

## ***Only, Finally***

Jonathan Brennan, New York University

This paper sets out to describe the syntactic properties of the focus particle *only* when the particle follows its focused associate (1), a construction that has not been explicitly addressed in the literature. Adopting the framework presented in Kayne (1998), I suggest that the syntactic and semantic properties of final *only* can be captured by appealing to a more finely articulated DP.

Notably, when *only* precedes its focused associate it can take scope over a variety of constituents including DPs, PPs, and VPs. When appearing finally, however, it associates only with a preceding DP, and not larger constituents (2-4). As a minimal contrast, the focus particle *too* obligatorily follows its associate and allows a much wider range of focus possibilities (5). Final and non-final *only* also differ with respect to interpretive possibilities. Bayer (1996) notes that *only* can induce both a quantitative and a scalar interpretation of its focus associate (6). Interestingly, the scalar reading disappears when *only* appears finally; whereas (7a) is ambiguous between these two readings, (7b) only permits a quantitative reading. Lastly, particle verbs evidence another asymmetry as the possibility of having a verbal particle follow the DP object disappears with final *only* (8).

Kayne (1998) offers an analysis of focus particles that captures their scope properties strictly in terms of overt syntactic movement. As a component of this analysis, he suggests a derivation for sentences in which *only* precedes its focused associate, as in (9), according to the steps illustrated in (10). *Only* is a VP-external head that attracts the focused element into its specifier, but this relationship is masked by subsequent movement. Kayne notes that particles like *too* which follow the constituent under focus can be easily accounted for if *too* does not raise past its specifier but instead remains *in situ*. Extending such an analysis to *only*, however, predicts that the two focus particles should have identical scope properties when appearing finally, but the contrast in (5) shows this to be false.

I account for these facts by expanding on a proposal that in certain circumstances *only* is base generated as a constituent with the DP, observing that in these instances a specifier position is available to which DP-internal material can raise. Noting a contrast between quantified and non-quantified DPs, shown in (11), Kayne modifies the derivation in (10) for quantified DPs such that *only* is base generated as a constituent with the DP to account for the difference, that is, *only Bill* in (11a) does not form a constituent, while *only one linguist* in (11b) does. The quantified DP must still raise to the specifier of a VP-external OnlyP (headed by an unpronounced counterpart of *only*) to be within the scope of the focus particle. Along these lines, I argue that this analysis for quantified DPs extends to all DPs containing common nouns, and that when *only* appears as a constituent with the DP it is the head of a DP-internal OnlyP (part of an articulated DP; e.g. Aboh 2004). Final *only* is possible when the complement of the DP-internal *only* optionally raises to its specifier (12). Crucially, there is no higher functional projection within the DP to which *only* may raise (that is, there is no WP), so it must remain *in situ*.

The proposal accounts for the scope facts in (2-4) straightforwardly as the option for a focused element to precede *only* is limited to DP-internal material; the W head always forces a VP-external *only* to raise past its specifier, so the configuration where the focused element precedes the particle only obtains in the DP. The interpretive differences are also explained by noting Barbiers' (1995) observation that scalar interpretation requires *only* to immediately c-command its focused associate. Such a configuration holds when the DP material remains *in situ* but is interrupted when the material is in the specifier of *only* and no longer c-commanded by that head. Lastly, the interaction with particle verbs is addressed by appealing to prosodic restrictions on particle placement (cf. Svenonius, 1996) that appear to extend beyond the domain of *only*, noting prosodically similar but syntactically quite different examples such as (13) which are equally as marginal as (8).

