

Michael Yoshitaka ERLEWINE, National University of Singapore  
 Hadas KOTEK, McGill University

mitcho@mitcho.com  
 hkotek@alum.mit.edu

**Summary:** We argue for covert focus movement in English focus association. Evidence comes from *Tanglewood* configurations from Kratzer (1991). We show that Tanglewood configurations are island-sensitive, which is unpredicted by Kratzer’s focus-index proposal. Kratzer’s arguments against covert focus movement for *Tanglewood* are overcome by the availability of covert pied-piping. We show that covert focus movement is different from QR and can be long-distance.

**Background:** Kratzer (1991) presents examples such as (1) as an argument against the unselective Alternative Semantics of Rooth (1985, a.o.). The intended reading requires that alternatives covary in the pronounced position of focus and the corresponding position in the ellipsis site. (We use  $\sqrt{TW}$  to indicate the availability of such a *Tanglewood* reading with covarying alternatives.)

- (1) Context: You accuse me of being a copy cat. “You went to Block Island because I did. You went to Elk Lake Lodge because I did. And you went to Tanglewood because I did.” I reply:  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  I **only** went to [Tanglewood]<sub>F</sub> because you did  $\Delta$ . (Kratzer, 1991, p. 830)  
Paraphrase: Tanglewood is the only place  $x$  such that I went to  $x$  because you went to  $x$ .

Kratzer claims that such data motivates the use of *focus-indices* on focused constituents rather than simple F-marking: both VPs will be of the form “go to [Tanglewood]<sub>F2</sub>” at LF, with focus alternatives computed using different distinguished assignments for the focus-index F2.

**Proposal:** We propose that *Tanglewood* configurations as in (1) always involve covert movement of the overt focus—possibly with *pied-piping*—to bind a bound variable in the ellipsis site:

- (2) LF for (1): I PAST **only** ( [Tanglewood]<sub>F</sub> ) ( $\lambda x$  [ <sub>VP</sub> go to  $x$  ] [because you PAST [ <sub>VP</sub> go to  $x$  ] ] )

Kratzer (1991) considers example (3) with a syntactic island to claim that a covert focus movement approach as in (2) is untenable. But here the island is *balanced* between the antecedent and the intended ellipsis site, allowing for an LF as in (4) using covert focus movement with pied-piping (Drubig, 1994; Krifka, 2006; Wagner, 2006; Erlewine and Kotek, 2014), which binds a variable over different persons in the ellipsis site.

- (3) Context: “You always contact every responsible person before me.” I reply:  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  I **only** contacted [the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]<sub>F</sub>] before you did  $\Delta$ . (p. 831)
- (4) LF for (3): I PAST **only** ( [the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]<sub>F</sub>] )  
 (  $\lambda x$  [ [ <sub>VP</sub> contact  $x$  ] [because you PAST [ <sub>VP</sub> contact  $x$  ] ] ] )

**Evidence from island sensitivity:**

- (5) *Tanglewood readings are unavailable with the antecedent focus in an island:*  
Context: Our son speaks Spanish, French, and Mandarin. At one point we hired a nanny that happened to speak French, but that wasn’t why we hired her. Another time we hired a nanny that spoke Mandarin, but that too was a coincidence...  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  We **only** hired [a nanny that speaks [Spanish]<sub>F</sub>] because our son does  $\Delta$ .  
Intended Tanglewood reading: Spanish is the only language  $x$  such that we hired [a nanny that speaks  $x$ ] because our son speaks  $x$ . (Intended  $\Delta$  = “speak it<sub>(language)</sub>”)
- (6) *Tanglewood readings are available with the ellipsis site in an island:*  
Context: I speak Spanish, French, and Mandarin. I also have many friends that speak these languages, but for the most part that’s not why I studied these languages...  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  I **only** speak [Spanish]<sub>F</sub> because I have [a friend who does  $\Delta$ ].
- (7) LF for (6): I **only** ( [Spanish]<sub>F</sub> ) (  $\lambda x$  [ [ <sub>VP</sub> speak  $x$  ] [because I have [a friend who [ <sub>VP</sub> speak  $x$  ]]] ] )

Examples (5) and (6) show that Tanglewood readings are island-sensitive, contrary to Kratzer, and furthermore that this island-sensitivity is asymmetric: embedding the pronounced focus in an island blocks the Tanglewood reading, but embedding the ellipsis site does not. Our proposal above predicts this asymmetry: the overt focus must move covertly to bind the variable in the ellipsis site—this covert movement is island-sensitive, but variable binding is not. The Tanglewood reading is unavailable in (5) because movement of the focus *Spanish* would violate the relative clause island, and movement of the island *a nanny that speaks Spanish* then cannot bind the variable in the ellipsis site intended to range over languages, not nannies.

Tanglewood readings are similarly unavailable with the overt focus in one conjunct and the ellipsis site in another conjunct (8). This is explained by the fact that covert movement is subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint (see e.g. Bošković and Franks, 2000). Additional examples using other islands exhibit similar effects.

- (8) Context: I am under investigation by the Real Estate Board. John and Mary claim that I advised them both to bid on many of the same houses, to raise their prices. I reply:

\*<sup>TW</sup> I **only** advised John to bid on [the Elm St. house]<sub>F</sub> and (told) Mary to  $\Delta$  as well.

Intended Tanglewood reading: The Elm St. house is the only house  $x$  such that I advised John to bid on  $x$  and (told) Mary to bid on  $x$  as well.

In contrast, the Kratzer (1991) focus-index proposal predicts that Tanglewood readings should be possible as long as both the overt focus and ellipsis site are within the scope of *only*. The unavailability of the Tanglewood reading in (5) and (8) shows that focus indices cannot be an option. The dynamic semantics proposal sketched in Beaver and Clark (2008) §4.6 must similarly be dismissed, as it also predicts no island-sensitivity.

**Tanglewood with overt bound variables**: Our approach predicts that Tanglewood readings are not dependent on ellipsis and are possible using overt bound pronouns. Such examples can be constructed; see e.g. (9). The context in (9) highlights the availability of the Tanglewood reading.

- (9) Context: We're interviewing witnesses in our murder investigation. You're concerned that the interviews you're getting have been affected by the witnesses talking to me first.

*My interviews*: Bill John Steve Sam  
*Your interviews*: Steve Sam John Dave  $\rightarrow$  time

<sup>\sqrt{TW}</sup> I **only** talked to [John]<sub>F</sub> before you talked to him. (TW: judged true in context)

**The nature of covert focus movement**: Covert focus movement can be long-distance, and is not clause-bound. Consider example (10) below, where a Tanglewood reading is available. The LF we propose for (10) is in (11): here the overt focus covertly moves to *only* across a finite clausal embedding.

- (10) Context: John, the first year grad student, doesn't quite understand the field yet. He seems to think that everyone works on focus, on ellipsis, and on binding. Some people think he is just extrapolating from what his advisor works on. But actually...

<sup>\sqrt{TW}</sup> He **only** thinks [that everyone works on [focus]<sub>F</sub>] because his advisor does  $\Delta$ .

- (11) LF for (10): He **only** ( [focus]<sub>F</sub> ) (  $\lambda x$  [ [thinks [<sub>CP</sub> that everyone [<sub>VP</sub> works on  $x$ ]] ] ] )  
^-----|  
[because his advisor [<sub>VP</sub> works on  $x$ ]] ] )

Furthermore, QR of a quantifier such as *exactly one topic* in the parallel configuration in (12) does not yield the bound variable Tanglewood reading. This shows that the covert movement feeding Tanglewood readings is longer-distance and specifically due to association with the higher focus operator, not simply QR.

- (12) \*<sup>TW</sup> He thinks [that everyone works on exactly one topic] because his advisor does  $\Delta$ .

**Selected references**: Bošković and Franks 2000. "Across-the-Board movement and LF." *Syntax* 3 • Drubig 1994. "Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus" • Erlewine & Kotek 2014. "Intervention in focus pied-piping." *NELS* 43 • Kratzer 1991. "The representation of focus." In *Semantik* • Krifka 2006. "Association with focus phrases." In *The architecture of focus* • Wagner 2006. "Association by movement: evidence from NPI-licensing." *NLS* 14