(1) Every statement ever made is the answer to some (perhaps implicit) question. That question is the **Question Under Discussion** or QUD.

Given a sentence A…

- Form the F-question A' by replacing the F-marked constituent with a question word (and performing appropriate syntax).
- Form the T-value A', a set of questions obtainable as F-questions with type-identical things replacing the T-marked constituent.

(2) Q: What did the pop stars wear?

A: **The female pop stars wore caftans.** (…but that’s all I noticed)

The deviation is replacing *pop stars* with *female pop stars*, so mark T.

A' What did the female pop stars wear?

A' { What did the female pop stars wear?,
      What did the male pop stars wear?,
      What did the male or female pop stars wear? }

**Congruence condition:**
For A to be congruent to QUD,

a. QUD must be an element of A', and
b. if A contains T-marking, some question in A' must remain open to serve as the new QUD.

does “funny things” to the truth conditions (via scope disambiguation).

(3) Q: Are all politicians corrupt?

A: **All politicians are not corrupt.**

All politicians are not corrupt would allow either ‘all-not’ or ‘not-all’ readings (maybe preferring all-not, at least in German), but All politicians are not corrupt disambiguates to not-all. Or so Büring says, anyway.

A' Are all politicians corrupt?

A' { Are some politicians corrupt?,
      Are many politicians corrupt?,
      Are most politicians corrupt?,
      Are all politicians corrupt? }

To be congruent, the QUD must be an element of A' (it is), and A’ – QUD has to be nonempty, leaving something open for discussion.

All politicians are not corrupt under the all-not (‘all politicians are non-corrupt’) reading implies the truth values of all of the questions in A'. (If all politicians are non-corrupt, are some politicians corrupt? No. Are many politicians corrupt? No. Are most politicians corrupt? Well, no.)

Under the all-not reading, A fails to be congruent.

Under the not-all reading, though, all of those questions remain open to serve as a new QUD.

Hence, A is disambiguated to the not-all reading.

**Problems and obnoxious questions**

- Multiple questions

(4) Q: Who bought what?

A: [John] bought [a plastic gorilla],
   [Silvie] bought a [a slimy monster], …

A' What did John buy?

A' { What did John buy?,
      What did Silvie buy?,
      What did the gardener buy? }

Doesn’t meet the current congruent condition—the QUD is who bought what? but that is not in A'.
• Focus—Topic exchange

(5) Q Who won at the card game? Wer hat beim Skat gewonnen?
A₁ [Second], was [I]₂. ZWEITER, bin [ICH], geworden.
A₂ ′ [I]₁ was [second]₂. ICH, bin ZWEITER, geworden.

A₁ ′ is {How did you place? How did John place? How did the gardener place?}
none of whose members are Who won? (Who got first place?).

A₂ ′ is {Who got first place, who got second place, …}.

• Focus—Topic misfits

(6) Q Who did Anna smile at? Wen hat Ana angelächelt?
A [Me], she did [not], smile at. MICHT hat sie NICHT, angelächelt.

A is then {did Anna smile at you?, did Anna smile at John?, …}, none of whose
members are Who did Anna smile at?

A and B accents, and discourse trees

Jackendoff (1972) §6.7 on the “A and B accents” (cites Bolinger for the terminology)

(7) a. FRED doesn’t write poetry in the garden. Who doesn’t…?
(It is F who doesn’t
write poetry in the g.)

b. FRED doesn’t write poetry in the garden. BILL does.
(It isn’t F who writes
poetry in the garden.)

(8) a. Fred doesn’t WRITE poetry in the garden. What doesn’t Fred
do with poetry in the
garden?

b. Fred doesn’t WRITE poetry in the garden. He READS it there.

(9) a. Fred doesn’t write POETRY in the garden. What doesn’t Fred
write in the garden?

b. Fred doesn’t write POETRY in the garden. He writes NOVELS
there.

(10) a. Fred doesn’t write poetry in the GARDEN. Where doesn’t Fred
write poetry?

b. Fred doesn’t write poetry in the GARDEN. He writes poetry in
the SHED.

So: A = pitch bump and final falloff. “H* L L%” Focus F-Accent
B = pitch bump and final rise. “H* L H%” Background T-Accent

(11) a. Well, what about people? Name someone, what did he eat?
FRED ate the BEANS. B—A

b. Well, what about the food? Who ate it?
FRED ate the BEANS. A—B

(12) a. Well, what about people? Name someone, what did he do to the beans?
FRED ATE the beans. B—A

b. I know who COOKED the beans. But then, who did the rest?
FRED ATE the beans. A—B

(…but Mary DROPPED the beans).
(13) a. I know what Fred COOKED. But then, what did he EAT?
Fred ATE the BEANS. B—A
b. Well, what about the BEANS? What did Fred do with THEM?
Fred ATE the BEANS. A—B

Discourse as hierarchy, questions and subquestions:

(14) How was the concert?
   Was the sound good? No.
   How was the audience? It was enthusiastic.
   How was the band? fantastic
   What about the singer? better than ever
   Did they play old songs? not a single one.
   So what did you do afterwards? ...

(15) discourse
    question question
    subquestion subq. subq answer
    answer ans subsubq subsubq

What we’re after: A theory of discourse
that tells us which D-trees are admissible.

(16) a. Any node in a D-Tree is called a Move.
b. For any Move M, the question minimally dominating it is called the immediate question under discussion: IQUD(M).
c. For any Move M, those questions dominating M form the question under discussion stack for M: QUD(M).
d. For any Move M, if M is a question, the sub-tree rooted in M is called the strategy to answer M.
e. For any Moves M₁ and M₂, M₁ precedes M₂ if:
   • M₁ dominates M₂, or
   • There are Moves M₃ and M₄ which are sisters, M₃ is to the left of M₄, and
   M₃ dominates or equals M₁, and
   M₄ dominates or equals M₂.

Any move M must be:
• congruent to the IQUD(M).
• relevant to the IQUD(M).
i.e. (partially) answers IQUD(M).
or if answers to M are at least partial answers to IQUD(M).

(17) Forming M′: Replace F-marked constituents by wh-words and form the grammatical question from M; if F marks verum focus, form a yes-no question.

(18) Q When are you going to China?
A Well, I’m going to [China], in [April].

(19) Q When are you going where?

When are you going to China? When are you going to Japan?

I’m going to China in April.

(20) Congruence condition
For M to be congruent to IQUD(M) the following conditions must be met:
a. F-condition: IQUD(M) = M′.
b. T-condition: M indicates a strategy S to answer IQUD(IQUD(M))
(provided M contains T marking)
So, for — _When are you going to China? — I’m going to China in April._

IQUD(M) = _When are you going to China?_

M’ = _When are you going to China? (from I’m going to China in [April]._

M’ = { _When are you going to China?, When are you going to Japan?, … _}

IQUD(IQUD(M)) = _When are you going where?_

(21) Focus only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SQ1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’ = Q</td>
<td>SQ2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SQ3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A’ = SQ1

{SQ1, SQ2, SQ3} ⊆ A’.

(22) Q. _What did the pop stars wear?_

SQ. _What did the [female], pop stars wear?_

A. The [female], pop stars wore [caftans].

(SQ indeed indicates a strategy to answer Q, F-congruence is met at each step)

(23) Q. _Who bought what?_

SQ. _What did [John], buy?_

A. [John], bought [a plastic gorilla]…

A’ _What did John buy?_

A’ _What did Silvie buy?_

A’ _What did the gardener buy? _

(A’ indicates a strategy to answer Q, A’ is SQ = IQUD(A). All is well.)

A problem with the idea that T-marking requires a QUD to be left?

(24) Q. _Which musician played which instrument?_

SQ1. _Which instrument did Copeland play?_

A1. [Copeland], played [the drums].

SQ2. _Which instrument did Summers play?_

A2. [Summers], played [the guitar].

SQ3. _Which instrument did Sumner play?_

A3. [Sumner], played [the bass].

Strategy is now over, _Which musician played which instrument?_

(We wanted this in the first place to disambiguate _[All]_ politicians are _[not]_ corrupt.)

Reinterpret T-marking as indicating “I am a proper part of a strategy.”

So: _not >> all_ is a proper part of a strategy, _all >> not_ isn’t (it’s the whole strategy).

This rules out:

(25) Q. _How many politicians are corrupt?_

SQ. _Are all politicians corrupt?_

A. _∀ not_: _[All]_ politicians are _[not]_ corrupt.

because A answers Q, in favor of:

(26) Q. _How many politicians are corrupt?_

SQ. _Are all politicians corrupt?_

A. _∀ not: All politicians are _[not]_ corrupt._ (T-marking would fail)

(27) Q

SQ1

SQ2

A2

Independent evidence?
How many politicians are corrupt? Some?
Yes, some are.
Most?
Even most.

SQ. Are perhaps all politicians corrupt?
A. Yes, the [politicians] are [all] corrupt.

Saying A (with topic marking) brings up a superquestion. But it isn’t a superquestion of Are all politicians corrupt?—it’s a superquestion of How many politicians are corrupt?

What about corruption in society?

How many politicians are corrupt? How many oil magnates are corrupt?

Some p’s c? all p’s c? the [p’s] are [all] c.

Implicit moves and precedence, AvoidF, and so forth

We need to figure out when and why T-marking is obligatory—so far, we haven’t said anything about that. We do, however, have the following data points, where italics indicate implicit moves.

(a) Q SQ A F-accent obligatory. T-accent optional.
(ex. [Fred], ate the [beans].)

(b) Q SQ A F-accent obligatory. T-accent obligatory.
(ex. [He], was at [home].)

(c) Q SQ A F-accent obligatory. T-accent obligatory.
(ex. the female pop stars wore [caftans].)

With (b) “obligatory” means “to get the implicatures.”
With (c) “obligatory” is really obligatory (where SQ is implicit).

Intuitively, we need to topic mark female because it’s new. Not mentioned. Implicit.
So, how about establishing a congruence relation with the predecessor instead? (most immediately preceding explicit Move).

Two ways to go in the search for an appropriate congruence relation:

**Match the Question!**
(MTQ): Focus in the answer must match the wh-word in the question!

**Deaccent as much as possible!**
(DAMAP): Do not focus what is contextually Given!

We’ve been really following a MTQ kind of approach, but we need DAMAP too:

(31) Q What did Mary’s husband do?
A He [KISSED Mary].
A’ He [kissed Sue].
A” He [kissed Mary].

Mary is deaccented because it’s old.

So, if we need DAMAP anyway, can we get by with just DAMAP?

**Schwarzschild and AvoidF**

Rule of Interpretation (Givenness): If a constituent is not F-marked, it must be Given.

AvoidF: F-mark as little as possible (without violating Givenness).

(32) Who drank Martin’s beer?
[Ottilie], drank Martin’s beer.

[IP [VP [drank [SP Martin’s ] beer ] ] ]

What needs to be F-marked?

Martin?
No, Martin is in the question.

Martin’s beer?
No, Martin’s beer is in the question.

drank?
No, someone drank something is implied by the question.

drank Martin’s beer?
No, someone drank Martin’s beer implied by the question.

Ottilie?
Yes, Ottilie is not in the question.

Ottilie, drank Martin’s beer? No, x drank Martin’s beer implied by the question.

Does that get the previous example? Why, yes…

(33) Q What did Mary’s husband do?
A He [KISSED Mary].

Mary is given, kissed (someone kissed someone) is not given…
…is [kissed, Mary] given?
Well, is [do something to Mary] in/implied by the context?
No. So [kissed, Mary] is not given, and so we F mark it.
A case where a Given thing must nevertheless be F-marked:

(34) Q: Who did Mary’s husband kiss?
   A: He kissed MARY.

Mary is Given, but F-marked. Why?
Suppose it weren’t:
Consider the VP [kissed Mary].
Is someone kissed Mary deducible from context? No.
So the VP is not Given. But if it is not F-marked, it would fail GIVENNESS.
So, the VP must be F-marked.
But that requires F-marking something inside.
Ok, so suppose kissed is F-marked (we’re supposing it isn’t Mary).
Finally, is He [kissed, Mary] \_ Given?
(i.e. is he did something implied by context?)
Yes, final result:
[He [kissed, Mary] \_].

Now, compare with He kissed MARY:
Is [kissed Mary] \_ Given? Yes, kissed x is deducible from context.
Is [He [kissed Mary]] \_ Given? Yes, he kissed x is deducible from context.
So, [He [kissed, Mary] \_] and [He [kissed Mary] \_] both satisfy GIVENNESS.
But [He [kissed, Mary] \_] violates AVOIDF compared to [He [kissed Mary] \_].
So, the latter wins, Mary must be F-marked, despite being Given.

(35) Avoid F
All else being equal, F-mark as little as needed to be consistent with the Rule of Interpretation.

Back to predecessor and a new statement of congruence

So, how about this?

(36) Congruence:
A move M is congruent within a D-tree D if it meets…
   a. F-condition: Any constituent that is neither T- nor F-marked must be Given wrt PRED(M) [the immediate explicit predecessor of M].
   b. T-condition: M’ indicates a strategy to answer IQUD(IQUD(M)) (provided M contains T-marking).

Evaluating Givenness—treat T and F on a par when evaluating "existential TF-closure"; replace each with general expressions (someone, something, etc.).
T-marking means that there has to be a strategy. Consider:

(41) No doubt Rufus and Eszter had an affair. The real question is who seduced whom.
I bet…
  a. Eszter, hat Rufus verführt.
  b. # Eszter, hat Rufus verführt.

Once one has been asserted, both questions (Did E seduce R? Did R seduce E?) are answered. Incidentally, this is a context which interacts with Superiority in German—check Wiltschko.

Summary of the system:
- A constituent must be marked as T or F if not Given.
- F is to be avoided as much as possible.
- T imposes additional restrictions (the existence of a [good] strategy).

Coda: One Topic, Many Foci

F-marking is “recursive” in that an F-marked constituent contains F-marked components, down to the words. F-marking is governed by AVOIDF, so we don’t get an excess of F-marking.

But the constraints on T-marking really only apply to the “top” T-mark. Below the top T-mark, you can use either F or T, so you’d use T to minimize F’s.

Yet, that doesn’t seem to work:

(42) Q Who won the awards?
   SQ1 Who’s the best FEmale LEAD?
   A1 The best [FEmale, LEAD], [Susan Sarandon].
   SQ2 Who’s the best MALE lead?
   A2 The best [MALE, lead], [Nicolas Cage].

In A2, lead is not TF-marked because it is Given wrt A1. But nothing should prevent T-marking lead, yet A2 sounds funny.

A2’ # The best [MALE, lead], [Nicolas Cage].

Given that T-Condition refers only to the top T, suppose that the top T is the only T, the stuff below T are F’s:

A1’ The best [MALE, lead], [Nicolas Cage].
A2” # The best [MALE, LEAD], [Nicolas Cage].

Now we’re in the domain of AVOIDF, and A2” is ruled out in favor of A1’.

Also: We need to consider T-marking as part of the “numeration”, part of the choice which determines that candidate set. We don’t want T-marked and non-T-marked variants competing under AVOIDF. (see pp. 52–3). Even more complicated: Where T is possible and you’d need an F if you don’t use a T, you need to use a T, according to fn. 34 p. 53.

Finally: Can we make T and F be compositional parts of the accent?

Suppose T is at the top, and F are all the word-level accents.

(43) a. If a lexical head is F-marked, associate its minimal prosodic category with H*L accent.
  b. If a syntactic category is T-marked, associate its minimal prosodic category with an H% boundary tone.
  c. By default, boundary tones are L%.

(44) a. Well, what about people? Name someone, what did he eat?
    FRED ate the BEANS. B—A
                        bump–rise, bump–fall
    [Fred], ate the beans.
    H* L %H  H*L (%L)

    b. Well, what about the food? Who ate it?
    FRED ate the BEANS. A—B
                        bump–fall, bump–rise
    Fred, ate the [beans].
    H*L (%L) H*L (%H)

Maybe…
Where does this put us wrt our overall project?

**Old vs. New** (Vallduví & Vilkhuna “Theme” [–Rheme] vs. “Rheme” [+Rheme])
Old = Given, New = not.
Note that under Schwarzschild & Büring New ≠ Focus.

**Link (Topic) vs. Tail** (Vallduví)
Remember, Topic vs. Tail appears to be syntactically relevant in Catalan.
(topics dislocate left, tails dislocate right).
So: T-marking is in syntax? Cf. “T” is in the numeration, according to Büring.
Tail is the unmarked part (neither T nor F). Is nonspecification able to drive movement?

*Deeper question:* Büring and Schwarzschild take F-marking to be more of an interface condition—if we say that F marking is available in the syntax, are we saying that mis-F-marked sentences crash at the interface (if they don’t meet the pragmatic conditions of the utterance)? Consider AvoidF: It must be the case that numerations with different numbers of F’s compete, since we need a sentence with “too many F’s” to crash. Is this pro-OT-style-syntax-pragmatics-integration?

**Shifted Topic vs. Continuing Topic**:
**Contrastive Topic vs. Noncontrastive Topic.**

*How does John get to school?* [He] usually [walks].

*How do the students get to school?* [John] usually [walks].
(There is at least a tendency for syntactic differentiation in the Mayan languages)
Shifted topics are topics which are new to the discourse, continuing are old.
This is a relation between assertions (i.e. with implicit questions between them).

This guy, he walked up to me and asked me for a quarter.

_SQ:_ What did this guy do?
_Q:_ What happened?

Büring-style topic-marking says that SQ needs to be part of a strategy to answer “what happened?”, so this suggests that there should be a further question left open, like “What did you do?”.. Perhaps.

Continuing topics have a less clear status—not everything that the sentence is “about” really constitutes a topic in Büring’s system—I think perhaps continuing topics aren’t Büring-style topics…?

*Next question, then:* Where continuing topics have syntactic positions associated with them, what are they?

*Insidious further question:* Is Büring talking only about contrastive topics? Maybe the fancy topic marking is for contrastive topics, yet there’s a different kind of topic that deals with “what the sentence is about.”

**Information Focus vs. Identificational Focus**
Schwarzschild/Büring-style focus seems to be closest to information focus, ironically enough (given the original basis in Rooth-style focus).
Identificational focus seems to be something over and above.
Maybe identificational focus really is some kind of semantic operator like a quantifier, over and above the pragmatic requirements.
(Quantifiers move in Hungarian, after all).

**Contrastive focus vs. Noncontrastive focus** (É. Kiss)
Basically hinges on whether the contrast set is “open” or “closed” (enumerable?). To the extent we believe this, perhaps this is a property of the operator mentioned above…?
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