

# A parametric view on exclusive focus particles Ka-Fai Yip

Yale

Yale University

☑ kafai.yip@yale.edu

## D- vs. A-quantification

- Two basic apparatuses of natural language meaning
- □ #1 **D-quantification** (e.g., every, some, ...) vs. Adfocal only
- □ #2 **A-quantification** (e.g., always, sometimes, ...) vs. Adverbial only
- a. John gave only adfoc MARY a book.
  - b. John only<sub>adv</sub> gave MARY a book.
- Recent attempts to reduce D- to A-quantification
  - □ Universal, existential, negation, ... (Kratzer 2005; Szabolcsi 2017, 2024) □ Prominent view on exclusives: the **Operator-Particle approach**

 $|\mathbf{OP_{EXCL}}|[VP ... Prt-XP_F]$ A-quantifier/operator "concord" particles

(Lee 2005; Quek & Hirsch 2017; Bassi et al. 2022; Sun 2021; Branan & Erlewine 2023, Aremu 2024; *i.a.*)

- Claim: this view is too strong and cannot be universal.
- Both D- and A- quantification strategies are available for exclusives, but the choice is *parameterized* in languages
- → Systematic variations in exclusive doubling
- → Parallels the typology of negative concord (Biberauer & Zeijlstra 2012)

### Exclusive doubling

- Doubling of adverbial & adfocal particles with the same focus association in Vietnamese [VN] & Yoruba [YO] (VN: Hole 2013, 2017, Erlewine 2017, Sun 2021, Yip 2023; YO: Yip & Adedeji 2024) □ VN Data: fieldwork in Vietnam (HN, HCM, DL) with 33 spkrs; YO: Y&A 2024
- (2) Nam chỉ [<sub>VP</sub> tặng hoa cho [**mỗi** Lan<sub>F</sub>]]. Nam only give flower to only Lan 'Nam only gave flowers to Lan.'
- (3) Bộdé kàn [VP fún [Adé<sub>F</sub> nìkan] ní ìwé]. Bode only give Ade only sec book 'Bode only gave *Ade* the book.'
- Apparent syntax-semantic mismatch
  - **cannot** both be carrying exclusive semantics
  - $\rightarrow$  Which one carries the exclusive semantics?
- Spoiler: Vietnamese adverbial chi = A-quantifier Yoruba adfocal nikan = D-quantifier

## A four-way typology

- Exclusives encoded on: (i) Adv; (ii) Adfoc; (iii) both; (iv) neither (but on null OP)
- □ Borne out! → Also displays parallelism with negative concord (Biberauer & Zeijlstra 2012)

### Typology of exclusive doubling

Typology of negative concord

Non-strict NC, only negative markers are negative

Type I: doubling, adverbial particle=OP<sub>EXCL</sub> Type II: doubling, adfocal particle= $Qu_{EXCL}$  $Prt \left[ v_P \dots \middle| \mathbf{Qu_{EXCL}} \middle| -XP_F \right]$ Type III:  $\overline{doubling}$ ,  $OP_{EXCL} = null$  $|\mathbf{OP_{EXCL}} - \varnothing| \dots \text{Prt} [_{VP} \dots \text{Prt-XP}_{F}]$ Type IV: no doubling, with  $OP_{EXCL}$  &  $Qu_{EXCL}$ 

 $\left| \begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{OP_{EXCL}} \end{array} \right| \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{VP} & \dots & \mathbf{Qu_{EXCL}} \end{array} \right| - \mathbf{XP_F} \right]$ 

(Afrikaans A)  $\log_{[u_{\text{NEG}}]} [v_{\text{P}} \dots n_{[i_{\text{NEG}}]} - NP]$ Strict NC, Neg markers & N-words are non-negative

 $\mathbf{OP}_{\neg[i_{NEG}]}$ - $\varnothing$  ...  $\mathbf{Neg}_{[u_{NEG}]}$  [VP ...  $n_{[u_{NEG}]}$ -NP]

Only N-words are negative

(Czech, Serbo-Croatian, Afrikaans B) DN languages: Neg markers & N-words are negative

(Spanish, Italian, ...)

 $|\operatorname{Neg}_{[i_{\operatorname{NEG}}]}|[v_{\operatorname{P}}...|n_{[i_{\operatorname{NEG}}]}]-NP]$ (Dutch, Swedish, ...) □ Kasem: single 'only' reading with 2 Adfoc; ellipsis bleeds wide scope → Type III (contra. Aremu 2024)

# Differential semantic import: parametric variations

#### Backward association

- Cross-linguistically robust pattern: adverbial *only* must **c-command its focus associate and cannot associate** "backward" with a moved focus (Jackendoff 1972; Tancredi 1990's Principle of Lexical Association; Erlewine 2014, i.a.) Compare: Mary only saw *this*  $dog_F$  vs. #*This*  $dog_F$ , Mary only saw. (only verbal focus possible, different truth conditions)
- □ *Vietnamese*: **No** backward association for adverbial *chi*. □ *Yoruba*: **Possible** for preverbal *kàn*!
- (4)a. Hôm qua Nam chỉ ăn mỗi [thịt bò]<sub>F</sub>. yesterday Nam only eat only beef. 'Nam only ate BEEF yesterday.'
  - b. \*Hôm qua (mỗi) [thịt bò]<sub>F</sub> Nam (mới) chỉ ăn \_\_. yesterday only beef Nam just only eat Int.:'Nam only ate beef yesterday.'
- (5)a. Akín kàn se German<sub>F</sub>. Akin only do German 'Akin only took German.'
  - b. [German]<sub>F</sub> (nikan) ni Akín kàn se \_\_. German only foc Akin only do 'It is only German that Akin took.'

### 2 Multiple association

- Multiple foci: an exclusive operator is expected to establish **independent focus association**
- □ *Vietnamese*: **Possible** for adverbial *chi*.
- ☐ *Yoruba*: Preverbal *kàn*'s association depends on *nìkan*!  $(7) [Adé]_{F1}$  nìkan ni ó {i. kàn} máa-ń ka
- (6) Mỗi [Minh]<sub>F</sub> (là) Nam chỉ tặng [hoa hồng]<sub>F</sub> (thôi). only Minh COP Nam only give rose sep.only 'M. is the only one who N. only gave *rose* to.' (N. gave rose and lavender to other people.)
- Ade only foc 3sg only hab-progread [àwọn ìwé Gèésì] $_{F2}$  {ii. nìkan}. PL book English
- i. 'A. is the only person who reads En. books.' ii. 'Only A. only reads En. books.'

- **3** Scopal interaction with negation
- □ *Vietnamese*: Scope **determined by** adverbial *chi*.
- (8) a. Nam chỉ không học mỗi [tiếng Pháp]<sub>F</sub>. Nam only not learn only French 'Nam only does not learn French.' (only>¬)
  - b. Nam không chỉ ăn **mỗi** [tiếng Pháp]<sub>F</sub>. Nam not only learn only French 'Nam does not only learn French.' (¬>only)
- □ The scope of 'only' with other operators should be determined by the position of the "carrier" of exclusive semantics
  - ☐ *Yoruba*: Preverbal *kàn*'s position to Neg does **not** affect scope! (9) a. kì-í șe German<sub>F</sub> (nìkan) ni Adé kàn șe \_\_. NEG do German only Foc Ade only do 'It is not only German that A. takes.'  $(\neg > \text{only})$ 
    - b. German<sub>F</sub> (nìkan) ni Adé kò kàn şe \_\_. German only Foc Ade NEG only do 'It is only German that A. didn't take.' (only $>\neg$ )

### Wide scope under ellipsis

□ Exclusive operators cannot associate into ellipsis site; whereas Quantifier Raising (QR) survives ellipsis (Han & Romero 2004; Beaver and Clark 2008; Bassi et al. 2022) (Sag 1976; Fox 2000; Bassi et al. 2022)

■ Mandarin: doubling disallowed → Type IV (contra. Sun 2021)

- □ *Vietnamese*: Ellipsis **bleeds** wide scope adfocal *môi*.
- (10) Nam có thể mang **môi** [rượu vang]<sub>F</sub>. Nam may bring only wine
  - i. 'It's allowed that Nam only brings wine.' (may>only) ii. 'Nam may only bring wine.' (only>may)
  - ... Lan cũng có thể.

Lan also may ONLY: '... It is also allowed that Lan only brings (may>only,\*only>may) [VN] wine.

- Yoruba: Wide scope adfocal nikan survives ellipsis!
- (11) Olùkó náà gba John láàyè [láti se German<sub>F</sub> nikan].
  - teacher the permit John give.chance to do German only i. 'The teacher allows John to only take German.' (permit>only)
  - ii. 'The teacher only allows John to take German.' (only>permit)
  - ... Olùkó gba Mary náà láàyè.

#### teacher permit Mary as.well give.chance

- i. 'The teacher also allows M. to only take Ger.'
- ii. 'The teacher also only allows M. to take Ger.'

Selected references ● Bassi, Hirsch & Trinh. 2022. Pre-DP only is a propositional operator at LF: a new argument from ellipsis. SALT 32, 814–830. ● Beaver & Clark. 2008. Sense and Sensitivity: How Focus Determines Meaning. ● Branan & Erlewine. 2023. Anti-pied-piping. Language 99 (3): 603-653. ● Biberauer & Zeijlstra. 2012. Negative Concord in Afrikaans: filling a typological gap. JoS 29 (3): 345-371. ● Erlewine. 2014. Movement out of focus. PhD diss., MIT. ● Erlewine. 2014. Movement out of focus. 2014. Movement out of focus. 2014. Movement out of fo Hirsch. 2017. Severing focus form and meaning in Standard and Colloquial Singapore English." NELS 47, 15-24. ● Yip & Adedeji. 2024. A quantifier-particle approach to exclusive focus particles in Yorùbá. Ms., Yale University. https://lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/008470