

## Givenness and Second Occurrence Focus

Association with Focus operators such as *only* must usually associate with a prosodically prominent (i.e. pitch accented) focus in English, as in the first sentence in (1). In second occurrence uses, this focus may not bear full prosodic pitch prominence yet must bear phrasal stress prominence (Beaver et al 2007, Féry & Ishihara 2009, a.o.), as with the italicized focus in (1) (Partee 1999) and (2) (Rooth 1992).

- (1) Everybody knows that Mary *only* eats VEGETABLES. If even PAUL knew that Mary *only* eats *vegetables*, he should have suggested a different RESTAURANT.
- (2) People who GROW rice generally *only* EAT *rice*.

Since a focus usually carries a (nuclear) pitch accent, the issue raised by SOF is what conditions the lesser phrase stress prominence in such cases. There are three recent accounts in the literature: SOF arises when – (i) one focus and its domain are contained within the domain of a higher focus – the SOF is maximally prominent only within the smaller domain and the higher focus is maximally prominent overall (Büring 2015, Rooth 2010); (ii) a SOF is discourse Given as a focus so it and its domain are deaccented, but the SOF is still maximally prominent within its (deaccented) domain (Selkirk 2008); (iii) a focus that is Given yields the ability to bear primary accent to a focus that is New and thereby acquires a secondary accent which is realized as phrase stress in the post-nuclear position (Beaver & Velleman 2011). I argue that all three accounts fail in different respects, and none addresses some new data (3), previously unnoticed.

- (3)
  - a. People who GROW rice *only* EAT *rice*.
  - b. People who GROW rice *only* eat RICE.
  - c. People who grow RICE *only* EAT *rice*.
  - d. People who grow RICE *only* eat RICE.

The data in (3) show that the same interpretation that holds for (2) holds also for sentences with different prosody than (2). I propose an alternative account, which addresses these failures. Like both accounts (ii) and (iii), this new proposal builds on the distinction between focus and discourse new (Rochemont 2013, a.o.). Consistent with this distinction I propose a revision to Schwarzschild's 1999 system of givenness calculation that is stated in terms of G-marking (Féry & Samek-Lodovic 2006, Selkirk 2008) rather than N-marking (Beaver & Velleman 2011).

**REFERENCES:** Beaver, D., et al. 2007. When semantics meets phonetics: acoustical studies of second occurrence focus. *Language* 83; Beaver, D, Velleman, D. 2011. The communicative significance of primary and secondary accents. *Lingua* 121; Büring, D. 2015. A theory of second occurrence focus. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 30; Féry, C., Ishihara, S. 2009. The phonology of second occurrence focus. *Journal of Linguistics* 45; Féry, C., Samek-Lodovici, V. 2006. Focus projection and prosodic prominence in nested foci. *Language* 82; Rochemont, M. 2013. Discourse new, F-marking, and information structure triggers. *Lingua*; Rooth, M., 2010. Second occurrence focus and relativized stress F. In *Information Structure*, OUP; Selkirk, E.O. 2008. Contrastive focus, givenness and the unmarked status of “discourse-new”. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 24.