

## Tanglewood (Kratzer 1991)

- (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.”  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  I only went to [Tanglewood]<sub>F</sub> because you did  $\Delta$ .  
Paraphrase: Tanglewood is the only place  $x$  such that I went to  $x$  because you went to  $x$ .

$\sqrt{TW}$  = intended reading available, where computed alternatives *covary* in the position of pronounced focus and in the ellipsis site.

This is unpredicted by the standard Roothian theory:

$$\llbracket \text{I went to [TW]}_F \text{ because you did [go to [TW]}_F \rrbracket^f$$

$$= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{I went to BI b/c you went to BI, I went to ELL b/c you went to BI,} \\ \text{I went to TW b/c you went to BI, I went to BI b/c you went to ELL,} \\ \text{I went to ELL b/c you went to ELL, I went to TW b/c you went to ELL,} \\ \text{I went to BI b/c you went to TW, I went to ELL b/c you went to TW,} \\ \text{I went to TW b/c you went to TW} \end{array} \right\}$$

## Kratzer’s solution: focus indices

Focused constituents bear *focus indices*, not simple F-marks.  
 Focused positions are interpreted as *distinguished variables*.

Alternatives then covary in positions with the same indices.  
 Ellipsis ensures equivalence of focus indices.

$$\llbracket \text{I went to [TW]}_{F_2} \text{ because you did [go to [TW]}_{F_2} \rrbracket^f$$

$$= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{I went to Block Island because you went to Block Island,} \\ \text{I went to Elk Lake Lodge because you went to Elk Lake Lodge,} \\ \text{I went to Tanglewood because you went to Tanglewood} \end{array} \right\}$$

Focus indices have also been adopted for overlapping focus dependencies (Wold, 1996) and for the movement (copying) of focused material (Erlewine, 2014).

**References** Drubig 1994. “Island constraints and the syntactic nature of focus and association with focus” • Erlewine 2014. *Movement out of focus*. MIT dissertation • 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 • Wold 1996. “Long-distance selective binding: the case of focus.” SALT 6.

## Proposal

**Only triggers covert movement of its focus.** In Tanglewood readings, the focus then binds a **bound variable** in the ellipsis site.

- (2)  $\underline{LF}$ : only( $[[TW]_F]$ )( $\lambda x$ . I went to  $x$  because you did [go there] <sub>$x$</sub> )

**This covert focus movement can pied-pipe material**  
 (Drubig, 1994; Krifka, 2006; Wagner, 2006; Erlewine & Kotek, 2014).

## TW readings with overt bound variables

- (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  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  I only talked to [John]<sub>F</sub> before you talked to him. (true)

## New evidence from island sensitivity

### $\sqrt{TW}$ with *balanced islands*

Kratzer briefly considers an analysis as in (2), but dismisses it as focus association for TW readings is not island-sensitive:

- (3) Context: You always contact every responsible person before me.  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  I only contacted [<sub>island</sub> the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]<sub>F</sub>] before you did  $\Delta$ . (Kratzer 1991)

But here the island is *balanced* in the antecedent and intended ellipsis site, allowing for appropriate pied-piping and binding:

- (4)  $\underline{LF}$ : only( $[[_{island}$  the person who chairs [the Zoning Board]<sub>F</sub>]) ( $\lambda x$ . I contacted  $x$  before you did [contact them] <sub>$x$  (person)])</sub>

**If Kratzer’s focus index derivation as in (3) is available, we cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (5). Therefore focus indices cannot be available in the grammar.**

### $\sqrt{TW}$ with *elided focus in an island*

- (6) 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 [<sub>island</sub> a friend who does  $\Delta$ ]. (Intended  $\Delta$  = “speak it<sub>(language)</sub>”)

Because variable binding is not island-sensitive, embedding the ellipsis site into an island does not block the TW reading.

- (7)  $\underline{LF}$ : only( $[[\text{Spanish}]_F]$ )( $\lambda x$ . I speak  $x$  because I have [<sub>island</sub> a friend that does [speak it] <sub>$x$  (language)])</sub>

### \* TW with *antecedent focus in an island*

- (5) Context: Our son speaks Spanish, French, and Mandarin. We once hired a nanny that happened to speak French, but that wasn’t why we hired her. Then we hired a nanny that spoke Mandarin, but that too was a coincidence...  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  We only hired [<sub>island</sub> a nanny that speaks [Spanish]<sub>F</sub>] because our son does  $\Delta$ . (Intended  $\Delta$  = “speak it<sub>(language)</sub>”)

The unavailability of the Tanglewood reading is explained by our account. Covert focus movement can move the island but not *Spanish* alone. But the bound variable in the ellipsis site must be bound by different languages, not different nannies.

### \* TW with the antecedent and ellipsis in conjunctions

It is not accidental that the famous *Tanglewood* example (1) uses adjunction. Conjunction blocks the Tanglewood interpretation:

- (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:  
 $\sqrt{TW}$  I only advised John to bid on [the Elm St. house]<sub>F</sub> and (told) Mary to  $\Delta$  as well. (Intended  $\Delta$  = “bid on it<sub>(house)</sub>”)

Covert movement of the pronounced focus in (8) to *only* would violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint.