On the typology of Focus Phenomena

Simon Dik et al.

University of Amsterdam

0. Introduction

This paper discusses some aspects of the typology of the pragmatic function Focus within the framework of Functional Grammar. We will mainly concentrate on the following two questions:

(a) what sorts or subtypes of Focus have to be distinguished if we want to adequately account for the variety of Focus-related constructions to be found in different languages?

(b) under what conditions do have to assume the presence of more than one Focus within one construction?

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 briefly sketches the status of the Focus function within FG. Section 2 more clearly defines the problems involved in questions (a) and (b). Section 3 summarises the theory of Focus types developed by Watters (1979) in his description of Aghem. The influence of Watters' work will be evident throughout this paper.

Section 4 discusses scope differences connected with the Focus function. Section 5 is concerned with the relations between Focus and Contrast: must these be seen as distinct phenomena, or can they be interpreted as subtypes of one focussing mechanism? Section 6 presents a typology of the Focus function in terms of a number of relevant parameters. Section 7, finally, illustrates how more complex Focus constructions could be actually described according to the principles of FG.

The examples from different languages used in this paper were determined by the knowledge and interests which happened to be represented in our group. No attempt has been made to arrive at anything like a representative sample of languages. Obviously, our contribution is anything but definitive, as may be expected in this relatively unexplored area of linguistic organization.
1. The status of Focus in PG.

Consider the following question-answer pair:

(1) A: What did John buy?
B: John bought an umbrella.

According to the principles of PG, (1B) would in this context get the following underlying representation:

(2) Past buy.(dix; John(x)) AgSubjTop
    (dix; umbrella(x)) dOObjFoc

The functional information contained in this representation tells us that John is the Agent, the Subject, and the Topic, and that an umbrella is the Goal, the Object, and the Focus of this construction. The pragmatic functions Topic and Focus were defined as follows (Dik 1978: 19):

Topic: the Topic presents the entity 'about' which the predication predicates something in the given setting.

Focus: the Focus represents what is relatively the most important or salient information in the given setting.

Focus has been assigned to the Goal in (2), because that constituent contains the crucial information requested in (1A). A constituent with Focus function presents information 'bearing upon the difference in pragmatic information between Speaker and Addressee, as estimated by the Speaker.' (Dik 1978: 149). By uttering (1A) the speaker indicates that there is a difference between him and the addressee concerning the identity of the thing that John bought. The answer (1B) levels out this difference.

It seems safe to assume that the Focus function, in the general sense outlined above, is relevant to the organization of all natural languages. Languages differ, however, in the expressive devices they use for signalling Focus in the actual form of linguistic expressions. These devices come in the following sorts:

(i) intonational prominence: extra stress, higher tone;
(ii) special constituent order: special positions for Focus constituents in the linear order of the clause;
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(iii) special Focus marks: from the rest of the sentence;
(iv) special Focus construc;

different languages use some or all of these.

The above account of Focus, the too vague and unspecified to a variety of Focus phenomena, must be reassigned to a more precise typology of Focus phenomena.

2. One Focus or more?

So far we have acted on the assumption that there is to be assigned. Both of these a simplifications of the facts to

2.1. More than one Focus per phrase?

It is easy to see that it must be reassigned to the constituent terms necessarily have Focus, as to be questioned within a single

(3) Who ate what in the room?

Similarly, in an answer to a question to a questioned term in (3) must

(4) JOHNFOC ate CHILLI FOC

From these examples it is clear that a constituent within a single

From these examples it is clear that a constituent within a single
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(iii) special Focus markers: particles marking off the Focus from the rest of the clause;

(iv) special Focus constructions: constructions which intrinsically define a certain distribution of Topic and Focus over the structure of the clause, such as cleft- or pseudocleft constructions. 2

Different languages use some or all of these devices in different combinations.

The above account of Focus, though probably not incorrect, is certainly too vague and unspecified to arrive at a correct understanding of the variety of Focus phenomena found in natural languages. The aim of the present paper is to arrive at a more detailed and differentiated picture of the typology of Focus phenomena.

2. One Focus or more?

So far we have acted on the assumption that only one Focus is assigned per predication, and that there is only one, undifferentiated type of Focus to be assigned. Both of these assumptions will turn out to be incorrect simplifications of the facts to be accounted for.

2.1. More than one Focus per predication.

It is easy to see that it must be possible for more than one Focus function to be assigned to the constituents of a single predication: questioned terms necessarily have Focus, and many languages allow more than one term to be questioned within a single predication, as in:

(3) Who ate what in the restaurant?

Similarly, in an answer to a question such as (3), each term corresponding to a questioned term in (3) must be assigned Focus:

(4) JOHN_Foc ate CHILI_Foc (in the restaurant)

From these examples it is clear that Focus must be assignable to more than one constituent within a single predication. In this respect Focus assignment differs from the assignment of semantic functions and syntactic
functions: functions such as Agent and Subject cannot be assigned to more
than one constituent per predication.
Another difference between Focus and the other functions is, that Focus
can be assigned to the predicate or to the predication as a whole, whereas
the other functions are restricted to terms.

2.2. Parameters determining different types of Focus.
Focus was generally defined above as characterizing that part of a ling-
ugistic expression that contains what is relatively the most important
or salient information within the given setting of use. Focus will usually
relate to differences in the pragmatic information of speaker and addres-
see, as estimated by the speaker. There are different ways, however, in
which a piece of information may be important or salient. Both informa-
tionally and syntactically, different sorts of Focus constructions may
come out according to the different values that the Focus function may
take along a number of parameters. These parameters, briefly outlined
here, will return for further discussion in the course of this paper.

(a) Scope of the Focus: Is Focus assigned to the predication as a
whole (or its truth value), or only to some constituent of the
predication?

Consider the following examples:

(5) John went to the market
(6) John DID go to the market
(7) John went to the MARKET

(5) can be taken as a Focus-neutral assertion of a certain fact. In (6),
the Focus is on the truth value of the predication as a whole. This con-
struction could be used in a context in which the issue was whether or not
it was the case that John went to the market, to assert emphatically that
this was indeed the case. In (7), Focus is only on the Direction consti-
tuent. This construction can be used when the issue is not whether or not
John went somewhere (that he went somewhere is presupposed in this case),
but when the issue is where precisely he went.
Thus, scope differences of the Focus function lead to quite different
types of linguistic expression. Comparable differences are found in other
languages. Compare the equivalents of (5) – (7) in Bahasa Indonesia:
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(8) Ali pergi ke pasar
'Ali go to the market'

(9) Ali ADA PERGI ke
'Ali exist go to'

(10) Ali pergi ke PAS
'Ali go to market'

Notice that Bahasa Indonesia,
a literal meaning of 'to exist'
value of the predication as a

(b) Emphasis or Contrast: the importance of a given c
information of that con
in some other constituent
unt which con
same linguistic express
pression, or is it pron

Consider the following example:

(11) John bought a TOYOTA
(12) John bought a TOYOTA
(13) John bought a TOYOTA

In (11), there is not neces-
car: the speaker can use o
of the event described. In (1)
two constituents contained i
there is a contrast with res addressee. In the particular
difference corresponding with
below, other languages do ha

(c) Relation to pragmatic :
stituent meant to fill
(8) Ali pergi ke pasar
    Ali go to market
    'Ali went to the market' (Focus-neutral)

(9) Ali ADA PERGI ke pasar
    Ali exist go to market
    'Ali DID GO to the market' (Focus on truth value)

(10) Ali pergi ke PASAR
     Ali go to market
     'Ali went to the MARKET' (Focus on Direction)

Notice that Bahasa Indonesia, too, uses an emphatic auxiliary verb (with a literal meaning of 'to exist') in order to express Focus on the truth value of the predication as a whole.

(b) Emphasis or Contrast: does the Focus merely emphasize the importance of a given constituent, or does it contrast the information of that constituent with the information given in some other constituent? In the latter case, is the constituent with which contrast is established contained in the same linguistic expression, or in some other linguistic expression, or is it presupposed?

Consider the following examples:

(11) John bought a TOYOTA! (you wouldn't believe it)
(12) John bought a TOYOTA, not a VOLKSWAGEN!
(13) John bought a TOYOTA! (not a Volkswagen, as you seem to assume)

In (11), there is not necessarily a contrast with another specific type of car: the speaker can use (11) merely to emphasize the unexpectedness of the event described. In (12), there is an explicit contrast between two constituents contained in the same linguistic expression. And in (13), there is a contrast with respect to the presumed presupposition of the addressee. In the particular case of (11) and (13), English has no formal difference corresponding with emphasis versus contrast. As we shall see below, other languages do have such formal differences.

c) Relation to pragmatic information of addressee: is the Focus constituent meant to fill in, to expand, to restrict, or to replace
a given piece of information contained in the pragmatic information of the addressee?

Consider the following examples:

(14) John went to the MARKET (‘filling in’)
(15) John not only went to the MARKET, but also to the STORE (‘expanding’)
(16) John didn’t go to the MARKET, he only went to the STORE (‘restricting’)
(17) John didn’t go to the MARKET, he went to the STORE (‘replacing’)

The relevance of these distinctions will be discussed in section 6 of this paper.

(d) New or Given: does the Focus present information new to the addressee, or does it select a salient item from among a ‘given’ set of possible items?

It is often assumed that Focus can only characterize information new to the addressee. There certainly is a strong correlation between Focus and ‘new information’. Indeed, how could information (assumed to be) ‘given’ to the addressee constitute the most important or salient information contained in a linguistic expression? However, consider the following exchange:

(18) A: What did John and Bill finally decide on?
B: John bought a TOYOTA and BILL a VOLKSWAGEN

In (18a), both John and Bill have Focus, although these constituents in themselves do not contain new information. What one could say in such a case, of course, is that the relations John - Toyota and Bill - Volkswagen are (presumed to be) ‘new’ to the addressee, and that this explains the Focus distribution in this case. We return to this matter below, in section 5.

(e) Exhaustive or not: is the information transmitted meant to be exclusively true of the focussed item, or does it leave open the possibility that it may be true of other items as well?
Consider the following examples:

(19) JOHNSON voted against the bill

(20) It was JOHNSON who voted against the bill

In (19) it is emphatically asserted that Johnson voted against the bill. This assertion is compatible with the possibility that others may also have voted against the bill. (20), however, will normally be used to indicate that Johnson was the only person who voted against the bill. This latter sort of Focus is what Kuno (1972) has called ‘exhaustive listing’ Focus.

2.3. Multiple Focus and different Focus types.

It is evident from the above discussion that the questions discussed in 2.1. and 2.2. are interrelated in several ways. When there are different Focus constituents in a single predication, these may be of different types, as in:

(21) John didn’t buy a TOYOTA, he bought a VOLKSWAGEN

Here, there is Focus on both Toyota and Volkswagen, but these Focus constituents function contextually in different ways: the former is meant to remove information from the pragmatic information of the addressee, the latter is used to insert new information into that pragmatic information.

Conversely, a given type of Focus may lead to multiple Focus constituents within one predication, as is the case in ‘parallel’ constructions such as:

(22) JOHN bought a TOYOTA and BILL a VOLKSWAGEN

An adequate theory of Focus will have to account for these interrelationships.

3. Watters’ analysis of Aghem.

3.1. Summary of the analysis.

In his analysis of Focus phenomena in Aghem, a Grassfields Bantu language of Cameroon, Watters (1979) demonstrates that the following Focus types must be distinguished in order to account for the syntactic properties of Focus constructions in this language.
Types of Focus in Aghem:

a. Unmarked Focus: occurs when the focus or foci are not formally marked on the surface, the sentence having the basic word order. Example: Inah gave fufu to his friends.

b. Assertive focus: that information which the speaker believes, assumes or knows the hearer does not share with him or her. Example: Inah gave FUFU to his friends.

c. Counter-assertive focus: that information which the speaker substitutes for information which the hearer asserted in a previous utterance. Example: Inah gave FUFU (not yam) to his friends.

d. Exhaustive listing focus: that information which the speaker asserts is unique in the sense that the rest of the sentence is true only with respect to it and false with respect to all other units of information which could be appropriately substituted for it in the sentence. Example: Inah gave FUFU only (and nothing else) to his friends.

e. Polar focus: the truth value 'true' or 'false' which the speaker asserts concerning a proposition. Example: It is TRUE THE CASE that Inah gave fufu to his friends = Inah DID give fufu to his friends.

f. Counter-assertive polar focus: the truth value 'true' or 'false' which the speaker asserts, contradicting the hearer's previous utterance concerning the truth value of the sentence. Example: It is TOO the case/true (contrary to your denial) that Inah gave fufu to his friends = Inah DID TOO give fufu to his friends.

(taken from Watters 1979: 177).

The Focus mechanisms of Aghem are rather complicated in detail, but the following summary gives the basic principles. Aghem uses the following devices for expressing Focus types: (a) constituent order, (b) a special Focus-bound complements Past tense marker, (c) a special Focus marker, (d) the cleft construction.

The basic functional pattern of the clause can be represented as:

(23) S Aux Pb V Pa O X

Especially important for Focus are the 'special positions' Pb (immediately before the verb) and Pa (immediately after the verb). Of these two, Pa is the main position for Focus terms. In this respect, Aghem deviates in an interesting way from the more common pattern in which the clause-initial position Pl is used for these purposes.
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The main rules for the expression of Focus:

(1) any Focus term, whether to Pa.

(II) when the Focus term in non-Focus, non-Subject necessarily part of the Focus term in that case simply asserted.

(III) when the Focus term in a dummy Subject in the Focus terms in the are alternatively be place a construction with mu Focus can only be expr Focus and thus in Pa.

(iv) there is one neutral a tense marker. When the the value of the predi

(v) when in the same cond in Pb so that the verb is

(vi) when the special Focus to the right of and is 'Counter-asserted' to question already has value 'Exhaustive lis

(vii) the cleft construction Focus.

We give one example for each of how these principles work:

a. Unmarked focus (Focus-neutral)

(24) Fufu & yam 2f friends SM Past eat 'The friends ate fufu

Comment: neutral word order,
The main rules for the expression of Focus are as follows:

(i) any Focus term, whether questioned or non-questioned, goes to Pa.

(ii) when the Focus term in Pa is not the Subject, then up to two non-Focus, non-Subject terms may go to Pb; these are then necessarily part of the presupposition (or Topics), and the Focus term in that case is counter-asserted rather than simply asserted.

(iii) when the Focus term in Pa is the Subject, then there will be a dummy Subject in the S position, and there may be other Focus terms in the area after Pa: up to two of these may alternatively be placed in Pb. In both cases, the result is a construction with multiple Foci. Notice that multiple term Focus can only be expressed when at least the Subject is in Focus and thus in Pa.

(iv) there is one neutral and one Focus-signalling completive Past tense marker. When the latter is placed in Aux, Focus is on the value of the predication as a whole: Polar focus.

(v) when in the same condition all verbal complements are placed in Pb so that the verb is in final position, the result is Counter-asserted polar focus.

(vi) when the special Focus marker mò is placed after a constituent to the right of and including the verb, it adds the value 'Counter-asserted' to that constituent; if the constituent in question already has this value on other grounds, it adds the value 'Exhaustive listing'.

(vii) the cleft construction is used for only exhaustive listing Focus.

We give one example for each of the Focus types cited under a-f above, to show how these principles work:

a. Unmarked focus (Focus-neutral):

(24) sìl à mò xì kí-bò ón 'sóm
    friends SM Past eat fufu in farm
    'The friends ate fufu in the farm'
    Comment: neutral word order, both Pa and Pb empty. SM = Subj marker.
b. Assertive focus:

(25) á mā zë ənjə bgi-kə ŋən 'səm / DS Past eat INAN fufu in farm
    'INAN ate fufu in the farm'
Comment: Subj-focus in Ps, dummy Subj in S (= DS): assertive Focus on Subj.

c. Counter-assertive focus:

(26) ŋni, ənə tə 'səm zë ə-ísh
    Inah Past in farm eat YAMS
    'No, Inah ate YAMS in the farm'
Comment: Object in Ps, Locative term in Pb: Counter-assertive Focus on Object.

d. Exhaustive listing focus:

(27) a mā əbɛ bɛtən wɛl 'sə a mə bɛn
    DS Past be CHIEF this be Past come
    'It was the CHIEF who came'
Comment: cleft construction: Exhaustive listing focus on 'the chief'.

e. Polar focus:

(28) ənə məfə fufu bgi-kə ə fɛn-kə
    Inah Past-Poc give fufu to friends
    'Inah DID give fufu to his friends'
Comment: Focus Past marker rather than simple Past marker: Polar focus on predication.

f. Counter-assertive polar focus:

(29) əfə ə mə bgi-kə zə
    friends SM Past-Poc fufu eat
    'The friends DID eat fufu'
Comment: Focus Past marker, Obj in Pb and verb in final position; counter-assertion of truth of predication.

4. Scope differences.

In 2.2. above we noted sub (a) that Focus types concern the scope of a to what part of the predication. A predication consists of a predicate terms, possibly extended with one
3.2. Some comments on Watters' analysis.

As will become clear in the further course of this paper, we believe that Watters' distinctions are essential to the development of a general typology of Focus phenomena. Some points in his analysis, however, would seem to require some modification. We mention the following points:

(i) We interpret 'unmarked Focus' as being equivalent to 'absence of Focus'. That is, we assume that a linguistic expression which does not relate in any way to a presupposition of the addressee, and has no internal contrast either, is simply Focus-neutral: no Focus function is assigned either to the expression as a whole, nor to any part of the expression.

(ii) We find the term 'Counter-assertive' less fortunate, because the type of construction falling under this label can be produced in precisely the same form in relation to (a) a specific assertion which the other participant has just made, or (b) a specific presupposition which the speaker assumes the addressee possesses at the moment of speech. The essential factor would thus seem to be, not what the other has just said, but what the speaker assumes about the pragmatic information of the other at the moment of speaking. The constructions involved are thus 'Counter-presuppositional' rather than 'Counter-asserted'.

(iii) Some distinctions made by Watters must be further refined, because some of his categories may result in different construction types according to (a) the precise presuppositional conditions involved, and (b) that which the speaker wishes to achieve by assigning Focus to a given item in a linguistic expression.

These points will be clarified in the further course of this paper.

4. Scope differences.

In 2.2. above we noted sub (a) that one of the parameters differentiating Focus types concerns the scope of the Focus function: i.e., the question as to what part of the predication is operated upon by the Focus function. A predication consists of a predicate, applied to one or more argument terms, possibly extended with one or more satellite terms. Thus, we get the
following possible scope distinctions:

The scope of Focus is:
(a) the predication as a whole;
(b) some constituent(s) of the predication;
   (b1) the predicate;
   (b2) some term(s).

In respect to these scope distinctions, there are close connections between Focus and Negation, and this is no coincidence: Negation typically applies to some piece of information concerning which there is some (real or presumed) difference between the pragmatic information of the speaker and that of the addressee. Thus, what is negated is usually in Focus. We might thus distinguish between positive Focus and negative Focus. The main difference between these is, that negative Focus is always marked by some explicit segmental element in the clause, whereas positive Focus may lack such a segmental marker and may be solely expressed through constituent order and/or suprasegmental distinctions.

The scope differences distinguished above may thus be compared to such distinctions as between 'sentence negation' and 'constituent negation': in the former case, the whole sentence (or predication) is in the scope of Negation, in the latter case only some constituent of the predication (either the predicate or some term) is in the scope of Negation.

4.1. Focus on the predication as a whole.

If the Focus is on the predication as a whole, it naturally concerns the illocutionary 'point' of the predication: if the predication is presented as an assertion, then the Focus will fall on the truth value of the assertion, as in:

(30) John did go to the market
(31) John did NOT go to the market

In (30) it is emphatically asserted that John went to the market, in (31) it is emphatically denied that he did so. This is a case of Polar Focus in Matters' terminology.

If the predication is presented as an invitation or an advice (in which...
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When the truth value is not at stake, the Focus will concern the force with which such speech acts are presented to the Addressee:

(32) **Do come over for dinner!**

(33) **DON'T give up!**

Since Focus, when it has the whole predication in its scope, may have different values according to the type of speech act in which the predication occurs, we shall use the neutral term Predication Focus for this type.

As Muellers has shown for Aphras, Predication Focus may differ according to whether the predication is emphatically asserted or counter-asserted. In Dutch, positive asserted Polar Focus has no specific marker (except emphatic intonation), but positive counter-asserted Polar Focus is marked by the emphatic particle *wel*, which quite clearly brings out the parallelism with negative Polar Focus, as in the following exchange:

(34) **A:** Jan heeft zijn huis verkocht!
John has his house sold
'John has sold his house!'

**B:** Nee, hij heeft zijn huis **NIET** verkocht.
No, he has his house **NOT** sold
'No, he has **NOT** sold his house'

**A:** Ja, hij heeft zijn huis **WEL** verkocht!
Yes, he has his house sold
'Yes, he **HAS** (indeed) sold his house'

Thus, Polar Focus is a specific type of Predication Focus; Predication Focus is the positive counterpart of what is usually called sentence negation; and the difference between assertion and counter-assertion is relevant to both the status and the expression of Predication Focus.

4.2. Focus on some constituent of the predication.

When Focus is on some constituent of the predication, it can either have the predicate or some term in its scope. In both cases it correlates with predicate or term negation. Thus, Focus is on the Recipient term in all of the following examples:
(35) John gave the book to Peter
(36) John gave the book to Peter, not to Charles
(37) John did not give the book to Charles

And in the following examples Focus is on the predicate:

(38) John gave the book to Peter
(39) John gave the book to Peter, he didn’t sell it to him
(40) John did not give the book to Peter

A characteristic of Constituent Focus is that it corresponds to a specific presupposition, which can be reconstructed by taking out the Focus constituent and replacing it by a variable (cf. Chomsky 1972, Jackendoff 1972). Thus, (35) connects with the presupposition ‘John gave the book to someone’; the only issue between Speaker and Addressee is the identity of the ‘someone’. And (38) connects with the presupposition ‘John did something with the book with respect to Peter’; the only issue is what precisely he did with the book.

Sentences with term Focus can typically be given as answers to term questions. Thus, (35) would be a correct answer to the question:

(41) To whom did John give the book?

In a similar way, we would expect constructions with predicate Focus, as in (38)-(40), to be correct answers to constructions in which the identity of the predicate is questioned. For some reason, however, most languages have no straightforward possibility of questioning the identity of predicates. E.g., if there is a presupposition of the form:

(42) John gave the book to Peter

then there is, in English and many other languages, no straightforward construction of the form:

(43) *John what-ed the book to Peter?

Instead, one has to make use of circumlocutions such as:
(44) What did John do with the book? Did he GIVE it to Peter?

Thus, terms and predicates behave differently under Question Focus in these languages.

The non-questionability of predicates, however, is not a universal property of languages.

Thus, Indonesian has three verbs derived from the question word apa 'what' which can serve to question the identity of the V: mengapa 'to do what', mengapa(apa) 'to do what to somebody', and mengapakan 'to do what with something or somebody', as in the following examples (where PASS stands for Passive):

(45) A: Mengapa Ali di kamar nya?
    do what Ali at room his
    'What is Ali doing in his room?'
B: Menulis surat.
    write letter
    'Writing letters'

(46) A: Ku-apai anak ini, hingga ia menjerit-jerit?
    you do what to PASS child this so that he scream
    'What did you do to this child to make him scream?'
B: Ku-pukuli dia.
    he was hit (repeatedly) by me =) 'I gave him a beating'

(47) A: Hendak kau-apakan buku ini?
    want you do what with PASS book this
    'What are you going to do with this book?'
    want I sell PASS to Ali
    'It is going to be sold by me to Ali =)
    'I'm going to sell it to Ali'
4.3. The distinction between term scope and predicate scope.

Although predicates in Indonesian can be questioned just like terms, it possesses other construction types which discriminate sharply between term scope and predicate scope. One of these is question formation by means of the particle *kah.* Indonesian Yes-no questions can be formed by means of the question particle *kah.* Compare:

(48) Ali membeli buku  
     Ali buy book  
     'Ali bought a book (or: books)'

(49) Ali membeli buku *kah?*  
     'Did Ali buy a book?'

The particle *kah* must have the predicate in its scope. It cannot have term-scope. This can be seen in the following way. In a construction type alternative to (48)-(49), the Subject and the predicate can appear in inverted order. This order gives Focus to the predicate:

(50) Membeli buku, Ali  
     'Ali did buy a book'

(51) Membeli buku *kah, Ali?*  
     'Did Ali buy a book?'

It is impossible, however, to get terms in front position with *kah:

(52) *Buku *kah, Ali membeli ?*  
(53) *Ali *kah, membeli buku ?*

A nominal can only be questioned by *kah* if it functions as a predicate, not as a term:

(54) Ali guru  
     'Ali teacher'

(55) Ali *guru *kah?*  
     'Is *Ali a teacher?*'

---
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(56) Guru, Ali!  
     'Ali is a TEACHER!'

(57) Guru *kah, Ali?*  
     'Is Ali a TEACHER?'

Fronting with *kah* can thus be used a given constituent is a term or a relation to the analysis of the sentence. Consider now:

(58) Ali (*lah), yang membeli  
     Ali Foc meli buy  
     'ALi (was the one) that bought'

In this constructions *Ali* is the if with the Focus marker *lah*, and *the* clause. Consider now:

(59) Ali *kah, yang membeli  
     'Was it ALi who bought?'

(60) Siapa (*kah), yang membeli  
     'Who was it that bought'

From these examples it is clear that clef construction can be questioned that this constituent function term.

5. Focus and Contrast.

A recurrent problem in connection relationship between the notions of focus in this respect is: do we nd side of the pragmatic Focus function (specific instances of) Focus In part, the answer that one want of terminology and definition. We of a predication which contains information in the given setting.
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[56] Guru, Ali!
   'Ali is a TEACHER!'

[57] Guru kah, Ali?
   'Is Ali a TEACHER?'

Posing with kah can thus be used as a criterion for determining whether a given constituent is a term or a predicate. This is interesting in relation to the analysis of the pseudo-cleft construction. Consider:

[58] Ali (lah), yang membeli buku itu
   Ali Foc Rel buy book the
   'ALI (was the one) that bought the book'

In this construction, Ali is the focussed constituent (optionally marked with the Focus marker lah), and the rest has the properties of a relative clause. Consider now:

[59] Ali kah, yang membeli buku itu?
   'Was it ALI who bought the book?'

[60] Siapa (kah), yang membeli buku itu?
   'Who was it that bought the book?'

From these examples it is clear that the Focus constituent of the pseudo-cleft construction can be questioned by means of kah. The conclusion must be that this constituent functions as a predicate rather than as a nominal term.

5. Focus and Contrast.

A recurrent problem in connection with Focus phenomena is the precise relationship between the notions of 'Focus' and 'Contrast'. The main question in this respect is: do we need a distinct device for Contrast by the side of the pragmatic Focus function, or can Contrast be handled in terms of (specific instances of) Focus assignment?

In part, the answer that one wants to give to this question is a matter of terminology and definition. We have defined Focus as marking that part of a predication which contains its relatively most important or salient information in the given setting. This implies that there will always be
a certain contrast between the Focus part of the predication, which is 'foregrounded' in one way or another with respect to the 'backgrounded' rest of the predication. If the notion of contrast is used in this broad sense, then any type of Focus assignment will necessarily imply Contrast. But this is then a contrast between that which is focused upon, as against that which is not focused upon.

'Contrast' is usually restricted, however, to the more specific case in which one piece of information, say X, is explicitly or implicitly opposed to some other piece of information, say Y, which stands in some specific relation of opposition to X in the given setting. This sort of Contrast is found in such patterns as the following:

(61)  A: It is the case that Y
     B: No, it is the case that X

(62)  It is the case that X, not Y

(63)  It is not only the case that Y, but also that X

(64)  X did V, but Y did W

From these examples it is clear that the contrast between X and Y may have different sources: B may counterassert X to an assertion Y of A; or the speaker may oppose X to a presumed presupposition Y. In these cases X is meant to correct the conversationally 'given' Y.

But contrast may also be determined by factors internal to the linguistic expression as such, as in (64), where the speaker asserts two different things, V and W, about two different entities, X and Y.

If Contrast is used in the restricted sense with respect to an opposition between X and Y, then it follows that Focus does not necessarily imply Contrast: speakers can emphatically assert X without opposing it to an explicitly given or presupposed Y.

On the other hand, Contrast will necessarily imply Focus on X, and also on Y if Y is explicitly given in the expression. The opposition between X and Y is obviously sufficient to give both X and Y the status of 'most important or salient information'.

In this context it is useful to also consider the relations between Focus and Contrast on the one hand, and the notions 'New' and 'Given' information on the other.

6. A typology of the Focus
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As we saw above, a constituent with Focus function is assumed to present information bearing upon the difference in pragmatic information between speaker and addressee, as estimated by the speaker. It is not immediately clear, however, that this information should necessarily be 'new' to the addressee in the given setting. It may certainly be, but the speaker may also focus on information which he knows is not new to the addressee, either to stress its importance in the given setting, or to reanimate that information in the addressee's memory.

Thus Focus does not necessarily imply that the information focused upon is new to the addressee. The same applies to Contrast. Although certainly a piece of 'new' information may be contrasted with a piece of 'given' information, the contrast may also be between two pieces of 'given' information, or between two pieces of 'new' information.

From this it follows that there is no simple one-to-one relation between Focus or Contrast on the one hand, and 'new' information on the other.

6. A typology of the Focus function.

Against the background of the various factors discussed in the preceding paragraphs, we shall now propose and discuss a subdivision of the Focus function, based on the various uses to which this function can be put. This subdivision may be seen as an attempt to get a picture of the 'etics' of Focus, in the sense that it distinguishes the various ways in which Focus can manifest itself, without necessarily implying that these different ways are also coded in different grammatical constructions in natural languages. In order to arrive at a clearer picture of the 'emics' of Focus (i.e. a picture of which of these distinctions are actually coded in grammatical oppositions), more research on the Focus systems of individual languages will be required.

The distinctions that we think are important for an understanding of Focus phenomena can be represented as in Diagram 1.

It is to be understood that the different terminal Focus types (italicized in the schema) are yet to be cross-classified for the scope differences discussed in section 4 above. Most Focus types distinguished occur either with Focus on the predication as a whole, or on some constituent of the predication — and in the latter case, either with Focus on the predicate or on a term. These scope differences will be illustrated in our discussion of the different types distinguished.
As we saw in section 5, Focus can, but need not involve Contrast. If no Contrast is involved, then the Focus information can be seen as 'filling in' a gap in the pragmatic information of the addressee (Complettive Focus). If there is Contrast, the Contrast established can either hold between the Focus information and a specific presupposition, or it can be determined by construction-internal factors, without any specific presupposition being involved. If a specific presupposition is involved, the Focus information can either be selected from an antecedently presupposed set (+Corrective), or it can be meant to bring about some modification in the pragmatic information of the addressee (+Corrective). These and the other distinctions made in the diagram will be clarified and illustrated below.

6.1. Complettive Focus

We speak of Complettive Focus when the Focus information is meant to fill in a gap in the pragmatic information of the addressee. The clearest case of this is answers to Q-word questions. Thus, when someone asks:

(65) What did John buy?

his partner can infer that he has the following presuppositional structure in his pragmatic information:

(66) John bought x; x = ___.
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question (65) will be interpreted as a request to fill in the blank within this presuppositional structure, when this question is answered by:

(67) John bought COFFEE

the focus on COFFEE signals that this particular bit of information is meant to fill in the blank in (66), and is by virtue of that fact the most important information in (67).

Collective Focus does not involve any specific contrast. It relates to a presupposition, but not to a specific presupposition concerning the identity of the unknown entity x in (66).

(67) is an example of Collective Focus on a term. Collective Focus on the predicate is found in the following exchange:

(68) A: What did John do with the book?
B: He SOLD it.

It is not immediately clear whether there is any application for the notion Collective Focus with respect to the whole predication. Consider an exchange such as:

(69) A: Did John sell the book?
B: He did.

From one point of view, (69a) could be analyzed as involving an informational gap with respect to the truth value of the predication 'John sold the book':

(70) It is x that John sold the book; x = ___.

The answer could then be seen as filling in the blank with the value TRUE. It is clear, however, that there is a difference between 2-word questions and Yes-no questions in this regard; in the latter case, the blank can only be filled in with one of two values, so that the presuppositional structure associated with the question could just as well be given as:
(71) It is x that John sold the book; x is TRUE or x is FALSE.

In that case the answer (69b) would select the value TRUE from among the presupposed possibilities, and the Focus would be of the Selective rather than of the Comitative type.

6.2. Selective Focus.
We speak of Selective Focus when the Focus information selects one item from among a presupposed set of possible values. Consider the following example:

(72) A: Did John buy coffee or rice?
    presupposition: John bought x; x = coffee or x = rice
    B: He bought COFFEE

The focussed item in (72b) indicates that coffee is the correct value for x. Selective Focus involves Contrast in this sense that it explicitly or implicitly excludes the other presupposed value(s) as the correct value for x. If this is made explicit, we get constructions such as:

(73) He bought COFFEE, not RICE

Thus, Selective Focus may involve two constituents with Focus, one selecting the correct value, and the other rejecting the incorrect value. But Selective Focus is not 'corrective' in the sense to be clarified below, because A's presupposition in (72) is not incorrect: it has to be specified rather than corrected.

Selective Focus on the predicate is found in a case such as:

(74) A: Did John hire or buy that car?
    B: He BOUGHT it.

As for Selective Focus with respect to predication scope, compare the preceding section. In a case such as the following, we clearly have Selective Focus:

(75) A: Did John buy the car or didn't he?
    B: He DID.
Thus, explicitly disjunctive yes-no questions lead to Selective Focus.
The question of whether non-disjunctive yes-no questions have to be re-
garded in the same way is thus related to the question of whether such
questions must or must not be analysed as implicitly disjunctive.

6.1. Replacing Focus.
We speak of Replacing Focus in cases in which a specific item in the prag-
matic information of the addressee is removed and replaced by another,
correct item.
Consider the following examples:

(76) a. A: John went to London.
b. B: No, he didn't go to LONDON, he went to NEW YORK
c. No, he went to NEW YORK, not to LONDON
d. No, he didn't go to LONDON
e. No, he went to NEW YORK

It is clear that the full operation in this case involves two distinct
steps: removing the incorrect information (to London) and substituting
the correct information (to New York). These two steps we will call the
Rejection and the Correction, respectively. We can then say that in
(76a-e) we have the following patterns:

(77) b. No, Rejection, Correction
c. No, Correction, Rejection
d. No, Rejection
e. No, Correction

In all these patterns, no indicates that the speaker does not agree with
the addressee, and believes that something is to be corrected in his prag-
matic information. (76b) would seem to be the most 'logical' form for re-
placing information. In (76c) the speaker first gives the Correction and
then, as an afterthought, the Rejection. (76d) is not complete, in a
sense: the addressee is told that something is wrong with his pragmatic
information, but he is not told what he is supposed to substitute for it.
A typical reaction of A's in such a situation could be:

(78) Well, where DID he go then?
On the other hand, (76a), though only giving the Correction, is complete in that the Correction presupposes the Rejection, which can be reconstructed on the basis of the Correction. When a construction with Replacing consists of a Rejection followed by a Correction, both the rejecting and the correcting constituent carry Focus function, but the functionality of these two Focus constituents is quite different:

(79) **Rejection**
rejects information presumed to be presupposed
'announces' Correction
is incomplete without Correction

**Correction**
inserts information presumed to be correct
fulfills announcement
presupposes Rejection and is thus complete without explicit Rejection

The 'open' and 'announcing' character of the Rejection comes out quite clearly in a construction such as the following (Latin, Cicero):

(80) ... cum ille dixisset non est suā, sed
when he had-said not him by-his-own, but
patrīae gloriā splendorum adducatur
of-fatherland by-glory splendid reputation
'... when he had said that he had achieved his splendid reputation not through his own glory, but through the glory of his fatherland.'

In this construction the Rejection non est suā must be interpreted along the lines of non est suā gloriā splendorum adducatur 'that he had not through his own glory achieved his splendid reputation'. In the shortened form in which the Rejection is given in (80), it is not only pragmatically 'incomplete' in the sense that it announces a Correction, but it is also grammatically incomplete in the sense that non est suā would have been uninterpretable without the following Correction. Although the Rejection is in principle incomplete without the following Correction, there are circumstances in which the content of the Correction can be fully or partially predicted on the basis of the Rejection. Consider:

6.4. Expanding Focus.
By Expanding Focus we understand a way to be added to the antecedent. Consider the following example:

(83) presupposition of A:
John bought X; X
B: John not only bought
B: Yes, but he also

Expanding Focus contains an eli which indicates that he believes A's the value for X. A's presupposition sense that it must be (partial) of Corrective Focus. Therefore applicable to Expanding Focus:

The following example gives Ex: scope:

(84) John not only BOUGHT LIVE in it.
(81) The number I have in mind is not EVEN.

(82) I have not painted my door YELLOW.

In (81) the addressee may rightly conclude that the correct property is even, even when this is not made explicit in the Correction. This is of course due to the fact that even-odd constitutes a binary opposition. In the case of (82) the addressee may rightfully conclude that the speaker has painted his door some other colour.

From this it follows that in constructions of the form not X but Y there must be a compatibility between X and Y in the sense that these must be drawn from the same oppositional dimension. If that dimension is a binary one, the Correction can be predicted on the basis of the Rejection, and the Rejection is thus sufficient in itself. But even if the dimension involved is not a binary one, the type of predicate to be expected in the Correction can be predicted on the basis of the Rejection.

5.4. Expanding Focus.

By Expanding Focus we understand cases in which the Focus information is meant to be added to the antecedently given presupposed information. Consider the following example:

(83) presupposition of A:
    John bought x; x = coffee
    B: John not only bought COFFEE, he also bought RICE
    B: Yes, but he also bought RICE

Expanding Focus contains an element of correction in this sense that B indicates that he believes A's information is incomplete with respect to the value for x. A's presupposition, however, is not incorrect in the sense that it must be (partially or wholly) replaced, as in the other types of Corrective Focus. Therefore, the label "Corrective is less clearly applicable to Expanding Focus than to the other cases to be discussed below.

The following example gives Expanding Focus with the predicate in its scope:

(84) John not only BOUGHT the house, he's also going to LIVE in it.
We see no clear application of Expanding Focus to cases where the whole predication is in scope.

6.5. Restricting Focus.
Restricting Focus is a type of Focus by which an antecedently given presupposed set is restricted to one or more correct values.
Consider the following example:

(65) presupposition of A:
    John bought \( x \); \( x = \text{coffee and rice} \)
    B: No, he didn't buy \( \text{RICE} \), he only bought \( \text{COFFEE} \)
    B: No, he only bought \( \text{COFFEE} \)

Restricting Focus clearly corrects the presupposed information of A, in that at least one value for \( x \) is explicitly or implicitly rejected as incorrect.

Restricting Focus with the predicate in scope is found in:

(66) No, John only \( \text{BOUGHT} \) the house, he is not actually going to \( \text{LIVE} \) in it.

Again, we see no application for Restricting Focus with the whole predication in scope.

6.6. Parallel Focus.
We speak of Parallel Focus in cases in which a speaker contrasts two pieces of information within one linguistic expression, as in:

(67) \text{JOHN bought a BIKE, but PETER a CAR}

In such a case each of the capitalized items has Focus function, but this is occasioned by the internal relations between the contrasted pairs \( \text{(JOHN, BIKE)} \) and \( \text{(PETER, CAR)} \) rather than by any specific relationship with the presumed pragmatic information of the addressee. The Focused items in this case do not necessarily reject or correct anything in the pragmatic information of the addressee, although the Parallel Focus construction may be used in a presuppositional context, as in:
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(88) A: I know that John is a Toyota. But what is he?
    B: JOHN bought a TOYOTA.

The point is, however, that Focus by relations between the speaker suppositions, but by the relationship proper.

(89) is thus also an example of constituents which in themselves Parallel Focus involves strong p constitutes which pairwise have the same functional status, mis, see below) take the same or sides the following examples for

(89) ton Jakob egapesa, the Jacob I-loved, 'Jacob I loved, Hana I

(90) to men soma nekron the body dead psama soo dia dikh spirit live through 'The body is dead thru through righteousness'

Notice that in (90) there are ti opposition between the two members named by \( \delta \) in (89), and by men hand) in (90).

Notice that in all examples giv tial P1 position for placing on again, that P1 is a preferred p this respect the difference bet

(91) I met \text{JOHN in PARIS,}

(92) \text{JOHN I met in PARIS,}
The point is, however, that Focus function in such a case is not occasioned by relations between the speaker's assertion and the addressee's presuppositions, but by the relationships of contrast internal to the predication proper.

(88) is thus also an example of a case in which Focus is assigned to constituents which in themselves do not provide 'new' information. Parallel Focus involves strong parallelisms between two or more pairs of constituents which pairwise belong to the same semantic category, usually have the same functional status, and often (except in the case of chiastic, see below) take the same ordering in their respective domains. Consider the following examples from New Testament Greek:

(89) ton Jakob egapesa, ton de Esaou emisesa
    the Jacob I-loved, the Esaou I-hated
    'Jacob I loved, Esaou I hated'

(90) to men soma nekron dia hemartian, to de
    the body dead through sin the
    pneuma meo dia dikaiosune
    spirit live through righteousness
    'The body is dead through sin, but the spirit is alive through righteousness'

Notice that in (90) there are three pairs of parallel constituents. The opposition between the two members of the parallel construction is signaled by de in (89), and by men ... de ('on the one hand ... on the other hand') in (90).

Notice that in all examples given here and below, use is made of the initial Pl position for placing one pair of parallel constituents. This shows, again, that Pl is a preferred position for Focus constituents. Compare in this respect the difference between:

(91) I met JOHN in PARIS, and PETER in MADRID

(92) JOHN I met in PARIS, and PETER in MADRID
Although (91) is certainly grammatical in English, (92) impresses us as more idiomatic in the case of the parallel construction. As far as the expression of constructions with Parallel Focus is concerned, asyndeton (absence of overt coordinators) seems to be used rather frequently for this purpose in quite different languages. Compare the following examples:

(93) Speiretai en asthenelai, egeiretai en duramai (NT Greek) it-is-sown in weakness, it-is-awakened in strength

(94) Tu fortunatus, ego miser (Latin, Plautus) you fortunate, I miserable
You are fortunate, I am miserable

(95) Bapak orang besar, saya orang kecil (Indonesian) father man big I man small
You sir, are an important person, I am but an ordinary man

A device with a strong stylistic effect, greatly appreciated in classical antiquity, was the so-called figure of chiasmus in which the members of the parallel pairs were arranged crosswise in A - B, B - A fashion. Consider the following examples from Cicero and from Varro:

(96) asssequor omnia, si procedo, si cunctor, omittoo I-reach everything, if I-proceed, if I-delay, I-omit

(97) lucifer interidiu, noctu hesperus morning star by-day, by-night evening star

7. Formal treatment within FG.

In this final section we discuss some aspects of the question how the different types of Focus configuration distinguished earlier in this paper could be formally handled within a Functional Grammar. Since this question is naturally quite complicated, we shall restrict ourselves to one construction in Dutch, which, however, illustrates most of the problems involved. Consider the following cases:

(98) Jan heeft Piet niet het boek John has not given Pete the book
John has not given Pete the book

(99) Kiet het BOEK heeft Jan P. Not the BOOK has John
Not the BOOK has John

(100) Jan heeft Piet niet het boek John has not given Pete the book
John has not given Pete the book

(101) Niet het BOEK, maar de PI Not the BOOK, but the book
Not the BOOK, but the book

These are four variants of a construction made earlier in this paper, we could have named these variants a Focus construction involves two Focus constructions are in Conflict with each other. Their specific presupposition:

(102) Jan heeft Piet het boek John has given Pete the book

The construction is Corrective: th in the pragmatic information of th to replace the information that has been contained in the addressation de plast. Construction 98: Replacing Focus in the Rejection (represented by nie dened by me de plast).

Given the principles of FG, Focus book and de plast. This is a pragmatic status of the construction tonal prominence of these c in order to be able to specify the constituents.

Further, because of points (1) a distinguish the Focus functions as that, although they can both be salient information in the predi
There are four variants of a construction which, in terms of distinctions made earlier in this paper, we could characterize as follows: this construction involves two Focus constituents (het boek, de plaats), which are in contrast with each other. The contrast involves the following specific presupposition:

(102) Jan heeft Piet het boek gegeven
'John has given Pete the book'

The construction is corrective: the speaker wishes to effect some change in the pragmatic information of the addressee; more specifically, he wishes to replace the information het boek in presupposition (102), which he presumes is contained in the addressee's pragmatic information, by the information de plaats. Construction (98) is thus an example of Replacing Corrective Focus. Replacing Focus involves two distinct acts of the speaker: the Rejection (represented by niet het boek) and the Correction (represented by maar de plaats).

Given the principles of FG, Focus function must be assigned both to het boek and to de plaats. This is necessary (i) in order to specify the special pragmatic status of the construction, (ii) in order to account for the intonational prominence of these constituents (contrastive stress), (iii) in order to be able to specify the special positional properties of these constituents.

Further, because of points (i) and (iii), we also have to be able to distinguish the Focus functions as assigned to these two constituents; we saw that, although they can both be said to represent 'the most important or salient information in the predication', they do so on different grounds:
het boek directs the addressee towards that place of information which is going to be replaced (we can here speak of Replacing Focus); de plant gives the information which has to be substituted for het boek (this we can call Correcting Focus).

And as we can see from (98)-(101), the constituents carrying the Replacing Focus (RF) and the Correcting Focus (CF) have different privileges of occurrence within the clause. The relevant rules can be given as follows:

(Rf) (a) place RF + CF in the appropriate pattern position (100);
(b) place RF + CF in P1 position (101);
(c) place RF in pattern position, CF at the end of the clause (98);
(d) place RF in P1 position, CF at the end of the clause (99).

As long as RF and CF stay together, as in (a) and (b), placement rules could globally refer to niet het boek, maar de plant as a unit; but when they are separated in the constituent order of the clause (as in (c) and (d)), placement rules must be able to pick out the correct subpart and bring it to its place in the clause.

In principle, correct results could be achieved even if only one undifferentiated Focus function is used. We would then get representations of the form:

(103) niet (het boek) FOC maar (de plant) FOC

and placement rules would have to be formulated in such a way that they can contextually identify the correct Focus constituent within configurations such as (103) for proper treatment. However, this would require rather complex context-dependent statements for the rules involved.

A simpler solution, then, is to accept RF and CF as sub-functions of the general Focus function, and to have these subfunctions properly assigned to their respective constituents. Later rules can then directly refer to these subfunctions without taking the context into account (for discussion of this question, see Hatters 1979).

A last question is: how do we generate configurations such as (103)? Within a transformational framework, it would of course be attractive to derive such constructions as (98)-(101) from some underlying representation of the form:
(104) Jan heeft Piet niet het boek gegeven, maar (Jan heeft Piet de plaat (gegeven)

through some form of Conjunction Reduction. This course is excluded in RG, however, because this model does not allow one to formulate the structure-changing operations required in this treatment. Dijk (1980), chapter 9, argues that constructions with term coordinations as well as so-called 'gapping' constructions should be handled in terms of expansion rather than of reduction. The expansion analysis is formulated in terms of a very general coordination schema:

(105) \( a + a^1, a^2, \ldots, a^n \quad (n > 2) \)

which, operating on some element \( a \), expands this element into an \( n \)-ary series of coordinated elements of the same type. This coordination schema will have to be specified (a) with respect to the possible values that \( a \) can take, and (b) with respect to what sorts of overt coordinating elements may or must appear in coordinated series of different types.

Adapting this approach to the present construction type, we would arrive at a description in which a given term position, representing \( a \), could be immediately expanded into a configuration of the form niet \( a^1 \) maar \( a^2 \). In the specific case of our examples, we would need an expansion as represented in:

(106) \[
\text{given, } (x_1)_{Ag} \quad (x_2)_{Go} \quad (x_3)_{Sec} \\
\text{nieuw-} (x_2)_{Go} \quad \text{maar-} (x_2)_{Go}
\]

This effect can be reached by formulating (107) as a subcase of the general coordination schema:

(107) \( a + \text{niet- } a^1 \text{ maar } a^2 \)

and by allowing \( a \) to take any term position (including its semantic function) as its possible value. Notice that this approach has the added advantage that it automatically excludes constructions with terms with non-matching functions, such as:
(108) John did not read the book with pleasure, but with his girl friend.

(109) John did not wait on the platform, but for three hours

(see Dik, ibid., for further discussion of these points).

The final question now is: how to assign the pragmatic functions SF and CF in the proper way to the relevant subparts of the configuration introduced by rule (107). One possibility is to formulate pragmatic function assignment rules operating on the output of this rule, contextually specified to achieve the correct result. However, since rule (107) is associated with a unique distribution of these pragmatic functions (i.e., SF will necessarily attach to the first part, and CF to the last part of its output), a simpler solution would be to have the rule itself attach these pragmatic functions to its output constituents. This can be done by reformulating (107) as follows:

\[(110) \alpha + \text{ niet-} \alpha^1 \text{ naar-} \alpha^2 \text{ CF}\]

In this way, then, we define the following derivation for the constructions (98)–(101):

Start with the predicate-frame for geven 'to give':

\[(111) \text{geven}_v (x_1)_\text{Ag} (x_2)_\text{Ho} (x_3)_\text{Rec}\]

Apply scheme (110) to the goal argument position in (111), to produce:

\[(112) \text{geven}_v (x_1)_\text{Ag niet-} (x_2)_\text{GCF naar-} (x_3)_\text{GCP} (x_3)_\text{Rec}\]

Apply term insertion and syntactic function assignment, so as to arrive at:

\[(113) \text{geven}_v (\text{Jan})_\text{AgSubj niet-(het boek)}_\text{GCF naar-(3e plaat)}_\text{GCP} (\text{Pist})_\text{RecObj}\]

Sentences (98)–(101) can now be derived from this underlying predication by applying expression rules which will properly specify both the form and the order of the constituents. SF and CF will lead to contrastive stress on boek and plaat in any realization of (113). And placement rules corres-
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According to (8) (a)-(d) formulated above will properly carry the constituents of (113) to their possible positions within the clause.

Although this approach would have to be refined and specified in several ways in order to accommodate the different types of Focus construction distinguished in this paper, we trust that the above sketch gives the basic elements for answering the question of how such constructions could be formally handled within a Functional Grammar.

NOTES
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2 For a discussion of these constructions within the framework of FG, cf. Dik (1980), ch. 10.

3 Compare Dik (1980), ch. 10.

Quirk et al. (1972: 939) use the term 'Contrastive Focus' both for the case where the Focus constituent 'fills in' a gap in the information of the addressee, as in:
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Syntactic function assignment must be properly constrained in such a way that parallel term positions introduced by (110) are treated in parallel fashion with respect to the syntactic functions Subject and Object.
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0. Introduction

In Functional Grammar one of the thematic functions. These functions are classified within the wider communicative perspectives, separating and distinguishing two internal (Topic and Focus) to

Focus: The Focus presents the entity about which the predicate is information in the given context.

I illustrate here the functions:

(1) That trunk, put it in the back.
(2) As for Paris, the Riffe

Themes are that trunk and as for Riffel Tower. The Theme commits the entity about which the predicate is information in the given context.