veera selittää Santulle miten Aleksin vanhemmat juhlivat jokaista hänen tentiään erilailailla.

**Veera:** Kun **ranskan tentit** Aleksi lopettaa, hänen vanhempansa järjestävät Pariisilaisen aperitiivin.

---

5 CF sub

Veera ja Santtu selittävät Luukasille miten Aleksin vanhemmat juhlivat jokaista hänen tentiään erilailailla.

**Veera:** Kun Aleksi lopettaa saksan tentit, vanhempansa järjestävät Pariisilaisen aperitiivin.

Santtu hämästeli ja keskeytti:

**Santtu:** Kun **ranskan tentit** Aleksi lopettaa, hänen vanhempansa järjestävät Pariisilaisen aperitiivin.

---

6 A-Topic Sub

Veera on kertomassa Santulle kuinka Aleksipärjää opinnoissaan.

**Veera:** Aleksitodella kovasti töitä opinnoissaan. Koko vuoden hän varmisti käyvänsä joka seminaarin ja luennon. Hän jopa otti ylimääräisiä oppitunteja yksityisesti kaikista aineista joita opiskeli.
Kun ranskan tentit lopettaa Aleksi, hän voi lopulta mennä lomalle. Ne ovat tenteistä viimeiset ja tenttikausi on määrätty toukokuun loppuun. Hän on niistä enemmän huolissaan kuin muista, koska hänestä ne ovat tenteistä kaikkein vaikeimmat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 CT Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanna ja Anni keskustelevat siitä kuinka kömpelö Oskar oli lapsena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hanna:</strong> Ei ole kysymys siitä rikkoisiko hän jotain, vaan milloin hän jotain rikkoisi. Minusta tuntuu että hän on rikkonut jokaisen lelun joka olemme antaneet hänelle. <strong>Esimerkiksi</strong>, <em>leluauton</em> hän rikko <em>kolmevuotiaana.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 CF Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanna, Iida ja Anni keskustelevat siitä kuinka kömpelö Oskar oli lapsena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hanna:</strong> Ei ole kysymys siitä rikkoisiko hän jotain, vaan milloin hän jotain rikkoisi. Minusta tuntuu että hän on rikkonut jokaisen lelun jonka olemme antaneet hänelle. <strong>Iida keskeyttää:</strong> <strong>Iida:</strong> Esimerkiksi, hän rikko <em>nuken kolmevuotiaana.</em> Hanna puidistaa päätä. <strong>Hanna:</strong> <em>Oikeastaan, leluauton</em> hän <em>rikko kolmevuotiaana.</em> Hän rikko <em>nuken seuraavana vuonna.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanna on kertomassa Annille millainen Oskar oli lapsena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hanna:</strong> Hän oli niin suloinen. Aina ystävällinen ja antelias. Hänen oli helppo saada ystäviä lastentarhassa ja koulussa. Hän pelasi kaikenlaisia pelejä, ja hänellä oli paljon mielikuvitusta. Ainoa asia oli, että hän oli aika kömpelö. <strong>Leluauton rikko Oskar kun se oli vielä ihkauusi.</strong> Sen oli antanut hänellelahjaksi hänen enonsa muutama viikko aikaisemmin ja se oli jo hänen mielileluansa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 CT sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hanna on kertomassa Annille millainen Oskar oli lapsena.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hanna:</strong> Hän oli niin suloinen. Aina ystävällinen ja antelias. Hänen oli helppo saada ystäviä lastentarhassa ja koulussa. Hän pelasi kaikenlaisia pelejä, ja hänellä oli paljon mielikuvitusta. Ainoa asia oli, että hän oli aika kömpelö. <strong>Leluauton rikko Oskar kun se oli vielä ihkauusi.</strong> Sen oli antanut hänellelahjaksi hänen enonsa muutama viikko aikaisemmin ja se oli jo hänen mielileluansa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hanna ja Anni keskustelevat siitä kuinka kömpelö Oskar oli lapsena.  
**Hanna:** Oskar oli herätäen lapsi, mutta aika kömpelö. Hän rikkoi lelujansa niin usein että aloin käyttää niitä kalenterina! Esimerkiksi, kun *leluauton* hän rikko, olimme vuonna 1994 kesälomamatkoilla.

5 CF sub
Hanna ja Iida kertovat Annille minkälainen Oskar oli lapsena.  
**Hanna:** Oskar oli herätäen lapsi, mutta aika kömpelö. Hän rikkoi lelujansa niin usein että aloin käyttää niitä kalenterina! Iida keskeyttää:  
**Iida:** Aivan niin! Kun hän rikko nuken olimme vuonna 1994 kesälomamatkoilla.  
**Hanna:** Oikeastaan, kun *leluauton* hän rikko, olimme vuonna 1994 kesälomamatkoilla.

6 A-Topic Sub
Hanna on kertomassa Annille millainen Oskar oli lapsena.  

D
1 CT Main
Joni ja Riku keskustellevat Hunnien valloituksista Euroopassa.  
**Joni:** Attila painoi läpi Eurooppaa valloittaen kaiken johon hän törmäsi! Muistan jopa vuodet. *Belgradin hän valloitti vuonna 441.*

1 CT main
Joni ja Riku keskustellevat Hunnien valloituksista Euroopassa.  
**Joni:** Attila painoin läpi Eurooppaa valloittaen kaiken johon hän törmäsi! Muistan jopa vuodet. *Belgradin hän valloitti vuonna 441.*

2 CF Main
Joni ja Jesse kertoavat Rikulle Hunnien valloituksista Euroopassa.  
**Joni:** Attila painoin läpi Eurooppaa valloittaen kaiken johon hän törmäsi! Muistan jopa vuodet.

2 CF main
Joni ja Jesse kertoavat Rikulle Hunnien valloituksista Euroopassa.  
**Joni:** Attila painoin läpi Eurooppaa valloittaen kaiken johon hän törmäsi! Muistan jopa vuodet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesse keskeyttää:</th>
<th>Jesse interjohtaa:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jesse:</strong> Niin! Attila valloitti Sofian vuonna 441.</td>
<td><strong>Jesse:</strong> Yeah! Attila conquered Sofia in 441. Joni frowns and corrects Jesse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joni ryöstää otsaansa ja oikaisee Jesseä.</td>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Actually, Belgrade, Attila conquered in 441.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> No, itse asiassa, Belgradin hän valloitti vuonna 441.</td>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> No, actually, Belgrade, Attila conquered in 441.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joni on kertomassa Rikulle Hunnien Attilasta.</td>
<td>Joni is telling Riku about Attila the Hun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila on seuraava aiheemme koulussa. Hän on todella kiehtova historiallinen hahmo, hunnien imperiumin johtaja, ja häntä pelättiin idässä ja lännessä. Belgradin valloitti Attila v. 441. Sitä kutsuttiin silloin Singidunum’ksi ja se oli Attilan huomattavin valloitus sotaretkellä roomalaisia vastaan.</td>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila is our next subject at school. He’s really a fascinating historical figure, ruler of the Hunnic Empire and he was feared in East and West. <strong>Belgrade</strong> Attila conquered in 441. It was called Singidunum at the time and was a major conquest in Attila’s campaign against the Romans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 CT sub</th>
<th>4 CT sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joni ja Riku keskustelevat Hunnien valloituksista Euroopassa.</td>
<td>Joni and Riku are chatting about the conquests made by the Huns in Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila painoi läpi Eurooppaa valloittaen kaiken johon hän törmäsi! Hän ja hänen veljensä Bleda valloittivat suuren osan Itäeurooppaa, mutta myöhemmmin Attila johti armeijaansa ilman Bledaa. Kun Metzin Attila valloitti, Bleda oli jo kuollut.</td>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila was sweeping through Europe conquering everything in his path! He and his brother conquered much of Eastern Europe, but later Attila led his armies without Bleda. <strong>When Belgrade</strong> Attila conquered, his brother Bleda was still alive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CF sub</th>
<th>5 CF sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joni ja Jesse kertovat Rikulle Hunnien valloituksista Euroopassa.</td>
<td>Joni and Jesse are telling Riku about the conquests made by the Huns in Europe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila painoi läpi Eurooppaa valloittaen kaiken johon hän törmäsi! Hän ja hänen veljensä Bleda valloittivat suuren osan Itäeurooppaa, mutta myöhemmmin Attila johti armeijaansa ilman Bledaa. <strong>Jesse:</strong> Aivan niin. Joten, kun Attila valloitti Belgradin, hänen veljesään Bleda oli jo kuollut. Joni hämmästelee ja oikaisee Jesseä: <strong>Joni:</strong> Kun Metzin Attila valloitti, Bleda oli jo kuollut.</td>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila was sweeping through Europe conquering everything in his path! He and his brother conquered much of Eastern Europe, but later Attila led his armies without Bleda. <strong>Jesse:</strong> Yeah! When Attila conquered Belgrade, his brother Bleda was already dead. <strong>Joni:</strong> Attila was sweeping through Europe conquering everything in his path! He and his brother conquered much of Eastern Europe, but later Attila led his armies without Bleda. <strong>Jesse:</strong> Yeah! When Attila conquered Belgrade, his brother Bleda was already dead. Joni frowns and corrects Jesse. <strong>Joni:</strong> When Metz Attila conquered, his brother Bleda was already dead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 A-Topic Sub</th>
<th>6 A-Topic Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joni on kertomassa Rikulle Hunnien Attilasta.</td>
<td>Joni is telling Riku about Attila the Hun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila on seuraava aiheemme koulussa. Hän on todella kiehtova historiallinen hahmo, hunnien imperiumin johtaja, ja häntä pelättiin idässä ja lännessä.</td>
<td><strong>Joni:</strong> Attila is our next subject at school. He’s really a fascinating historical figure, ruler of the Hunnic Empire and he was feared in East and West. <strong>When Belgrade</strong> Attila conquered, he was leading a campaign against the Romans. It</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kun Belgradin valloitti Attila, hän oli johtamassa sotaretkeä roomalaisia vastaan. Sitä kutsuttiin silloin Singidunum’ksi ja se oli tärkeä valloitukse Attilan hyökätessä Balkanille.

was called Singidunum at the time and was a major conquest in Attila’s invasion into the Balkans.

---

1 CT main
Emma ja Noora kummastelevat miksi Jenni mököttää huoneessaan.
Noora: Olen melko varma että hänellä oli vähemmän päällään kun palasimme kotiin. Luuletko hänen hukanneen jotain?

1 CT main
Emma and Noora are wondering why Jenni is sulking in her room.
Noora: I’m pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things?
Emma: That’s it! She’s lost a few of her things. I think I even know where. Her shawl Jenni lost at the Christmas market.

2 CF main
Emma, Noora ja Sara kummastelevat miksi Jenni mököttää huoneessaan.
Noora: Olen melko varma että hänellä oli vähemmän päällään kun palasimme kotiin. Luuletko hänen hukanneen jotain tavaroihassa?
Emma: Sepä se! Hän on hukannut jotain tavaroihassa. Luulen sitä asiassa tietävän minne.

2 CF main
Emma, Noora and Sara are wondering why Jenni is sulking in her room.
Noora: I’m pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things?
Emma: That’s it! I think I even know where.
Sara: I know too! She lost her mittens at the Christmas fair!
Emma raises an eyebrow.
Emma: *cough* Her shawl Jenni lost at the Christmas market. She only lost her mittens later, on the bus ride home.

---

3 A-Topic Main
Emma on kertomassa Nooralle Jennin kaupunkimatkaa.
Emma: Se oli hänelle todella makupala! Hän ehdottomasti palvoi kaikkia vanhoja rakennuksia vanhassa kaupungissa ja meillä oli hyvin hauskaa syödä keskiaikaisessa ravintolassa. Oli onni että heillä oli lasten ruokalista, koska annokset olivat niin suuria! Se meni kuitenkin vähän alaspäin kotimatkalla. Hartiahuivinsa hukkasi Jenni joulumarkkinoilla. Se oli hänen mielihuivinsa ja hän oli melkein

3 A-Topic Main
Emma is telling Noora about Jenni’s trip into town.
Emma: It was a real treat for her! She absolutely adored all the old buildings in the old town and we all had lots of fun eating at the medieval restaurant. Good thing they had a children’s menu, because the portions were so big! It went a bit downhill on the way back though. Her shawl Jenni lost at the Christmas market. It was her favourite shawl and she’s almost inseparable from it, so it's understandable that she was really upset
erottamaton siitä. Se on vaaleanpunainen ja valkoinen, tehty silkistä, ihastuttavin kukkakoristein reunoilla.

| 4 CT sub | Emma ja Noora kummastelevat miksi Jenni mököttää huoneessaan.  
Noora: Olen melko varma että hänellä oli vähemmän pällään kun palasimme kotiin. Luuletko hänen hukanneen jotain tavaroihna?  
Emma: Se on varma se ongelma! Niin, minä tiedän minne hän on ne hukannut! Kun hukkasi Jenni, meillä oli hyvin hauska syödä keskiaikaisessa ravintolassa ja meillä oli hyvin hauska syödä keskiaikaisessa ravintolassa. Oli onni että heillä oli lasten ruokalista, koska annokset olivat niin suuria! Se meni vähän alaspin kotimatkalla.  
Kun hukkasi Jenni, meillä oli hyvin hauska syödä keskiaikaisessa ravintolassa. Oli onni että heillä oli lasten ruokalista, koska annokset olivat niin suuria! Se meni vähän alaspin kotimatkalla. | 4 CT sub | Emma and Noora are wondering why Jenni is sulking in her room.  
Noora: I’m pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things?  
Emma: That must be it! Oh, I know where she lost them, too! When her shawl Jenni lost, we were having mulled wine at the Christmas market. I think she lost the other things on the bus ride home.  
Sara interrupts Emma and blurts out:  
Sara: I know too! When Jenni lost her shawl, we were having mulled wine at the Christmas market. Emma raises an eyebrow.  
Emma: *cough* When her shawl Jenni lost, we were at the Christmas market. She lost the other things on the bus ride home. |
| 5 CF sub | Emma, Sara ja Noora kummastelevat miksi Jenni mököttää huoneessaan.  
Noora: Olen melko varma että hänellä oli vähemmän pällään kun palasimme kotiin. Luuletko hänen hukanneen jotain tavaroihna?  
Emma: Se on varma se ongelma! Niin, minä tiedän minne hän on ne hukannut! Sara keskeyttää nauran:  
Sara: Varma! Hän hukkasi lapasensa kun olimme keskiaikaisessa ravintolassa. Emma kohottaa kulmakarvaansa.  
Kun hukkasi Jenni, meillä oli hyvin hauska syödä keskiaikaisessa ravintolassa. Oli onni että heillä oli lasten ruokalista, koska annokset olivat niin suuria! Se meni vähän alaspin kotimatkalla. | 5 CF sub | Emma, Noora and Sara are wondering why Jenni is sulking in her room.  
Noora: I’m pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things?  
Emma: That must be it! Oh, I know where she lost them, too! When her shawl Jenni lost, we were having mulled wine at the Christmas market. Emma raises an eyebrow.  
Emma: *cough* When her shawl Jenni lost, we were at the Christmas market. She lost the other things on the bus ride home. |
| 6 A-Topic Sub | Emma on kertomassa Nooralle Jennin kaupunkimatkakasta.  
Emma: Se oli hänelle todella makupala! Hän ehdottomasti palvoi kaikkia vanhoja rakennuksia vanhassa kaupungissa ja meillä oli hyvin hauska syödä keskiaikaisessa ravintolassa. Oli onni että heillä oli lasten ruokalista, koska annokset olivat niin suuria! Se meni kuitenkin vähän alaspin kotimatkalla.  
Emma: It was a real treat for her! She absolutely adored all the old buildings in the old town and we all had lots of fun eating at the medieval restaurant. Good thing they had a children’s menu, because the portions were so big! It went a bit downhill on the way back though.  
When her shawl Jenni lost, we were at the Christmas market. It was only noticed to be missing when we got on the bus back. It was her favourite shawl and she’s almost inseparable from it, so it’s understandable. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 CT main</th>
<th>1 CT main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teemu ja Emilia ovat katsomassa Samuelin lastennäyttöä. Heistä se on hyvin viihtyvävä, mutta kun Samuel aloittaa ilmapallonäyttönsä, Teemun täytyy mennä ulos vastaamaan kännykkäänsä. Kun hän palaa, hän kysyy: <strong>Teemu:</strong> No, kuinka hän puhkaisi ilmapallot? <strong>Emilia:</strong> Niin, hän puhkaisi jokaisen pallon eri tavalla! <strong>Punaisen ilmapallon Samuel puhkaisi tikalla.</strong></td>
<td>Teemu and Emilia are attending Samuel’s show for children. They find it very entertaining but while Samuel starts his balloon act, Pétr has to step out to answer his mobile. When he comes back, he asks: <strong>Teemu:</strong> So, how did he pop the balloons? <strong>Emilia:</strong> Oh, he popped each balloon differently! The red balloon, Samuel popped with a dart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 CF main</th>
<th>2 CF main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teemu, Johanna ja Emilia ovat katsomassa Samuelin lastennäyttöä. Heistä se on hyvin viihtyvävä, mutta kun Samuel aloittaa pallonäyttönsä, Teemun täytyy mennä ulos vastaamaan kännykkäänsä. Kun hän palaaa, hän kysyy: <strong>Teemu:</strong> No, kuinka hän puhkaisi ilmapallot? <strong>Johanna:</strong> Niin, hän puhkaisi jokaisen pallon eri tavalla! Hän puhkaisi sinisen pallon tikalla. <strong>Emilia:</strong> No, itse asiassa, hän puhkaisi sen siilillä. <strong>Punaisen ilmapallon Samuel puhkaisi tikalla.</strong></td>
<td>Teemu, Johanna and Emilia are attending Samuel’s show for children. They find it very entertaining but while Samuel starts his balloon act, Pétr has to step out to answer his mobile. When he comes back, he asks: <strong>Teemu:</strong> So, how did he pop the balloons? <strong>Johanna:</strong> Oh, he popped each balloon differently! He popped the blue balloon with a dart! <strong>Emilia:</strong> Well, actually, he popped that with a hedgehog. The red balloon, Samuel popped with a dart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emilia on kuvailemassa Samuelin lastennäyttelää Teemulle. <strong>Emilia:</strong> Samuelin näytös oli aivan fantastinen. Lapset rakastivat sitä! Jopa minä ihailin sitä, koska se oli niin alkuperäinen ja kekseliäs. Kaikki lapset olivat haljoissaan ja kirkuvat nauraen. En ollut kuvitellut että hän olisi niin erinomainen viihtyttäjä. <strong>Punaisen ilmapallon puhkaisi Samuel sitten kun oli käytännöllä sitä kaikkien tavoin esityksessä.</strong> Kuitenkaan se ei ollut lapsille ainoastaan ilmapallo, koska sitä oli käytetty koko esityksen ajan eräänlaisena hauskan ilkeänä hahmona, josta Samuel teki pilaa.</td>
<td>Emilia is describing Samuel’s show for children to Teemu. <strong>Emilia:</strong> Samuel’s show was absolutely fantastic. The kids loved it! Even I adored it, because it was so original and inventive. All the children were ecstatic and screaming with laughter. I had no idea he was such an excellent entertainer! The red balloon, Samuel popped after using it in all kinds of ways in the show. It wasn’t just a balloon to the children, though, because it had been used throughout the show like a kind of funny evil character Samuel would make fun of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4 CT sub | 4 CT sub |
Teemu ja Emilia ovat katsomassa Samuelin lastennäytöstä. Heistä se on hyvin vihdyttävä, mutta kun Samuel aloittaa ilmapallonäytönsä, Teemun täytyy mennä ulos vastaamaan kännykkäänsä. Kun hän palaa, hän kysyy:

**Teemu:** No, kuinka hän puhkaisi pallot?

**Emilia:** Niin, hän puhkaisi kunkin ilmapallon ollen olevinaan eri eläin! Kun *punainen* ilmapallon Samuel puhkaisi, hän oli olevinaan leijona.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CF sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teemu, Johanna ja Emilia ovat katsomassa Samuelin lastennäytöstä. Heistä se on hyvin vihdyttävä, mutta kun Samuel aloittaa ilmapallonäytönsä, Teemun täytyy mennä ulos vastaamaan kännykkäänsä. Kun hän palaa, hän kysyy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teemu:</strong> No, kuinka hän puhkaisi pallot? <strong>Johanna:</strong> Niin, hän puhkaisi kunkin ilmapallon ollen olevinaan eri eläin! Kun Samuel puhkaisi sinisen ilmapallon, hän oli olevinaan leijona. <strong>Emilia:</strong> Kiinnititkö sinä edes huomiota? Kun <em>punainen</em> ilmapallon Samuel puhkaisi, hän oli olevinaan leijona.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 A-Topic Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 A-Topic Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emilia is describing Samuel’s show for children to Teemu. <strong>Emilia:</strong> Samuel’s show was absolutely fantastic. The kids loved it! Even I adored it, because it was so original and inventive. All the children were ecstatic and screaming with laughter. I had no idea he was such an excellent entertainer! When the <em>red</em> balloon, Samuel popped, the children cheered. Because it wasn’t just a balloon to the children. It had been used by Samuel throughout the show like a kind of funny evil character he would make fun of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonja on kertomassa Julialle kaikesta siitä mitä tapahtui kun hän oli lähdössä lentokentälle Tuukan kanssa. <strong>Sonja:</strong> Yht’äkkii olimme kuumeisesti etsimässä kaikenlaisia kamaa ympäri huoneistoa. Mutta on hämäystyttävää</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 CT main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonja is telling Julia about all the incidents that happened as she was leaving for the airport with Tuukka. <strong>Sonja:</strong> Suddenly we were frantically searching for all kinds of stuff around the flat. But it’s amazing where these things end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 165 of 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>minne nämä tavarat päätyvät.</strong> <em>Esimerkiksi, avaimet</em> Tuukka löysi sohan alta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 CF main</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja ja Elina ovat kertomassa Julialle kaikesta siitä mitä tapahtui kun he olivat lähössä lentokentälle Tuukan kanssa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonja:</strong> Yht’ääkkiä olimme kuumeisesti etsimässä kaikenlaista kamaan ympäräi huoneistoa. Mutta on hämmästytytävää minne nämä tavarat päätyvät.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elina:</strong> Joo, Tuukka löysi lentoliput sohan alta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonja:</strong> Niin, itseasiassa, <em>avaimet</em> Tuukka löysi sohan alta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 A-Topic Main</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja on kertomassa Julialle selkkauksista, joita sattui kun hän oli lähössä lentokentälle Tuukan kanssa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonja:</strong> Tuukka ja minä olemme niin väsyneitä! Aamusta lähtien on ollut jatkuva maratoni. Ja lennot olivat kauheita: en ole koskaan tavannut kauheaa lentomiehiä. Mutta hankaluudet olivat kotoaan jo ennen kuin varusiin kotoaan. <em>Avaimet löysi Tuukka ihmeen kaupalla!</em> Ne ovat tätäkin niin häntä, koska lainasimme hänen autoaan. Ne on kauniit avaimenperät niinkuin koiranpentu. Kuitenkaan emme voi löytää niitä, koska ne olivat jotainkin hukkuneet ja joutuneet sohan alla!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 CT sub</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja on kertomassa Julialle kaikesta siitä mitä tapahtui kun hän oli lähössä lentokentälle Tuukan kanssa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonja:</strong> Yht’ääkkiä olimme kuumeisesti etsimässä kaikenlaista kamaan ympäräi asuntoa. Kello tikitti, ja minä katsoin kelloa joka kerta kun löysimme yhden asioista. <em>Kun avaimet Tuukka löysi, meillä oli vain 10 minuuttia ennen kuin meidän piti syöksyä ulos.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 CF sub</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja ja Elina ovat kertomassa Julialle kaikista niistä selkkauksista joita sattui kun he olivat lähössä lentokentälle Tuukan kanssa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonja:</strong> Yht’ääkkiä olimme kuumeisesti etsimässä kaikenlaista kamaan ympäräi asuntoa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elina: That’s right, so when Tuukka found the plane tickets, we had just 10 minutes left before we had to dash out.
Sonja: Elina, I’m telling the story. Anyways… When the keys Tuukka found, we just had 10 minutes left.

Jenna: He’s doing well, thanks! We play this reflex game where he has to stop different coloured balls that are rolling down a slope using a paddle. the red ball Jere stopped in just 3 seconds.

Jenna: He’s doing well, thanks! We play this reflex game where he has to stop different coloured balls that are rolling down a slope using a paddle. the red ball Jere stopped in just 3 seconds.

Jenna is telling Otto about her child, Jere.

Jenna: He’s growing so quickly! And he’s very active. At the moment it’s me watching him. I’m still on maternity leave. He’s

Jenna: He’s doing well, thanks! We play this reflex game where he has to stop different coloured balls that are rolling down a slope using a paddle. the red ball Jere stopped in just 3 seconds.

Jenna is telling Otto about her child, Jere.
Hän on alkanut kontata ja hän liikkuu todella nopeasti!

Punaisen pallon pysäytti Jere vain kolmessa sekunnissa. Se on sellainen laite jota me käytämme refleksipelinä, mutta uskon että Jere todella pitää siitä. Lahja hänen isovanhemmiltaan. Me annamme sen pyöriä alas luiskaa ja hänen on saatava se kiinni. Luulen että siitä on nopeasti tulossa hänelle uusi mielilelu.

Otto kysyy Jennalta pikku Jerestä.

Jenna: Hän voi hyvin, kiitos! Pelaamme tätä refleksipeliä, jossa hänen on pysäytettävä mailalla erivärisiä palloja, jotka pyörivät luiskaa alas. Mutta oli huvittavaa eilen koska hänellä oli erilainen reaktio pysäytetystään kunkin pallon. Kun punaisen pallon Jere pysäytti, hän näytti hyvin vakavalla ja keskittyneeltä.

Jenna on kertomassa Otolle Jere lapsestaan.


started crawling and he really moves quickly!
The red ball Jere stopped in just three seconds. It’s something we use in a reflex game, but I think Jere really likes it. A gift from his grandparents. We roll it down a slope and he has to catch it. I think it’s quickly becoming his new favourite toy.

Otto kysyy Jennalta ja Juholta pikku Jerestä.

Jenna: Hän voi hyvin, kiitos! Me pelaamme refleksipeliä, jossa hänen on pysäytettävä mailalla erivärisiä palloja kun ne pyörivät luiskaa alas. Mutta oli hauskaa kun hänellä eilen oli erilainen reaktio kun pysäytti kunkin pallon.

Juho: Niinpä, kun hän pysäytti keltaisen pallon, hän näytti hyvin vakavalla ja keskittyneeltä.


Jenna is telling Otto about her child, Jere.

Jenna: He’s growing so quickly! And he’s very active. At the moment it’s me watching him. I’m still on maternity leave. He’s started crawling and he really moves quickly!

When the red ball Jere stopped, he looked very serious and concentrated.

Otto asks Jenna and Juho about little Jere.

Jenna: He’s doing well, thanks! We play this reflex game where he has to stop different coloured balls that are rolling down a slope using a paddle. But it was funny because yesterday he had a different reaction after he stopped each ball.

Juho: Yes, when he stopped the yellow ball, he was looking very serious and concentrated.

Jenna: Juho! You weren’t paying attention, were you? Again. When the red ball Jere stopped, he looked very serious and concentrated.

Jenna is telling Otto about her child, Jere.

Jenna: He’s growing so quickly! And he’s very active. At the moment it’s me watching him. I’m still on maternity leave. He’s started crawling and he really moves quickly!

When the red ball Jere stopped in just three seconds, I was so pleased. It’s something we use in a reflex game, but I think Jere really likes it. A gift from his grandparents. We roll it down a slope and he has to catch it. I think it’s quickly becoming his new favourite toy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 CT main</th>
<th>Pinja has invited Veeti over for lunch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veeti: Ruoka oli herkullista, mutta mitä on tapahtunut astioille? Niissä on kaikissa säröjä.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 CF main</th>
<th>Pinja ja Akseli ovat kutsuneet Veetin lounaalle.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veeti: Ruoka oli herkullista, mutta mitä on tapahtunut astioille? Niissä on kaikissa säröjä.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 CF main</th>
<th>Pinja and Akseli have invited Veeti over for lunch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veeti: The food was delicious, but what happened to the crockery? There are cracks on all of them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinja: Oh I am so sorry! Unfortunately, little Sofia has been at them and I’ve not had time to get a new set. The bowl Sofia cracked by banging it with her spoon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
<th>Pinja is telling Veeti about her little girl Sofia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 4 CT sub | Pinja: She’s so active and full of energy. I can’t really keep up anymore. It was easier when she couldn’t run yet. But I don’t really mind. Most of the time, she behaves. The bowl Sofia cracked after she found a way to reach our china collection. It was such a lovely piece: it showed a lovely mountain landscape in blue. But it stood no chance against Sofia. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 CT sub</th>
<th>Pinja has invited Veeti over for lunch.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veeti: The food was delicious, but what happened to the crockery? There are cracks on all of them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinja: Oh I am so sorry! Unfortunately, little Sofia has been at them and I’ve not had time to get a new set. And Akseli, my husband, has really had enough of it. He had managed to keep his cool until recently, but… when the bowl Sofia cracked yesterday, Akseli lost his temper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5 CF sub | 5 CF sub |
Pinja ja Akseli ovat kutsuneet Veetin lounaalle.

Veeti: Ruoka oli herkullista, mutta mitä on tapahtunut astioille? Kaikissa niissä on naarmuja.

Pinja: Ai, olen pahoillani! Valitettavasti pikku Sofia on käsittelystä niitä eikä meillä ole ollut aikaa hankkia uusia. Ja Akseli, mieheni, on todella saanut tarpeekseen. Hän onnistui pysymään rauhallisena viime aikoina asti, mutta ...

Akseli: Ihana, se tekee minut hulluksi! Kun hän särki teekannun eilen, minä menetin malttinsa.

Pinja: Tuntuu että hän oli niin vihainen että unohti mikä oli aluksi aiheuttanut kiiukunpuuskan. Kun kulhon Sofia särki eilen, Akseli menetti malttinsa.

Pinja on kertomassa Veetille pikku Sofia työstä.


Roosa ja Milla ovat keskustelemassa heidän mielikomediansa viimeisimmästä episodista.


Milla: Niin, hän on loistava! Mutta mitä kaveria tarkoitat? Sitä jolla on iso parta?

Kim, Aino ja Aatu ovat aikeissa avata uuden ravintolan.

Kim: I can handle getting people to give us the funds, but don’t ask me to cook or wait tables!

Roosa and Milla are discussing the most recent episode of their favourite sit-com.

Roosa: My favourite character is the linguist. Because she’s always getting into all kinds of trouble! Did you see what happened when she tried to switch her cup with the other guy?

Milla: Yes, she’s brilliant! But which guy do you mean? The one with the huge beard?

Kim, Aino and Aatu are planning to open a new restaurant.
| **Kim:** Minä voin saada ihmiset antamaan meille varoja, mutta älkää pyytäkö minua keittämään tai tarjoilemaan. |
| **Aino:** Älä ole siitä huolissasi. Aatu hoitaa keittämisen ja minä tarjoilen. Mutta se sitten vasta kun meillä on riittävästi varoja palkataksemme lisää henkilökuntaa. |
| **Aatu:** Niin se on. Hyvällä alulla voimme tienata riittävästi palkataksemme runsaasi tarjoilijoita jakokkeja. |
| **Aino:** No, ei nyt liioitella! Emme voi toivoa tuollaisista tuottoa yhdessä yössä. |

| **Don’t worry about that. Aatu will be cooking and I will wait the tables. But it’s only until we have enough money to hire more staff.** |
| **That’s right. With a good start, we’ll be earning enough to hire lots of waiters and cooks!** |
| **Well, let’s not get carried away now! We can’t expect those kinds of profits overnight!** |

| **Heidi ja Antto haluavat valita karnevaaliasun lapselleen Sakalle.** |
| **Heidi:** Mistä luulet Sakan pitävän eniten: mustan merirosvon vai supersankarin asusta? |
| **Antto:** En tiedä. Ehkä mustan merirosvon asusta. |
| **Heidi:** Luuletko niin? |
| **Antto:** Odota, ei! Nyt kun ajattelen sitä, supersankarin asu kuuluu eräälle hänen mielisankarilleen televisiossa. Meidän on ehottomasti saatava se. |

| **Heidi and Antto want to pick a carnival outfit for their child, Saki.** |
| **What do you think Saki will like best: the black pirate costume or the superhero costume?** |
| **I don’t know. Maybe the black pirate costume.** |
| **You think so?** |
| **Wait, no! Now that I think about it, the superhero costume belongs to one of his favourite superheroes on television. We should definitely get that one.** |

| **Oona on kysymässä Nallelta kulkuohjeita rokkikonserttiin.** |
| **Oona:** Hei! Anteeksi jos vaivaan sinua … Tiedätkö miten pääsen Suurelle Kesärökkifestivaalille? |
| **Nalle:** Tietysti. Mutta jalkaisin siihen menee paljon aikaa. Sinun kannattaa palata takaisin tuolle bussipysäkille ja ottaa bussi numero 12. Voit jäädä pois viidenneällä pysäkilla ja käännyt oikealle. |
| **Kiitos! Minulla on vielä aikaa ja ulkona on ihana sää. Luulen että kävelen kuitenkin. Kuinka kaukana se on?** |
| **Se on puolen tunnin kävely.** |
| **Vai niin! Unohdetaan se sitten. Minkä bussin sanoit että minun olisi otettava?** |

| **Oona is asking Nalle for directions on his way to a rock concert.** |
| **Hello! I’m sorry to bother you… Do you know the way to the Big Summer Rock festival?** |
| **Of course. But it will take you ages on foot. You should walk back to that bus stop over there and get on the number 12 bus. You can get off at the 5th stop and turn right.** |
| **Thanks! I still have time and it’s lovely outside. I think I’ll walk after all. How far is it?** |
| **It’s a thirty minute walk.** |
| **Oh! Never mind. Which bus did you say I should take?** |

| **Onni ja Saara ovat keskustelemassa työpäivästä luonaan aikana.** |
| **Onni:** En voi kestää sitä enää! Jos Bob korjaa englantiani vielä kerrankin kokouksessa, mina kuristan hänet. |

| **Onni and Saara are discussing their work day over supper.** |
| **I can’t stand it anymore! If Bob corrects my English one more time in a meeting I will strangle him!** |
| **Saara:** Rauhoitu nyt! Hän ei tarkoittanut sitä sillä tavalla. Hän ajatteli auttavansa sinua. |
| **Onni:** Hän varmaan tekee sen tarkoituksella. **Hän nolaa minut asiakkaitemme edessä!** Sitä en voi hyväksyä. |
| **Saara:** Calm down! He didn’t mean it that way. He thought he was doing you a favour. **Onni:** He must be doing it on purpose. **He’s embarrassing me in front of our clients!** It’s unacceptable. |

| **6 WEIRD** |
| Eelis ja Aapo yrittävät päätä mitä filmiä menisivät katsomaan elokuviihin. **Eelis:** Haluaisitko toimintafilmin vai jännityselokuvan? **Aapo:** En ole varma. Elokuvaliput ovat niin kalliita nykyään … mitä ajattelet että meidän pitäisi mennä katsomaan? **Eelis:** No, toimintafilmissa on isompia räjäytyksiä. Minä todella pidän isoista räjäytyksistä. **Aapo:** Lasket leikkiä, vai? Onko se sinulle ainoa syy katsoa näitä filmejä elokuvateatterissa? **Eelis:** Varmasti. Tabletillani vain muuten niitä katson. |
| **6** Eelis and Aapo are trying to decide which film to go and see at the cinema. **Eelis:** Do you want the action film or the thriller? **Aapo:** I’m not sure. Cinema tickets are so expensive these days… which one do you think we should watch? **Eelis:** Well, the action film has bigger explosions. I really like big explosions. **Aapo:** You’re kidding right? Is that the only reason you watch these films at the cinema? **Eelis:** Yeah. Otherwise I’d just watch it on my tablet. |

| **7 WEIRD** |
| Pauli ja Annika kinastelevat siitä kenen olisi viettävä Ressun ulos iltakävelylle. **Pauli:** Minulla ei vain ole aikaa! Minulla on määräaika huomenna aamulla ja minun on vielä kirjoitettava viisitoista sivua uudelleen. Vie sinä Ressu ulos. **Annika:** Miten? Minun on lähdettävä viidentoista minuutin kuluttua mennäkseni elokuviihin enkä ole vielä edes valmis! **Pauli:** Varmasti. Tabletillani vain muuten niitä katson. |
| **7** Pauli and Annika are arguing about who should take Ressu out for his evening walkies. **Pauli:** I just don’t have time! I have a very urgent deadline tomorrow morning and I still have fifteen pages to rewrite. You take Ressu out. **Annika:** What? I need to head out in fifteen minutes to go to the cinema and I’m not even ready! **Pauli:** You will have all the time to finish your work before tomorrow. **You’re making a big deal out of nothing.** **Annika:** Well, okay then. But you have to do it next time. |

| **8 GOOD** |
| Nea, Jussi ja Misha ovat valmistautumassa menneenä meren rannalle. **Nea:** Jussi, oletko pakannut kaiken listaltasi? **Jussi:** Kyllä, Nea. Pakkasen aurinkosuojan, lasit, pyyhkeet ja picnic laatikkomme. **Nea:** Misha? Oletko pakannut rantapallon kuten pyysin sinua? **Misha:** En, se on vielä kaapissa. **Nea:** Pidä kiirettä! Meidän täytyy nyt lähteä että välttämme liikennettä! |
| **8** Nea, Jussi and Misha are getting ready to go to the seaside. **Nea:** Jussi, have you packed everything on your list? **Jussi:** Yes, Nea. I packed the sunscreen, the glasses, the towels and our picnic boxes. **Nea:** Misha? Have you packed the beach ball like I asked you to? **Misha:** No, that’s still in the cupboard. **Nea:** Hurry up! We have to leave now to avoid the traffic! |
9 GOOD
Krista and Ella are revising for their French exam.

Krista: Okay, we’ve done all the verbs in the unit. What else do we need to do?
Ella: We also need to do the revision exercises. There is the one on the past tenses and then there is also the letter writing exercise.

Krista: Okay great! Let’s do the past tenses first, then.

10 WEIRD
Sami is talking about his/her favourite piece of classical music.

Sami: I adore it. I think it amazing that Mozart could have written it at that age. Maybe it isn’t as complex as his work as an adult, but I still think it is really charming. I love it especially because it always makes me feel better when I’m sad.

11 GOOD
Sanni and Essi want to buy a new refrigerator and are bargain hunting.

Sanni: Look at this model. We really should get it. It can do everything! It has plenty of room, it keeps track of everything you put in the fridge and tells you when you need to buy more food!

Essi: Sure, it has plenty of room… but we don’t really need all those extra things and have you seen the price? It’s almost two times more expensive than the other one we liked!

12 GOOD
Eveliina is conducting a survey and is asking Venla questions about how often she uses her mobile phone.

Eveliina: On average, how many hours a week do you spend talking to your family?
Venla: I don’t know. Maybe 5 hours.

Eveliina: What about your friends?
Venla: Yeah, but what do you mean by talking? Because I also use apps to talk to them over the internet. Does that count?

13 WEIRD
Joel is telling Salla about his morning routine.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td><strong>Joel:</strong> Kun nousen ylös, ensimmäiseksi teen joogani. Sitten teen nopean juoksulenkkin.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Salla:</strong> Entä jos on kylmä?  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Joel:</strong> Juoksen joka tapauksessa koska ostin erikoiset urheiluvarusteet jotka pitävät minut lämpimänä. Joka tapauksessa, juostuani teen lisää venyttelyä ja syön aamiaiseni.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Salla:</strong> O-ho, sinulla on varmaan hyvä terveys.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Joel:</strong> En tiedä siitä. Kuitenkin, vasta sitten panen puhelimen päälle. Halua en kenenkään häiritsevän aikana aamurutiiniin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After I get up, the first thing I do is my yoga. Then I go for a quick run.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Salla:</strong> What about when it’s cold?  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Joel:</strong> I still go for a run, because I bought special sports gear that keeps me warm. Anyways, after the run I do some more stretching and have my breakfast.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Salla:</strong> Wow, you must be really healthy.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Joel:</strong> I don’t know about that. Anyways, it’s only then that I turn on my phone. I don’t want anybody disturbing me during my morning routine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Vili</strong> yrittää taivutella <strong>Pasi</strong> ostamaan uuden auton.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Vili:</strong> Tee nyt jotain, Pasi! Sinulla on ollut se vanha rähjä jo kymmenen vuotta!  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Pasi:</strong> Niinkö? En halua antaa sitä pois. Se on mukava, luotettava, eikä vie paljon polttoainetta. Miksi minun olisi ostettava uusi auto?  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Vili:</strong> Se on hajoamassa!  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Pasi:</strong> Se ei ole edes totta! En ymmärrä miksi olet niin itsepintainen. Se on kuitenkin minun autoni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Ville ja Henna</strong> istuvat bussissa kotimatkalla töistä.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ville:</strong> Toivoisin asuvani lähempänä työpaikkaani. Ehkä sitten voisin kävellä toimistoon.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Henna:</strong> Todellako? Minulla ei ole mitään bussimatkaa vastaan töihin mennessä. Voin jutella jonkun kanssa tai lukea kirjaa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Merja</strong> kysyy <strong>Aamu</strong> tyytäreltään:  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Merja:</strong> Mitä olet tehnyt tänään?  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Aamu:</strong> Se oli kauheaa! Kaikilla on uusi Gucci laukku. Olen minä hupsu ainoa, ostanut joka ei sitä.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Merja:</strong> Oi voi, pikkukaukka! Katso, minä olen ostanut sinulle tämän uuden Gucci laukun.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Aamu:</strong> En halua punaista laukkua! Minä vihaan sinua!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>Mimmi ja Aku</strong> ovat keskustelemassa juhlista.  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mimmi:</strong> Olen niin erittäin tyytynyt juhlimaan! Tässä on kaikki, mitä haluaisin haastaa! Auki olen mielekuvaan!  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Aku:</strong> Olen hyvin tyytynyt juhlimaan! M Painostaa, mutta minä haluaisin heti ostaa kaksi samaa!  &lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mimmi:</strong> Olen niin tyytynyt juhlimaan! Tässä on kaikki, mitä haluaisin haastaa! Auki olen mielekuvaan!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mimmi: Minä olen niin innoissani!
Aku: Minä myös, mutta...
Mimmi: Mikä on hätänä?
Aku: Mutta minä olen hukannut naamiaispukuni.
Mimmi: Älä välitä. Me löydän sitä jos etsimme sen perusteella.

Aku: Me too, but…
Mimmi: What’s the matter?
Aku: But I’ve lost my fancy dress.
Mimmi: Don’t worry. We’ll find it, if we look for it thoroughly.

18 SLIGHTLY WEIRD
Anssi kertoo Inkerille kirjoista joista hän pitää.
Inkeri: Hienoa! Nyt tiedän mitä hankin sinulle syntymäpäivästä!

18
Anssi tells Inkeri about the books he likes.
Anssi: There is Jäniksen vuosi, Seitsemän veljestä, Sinuhe egyptiläinen. I love reading. Inkeri: Great! Now I know what I will get for your birthday!

19 SLIGHTLY WEIRD
Hra Virtanen on kysymässä Siiriltä hänen mielisilmistään.
Hra Virtanen: Mikä on mieluisin kotimainen filmi?

19
Mr Virtanen is asking Siiri about her favourite film.
Mr Virtanen: What is your favourite Finnish film?
Siiri: My favourite film? Without doubt Betoniyö. Johannes Brotherus is so good as Simo: he’s so sensitive and believable.
Mr Virtanen: Oh! I haven’t even seen this film.

20 WEIRD
Pauliina on kysymässä Tatulta ja Ollilta rokkikonsertista.
Pauliina: Sinä soitit Amerikassa jouluuussa. Kertoisitko meille siitä?
Tatu: Meillä oli upea vastaanotto kaikkialla ja konsertit olivat hyvin mukavia. Ne olivat pitkän matkan arvoisia.
Olli: Olemme aina soittaneet koko sydämellä. Emme valita, koska yleisömme on aina kasvamassa, joka on hienoa!

20
Pauliina is asking Tatu and Olli about the rock concerts.
Pauliina: You played in America in December. Would you tell us about it?
Tatu: We had a great welcome everywhere and the concerts were great fun. They were worth the long journey.
Olli: We’ve always played from our hearts. We don’t complain, our audience gets bigger which is great!

9.3 Hungarian

A
1 CT main
Anna megkérdezi Vilitől, hogy mikor szeret Jáno szeret hallgatni.
Vili: Attól függ… (János) klasszikus zenét szeret hallgatni, amikor vonattal utazik.

1 CT main
Anna asks Vili when János likes to listen to music.
Vili: It depends … Classical music, János likes to listen when he travels by train.

2 CF main
Anna, János és Vili Maríről beszélgetnek. Anna megkérdezi Jánostól, hogy mikor Anna, János and Vili are talking about Mari. Anna asks János when Mari likes to listen to music.

3 A-Topic Main

3 A-Topic Main
János is telling Anna about Vili’s hobbies. János: Vili has always been very interested in the arts. Even as a child, he was really interested in performing. He recently enrolled in a drama college to study film and theatre part-time and is now preparing a role in a Greek tragedy his class is organising. So drama is an important part of his life now. But, you know, that’s what he loves. So he feels it’s worth it even though it takes a lot of time away from his work. Classical music, Vili listens to almost constantly. He also plays the violin and used to play in an orchestra until he graduated from school.

4 CT sub

4 CT sub
János and Anna are talking about how Vili feels when he listens to music. János: When Classical music Vili listens to…images of green pastures run through his head.

5 CF sub

5 CF sub
János, Anna and Vili are discussing music. Anna asks János how Mari feels when she listens to music. Vili answers before János has time to reply. Vili: When Mari listens to Rap music, images of green pastures go through her head. János: When Classical music Mari listens to…images of green pastures go through her head.

6 A-Topic Sub

6 A-Topic Sub
János is telling Anna about Vili’s hobbies. János: Vili has always been very interested in the arts. Even as a child, he was really interested in performing. He recently enrolled in a drama college to study film and theatre part-time and is now preparing a role in a Greek tragedy his class is organising. So drama is an important part of his life now. But, you know, that’s what he loves. So he feels it’s worth it even though it takes a lot of time away from his work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 CT Main</td>
<td>Aliz megkérdezi Bencétől, hogy mikor végez István a vizsgákkal. <strong>Bence:</strong> Attól függ… (István) a <em>francia vizsgákkal május vége</em> előtt végez.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CF Main</td>
<td>Aliz, Bence és David István vizsgáiról beszélnek. Aliz megkérdezi Bencétől, hogy mikor végez István a vizsgákkal. Dávid próbál válaszolni a kérdésre, mielőtt Bence válaszolni tudna: <strong>Dávid:</strong> István a német vizsgákkal-május vége előtt végez. Bence szemét forgatva azt mondja: <strong>Bence:</strong> (István) a <em>francia vizsgákkal</em> végez május vége előtt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A-Topic Main</td>
<td>Aliz éppen azt magyarázza Bencének, hogyan boldogul István a tanulással. <strong>Aliz:</strong> István nagyon keményen tanult egész évben, minden órára bejárt. Még különórát is vett minden tantárgyból. <em>A francia vizsgákkal (István) május vége előtt végez.</em> Ezek lesznek a nyári szünet előtti utolsó vizsgái, de egyben a legnehezebbek is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A-Topic Main</td>
<td>Aliz is explaining to Bence how István is managing with his studies. <strong>Aliz:</strong> István worked really hard on his studies. Throughout the year he made sure to go to every seminar and lecture. He even took extra lessons with some tutors for all of the modules he’s doing. <em>The French exams István finishes before the end of May.</em> They’re the last of the exams he needs to do before he can go on holiday, but they’re also among the most difficult for him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CT sub</td>
<td>Aliz elmondja Bencének, hogy István szülei másképp ünneplik minden vizsgájának a végét. <strong>Aliz:</strong> Amikor (István) a <em>francia vizsgákkal</em> végez, szülei egy párizsi jellegű <em>apéro</em>-t szerveznek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CT sub</td>
<td>Aliz is explaining to Bence how István’s parents celebrate the end of each of his exams differently. <strong>Aliz:</strong> When the <em>French exams</em> István finishes… his parents will organise a <em>Parisian-themed apéro</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CF sub</td>
<td>Aliz és Dávid elmondják Bencének, hogy István szülei másképp ünneplik minden vizsgájának a végét. <strong>Aliz:</strong> Amikor István a német vizsgákkal végez, szülei egy párizsi jellegű <em>apéro</em>-t szerveznek. Dávid felhúzza a szemöldökét és félbeszakítja Alizt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CF sub</td>
<td>Aliz and David are explaining to Bence how István’s parents celebrate the end of each of his exams differently. <strong>Aliz:</strong> When István finishes the German exams, his parents will organise a <em>Parisian-themed apéro</em>. David raises his eyebrow and interrupts Aliz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dávid: Amikor (István) a francia vizsgákkal végez..., akkor rendeznek a szülei párizsi jellegű apérot-t.

David: When the French exams István finishes... his parents will organise a Parisian-themed apéro.


Aliz: István worked really hard on his studies. Throughout the year he made sure to go to every seminar and lecture. He even took extra lessons with some tutors for all of the modules he’s doing. When the French exams István finishes, he will finally be able to go on holiday. They’re the last of the exams and the exam session is set for the end of May. They worry him more than the others, because they’re among the exams he finds most difficult.

Dóra és Réka arról beszélgetnek, hogy milyen ügyetlen volt Balázs, amikor gyerek volt.

Dóra: Nem az volt a kérdés, hogy el fog-e töri valamit, hanem hogy mikor! Azt hiszem, eltört minden egyes játékot, amit valaha kapott. Például... (Balázs) a játékautót három évesen törte el.

Virág közbevág: Virág: Például amikor három éves volt, eltört az akciófigurát. Dóra megrázza a fejét.

Dóra: Tulajdonképpen, (Balázs) a játékautót törte el, amikor három éves volt. Az akciófigurát a következő évben törte el.

Dóra arról mesél Balázsnak, milyen volt Balázs, amikor gyerek volt.

Dóra: Olyan édes volt. Mindig barátságos és jószívű. Mindig könnyen barátkozott

Virág interjúja: Virág: For example, Balázs broke the action figure when he was three. Dóra shakes her head.

Dóra: Actually, the toy car Balázs broke when he was three. He broke the action figure the following year.

Dóra is telling Réka about what Balázs was like when he was a child.

Dóra: He was so sweet. Always friendly and generous. It was so easy for him to make
Dóra és Réka arról beszélgetnek, hogy milyen volt Balázs, amikor gyerek volt.

Dóra: Balázs édes gyerek volt, de elég ügyetlen. Olyan gyakran törte el a játékait, hogy az eseteket naptárként kezdtem használni! Például, amikor (Balázs) a játékautót eltörte, ő nyaraltunk 1994-ben.

Dóra és Virág Rékának mesélnek arról, hogy Balázs milyen volt, amikor gyerek volt.

Dóra: Balázs aranyos gyerek volt, de elég ügyetlen. Olyan gyakran törte el a játékait, hogy az eseteket naptárként kezdtem használni!


Dóra: Tulajdonképpen, amikor (Balázs) a játékautót törte el, akkor nyaraltunk 1994-ben.

Dóra arról mesél Balázsnak, milyen volt Balázs, amikor gyerek volt.


Amikor a játékautót (Balázs) eltörte, az még vadonatúj volt. A nagybátyjától kapta ajándékba pár héttel korábban és egyből a kedvene játéka lett.

Dóra és Réka arról beszélgetnek, hogy milyen volt Balázs, amikor gyerek volt.

Dóra: Balázs édes gyerek volt, de elég ügyetlen. Olyan gyakran törte el a játékait, hogy az eseteket naptárként kezdtem használni! Például, amikor (Balázs) a játékautót eltörte, ő nyaraltunk 1994-ben.

Dóra és Virág Rékának mesélnek arról, hogy Balázs milyen volt, amikor gyerek volt.

Dóra: Balázs aranyos gyerek volt, de elég ügyetlen. Olyan gyakran törte el a játékait, hogy az eseteket naptárként kezdtem használni!


Dóra: Tulajdonképpen, amikor (Balázs) a játékautót törte el, akkor nyaraltunk 1994-ben.

Dóra arról mesél Balázsnak, milyen volt Balázs, amikor gyerek volt.


Amikor a játékautót (Balázs) eltörte, az még vadonatúj volt. A nagybátyjától kapta ajándékba pár héttel korábban és egyből a kedvene játéka lett.
Dátumra is. (Attila) Belgrádot meghódította 441-ben.

2 CF Main
Tamás és Dániel a hunok európai hódításairól mesélnek Bálintnak.

Tamás: Attila végigsopórt Európán, mindent elfoglalva az útjában! Emlékszem néhány dátumra is.

Dániel közebevág:
Dániel: Igen! (Attila) 441-ben meghódította Szőfját...

Tamás homlokát ráncolja és kiigazítja Dánielt.

Tamás: Nos, valójában, (Attila) Belgrádot hódította meg 441-ben.

Remember some of the dates, too. Belgrade Attila conquered in 441.

2 CF main
Tamás and Daniel are telling Bálint about the conquests made by the Huns in Europe.

Tamás: Attila was sweeping through Europe conquering everything in his path! I remember some of the dates, too.

Daniel interjects:
Daniel: Yeah! Attila conquered Sofia in 441. Tamás frowns and corrects Daniel.

Tamás: Actually, Belgrade, Attila conquered in 441.

3 A-Topic Main
Tamás Attiláról, a hun vezéről mesél Bálintnak.

Tamás: Az iskolában Attiláról fogunk tanulni a következő órán. Igazán lenyűgöző történelmi figura, a Hun Birodalom uralkodója, rettegekték tőle kelettől nyugatig.

Belgrádot (Attila) meghódította 441-ben. Akkoriban Singidunumnak hívták és meghódítása hatalmas győzelemnek számított Attila rómaiak elleni hadjáratában.

3 A-Topic Main
Tamás is telling Bálint about Attila the Hun.

Tamás: Attila is our next subject at school. He’s really a fascinating historical figure, ruler of the Hunnic Empire and he was feared in East and West.

Belgrade Attila conquered in 441. It was called Singidunum at the time and was a major conquest in Attila’s campaign against the Romans.

4 CT sub
Tamás és Bálint a hunok európai hódításairól beszélgetnek.


4 CT sub
Tamás and Bálint are chatting about the conquests made by the Huns in Europe.

Tamás: Attila was sweeping through Europe conquering everything in his path! He and his brother conquered much of Eastern Europe, but later Attila led his armies without Bleda. When Belgrade Attila conquered, his brother Bleda was still alive.

5 CF sub
Tamás és Dániel a hunok európai hódításairól mesélneknak.

Tamás: Attila végigsopórt Európán és mindenkit legyőzött, aki az útjába került. Ő és a bátyja meghódították Kelet-Európa nagy részét, de később Attila Bleda nélkül vezette a seregeit. Dániel közebevág:
Dániel: Igen! Amikor Attila meghódította Belgrádot, bátyja Bleda még élt.

Tamás homlokát ráncolva kijavítja Dánielt.

Tamás: Amikor (Attila) Belgrádot hódította meg. akkor élt még a bátyja.

5 CF sub
Tamás and Daniel are telling Bálint about the conquests made by the Huns in Europe.

Tamás: Attila was sweeping through Europe conquering everything in his path! He and his brother conquered much of Eastern Europe, but later Attila led his armies without Bleda. Daniel interjects:
Daniel: Yeah! When Attila conquered Belgrade, his brother Bleda was still alive. Tamás frowns and corrects Daniel.

Tamás: When Belgrade Attila conquered, his brother Bleda was still alive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Sub-Topic</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 A-Topic Sub</td>
<td>Tamás is telling Bálint about Attila the Hun. When Belgrade Attila conquered, he was leading a campaign against the Romans. It was called Singidunum at the time and was a major conquest in Attila’s invasion into the Balkans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CT main</td>
<td>Petra és Fruzi azon tanakodnak, hogy miért duzzog Eszter a szobájában. <strong>Fruzi</strong>: Biztos vagyok benne, hogy nem volt rajta annyi holmi, amikor hazaértünk, mint amikor elindultunk. Gondolod, hogy elveszette valamijét? <strong>Petra</strong>: Ez az! Elveszette néhány holmiját. Azt hiszem, én tudom is, hol. (Eszter) a kendőjét a karácsonyi vásárban vesztette el.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CT main</td>
<td>Petra and Fruzi are wondering why Eszter is sulking in her room. <strong>Fruzi</strong>: I’m pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things? <strong>Petra</strong>: That’s it! She’s lost a few of her things. I think I even know where. <em>Her shawl Eszter lost at the Christmas market.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CF main</td>
<td>Petra, Fruzi és Laura azon tanakodnak, hogy miért duzzog Eszter a szobájában. <strong>Fruzi</strong>: Biztos vagyok benne, hogy nem volt rajta annyi holmi, amikor hazaértünk, mint amikor elindultunk. Gondolod, hogy elveszette valamijét? <strong>Petra</strong>: Ez az! Elveszette néhány holmiját. Azt hiszem, én tudom is, hol. Laura hirtelen félbeszakítja Petrát: <strong>Laura</strong>: Én is tudom! A karácsonyi vásárban elveszette a kesztyűjét! Petra felvonja a szemöldökét. <strong>Petra</strong>: <em>cough</em> (Eszter) a kendőjét vesztette el a karácsonyi vásárban. A kesztyűjét csak később, a buszon hazafelé vesztette el.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CF main</td>
<td>Petra, Fruzi and Laura are wondering why Eszter is sulking in her room. <strong>Fruzi</strong>: I’m pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things? <strong>Petra</strong>: That’s it! I think I even know where. Laura interrupts Petra and blurts out: <strong>Laura</strong>: I know too! She lost her mittens at the Christmas fair! Petra raises an eyebrow. <strong>Petra</strong>: <em>cough</em> <em>Her shawl Eszter lost at the Christmas market</em>. She only lost her mittens later, on the bus ride home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A-Topic Main</td>
<td>Petra Eszter városi kiruccanásáról mesél Fruzsínak. <strong>Petra</strong>: Egy igazi élmény volt neki! Nagyon tetszette neki az óváros régi épületei és jó móka volt a középkori étteremben. Még jó, hogy volt gyerekmenü, mert akkora adagokat adtak! Hazafelé viszont kicsit elromlott a hangulat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A-Topic Main</td>
<td>Petra is telling Fruzi about Eszter’s trip into town. <strong>Petra</strong>: It was a real treat for her! She absolutely adored all the old buildings in the old town and we all had lots of fun eating at the medieval restaurant. Good thing they had a children’s menu, because the portions were so big! It went a bit downhill on the way back though.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 CT sub</strong></td>
<td><strong>4 CT sub</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra és Fruzsi azon tanakodnak, hogy miért duzzog Eszter a szobájában. <strong>Fruzsi:</strong> Biztos vagyok benne, hogy nem volt rajta annyi holmi, amikor hazáértünk, mint amikor elindultunk. Gondolod, hogy elvesztette valamit? <strong>Petra:</strong> Ez lesz az! Ö, tudom is, hol vesztette el Őket! Amikor (Eszter) a kendőjét elvesztette, éppen forralt bort ittunk a karácsonyi vásárban. Azt hiszem, a többi holmiját a buszon hazafelé vesztette el.</td>
<td>Petra and Fruzsi are wondering why Eszter is sulking in her room. <strong>Fruzsi:</strong> I'm pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things? <strong>Petra:</strong> That must be it! Oh, I know where she lost them, too! When <em>her shawl</em> Eszter lost, we were having mulled wine at the Christmas market. I think she lost the other things on the bus ride home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 CF sub</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 CF sub</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra, Fruzsi és Laura azon tanakodnak, hogy miért duzzog Eszter a szobájában. <strong>Fruzsi:</strong> Biztos vagyok benne, hogy kevesebb ruha volt rajta, amikor visszajöttünk. Szerintetek elhagyott valamit? <strong>Petra:</strong> Ez az! Ö, én tudom hol hagytta el a cuccait! Laura félbe szakítja Petrát és azt mondja: <strong>Laura:</strong> Én is tudom! Amikor elvesztette a kendőjét, épp forraltbороzтunk a karácsonyi vásárban. Petra ráncolja a homlokát: <strong>Petra:</strong> <em>köhögés</em> Amikor (Eszter) a kendőjét vesztette el, akkor forraltbороzтunk a karácsonyi vásárban. A többi holmiját hazafelé a buszon vesztette el.</td>
<td>Petra, Fruzsi and Laura are wondering why Eszter is sulking in her room. <strong>Fruzsi:</strong> I'm pretty sure she wasn’t wearing as much when we got back in. Do you think she lost some of her things? <strong>Petra:</strong> That must be it! Oh, I know where she lost them, too! Laura interrupts Petra and blurts out: <strong>Laura:</strong> I know too! When Eszter lost her shawl, we were having mulled wine at the Christmas market. Petra raises an eyebrow. <strong>Petra:</strong> <em>cough</em> When <em>her shawl</em> Eszter lost, we were <em>having mulled wine</em> at the Christmas market. She lost the other things on the bus ride home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 A-Topic Sub</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 A-Topic Sub</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Petra Eszter városi kiruccanásáról mesél Fruzsinak. **Petra:** Egy igazi élmény volt neki! Nagyon tetszettek neki az óváros régi épületei és jó móka volt a középkori étteremben enni. Még jó, hogy volt gyerekmenü, mert akkora adagokat adtak! Hazafelé viszont kicsit elromlott a hangulat. Amikor a kendőjét (Eszter) elvesztette, a karácsonyi vásárban voltunk. Csak akkor vettüks észre, hogy nincs meg, amikor felszálltunk hazafelé a buszra. Az volt a kedvenc kendője, mindig viselte, így érthető, hogy nagyon szomorú lett miatta. Rózsaszín | Petra is telling Fruzsi about Eszter’s trip into town. **Petra:** It was a real treat for her! She absolutely adored all the old buildings in the old town and we all had lots of fun eating at the medieval restaurant. Good thing they had a children’s menu, because the portions were so big! It went a bit downhill on the way back though. **When her shawl* Eszter lost, we were at the Christmas market. It was only noticed to be missing when we got on the bus back. It was her favourite shawl and she’s almost inseparable from it, so it’s understandable.

that she was really upset about it. It’s a pink and white, made of silk, with lovely flower decorations at the edges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Péter: Szóval, hogy durrantotta ki a lufikat?</th>
<th>Barbara: Oh, he popped each balloon while pretending to be a different animal! When the red balloon, Ádám popped, he was pretending to be a lion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbara:</strong> Ó, úgy durrantott ki minden lufit, hogy közben úgy tett, mintha más-más állat lenne! Amikor (Ádám) a piros lufit durrantotta ki, úgy tett, mintha egy oroszlán lenne.</td>
<td>5 CF sub Péter, Fanni and Barbara are attending Ádám’s show for children. They find it very entertaining but while Ádám starts his balloon act, Péter has to step out to answer his mobile. When he comes back, he asks: <strong>Péter:</strong> So, how did he pop the balloons? <strong>Fanni:</strong> Oh, he popped each balloon while pretending to be a different animal! When Ádám popped the blue balloon, he was pretending to be a lion. <strong>Barbara:</strong> Were you even paying attention? When the red balloon, Ádám popped, he was pretending to be a lion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CF sub Péter és Barbara részt vesznek Ádám gyermekek számára készült showján. Nagyon szórakoztatónak találják, de amikor Ádám elkezdő a lufis mutatványt, Péternek ki kell mennie, hogy felvegye a mobilját. Amikor visszajön, azt kérdezi: <strong>Péter:</strong> Szóval, hogy durrantotta ki a lufikat? <strong>Fanni:</strong> Ó, úgy durrantott ki minden lufit, hogy közben úgy tett, mintha más-más állat lenne! Amikor a piros lufit durrantotta ki, úgy tett, mintha egy oroszlán lenne. <strong>Barbara:</strong> Figyeltél egyáltalán? Amikor (Ádám) a piros lufit durrantotta, akkor tett úgy, mintha egy oroszlón lenne.</td>
<td>6 A-Topic Sub Barbara is describing Ádám’s show for children to Péter. <strong>Barbara:</strong> Ádám’s show was absolutely fantastic. The kids loved it! Even I adored it, because it was so original and inventive. All the children were ecstatic and screaming with laughter. I had no idea he was such an excellent entertainer! When red balloon, Ádám popped, the children cheered. Because it wasn’t just a balloon to the children. It had been used by Ádám throughout the show like a kind of funny evil character he would make fun of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbara:</strong> Amikor (Ádám) a piros lufit durrantotta, a gyerekek újjonják. Ez nem csak egy lufi volt, Ádám az egész show alatt egy gonosz karakterként ábrázolta, akivel sok tréfát üzött.</td>
<td>6 A-Topic Sub Barbara Ádám gyerekeknek készült showjáról mesél Péternek. <strong>Barbara:</strong> Ádám műsora fantasztikus volt. A gyerekek imádták! Még én is odavoltam érte, olyan eredeti és ötletes volt. A gyerekek rettentően élvezték és dölték a röhögéstől. Fogalmam sem volt, hogy ilyen szórakoztató előadó. Amikor a piros lufit (Ádám) kidurrantotta, a gyerekek úgy tették ki, hogy közben úgy tett, mintha más-más állat lenne! Amikor a piros lufit durrantotta ki, úgy tett, mintha egy oroszlán lenne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barbara:</strong> Amikor a piros lufit (Ádám) kidurrantotta, a gyerekek újjonják. Ez nem csak egy lufi volt, Ádám az egész show alatt egy gonosz karakterként ábrázolta, akivel sok tréfát üzött.</td>
<td>2 CF main Dóri és Marci elmesélí Zsófinak, hogy mi minden történt, amikor Lászlóval a repülőterre indultak. <strong>Dori:</strong> Kétségbeesetten elkezdünk mindenféle dolgot keresgélni a lakásban. Hihetetlen, hogy egyes dolgok hol kötnek ki. Például... László a kulcsot a kanapé alatt megtalálta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A-Topic Main</td>
<td>Dóri Zsófinak mesél arról, hogy mi minden történt vele, amikor Lászlóval a repülőtérre indult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dóri:</strong></td>
<td>Kétségbeesetten elkezdtünk mindenféle dolgot keresgélni a lakásban. Hihetetlen, hogy egyes dolgok hol kötnek ki.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcı:</strong></td>
<td>Igen, László a repülőjegye ket a kanapé alatt találta meg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dóri:</strong></td>
<td>Nos, valójában, László a kulcsot találta meg a kanapé alatt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 CT sub</th>
<th>Dóri elmeséli Zsófinak, hogy mi minden történt, amikor Lászlóval a repülőtérre indultak.</th>
<th>Dori is telling Zsófi about all the incidents that happened as she was leaving for the airport with László.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dóri:</strong></td>
<td>Kétségbeesetten elkezdtünk mindenféle dolgot keresgélni a lakásban. Az óra ketyegett, és minden alkalommal, amikor valamit megtaláltunk, ránéztem az órára. Amikor László a kulcsot megtalálta, csak 10 percünk maradt indulásig.</td>
<td>Suddenly we were frantically searching for all kinds of stuff around the flat. The clock was ticking, and I looked at the time every time we found one of the things. When the keys László found, we just had 10 minutes left before we had to dash out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcı:</strong></td>
<td>Így van. Amikor László megtalálta a repülőjegye ket, csak 10 percünk volt indulásig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dóri:</strong></td>
<td>Marci, én mesélem a történetet. Mindenesetre… Amikor (László) a kulcsot találta meg, akkor volt 10 percünk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CF sub</th>
<th>Dóri és Marci elmesélík Zsófinak, hogy mi minden történt, amikor Lászlóval a repülőtérre indultak.</th>
<th>Dori and Marci are telling Zsófi about all the incidents that happened as they were leaving for the airport with László.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dóri:</strong></td>
<td>Kétségbeesetten elkezdtünk mindenféle dolgot keresgélni a lakásban. Az óra ketyegett, és minden alkalommal, amikor valamit megtaláltunk, ránéztem az órára.</td>
<td>Suddenly we were frantically searching for all kinds of stuff around the flat. The clock was ticking, and I looked at the time every time we found one of the things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marcı:</strong></td>
<td>Így van. Amikor László megtalálta a repülőjegye ket, csak 10 percünk volt indulásig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6 A-Topic Sub | Dori: Marci, I’m telling the story. anyways... when the keys László found, we just had 10 minutes left. | Dori: Marci, I’m telling the story. anyways... when the keys László found, we just had 10 minutes left. |
Dóri is telling Zsófi about all the incidents that happened as she was leaving for the airport with László. **Dóri:** László and I are so exhausted! It’s been a non-stop marathon since this morning. And the flight was awful: I’ve never had a ruder flight attendant. But the troubles had begun even before we had left the house. When the keys László found, I had almost given up hope! They are my aunt’s, you see, because we borrowed her car. They have a beautiful keychain which looks like a puppy. But we couldn’t find them, because they had somehow got lost and ended up under the sofa!

| 1 CT main | Máté asks Viktória about little Gábor.  
**Viktória:** He’s doing well, thanks! We play this reflex game where he has to stop different coloured balls that are rolling down a slope using a paddle.  
**Viktória:** The red ball Gábor stopped in just 3 seconds. |
| 2 CF main | Máté asks Viktória and Krisztián about little Gábor.  
**Viktória:** He’s doing well, thanks! We play this reflex game where he has to stop different coloured balls that are rolling down a slope using a paddle.  
**Krisztián:** Yes, last time he stopped the yellow bawl in just 3 seconds. |
| 3 A-Topic Main | Viktória is telling Máté about her child, Gábor.  
**Viktória:** He’s growing so quickly! And he’s very active. At the moment it’s me watching him. I’m still on maternity leave. He’s started crawling and he really moves quickly! The red ball Gábor stopped in just three seconds. It’s something we use in a reflex game, but I think Gábor really likes it. A gift from his grandparents. We roll it down a slope and he has to catch it. I think it’s quickly becoming his new favourite toy. |
Máté asks Viktória about little Gábor.

Viktória: He’s doing well, thanks! We play this reflex game where he has to stop different coloured balls that are rolling down a slope using a paddle. But it was funny because yesterday he had a different reaction after he stopped each ball. When the red ball Gábor stopped, he looked very serious and concentrated.

Viktória: He’s growing so quickly! And he’s very active. At the moment it’s me watching him. I’m still on maternity leave. He’s started crawling and he really moves quickly!

When the red ball Gábor stopped in just three seconds, I was so pleased. It’s something we use in a reflex game, but I think Gábor really likes it. A gift from his grandparents. We roll it down a slope and he has to catch it. I think it’s quickly becoming his new favourite toy.

Anita has invited Márton over for lunch.

Márton: The food was delicious, but what happened to the crockery? There are cracks on all of them.

Anita: Oh I am so sorry! Unfortunately, little Alexandra has been at them and I’ve not had
időm újakat venni. (Alexandra) a tálat megrepesztette, ahogy ütögette a kanállal.

2 CF main
Anita és Norbert meghívた Mártont ebédre.
Márton: Az étel finom volt, de mi történt az edényekkel? Mindegyiken repedések vannak.
Anita: Ó, anyyira sajnálmom! Sajnos, kis Alexandra játszott velük, és még nem volt időm újakat venni.
Norbert: Igen, Alexandra megrepesztette a tálat, amikor leejtette a földre.
Anita: Az a teáskanna volt, Norbert. És szerencsére nem esett túl magasról.
(Alexandra) a tálat repesztette meg a kanállal.

2 CF main
Anita and Norbert have invited Márton over for lunch.
Márton: The food was delicious, but what happened to the crockery? There are cracks on all of them.
Anita: Oh I am so sorry! Unfortunately, little Alexandra has been at them and I’ve not had time to get a new set.
Norbert: Yeah, Alexandra cracked the bowl by dropping it on the floor.
Anita: That was the teapot, Norbert. And thankfully it didn’t fall very far. The bowl Alexandra cracked by banging it with her spoon.

3 A-Topic Main
Anita kislányáról, Alexandráról mesél Mártonnak.
A tálat (Alexandra) megrepesztette, miután kitalálta, hogyan éri el a porcelángyűjteményt. Olyan szép darab volt, egy szép kék hegyes tájat ábrázolt. De esélye sem volt Alexandrával szemben.

3 A-Topic Main
Anita is telling Márton about her little girl Alexandra.
Anita: She’s so active and full of energy. I can’t really keep up anymore. It was easier when she couldn’t run yet. But I don’t really mind. Most of the time, she behaves.
The bowl Alexandra cracked after she found a way to reach our china collection. It was such a lovely piece: it showed a lovely mountain landscape in blue. But it stood no chance against Alexandra.

4 CT sub
Anita áthívta Mártont ebédre.
Márton: Az étel finom volt, de mi történt az edényekkel? Mindegyiken repedések vannak.
Anita: Ó, anyyira sajnálmom! Sajnos, kis Alexandra játszott velük, és még nem volt időm újakat venni. Norbertnek, a férjemnek, elege is lett belőle. Eddig elég türelmes volt, de ...
Amikor Alexandra a tálat megrepesztette tegnap. Norbert kijött a sodrából.

4 CT sub
Anita has invited Márton over for lunch.
Márton: The food was delicious, but what happened to the crockery? There are cracks on all of them.
Anita: Oh I am so sorry! Unfortunately, little Alexandra has been at them and I’ve not had time to get a new set. And Norbert, my husband, has really had enough of it. He had managed to keep his cool until recently, but…when the bowl Alexandra cracked yesterday, Norbert lost his temper.

5 CF sub
Anita és Norbert áthívた Mártont ebédre.
Márton: Az étel finom volt, de mi történt az edényekkel? Mindegyiken repedések vannak.
Anita: Ó, anyyira sajnálmom! Sajnos, kis Alexandra játszott velük, és még nem volt időm újakat venni. Norbertnek, a férjemnek,

5 CF sub
Anita and Norbert have invited Márton over for lunch.
Márton: The food was delicious, but what happened to the crockery? There are cracks on all of them.
Anita: Oh I am so sorry! Unfortunately, little Alexandra has been at them and I’ve not had
Norbert: Ó, az örületbe kerget! Amikor tegnap megrepesztette a teás kancsót, nagyon dühbe gurultam.

Anita: Úgy látszik olyan mérges volt, hogy el is felejtette, hogy mi is volt az, ami kihozta a sodrából. Amikor (Alexandra) a tálat repesztette meg, akkor veszítette el Norbert a türelmét.

time to get a new set. And Norbert, my husband, has really had enough of it. He had managed to keep his cool until recently, but…

Norbert: Oh, it makes me mad! When she cracked the teapot yesterday, I flew off the handle.

Anita: Looks like he was so angry he’s forgotten what triggered his tantrum in the first place. When the bowl Alexandra cracked yesterday, Norbert lost his temper.


Amikor a tálat (Alexandra) megrepesztette, le kellett szidnunk. Olyan szép darab volt, egy szép kék hegyes tájat ábrázolt. De esélye sem volt Alexandrával szemben.

Anita is telling Márton about her little girl Alexandra.
Anita: She’s so active and full of energy. I can’t really keep up anymore. It was easier when she couldn’t run yet. But I don’t really mind. Most of the time, she behaves.

When the bowl Alexandra cracked, we had to tell her off. It was such a lovely piece: it showed a lovely mountain landscape in blue. But it stood no chance against Alexandra.

Ada: It’s an interesting game with magic, swords and everything, but its main attraction to me is that it tests Dénes’s creativity and problem-solving ability. Every round, he needs to find a new way to get through.

The third monster, Dénes killed after jumping on its back to reach its weak spot.

Ada: You’ve got it wrong. The third monster, Dénes killed after jumping on its back to reach its weak spot.
Ada: Rosszul tudod. (Dénes) a harmadik szörnyet ölte meg, miután a hátára ugrott és eltalálta a gyenge pontját.

3 A-Topic Main
Ada Dénes új videó játékáról mesél Bandinak.
Ada: Nagyon érdekes játék varázslatokkal, kardokkal meg minden, de ami a legjobban tetszik benne az az, hogy próbára teszi Dénes kreativitását és problémamegoldó készségét. Mindenesetre, állandóan ezzel játszik, de elég nehéz és ráadásul az iskolában is nagon elfoglalt, így nincs sok ideje. Azért mindig érdekes nézni, amikor játszik!
A harmadik szörnyet (Dénes) úgy ölte meg, hogy ráugrott a hátára, hogy megtalálja a gyenge pontját. Azért emlékszem erre ilyen jól, mert nagyon nehéz volt rájönni arra, hogy van ott egy gyenge pontja. Mindig Dénes felé fordult és nagyon nehéz volt mögé kerülni.

3 A-Topic Main
Ada is telling Bandi about Dénes’s new video game.
Ada: It’s an interesting game with magic, swords and everything, but its main attraction to me is that it tests Dénes’s creativity and problem-solving ability. Anyways, he’s always playing it now, but it’s tough and he’s busy with school, too. So he doesn’t have much time. It’s always interesting to watch, though!
The third monster, Dénes killed by jumping on its back to reach its weak spot. I remember that one well because it was really tough to figure out it even had a weak spot there. It kept turning to face Dénes and he had to work hard to get behind it.

4 CT Sub
Ada Dénes új videó játékáról mesél Bandinak.
Ada: Nagyon érdekes játék varázslatokkal, kardokkal meg minden, de ami a legjobban tetszik benne az az, hogy próbára teszi Dénes kreativitását és problémamegoldó készségét. Minden alkalommal, amikor tovább jut, máshogy ünnepel. Amikor (Dénes) a harmadik szörnyet megölte, futott egy öröm-kört a ház körül. Jó, mi?

4 CT Sub
Ada is telling Bandi about Dénes’s new video game.
Ada: Yeah! When he killed the fourth monster, he ran a victory lap around the house! Wow, right?

5 CF Sub
Ada és Frigyes Dénes új videó játékáról mesélnek Bandinak.
Ada: Nagyon érdekes játék varázslatokkal, kardokkal meg minden, de ami a legjobban tetszik benne az az, hogy próbára teszi Dénes kreativitását és problémamegoldó készségét. Minden alkalommal, amikor tovább jut, máshogy ünnepel.
Frigyes: Igen! Amikor a negyedik szörnyet megölte, futott egy öröm-kört a ház körül.
Ada: Rosszul tudod. Amikor (Dénes) a harmadik szörnyet ölte meg, akkor futott

5 CF Sub
Ada and Frigyes telling Bandi about Dénes’s new video game.
Ada: It’s an interesting game with magic, swords and everything, but its main attraction to me is that it tests Dénes’s creativity and problem-solving ability. Every time he gets past a round, he celebrates in a different way. When the third monster, Dénes killed, he ran a victory lap around the house! Yeah! When he killed the fourth monster, he ran a victory lap around the house! You’ve got it wrong. When the third monster, Dénes killed, he ran a victory lap around the house. He celebrated the other one by dancing like in Pulp Fiction.
| 6 A Sub | Ada is telling Bandi about Dénes’s new video game. Ada: It’s an interesting game with magic, swords and everything, but its main attraction to me is that it tests Dénes’s creativity and problem-solving ability. Anyways, he’s always playing it now, but it’s tough and he’s busy with school, too. So he doesn’t have much time. It’s always interesting to watch, though! When the third monster, Dénes killed, he ran a victory lap around the house. I remember that one well because he banged his toe when he got back. I couldn’t stop laughing! |

| 1 CT main | Edvin a nemzetközi ifi tenisztornáról mesél Filipnek, amin Gáspár részt vett. Edvin: Az eddigi legjobb játékát hozta, de csak negyedikként végzett. (Gáspár) a holland ellenfelét eléggé könnyedén legyőzte. Viszont az angol már nem tudta megverni. |
| 1 CT main | Edvin is telling Filip about the international youth tennis tournament Gáspár participated in. Edvin: He played his best but only finished fourth. The Dutch opponent, Gáspár defeated quite easily. He didn’t manage to get past the English opponent, though. |

| 2 CF main | Edvin and Gellért are telling Filip about the international youth tennis tournament Gáspár participated in. Edvin: He played his best but only finished fourth. Gellért: But he defeated the English opponent quite easily. Edvin: The Dutch opponent, Gáspár defeated quite easily. He lost to the Englishman. |

| 3 A-Topic Main | Edvin is telling Filip about how much Gáspár loves tennis. Edvin: He absolutely loves it. He practices every other day and talks about it constantly. I think his passion for tennis began when we took him to Wimbledon when he was a little boy. But nowadays he’s even playing in tournaments. |
The Dutch opponent, Gáspár defeated quite easily. He was even younger than Gáspár, but he had played really well until then. I guess Gáspár is just that good!

Edvin is telling Filip about the international youth tennis tournament Gáspár participated in. Edvin: He played his best but only finished fourth. When the Dutch opponent, Gáspár defeated, he was at the top of his game. He didn’t manage to get past the English opponent, though. I think he was just unlucky that time.

Edvin and Gellért are telling Filip about the international youth tennis tournament Gáspár participated in. Edvin: He played his best but only finished fourth. Gellért: But he was at the top of his game when he defeated the English opponent. Edvin: No, I think you’re getting the matches mixed up. When the Dutch opponent, Gáspár defeated, he was at the top of his game. He actually made a lot of mistakes against the Englishman.

Edvin is telling Filip about how much Gáspár loves tennis. Edvin: He absolutely loves it. He practices every other day and talks about it constantly. I think his passion for tennis began when we took him to Wimbledon when he was a little boy. But nowadays he’s even playing in tournaments. When the Dutch opponent, Gáspár defeated, he was at the top of his game. He was even younger than Gáspár, but he had played really well until then. I guess Gáspár is just that good!

Hajnal is telling Ibolya about how angry Ilona was the day before. Hajnal: She was fuming! She screamed at us at the top of her voice and left slamming every door on her way out. The front door, she slammed so hard it deafened us.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 CF main</th>
<th>Hajnalka és Roland arról mesélnek Ibolyának, hogy milyen mérges volt Ilona az előző nap.</th>
<th>2 CF main</th>
<th>Hajnalka és Roland are telling Ibolya about how angry Ilona was the day before.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hajnalka</strong>: Tajtékzott! Torkaszakadtából üvöltött velünk és becsapott maga után minden ajtót, amikor elment. <strong>Roland</strong>: Igy van. És olyan erősen csapta be a kaput, hogy majdnem megsüketültünk. <strong>Hajnalka</strong>: (Hajnalka) a <em>bejárat</em> ajtót csapta be olyan erősen, hogy majdnem megsüketültünk. <strong>Hajnalka</strong>: Amikor (Hajnalka) a <em>bejárat</em> ajtót csapta be, akkor süketültünk meg majdnem. Azt nem hallottam, hogy a kaput becsapta-e, úgy csengett a fülem.</td>
<td><strong>Hajnal</strong>: She was fuming! She screamed at us at the top of her voice and left slamming every door on her way out. <strong>Roland</strong>: That’s right. And she slammed the gate so hard it deafened us. <strong>Hajnal</strong>: The <em>front door</em>, she slammed so hard it deafened us. I don’t know if she slammed the gate, my ears were ringing so loud.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
<th>Hajnalka arról mesél Ibolyának, hogy milyen mérges volt Ilona az előző nap.</th>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
<th>Hajnal is telling Ibolya about how angry Ilona was the day before.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hajnalka</strong>: Tajtékzott! Torkaszakadtából üvöltött velünk. Szerintem azért volt mérges, mert úgy érezte, hogy kihagyjuk a projektből. Nagyon sajnálom, hogy így bántunk vele. A bejárati ajtót (Hajnalka) olyan erősen becsapta, hogy majdnem megsüketültünk. Kissé megrongálódott, ki kellett hívnunk valakit, hogy megjavítsa.</td>
<td><strong>Hajnal</strong>: She was fuming! She screamed at us at the top of her voice. I think it was because she felt she wasn’t being involved in the project and she felt left out. I feel really sorry about how we treated her. The <em>front door</em>, she slammed so hard it deafened us. It’s now a little damaged so we had to have someone come and repair it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 CT Sub</th>
<th>Hajnalka arról mesél Ibolyának, hogy milyen mérges volt Ilona az előző nap.</th>
<th>4 CT Sub</th>
<th>Hajnal is telling Ibolya about how angry Ilona was the day before.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hajnalka</strong>: Tajtékzott! Torkaszakadtából üvöltött velünk és becsapott maga után minden ajtót, amikor elment. *<em>Amikor (Hajnalka) a bejárat</em> ajtót becsapta, majdnem megsüketültünk.</td>
<td><strong>Hajnal</strong>: She was fuming! She screamed at us at the top of her voice and left slamming every door on her way out. <strong>When the front door, she slammed, it was so loud that it deafened us.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CF Sub</th>
<th>Hajnalka és Roland arról mesélnek Ibolyának, hogy milyen mérges volt Ilona az előző nap.</th>
<th>5 CF Sub</th>
<th>Hajnal and Roland are telling Ibolya about how angry Ilona was the day before.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hajnalka</strong>: Tajtékzott! Torkaszakadtából üvöltött velünk és becsapott maga után minden ajtót, amikor elment. <strong>Roland</strong>: Igy van. És olyan erősen csapta be a kaput, hogy majdnem megsüketültünk. <strong>Hajnalka</strong>: Amikor (Hajnalka) a <em>bejárat</em>' ajtót csapta be, akkor süketültünk meg majdnem. Azt nem hallottam, hogy a kaput becsapta-e, úgy csengett a fülem.</td>
<td><strong>Hajnal</strong>: She was fuming! She screamed at us at the top of her voice and left slamming every door on her way out. <strong>Roland</strong>: That’s right. And when she slammed the gate it was so loud that it deafened us. <strong>Hajnal</strong>: When the <em>front door, she slammed, it was so loud that it deafened us.</em> I don’t know if she slammed the gate, my ears were ringing so loud.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 A-Topic Sub</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 CT main</th>
<th>1 CT main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irma arról mesél Jolánnak, hogy milyen rossz Kálmán arcmemóriája.</td>
<td>Irma is telling Jolán about how bad Kálmán is at remembering faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irma:</strong> Mostanában kicsit feledékeny. Mindig kicsit kínos, mert sosem tudom, hogy tudja-e kivel beszél. Például, (Kálmán) az egyiptomi diákat felismeri, mert őt gyakran látja. De azokat a diákokat, akiket ritkábban lát, nem mindig ismeri fel.</td>
<td><strong>Irma:</strong> He’s a little forgetful nowadays. It’s always a little awkward because I’m never sure if he can tell who he is talking to. For example, the Egyptian student, Kálmán recognises because he sees him often. But he doesn’t always recognise students he sees less frequently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 CF main</th>
<th>2 CF main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irma és Szilveszter arról mesélnek Jolánnak, hogy milyen rossz Kálmán arcmemóriája.</td>
<td>Irma and Szilveszter are telling Jolán about how bad Kálmán is at remembering faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irma:</strong> Mostanában kicsit feledékeny. Mindig kicsit kínos, mert sosem tudom, hogy tudja-e kivel beszél. Az idős Szilveszter, aki kicsit elpillantott, miközben Irma beszélt, hangosan közbevág. <strong>Szilveszter:</strong> Igen, így van! Annyi bizonyos, hogy a japán diákat felismeri, amikor látja. Szerintem azért, mert olyan gyakran látja. Irma nevet és azt mondja: <strong>Irma:</strong> Nem, kedves Szilveszter, attól tartok tévedszi. (Kálmán) az egyiptomi diákat ismeri fel, mert gyakran látja. Az mindig nagyon kellemetlen, amikor a japán diák beszél vele. Kálmán sosem emlékszik rá.</td>
<td><strong>Szilveszter:</strong> That’s right, that’s right! I can tell he recognises that Japanese student when he sees him. Because he sees him so often, I think. Irma laughs and says: <strong>Irma:</strong> No, dear Szilveszter, I’m afraid you’re mistaken. The Egyptian student, Kálmán recognises because he sees him often. It’s always a big drama when the Japanese student talks to him. Kálmán never remembers who he is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irma arról mesél Jolánnak, hogy milyen rossz Kálmán arcmemóriája.</td>
<td>Irma is telling Jolán about how bad Kálmán is at remembering faces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irma:</strong> Mostanában kicsit feledékeny. Állandóan dolgozik, amikor otthon van, és sosem megy el szórakozni. Talán ez is</td>
<td><strong>Irma:</strong> He’s a little forgetful nowadays. He works all the time when he’s at home and rarely goes out for social activities. Perhaps that is part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 CT Sub</td>
<td>Irma is telling Jolán about how bad Kálmán is at remembering faces. <strong>Irma:</strong> He’s a little forgetful nowadays. It’s always a little awkward because I’m never sure if he can tell who he is talking to, except sometimes, when he reacts in some way. For example, when Egyptian student Kálmán recognises, he always cracks a broad smile, because he sees him often and they get along so well. But he doesn’t react like that to the students he sees less frequently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 CF Sub</td>
<td>Irma and Szilveszter are telling Jolán about how bad Kálmán is at remembering faces. <strong>Irma:</strong> That’s right, that’s right! I can tell he recognises that Japanese student, because when he sees him he always grins. He sees him often and they get along really well. Irma laughs and says: <strong>Irma:</strong> No, dear Szilveszter, I’m afraid you’re mistaken. When Egyptian student Kálmán recognises, he always cracks a broad smile, because he sees him often and they get along so well. It’s always a big drama when he meets the Japanese student. Kálmán doesn’t get along with him at all and he can’t help but frown. I don’t really know why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A-Topic Sub</td>
<td>Irma arról mesél Jolánnak, hogy milyen rossz Kálmán arcmemóriája.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A Sub</td>
<td>Irma is telling Jolán about how bad Kálmán is at remembering faces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Irma: He’s a little forgetful nowadays. He works all the time when he’s at home and rarely goes out for social activities. Perhaps that is part of the reason why his memory seems to be failing.

When the Egyptian student Kálmán recognises, he always cracks a broad smile, because he sees him often and they get along so well. He’s a research student who comes by to discuss his work on Ancient Egypt with Kálmán. I like him, though, because he’s so polite and always brings flowers or something for me.

N

1 CT main
Lajos is telling Magdolna about Nándor’s prize draw obsession.

Lajos: Oh, Magdolna! He’s completely mad about it! Every day he goes through the local papers to find every single prize draw competition he can enter and buys tickets for them. At least, now and then, he manages to win something. Last week was pretty special because he won more than one prize. The trip to New Zealand, he won after he entered a prize draw organised by the local council. He won two other prizes at fair raffle.

2 CF main
Lajos and Teca telling Magdolna about Nándor’s prize draw obsession.

Lajos: Oh, Magdolna! He’s completely mad about it! Every day he goes through the local papers to find every single prize draw competition he can enter and buys tickets for them. At least, now and then, he manages to win something. Last week was pretty special because he won more than one prize. The trip to New Zealand, he won after he entered a prize draw organised by the local council. He won two other prizes at fair raffle.

Teca: Yeah! It’s so wonderful! He won this trip to Australia by buying a ticket at a prize draw organised by the local council! I can’t wait to see Ayer’s Rock!

Lajos: The trip to New Zealand, he won after he entered a prize draw organised by the local council. He won the other trip on the internet with some insurance company, but it turns out he is not eligible for it. And who said he’s taking you anywhere, anyways?
Lajos Nándor nyereményjáték függőségéről mesél Magdolnának.

**Lajos:** Ó, Magdolna! Nándor teljesen megőrül a nyereményjátékokért! Mindennap végig néz a helyi lapokat és minden nyereményjátékról befizet. Nagyon aggódom, mert attól tartok, ez már valami féle játékfüggőség.

Az új-zélandi utat (Nándor) azután nyerte, miután jelentkezett egy nyereményjátékről, amit a helyi tanács szervezett. Biztosan nagyon különleges nyeremény ez számára, mert nagyon sokat ér. És elég hosszú út, több mint két hét!

Végigvisznek az országon, miközben a táj természetes szépségét csodálhatod.

4 CT Sub

Lajos Nándor nyereményjáték függőségéről mesél Magdolnának.

**Lajos:** Ó, Magdolna! Nándor teljesen megőrül a nyereményjátékokért! Mindennap végig néz a helyi lapokat és minden nyereményjátékről befizet. Legalább néha-néha nyer valamit. Múlt héten például többször is nyert. Amikor (Nándor) az új-zélandi utat nyerte, hatalmasat bulitztunk! Mert olyan drága nyeremény. A másik két nyeremény nem ért túl sokat.

5 CF Sub

Lajos és Teca Nándor nyereményjáték függőségéről mesélnek Magdolnának.

**Lajos:** Ó, Magdolna! Nándor teljesen megőrül a nyereményjátékokért! Mindennap végig néz a helyi lapokat és minden nyereményjátékről befizet. Ekkor Teca lelkesen közbevág.

**Teca:** Igen! Ez csodálatos! Nyerte ezt az utat Ausztráliába és akkorát bulitztunk! Alix várom, hogy lássam az Ayer’s Rock-ot!

**Lajos:** Amikor (Nándor) az új-zélandi utat nyerte, akkor bulitztunk! Kiderült, hogy az ausztráliai útsoz mégsem felel meg a feltételeknek, szóval egy olyan nyeremény miatt nem bulizhattunk, amit nem is tudunk használni, nem igaz?

6 A-Sub
Lajos is telling Magdolna about Nándor’s prize draw obsession.

**Lajos:** Oh, Magdolna! He’s completely mad about it! Every day he goes through the local papers to find every single prize draw competition he can enter and buys tickets for them. I’m really worried because I’m afraid this is some kind of gambling addiction.

*When the trip to New Zealand, he won, we had a big party!* It was a particularly special prize, because it’s worth a lot of money. Also, it’s quite long, over two weeks! It takes you all over the country, focusing on the natural beauty of the landscape.

---

**Lajos Nándor nyereményjáték függőségéről mesél Magdolnának.**

**Lajos:** Ó, Magdolna! Nándor teljesen megőrül a nyereményjátékokért! Mindennap végig nézi a helyi lapokat és minden nyereményjátékra befizet. Nagyon aggódom, mert attól tartok, ez már valami féle játékfüggőség.

Amikor az új-zélandi utat (Nándor) nyerte, hatalmasat buliztunk! Ez egy nagyon különleges nyeremény, mert nagyon sokat ér. És eléggé hosszú út, több mint két hét! Végigvisznek az országon, miközben a táj természetes szépségét csodálhatod.

---

Ödön is telling Piroska about Ráhel’s new hobby.

**Ödön:** Csak pár hete kezdett íjászatot tanulni, de az edzője azt mondja, természetes adottsága van hozzá. A célpontok különböző színűek attól függően, hogy milyen nehéz őket eltalálni. (Ráhel) a sárga célpontot már néhány nap után eltalálta. Az edző el volt ámulva! Ez már haladó szint.

---

**Ödön és Ambrus Ráhel új hobbijáról mesélnek Piroskának.**

**Ödön:** Csak pár hete kezdett íjászatot tanulni, de az edzője azt mondja, természetes adottsága van hozzá. A célpontok különböző színűek attól függően, hogy milyen nehéz őket eltalálni.

**Ambrus:** Így van! A kék célpontot pár nap után eltalálta!

**Ödön:** (Ráhel) a sárga célpontot találta el pár nap után. Az edző el volt ámulva! Ez már haladó szint. A kéket mindenkinek könnyű eltalálni.

---

**Ödön:** Csak pár hete kezdett íjászatot tanulni, de az edzője azt mondja, természetes adottsága van hozzá. De Ráhel mindig minden sportban nagyon
Even as a little child she was so agile and had excellent balance. 
The yellow target, Ráhel hit after just a couple of days. It’s an intermediate level target and it’s something students are expected to hit after they’ve been shooting for some time. So when the instructor found Ráhel had hit it so soon, he was amazed!

Ödön is telling Piroska about Ráhel’s new hobby.

She only started a few weeks ago, but the archery instructor says she’s got a natural talent. The range has different colour grades indicating the difficulty of the target. When the yellow target, Ráhel, the instructor was amazed! That’s an intermediate level target and she had only just started a couple of days earlier.

Ödön and Ambrus are telling Piroska about Ráhel’s new hobby.

They only started a few weeks ago, but the archery instructor says she’s got a natural talent. The range has different colour grades indicating the difficulty of the target. When the yellow target, Ráhel, the instructor was amazed! Ambrus: That’s right! When she hit the blue target the instructor was amazed!

Ödön: When the yellow target, Ráhel, the instructor was amazed! That’s an intermediate level target and she had only just started a couple of days earlier. The blue target is easy for anyone.

Ödön and Ambrus are telling Piroska about Ráhel’s new hobby.

They only started a few weeks ago, but the archery instructor says she’s got a natural talent. The range has different colour grades indicating the difficulty of the target. When the yellow target, Ráhel, the instructor was amazed! That’s an intermediate level target and she had only just started a couple of days earlier. The blue target is easy for anyone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 CT main</th>
<th>1 CT main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebestyén a Valériával való hétvégi vonatozásáról mesél Teréziának.</td>
<td>Sebestyén is telling Terézia about the train ride Valéria and he had at the weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> Még jó, hogy vittünk kártyát. (Valéria) a sudoku rejtvényeket fél óra alatt megoldotta. Ezután befejezte a rejtvényt is, így már csak a kártya maradt, hogy szórakoztassuk magunkat a 4 órás vonatút hátralevő részében.</td>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> It’s a good thing we brought our playing cards. The sudoku puzzles Valéria solved after just half an hour. Then she finished the crosswords too, and then we only had the cards to entertain us for the rest of the 4-hour train ride!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 CF main</th>
<th>2 CF main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebestyén és Bözsi a Valériával való hétvégi vonatozásukról mesélnek Teréziának.</td>
<td>Sebestyén and Bözsi are telling Terézia about the train ride they had with Valéria at the weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> Még jó, hogy vittünk kártyát. <strong>Bözsi:</strong> Igen. Harminc perc és Valéria már be is fejezte a keresztrejtvényt.</td>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> It’s a good thing we brought our playing cards. <strong>Bözsi:</strong> Yeah. Thirty minutes and Valéria had already finished her crosswords.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> (Valéria) a sudoku rejtvényeket oldotta meg fél óra alatt. A keresztrejtvényt úgy negyed órával később fejezte be, és azután már csak a kártya maradt, hogy szórakoztassuk magunkat a 4 órás vonatút hátralevő részében.</td>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> The sudoku puzzles Valéria solved after just half an hour. She finished the crosswords some fifteen minutes later, and then we only had the cards to entertain us for the rest of the 4-hour train ride!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
<th>3 A-Topic Main</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebestyén a Valériával való hétvégi vonatozásáról mesél Teréziának.</td>
<td>Sebestyén is telling Terézia about the train ride Valéria and he had at the weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> Úton voltunk Szeged felé és tudtuk, hogy hosszú út lesz. Bepakoltam a kártyákat és egy pár könyvet, de tudtam, hogy Valéria utálja, ha a vonaton olvasok, mert azt szereti, ha együtt múlatjuk az időt, különben magányosan érzi magát. A sudoku rejtvényeket (Valéria) fél óra alatt megoldotta. Azokat az út nagy részére szánta, de meglepően könnyűek voltak, így gyorsan megoldotta őket.</td>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> We were on our way to Szeged and we knew it was going to be a long journey. I packed my playing cards and a couple of books, but I knew that Valéria hates it when I read on train rides because she likes to do activities together or she feels lonely. The sudoku puzzles Valéria solved after just half an hour. They were supposed to be her entertainment for most of the journey, but they were so easy Valéria couldn’t believe it. So they went pretty quickly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 CT Sub</th>
<th>4 CT Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebestyén a Valériával való hétvégi vonatozásáról mesél Teréziának.</td>
<td>Sebestyén is telling Terézia about the train ride Valéria and he had at the weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> Még jó, hogy vittünk kártyát. **Amikor (Valéria) a sudoku rejtvényeket megoldotta, még csak fél órája utaztunk. Ezután befejezte a rejtvényt is, így már csak a kártya maradt, hogy szórakoztassuk magunkat a 4 órás vonatút hátralevő részében!</td>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> It’s a good thing we brought our playing cards. When the sudoku puzzles Valéria solved, we had only been travelling for half an hour. Then she finished the crosswords too, and then we only had the cards to entertain us for the rest of the 4-hour train ride!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 CF Sub</th>
<th>5 CF Sub</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebestyén a Valériával való hétvégi vonatozásáról mesél Teréziának.</td>
<td>Sebestyén is telling Terézia about the train ride Valéria and he had at the weekend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> Még jó, hogy vittünk kártyát. **Amikor (Valéria) a sudoku rejtvényeket megoldotta, még csak fél órája utaztunk. Ezután befejezte a rejtvényt is, így már csak a kártya maradt, hogy szórakoztassuk magunkat a 4 órás vonatút hátralevő részében!</td>
<td><strong>Sebestyén:</strong> It’s a good thing we brought our playing cards. When the sudoku puzzles Valéria solved, we had only been travelling for half an hour. Then she finished the crosswords too, and then we only had the cards to entertain us for the rest of the 4-hour train ride!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sebestyén és Bözsi a Valériával való hétvégéi vonatozásukról mesélnek Teréziának.

Sebestyén: Még jó, hogy vittünk kártyát.
Bözsi: Igen. Még csak harminc perce utaztunk és Valéria már be is fejezte a keresztrejtvényt.

Sebestyén: Amikor (Valéria) a sudoku rejtvényeket oldotta meg, akkor voltunk úton fél órája. A keresztrejtvényt úgy negezd orával később fejezte be, és az után már csak a kártya maradt, hogy szórakoztassuk magunkat a 4 órás vonatút hátralevő részében.

Sebestyén és Bözsi are telling Terézia about the train ride they had with Valéria at the weekend.

Sebestyén: It’s a good thing we brought our playing cards.
Bözsi: Yeah. We had only been travelling for thirty minutes and Valéria had already finished her crosswords.

Sebestyén: When the sudoku puzzles Valéria solved, we had only been travelling for half an hour. She finished the crosswords some fifteen minutes later, and then we only had the cards to entertain us for the rest of the 4-hour train ride!

Zsanett és Adorján a kicsi Bélával tett állatkerti látogatásukról beszélnek.

Zsanett: Hát nem imádta Béla azt a rengeteg állatot! Különös figyelmet kereste a hüllőket. (Béla) a kis barna gyíkot hosszú idő után vette észre! Azt nagyon nehéz volt megtalálni!

Zsanett: Didn’t Béla adore seeing all the animals! Especially looking for them in the reptiles section. The little brown lizard Béla noticed after a long time! That one was really hard to find!

Zsanett, Kelemen és Adorján a kicsi Bélával tett állatkerti látogatásukról beszélnek.

Zsanett: Hát nem imádta Béla azt a rengeteg állatot! Különös figyelmet kereste a hüllőket. (Béla) a kis barna gyíkot vette észre hosszú idő után!

Zsanett: Didn’t Béla adore seeing all the animals! Especially looking for them in the reptiles section. The little brown lizard Béla noticed after a long time! The chameleon
A kaméleon nem változtatta meg a színét, ezért Béla azt egyből észrevette.

3 A-Topic Main
Zsanett és Adorján a kicsi Bélával tett állatkerti látogatásukról beszélnek.
Zsanett: Hát nem imádta Béla azt a rengeteg állatot! Még sosem volt azelőtt állatkertben. Úgy örülök, hogy elvittük.
Zsanett: Igen, ez Bélával is így volt. Szerintem nyomozónak kéne lennie: A kis barna gyíkot (Béla) hosszú idő után vette észre! Azt nagyon nehéz volt megtalálni! De nem baj, mert Béla olyan boldog volt mikor megtalálta. Szerintem kihívás volt neki megtalálni a gyíkot, és nagyon büszke volt magára, hogy észrevette.

3 A-Topic Main
Zsanett and Adorján are chatting about their trip to the zoo with little Béla.
Zsanett: Didn’t Béla adore seeing all the animals! He had never been to the zoo. I’m so glad we took him.
Adorján: Yes. I remember when I first went to the zoo. It was so exciting!
Zsanett: Quite right. And so it was for Béla, too! But he should be a detective, I think: The little brown lizard Béla noticed after a long time! That one was really hard to find! But that was okay because Béla was so happy after finding it. I think the lizard was like a challenge to him and he was really proud that he managed to spot it.

4 CT Sub
Zsanett és Adorján a kicsi Bélával tett állatkerti látogatásukról beszélnek.
Zsanett: Hát nem imádta Béla azt a rengeteg állatot! Különös figyelemmel kereste a hüllőket. Amikor (Béla) a kis barna gyíkot észrevette, mindannyian nevetünk! Nagyon nehezen látszott a faágon.

4 CT Sub
Zsanett and Adorján are chatting about their trip to the zoo with little Béla.
Zsanett: Didn’t Béla adore seeing all the animals! Especially looking for them in the reptiles section. When the little brown lizard Béla noticed we all laughed! It was really hard to see on the branch.

5 CF Sub
Zsanett, Kelemen és Adorján a kicsi Bélával tett állatkerti látogatásukról beszélnek.
Zsanett: Hát nem imádta Béla azt a rengeteg állatot! Különös figyelemmel kereste a hüllőket. Amikor Béla a kis barna gyíkot észrevette, mindannyian nevetünk!

5 CF Sub
Zsanett, Kelemen and Adorján are chatting about their trip to the zoo with little Béla.
Zsanett: Didn’t Béla adore seeing all the animals! Especially looking for them in the reptiles section. When the little brown lizard Béla noticed we all cheered! It was really hard to see on the branch.

6 A-Topic Sub
Zsanett és Adorján a kicsi Bélával tett állatkerti látogatásukról beszélnek.
Zsanett: Hát nem imádta Béla azt a rengeteg állatot! Még sosem volt azelőtt állatkertben. Úgy örülök, hogy elvittük.

6 A-Sub
Zsanett and Adorján are chatting about their trip to the zoo with little Béla.
Zsanett: Didn’t Béla adore seeing all the animals! He had never been to the zoo. I’m so glad we took him.
Adorján: Igen. Emlékszem, amikor én először voltam állatkertben. Olyan igazalmas volt!
Zsanett: Igen, ez Bélával is így volt. Szerintem nyomozónak kéne lennie: Amikor a kis barna gyíkot (Béla) észrevette, ragyogtak a szemei az örömől! Azt nagyon nehéz volt megtalálni! De nem baj, mert Béla olyan boldog volt mikor megtalálta. Szerintem kihívás volt neki megtalálni a gyíkot, és nagyon büszke volt magára, hogy észrevette.

Adorján: Yes. I remember when I first went to the zoo. It was so exciting!
Zsanett: Quite right. And so it was for Béla, too! But he should be a detective, I think: When little brown lizard Béla noticed, we could see his eyes light up in joy! That one was really hard to find! But that was okay because Béla was so happy after finding it. I think the lizard was like a challenge to him and he was really proud that he managed to spot it.

R
1 CT main
Delia arról mesél Eleknek, hogy milyen jó orvos Nagy doktor.
Delia: Ó, nagyszerű orvos! Tudod, hogy mindig minden betegséget elkapok. (Nagy doktor) a kiütéseimet szuper gyorsan meggyógyította! Mindössze 2 nap alatt elmulultak!

1 CT main
Delia is telling Elek about how good Doctor Nagy is at his job.
Delia: Oh he’s brilliant! You know how I’m always plagued by all these illnesses. Well, the rash, Doctor Nagy cured super quickly! It was gone in just two days!

2 CF main
Delia és Mara arról mesélnek Eleknek, hogy milyen jó orvos Nagy doktor.
Delia: Ó, nagyszerű orvos! Tudod, hogy mindig minden betegséget elkapok.
Mara: Tényleg nagyszerű! Nagyon gyorsan meggyógyította a térdét.
Delia: Nem! (Nagy doktor) a kiütéseimet gyógyította meg nagyon hamar. Mindössze 2 nap alatt elmulultak! A térdemmel még mindig járok hozzá, de meggyőződésem, hogy arra is hamarosan meg fogja találni a gyógymódot!

2 CF main
Delia and Mara are telling Elek about how good Doctor Nagy is at his job.
Delia: Oh he’s brilliant! He cured her knee problem really quickly. It was gone in just two days! My knee problem is still a work in progress, but I’m confident he’ll find out how to cure that too and soon!

3 A-Topic Main
Delia arról mesél Eleknek, hogy milyen jó orvos Nagy doktor.
Delia: Ó, nagyszerű orvos! Ráadásul jöképű is! Szerintem egy kicsit hasonlít George Clooney-ra! Mindenesetre egy igazi úriember. Lesegítette a kabátomat, amikor megéreztem, és megnyugtatott. A kiütéseimet (Nagy doktor) szuper gyorsan meggyógyította! Mindössze 2 nap alatt elmulultak! Már hetek óta tartott és pár hónapja is voltak. De kiderült, hogy csak allergiás vagyok az egyik arckrémemre.

3 A-Topic Main
Delia is telling Elek about how good Doctor Nagy is at his job.
Delia: Oh he’s brilliant! And handsome too! I think he looks a little bit like George Clooney! Anyways he was such a gentleman and took my coat when I came in and made me feel really at ease. The rash, Doctor Nagy cured super quickly! It was gone in just two days! I had had it for weeks now and then a few months before. But it turns out it’s just an allergy to one of my skin creams.
Délia arról mesél Eleknek, hogy milyen jó orvos Nagy doktor.
**Délia:** Ő, nagyszerű orvos! Tudod, hogy mindig minden betegséget elkapok. Amikor (Nagy doktor) a *kiütéseimet* mindössze két nap alatt meggyógyította, tudtam, hogy megtaláltam az orvosomat!

---

Délia is telling Elek about how good Doctor Nagy is at his job.
**Délia:** Oh he’s brilliant! You know how I’m always plagued by all these illnesses. Well, when the *rash*, Doctor Nagy cured in just two days, I just knew I had found the doctor for me!

---

Délia és Mara arról mesélnek Eleknek, hogy milyen jó orvos Nagy doktor.
**Délia:** Ő, nagyszerű orvos! Tudod, hogy mindig minden betegséget elkapok.
**Mara:** Tényleg nagyszerű! Amikor mindössze két nap alatt meggyógyította a térdét, tudtuk, hogy megtaláltuk Délíának a megfelelő orvost.

---

Délia and Mara are telling Elek about how good Doctor Nagy is at his job.
**Délia:** Oh he’s brilliant! And handsome too! I think he looks a little bit like George Clooney! Anyways he was such a gentleman and took my coat when I came in and made me feel really at ease. When *rash*, Doctor Nagy cured, we knew we had found the doctor for Délia. It was gone in just two days! My knee problem is still a work in progress, but I’m confident he’ll find out how to cure that too and soon!

---

Délia arról mesél Eleknek, hogy milyen jó orvos Nagy doktor.
**Délia:** Ő, nagyszerű orvos! Ráadásul jóképű is! Szerintem egy kicsit hasonlítható George Clooney-ra! Mindenesetre egy igazi úriember. Lesegítette a kabátomat, amikor megérkeztem, és megnyugtatott. Amikor a *kiütéseimet* meggyógyította, tudtam, hogy megtaláltuk az orvosomat. Mindössze 2 nap alatt elmúltak! A térdemmel még mindig járok hozzá, de meggyőződésem, hogy arra is hamarosan meg fogja találni a gyógymódot!

---

Délia is telling Elek about how good Doctor Nagy is at his job.
**Délia:** Oh he’s brilliant! And handsome too! I think he looks a little bit like George Clooney! Anyways he was such a gentleman and took my coat when I came in and made me feel really at ease. When *rash*, Doctor Nagy cured, I knew I had found the doctor for me. It was gone in just two days! My knee problem is still a work in progress, but I’m confident he’ll find out how to cure that too and soon!

---

Dorina és Vivien a kedvenc televíziós vígjátékokról beszélgetnek.
**Dorina:** Az én kedvencem az a nyelvésznő, mert mindig belekeveredik valamibe. Láttad, mi történt, amikor megpróbálta kicsérélni a csészéjét azzal a fickóval?

---

Dorina and Vivien are discussing the most recent episode of their favourite sit-com.
**Dorina:** My favourite character is the linguist. Because she’s always getting into all kinds of trouble! Did you see what happened when she tried to switch her cup with the other guy?
Vivien: Igen, ő zseniális! De melyik fickóra gondolsz? Arra a nagyszakállúra?

2 VERY WEIRD
Csabi, Szandra és Józsi azt tervezik, hogy új éttermet nyitnak.
Csabi: Pénzt tudok szerezni, de ne várjátok tőlem, hogy főzzek vagy felszolgáljak.
József: Így van. Ha jól indulunk, eleget fogunk keresni, hogy sok szakácsot és pincért alkalmazzunk!
Szandra: De ne menjünk ennyire előre! Néhány eszköz alatt.

3 GOOD
Renáta és Robi farsangi jelmezt választanak a fiuknak, Robinnak.
Renáta: Mit gondolsz, melyik tetszene Robinnak a legjobban: a fekete kalózruha, vagy a szuperhős jelmez?
Robi: Nem tudom. Talán a fekete kalózruha.
Renáta: Úgy gondolod?
Robi: Várj, mégsem. Most, hogy végiggondoltam, a szuperhős jelmezt az egyik kedvenc TV-s szuperhősé viseli. Határozottan azt kellene választanunk.

4 GOOD
Ágnes útbaigazítást kér Sámueltől egy rock koncertre.
Ágnes: Szia! Bocs, hogy zavarok. Meg tudnám mondani, hogy jutok el a Nagy Nyári Fesztiválra?
Ágnes: Kösz. Még van időm és szép az idő. Azt hiszem, inkább gyalog megyek. Milyen messze van?
Sámuel: Harminek perc séta.
Ágnes: Ő, nem számít. De melyik buszt is mondtad?

5 GOOD
Ágnes is asking Sámueltől a direction on his way to a rock concert.
Ágnes: Hello! I’m sorry to bother you… Do you know the way to the Big Summer Rock festival?
Sámuel: Of course. But it will take you ages on foot. You should walk back to that bus stop over there and get on the number 12 bus. You can get off at the 5th stop and turn right.
Ágnes: Thanks! I still have time and it’s lovely outside. I think I’ll walk after all. How far is it?
Sámuel: It’s a thirty minute walk.
Ágnes: Oh! Never mind. Which bus did you say I should take?
| 6 WEIRD | 6 |  
|---|---|---|
| Olivér és Mohamed megpróbálják eldönteni, melyik filmet nézzenek a moziban.  
**Olivér:** Akciófilmet szeretnél vagy thrillert?  
**Mohamed:** Nem is tudom. A mozijegyek olyan drágák manapság… szerinted melyiket nézzük meg?  
**Olivér:** Nos, az akciófilmekben jó nagy robbanások vannak. Én nagyon szeretem a nagy robbanásokat.  
**Mohamed:** Viccelsz, ugye? Csak ezért akarsz moziba menni?  
**Olivér:** Igen. Különben a őket tabletemen is megnézhetném.  
| Olivér and Muhamad are trying to decide which film to go and see at the cinema.  
**Olivér:** Do you want the action film or the thriller?  
**Muhamad:** I’m not sure. Cinema tickets are so expensive these days… which one do you think we should watch?  
**Olivér:** Well, the action film has bigger explosions. I really like big explosions.  
**Muhamad:** You’re kidding right? Is that the only reason you watch these films at the cinema?  
**Olivér:** Yeah. Otherwise I’d just watch it on my tablet.  |

| 7 VERY WEIRD | 7 |  
|---|---|---|
| Paszkál és Zsuzsa azon vitatkoznak, melyikük vigye le Kedves sétálni.  
**Paszkál:** Nekem nincs erre időm! Van egy sürgős határidős munkám holnap délig és még 15 oldalt kell átírnom addig. Neked kell levinned Kedvest.  
**Zsuzsa:** Micsoda? Tizenöt perc múlva el kell indulnom a moziba, és még nem vagyok kész! És itt az ideje, hogy befejezzze a munkát holnap. Bolhából csináló elveszítet.  
**Paszkál:** Nos, rendben. De legközelebb te viszed le.  
| Pascal and Zsuzsa are arguing about who should take Kedves out for his evening walkies.  
**Pascal:** I just don’t have time! I have a very urgent deadline tomorrow morning and I still have fifteen pages to rewrite. You take Kedves out.  
**Zsuzsa:** What? I need to head out in fifteen minutes to go to the cinema and I’m not even ready! You will have all the time to finish your work before tomorrow. You’re making a big deal out of nothing.  
**Pascal:** Well, okay then. But you have to do it next time.  |

| 8 GOOD | 8 |  
|---|---|---|
| Sára, Mátyás és Ábel készülődnek a tengerpartra.  
**Sára:** Mátyás, mindent becsomagoltál, ami a listádon volt?  
**Mátyás:** Igen Sára. Napellenző, napszemüveg, törölközők, piknikes dobozok.  
**Sára:** Ábel? És te becsomagolad a felfújható labdát, amire megkértelek?  
| Sára, Mátyás and Ábel are getting ready to go to the seaside.  
**Sára:** Mátyás, have you packed everything on your list?  
**Mátyás:** Yes, Sára. I packed the sunscreen, the glasses, the towels and our picnic boxes.  
**Sára:** Ábel? Have you packed the beach ball like I asked you to?  
**Ábel:** No, that’s still in the cupboard.  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Hungarian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ábel</td>
<td>Nem, az még a szekrényben van.</td>
<td>Sára: Hurry up! We have to leave now to avoid the traffic!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sára</td>
<td>Siessetek! Indulunk kell, ha el akarjuk kerülni a nagy forgalmat.</td>
<td>9 Kriszti és Daniella a francia nyelvvizsgára gyakorolnak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Kriszti: Oké, már minden igét átvetttünk ebben a leckében. Még mit csináljunk?</td>
<td>Kriszti: Okay, we’ve done all the verbs in the unit. What else do we need to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniella</td>
<td>Az ismétlő feladatokat is át kell vennünk. Van itt egy a múlt időkkel kapcsolatban, és még ott van a levélírási feladat is.</td>
<td>Daniella: We also need to do the revision exercises. There is the one on the past tenses and then there is also the letter writing exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Kriszti: Okay great! Let’s do the past tenses first, then.</td>
<td>10 Edina and Kata want to buy a new refrigerator and are bargain hunting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szilárd</td>
<td>Imádom. Szerintem bámulatos, hogy Mozart ennyi idős korában írta. Talán nem annyira összetetett, mint a felnőttkori munkái, de szerintem igazán bájos. Különösen azért szeretem, mert ha szomorú vagyok, felvidít mindig.</td>
<td>Szilárd is talking about his/her favourite piece of classical music.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Menno: After I get up, the first thing I do is my yoga. Then I go for a quick run.
Melinda: What about when it’s cold?
Menno: I still go for a run, because I bought special sports gear that keeps me warm. Anyways, after the run I do some more stretching and have my breakfast.
Melinda: Wow, you must be really healthy.
Menno: I don’t know about that. Anyways, it’s only then that I turn on my phone. I don’t want anybody disturbing me during my morning routine.

Ferenc is trying to convince Jenő to buy a new car.
Ferenc: Come on, Jenő! You’ve had that old piece of junk ten years!
Jenő: So? I’m not getting rid of it. It’s comfortable, reliable and doesn’t use up much fuel. Why would I need a new car?
Ferenc: It’s falling apart!
Jenő: That’s not even true! I don’t understand why you are so insistent. It’s my car, after all.

Timi and Ági are sitting on a bus on their way home from work.
Timi: I wish I lived closer to my work place. Maybe I could walk to the office.
Ági: Really? I don’t mind sitting on the bus to go to work. I can chat with someone or read a book.

Adrienn asks her daughter, Bernadett:
Adrienn: What have you done today?
Bernadett: It was terrible! Everyone has the new Gucci purse. I am the only fool who didn’t buy it! I hate you!

Klaudia and József are talking about the party.
Klaudia: I’m so excited!
József: Me too, but…
Klaudia: What’s the matter?
József: But I’ve lost my fancy dress.
| 18 SLIGHTLY WEIRD | Andreas elmondja Flórának, hogy milyen könyveket szeret.  
**Andreas:** Van A gyertyák csonkig égnek, A Pál utcai fiúk, Utas és holdvilág. Imádok olvasni.  
**Flóra:** Nagyszerű! **Tudom most,** születéswapkodra mit fogok neked venni.  
| Klaudia: Don’t worry. We’ll find it, if we look for it thoroughly.  
| 18 | Andreas tells Flora about the books he likes.  
**Andreas:** There is The Embers, The Boys of Paul Street, Journey by Moonlight. I love reading.  
**Flóra:** Great! Now I know what I will get for your birthday!  
| 19 SLIGHTLY WEIRD | Király úr kérdezősködik Blankától a kedvenc filme után.  
**Király úr:** Mi a kedvenc magyar nyelvű filmem?  
**Blanka:** A kedvenc filmem? Kétségkívül a Fehér Isten. Az egyszerű cselekmény volt, a kislány tényleg nagyon jó színésznő volt, és Hagen, a kutya, annyira aranyos volt!  
**Király úr:** Ó! Ezt a filmet még nem is láttam.  
| 19 | Király is asking Blanka about her favourite film.  
**Király:** What is your favourite Hungarian film?  
**Blanka:** My favourite film? Without doubt White God. It has an easy plot to follow, the girl is a great actress and Hagen the dog is so cute!  
**Király:** Oh! I haven’t even seen this film.  
| 20 WEIRD | Edit Endrét és Teodórát a rock koncertekről kérdezi.  
**Edit:** Decemberben Amerikában koncerteztetek. Mesélnétek erről?  
**Endre:** **Bennünket fogadtak hatalmas szeretettel bennünket mindenhol,** és a bulik is nagyszerűen sikerültek. **Megérte a hosszú utazás.**  
**Teodóra:** Végig a szívünk ből zenélünk. Nem panaszkodunk, folyamatosan bővül a közönségünk, és ez jó!  
| 20 | Edit is asking Endre and Teodora about the rock concerts.  
**Edit:** You played in America in December. Would you tell us about it?  
**Endre:** We had a great welcome everywhere and the concerts were great fun. They were worth the long journey.  
**Teodóra:** We’ve always played from our hearts. We don’t complain, our audience gets bigger which is great!  
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