Where we left off

Vallduví & Vilkuna: ±Rheme is different from ±Kontrast (basically É. Kiss’ point too).
+Kontrast things move in Finnish, only associates with +Kontrast.
+Kontrast evokes a contrast set (a restriction if you will).

É. Kiss: +Kontrast focus is an operator, a quantifier, a real semantic entity.
Vallduví & Vilkuna: identificational focus ⇔ +Rheme +Kontrast
information focus ⇔ +Rheme –Kontrast

Probable conclusion: +Rheme things are “focus”, –Rheme things are “background”
+Kontrast marks things as contrastive operators
±Rheme and ±Kontrast are independent.

Probable conclusion: +Rheme things are “focus”, –Rheme things are “background”
+Kontrast marks things as contrastive operators
±Rheme and ±Kontrast are independent.

Vallduví: –Rheme (“background”) actually consists of two components:
Link (topic) being what the sentence is about
and Tail being the non-topic, non-focus part of the sentence.

Link tells you “on which file card” to store your new information.
Tail tells you what you already have on the card.
Focus tells you what you need to add to the card.

Right now, it’s not clear what to do with Link vs. Tail.

Büring/Schwarzschild: B marking indicates a (good) strategy, B-accent.
Marking is required if not GIVEN.
F marking should be minimal.
(If marking is required and B marking is ok, B-mark).

Let’s try to build some D-trees… First, how about a “simple case”?

(1) [[A man] [walked] [into [the crowded room]]].
[the crowded room] (say, GIVEN).
[A man] (not GIVEN), [walked] (not GIVEN), [into x] (not GIVEN).
[(some argument) verbed an argument] (GIVEN?) (both VP and sentence).

So what question does this answer? Who did what to what? That’s probably the closest we can come.

Or maybe the whole sentence is focused, in which case the question could be What happened? which sounds more reasonable. Let’s suppose this for a while, that is, let’s suppose that even someone did something (probably to something) isn’t GIVEN by the context here.

(2) He [sat down].

Probably congruence tells us that this means there’s a question this answers of the shape: What did he do? which, like (1), provides a partial answer to What happened?

(3) [He] [sat down].

There’s no particular status to being a regular Vallduví-link here in the D-tree. Of course, (2) is about the link; if we want to record the information, we’ll want to write it down on the link’s card. But it isn’t clear how topichood is going to affect the well-formedness of D-trees.

B-marking says: the question above me is part of a strategy to answer the question above it, and the strategy consists of trying out all the alternatives to the B-marked thing:

(1) [[A man] [walked] [into [the crowded room]]].
[the crowded room] (say, GIVEN).
[A man] (not GIVEN), [walked] (not GIVEN), [into x] (not GIVEN).
[(some argument) verbed an argument] (GIVEN?) (both VP and sentence).
Now, what about this link—tail—focus distinction? Here are some examples from Vallduvi and how they’re supposed to work:

(4) [The BOSS called]Focus

Record:  The boss called on a “situation” card.

(5) [Broccoli]Link [the boss]Link [doesn’t EAT]Focus

Find the card marked broccoli.
Find the card marked the boss.
Record:  doesn’t eat broccoli on the card marked the boss.
Record:  boss doesn’t eat on the card marked broccoli.

(6) What does John drink?

Find the card marked John.
Note that it already has drinks — on it.
Replace the — with beer.

(7) [The boss]Link [HATES]Focus [broccoli]Tail

Find the card marked the boss.
Note that it already has —s broccoli on it (or maybe likes broccoli)
Replace — (or likes) with hates.

F-marking as it stands doesn’t differentiate link & tail:

(7) The boss [HATES] broccoli.

Suppose we thought we knew about the boss that he likes broccoli.

The boss GIVEN hates someone hates something not GIVEN; F-mark broccoli GIVEN
R(someone, broccoli) someone stands in some relation to broccoli. GIVEN
R(the boss, broccoli) the boss stands in some relation to broccoli. GIVEN

So, when do you use Tail? Seems to be part of cooperativeness. If you know that what you’re about to say about the link is already partly known, you Tail-mark the known parts. Or conversely, you Focus mark only the parts that you know aren’t known. This will pretty much fall out of GIVENNESS. What we need is a way to identify the link as separate from the ground.

Since I see no alternative, suppose link is in the input; i.e. something is marked +Link.

Where I think we are

You have an input. • It may have something marked +Link.
• It may have something marked +Kontrast.

The influence of GIVENNESS and AVOIDF will divide the sentence up into F-marked and non-F-marked things.

• If your Link was F-marked, you’re a shifted topic.
• If your Link was not F-marked, you’re a continuing topic.
• If your +Kontrast thing was F-marked, it’s identificational focus.
• If your +Kontrast thing was not F-marked, it’s —“contrastive tail?”

• If your +Konstrast thing overlaps your Link:
  • If the +Kontrast bit is inside the Link (or coincident), contrastive topic.
    (as before, if F-marked, shifted topic with contrast, if not F-marked, continuing topic with contrast).
  • If the +Kontrast bit includes your Link??

• Remaining F-marked things are information focus.
• Remaining non-F-marked things outside your Link are Tail.

That is, the link says what card we’re changing, the tail says what we should expect to find there, and the focus says what change we are going to apply.

If he’s right, it seems that there is a difference between entities that are GIVEN in the discourse and things known about entities. Links refer to the entities, Tails refer to the things known about the entities.
So it looks like this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F-marked</th>
<th>not F-marked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Kontrast Link</td>
<td>shifted topic</td>
<td>continuing topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not Link) identificational focus</td>
<td>??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not Link Shifted topic</td>
<td>continuing topic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Kontrast information focus</td>
<td>tail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which is basically the chart we had last time, transposed a bit:

But are we there?

• Why does +Kontrast have the “strategy” effect only on Links?
  (that is, do identificational focus & Büring CTs really share a feature?)
  (is there some comparable “strategy” effect with identificational focus?)

• What is that elusive GIVEN +Kontrast outside the Link?
  What did the students eat?
  They ate the pizza (but they didn’t like it).
  In the input we marked ate as Kontrast and They as link, so:
  [They]_free [ate]_Kontrast [the pizza]_focus.
  Do we buy it?

Portner & Yabushita (1998)

(9) setup a. A woman with a small child came in first.
  b. [She] ordered chicken-fried steak.
  c. Next, a young man holding a tennis racket came in.
  d. [He] handed her the racket and went to the bar to get a beer.
  e. Another man and woman, who were late, came in.
  f. It seemed (they) had been at a movie. [Japanese]

  g. The woman who ordered chicken-fried steak left first.
  g′. ??The woman who the man had handed a racket left first.

b: record “ordered chicken-fried steak” on card for she (woman with small child).

d: record “handed tennis racket to _” on card for he (man with racket).

g: Check cards for women: does one have the property of having ordered CFS?
  Yep; recorded in step b. on the card of the woman with the small child.

g′: Check cards for women: does one have property of having been handed a racket?
  Nope. (In step d., this was recorded on tennis-racket-man’s card, never on a woman’s card).

Examples from last handout…

As for Büring’s “topics”, do they need to be contained in the Theme? Do they need to be coextensive with the Theme?

(10) We are speaking today of topics.
  Some topics require no special accent. [[Büring’s] topics] require a [B]-accent.

I don’t think B-accent even needs to be in the Theme. Shouldn’t the use of the pronoun he tell us that he (Bill) is the Theme?

(11) What did Bill buy yesterday?
  Well, [he], certainly didn’t buy [me], anything.
  (strategy: [Did Bill buy x anything yesterday?])

Chart we ended up with last time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+B</th>
<th>−B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+Rheme</td>
<td>contrastive shifted topic?</td>
<td>shifted topic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−Link identificational focus</td>
<td>information focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−Rheme</td>
<td>contrastive topic</td>
<td>link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>−Link [ate]</td>
<td>tail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Point: There is a sense in which information is recorded with respect to a topic.