A compositional morphosemantic analysis of exclusivity in Ch'ol

We argue that novel empirical generalizations on exclusive operators in Ch'ol (Mayan) provide strong evidence for a morphological decompositionality of exclusivity into a core semantic entry and focus sensitivity. There is a robust literature on exclusivity and the distributions of scalar particles in various languages (Beaver & Clark 2003, 2008; Orenstein & Greenberg 2010; Coppock & Beaver 2011a,b). Coppock & Beaver (2011a) argue that *mere* operates in a different domain (properties) than *only* (propositions). Recent work on focus constructions in Mayan languages include Yasavul (2013) for K'iche' and AnderBois (2012) for Yucatec Maya. However, little work has been done on the variation among exclusives in morphologically rich languages like Ch'ol. Original data from fieldwork indicate that exclusivity can occur independently of focus marking, and when divorced from focus, the exclusive morpheme has a wider distribution and range of meanings.

The morphemes of interest are a focus particle $ji\tilde{n}$, an exclusive clitic =jach, and a bimorphemic exclusive $ji\tilde{n}=jach$. Focus structures can be marked with the focus particle $ji\tilde{n}$ (1); exclusivity is marked with either the second position clitic =jach (glossed as EXCL (2)), or the bimorphemic $ji\tilde{n}=jach$, analyzed as FOC=EXCL (3).

(1) **Jiñ** x-ch'ok tsa' jul-i- \emptyset . **FOC** NC-girl PRF arrive-IV-B3 '[FOC The girl] arrived.'

(2) X-ch'ok=jach tsa' jul-i-Ø. (3)
NC-girl-CL=EXCL PRF arrive-IV-B3
'Just a girl arrived.'

Jiñ=jach x-ch'ok tsa' jul-i-Ø. FOC=EXCL NC-girl PRF arrive-IV-B3 'Only the girl arrived.'

Vázquez Álvarez (2011) reports that the particle $ji\tilde{n}$ is restricted to elements containing definiteness, resulting in restriction to focused nominals. However, =jach shows no such distributional restriction. =Jach is licensed as an exclusive over numerals (4a) and PPs (4b), while $ji\tilde{n}$ is not (5). The bimorphemic $ji\tilde{n}=jach$ 'only', though synonymous with =jach, is restricted in the same way as $ji\tilde{n}$, i.e., not licensed over numerals (6a) or PPs (6b).

- (4) a. Juñ-k'ej=jach k-om-Ø waj. one-CL=EXCL A1-want-B3 tortilla. 'I want just one tortilla.'
 - b. Tyi Palenque=jach tsa' k'oty-i-Ø.

 PREP Palenque=EXCL PRF arrive-IV-B3

 'He arrived just to Palenque.'
- (6) a. * Jiñ=jach juñ-k'ej k-om-Ø waj.

 FOC=EXCL one-CL A1-want-B3 tortilla
 Intended: 'I want only one tortilla.'

) a. * **Jiñ** juñ-k'ej k-om-Ø waj. **FOC** one-CL A1-want-B3 tortilla.

Intended: 'I want [FOC one] tortilla.'

- b. * Jiñ tyi Palenque tsa' k'oty-i-Ø.

 FOC PREP Palenque PRF arrive-IV-B3

 Intended: 'He arrived [FOC to Palenque].'
- b. * Jiñ=jach tyi Palenque tsa' k'oty-i-Ø.

 FOC=EXCL PREP Palenque PRF arrive-IV-B3
 Intended: 'He arrived only to Palenque.'

This pattern indicates that for $ji\tilde{n}=jach$, the semantic content of exclusivity is provided by the morpheme =jach, but selectional requirements come from $ji\tilde{n}$. We argue that this parallels the distribution of English *only* and *just*, where *only* is more restricted and always requires focus, while *just* exhibits a wider range of uses, some not tied to focus. Wiegand (2017) captures this in a framework analyzing *only* as morphologically more complex than *just* as in (7), accounting for the wider range of uses of *just*. We adopt and modify this account for the Ch'ol data.

 $(7) \quad \text{a.} \quad \llbracket \texttt{EXCL} \rrbracket = \lambda C. \lambda p. \lambda w. \forall q [(q \in C \land w \in q) \to p \leq q]$

(semantics for *just/=jach*)

- b. $\llbracket FOC \rrbracket = \lambda F. \lambda K. \lambda q \llbracket F(K)(q) \wedge \partial (K \subseteq \llbracket q \rrbracket^F) \rrbracket$
- (focus restriction on *only*/(partial) semantics for *jiñ*)
- c. $[EXCL+FOC] = \lambda C.\lambda p.\lambda w. \forall q[(q \in C \land w \in q) \rightarrow p \leq q] \land \partial(C \subseteq [p]^F)]$ (semantics for *only/jiñ=jach*) (∂ used for selectional requirement/presupposition; \leq a variable over orderings on C)

For Ch'ol, we need more than the restriction to subset of focus alternatives, as $ji\tilde{n}=jach$ is restricted by definiteness. However, since the focus particle $ji\tilde{n}$ is also restricted, this restriction must be part of the semantics $ji\tilde{n}$, rather than exclusivity. Further evidence for analyzing (7a) as the semantics of just and =jach comes from the additional parallels between these operators. In some contexts both can serve as an intensifier (8/9a), and also serve some broader functions (8/9b-c).

- (8) a. *Uts'aty=jach aw-otyoty*. nice=EXCL A2-house 'Your house is so nice.'
- b. Che'=jach tsa' jul-i-Ø.

 PART=EXCL PRF arrive-IV-B3

 'Just like that he arrived.'
- c. alas-ty'añ=jach game-word=EXCL 'just kidding'

- (9) a. Your house is just gorgeous!
- b. The man just appeared!
- c. I was just wondering...

This is strong evidence that exclusives when dissociated from focus can result in a variety of discourse effects beyond basic exclusivity, including intensification and mitigation of social implications. Overall, these original data constitute compelling crosslinguistic support for decomposing the meaning attributed to exclusive operators like *only* into smaller components, each of which contribute a portion of exclusive semantics in general.