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1. Foci

A little discouragement

The category focus is notoriously obscure.

vON STECHOW (1991)
1.1. Motivation
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1.1. Motivation

(1) **Frank** is reading a book.  
Who is reading [a book]?

(2) Frank is reading a **book**.  
What is Frank reading?

(3) Frank is **reading** a book.  
What does Frank do with a book?

*Does Frank still use his books to support his furniture?*

**Observation:** What answers a question is specially accentuated.
1.2. Kinds of Foci

**Phonetic Foci** are specially accentuated.

**(Morpho-)Syntactic Foci** must be placed somewhere in a sentence.

**Semantic Foci** are special constituents of sentences which associate with certain operators and contribute to the denotation of an expression.

**Pragmatic Foci** can be modelled as answers to background questions and give rise to context-dependent conclusions (implicatures). Usually they are new in the discourse or for at least one discourse participant.
1.3. Overview of the Terminology
### 1.3. Overview of the Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\psi) Subjekt</th>
<th>(\psi) Prädikat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Rheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic proper</td>
<td>Topic[Rest]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link</td>
<td>Tail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Focus-Phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(H. Paul)
(Daneš)
(z.B. REINHART (1982))
(Prague School, Hajičová)
(formal Semantics)
(Vallduví)
(formal Semantics)
(late Krifka)
1.4. Syntax: Where to put a focus

(Vallduví, Hajičová, É. Kiss).

(4)   a. Trueman è morto.
     b. È morto Johnson.
1.5. Semantics: Association

1.5.1. Examples

(5) Frank only reads books on focī.

(6) Frank only reads books on focī.

(7) Frank only reads books on focī.
1.5. Semantics: Association

1.5.1. Examples

(5) Frank only **reads** books on focī.

(6) Frank only reads **books** on focī.

(7) Frank only reads books on **focī**.

We should of course not focus solely on *only* alone but always also look at even other focus operators.

(8) Frank **even only** reads books on focī.

(9) Frank **even only** reads **books** on focī.

(10) Franz **even only** reads books on focī.

Here, semantic and phonological focī do not really fit together any more!
1.6. Scalar Implicatures
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1.6. Scalar Implicatures

(11) I passed.

(12) I **passed**. … but could have done better

(13) I passed. … the others didn’t!

Then everyone else will have aced!

**Quantity** *(Grice (1968))*

1. Make your contribution to the conversation as informative as necessary.
2. Do not make your contribution to the conversation more informative than necessary.

**Quality**

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
1.6. Scalar Implicatures

(11) I passed.

(12) *I passed.* … but could have done better

(13) I passed. … the others didn’t!

Then everyone else will have aced!

Quantity

1. Make your contribution to the conversation as informative as necessary.
2. Do not make your contribution to the conversation more informative than necessary.

Quality

1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

[Semantic] Focus theories treat these cases similarly to semantic focî.
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2. Empirical Investigations on Focus Constructions

**Fundamental Question**  Which of the effects we observe with ‘focus constructions’ are really due to focus constructions and which of them are caused by context?

**Fundamental Problem**  Neutral contexts where only effects of focus constructions show are difficult to construct as communication rarely takes place out-of-the-blue and in a setting without any context.

**Second Fundamental Problem**  If you’ve grown used to a certain reading of a construction, it is fairly difficult to find a new one, even and especially if you are a linguist.

**Really Fundamental Problem**  The empirical foundations of focus theories are shaky.
2.1. Second Occurrence Foci

2.1.1. Experiment

Hypothesis Generally, precisely pragmatic foci bear focus accents; semantic foci only bear a focus accent if they are also pragmatic foci. Focus accents do not directly semantically disambiguate sentences.

Method In the experiment, 12 test persons were offered recordings of short dialogues which only differed in the accentuation of the last answer. Test persons rated the dialogues for naturality and understandability.

Schmitz et al. (2001)
2.1.2. The Text

(14)  a.  

Wen hat Peter heute gefüttert?
Whom did Peter feed today?

Today, Peter only fed Mimi.

c.  Wer hat sonst noch nur Mimi gefüttert?
Who else only fed Mimi?

d.  Anne hat nur Mimi gefüttert.
Anne only fed Mimi.

pragmatic focus — semantic focus

The following words were accentuated:

1.  Anne
2.  Anne and Mimi
3.  Mimi
4.  gefüttert
5.  Mimmi and gefüttert
2.1.3. Variables

**independent variables:** Accentuation of the words *Anne, Mimi, ge-füttert*

**dependent variable:** Judgment of naturality and understandability.
2.1.4. Result

Accentuation of constituents that were not focused was rated bad. Dialogues in which only the pragmatic focus was stressed were rated better than those where also or only the semantic focus was accentuated.

2.1.5. Result of the Series of Experiments

The hypothesis was supported by one of three experiments, by the others it was not falsified.

Test subjects avoid constructions with multiple focus.
2.2. Can Foci be Assigned to Contexts?

- two-stage experiment
- focus utterances in picture stories

**First Stage**  How does accentuation work when reading aloud?

**Second Stage**  Do test subjects agree which utterance fits which story?
First Stage

**Independent variable**  ‘controlled’ context that should focus certain foci

**Dependent variable**  Accentuation of ‘interesting’ words
2.2.1. Variables

First Stage

*indendent variable*  ‘controlled’ context that should focus certain focī

*dendent variable*  Accentuation of ‘interesting’ words

Second Stage

*indendent variable*  Story fits utterance
  1. story read — story viewed
  2. intonation fits — does not fit sentence

*dendent variable*  Judgment of appropriateness
2.2.2. Result

No statistically significant result.

**First Step**  Accentuation often did not fulfill expectations

**Second Step**  Focus accentuation did not seem to influence appropriateness ratings.
3. Experiments

3.1. Considerations when Designing Experiments

- **test of acceptance**: Test persons accept a lot.
- **production experiment**: Test persons refuse to say what we want.
- **testing interpretation**: If possible non-linguistically — seems to be the method of choice.
3.2. Exhaustivity

**Well-known Claim:** Foci are interpreted exhaustively.
It’s all the fault of Grice (1968) and his maxims.

3.2.1. Typical Examples Quoted by Linguists

(15) a. Who of the IKP staff had a beer together yesterday?
    b. Bernhard and Bernhard.

(16) a. Who had a beer together yesterday?
    b. Some people of the IKP staff and some participants of the ILLC day from Amsterdam.
    c. Bernhard and Bernhard.
3.2. Exhaustivity

**Well-known Claim:** Foci are interpreted exhaustively.
It’s all the fault of *Grice* (1968) and his maxims.

3.2.1. Typical Examples Quoted by Linguists

(15)  
   a. Who of the IKP staff had a beer together yesterday?  
   b. Bernhard and Bernhard.

(16)  
   a. Who had a beer together yesterday?  
   b. Some people of the IKP staff and some participants of the ILLC day from Amsterdam.  
   c. Bernhard and Bernhard.

Aspects of mention-some answers

- relevance
- competence of the speaker — epistemic force

Should we really generally assume exhaustivity?
3.2.2. Scenario
3.2.3. Stimuli

(17)  a. Die Sterne, die *rot* sind, befinden sich rechts.
    b. Die blauen *Quadrat* befinden sich rechts.
    c. Rechts befinden sich die gelben *Kreise*.
    d. Rechts befinden sich die Quadrate, die *rot* sind.

(18)  a. The stars that are *red* are on the right.
    b. The blue *squares* are on the right.
    c. The yellow *circles* are on the right.
    d. The squares that are *red* are on bright.
Die Sterne, die rot sind, befinden sich rechts.
The stars that are red are on the right.
Die blauen Quadrat befinden sich rechts.
The blue squares are on the right.
Die [blauen Quadraten] befinden sich rechts.
The [blue squares] are on the right.
3.2.4. Variables

**independent variables**

- Placement of the focus: preverbally or postverbally
- medium: written text or (synthesised) speech

**dependent variable** Exhaustivation of focî, to be ‘measured’ by placement of the figures

- Is any focus interpreted exhaustively?
- Does focus projection occur?
3.3. Exclusivity under Con-/Disjunction

3.3.1. Typical Examples Quoted by Linguists

(19) a. How many people had what menu in the mensa yesterday?
    b. 400 people had menu 1, 600 menu 2 and 80 had salad.
3.3. Exclusivity under Con-/Disjunction

3.3.1. Typical Examples Quoted by Linguists

(19)  a. How many people had what menu in the mensa yesterday?
    b. 400 people had menu 1, 600 menu 2 and 80 had salad.

3.3.2. Dubious Examples?

(20)  a. How many people had what side-dishes with menu 2 in the mensa yesterday?
    b. 310 had chips, 280 potatoes, 400 salad and 190 vegetables.
3.3.3. Scenario
3.3.3. Scenario
3.3.4. Stimuli

(21)  
a. Wie haben denn in der Pause die Leute ihren Kaffee getrunken?
b. Zwei Leute hatten Milch und drei hatten Zucker.
c. Vier Leute hatten Milch und vier hatten Zucker.

(22)  
a. How did people drink their coffee in the break?
b. Two had milk and three had sugar.
c. Four had milk and four had sugar.
Zwei Leute hatten **Milch** und drei hatten **Zucker**.
Two had **milk** and three had **sugar**.
Vier Leute hatten Milch und vier hatten Zucker.
Four had milk and four had sugar.
3.3.5. Variables

**independent variables**

- compatibility (constantly: yes)
- More cups than items mentioned. (varies)

**dependent variables** exclusivity of focī in the conjunct

- Do test subjects assign milk and sugar to different ‘people’ if possible? →
- How do they react if it’s not possible? →

**Hypothesis**

- Inclusive interpretation is (more) acceptable if there are fewer cups than items mentioned.
3.4. **Topic/Focus: Sum Reading**

3.4.1. **Scenario**

I suffer from the Really Dangerous Spot Disease. This means that spots appear on my skin and stay forever. Spots that appear on Monday are yellow, Tuesday’s spots are red and spots appearing on Wednesday are blue.
3.4.2. Data

(23) On Monday, one spot appeared, on Tuesday two spots appeared, on Wednesday four spots appeared. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.

⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐
3.4.2. Data

(23) On Monday, one spot appeared, on Tuesday two spots appeared, on Wednesday four spots appeared. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.

★★★★★★★

(24) On Monday, one spot had appeared, on Tuesday three spots had appeared, on Wednesday seven spots had appeared.

★★★★★★★ — or even ★★★★★★★★★★★★?
3.4.2. Data

(23) On Monday, one spot appeared, on Tuesday two spots appeared, on Wednesday four spots appeared. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.
★★★★★★

(24) On Monday, one spot had appeared, on Tuesday three spots had appeared, on Wednesday seven spots had appeared. ★★★★★★★ — or even ★★★★★★★★★★★★★★?

(25) On Monday, I had one spot, on Tuesday I had three, on Wednesday I had seven. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.
★★★★★★★★
3.4.2. Data

(23) On Monday, one spot appeared, on Tuesday two spots appeared, on Wednesday four spots appeared. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.

(24) On Monday, one spot had appeared, on Tuesday three spots had appeared, on Wednesday seven spots had appeared.

(25) On Monday, I had one spot, on Tuesday I had three, on Wednesday I had seven. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.

(26) On Monday, I had one new spot, on Tuesday I had two new spots, on Wednesday I had four new spots.
3.4.2. Data

(23) On Monday, one spot appeared, on Tuesday two spots appeared, on Wednesday four spots appeared. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.

(24) On Monday, one spot had appeared, on Tuesday three spots had appeared, on Wednesday seven spots had appeared. — or even

(25) On Monday, I had one spot, on Tuesday I had three, on Wednesday I had seven. Thus, I’ve got seven spots now.

(26) On Monday, I had one new spot, on Tuesday I had two new spots, on Wednesday I had four new spots.

(27) By Monday, one spot had appeared, by Tuesday three spots had appeared, by Wednesday seven spots had appeared.
3.4.3. Possible Variables

Do we consider the whole period of time or only moments?

- the kind of verb used (state/action)
- tense
- adverbial phrase indicating time
- NP: is incompatibility indicated?
Conclusion

- Focus constructions are interesting.
- Empirical testing of hypotheses concerning focus constructions is desirable.
- It is not trivial.
- We’ll still try.
- Feedback is appreciated!
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