

Focus association by movement: Evidence from Tanglewood

Michael Yoshitaka ERLEWINE and Hadas KOTEK, July 2016

Comments welcome: mitcho@nus.edu.sg, hkotec@alum.mit.edu

We argue for the existence of covert focus movement in English focus association. Our evidence comes from *Tanglewood* configurations of the form in Kratzer 1991. We show that Tanglewood configurations are sensitive to syntactic islands, contrary to Kratzer’s claims and predictions. We propose that Tanglewood configurations always involve covert movement of the focused constituent—possibly with covert pied-piping (Drubig 1994; Krifka 1996, 2006; Tancredi 1997, 2004; Wagner 2006; Erlewine and Kotek 2014)—to bind a bound variable in the ellipsis site. This availability of covert pied-piping explains examples such as Kratzer’s which are apparently not island-sensitive. We show that covert focus movement is long-distance and not simply QR. Kratzer’s proposal that ellipsis enforces the identity of focus indices and many other previous approaches are shown to overgenerate Tanglewood readings.

Keywords: association with focus, covert focus movement, covert pied-piping, island-sensitivity, variable binding, *only*

Contents

1	The problem of <i>Tanglewood</i>	2
2	Proposal	6
3	New evidence from island (in)sensitivity	11
4	Tanglewood readings with overt bound variables	16
5	Alternative analyses of Tanglewood readings	18
6	Covert focus movement is long-distance, not QR	20
7	Conclusion	21

Acknowledgements: For valuable comments and discussion, we thank audiences at the University of Edinburgh, Yale University, SALT 26, and the Tokyo Semantics Research Group, Brian Buccola, Miriam Nussbaum, Gary Thoms, anonymous reviewers, and especially Aron Hirsch. Errors are of course each other’s.

This paper studies the mechanism of *association with focus* in English: in particular, the relationship between focus-sensitive adverbs such as *only* and the associating focused constituent in their scope. We begin the paper by briefly introducing the influential analysis of association with focus in Rooth 1985, 1992 and discussing the problem posed by Kratzer’s (1991) famous *Tanglewood constructions*. We then present our proposal for their explanation via covert focus movement and evidence supporting our proposal from island sensitivity and Tanglewood readings with overt bound variables. We discuss previous alternative analyses of Tanglewood readings and argue that they cannot explain the facts we present here. Finally, we show that covert focus movement can be long-distance, arguing that its effects cannot be reduced to QR.

1 The problem of *Tanglewood*

Focused constituents, indicated by F-marking, are pronounced with prosodic prominence. Semantically, they introduce a set of *alternatives* into the computation. Focus-sensitive operators such as *only* then quantify over those alternatives.

- (1) I only wear [red]_F shirts.

Alternatives to “red”: green, blue, ...

Presupposition: I wear red shirts.

Assertion: I do not wear green shirts, I do not wear blue shirts, ...

Under the Alternative Semantics theory of focus in Rooth 1985, 1992—which continues to be the most widely adopted theory of association with focus—each syntactic node α has two “dimensions” of meaning: an ordinary semantic value $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^o$ as well as a *focus semantic value* $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^f$, which can be thought of as a set of alternative denotations and which includes $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^o$ as a member. Focus semantic values for complex phrases are computed compositionally using the meanings of their parts, just as ordinary semantic values are.

- (2) **Recursive definition for focus semantic values (Rooth 1985: 14):**¹

The focus semantic value of node α , $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^f$, is:

- a. the set of objects in the model matching $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^o$ in type, if α bears the feature F;
- b. the unit set $\{\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^o\}$, if α is a non-focused non-complex phrase;
- c. the set of objects which can be obtained by picking one element from each of the focus semantic values corresponding to the component phrases of α , and applying the semantic rule for α to this sequence of elements, if α is a non-focused complex phrase.

Rooth proposes that focused constituents such as *red* in (1) are interpreted in their pronounced position at LF. Following the procedure in (2), the alternatives introduced locally (3a) will be reflected in the focus semantic values of all dominating phrases, resulting in a corresponding set of propositional alternatives (3b) in the complement of focus-sensitive operators.² *Only* α then asserts the negation of all alternatives in $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^f$ which do not entail the prejacent proposition $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^o$ (Horn 1969; a.o.); this results in the correct assertive content as in (1).

- (3) LF: only $[_{VP}$ I wear $[_{F}$ red] shirts]
 a. $\llbracket \text{red} \rrbracket^f = \{\text{red, green, blue, ...}\}$
 b. $\llbracket \text{VP} \rrbracket^f = \{\text{I wear red shirts, I wear green shirts, I wear blue shirts, ...}\}$

Empirically, this paper centers around the *Tanglewood* phenomenon first discussed in Kratzer 1991. Tanglewood examples were introduced as a challenge to the basic Roothian theory sketched above, motivating a minor but powerful refinement to the theory. Kratzer’s original example is in (4).

(4) **Tanglewood (Kratzer 1991: 830):**

Context: Imagine now you are angry at me and start voicing the following accusations. “What a copy cat you are! 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 feel you exaggerate and reply:

I only went to $[_{F}$ Tanglewood] because you did Δ .

- (5) Paraphrase: Tanglewood is the only place x such that I went to x because you went to x .

Her observation is as follows: considering the interpretation of the ellipsis site in (4), indicated by Δ , let us assume the LF for (4) to be as in (6) below. Now notice that (6) includes two instances of the F-marked constituent *Tanglewood*. According to Rooth’s definition for focus semantic values in (2) above, the result will include all combinations of different values for the two positions of focus, as in (7a). The assertion of *only* in (4) is then predicted to be as in (7b) below.

(6) **Assumed LF for (4):**

only $[_{VP}$ I $[_{\text{antecedent}}$ go to $[_{F}$ Tanglewood] $[_{\text{ellipsis site}}$ because you go to $[_{F}$ Tanglewood]]]

¹In Rooth 1985, focus semantic values were called *p-sets*, short for *presuppositional set* from Jackendoff 1972. The definition here is a quote from Rooth 1985: 14 but modified to use the now standard terminology and notation of Rooth 1992. As noted in Rooth 1992: fn 7, the recursion step in (2c) is equivalent to that for the compositional interpretation of *wh*-questions proposed in Hamblin 1973; see Hamblin’s page 49 and in particular footnote 8.

²For convenience, here and elsewhere, we will ignore the contribution of tense and illustrate subjects in their VP-internal base positions. The categories we label “VP” could also, more precisely, be called “*vP*”s. The denotations of propositional alternatives as in (3b) and (7a) below should also be thought of as standing in for their intensions.

(7) **Predicted interpretation of *Tanglewood* (4) using Rooth's (2):**

- a. $[[VP]]^f = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{I go to Tanglewood because you go to Tanglewood,} \\ \text{I go to Tanglewood because you go to Block Island,} \\ \text{I go to Tanglewood because you go to Elk Lake Lodge,} \\ \text{I go to Block Island because you go to Tanglewood,} \\ \text{I go to Block Island because you go to Block Island,} \\ \text{I go to Block Island because you go to Elk Lake Lodge,} \\ \text{I go to Elk Lake Lodge because you go to Tanglewood,} \\ \text{I go to Elk Lake Lodge because you go to Block Island,} \\ \text{I go to Elk Lake Lodge because you go to Elk Lake Lodge} \end{array} \right\}$
- b. $[[VP]]^o = \text{I go to Tanglewood because you go to Tanglewood}$
- c. Assertion of (4):

it's not the case that [I went to Tanglewood because you went to Block Island],
it's not the case that [I went to Tanglewood because you went to Elk Lake Lodge],
it's not the case that [I went to Block Island because you went to Tanglewood],
it's not the case that [I went to Block Island because you went to Block Island],
it's not the case that [I went to Block Island because you went to Elk Lake Lodge],
it's not the case that [I went to Elk Lake Lodge because you went to Tanglewood],
it's not the case that [I went to Elk Lake Lodge because you went to Block Island],
it's not the case that [I went to Elk Lake Lodge because you went to Elk Lake Lodge]

Kratzer argues that this predicted assertion in (7c) does not reflect the actual interpretation of example (4). As the paraphrase in (4) above indicates, the correct interpretation asserts only that *it is not the case that I went to Block Island because you went to Block Island* and *it is not the case that I went to Elk Lake Lodge because you went to Elk Lake Lodge*. In other words, the set of alternatives must be computed so that the alternatives in the two positions of focus *covary* across the alternatives, as in (8). We will refer to such interpretations which require such covarying alternatives under an in-situ approach to focus as *Tanglewood constructions* or *Tanglewood readings*.

(8) **Covarying alternatives, to yield the correct interpretation of (4):**

$$[[VP]]^f = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{I go to Tanglewood because you go to Tanglewood,} \\ \text{I go to Block Island because you go to Block Island,} \\ \text{I go to Elk Lake Lodge because you go to Elk Lake Lodge} \end{array} \right\}$$

Kratzer proposes an amendment to Rooth's theory which allows for the natural derivation of covarying alternatives as in (8). In brief, Kratzer proposes that focused constituents bear distinguished *focus indices* and ellipsis ensures their identity, resulting in the LF in (9a). Focused

constituents are then interpreted as *distinguished variables* in the focus semantic value, ranging over different assignment functions h (9b). This yields the desired covarying alternatives in (9c).³

(9) **Tanglewood (4) with covarying alternatives under Kratzer 1991's system:**

a. LF: only $[_{VP} I [_{\text{antecedent}} \text{go to } [TW]_{F7}] [_{\text{ellipsis}} \text{go to } [TW]_{F7}]]$ (cf 6)

b. $H = \{h_0, h_1, h_2\}$; $h_0(7) = \text{Tanglewood}$, $h_1(7) = \text{Block Island}$, $h_2(7) = \text{Elk Lake Lodge}$

c. $[[VP]]^f = \{I \text{ go to } h(7) \text{ because you go to } h(7) \mid h \in H\}$
 $= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} I \text{ go to Tanglewood because you go to Tanglewood,} \\ I \text{ go to Block Island because you go to Block Island,} \\ I \text{ go to Elk Lake Lodge because you go to Elk Lake Lodge} \end{array} \right\}$ (=8)

d. Assertion:

it's not the case that [I went to Block Island because you went to Block Island],

it's not the case that [I went to Elk Lake Lodge because you went to Elk Lake Lodge]

We make two notes here regarding Kratzer's theory. First, Kratzer 1991 retains from Rooth's work (a) the idea of a multidimensional semantics, with ordinary and focus semantic values, and (b) the claim that foci are interpreted in-situ at LF. Her Tanglewood argument challenges *how* focus semantic values are computed, motivating her focus index approach over Rooth's recursive procedure in (2). She also briefly considers and argues against an alternative account where the focused constituent covertly moves; we will detail this approach and her argument against it in the next section.

Second, we note that Kratzer's proposal that ellipsis can enforce the identity of focus indices is quite powerful. In particular, it predicts no locality restrictions between the focus-sensitive operator (*only*), the pronounced focus, and the ellipsis site. As long as the pronounced focus and its interpreted copy in the ellipsis site are both in the scope of the focus-sensitive operator, the Tanglewood effect is predicted: the operator will quantify over alternatives where the two focused positions covary.

In this paper, we present previously unobserved restrictions on the distribution of Tanglewood readings which are unpredicted by previous accounts of the phenomenon. We concentrate first on Kratzer's account, as the most widely known account of Tanglewood readings, and discuss alternative accounts in a later section of the paper. Of particular importance are two findings: (a) that Tanglewood readings exhibit sensitivity to syntactic islands, and (b) that Tanglewood readings are possible in the absence of ellipsis.

³Other solutions to the Tanglewood problem have also been proposed. See Section 5 for discussion.

In the following section, we present our own proposal for Tanglewood constructions. We maintain the Roothian multidimensional semantics for the computation of alternatives, but diverge from Rooth and Kratzer in arguing that foci are not interpreted in-situ when associating with a focus-sensitive operator: they move covertly to the higher operator, and it is this movement that makes Tanglewood readings possible. In subsequent sections, we then present our new evidence which motivates this approach, discuss the nature of the movement, and discuss alternative accounts.

2 Proposal


We propose that Tanglewood constructions such as (4) always involve covert movement of the focused constituent to a position from which it binds a bound variable in the ellipsis site.

We first illustrate a basic example of association with English adverb *only* using covert focus movement in (10).⁴ For concreteness, we adopt the form of covert focus movement discussed briefly in Rooth 1985: 31–32 and used in Wagner 2006. This involves covert movement of a constituent containing the focus to a *complement* position of the the attractor—also called *Undermerge* by Pesetsky (2007, 2013)—together with adjunction of the associated λ -binder to the complement from which the focused constituent is moved out.⁵


(10) **Covert focus movement:**

“I only went to [Tanglewood]_F.”

PF:



LF:



⁴Again, we do not illustrate tense or movement of the subject out of its predicate-internal base position.

⁵Three notes on this movement. First, we present only the corresponding PF and LF representations here in (10); for our purposes, this movement could be thought of as taking place in the narrow syntax, with pronunciation at the tail of the chain, or taking place after Spell-Out, feeding only LF. Second, the movement in (10) can be derived without violating the Extension Condition (Chomsky 1993) by (a) first merging the focused constituent with *only*, resulting in an independent [only Tanglewood_F] tree in the workspace, (b) adjoining the λ -binder to the root of the tree containing the trace of the focused constituent, then (c) merging the results of steps (a) and (b). The necessity of such derivations has been independently claimed for cases of head-movement (Bobaljik and Brown 1997) and sideward movement (Nunes

Let (11) be the semantics of this two-place *only*, based on the classic Horn 1969 description of *only*'s meaning: *only* presupposes the truth of its prejacent (the combination of its first and second arguments) and asserts that, for all alternatives to the first argument in set C , if it is not equal to the stated (prejacent) value of the first argument, its combination with the second argument must be false.⁶ The variable C must be fixed contextually to be equal to (or a subset of) the focus semantic value of the first argument of *only* at LF; see e.g. discussion in Rooth 1992; Tancredi 2004; Wagner 2006. Here we let $C = \llbracket [\text{Tanglewood}]_F \rrbracket^f = \{\text{Tanglewood, Block Island, Elk Lake Lodge}\}$. The resulting interpretation of (10) is given in (12).

(11) **Semantics for two-place *only*:**

$$\llbracket \text{only} \rrbracket = \lambda \alpha_\sigma . \lambda \beta_{\langle \sigma, t \rangle} : \underbrace{\beta(\alpha)}_{\text{presupposition}} . \underbrace{\forall \gamma \in C [(\gamma \neq \alpha) \rightarrow \neg \beta(\gamma)]}_{\text{assertion}}$$

(12) **Interpretation of *I only went to [Tanglewood]_F* (10) using (11):**

a. LF: $\text{only} \left(\underbrace{[\text{Tanglewood}]_F}_{\uparrow = \alpha} \left(\lambda x . \text{I go to } x \right) \right)_{\downarrow = \beta}$

b. Presupposition: $\beta(\alpha) = \text{I go to Tanglewood}$

c. Assertion:

$$\forall \gamma \in \{\text{Tanglewood, Block Island, Elk Lake Lodge}\} [(\gamma \neq \text{Tanglewood}) \rightarrow \neg \beta(\gamma)]$$

$$\iff \neg \beta(\text{Block Island}) \wedge \neg \beta(\text{Elk Lake Lodge})$$

$$\iff \text{it is not the case that [I go to Block Island], it is not the case that [I go to ELL]}$$

We now demonstrate how this covert focus movement helps derive the Tanglewood reading in Kratzer's original example, (4). We propose that the overt focus *Tanglewood* moves covertly to become the first argument of *only*, leaving the variable x in its trace position with a corresponding

2001, 2004). Third, it also does not violate the Proper Binding Condition (PBC; Fiengo 1977) if we think of the PBC as a semantic condition requiring variables to be bound by their binders. Even though the landing site of movement does not c-command its trace position, the λ -binder associated with its movement does properly bind the trace position.

See also Pesetsky 2007, 2013 for independent motivation for overt movement of this form, unrelated to focus constructions, and see Yuan 2016 for an application of overt Undermerge to the syntax of focus particles in Kikuyu.

⁶The semantics for (11) here is a naive formulation which blindly negates all non-prejacent alternatives. Formally, this must be modified so that it is all alternatives that are not entailed by the prejacent that is negated. See discussion in e.g. von Stechow 1997: 13. Wagner 2006: 298 gives such a formulation for a two-place *only*:

$$(i) \llbracket \text{only} \rrbracket = \lambda \alpha_\sigma . \lambda \beta_{\langle \sigma, t \rangle} : \beta(\alpha) . \forall \gamma \in C [\beta(\gamma) \rightarrow (\wedge \beta(\alpha) \Rightarrow \wedge \beta(\gamma))]$$

In the examples in this paper, this entailment issue will not arise, so we will use the naive formulation in (11), but our "official" proposal would be to adopt a formulation such as Wagner's in (i).

There are also debates in the literature regarding the status of the prejacent inference, which we call a presupposition here. This question is orthogonal to the discussion here.

λ -binder. In the ellipsis site, we have a matching bound variable x , which will also be bound by the same λ -binder.⁷ This yields the correct interpretation for the *Tanglewood* example (4).

(13) **Interpretation of Kratzer’s *Tanglewood* example (4) using covert focus movement:**

- a. LF: only $\left(\left[\text{Tanglewood} \right]_{\text{F}} \right)_{=\alpha} \left(\lambda x . \text{I} \left[\text{antecedent go to } x \right] \text{ because you } \left[\text{ellipsis go to } x \right] \right)_{=\beta}$
- b. Presupposition: $\beta(\alpha) = \text{I go to Tanglewood because you go to Tanglewood}$
- c. Assertion:
 $\forall \gamma \in \{\text{Tanglewood, Block Island, Elk Lake Lodge}\} [(\gamma \neq \text{Tanglewood}) \rightarrow \neg\beta(\gamma)]$
 $\iff \neg\beta(\text{Block Island}) \wedge \neg\beta(\text{Elk Lake Lodge})$
 $\iff \text{it is not the case that [I go to Block Island because you go to Block Island]},$
 $\text{it is not the case that [I go to Elk Lake Lodge because you go to Elk Lake Lodge]}$

This approach ensures quantification over propositions with the same values in the position of pronounced focus and within the ellipsis site through general mechanisms of movement, abstraction, and variable binding. This takes away the need to generate alternatives which covary in two positions of focus, discussed in the previous section. Note that, under this approach, ellipsis is not a crucial ingredient of *Tanglewood* readings; we discuss this point in Section 4.

Note that there is an asymmetry between the two positions of x in this LF structure in (13a). The first variable x is a trace position of movement, and therefore the relationship between the LF position of *Tanglewood* and the λ -binder and the position of the variable x in the trace position should be subject to constraints on syntactic movement. The second variable x , however, is simply base-generated as a variable; it is not the product of movement and therefore should have no constraints beyond being in the scope of the matching λ -binder derived by movement. This asymmetry underlies the novel evidence we present in the following Section 3: in brief, we will show that the position of overt focus (corresponding to the first variable x in (13a)) is sensitive to syntactic islands, whereas the hypothesized bound variable position, within the ellipsis site, is not sensitive to islands.

Kratzer (1991: 831) briefly considers this type of movement approach to *Tanglewood* readings but dismisses it, based on the availability of examples such as (14). As the paraphrase below makes clear, this example has a *Tanglewood* reading where *only* quantifies over the possibilities that I contacted the person who chairs a certain group before you contacted the person who chairs that same group. It does not assert, for example, that *it’s not the case that I contacted the person who chairs the Zoning Board before you contacted the person who chairs the Planning Board*.

⁷This variable in the ellipsis site can, in fact, be a coindexed free pronoun which is not bound by the λ -binder of covert movement. Charlow 2008 presents a number of examples demonstrating this possibility. Here we will concentrate on the derivation of *Tanglewood* readings, narrowly defined, where this variable will be bound.

(14) **A Tanglewood construction with the focus inside an island (Kratzer 1991: 831):**

Context: “You always contact every responsible person before me.”

No, I only contacted _{[island} the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]_{F]} before you did Δ.

- (15) Paraphrase: The Zoning Board is the only x such that I contacted the person who chairs x before you contacted the person who chairs x .

What is important about example (14) is that the focus *the Zoning Board* is contained within a relative clause island. If Tanglewood readings require movement of the focus to a position to bind a variable in the ellipsis site, we might expect (14) to have an LF as in (16). But this would be an island violation. To wit, corresponding overt movement of the focus as in (17) is ungrammatical.

(16) **LF for (14) using covert focus movement of *the Zoning Board*:**

only (_{[the Zoning Board]_{F]}) ($\lambda x . I$ _{[antecedent contact _{[island} the person who chairs x]]} before you _{[ellipsis contact _{[island} the person who chairs x]]})}

(17) **Corresponding overt focus movement of *the Zoning Board* (Kratzer 1991: 831):**

* It was _{[the Zoning Board]_{F]} that I contacted _{[island} the person who chairs ___].}

Therefore—Kratzer claims—the grammaticality of (14) with its intended Tanglewood interpretation shows that Tanglewood readings do not depend on covert movement of the focus. This then motivates Kratzer’s proposal where ellipsis enforces identity of focus indices, briefly introduced in Section 1.

What Kratzer did not consider is the possibility of covert focus movement triggering *pied-piping* (Drubig 1994; Tancredi 1997, 2004; Krifka 2006; Wagner 2006; Erlewine and Kotek 2014).⁸ Under our approach presented here—based on the work of the authors listed here—the first argument of *only* at LF, derived by covert movement, need only *contain* the focused constituent. In this case, we can covertly move the island containing the focus, *the person...*, leaving a variable and associated λ -binder which, roughly speaking, ranges over different persons chairing organizations. This binder will also bind the matching variable in the ellipsis site.

(18) **LF for (14) using covert focus movement with pied-piping:** (cf 16)

only (_{[island} the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]_{F]}) ($\lambda x . I$ _{[antecedent contact x] before you [ellipsis contact x]]})

⁸None of these previous authors specifically discusses—let alone argues for—the application of covert pied-piping to the problem of Tanglewood and Kratzer’s challenge to the movement account. To our knowledge, the closest that anyone has come to this in previous literature is the last sentence of footnote 14 in Beaver and Clark 2008: 110–111, which suggests pied-piping to avoid a *that*-trace effect violation triggered by covert movement of an embedded subject alone. We will discuss their example in (36) below. See also discussion of Beaver and Clark’s approaches to Tanglewood in Section 5 below.

No islands are violated in this LF. We note that parallel pied-piping is possible in overt focus movement, as in (19). Such structures have previously been described simply as clefts where a subpart of the pivot is focused (Chomsky 1970: 91ff, summarized in Jackendoff 1972: 232–234; see also, more recently, Velleman, Beaver, Destruel, Bumford, Onea, and Coppock 2012 and Erlewine and Kotek 2014).

(19) **Corresponding overt focus movement with pied-piping:** (cf 17)

✓ It was $[[_{\text{island}} \text{the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]}_F]$ that I contacted ____.

For completeness, we demonstrate the interpretation of Kratzer’s *Zoning Board* example (14) under our approach to Tanglewood constructions, using the LF in (18) involving covert focus movement with pied-piping. Following the context discussed by Kratzer (1991: 829), we let $[[\text{the Zoning Board}]_F]^f = \{\text{the Zoning Board, the Planning Board, the Rent Control Board, the Conservation Commission}\}$. Using the simple Roothian procedure for the interpretation of focus semantic values (2), we yield the focus semantic values for the moved constituent—labeled *island* here—in (20b). As noted above, the variable *C* used by *only* must be a subset of the focus semantic value of its first argument; here we let the variable *C* simply be equal to $[[\text{island}]^f]$.

(20) **Interpretation of Kratzer’s *Zoning Board* example (14) under our approach:**

- a. LF (=18): only $\left([[_{\text{island}} \text{the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]}_F] \right)_{=\alpha}$
 $\left(\lambda x . I [\text{antecedent contact } x] \text{ before you } [\text{ellipsis contact } x] \right)_{=\beta}$
- b. $C = [[\text{island}]^f = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{the person who chairs the Zoning Board,} \\ \text{the person who chairs the Planning Board,} \\ \text{the person who chairs the Rent Control Board,} \\ \text{the person who chairs the Conservation Commission} \end{array} \right\}$
- c. Presupposition: $\beta(\alpha) = I \text{ contact the person who chairs the Zoning Board before you contact the person who chairs the Zoning Board}$
- d. Assertion: $\forall \gamma \in C [(\gamma \neq \alpha) \rightarrow \neg \beta(\gamma)]$
 $\iff \neg \beta(\text{the person who chairs the Planning Board}) \wedge$
 $\neg \beta(\text{the person who chairs the Rent Control Board}) \wedge$
 $\neg \beta(\text{the person who chairs the Conservation Commission})$
 $\iff \text{it is not the case that [I contact the person who chairs the Planning Board before you contact the person who chairs the Planning Board],}$
 $\text{it is not the case that [I contact the person who chairs the Rent Control Board before you contact the person who chairs the Rent Control Board],}$
 $\text{it is not the case that [I contact the person who chairs the Conservation Commission before you contact the person who chairs the Conservation Commission]}$

The semantics for *only* here correctly reflects sensitivity to the placement of focus, even though the focus is a proper subpart of the constituent moved to be the first argument of *only*. This is because the set of alternatives *C* quantified over in (20) is constrained by the focus semantic value of the first argument of *only*. This is the domain restriction mechanism of Rooth 1985, 1992, adapted for the two-place *only* in (11), also used by Wagner 2006.

The demonstration in (20) shows that Kratzer’s one argument against a covert movement account of Tanglewood readings is easily defeated by the possibility of pied-piping in covert focus movement, which has since been independently developed and argued for by work such as Drubig 1994; Krifka 1996, 2006; Tancredi 1997, 2004; Wagner 2006; Erlewine and Kotek 2014. At the same time, this discussion reflects the difficulty of testing for reflexes of movement such as island-sensitivity in Tanglewood constructions, because of the possibility of covert pied-piping. In the next section, we present new evidence that focus association in Tanglewood *is* island-sensitive in a manner predicted by our proposal but not by Kratzer’s approach.

3 New evidence from island (in)sensitivity

Our proposal for Tanglewood constructions, presented above, involves covert movement of the overt focus—or a constituent properly containing it—which then binds a corresponding bound variable in the ellipsis site. This predicts an asymmetric pattern of island-sensitivity: covert movement of the focus (possibly with pied-piping) is subject to island constraints, but variable binding is not. In this section we will show that Tanglewood constructions exhibit precisely this pattern of island-sensitivity, predicted by our covert focus movement account but unpredicted by alternative proposals, including Kratzer’s account.

We begin with example (21). The context is designed to make the intended Tanglewood reading natural; nonetheless, the sentence does not have the intended Tanglewood reading, which we indicate with *^{TW}. We note that this sentence does have a number of other possible readings.⁹

(21) **Focus in a relative clause, without a matching island in the intended ellipsis site:**

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...

*^{TW} We only hired [_{island} a nanny that speaks [Spanish]_F] because our son does Δ .

Intended Tanglewood reading: Spanish is the only language x such that we hired [a nanny that speaks x] because our son speaks x . (Δ = “speak...”)

⁹In particular, there is another reading which we would call a Tanglewood reading: this is a reading where the

Why is this intended reading unavailable? Under our approach, the intended Tanglewood reading requires covert movement of *Spanish* or a phrase properly containing *Spanish* to *only*, binding a corresponding bound variable within the ellipsis site. Consider first the LF in (22a): although movement of the focus *Spanish* would arrive at the intended Tanglewood reading, movement of *Spanish* alone is a violation of the relative clause island. We also consider movement of the entire island containing the focus in (22b). The problem here is that the bound variable in the ellipsis site is the object of *speak* and therefore should correspond to a language, but in order to yield the Tanglewood reading, this variable will be bound by the λ -binder introduced by covert focus movement, and this λ -binder ranges over different nannies, not languages.

(22) **Problematic LFs for the unavailable Tanglewood reading of (21):**

- a. $\text{only} \left(\left[\text{Spanish} \right]_F \left(\lambda x . \text{we hire } \left[\text{island a nanny that } \left[\text{antecedent speaks } x \right] \right] \right) \right)$
↑ × because our son $\left[\text{ellipsis speaks } x \right]$
- b. $\text{only} \left(\left[\text{island a nanny that } \left[\text{antecedent speaks } \left[\text{Spanish} \right]_F \right] \right) \right)$
↑ ($\lambda x . \text{we hire } x \text{ because our son } \left[\text{ellipsis speaks } x \right]$)

The unavailability of the Tanglewood reading in (21) is unpredicted by Kratzer’s account. Recall that under her proposal, foci are interpreted in-situ at LF (following Rooth 1985) with distinguished focus indices and ellipsis enforces their identity. Focus association through focus indices and ellipsis are both insensitive to syntactic islands, as explicitly claimed by Kratzer, predicting the availability of a Tanglewood reading here:

(23) **The Tanglewood reading of (21) under Kratzer 1991’s approach:**

- a. LF: $\text{only} \left[\text{VP we hire a nanny that } \left[\text{antecedent speaks } \left[\text{Spanish} \right]_{F5} \right] \right]$
[because our son $\left[\text{ellipsis speaks } \left[\text{Spanish} \right]_{F5} \right]]$
- b. $H = \{h_0, h_1, h_2\}; h_0(5) = \text{Spanish}, h_1(5) = \text{French}, h_2(5) = \text{Mandarin}$
- c. $\left[\text{VP} \right]^f = \{ \text{we hire a nanny that speaks } h(5) \text{ because our son speaks } h(5) \mid h \in H \}$
 $= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{we hire a nanny that speaks Spanish because our son speaks Spanish,} \\ \text{we hire a nanny that speaks French because our son speaks French,} \\ \text{we hire a nanny that speaks Mandarin because our son speaks Mandarin} \end{array} \right\}$
- d. Assertion of *only*:

it is not the case that [we hire a nanny that speaks French because our son speaks French],

it is not the case that [we hire a nanny that speaks Mandarin because our son speaks Mandarin]

ellipsis is resolved to a higher VP, $\Delta = \text{“hire a nanny that speaks...”}$, paraphrasable as *Spanish is the only language x such that we hired [a nanny that speaks x] because our son hires [a nanny that speaks x]*. The availability of this reading is predicted under our account, following a derivation parallel to (20) for Kratzer’s *Zoning Board* example. This reading differs from our intended reading here, and is not supported by the context in (21).

In (21), we placed the overt focus inside an island, without a corresponding island in the intended ellipsis site, and as a result the Tanglewood reading became unavailable. However, as we have shown, Kratzer 1991’s proposal of enforcing the identity of focus indices under ellipsis predicts this reading to be available. This is not a coincidence—this mechanism was explicitly designed to generate Tanglewood readings without locality restrictions or island sensitivity. As a result, this mechanism will massively overgenerate such Tanglewood readings, and will not predict any island sensitivity.

Next, we change the position of the island in the sentence: we place the ellipsis site inside a syntactic island, without a corresponding island around the antecedent. The intended Tanglewood reading in this configuration, in (24), is grammatical.

(24) **Ellipsis site in a relative clause 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]_F because I have [_{island} a friend who does Δ].

Intended Tanglewood reading: Spanish is the only language x such that I speak x because I have a friend who speaks x . ($\Delta =$ “speak...”)

The grammaticality of this Tanglewood construction in (24) is predicted by our account. Covert movement of the focus *Spanish* in (24) is not constrained by any syntactic island. This movement introduces a variable and its λ -binder, which in turn binds the matching bound variable in the ellipsis site. This ellipsis site is inside an island, but this is not a problem: variable binding is not sensitive to syntactic islands. This LF for (24) is illustrated in (25).

(25) **LF for (24), involving variable binding into an island:**

only ([Spanish]_F) ($\lambda x . I$ [_{antecedent} speak x]
↑
because I have [_{island} a friend that [_{ellipsis} speak x]])

The asymmetry in the availability of Tanglewood readings between (21) and (24) is exactly what we predict under our account. The overt focus must covertly move—possibly with pied-piping—and is thus sensitive to islands, but the position of the ellipsis site, under our account, simply hosts a bound variable and is thus insensitive to islands. In contrast, Kratzer’s account would predict no contrast between these examples, predicting the availability of a Tanglewood reading in (21), as demonstrated above in (23) above.

The ungrammaticality of the Tanglewood construction in (21) also serves as an argument for the sensitivity of covert (focus) movement to relative clause islands. We can similarly demonstrate sensitivity to adjunct islands. This is illustrated by the contrast in (26). Example (26a) is a

grammatical Tanglewood baseline, which is then modified in (26b) so that the focus is in an adjunct clause. The intended Tanglewood reading is then judged as unavailable in (26b).

(26) **Tanglewood reading blocked by adjunct island:**

Context: Smith, Jones, and Stevens are all very famous scholars, but they cause trouble at conferences. When I heard that Stevens was being considered as a plenary speaker, I voiced concerns, but the organizers invited her anyway. I then decided to stay out of the invitation process. But after I learned that Smith and Jones had also been invited, I warned the organizers about them, too. The conference was a disaster. I wish I'd been more vocal in my opposition.

- a. $\sqrt{\text{TW}}$ I only told them that they shouldn't invite [Stevens]_F before they did Δ .

Intended Tanglewood reading: Stevens is the only person x such that I [told them that they shouldn't invite x [before they invited x]]. (Δ = "invite...")

- b. $\ast\text{TW}$ I only told them that they would regret it [_{island} if they invite [Stevens]_F] before they did Δ .

Intended Tanglewood reading: Stevens is the only person x such that I [told them that they would regret it if they invite x [before they invited x]]. (Δ = "invite...")

Tanglewood readings are similarly unavailable with the overt focus in one conjunct and the ellipsis site in another conjunct (27). This reflects the fact that covert movement is subject to the Coordinate Structure Constraint, as has been independently argued by Bošković and Franks (2000).

(27) **Tanglewood reading blocked by coordination:**

Context: I am under investigation by the Real Estate Board. Sarah and Rebecca claim that I advised them both to bid on many of the same houses, to raise their prices. I reply:

- $\ast\text{TW}$ I only advised Sarah to bid on [the Elm St. house]_F and (told) Rebecca to Δ as well.

Intended Tanglewood reading: The Elm St. house is the only house x such that I advised Sarah to bid on x and (told) Rebecca to bid on x as well. (Δ = "bid on...")

Again, we note that Kratzer's proposal predicts no difficulty in deriving the intended Tanglewood readings in (26b) and (27), in the same way that it would overgenerate a Tanglewood reading without island-sensitivity in (23) above.

The inability to construct a Tanglewood construction with the focused constituent in a conjunction helps us notice one previously undiscussed quirk of Tanglewood constructions: in all Tanglewood examples in Kratzer 1991 and, to our knowledge, in all subsequent literature, the ellipsis site is hosted by an adjunct clause. The adjunction strategy lets us introduce the ellipsis site

while also preserving the ability of the focused constituent to move to the focus-sensitive operator. It is, in fact, somewhat tricky to construct Tanglewood constructions without the use of an adjunct clause, although it is not impossible. Here is one example using a ditransitive verb:

(28) **A Tanglewood construction without an adjunct clause:**

Context: Liz buys lots of books for lots of people. I always have trouble buying books for people that they have not already received from Liz. This year during Book Week, I bought books for all my friends, and it seems like I got lucky.

\sqrt{TW} I only gave [Noah]_F a book that Liz already had Δ .

Intended Tanglewood reading: Noah is the only person x such that I gave x a book that Liz had already given x . (Δ = “given...”)

Finally, we note that in contrast to the relative clause, adjunct, and coordinate structure islands above, covert focus movement can violate *wh*-islands, which have classically been observed to be of weaker or variable strength than many other islands in English (see discussion in e.g. Ross 1967; Pesetsky 1982; Grimshaw 1986). This is demonstrated through the grammaticality of (29).

(29) **Tanglewood reading not blocked by *wh*-island:**

Context: Reporters know a lot about Secretary Clinton’s technology use. They know she uses a Blackberry, and they know she uses teleprompters, but they’ve never cared who else uses such things.

\sqrt{TW} Reporters only asked [_{island} who else uses [a private email server]_F]
after learning that Clinton does.

Intended Tanglewood reading: A private email server is the only technology x such that reporters [asked who else uses x [after learning that Clinton uses x]]. (Δ = “use...”)

Tanglewood constructions can thus be used as a diagnostic for the island-sensitivity of covert (focus) movement. To this end, we also discuss the apparent insensitivity of covert focus movement to the *that*-trace effect in the following section.

We conclude that Tanglewood constructions *are* island-sensitive, contrary to Kratzer’s claim and prediction. The patterns of island-sensitivity observed—where the position of overt focus is island-sensitive but the position of the ellipsis site is not—is precisely what is predicted by our proposal, where Tanglewood readings involve covert movement of the focus which then binds a bound variable in the ellipsis site. Kratzer’s approach of enforcing identity of focus indices under ellipsis systematically overgenerates Tanglewood readings, as it was explicitly designed to not require syntactic movement for their derivation, as do other previous accounts of Tanglewood readings. Kratzer’s approach of enforcing the identity of focus indices under ellipsis must not

be available to the grammar.¹⁰ Other previous approaches to Tanglewood constructions will be discussed in Section 5.

4 Tanglewood readings with overt bound variables

All of the Tanglewood examples we have discussed thus far have involved ellipsis. For Kratzer’s (1991) proposal, the ellipsis is a crucial component of Tanglewood readings: the ellipsis site is interpreted under identity with the antecedent focus, yielding an LF with two foci (30). Matching focus indices between the two positions of focus yield covarying alternatives, as demonstrated above in (7).

(30) **Kratzer’s approach requires ellipsis to generate Tanglewood readings:**

I only went to [Tanglewood]_F because you did Δ .

LF (=9a): only [I [_{antecedent} go to [TW]_{F7}] [because you [_{ellipsis site} go to [TW]_{F7}]]]

In contrast, the proposal here derives Tanglewood readings through general mechanisms of (covert) movement and variable binding, and does not depend on ellipsis. This predicts that Tanglewood readings could also involve *overt* bound variables. Beaver and Clark (2008) has observed that this is indeed the case:

(31) **Tanglewood with an overt bound variable and no ellipsis (Beaver and Clark 2008: 112):**

\sqrt{TW} I only went to [Tanglewood]_F because you went there.

Intended Tanglewood reading: Tanglewood is the only place x such that I went to x because you went to x . (=5)

In the intended reading of (31), *there* is an overt bound variable. The availability of this reading follows immediately from our account. This LF is equivalent to the LF proposed above in (13a) for the original Tanglewood example, modulo the locative bound variable *there* in place of the prepositional phrase bound variable *to x*.

(32) **Covert focus movement LF for (31):**

only ([Tanglewood]_F) (λx . I go to x because you go *there* _{x}) (\approx 13a)

¹⁰A possible stronger conclusion that we might entertain is that Kratzer’s mechanism of computing focus alternatives using focus indices as a whole must not be available to the grammar. Aside from Kratzer’s argument for this mechanism from Tanglewood readings, two additional arguments can be found in the literature. The first comes from Wold (1996) from crossing focus dependencies, but see Krifka 1996, 2006; Tancredi 1997, 2004 for arguments that such data is better captured by assuming covert focus movement. A second argument comes from the interaction of focus with the Copy Theory of movement (Erlewine 2014). It is not clear to us at the moment whether there is a way to recast the arguments presented in Erlewine’s work in terms of covert focus movement.

Such Tanglewood examples with overt bound variables allow us to explicitly observe the effects of the covert pied-piping proposed here. Recall Kratzer’s original *Zoning Board* example, repeated below in (33), which is a grammatical Tanglewood construction despite its focus being within an island. We proposed above that this example is grammatical due to covert movement of the island *the person...*, binding a variable over different persons; see (18) above. This is reflected explicitly by the bound variable in the grammatical ellipsis-less variant (34), which has the truth-conditionally equivalent Tanglewood reading from (33).

(33) **Kratzer’s *Zoning Board* example, repeated from (14):**

Context: “You always contact every responsible person before me.”

$\sqrt{\text{TW}}$ I only contacted [_{island} the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]_F] before you did Δ .

Intended Tanglewood reading: The Zoning Board is the only x such that I contacted the person who chairs x before you contacted the person who chairs x .

(34) **Overt bound variable paraphrase of Kratzer’s *Zoning Board* example (14):**

$\sqrt{\text{TW}}$ I only contacted [_{island} the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]_F]

before you contacted her/him/them.¹¹

The example in (34) corresponds to a parse of (33) where the ellipsis site is resolved as Δ = “contact her/him/them.” In contrast, there is no grammatical equivalent of (33) which explicitly spells out the ellipsis site as Δ = “contact the person who chairs...” This again reflects the fact that the focused constituent *the Zoning Board* cannot covertly move out of the island to a position to bind the bound variable *it*. Instead, the entire island must move.

(35) **Bound variable corresponding to the focus, not the island, is not possible:**

$\ast\text{TW}$ I only contacted [_{island} the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]_F]

before you contacted [_{island} the person who chairs it].

We can also use such evidence from overt bound variables to further investigate potential restrictions on covert focus movement. For example, Beaver and Clark (2008: 110–111 fn 14) (mentioned in footnote 8 above) briefly considers the example in (36) below. In this passage, Beaver and Clark are temporarily considering a covert movement approach to Tanglewood constructions—an approach they ultimately do not commit themselves to; see Section 5. Assuming that covert movement in English is sensitive to the *that*-trace effect (Perlmutter 1968; see Pesetsky to appear

¹¹In the authors’ English, this sounds best with the gender-neutral singular *them*, but we want to make it clear that this pronoun here is animate. Given sufficient contextual expectations of all persons chairing relevant organizations to be female or male, the singular *her* or *him* becomes grammatical.

for a recent review), they suggest that example (36) may necessitate covert pied-piping of a much larger constituent containing the focus *Tanglewood*.

(36) **A Tanglewood structure in danger of triggering a *that*-trace effect (Beaver and Clark 2008: 110):**

√^{TW} I only said that [Tanglewood]_F was nice because you did Δ.

If, however, a constituent properly containing *Tanglewood* is covertly moved, a variant of (36) with an overt bound variable corresponding to different places would be predicted to be ungrammatical, contrary to fact (37). The grammaticality of (37) with the Tanglewood reading identical to that of (36) leads us to conclude that the focused constituent *Tanglewood* is moving out of the embedded clause by itself, then binding the overt bound variable. This in turn is evidence that English covert focus movement is not sensitive to the *that*-trace effect.¹²

(37) **Bound variable shows that covert focus movement does not trigger a *that*-trace effect:**

√^{TW} I only said that [Tanglewood]_F was nice because you said it was nice.

Intended Tanglewood reading (also for 36): Tanglewood is the only place *x* such that I said that *x* was nice because you said that *x* was nice.

To conclude, Tanglewood constructions can involve overt bound variables and do not depend on ellipsis, as predicted by our account. This was previously observed by Beaver and Clark (2008), but without an explicit account which predicts the island sensitivity observed in the previous section. Such data is problematic for Kratzer's account, which relied on ellipsis for the generation of Tanglewood constructions. Kratzer's proposal undergenerates the examples with overt bound variables in this section, while simultaneously overgenerating the island examples in the previous section.

5 Alternative analyses of Tanglewood readings

Several alternative analyses to Kratzer's can be found in the previous literature. In this section we briefly discuss these alternatives and highlight their shortcomings. In particular, two common difficulties faced by these accounts are (a) the asymmetric island sensitivity we presented in Section 3—a fact that has never been previously noted—and (b) the availability of Tanglewood readings with overt bound variables but without ellipsis, discussed in Section 4.

¹²This argument also shows, more generally, that covert focus movement of an embedded finite subject is possible. This runs counter to the behavior of in-situ *wh*-phrases, as documented by Kayne (1979) and also discussed briefly in Pesetsky to appear.

We first discuss analyses in the Structured Meaning (SM) framework, beginning with Krifka 1991. This framework involves “projection” of the focused constituent in a separate “stack” of the computation, without requiring any movement. Krifka 1991 applies this approach to Kratzer’s Tanglewood constructions, assuming a complete copy of the focus within the ellipsis site, together with a mechanism to equate the projected foci. This analysis is then extended in Jäger 1999 using a theory of ellipsis in categorial grammar which posits no covert material in the ellipsis site. Akin to our conclusions for Kratzer’s enforcement of identical focus indices through ellipsis, the evidence presented in Sections 3 and 4 of this paper shows that the original SM mechanism of focus “projection” in Krifka 1991 and Jäger 1999 is far too powerful and cannot be available to the grammar.

Krifka (2006) has in fact independently proposed that SM’s “projection” mechanism should be replaced by syntactic movement, suggesting a playful dual meaning for the abbreviation *SM*. By our reading of these works in the SM framework, however, the account in Krifka 1991 will continue to have problems, in that it was built on joint “projection” of focus from both the position of overt focus as well as from within the ellipsis site. Updating it using the assumptions of Krifka 2006 will predict island-sensitivity for both the position of overt focus and the ellipsis site, contrary to what we have shown here. Jäger 1999 may fare better on this point, but also falls short in being explicitly tied to a particular mechanism for ellipsis. As we have shown in section 4, Tanglewood readings are also possible with overt bound variables and do not require ellipsis.

Charlow 2008 proposes an approach to VP-ellipsis in categorial grammar similar to that in Jäger 1999 and explicitly relates his account to readings of pronominal anaphora. This work provides clear and compelling evidence that Tanglewood readings involve variable-binding, which is a component of our analysis as well. It is unclear to us, however, how Charlow’s categorial grammar approach would generalize to cases where the focused constituent or ellipsis site/bound pronoun is embedded under additional structure, including islands.

Another proposal is the so-called structure-sharing account of Sauerland 2007a,b. Sauerland briefly relates Tanglewood constructions to more general effects of dependence on contrastive foci that can occur specifically in ellipsis, independently observed in Hardt 1999 and Schwarz 2000. Based on these other, non-Tanglewood examples, Sauerland claims explicitly that this structure-sharing technology is not subject to syntactic locality conditions. Furthermore, his structure-sharing account would also fail to extend to Tanglewood readings with overt bound variables.

Finally, Beaver and Clark 2008 discusses Tanglewood constructions at some length and discusses two possible approaches, which seem to each capture some but not all the properties of Tanglewood constructions. The first is a movement account which differs significantly from ours in involving VP movement as the mechanism for VP-ellipsis and using this movement to derive the Tanglewood

effect (pp. 109–111). This approach is challenged by the availability of Tanglewood readings which involve overt bound variables, without ellipsis, which they too observe (p. 112). They then present a proof-of-concept dynamic semantic approach to Alternative Semantics (pp. 111–115), with the aim of accounting for both overt pronouns bound by focused constituents and Kratzer’s Tanglewood examples. However, we believe that this account predicts no sensitivity to syntactic islands, and hence cannot be extended to model the data we have presented in section 3. Ultimately, Beaver and Clark do not commit themselves to either approach.

6 Covert focus movement is long-distance, not QR

In this section we consider and argue against one final possible alternative analysis for the data we have presented here. This is the possibility that Tanglewood readings indeed involve covert movement and variable binding, but that this movement is not covert focus movement but rather reflects a general purpose operation such as QR. We will show that the covert movement involved in Tanglewood constructions can be long-distance, across finite clause boundaries, and in particular that this movement can be longer than that of quantifiers undergoing QR.

We first consider example (38), which is a grammatical Tanglewood construction. In the intended reading here, the *because*-clause adjoins to and modifies *think*. Therefore, for the binder of the moved focus *anaphora* to bind the bound variable in the ellipsis site, *anaphora* must necessarily move outside of the embedded finite clause. (39) below gives the LF that we would propose for this sentence.

(38) **Tanglewood construction requiring long-distance covert movement:**

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 anaphora. Some people think he is just extrapolating from what his advisor works on. But actually...

\sqrt{TW} He only thinks $[_{CP}$ that everyone works on $[anaphora]_F$] because his advisor does Δ .

Intended Tanglewood reading: Anaphora is the only topic x such that John [thinks that everyone works on x [because his advisor works on x]]. $\Delta =$ “work on...”

(39) LF: $only([anaphora]_F) \left(\lambda x . he\ think\ [_{CP}\ that\ everyone\ [antecedent\ work\ on\ x]] \right)$
because his advisor $[ellipsis\ work\ on\ x]$

Next let us compare this with the behavior of variable binding by a QR-ed quantifier. Example (40) is a version of (38) with the focus replaced by the quantifier *at least one topic* and without the associating *only*. This sentence does not have the intended Tanglewood-esque reading, which would involve binding into the ellipsis site by a long-distance QRing *at least one topic*. The baseline

in (41) shows that variable binding into a *because*-clause by an object quantifier *at least one topic* is possible, if the *because*-clause is attached to the local clause.

(40) **QR does not move as high as the focus in (38):**

*^{TW} He thinks [that everyone works on at least one topic] because his advisor does Δ .

Intended Tanglewood-like reading: There is at least one topic x such that he [thinks everyone works on x [because his advisor works on x]]. $\Delta =$ “work on...”

(41) **Baseline variable binding by *at least one topic*:**

^{TW} He works on at least one topic because his advisor does Δ .

Intended Tanglewood-like reading: There is at least one topic x such that he [works on x [because his advisor works on x]]. $\Delta =$ “work on...”

The contrast between example (40), containing a quantifier, and example (38), with focus associating with *only*, shows that the covert movement in Tanglewood constructions cannot simply be reduced to QR’s independent ability to covertly move arguments.¹³ Covert focus movement is long-distance, crossing finite clause boundaries, in environments where quantifiers cannot. Hence, we argue here for the existence of covert focus movement, which is distinct from QR and must be available to the grammar alongside QR. This focus movement is necessitated in our analysis for simple reasons of semantic composition: the two-place formulation of *only* in (11) requires a first argument. This argument is supplied to the operator through covert movement of the overt focus—or a constituent properly containing it—as detailed in our proposal above.

7 Conclusion

In this paper we argued for covert focus movement in English focus association. Our evidence comes from *Tanglewood* configurations of the form in Kratzer 1991. We showed that Tanglewood configurations are sensitive to syntactic islands, contrary to Kratzer’s claims and predictions. In particular, we showed an asymmetric pattern of island sensitivity: the position of overt focus is island-sensitive but the position of the ellipsis site is not.

We propose that Tanglewood constructions are derived through covert movement of the focused constituent to the focus-sensitive operator, with binding of a bound variable in the ellipsis site. This movement may involve covert pied-piping of a larger constituent properly containing the focus (Drubig 1994; Krifka 1996, 2006; Tancredi 1997, 2004; Wagner 2006; Erlewine and Kotek

¹³We recognize that there is some cross-linguistic variability in the locality of QR (see e.g. Wurmbrand 2015). What is important here is that there is a contrast here between these two examples in the availability of the intended reading.

2014). This availability of covert pied-piping explains examples such as Kratzer's which are apparently island-insensitive: in such examples, the entire island must undergo covert movement to the operator, and hence there is no island violation. It also explains the asymmetric pattern of island sensitivity we describe above, since the ellipsis site contains a base-generated bound variable that does not undergo any movement and hence is not island-sensitive.

This proposal severs the link between Tanglewood readings and ellipsis. Indeed, we show that parallel Tanglewood readings are available in sentences with overt bound variables, which do not involve ellipsis. We additionally show that covert focus movement is long-distance and may cross finite clause boundaries, unlike QR in the same environment. The Kratzer 1991 focus index approach to the computation of focus alternatives—together with a view of ellipsis which enforces identity of focus indices—will greatly overgenerate Tanglewood constructions. We suggest that the lesson to draw here is that *ellipsis cannot enforce identity of focus indices*. Alternative analyses to Tanglewood constructions were also shown to fail to capture the facts presented in this paper.

References

- Beaver, David Ian, and Brady Clark. 2008. *Sense and sensitivity: How focus determines meaning*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Samuel Brown. 1997. Interarboreal operations: Head movement and the extension requirement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:345–356.
- Bošković, Željko, and Steven Franks. 2000. Across-the-board movement and LF. *Syntax* 3:107–128.
- Charlow, Simon. 2008. Free and bound pro-verbs: A unified treatment of anaphora. In *Proceedings of SALT XVIII*, 198–211.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Deep structure, surface structure and semantic interpretation. In *Studies in general and oriental linguistics*, ed. Roman Jakobson and S. Kawamoto, 62–119. TEC Corporation for Language Research. Reprinted in *Semantics: An interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology* 1971, pages 183–216.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The view from Building 20*, ed. Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 1–52. MIT Press.
- Drubig, Hans Bernhard. 1994. Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus. *Arbeitspapiere des Sonderforschungsbereichs 340: Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen der Computerlinguistik* 51.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2014. Movement out of focus. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka, and Hadas Kotek. 2014. Intervention in focus pied-piping. In

- Proceedings of NELS 43*, ed. Hsin-Lun Huang, Ethan Poole, and Amanda Rysling, volume 1, 117–130.
- Fiengo, Robert. 1977. On trace theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:35–62.
- von Stechow, Kai. 1997. Bare plurals, bare conditionals, and *only*. *Journal of Semantics* 14.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1986. Subjacency and the S/S' parameter. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:364–369.
- Hamblin, Charles. 1973. Questions in Montague English. *Foundations of Language* 10:41–53.
- Hardt, Daniel. 1999. Dynamic interpretation of verb phrase ellipsis'. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22:185–219.
- Horn, Laurence Robert. 1969. A presuppositional analysis of *only* and *even*. In *Papers from the Fifth Regional Meeting*, ed. Robert I. Binnick, Alice Davison, Georgia M. Green, and J.L. Morgan, 98–107. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in generative grammar*. MIT Press.
- Jäger, Gerhard. 1999. Focus without variables: A multi-modal analysis. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 17*, ed. K. N. Shahin, S. Blake, and E. Kim. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Kayne, Richard. 1979. Two notes on the NIC. In *Theory of markedness in generative grammar*, ed. Adriana Belletti, Luciana Brandi, and Luigi Rizzi, 317–346.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. The representation of focus. In *Semantik: Ein internationales handbuch der zeitgenössischen forschung*, ed. Arnim von Stechow and Dieter Wunderlich, 825–834. Walter de Gruyter.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1991. A compositional semantics for multiple focus constructions. In *Proceedings of SALT 1*, 127–158.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1996. Frameworks for the representation of focus. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Formal Grammar at the 9th European Summer School in Logic, Language, and Information*.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2006. Association with focus phrases. In *The architecture of focus*, ed. Valéria Molnár and Susanne Winkler, 105–136. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2001. Sideward movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:303–344.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. MIT Press.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1968. Deep and surface constraints on syntax. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and categories. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Pesetsky, David. 2007. Undermerge, overmerge, and the secret genitive inside every Russian noun. URL http://web.mit.edu/linguistics/people/faculty/pesetsky/Pesetsky_FASL_handout.pdf, presented at Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL) 16.

- Pesetsky, David. 2013. *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David. to appear. Complementizer-trace effects. In *Companion to syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Wiley-Blackwell, second edition.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. Association with focus. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. Constraints on variables in syntax. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2007a. Copying vs. structure sharing: a semantic argument. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7:27–51.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2007b. Focus dependency as structure sharing. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, 540–554.
- Schwarz, Bernhard. 2000. Topics in ellipsis. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Tancredi, Christopher. 1997. Focus, focus types, and associative operators. Manuscript.
- Tancredi, Christopher. 2004. Associative operators. *Gengo Kenkyu* 125:31–82.
- Velleman, Dan Bridges, David Ian Beaver, Emilie Destruel, Dylan Bumford, Edgar Onea, and Liz Coppock. 2012. It-clefts are IT (inquiry terminating) constructions. In *Proceedings of SALT 22*, 441–460.
- Wagner, Michael. 2006. Association by movement: evidence from NPI-licensing. *Natural Language Semantics* 14:297–324.
- Wold, Dag. 1996. Long distance selective binding: the case of focus. In *Proceedings of SALT 6*, ed. Teresa Galloway and Justin Spence, 311–328.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2015. The cost of raising quantifiers. Manuscript, University of Connecticut.
- Yuan, Michelle. 2016. Wh-movement to complement position in Kikuyu (and cross-linguistically). URL <http://web.mit.edu/yuanm/www/yuansyntaxsq2016.pdf>, unpublished handout.