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Abstract
The present paper explores the extent to which narrow syntax is responsible for the computation of discourse functions such as focus/topic. More specifically, it challenges the claim that language approximates ‘perfection’ with respect to economy and conceptual necessity by reconsidering the roles and interactions of the different modules of the grammar. Empirical considerations strongly indicate that narrow syntax is ‘blind’ to properties and operations involving the interpretive components, i.e., PF and LF. As a result, syntax-phonology interface rules do not ‘see’ everything in the levels they connect. In essence, the architecture of grammar proposed here from the perspective of focus marking necessitates the autonomy of the different levels of grammar, presupposing that NS is minimally structured only when liberated from any discourse implementations, i.e., movement operations to satisfy both interface needs.

0 Introduction
A key assumption of generative grammar, from very early stages of the theory (e.g., Chomsky 1965) to the present, is that the narrow syntax is the fundamental generative component of the computational system and that the phonological and semantic components are ‘interpretive’. Whatever recursive properties phonology and semantics have, they are a reflection of interpreting the underlying recursion in syntactic phrases.

A departure from this syntactocentric view came from phonology where, in particular, Autosegmental Phonology (Goldsmith 1976; Liberman & Prince 1977) proposed several independent tiers connected by association lines. Thus, the connection of syntax to phonology was not seen as derivational, but rather involved constraints. Phonology consists of a generative system independent of syntax and related to it by interface rules. The important feature of these interface rules is that they do not ‘see’ everything in the levels they connect. On this view, Phonetic Form (PF) is part of phonological structure, and not a late level of narrow syntactic structure. The basic claim of this paper is that information structure units, such as the topic and foci conveyed by stress or intonation in many languages, necessitate an approach to grammar in which the phonological and semantic components are independent modules which can be directly available to each other, bypassing syntax. We follow Brody (1995), Jackendoff (1997), Reinhart (1995) and Szendrői (2001), among others, in claiming that the grammar should allow for direct PF-LF association without the mediation of syntax.

The outcome of such an approach, from a formal point of view, is a model in which phonology and semantics interface with syntax at the same level. Hence, we follow the main insights of Jackendoff’s (1997) hypothesis of Representational Modularity, in that the informational structure of the mind strictly segregates phonological,

---

1 This paper is a short revised version of a larger study published in ZASPiL 35, Volume 1, 2004. I would like to thank my supervisor Wynn Chao for her discussions and insightful input on earlier drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank Thomas Doukas for putting up with me in delaying his deadline.
syntactic and conceptual representations from each other. Each lives in its own module, and there can be no mixed representations that are, for example, partly phonological and partly syntactic. Rather, all coordination among these representations is encoded in correspondence mapping rules.\(^2\)

The natural question that arises from such a view is the following one: if we allow PF to access LF directly and vice versa, then what is the role of NS? Probably, the answer lies in the assumption of trying to give NS a more simple structure. We argue that NS is free from semantics and more particularly the semantics of discourse notions, such as focus or topic. A fuller discussion of the Greek word order facts in sections 4 and 5 will enhance this view.

The present study applies the above assumptions to the syntax-prosody interface, describing information structure in Greek in terms of parallel representations licensed by interface rules. Section 2 rejects Chomskian assumptions about economy in favour of a direct PF-LF connection without the intervention of NS and the view that prosodic information is available at conceptual structure or C-I. Section 3 presents the word order facts and proposes that the role of syntax in the realization of focus in Greek is smaller than previously thought. Section 4 argues for a unification of focus position, showing that there are no interface differences between two distinct foci in Greek. It also predicts that the syntax of focus is uniform; both contrastive and information focus can occupy any position in the clause ex-situ or in-situ. Finally, section 5 presents my proposal for syntax-prosody mapping, which accounts in a uniform way for the three attested focus structures in Greek, namely left-peripheral, right-peripheral and medial. Section 6 summarizes and offers some concluding remarks.

1 Minimalism, Economy and the Interfaces

The relation between the meanings and the articulations of expressions that is assumed in minimalist research is an indirect one, mediated by the syntax. The language faculty as described by Chomsky (1995) consists of the syntax and the lexicon, which interact with the ‘articulatory-perceptual’ (A-P) and the ‘conceptual-intentional’ (C-I) systems at the interface levels PF and LF, respectively. On this view, a given language is a procedure for constructing sound-meaning pairs out of items selected from the lexicon, the members of these pairs constituting ‘instructions’ for the relevant performance systems.

Chomsky describes this procedure for constructing such sound-meaning pairs as a derivation which ‘converges’ if the representations that it yields satisfy a ‘Principle of Full Interpretation’ at the two relevant interface levels, PF and LF (1995: 219-220). Chomsky takes the convergence of a derivation to involve only its interpretability at both interface levels, there being ‘no PF-LF interactions relevant to convergence’. This leaves no space for any direct communication between PF and LF, since on this view the performance systems access phonetic and semantic information.

\(^2\) Evidence for such an approach comes from late lexical insertion. In mainstream generative grammar, words are inserted into syntax by lexical insertion. But Jackendoff (1997), for example, has argued that lexical insertion has to be delayed until S-Structure (cf. Di Scuillo & Williams 1987; Halle & Marantz 1993). The reason is that a lexical item is a mixed representation, an interface rule which licenses the linking of phonological, semantic and syntactic information. Most differentiation of words is by virtue of sound and meaning, since lexical items are not finely individuated in syntax, but rather in semantics and phonology.
independently. No principles or rules can simultaneously and directly refer to both pragmatico-semantic and prosodic information.

Focus is one of the several linguistic phenomena which appear to require a multidimensional approach to the grammar. Focus is not unique to any of the interfaces or to syntax. Recent research shows that a uniform analysis of focus phenomena requires the examination of a number of factors. For instance, focus is realized with stress or accent in a number of languages and many authors have assumed that a focused constituent will always carry the main stress (e.g., Cinque 1993; Reinhart 1995; Zubizarreta 1998). Such a direct relation between stress and focus cannot be captured in minimalist terms, where even semantic features such as [+focus] and phonological features such as [+stress] cannot be justified by Full Interpretation.

Thus, I argue that the standard Minimalist conception of the architecture of grammar is inadequate in the sense that it has to be customized to allow, first, for the independence of prosodic information from syntactic and semantic information which in due course interacts with the conceptual-intentional system and second, to allow for prosodic information to interface with LF structure, in order to capture the basic intuition that prosodic information has an effect on semantic and pragmatic structure. The claim that prosody is should be able to influence the pragmatic structure is discussed in section 4.

To satisfy economy considerations, the analysis proposed here dispenses with semantic/prosodic movements for discourse reasons, having no justification in the grammar, since they impose violations of economy. Rather, economy is fully satisfied in the sense that the relation between focus and stress is accounted for via mapping processes that directly relate the interfaces. This is the analysis proposed in section 5.

2 Word Order and Information Structure

Although the cross-linguistic variation shows that languages may use one or more strategies to identify focus, the different strategies employed for each language nonetheless make a strategy obligatory, especially when the occurrence of a specific strategy is necessarily related with a specific semantic focus interpretation and the opposite result would result in ungrammaticality. Thus, the obligatory nature of focus movement in a language has to account for a special interpretational pattern, such as exhaustive, contrastive, or completive focus, or a certain phonological requirement.

What I will show for Greek, however, is that, although different strategies have been proposed especially for the syntactic domain, these strategies are optional, since they are not related with a specific focus interpretation. I show (contra Discourse Configurational approaches) that there is no difference in the semantic focus interpretation in the different spell-out positions of focus allowing the same semantic type of focus to be instantiated by different word orders. In what follows, I will investigate the interaction between intonation, information structure and word order in Greek.3

---

3 In Greek all the logically possible word order variations for a simple sentence like that in (9) are grammatical, however, word order variations do not have the same meaning. Alexiadou (1999), Philippaki-Warburton (1982, 1985), Tsimpi (1995, 1997), Tsiplakou (1998), among others have revealed that topic and focus in Greek are syntactically encoded.
Two prosodic patterns will be the focus of this section. The first is the neutral prosodic pattern which characterizes broad focus contexts in declarative sentences. The second prosodic pattern is the non-neutral one, with non-final accent placement realized as narrow focus.

In the neutral prosodic pattern, the typical structure is an SVO sentence structure. It is clear that a default or canonical order of the nominal arguments is required for getting a broad sentence focus and focus projection or ambiguity possibilities. In addition, the verb can occupy the initial or the medial-string position excluding the final position. I will look first at word order realized under neutral accent placement.

In Greek, for a sentence to be compatible with an ‘all-new’ context sentence-broad focus, the prosodic/intonational component requires a canonical ordering of the nominal arguments where the verb either precedes the subject or immediately follows it and the final verb position is disallowed. None of the other ordering possibilities can produce an ‘all-new’ broad focus sentence because they reveal focus domains which are smaller than the whole sentence; only SVO and VSO are compatible with an ‘all-new’ context. The interesting fact, though, is that all of the orderings allow for a narrow focus on the last constituent, which carries the nuclear stress. Note also that SVO and VSO include the object in the final position, which receives nuclear stress.

(1) a. Kanena neo?
   Any news?

   b. i kivernisi tha afksisi ti forologia
      the government-nom will-fut raise-3sg the taxes-acc
      ‘The government will raise the taxes’

   c. *i kivernisi ti forologia tha afksisi
      SOV

   d. *tha afksisi ti forologia i kivernisi
      VOS

   e. *ti forologia tha afksisi i kivernisi
      OVS

   f. *ti forologia i kivernisi tha afksisi
      OSV

Let us now consider VOS and OVS orders with neutral stress — that is, stress on the rightmost constituent, the subject. Both of these are answers to questions that license narrow focus on the subject, as shown in (2):

(2) a. Pjos afksise ti forologia?
   Who raised the taxes?

   b. afksise ti forologia I KIVERNISI
      VOS

   c. ti forologia afksise i KIVERNISI
      OVS
      ‘The government raised the taxes’

The last orders are the verb-final ones, SOV and OSV. Both orders license narrow focus on the verb. Verb final orders are understood in the literature as less acceptable. However, if followed by clitic doubling of the object NP, their acceptability improves.

---

4 According to Arvaniti & Baltazani (2000), the typical melody tune of a Greek declarative in an ‘all-new’ context, broad focus, is H* accent, followed by L¯ L% boundary tone. The typical melody tune of narrow focus is realized as L+ H* nuclear pitch accent.
Keller & Alexopoulou (2000) argue that they usually induce a contrastive focus interpretation in a *correction* context.

(3) a. Ti ekane i kivervisi me ti forologia?
   *what did-3sg/PS the government-nom with the taxes-acc?*
   Tin KATEVASE?
   *it-cl -dropped-3sg*
   'What did the government do with the taxes? Did it LOWER them?'

b. (Ohi,) ti forologia i kivernisi tin AFKSISE OSV
   *(no,) the taxes-acc the government-nom it-cl raise-3sg/PS*

c. (Ohi,) i kivernisi ti forologia tin AFKSISE SOV
   *(no,) the government-nom the taxes-acc it-cl raise-3sg/PS*
   ‘(No,) the government raised the taxes’

Let us look at the non-neutral prosodic patterns. To accomplish this task, we need to look at all the possible constituent arrangements and the prosodic prominence from constituent to constituent, as shown in (4)-(6).

(4) **OBJECT FOCUS (FINAL, MEDIAL, LEFT-PERIPHERAL)**

a. i kivernisi afksise tus misthou?
   *the government-nom raise-3sg/PS the salaries-acc/PL?*
   ‘Did the government raise the salaries?’

b. Ti afkise i kivernisi?
   *what raise-3sg/PS the government-nom?*
   ‘What did the government do?’

c. i kivernisi afksise TI FOROLOGIA SVO
   *the government-nom raise-3sg/PS the taxes-acc*
   ‘The government will raise the taxes’

d. TI FOROLOGIA i kivernisi afksise OSV

e. afksise TI FOROLOGIA i kivernisi VOS

f. i kivernisi TI FOROLOGIA afksise SOV

g. TI FOROLOGIA afksise i kivernisi OVS

h. afksise i kivernisi TI FOROLOGIA VSO

(5) **SUBJECT FOCUS (FINAL, MEDIAL, LEFT-PERIPHERAL)**

a. Pjos afkise ti forologia?
   *who-nom raise-3sg/PS the taxes-acc*
   ‘Who raised the taxes?’

b. I ANDIPOLITEUSI afkise ti forologia?
   *the opposition-nom raise-3sg/PS the taxes-acc*
   ‘Was it the OPPOSITION that raised the taxes?’

c. I KIVERNISI afksise ti forologia SVO

d. I KIVERNISI ti forologia afksise SOV

e. afksise I KIVERNISI ti forologia VSO

f. ti forologia I KIVERNISI afksise OSV
Given the examples in (1)-(3) and (4)-(6), we can arrive at the following generalizations. Under rightward prominence different word orders realize different focus domains. Thus, I propose the following generalizations on the interaction between stress placement and information structure.

**Generalization 1:** An identical intonational structure can realize different information structures.

Under neutral prosody — accent or stress assigned on the final constituent, e.g. H* or L+H* — we can derive different focus domains or different partitions of information structure. This is the case for the set of examples (8)-(10).

The second generalization is that under non-neutral intonation pattern, one and the same word order can provide different focus structures.

**Generalization 2:** One word order can realize different information structures.

In fact, in all of the sets of examples it is obvious that SVO word order is involved in at least five focus domains. These include both broad domains — sentence-focus and VP-focus — as well as narrow domains — O-focus, S-focus and O-focus. Also, VOS word order can realize at least four information structures: that is, VP-focus, V-focus, O-focus and S-focus. Similarly, OVS can realize at least two narrow focus domains: O-focus and V-focus and, probably on a marked context, an S-focus, etc. Now the reverse is also true: under non-neutral intonation a certain information structure can be realized by more than one word order. Any focus context can be realized by the focus constituent in initial, medial or final position. For instance, a subject focus context can be realized by SVO, VOS, OVS, and VSO orders. An object focus context can be realized by object-initial OVS and OSV orders, object-final SVO. This claim is consistent with generalization 3.

**Generalization 3:** A certain information structure can be realized by a range of word orders.

Of course, certain restrictions apply regarding the word orders that can accommodate a certain information structure or the same focus context. Moreover, certain word orders may be preferred in a given context. These restrictions on the information
structure of the Greek language hold as a result of a combination of syntactic and phonological factors.\(^5\)

The data above show that the same type of prominence can signal different focus domains. This argument supports the view that prominence itself is not sufficient to say what the exact focus domain is each time, because it is ambiguous with respect to focus. Haidou (2004) argues that, focus projection, (SVO order), is unexceptional because it does not have to be postulated anywhere. If we observe the evidence closely, the role of the relation between focus and stress lies systematically in the directionality of prominence: all that is sufficient and necessary is rightmost prominence. I propose in section 5 that the outcome of the focus projection is the result of the alignment or placement of rightmost boundaries of constituents. Therefore, stress assignment on the right periphery will indicate the focus domain with the consequence that the right border of a constituent will coincide with its right domain of prominence. Any other stress pattern will preclude projection, as a result of misaligned structures, since it is not motivated independently. It is just the end product of ambiguity between sequences of several rightward constituent borders.

Assuming that syntax only ‘accommodates’ or ‘facilitates’ the representation of focus in the grammar correctly predicts that the interaction between prominence and focus cannot be anything else than one-to-many because the focus domain is not always isomorphic with the stressed constituent and only one-to-one when focus coincides with the stressed element. I argued in section 2 that the relation between focus and prominence need not be defined in syntax, that is, by feature assignment. Syntax is not responsible for the actual focus that will be chosen each time a sentence is uttered. The role of syntax, which involves the syntactic machinery available in each language — that is, word order, scrambling, clitic doubling, and clefting — is, to use Vallduvi’s (1992) term, to ‘package’ the information chosen by discourse requirements, with the help of intonation or word order or both so as to ‘feed’ it directly to the interpretive components, i.e. PF and LF.

It appears that focus ambiguity does not arise as result of the (one-to-many) computation between stress and focus in the syntax. Rather, focus marking is syntactically unconstrained (Schwarzschild 1999). Focus-markers are freely assigned. That is, focus will always be marked by prosodic means and not by syntactic F-markers. Prosodic prominence will be assigned to focused any constituent without exception.

My claim is that focus ambiguity can be resolved as the end-product of the interaction between intonation and discourse, and not directly at the correspondence between prominence and focus. It is in fact because each interpretation is linked directly with a specific intonation, defined by discourse conditions, that the output of the grammar is an ambiguous utterance. Thus, discourse requires, and the phonology justifies, the positioning of focus. This claim has the further desirable theoretical gain that the phonological information interfaces with the pragmatic component of the grammar, i.e. the conceptual-intentional interface, contra Chomsky (1995, 1999, 2001)\(^6\). Thus, I propose that under neutral or marked prosodic patterns, the

\(^5\) The generalizations can be described in terms of formal constraints that restrict the realization of information structure in the language. For a fuller picture of the role of the different components of grammar that mark the realization of information structure in Greek and how the influence of these components is ranked, see Haidou 2004.

\(^6\) For a detailed discussion under the formal view of grammar, see Haidou (2004)
pragmatics-discourse component of the grammar allows multiple word order variations as equally possible focus answers to only one question.

To conclude this section, I have suggested that the syntax of discourse constructions should be independent of the discourse functions encoded. On the view being defended here, focus and given elements are represented at a level independent of syntax, i.e., Information Structure (IS), whereas the syntax (probably) carries information related to EPP satisfaction (Chomsky 1999, 2001) In the next section, I propose, contra standard assumptions, that there are no interface differences between the two types of focus.

3 Identificational versus Information Focus in Greek? Towards a Unification of Focus at the Interfaces

Greek has traditionally been described as having only one focusing strategy: focus fronting (Agouraki 1990, 1993; Tsimpli 1995, 1997). However, all the above authors, among others (Alexopoulou 1999; Baltazani 2002; Tsimplakou 1998), have recognized that there is evidence for a focus in-situ strategy in the language. Nevertheless, their common assumption is that focus strategies in Greek maintain a rigidly fixed correspondence between the syntactic position of focus and its semantic interpretation.7

My own research (Haidou 2003, 2004) has offered a different picture of the Greek focus phrase, since it allows for an indirect mapping between syntax and semantics/prosody. It is argued, contra previous work on the language, that the idea of in-situ focus equalling new information and ex-situ focus equalling exhaustive-identificational properties cannot be sustained for Greek. Given the word order facts presented in the previous section, it appears that Greek has different word order options for satisfying discourse requirements.

In line with Grillia’s (2004) arguments, I will proceed in the next sections by providing additional tests and evidence, both semantic and prosodic, to show that there is no correlation between syntactic position and semantic interpretation (contra É. Kiss 1998).8 In a nutshell, this section argues for a merger of ex-situ and in-situ focus structure — that is, a unification of focus position (see also Brunetti 2003 for Italian). That is, focus is one and the same phenomenon realized though different positions allowed by the grammar of discourse and exploited by the computational system C_HL.

This section has two aims. First, it clarifies the descriptive facts, in order to establish whether there is a systematic correlation between the syntax and semantics of focus, or whether the interpretation of focus rests purely on discourse-pragmatic factors. The second aim is theoretical: to consider the data in the light of Minimalist considerations, in order to present a unified syntactic analysis of in-situ and ex-situ

---

7 More specifically, Tsimpli (1990, 1995) formulates a semantic division between ex-situ and in-situ focus and constantly links ex-situ focus with exhaustive listing interpretation (identificational focus) and in-situ focus with new information focus. Alexopoulou (1999), though acknowledging the different characteristics of ex-situ and in-situ focus, still advocates a mapping which relates the specific positioning of focus with a specific semantic interpretation. Baltazani & Jun (1999), argue that the preposed focus phrase carries exhaustive interpretation by the existence of an exhaustive identification (EI) operator.

8 For syntactic evidence and a detailed discussion of prosodic, semantic as well as syntactic evidence, see Haidou (forthcoming).
focus. This in turn relates to broader theoretical issues, concerning ‘optionality’ in a perfectly economical system.

3.1 The LF Interface
The central interpretive property that sets the two foci apart, according to É. Kiss (1998), is the property of ‘exhaustive identification’. A focused element expresses exhaustive identification when it identifies a ‘unique referent’ from the context to be interpreted as focus or part of focus. This property is consistent only with syntactically preposed foci or identificational foci. New information focus which expresses non-presupposed information is not compatible with this property.

The first piece of evidence for this comes from test A, which É. Kiss attributes to Szabolcsi (1981): Given a pair of sentences where the first contains focused co-ordinate DPs and the second contains only one of those focused DPs, if the second sentence is not among the logical entailments of the first, then the type of focus involved is identificational (exhaustive). According to É. Kiss (1998), test A shows that in Hungarian ex-situ focus will always have identificational properties.

(7) a. Mari EGY KALAPOT ÉS EGY KABÁTOT nézett ki magának.-/> Mary a hat-acc and a coat-acc picked out herself-acc

‘It was a hat and a coat that Mary picked out herself.’

b. Mari EGY KALAPOT nézett ki magának.

Mary a hat-acc picked out herself-acc

‘It was hat that Mary picked for herself.’

It is the exhaustivity of (14b) that results in the failure of the entailment. With respect to the data in (14) above, Baltazani (1999) makes a distinction between contrastive focus and information focus for Greek, as shown in (8), where the former appears only in a preverbal position and always receives an exhaustive interpretation due to the presence of an exhaustive identification (EI) operator.

(8) a. STO YANI KE STI MARIA agorasa padeloni. -/> to-the John and to-the Mary bought-1sg trousers-acc-sing

‘I bought a pair of trousers for John and for Mary.’ (Grillia 2004)

b. STO YANI agorasa padeloni.

to-acc John-acc bought-1sg trousers-acc-sing

‘I bought a pair of trousers for John.’ (Grillia 2004)

As a result, she claims that (8b) is not among the logical entailments of (8a) and therefore that ex-situ focus is always identificational. However, Grillia (2004) successfully shows that Baltazani’s (1999) conclusions need to be rethought, based on the observation that the above claim holds only if the predicate is interpreted collectively. According to Grillia’s tests, (8a) is ambiguous in that it carries both a collective and a distributive reading. That is, when the predicate gets the distributive reading, (8b) is among the logical entailments of (8a). In that case, ex-situ focus is not identificational. As a result, the ambiguity present in cases like (8) makes the judgements inconclusive with respect to the relation between ex-situ focus and exhaustive interpretation. Grillia (2004) thus decides to control for ‘collectivity’ using (i) an overt distributive marker and (ii) a plural. The test is modified in the following way:
(9) a. **sto yanike sti maria agorasa** apo ena padeloni. \(\rightarrow\)  
\textit{to-the John and to-the Mary bought-1sg eachone-acc trousers-acc-sing}  
‘I bought for John and Mary a pair of trousers each’  

b. **sto yani** agorasa padeloni 
\(\textit{to-acc John-acc bought-1sg trousers-acc-sing}\)  
‘I bought a pair of trousers for John’

(9b) is among the logical consequences of (9a), and therefore the ex-situ focus is not identificational. Grillia (2004) also controls for collectivity by using an ‘aggressively non-D-linked’ wh-question, such as \textit{What the hell did you buy for John?} for (9b). Thus, Tsimpli (1995) and Baltazani (1999) seem to have incorrectly attributed to the preposed focus phrase in Greek an exhaustive interpretation resembling that of the English cleft construction.

To control for the collective reading found in (10), Grillia (2004) uses a bare plural instead of a definite DP and replaces the singular predicate in (10) with a plural one, as shown in (11) and (12):

(10) **ston petro** danise to vivlio. 
\(\textit{to-the-acc Peter-acc lent-3pl the-acc book-acc}\)  
‘They lent the book to Peter.’

In this case, (11b) is among the logical consequences of (11a) and the same holds for (12a) and (12b). Not only does the preverbal focus not carry an exhaustive interpretation, but the same focused phrase can also occur in postverbal position with no difference in interpretation:

(11) a. **ston petro ke ston yani** danisan vivlia. \(\rightarrow\)  
\textit{to-the-acc Peter-acc and to-the-acc John-acc lent-3pl books-acc}  
‘They lent books to Peter and to John’

b. **ston petro** danisan vivlia. 
\(\textit{to-the-acc Peter-acc lent-3pl books-acc}\)  
‘They lent books to Peter’

(12) a. **danisan vivlia ston petro ke sto yani.** \(\rightarrow\)  
\textit{lent-3pl books-acc to-the-acc Peter and to-acc-the-acc John}  
‘They lent books to Peter and John’

b. **danisan vivlia ston petro.**  
\(\textit{lent-3pl books-acc to-the-acc Peter}\)  
‘They lent books to Peter’

Test B concerns the possibility of negating exhaustivity and information focus. More specifically, in a dialogue pair where the first sentence contains a focus and the second sentence denies the uniqueness of the referent identified by the focus, this focus can only have an exhaustive interpretation. What (13) shows is that in Hungarian exhaustivity can be negated, as shown in (13a, b), but new information focus cannot, as shown in (13c, d):

(13) a. **marie egy kalapot** nezett ki maganak  
\(\textit{Mary-nom a hat-acc picked out herself-dat}\)  
‘It was a hat that Mary picked for herself.’
b. Nem, egy kabátot is ki nézett  
   no a coat too out picked 
   ‘No, she picked a coat too.’

c. Mari ki nézett magának egy kalapot 
   Mary-nom out picked herself-dat a hat-acc 
   ‘Mary picked a hat for herself.’

d. *Nem, egy kabátot is ki nézett  
   no a coat too out picked 
   ‘No, she picked a coat too.’

In example (c) the focused object represents the only thing that Mari picked out for herself. In (d), in contrast, it represents one of the possible relevant things that she could have picked for herself; thus the focused object in (d) is new information focus. The ungrammaticality of (d) is obvious because it unnaturally negates the assertion of a proposition where there is a list of possible referents available rather than only one unique referent. Thus, in Hungarian exhaustivity cannot be negated.

If we apply this test to a Greek example, we can see immediately that there is no direct correlation between ex-situ focus and exhaustive interpretation.

(14) a. ENA KAPELO agorase i Eleni. 
   a hat-acc bought-3sg the Helen-nom 
   ‘Helen bought a hat.’

b. oxi, agorase ke ena pandeloni. 
   no bought-3sg and a trousers-acc 
   ‘No, she bought (this) and a pair of trousers, too.’

(15) a. i Eleni agorase ena kapelo 
   the Helen-acc bought-3sg a hat-acc 
   ‘Helen bought a hat.’

b. oxi, agorase ke ena pandeloni. 
   no bought-3sg and a trousers-acc 
   ‘No, she bought (this) and a pair of trousers, too.’

When applied to Greek, then, this test shows that information focus or in-situ focus can also have the exhaustive interpretation. That is, if by negating the proposition that Helen bought a hat for herself, we negate the exhaustive reading of the proposition, then both types of focus can be interpreted exhaustively. Thus, the Greek data show that we can maintain the claim that focus interpretation is independent of syntactic position. Both positions, in-situ and ex-situ, carry the same interpretation. Therefore, the distinction made by É. Kiss (1998) does not hold for the Greek data.

Intuitively, even in the above test the exhaustive interpretation does not seem very salient. That is, it is not clear that the above exchange in (14)-(15) identifies a unique referent or is the result of the semantic function of exclusion of identification, in É. Kiss’s terms. I believe that the exhaustive interpretation can be maintained in both syntactic positions if the sentences imply association with focus with the use of an
adverb like *mono* ‘only’, which inherently carries an exhaustive interpretation. In such a case, the proposition excludes Helen buying something else besides a hat.

(16) a. i Eleni agorase *mono* ena kapelo.
    *the Helen-acc bought-3sg only a hat-acc*
    ‘Helen only bought a hat.’

    b. oxi, agorase ke ena pandeloni.
    *no bought-3sg and a trousers-acc*
    ‘No, she bought (this) and a pair of trousers, too.’

Test C shows that identificational focus cannot consist of a universal quantifier, an existential quantifier, an *even*-phrase, or an *also*-phrase, but that information focus does not display these distributional restrictions. É. Kiss attributes these restrictions to the semantic content involved in these cases, which are not compatible with the semantic function of *exclusion of identification*. Interestingly, however, the Greek examples do not show this identification focus/informational focus contrast:

(17) **KATHE FITITIS** perimeni ta apotelesmata (UNIVERSAL QUANTIFIER)
    *every student-nom wait-3sg the results-acc*
    ‘Every student waits for the results’

(18) **KAPJA THEMATA** tha lithoun avrio (EXISTENTIAL QUANTIFIER)
    *some issues-nom will-fut be solved-3pl tomorrow*
    ‘Some issues will be solved tomorrow’

(19) **AKOMI KAI STIN MARIA** edosan vravio (EVEN-PHASE)
    *even and to-the Maria-acc gave-3pl prize-acc*
    ‘They gave a prize even to Mary’

(20) **KAI LOULOUDIA** tis agorase tis Elenis o Janis (ALSO-PHASE)
    *and flowers-acc her-cl bought-3sg the Helen-gen the John-nom*
    ‘He bought and flowers for Helen’

As (17)-(20) show, quantifiers can occupy the preverbal position in Greek. Therefore, no restriction with respect to exhaustivity applies: the focus constituent can be any of the quantifier phrases in preverbal position. However, native speakers’ opinions are not uniform on the question whether the sentences in (17)-(20) express exhaustive identification. What is most likely is that not all quantifiers in preverbal position have an easily available interpretation as *exclusion of identification*. However, they definitely carry new-information focus, which is also significant, since a preverbal as well as a postverbal position for the quantifier can be filled by a new-information focus phrase. Especially interesting is the case of the existential quantifier. According to É. Kiss, the existential quantifier in Hungarian is not compatible with new information focus, in particular when found in postverbal position (which is the only position consistent with new-information focus in É. Kiss’s terms). However, in Greek, this is not the case, as shown in (21):

---

9 For a similar test in Italian, see Brunetti 2003. Brunetti shows, interestingly, that the preverbal focus position is acceptable only if the sentence includes an *only*-phrase. In this case, the focus can express exhaustive identification.
(21) Yiati oles autes i etimasies?
‘Why all these preparations?’
Perimeno kapjon gia fagito.
‘I am waiting for someone for dinner.’

The fact that the existential quantifier is odd as new-information focus is due to its limited potential to provide precise information in updating the information status of the utterance. Also, the *referential* use of an existential quantifier is limited to contexts such as questions, which presuppose a referential expression in the answer. Nevertheless, if the quantifier functions as an answer to an all-focus question, given that it becomes more informative, it can also become much more acceptable.

É. Kiss’s test D indicates that only identificational focus takes wide scope since only this focus expresses exhaustive identification. This characteristic of exhaustive identification is exactly what makes the focus interact with other scope-carrying elements. For the application of test D to Greek, speakers were presented with examples where the universal quantifier takes scope over focus in-situ (22), and where focus (ex-situ) takes scope over the universal (23).

(22) Kathe sinadelfos ithele me TON DIEUTHINDI na milisi
every colleague-nom wanted-3sg with the director-acc to talk-inf
‘Every colleague wanted to talk with the director.’

(23) me TON DIEUTHINDI ithele na milisi kathe sinadelfos
with the director-acc wanted-3sg to talk-inf every colleague-nom
‘Every colleague wanted to talk with the director.’

According to É. Kiss, a similar example in Hungarian would induce two different interpretations. Thus, the Hungarian counterpart of (22) indicates that every colleague wanted to talk with one person, the director, and not with any other relevant person. Thus, the universal quantifier takes scope over the exhaustive identification. On the other hand, the Hungarian counterpart of (23) indicates that the director is the only person all of the colleagues want to talk to and that other people were talked to by a subgroup of colleagues but not all of them. Thus, the exhaustive identification takes scope over the universal quantifier. In contrast to the situation in Hungarian, native speakers of Greek perceive no difference with respect to the propositional content of the sentences in (22)-(23). That is, these sentences both have the same truth value, namely that all the colleagues wanted to talk to the same person and nobody else. Moreover, none of the sentences prohibit the possibility that some colleagues wanted to talk to with some other person apart from the director. Naturally, the focused phrase carries no property of exclusion, therefore no exhaustive interpretation. In this sense, there is no real scope-taking difference with respect to exhaustivity and the universal quantifier. On the contrary, the focused phrase has only properties of an ordinary focused nominal argument.

3.2 The PF Interface
In the previous section, I presented evidence against the standard assumption that there are two semantically unrelated types of focus in Greek. The arguments presented favoured the claim that focus is a uniform phenomenon with a uniform interpretation: that is, it always expresses new information. The exhaustive interpretation of focus is
only the outcome of the interaction between the semantic component and the discourse component.

In what follows, I will argue that focus is also one and the same phenomenon with respect to the PF interface. There are no different stress/accent assignments corresponding to different semantic types of focus. However, the two semantic types of focus have been traditionally related to two types of prosodic prominence, contrastive and non-contrastive.\(^{10}\)

Zubizarreta (1998) proposes an extra phonological rule, the Emphatic/Contrastive Rule (E/CSR), to account for focal stress related with a contrastive/emphatic focus interpretation. She argues that the position of NS in Germanic languages is a result of the interplay of two rules, one sensitive to selectional ordering and one sensitive to ordering defined in terms of asymmetric c-command. In both, the ‘lowest’ constituent receives the NS under different dimensions, as shown in (24)-(25).

\[(24)\quad S\text{-NSR}: \text{Given two sister categories } C_i \text{ and } C_j, \text{ if } C_i \text{ and } C_j \text{ are selectionally ordered, the one lower in the selectional ordering is more prominent.}\]

\[(25)\quad C\text{-NSR}: \text{Given two sister categories } C_i \text{ and } C_j, \text{ the one lower in the asymmetric c-command ordering (Kayne 1994) is more prominent.}\]

Only the C-SNR is available in Romance languages, subject to parametrization. In German, English and French, defocalised and anaphoric constituents are ‘metrically invisible’ with respect to the NSR. However, in Spanish and Italian, all phonologically specified constituents are ‘metrically visible’. Main prominence on phrase-internal constituents may be associated with a non-contrastive focus interpretation in Germanic:

\[(26)\quad \text{John ate the apple}\]

[Who ate the apple?]

In contrast, in Spanish and Italian, the interpretation is contrastive or emphatic, and therefore not compatible with a focus neutral interpretation.

\[(27)\quad \ast \text{María puso el libro sobre la mesa}\]

Maria put the book on the table.

What did María put on the table?]

\[(28)\quad \text{María puso el LIBRO sobre la mesa (no la revista)}\]

Maria put the book on the table not the journal.

In cases where the focused element appears in a phrase-internal or –initial position, stress is assigned via the E/CSR, as given in (30). The position of NS is unambiguously at the end of the sentence (or phrase), but the scope of contrastive focus in phrase-internal cases is identified by the E/CSR. Thus, sentences with main prominence on the preverbal subject in Spanish, as in (29), receive stress via the E/CSR rather than by the NSR, and can only have a contrastive focus interpretation on the subject.

\[(29)\quad \text{MARÍA se comió el pastel (no Marta)}\]

Maria ate the cake (not Marta)\(^{10}\)

---

(30) **FOCUS/CONTRASTIVE STRESS CORRESPONDENCE PRINCIPLE** (E/CSR): A word with contrastive stress must be dominated by every F-marked constituent in the phrase.

If we can show that information focus can occupy any higher position in the clause (phrase-internal, left-peripheral), then the E/CSR in (30) fails to maintain its idiosyncratic nature. In this case, we could dispense with Zubizarreta’s extra metalinguistic use of the E/CSR and assimilate it to one rule, the NSR, which reintegrates all the different interpretational functions.

According to (30), the element that bears the stress of the sentence must be dominated by any focused part of the sentence. Zubizarreta offers the following examples as support for the E/CSR. In (31), with contrastive stress on the adjective, either the adjective or a constituent that exhaustively dominates the adjective may constitute the scope of the contrast. In (32), with contrastive stress on the noun, the scope of contrast is limited to the noun. In effect, the DP that contains the contrastively stressed noun cannot be interpreted as focused, because the DP is marked [F]. So is the PP that it dominates, but the contrastively stressed noun does not dominate the PP. Thus, [+F]-marked constituents may only dominate [+F]-marked constituents.

(31) a. El gato de sombrero {ROJO} escribio un libro sobre ratones

    *The cat with a red hat wrote a book about rats (not the one with a blue hat).’

    (no el sobrero azul).

b. {El gato de sombrero ROJO} escribio un libro sobre ratones

    *The cat with a red hat wrote a book about rats (not the dog with a green jacket).’

(32) a. El {GATO} de sombrero rojo escribio un libro sobre ratones

    ‘The cat with a red hat wrote a book about rats (not the dog with a red hat)”

    (no el PERRO de sobrero rojo).

b. *El {GATO de sombrero rojo} escribio un libro sobre ratones (no el PERRO de chaqueta verde). (Zubizarreta 1998)

What seems to be important in the two sets of examples is that in accordance with the E/CSR, stress must always coincide with the most embedded constituent of the focused phrase. In effect, every word that is F-marked dominates the stressed constituent as of that position. Thus, the only difference in the requirements between the NSR and the E/CSR is that in the former, main stress must coincide with the most embedded constituent of the clause in Romance, whereas in the latter, contrastive/emphatic stress must fall on the most embedded constituent of the focused phrase. The Greek word order examples given in section 4 clearly established that stress assigned to the focused element does not always have to be rightward or the
most embedded in a clause. What is required is that the stress indication of focus must be as far right as possible within the phrase that contains it. In this respect, it can freely occupy any position in the clause, as long as it falls on the most embedded element in the phrase carrying the focus.

Given this, there seems no need to postulate another rule to account for the metalinguistic/contextual effects of focus. E/CSR is conceptually and empirically redundant, since it derives exactly the same result as the NSR. Stress-inducing focus is assigned by the NSR to the rightmost constituent regardless of the position of the phrase in the clause. As such, the realization of focus by prosodic means is independent of the syntax of focus. In the next section, I will propose a syntax-prosody mapping to account for the Greek data in section 3.

4. The Syntax-Prosody Interface

As mentioned in section 1, I adopt the position of Chen (1987), Nespor & Vogel (1986), Zec & Inkelas (1990) and Jackendoff (1997) Selkirk (1984, 1986), among others, that the grammar represents syntactic and phonological-prosodic information in two distinct levels of representation. Thus, the prosodic representation is not derived directly and unambiguously from the syntax. Syntactic and prosodic representations are related by mapping rules that group the terminal elements in a string in a way that creates units which are not in one-to-one relation with the constituents of the syntactic hierarchy. Prosodic units are created by means of a mapping algorithm — a set of rules that determine the type of information accessible from one grammatical module to another. Selkirk’s mapping algorithms are basic to an analysis where phrase-edge prominence plays a crucial role. I will follow Selkirk (1986) in assuming the following mapping procedure in (33) for phonological phrase, or p-phrase ($\phi$), formation (cf. also Neeleman & Reinhart 1998):

(33) $\phi$-FORMATION
   Close $\phi$ when encountering $\text{XP}$

The procedure in (57) has the effect that the right edges of phonological phrases coincide with the right edges of syntactic phrases. Selkirk (1995) claims that there is a predisposition towards lexical categories. More specifically, Selkirk proposes that only prosodic constraints refer to lexical elements ($L^0$ elements and $L^{\text{max}}$) but not to functional elements ($F^0$ elements and $F^{\text{max}}$) nor to empty categories and their projections, in accordance with the Lexical Category Condition (LCC) of Truckenbrodt (1999: 226).

In Optimality Theory, edge-based rules have been converted into McCarthy & Prince’s (1993) Generalized Alignment constraint system. Selkirk (1995) has proposed the following constraints on edge-alignment of syntactic phrases with phonological phrases:

(34) EDGE-ALIGNMENT CONSTRAINTS:
   a. Align-XP,L: Align (XP, L; PPh, L)
      ‘For each XP, there is a PPh such that the left edge of XP coincides with the left edge of PPh.’
I thus follow Selkirk and Truckenbrodt (1995, 1999) in maintaining the idea that syntactic structure is parsed into prosodic constituents and that the heads of these constituents in turn determine the rhythmic grid eventually responsible for the position of main stress.

### 4.1 Aligned versus Misaligned Mapping

Assuming the framework introduced above, I propose that two types of rules are operational in the mapping process: *default alignment rules* and *focus-related rules*. In the unmarked cases, which I will call *Syntax-Prosody Alignment* (henceforth, SPA), a well-formed syntactic representation can be paired up with a well-formed prosodic representation in a way that the syntax-prosody mapping is completely satisfied. This is the case where the right edge of prosody meets the right edge of syntax, where NSR is applied to the most embedded syntactic constituent.

In cases where an element other than the most embedded in the syntactic structure is to be focused, *Syntax-Prosody Misalignment* (henceforth, SPM) applies to ensure that the element in question appears at the relevant edge of the phonological domain to receive main stress. The relation between the syntactic and the prosodic structure can be altered in a way so that the focused constituent closes off the edge of a phonological phrase other than the one that is final in the clause. Postfocal material is deaccented and therefore integrated into the larger phonological or intonational phrase corresponding to the clause.

This mapping reflects the view that the position of focus is prosodically determined (Cinque 1993, Zubizarreta 1998). The advantage of the mapping is that main stress is not always rightmost but only as far right as possible, the result of the *misalignment* process. Such a generalization is nevertheless problematic for syntactic approaches to stress under parametric analyses, so it offers a serious challenge to them (for discussion, see Haidou forthcoming).

#### 4.1.1 The SPA of the Right Periphery

As regards to the syntax-prosody mapping of the right periphery, I assume, following Selkirk (1995) that the mapping between syntactic and phonological phrases is subject to the Alignment Mapping Rules given in (35).

(35) **SYNTAX-PROSODY MAPPING OF PHRASES (GREEK):**

Align the left edge of a syntactic phrase with the left edge of the phonological phrase.

As far as prosodic phonology is concerned, nuclear stress in Greek is assigned as follows:

(36) **NSR (GREEK):**

Assign main stress on the phonological word in the rightmost p-phrase of the intonational phrase. Under wide focus, the rightmost p-phrase within the IP is the intonationally most prominent and receives main stress.
Let me start by illustrating the application of syntax-prosody mapping together with the stress rules with the example in (37a) and the focus set in (37b).

(37) a. \[ F \text{pire tilefono o Yanis } [F \ti \text{MARIA}] \ke \ti \text{is ipe…} \]
\[ F \text{took-3sg phone } \text{the Yanis-nom the Maria-acc} \text{and her-CL told-3sg} \]

b. Focus set: \{DP\text{DO}, VP, IP\}

(38) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IntPs} \\
\phi_w \\
\omega_s \\
\phi_s \end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\phi_w \\
\omega_s \\
\phi_w \end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\omega_s \\
\phi_s \\
\omega_s \end{array}
\]

\[
\text{[IP pire tilefono } \text{[VP[DP o Yanis [DP ti } \text{MARIA]]]]}
\]

The SPA mapping and prosodic rules derive the representation in (38). Relevant to these rules is the fact that in (37), MARIA is the rightmost syntactically most embedded constituent and the rightmost phonological word in the rightmost phonological phrase. Therefore in the unmarked case (37), the right edge of the intonational phrase is aligned with the right edge of the clause. Given the NSR in (36), MARIA will receive main stress. Therefore at the clausal level of (37), nuclear stress and phrasal stress occur together on MARIA according to the mapping principle (35). That is, nuclear stress in Greek is assigned to the rightmost phonological phrase in the intonational phrase, while phrasal stress is assigned to the rightmost phonological word in the phonological phrase, according to (35). The SPA mapping allows direct connection between LF and PF; between stress assigned by the NSR and the [+F] feature which identifies the focused constituent as the legitimate recipient of stress. In the SPA mapping prosody being the image of syntax. However, the interpretations we derive from the SPA mapping are one-to-many (cf. SVO structure).

4.1.2 Clause-internal Focus and Misalignment

We now return to the analysis of sentence-medial focus constructions, with respect to the mapping between syntax and prosody. We can identify the following phrasal stress rules for Greek:

(39) **GREEK P-PHRASE STRESS RULE:**
Within the P-phrase, the leftmost non-clitic word is prosodically the most prominent carrying the intonational nucleus of the phrase.

(40) **GREEK I-PHRASE STRESS RULE:**
A P-phrase bearing narrow focus receives the most prominent stress of its IntP.

Furthermore, as far as prosodic phonology of Greek is concerned, the prosodic phrasing domain is defined as follows.

(41) In Greek, a P-phrase boundary must be inserted at the left edge of the focused constituent.
Thus, from the Align (Info, Pcat) family of constraints that Selkirk (1995) proposes in her model of information structure-phonology interface, we can use the constraint ALIGN-FOCUS, L in (42) to ensure the mapping of some edge of a focus constituent with some edge of a prosodic unit.

(42) ALIGN-FOCUS, L
   Align the left edge of a Focus constituent in information structure with the left edge of a P-phrase in the prosodic structure.

Given (41) and (42), we may offer in place of the NSR the following mapping rule in (43) for misaligned or internal focus-related structures:

(43) MISALIGNMENT MAPPING NSR (GREEK): Within the I-phrase, NS falls on the rightmost intonationally most prominent P-phrase, the left edge of which must be aligned with the left-edge of the focused constituent.

The above rule predicts that in a narrow-focused constituent in clause-medial position, NS will fall within the intonationally most prominent P-phrase of the I-phrase. The last phrasal stress will be the strongest. So in cases where the narrow-focused constituent is internal to the I-phrase, NS will not be rightmost but as right as possible.

(44) o Janis esteile STIN MARIA to gramma.

\textit{John-nom sent-3sg to Mary-dat the letter-acc}

\textit{‘John sent to Mary the letter.’}

According to the misaligned mapping rules, the structure is a narrow focus structure within the I-phrase. Thus, in accordance with Greek P-phrase stress, STIN MARIA is prosodically the strongest phonological word of the phonological phrase it belongs to in virtue of being the rightmost one. Intonationally, the narrow-focused constituent is realized by an intonational boundary taking the form of a L+H* nuclear pitch accent (Baltazani 2002), which signals the beginning of a new P-phrase. The following material is deaccented; this material is in turn followed by a LL% boundary, which closes off the intonational phrase. As regards Greek I-phrase stress, STIN MARIA will bear narrow focus. As a result of the mapping process the intonational boundary on the focus constituent marks its prosodic prominence and as the rightmost intonationally accented constituent it will receive the strongest stress in the intonational phrase. The P-phrase boundary will be inserted at the left edge of STIN
MARIA, in accordance with ALIGN-FOCUS-L, which carries the focus. Therefore, the misaligned syntax-prosody mapping process decides that the left edge of the most prominent P-phrase within the I-phrase will coincide with the left edge of the focused constituent. The P-phrase boundary defines the domain of the assignment of the NSR. The NS will receive focus since it constitutes intonationally the rightmost P-phrase of the I-phrase. Thus, in cases of where the narrow-focused constituent is internal to the I-phrase, the NS will not be rightmost in the clause. On the contrary, it will be rightmost in the phonological phrase that is closed off when it ‘reads off’ the focus structure.

It is now apparent how SPM mapping provides a way of focusing a constituent which is not on the right-edge of the utterance. Given that main stress is assigned to the rightmost element in the prosodic structure, it does not matter that this element is not the rightmost within the syntactic structure, as the grammar allows for distinct prosodic and syntactic representations.

4.1.3 The SPM of the Left Periphery
Having analysed right-peripheral and clause-internal focus constructions, I will now analyse the last set of focus constructions attested in Greek, the left-peripheral constructions. The example in (45) contains a left-peripheral focus:

(45) Pjon kitakse i Maria?
    ‘Who did Mary look at?’
    [F TON YANI] kitakse i Maria
    [F the Yani-ACC] looked-3SG the Maria-NOM
    ‘Maria looked at Yanis.’

Given the stress rules in (39) and (40) ALIGN-FOCUS-L in (42) and the misalignment mapping principle in (43), I assume that an intonational phrase boundary is introduced before the focused constituent. In the example in (44), the context question indicates that the whole IP except for the focused constituent is given or ‘discourse-linked’. The misaligned mapping operation discussed ensures that the focused constituent is at the right edge of its intonational phrase in order to receive stress. Since the focused constituent is a legitimate discourse entity on its own; it forms its own intonational phrase (pitch accent H* followed by a LL% boundary tone). Any material that follows will be phonologically unparsed in the Intonational phrase that closes after the focus is encountered and parsed within its own intonational phrase. This makes the postfocal material discourse linked. However, the material that follows is not phonologically de-accented, in contrast to clause-internal focus (section 5.1.2), and can therefore form a separate intonational phrase. The SPM mapping is illustrated in (46) below:
5 Concluding Remarks

The present study has sought to challenge the claim that language embraces ‘perfection’ in arguing against economy considerations as pursued by the Minimalist Program. What I proposed was that the standard Minimalist grammatical architecture has to be modified to allow for both syntactic and prosodic information to access the interface with conceptual structure (C-I) (cf. Reinhart 1995). In other words, the grammar has to reflect the basic intuition that prosodic information has a direct influence on semantics and pragmatics — in particular, that stress = focus. Thus, I argued for a direct interaction between PF and LF, bypassing syntax, in order to capture the observation that a focused constituent will always carry the main stress.

Based on the above assumptions, I proposed that the syntactic, semantic and prosodic representations are independent components of grammar linked by interface mapping processes that access each other simultaneously when necessary (Jackendoff 1997; Williams 2003). Such a grammatical architecture is forced by the evidence from Greek regarding the interaction of focus with the other components of the grammar. It was shown that in Greek there is no one-to-one mapping between focus position and semantic interpretation. Moreover, it was shown that focus is also a uniform phenomenon at the PF interface. I proposed a special type of mapping (SPA and SPM) which accounts for word order variation on the hypothesis that the different spell-out positions of the same focus constituent carry the same interpretation.

I argued that focus is freely assigned via stress and further claimed that focus-markers are syntactically unconstrained. This has the major theoretical consequence: namely that in a language with no pre-determined position for stress there will be no predetermined position for focus. This dispensed with the postulation of unjustified syntactic Focus projections.

The model proposed here is conceptually advantageous since it respects the independence of different levels of representation. No movement for focus-internal reasons is permitted in the syntax in order to derive a consistent set of mapping
principles from syntax to phonology/semantics (contra Costa 1996; Choi 1996; Neeleman & Reinhart 1998; Szendrői 2001; Zubizarreta 1998). The mapping process proposed here straightforwardly predicts that rightmost prominence at the right edges is all that is needed for focus identification.
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