The realization of focus in monolingual and bilingual Spanish

Maria del Mar Vanrell[1] & Ingo Feldhausen[2]
[1]Universitat de les Illes Balears, [2]Goethe-Universität Frankfurt

In this paper, we shed new light on the question of how narrow contrastive and information focus is realized in Central-Peninsular Spanish. We show that there is an important difference with respect to the use of both pitch accents and syntactic strategies for realizing focus between monolingual native speakers and German-Spanish bilingual speakers. Our five main findings:

(a) Bilingual speakers realize both types of focus almost always by stress shift, (1a), and the pitch accent is predominantly realized by L+H* (see section *Bilinguals*);
(b) Monolingual speakers, in turn, realize information focus by different strategies (*cf.* (1b), (2), and (3)), but stress shift is not a relevant option (see section *No stress shift*);
(c) Cleft constructions are used by monolinguals for both focus types even though there are certain preferences (see section *Cleft and focus type*);
(d) Focus does not have to bear always sentential stress: in clefts, prosodic alignment can be a sufficient correlate of focus (see section *Focus without sentential stress*);
(e) Monolinguals typically realize the pitch accents by L+H* for non-final focused constituents and L* for final focused constituents.

We further argue that existing discrepancies between claims made in theoretical work on the one hand and in empirical work on the other can often be reduced to diatopic differences.

Methodology: We conducted a production test based on semi-spontaneous speech designed to elicit different focus readings (narrow informational and contrastive focus on the subject and (in)direct objects) by means of question-answer pairs from short picture stories. A total of 2508 contours were obtained (Monolinguals: 1848 = 24 short stories x 11 questions x 7 speakers; bilinguals: 660 = 12 x 11 x 5; all native speakers of Central-Peninsular Spanish).

No stress shift: There is an ongoing discussion on how focus is realized in Spanish. Theoretical work (such as Zubizarreta 1998, Gutiérrez-Bravo 2002) argues that neutrally focused elements must be located in sentence-final position (via *p-movement*, (1b)) in order to receive main stress by means of the *Nuclear Stress Rule*. Empirical studies, in turn, show that neutrally focused elements actually can be realized *in situ* (1a) and that this option reflects the predominant strategy for focus realization (e.g. Muntendam 2013, Leal et al. 2018, among many others). Our empirical results of the monolingual speakers (N=7) show that stress shift is not an option in Central-Peninsular Spanish and suggest that dialectal variation must be taken into account as a decisive factor involved in the variation of focus realization strategies.

Cleft and focus type: While the cleft constituent (such as *Juan* in (3)) is generally considered to be the contrastively focused element in Spanish (see, e.g., Zubizarreta 1998), Moreno Cabrera (1999: 4298f.) states that simple clefts on the one hand and (inverted) pseudo-clefts on the other hand have different information structural properties. Our study – as far as we know – represents the first empirical verification of this claim and confirms it; see Table 2.

Focus without sentential stress: It is generally accepted that focus in Spanish bears sentential stress (see, e.g., Ortiz-Lira 1994, Zubizarreta 1998 among many others). However, contrary to what has been claimed in the past, our results show the contrastively focused constituent in clefts such as (3a) does not always bear sentential stress (in up to 80% of the cases) – independently of the grammatical function of the clefted element.

Bilinguals: We tested five early bilinguals (so far) who grew up and still live in Germany and who speak Central-Peninsular Spanish as a heritage language. The speakers show a clear preference for stress shift in both informational and contrastive focus, see Table 1 (in line with other studies on bilinguals, e.g. Leal et al. 2018). The realized focal pitch accent is almost always L+H*, but it is longer and more intense in contrastive contexts. Interestingly, the few instances of p-movement attested in the bilingual data occur with contrastive focus and not

with information focus. Thus, the bilinguals clearly differ from the monolinguals. Future research will show whether the differences might be due to the influence of German (a language allowing for stress shift) or whether stress shift is a default strategy of bilinguals.

(1) a. [$_{F}$ Los aLUMnos] se enfrentaron con la policía. (*Europ. Sp. / LatinAmSp.)
'The students confronted the police'.
b. Se enfrentaron con la policía [$_{F}$ los aLUMnos]. (Europ. Sp. / ^{ok}LatinAmSp.)

(2) [$_{CF}$ ManZAnas] compró Pedro (y no peras). Contrastive focus fronting
'Pedro eats apples (and not pears).'

(3) a. Es *Juan* el que viene. Clefts
'It is Juan who comes.'
b. El que viene es *Juan*. Pseudo-clefts
c. *Juan* es el que viene. Inverted pseudo-clefts

Information focus		
	Monolinguals	Bilinguals
[$_{F}$S]	Clefting 71.1% P-movement 14.5%	Stress shift 77% Clefting 18%
[$_{F}$O$_{OD}$]	P-movement 47.9% Clefting 23.3%	Stress shift 83% Clefting 15%
[$_{F}$O$_{OI}$]	Neutral WO 43.6 % Clefting 21.3%	Neutral WO 99%

Contrastive focus		
	Monolinguals	Bilinguals
[$_{CF}$S]	Clefting 61.4% Focus fronting 15%	Stress shift 72% Clefting 23%
[$_{CF}$O$_{OD}$]	Clefting 61.8% Focus fronting 23.6%	Stress shift: 63% P-movement: 27%
[$_{CF}$O$_{OI}$]	Clefting 41.2% Focus fronting 23.7%	Neutral WO 87%

Table 1: Types and frequency of focus marking strategies in neutral focus (left panel) and contrastive focus (right panel) declaratives; types of clefts (see (3)) are not distinguished here.

Neutral focus	Clefts 44,9% Pseudo-clefts 13,4 % Inverted pseudo-clefts 41,5%
Contrastive focus	Clefts 70,98% Pseudo-clefts 23,52 % Inverted pseudo-clefts 5,4 %

Table 2: Types and frequency of cleft constructions attested in neutral and contrastive focus declaratives (monolingual speakers).

References:

[1] Gutiérrez-Bravo, R. 2002. Focus, Word Order variation and intonation in Spanish and English. In C. Wiltshire & J. Camps (eds), *Romance Phonology and Variation*. John Benjamins, 39-53.

[2] Leal, T., Destruel, E. & Hoot, B. 2018. The realization of information focus in monolingual and bilingual native Spanish. *LAB* 8(2): 217–251

[3] Moreno Cabrera, J.C. 1999. Las funciones informativas: las perífrasis de relativo. In: *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, I. Bosque & V. Demonte (eds.), Madrid, Espasa, 4245-4302.

[4] Muntendam, A. 2013. On the nature of cross-linguistic transfer. *BLC* 16(1), 111–131.

[5] Ortiz-Lira, H. 1994. A contrastive analysis of English and Spanish sentence accentuation. PhD dissertation, U of Manchester.

[6] Zubizarreta, M.L. 1998. *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. MIT Press.