Abstract

Based on new fieldwork data, this paper gives the first overview and analysis of focus sensitive operators in Nłeʔkepmxcin. Free foci in discourse exchanges are obligatorily marked using a predicative strategy, resulting in a clefting strategy for DPs. Exclusive and additive readings are expressed using the same predicative strategy, and we show that exclusive ƛ̓uʔ ‘only’ and additive ʔełƛ̓uʔ ‘also, even’ are adverbial: as 2nd position clitics, they occupy a high functional projection in the left periphery. There is no specific marker of scalarity like English even. Finally, although exclusive ƛ̓uʔ is strictly f-sensitive in the sense of Beaver and Clark (2008), additive ʔełƛ̓uʔ has the more flexible syntax and association behaviour of Q-adverbials like always.

1 Introduction

This article presents the first overview and the first syntactic and semantic analysis of focus-sensitive operators in Nłeʔkepmxcin (Thompson River Salish), a severely endangered Salishan language of southwestern Canada. We concentrate on the expression of exclusive (only) and additive (also, too) readings, and show that there is no specific marker of scalarity like English even.

After briefly outlining some general properties of Nłeʔkepmxcin (§2), we review data showing that free foci are obligatorily marked using a predicative strategy, which results in a clefting strategy in case of DP-foci (§3). In section 4, we show that the formal expression of exclusive and additive readings is based on the same predicative strategy. Section 5 presents the syntactic analysis, according to which focus-sensitive operators ƛ̓uʔ ‘only’ and ʔełƛ̓uʔ ‘also’ are adverbial in nature: as 2nd position clitics (2CL), they occupy a high functional projection in the left periphery of the clause.

Despite superficial similarities, the syntactic and (discourse-)semantic behaviour of exclusive and the additive particle differs in a number of ways (§6): unlike exclusive ƛ̓uʔ ‘only,’ which is strictly f-sensitive in the sense of Beaver and Clark (2003, 2008), the additive particle ʔełƛ̓uʔ shows the more flexible association behaviour of Q-adverbials like always.
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always. We conclude that exclusive and additive particles do not form a natural class of f-sensitive expressions in Nlêʔkepmxcin, as in some West African languages (Hartmann and Zimmermann 2008).

2 General language background

Nlêʔkepmxcin is one of 23 Salish languages, and is spoken in southwestern British Columbia, Canada (see Thompson and Thompson 1992, Kinkade 1992, Kroeber 1999, Davis and Matthewson 2009). Like in all Salish languages, word order is predicate initial, typically Verb-Subject-Object-Oblique-Adjunct (though post-predicative order is quite flexible). Transitivity and argument agreement is obligatorily marked on the verb/predicate (1), and topical arguments are typically null (pro in 1c). The Salish languages are well-known for their predicate-argument flexibility, since any open-class category can function as the predicate (e.g. bare NP predicates - 1d) without the use of a copula (e.g. Kuipers 1968, Kinkade 1983, Jelinek and Demers 1994, Kroeber 1999, Koch and Matthewson 2009).

(1) a. V 2CL S O Oblique
   n̓-t-O-ēs =xeʔ e=Bill e=q̓atmin
t̓=eʔc̓sc̓eqʷ teʔépl̓.setTitle.
   ‘Bill gave the elder a red apple.’

   b. V 2CL S O ADV
   nciq-O-O-ēs =ekʷǔ=xeʔe e=Flóra
   t̓=swuxʷt̓ t̓=sp̓íʔx̌áwt.
   ‘Flora dug the snow out yesterday.’

   c. Aux 2CL V S O
   xʷǔy̓ =xeʔ niék-O-O-ēs
   pro e=siʔqm.
   ‘He’s going to cut the grass.’

   d. NP 2CL S
   sq̓éʔc̓ =ekʷǔ=xeʔ e=Bóʔb.
   chickenhawk =evid =DEM DET=Bob
   ‘Bob is a policeman.’

Second position clitics (2CL) include situational deictics (xeʔ in 1a-d), modal evidentials

---

1 Abbreviations used in the glosses (based on Thompson and Thompson 1992, 1996; Kroeber 1997) are as follows: ‘/’ = affix, ‘*’ = clitic, * = ungrammatical structure or interpretation, # = pragmatically infelicitous, appl = applicative, aug = augmentative reduplicant, aut = autonomous [intransitive suffix], aux = auxiliary, caus = causative, cleft = cleft predicate, cncl = conjunctive subject clitic, comp = complementizer, dem = demonstrative, det = determiner, dem = diminutive reduplicant, drv = directive transitivizer, emph = emphatic, evid = evidential, fut = future, idf = indefinite, impf = imperfective, inch = inchoative, lncl = indicative subject clitic, intrans, intr = intransitive, irr = irrealis, link = attributive link marker, loc = locative, mdl = middle, ncm = non-control middle, neg = negation, nom = nominalizer, obl = object, obl̓ = oblique, perf = perfective, pl = plural, pocl = possessive subject clitic, poss, ps = possessive, part = particle, q = yes/no question marker, red = reduplicant, rel = relational [transitive suffix], sg = singular, stat = stative prefix, subj, s = subject (transitive), subjGAP = subject gap marker, trans, tr = control transitivizer.

Data are presented in the orthography developed in Thompson and Thompson (1992, 1996). Acute accent ‘ on vowels indicates word-level stress. The phonemic key to the orthography follows; symbols not listed have the standard International Phonetic Alphabet interpretation. See Thompson and Thompson (1992) in particular for the phonetic realizations of phonemic vowels across contexts.

c = [t], c̓ = [ts], č̓ = [tsʷ*], e = [æ, a, ə, e, e], ʔ̓ = [ʔ], s = [s], x̓ = [ʃ], y̓ = [j, i].
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(ekʷu in 1b and 1d), clause-typers (us in 2), and (to be shown) focus-sensitive operators with exclusive and additive meanings. Clitic strings can include up to five or six elements:\(^2\)

(2)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aux</th>
<th>2CL</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ꦍe</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>ꦍʔʕʰʔ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF=3CnCl</td>
<td>indeed</td>
<td>ꦍʔʕʰʔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Better let him sleep.’

Direct arguments (S of V\text{INTRANS}, S and O of V\text{TRANS}) must be marked by one of the determiners (h)ε, ł, or k (3a-c). Oblique arguments (e.g. O of formally V\text{INTRANS}) additionally have an oblique marker t (1a, 3d). Determiners do not encode a definite/indefinite-distinction, nor a uniqueness presupposition (c.f. Matthewson 1998, 1999, 2006, von Fintel and Matthewson 2008 on St’át’imcets Salish).

(3)  

a.  

kʷéw-Ø-Ø-es=xe?  
float-TR-3o-3s=DEM  
e=John  
ee=syép.  
‘John is floating the logs down the river.’  
[DPs visible]

b.  

zóqʷ=ʔəm̓  
néʔ?  
ł=t-n-kix.  
‘My older sister died.’  
[DP not visible/deceased; cf. Burton 1997]

c.  

čík=ʔəm̓  
k=sq̓e̓ytn.  
use.up=PERF  
irl=salmon  
‘The salmon is all gone.’  
[DP no longer in existence]

d.  

wík-m=kʷ=ł̓̓  
see-MDL=2SG.InCl=Q  
l̓̓=smíyc.  
‘Did you see any deer?’  
[DP\text{OBLIQUE} of V\text{INTRANS}]

Finally, relative clauses are head external (typically head initial). One determiner introduces the head NP, while a second introduces the relative clause. The second determiner reflects operator movement of the clause-internal DP to Spec,CP (Kroeber 1997, Davis 2004, Koch 2006, Koch 2008b): the determiner of the fronted DP is pronounced and functions as a quasi-relative pronoun (predicate abstraction – Heim and Kratzer 1998). An attributive \text{LINK} marker between the head NP and the relative clause marks predicate modification (Kroeber 1997), c.f. (4a), but is absent in locative relative clauses (4b):

(4)  

a.  

e=cítx  
[CP[DP[t ]],  
DET=house  
l̓̓=build-house=3PoCl  
DET=John  
t[=John  
t]  
‘the house which John built’

b.  

e=npúytn  
[CP[DP[e ]],  
xʷú̑y̓=wn  
ʕʷó̑t  
t[=John  
t]  
‘a bed in which I will sleep’

Headless relative clauses realize only the initial determiner. The \text{LINK} marker and the second determiner are not pronounced (shown by strikethrough in 5):

(5)  

ʔέ̑s-χ̓ə̑k-st-Ø-éne=xe?  
[CP[DP[t ]],  
STAT-know-TR-3o=1SG.S=DEM  
DET=  
l̓̓=leave-AUT  
t[=Lytton  
t]  
‘I know the one that went to Lytton.’

\(^2\)It is important to observe that the 2CL-position in Nleʔkepmxcin is the position after the first word. As a result, we find (strings of) 2CL-elements inside complex nominal constituents.
3 Free foci

This section shows that Nlèʔkepmxcin employs a purely predicative focus marking strategy (Kroeber 1997, Koch 2008a; Davis 2007 for St’át’imcets, Benner 2006 for Sencóthen): the focus constituent, or the focus exponent, form (part of) the syntactic predicate in sentence-initial position. Parallel to three syntactic types of focus constituents (V(P)-predicate/sentence, bare NP, or DP-argument), three different syntactic focus structures emerge: (i.a) V(P) initial; (i.b) Nominal Predicate Construction (NPC); and (ii.) DP-argument cleft.

Before we go into the data, observe that syntactic focus marking in Nlèʔkepmxcin seems to be primarily triggered by the need to indicate the question under discussion (Roberts 1996, Beaver & Clark 2008), and not contrastivity as such. Thus, all examples of focus marking in this section come from discourse exchanges between participants; contrastive focus within a speaker’s discourse turn is not necessarily marked (see 39b-d).

All instances of predication focus (V-, VP-, Tense/Aspect/Mood, verum-focus) as well as CP-focus on the extended verbal projection are realized with the verbal predicate in default sentence-initial position (for reasons of space, wh-questions are just given in English):

(6)  a. A: What’s going on? [CP focus]
B: wʔex=xeʔ=neʔ? ʔes-tēl-ix e=Pátricia.
    IMPF=DEM=DEM STAT=stand-AUT DET=Patricia
    ‘Patricia is standing there.’

b. A: What are you doing? [VP focus]
B: ?ex=xeʔ ʔes-kʷēł-st-Ø-ne e=stēʔ=us=nke.
    IMPF=DEM STAT=look.at-TR-3SG=DET=what=3CnCl=EVID
    ‘I’m looking at something.’

c. A: Does your grandmother like cherries? [verum focus]
B: heʔáy, ʔecín-m-Ø-s=xeʔ  e=n-kžé e=céris.
    yes, like-TR-3SG=DET=POSS-grandmother DET=cherry
    ‘Yes, my grandmother likes cherries.’

For focus on a bare NP, a Nominal Predicate construction is employed. The nominal predicate is realized in sentence-initial position (Davis et al. 2004). This is a subcase of predication focus.

(7)  a. A: What is Betsy going to put in her soup? [O-focus]
B: [kálec]FOC=xeʔ=nēʔ? [e=xʷúy  mčX-e-Ø-s]BACKGROUND.
    carrot=DEM=DEM COMP=FUT mix TRANS-3OBJ-3SUBJ
    ‘[What she’s going to put in]BACKGROUND is [carrots]FOC.’

b. A: What appeared now? [S-focus]
B: [nčesqáx̣a]FOC=neʔ? [e=wʔáz  cʔéy]BACKGROUND.
    horse=there COMP=appear now
    ‘[What appeared now]BACKGROUND is [a horse]FOC.’

Finally, focus on DP-arguments is marked by means of a cleft-structure in which the focused DP is base-generated after the cleft-marker cē or ?e in sentence-initial position. The background (cleft remnant) is realized as an argument clause: this is introduced by a complementizer e or k, and contains a gap t, marked by subordinating morphology on the
verb (Kroeber 1997, 1999, Koch 2008a, 2008b; Davis et al. 2004 on St’át’imcets Salish). The gap is coreferent with the clefted focus.

(8) a. A:  *I heard that it was Fred who painted it.*  
   [S-focus]  
   B:  \( \text{c̓é} [\text{t}=\text{Ross}] \)  
   [e pint-t-Ø-mus \( t_k \)]  
   \( \text{CLEFT} = \text{Ross} \)  
   \( \text{COMP} \)  
   paint-TRANS-3=SUBJ.GAP \( t_k \)  
   ‘It was [Ross] [that \( t_k \) painted it].’

b. A:  *What do you see there?*  
   [O-focus]  
   B:  \( \text{ʔc̓=}\text{xe}?=\text{ne}? \)  
   \( [\text{e}=\text{krēps}] \)  
   \( [\text{e}=\text{wik-t-Ø-ne} \ t_k] \)  
   \( \text{CLEFT}=\text{DEM}=\text{there} \)  
   \( \text{DET}=\text{grape} \)  
   \( \text{COMP}=\text{see}-\text{TRANS}-3=\text{SUBJ.GAP} \) \( t_k \)  
   ‘It’s [grapes] [that I see \( t_k \)].’

Syntactically, the cleft predicate takes the cleft-DP and a cleft-remnant CP as arguments (9a). Thus, clefts conform to the general constraint that focus is always initial and (part of) the predicate. Semantically, the cleft marker denotes a 2-place-function that takes an individual (\{cleft-DP\}) and a property (\{cleft-remnant\}) as arguments (9b). For detailed argumentation, see Kroeber (1997, 1999), Koch (2008a, 2008b) and Davis et al. (2004).

(9) a. DP-CP analysis of clefts:  
   \( \text{[\text{Prep}} \text{c̓e}_{c<,\text{cleft}>, [\text{DP}_{c<}] [\text{c<}] \text{CP}] \)  

b. denotation of cleft predicate:  
   \( \llbracket \text{c̓e} \rrbracket = \lambda x \in D_e. \lambda P \in D_e. \text{P}(x) \)

Two kinds of evidence for the structure in (9a) are: (i.) The cleft predicate \( \text{c̓e} \) behaves like other verbal predicates in taking particular morphology under embedding (e.g. nominalization and possessive morphology in 10); (ii.) the cleft-remnant must be introduced by complementing elements that are independently attested on complement clauses (e in 8bB, \( k \) in 11), but it cannot be introduced by the determiner \( t \) (11), which is found in free relative DPs, such as (5) above.

(10) a. Embedded verb with nominizer and possessive morphology \( s=-=s \) on V:  
   \( \text{qẽn̓im-Ø-ne}=\text{xe}? \)  
   \( k=s=\text{wʔxum}=s \)  
   \( e=\text{Sue} \)  
   \( t=k=n̓e\text{esqá}x.a \)  
   hear-TRANS-3=1=SG.S=DEM c=\text{nom}=\text{have}=3POCl \text{DET}=\text{Sue} \text{OBL}=\text{IRL}=\text{horse} \)  
   ‘I heard that Sue has some horses.’

b. Embedded cleft with nominizer and possessive morphology \( s=-=s \) on \( \text{c̓e} \):  
   \( \text{qẽni-m-Ø-ne} \)  
   \( k=s=\text{c̓e} \)  
   \( t=\text{Fréd} \)  
   \( k=\text{pint-Ø-mus}. \)  
   hear-TRANS-3=1=SG.S c=\text{nom} \( \text{c̓e}=3=\text{POCl} \)  
   \( d=\text{Fréd} \)  
   \( c=\text{paint-TRANS-3=SUBJ.GAP} \)  
   ‘I heard that it was Fred who painted it.’

(11) \( \text{c̓e}=\text{ʔn̓e}=\text{xe}? \)  
   \( t=\text{Monique} \)  
   \( k=(/\text{t}=/) \)  
   \( \text{ʔx̣ax̣}=\text{t}=\text{e}=\text{šla} \text{x̣ax̣}. \)  
   \( \text{CLEFT}=\text{Q}=\text{indeed} = \text{DEM} \text{DET}=\text{Monique} \text{COMP}=\text{OBL}=\text{DET}=\text{food} \)  
   ‘Was it Monique that ate the food?’

Semantically, Nleʔkepmxcin clefts differ from English clefts in two important respects. First, they do not introduce an existence presupposition (Soames 1982, Rooth 1996, Percus 1997, Hedberg 2000 on English; Davis et. al 2004, Koch 2007, 2008a, on Salish): speakers do not judge discourse-initial clefts as infelicitous when presented with them (Davis et al. 2004, Matthewson 2006, von Fintel and Matthewson 2008, on St’át’imcets & Straits Salish):

(12) A:  \( \text{c̓e}=\text{xe}? \)  
   \( e=\text{káh} \)  
   \( e=s=\text{tx̣}=\text{up}=s \)  
   \( e=\text{Pátrick}. \)  
   \( \text{CLEFT}=\text{DEM}=\text{DET}=\text{car} \)  
   COMP=\text{nom}=\text{buy-INCH}=3=\text{POCl}  
   \( \text{DET}=\text{Patrick} \)  
   ‘Patrick bought a car.’ (more literally: ‘It was a car that Patrick bought.’)
Secondly, Nleʔkepmxcin clefts come without a uniqueness or exhaustivity effect: they are felicitous even if the cleft-denotation does not exhaust the domain of individuals satisfying the backgrounded predicate (13).

(13) [Context: There are 6 people in a picture. Several of them are carrying apples.]

A: Who is carrying apples?
B: če=xeʔ e=Bétsy e=Bétsy e=ʔe k*ák w ák w t=e=péyeʔ, CLEFT=DEM DET=Betsy COMP=STAT-carry-MDL OBL=DET=one, ?et če=xeʔ e=Jón.
and CLEFT=DEM DET=Jon.
‘Betsy is carrying one, and so is John.’
(literally: ‘It is Betsy that is carrying one (basket), and it is John.’) (# only Betsy)

Since Nleʔkepmxcin clefts are semantically not exhaustive, additive particles should be able to associate with the focused cleft-DP. We show that this prediction is borne out in §4.2.

4 Exclusive ‘only’, additive ‘also’, and scalar readings

4.1 Expression of the exclusive reading ≈ only

Exclusive readings are obligatorily expressed by means of the 2CL ƛ̓uʔ. ƛ̓uʔ must associate with a syntactically-marked focus. Completely parallel to the three syntactic focusing strategies observed in section 3, this focus is either the initial verbal or nominal predicate (14ab), or a clefted DP (14c). When the 2CL ƛ̓uʔ associates with a clefted DP-focus, the default predicative cleft marker če or ?e is replaced by the exclusive cleft marker cukʷ (14c).

(14)  a. 2CL ƛ̓uʔ? in a verb-initial clause associates with VP focus (also V, CP focus):
        nʕʷłqʷ-ə́ m=kn=ƛ̓uʔ?=neʔ. boil-MDL=1SG.InCl=ƛ̓uʔ?=DEM OBL=DET=egg
        ‘I only [boiled an egg]FOC.’ / ‘I only [boiled]FOC an egg.’
        (NOT * ‘Only [I]FOC boiled an egg.’ / * ‘I boiled only [an egg]FOC.’)

    b. 2CL ƛ̓uʔ? with initial nominal predicates associates with bare NP-focus:
        tiy=us=ƛ̓uʔ?=neʔ k=ex=c?=ʔe=ʔuqʷ eʔ. tea=3CONJ=ƛ̓uʔ?=DEM COMP=IMPF=2SG.PoCl=DEM=drink
        ‘You should only drink [tea]FOC.’
        (NOT: * ‘Only [you]FOC should drink tea.’ / * ‘You should only [drink]FOC tea.’)

    c. 2CL ƛ̓uʔ? preceded by exclusive cleft marker cukʷ and associated with clefted DP:
        cukʷ=ƛ̓uʔ?=weʔ [dB e=kéyx]FOC [cP e=wík-t-Ø-ne]BG.
        CLEFT=DEM DET=hand COMP=see TRANS=3OBJ=1SG.SUBJ
        ‘I only see [a hand]FOC there.’ (literally ‘It’s only [a hand]FOC that I see.’)
        (NOT: * ‘Only [I]FOC see a hand there.’ / * ‘I only [see]FOC a hand there.’)
The negative judgements in (14) show that the 2CLƛ̓uʔ must associate with the syntactically-marked foci (in situ or clefted). In the absence of overt cleft-structure,ƛ̓uʔ must associate with the sentence-initial verbal (14a) or nominal predicate (14b). With DP-argument clefts, 2CLƛ̓uʔ must associate with the clefted focus DP (14c).

The exclusive meaning component of the 2CLƛ̓uʔ is truth conditional, like English only, since it can be targeted by negation (15), and is not cancellable (16).

(15) Exclusiveness can be targeted by negation (= only):

tetę k=s=cuk*=s=ƛ̓uʔ e=ʔám t=kʷən-nwēn t=k=sqyēytn.

‘Not only Sam caught a fish.’

get-NCM=ʔełƛ̓uʔ=DEM DET=Tom OBL=DET=salmon

‘Tom also caught a fish.’

(16) Exclusive meaning is not cancellable (= only):

cuk*=ƛ̓uʔ e=ʔéy w̓=m e=ʔérm̓es.

cleft=ƛ̓uʔ DET=Janet comp=pick-MDL obl=DET=mushroom

‘Only Janet picked mushrooms.’

# ʔeł x̣áy-m=ʔełƛ̓uʔ=DEM e=Tóm.

‘And so did Tom.’

4.2 Expression of the additive reading ≈ also, too

Additive readings are expressed by means of the expression ʔełƛ̓uʔ, which is also typically realized as a 2CL (but see §6). Again parallel to the basic focusing strategies outlined in section 3, ʔełƛ̓uʔ can associate with sentence-initial verbal (17a) or nominal predicates (17b). In cleft-structures, it associates with the clefted DP-argument (17c). Unlike the exclusive ƛ̓uʔ, when the 2CLʔełƛ̓uʔ associates with a clefted DP-focus, it co-occurs with the default predicative cleft marker če or ʔe in initial position.

(17) a. 2CLʔełƛ̓uʔ in a verb-initial clause, associating with VP focus (also V, CP):

t=ʔáp=us[FOC].

‘And I also [cooked supper]FOC.’

b. 2CLʔełƛ̓uʔ associating with a bare NP predicate that is narrowly focused:

[cp e=s=pũb̓n=s]BACKGROUND, det=ʔełƛ̓uʔ=DEM comp=nom=find[DIM]=3poCl

‘[What he also found was]BACKGROUND [a bed]FOC.’

c. 2CLʔełƛ̓uʔ associated with a clefted DP:

‘It was also [Sue]FOC that got hit in the head by an apple]BG.’

However, in section 6 we will see that the syntactic distribution and the association behaviour of additive ʔełƛ̓uʔ are more flexible compared to exclusive ƛ̓uʔ. ʔełƛ̓uʔ can also occur in sentence-final adverb position, and can associate freely with the focus. This raises
the question: do exclusive and additive particles really belong in the same class of focus-sensitive expressions, as Beaver and Clark (2008) suggest?

Finally, the use of ʔełƛ̓uʔ induces an additive existential presupposition (unlike plain clefts). Discourse-initial uses of ʔełƛ̓uʔ are often judged infelicitious by speakers (18).

(18) # če=ʔełƛ̓uʔ?=xeʔ
cleft=ʔełƛ̓uʔ?=DEM
e=Monik
e=nēs
u=t=n̓laʔxanséytn.

‘It was also Monique that went to a restaurant.’

[Consultant comment: You should say that somebody else went before she did.]

While speakers’ reactions to out-of-the-blue utterances of ‘also’ are quite strong, it is unclear whether these consultant responses constitute instances of ‘Hey, wait a minute!’ responses (von Fintel 2004). If so, then at least some Salish languages may have some English-style presuppositions à la Stalnaker 1974 (contra Matthewson 2006). However, if these are metalinguistic comments relating only to the speaker’s perspective, then they may be compatible with a language-wide lack of presuppositional content for the hearer (Matthewson 2006, who adopts Gauker 1998). We set this issue aside for future work.

4.3 Expression of the scalar reading \( \approx \) even

Unlike in European languages, scalarity is not lexically coded in Nłeʔkemxn̓cin by means of a separate lexical item (though it is in the Lower dialect of Stát’imctc̓ets (Davis 2007, p.c.) and Klallam Salish (Montler 2003)). Instead, the additive particle ʔełƛ̓uʔ can get a scalar interpretation depending on context. The expression of the additive ‘also’- and scalar ‘even’-reading in (19) is not distinguished by prosody either, and must be contextually resolved.

(19) context I: Bill yelled at all the pets in the house and ...
context II: The boss was angry. He yelled at the workers and ...
če=ʔełƛ̓uʔ? e=pús, e=ƛ̓ixʷ-Ø-Ø-Ø-es.
cleft=ʔełƛ̓uʔ? det=cat comp=yell-trans-3obj-3subj
i. ‘He also yelled at [the cat]\textit{FOC}.’ (in context I)
ii. ‘He even yelled at [the cat]\textit{FOC}.’ (in context II)

In some languages, use of the additive marker plus grammatical focus marking yields a scalar interpretation (e.g. Hindi – Lahiri 1998, Vietnamese – Hole 2008). However, in Nłeʔkemxn̓cin, scalarity is a pragmatically induced special instance of additivity in need of contextual resolution. There is no structural position and no syntactic focus realization that would force the particle ʔełƛ̓uʔ to get only an additive or a scalar interpretation.

4.4 Summary of empirical observations

We have shown that focus-sensitive exclusive and additive readings are expressed by the obligatory presence of the 2CLs ƛ̓uʔ and ʔełƛ̓uʔ. When ƛ̓uʔ and ʔełƛ̓uʔ associate with clefted DP-foci, they co-occur with the special exclusive cleft marker cukʷ and the default cleft marker če / ?e, respectively. There is no separate lexical marker of scalarity. Finally, the meaning contribution of the exclusive and additive particles ƛ̓uʔ and ʔełƛ̓uʔ is parallel to that of their English counterparts only and also: the exclusive interpretation with ƛ̓uʔ is
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truth-conditional, while the additive interpretation with ?eľƛ̓uʔ is presuppositional. Since plain DP-clefts do not come with uniqueness presuppositions, the additional occurrence of exclusive ƛ̓uʔ is not redundant, nor is the co-occurrence of additive ?eľƛ̓uʔ incompatible.

5 Analysis: Focus-Sensitive Expressions in Thompson

5.1 The general picture

We propose that the exclusive and additive meaning components are coded in the 2CL elements, since only the 2CL are mandatory for all 3 focus-marking strategies (V-initial, NP-initial, DP-cleft). Under our account, the 2CLs ƛ̓uʔ and ?eľƛ̓uʔ are adverbial elements in a high functional projection FP, where they take proposition-denoting expressions (= clauses) as their arguments. This is parallel to recent accounts of 2CL modal and evidential markers in Salish (e.g. Matthewson et al. 2007).

(20) a. FP
    2CL  ƛ̓uʔ
    NP  FOC ...

b. FP
    2CL  ?eľƛ̓uʔ  çe-DP  CP  BG
    V(P)  FOC ...

On our analysis, the cleft predicates če / ?e and cukʷ do not form part of complex focus-sensitive operators: če / ?e in additive clefts is simply the ordinary cleft-marker found in plain DP-clefts, while we treat cukʷ in exclusive clefts as a semantically vacuous focus-agreement cleft marker; see below.

5.2 The analysis of exclusive readings = only

We assign the adverbial 2CL ƛ̓uʔ the same meaning as its adverbial proposition-taking counterpart only in English, on the analysis in Rooth (1996):

(21) [[ƛ̓uʔ]] = λp. p(w) ∧ ∀q ∈ [[p]] f : [ q(w) → q = [[p]] 0 ] (Rooth 1996)

Relevant alternative propositions are computed off the surface structure, where the focus constituent is (part of) the sentence-initial predicate:

(22) a. 2CL ( V(P) FOC X ) (predication focus)
    b. 2CL ( [NP FOC] [e-CP] BG ) (bare NP-focus)
    c. 2CL ( [cukʷ DP FOC] [e-CP ... ] BG ) (DP-argument focus)

The 2CL ƛ̓uʔ is focus-functional (strictly f-sensitive in the sense of Beaver and Clark 2003, 2008), in that it can only associate with the focus-marked predicative constituent (or its extended projection) in sentence-initial position. Sample derivations are given below:

(23) a. [[I only boiled an egg] FOC.] (‘I only boiled an egg’) b. = [[ƛ̓uʔ]] ( [nʕʷłqʷ-ə́ m=n̓eʔ t=e=heʔúseʔ] FOC ) c. = λp. p(w) ∧ ∀q ∈ [[p]] f : [ q(w) → q = [[p]] 0 ] (λw. I boiled an egg in w)
d. = 1 iff I boiled an egg in w and for all focus-alternative propositions q in the set \{\lambda w. I boiled an egg in w, \lambda w. I peeled a carrot in w, \ldots\}: If q is true in w it is the proposition that I boiled an egg.

\[(24)\]
a. \[\llbracket (14c) \rrbracket = \llbracket (\lambda w. \text{I boiled an egg in } w) \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{It’s only [a hand] FOC that I see there.} \rrbracket\]
b. \[\llbracket \lambda u? \rrbracket \llbracket [\lambda w. \text{I boiled an egg in } w, \lambda w. \text{I peeled a carrot in } w, \ldots] \rrbracket = \llbracket \text{[a hand] FOC} \rrbracket
c. \lambda p. p(w) \land \forall q \in \llbracket p \rrbracket \lnot q w \Rightarrow q = \llbracket p \rrbracket \wedge (\lambda w. \text{I see a hand there})
d. = 1 iff I see a hand there in w and for all focus-alternative propositions q in the set \{\lambda w. \text{I see a hand there in } w, \lambda w. \text{I see a foot there in } w, \ldots\}: If q is true in w it is the proposition that I see a hand there in w.

The cleft-marker \text{cuk}_w^*\text{ derives from the homonymous lexical verb} \text{cuk}_w^*\text{ ‘to stop/finish.’}

\[(25)\] \text{cuk}_w^* = \lambda \theta m = \chi \theta = n = s = \theta \text{emit ne'c?}.

\text{finish=PERF=DEM} \quad \text{comp=1SG.PoCl=NOM=babysit 1SG.EMPH}

‘I stopped babysitting, myself.’ (more lit. ‘Finished that my babysitting myself.’)

However, since \text{cuk}^* is absent in cases of V- and NP-initial focus (14ab), we contend that it does not form part of a syntactically complex exclusive focus operator. Rather, following Hole’s (2008) analysis of adnominal focus-agreement markers in Mandarin and Vietnamese (26), we analyze it as a semantically empty (as far as exclusive content goes) marker of focus agreement. Thus, \text{cuk}^* is a lexically specified cleft predicate that has undergone semantic bleaching and is restricted to occur in the scope of the adverbial exclusive operator \text{\lambda u?}.

\[(26)\] \text{Nam chỉ} [\llbracket \text{VP ăn mòi [thít bò] FOC thỏi } \rrbracket].

\text{Nam only eat PRT FOC only meat beef PRT.}

‘Nam ate only [beef] FOC.’

5.3 The analysis of additive readings \approx \text{also, too}

The cleft marker \text{c'e} with DP-clefs under the additive operator \text{\?el\lambda u?} is the default cleft marker found in plain DP-clefs and carries no additive semantic load. Because plain clefs do not come with any existential presupposition or uniqueness effect, \text{c'e} is compatible with additive \text{\?el\lambda u?}, which introduces an existential presupposition. In a first approximation, we have the additive operator \text{\?el\lambda u?} denote the identity function on propositions and add a presupposition to the effect that a contextually relevant alternative proposition is true in addition to the proposition expressed (but see §6 for observations to the effect that things are not quite as simple):

\[(27)\] (first approximation): \[\llbracket \text{\?el\lambda u?} \rrbracket = \lambda p: \exists q [q \in \llbracket p \rrbracket \land q \neq p]: q(w) \Rightarrow p\]

\text{presupposition}

5.4 Evidence for the (head-like) adverbial nature of focus-sensitive 2CLs

In this section, we go over several further correct predictions of the analysis. First, if the exclusive 2CL \text{\lambda u?} is adverbial in nature, its scope should be clause-bounded by analogy to the behaviour of adverbial \text{only} in English (28a) (Taglicht 1984). The scope of adnominal \text{only}, by contrast, is not clause-bounded, as illustrated in (28bii). On standard accounts (e.g.
von Stechow 1991), this follows from the fact that adnominal instances of only can undergo QR and thus take wide scope (29).

(28)  
a. They were advised [ to only learn Spanish]  
   ‘The advice was: Learn Spanish and nothing else.’

   a. They were advised [to learn only Spanish]
   i. ‘The advice was: Learn Spanish and nothing else.’ (=26a)
   ii. ‘Spanish is the only language such that they were advised to learn it (but they were free to learn other languages in addition).’

(29)  
(28bii): only-DP, advise [... t, ...]

(30) shows that inverse scope construals are available in Nleʔkepmxcin, in principle, as the universal QNP tek̓m ‘all’ can take inverse scope over the higher negation predicate, possibly after QR (see Davis 2005 on negation in Salish):

(30)  
tetéʔ  k=sʔut̓iʔ-t-O-iyxs  tek̓m  e=sq̓eʔc̓w̓-s.
   NEG  COMP NOM get-TR-3-O-3PL.S all  DET children  D=dry.salmon-3POSS
   ‘All the kids did not eat their dried salmon.’ [all > not]

However, as expected on our analysis, exclusive 2CL ĭuʔ cannot take inverse scope over the negation predicate tetéʔ in (31a). The semantic scope of ĭuʔ always corresponds to its surface position: In order to take wide scope, cukʷ ĭuʔ must be the leftmost matrix predicate, while negation tetéʔ is embedded in the cleft-remnant (31b):

(31)  
a. tetéʔ  k=s=cúkʷ=s= đâu̱ʔ e=Šám k=kʷən-nwēn̓ t=k=sq̓eʔtn.
   NEG  C=NOM=cúkʷ=3PoCl= đâu̱ʔ  D=Šám  c=get-NCM  OBL=IRL=salmon
   ‘Not only Sam caught a fish.’ [not > only (*only > not)]

b. cúkʷ= đâu̱ʔ  e=Šám  [tetéʔ  k=s=kʷən-nwēn̓=s  t=k=sq̓eʔtn.]
   cukʷ= đâu̱ʔ  DET=Sam  C NOT  c=NOM=get-NCM=3PoCl  OBL=IRL=salmon
   ‘Only Sam didn’t catch any fish.’ [only > not (*not > only)]

Nor can 2CL ĭuʔ scope over other verbal predicates (‘forget’ in 32). Again, to take wide scope, cukʷ ĭuʔ must be the matrix predicate (33), while the verbal predicate is embedded in the cleft-remnant CP (‘remember’ in 33).

(32)  
CONTEXT: my mother tells me to only buy potatoes. But I forget and I come home
with a whole bag full of groceries: forget > only; only embedded.
łép-O-0-ne=xeʔ  [k=s=cúkʷ=s= đâu̱ʔ)
   forget-TRANS-3OB-1SG.SUBJ=DEM  COMP=NOM=CLEFT сент̓=3PoCl= đâu̱ʔ
e=Šq̓ol̓s  xʷú̓y̓ e=n=s=kʷn-ə̓m.
   DET=potato  FUT  COMP=1SG.PoCl=NOM=get-MDL
   ‘I forgot that it was only potatoes that I was supposed to get.’
   (NOT: * ‘It was only potatoes that I forgot to get.’)

(33)  
CONTEXT: I went grocery shopping. And I forgot everything that I was supposed to
buy. I remembered to buy only potatoes: only > remember , verb embedded.
cúkʷ= đâu̱ʔ  e=Šq̓ol̓s
   cleft=Potato  COMP=remember-TRANS-3OBJ-1SG.SUBJ
   k=xʷú̓y̓  n=s=kʷn-ə̓m.
   COMP=FUT  1SG.PoCl=NOM=get-MDL
‘Only potatoes did I remember that I had to get.’

(Not: * ‘I forgot to buy only potatoes, I bought more than just potatoes.’)

Thus, the semantic scope of 2CL ʔu? is clause-bounded, consistent with adverbial status.

The second prediction of the adverbial analysis is that 2CL focus particles are not possible in left-extraposed contrastive topics. Since left-extraposed topics are not propositional in nature, they are incompatible with adverbial focus-sensitive operators and have no left-peripheral position to host these clitics:

\[(34)\]  
  \[\text{/documentation} = \text{Bill}, \text{cúk}=\text{ʔu?} \ [\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}=[\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}=	ext{cut.pants} \ \text{قود}=	ext{stat-wear-3-o-3}] \ \text{قود}=	ext{Bill} \ ... \]
- b. Intended: ‘[Their cat]قود too, it’s also [smiling]قود.’
  \[\text{/documentation} = \text{cat}, \text{ʔe}=\text{ʔu?}, \ \text{ʔe}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}=\text{DEM} \ \text{قود}=\text{DEM} \ \text{قود}=\text{stat-smile} \ ... \]

The third prediction is the absence of multiple occurrences of 2CL focus particles in a single clause. Since there is only one structural position for focus-sensitive 2CLs and only one structural focus position (sentence-initial predicate), we expect to find no more than one focus-sensitive particle per clause. Again, this prediction is borne out, as second occurrence focus (SOF) contexts incur no additional focus particle (35iv). However, when there is a second clause-embedding predicate, a second focus-sensitive particle is possible, alongside syntactic marking of the second occurrence focus (36).

\[(35)\]  
- i. Intended: ‘Only [Bill]قود is wearing only [shorts]قود.’
  \[\text{/documentation} = \text{Bill}, \text{cúk}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود} ... \]
  \[\text{قود} = \text{stat-wear-3-o-mus} \ (\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}[\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}=	ext{cut.pants} \ ... \]
  intended: ‘... that is wearing only [shorts]قود.’
- ii. Intended: ‘... that what he’s wearing is only [shorts]قود.’
  \[\text{/documentation} = \text{Bill}, \text{cúk}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود} ... \]
  \[\text{قود} = \text{stat-wear-3-o-3b} \ (\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}[\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}=	ext{cut.pants} \ ... \]
  intended: ‘... that is wearing only [shorts]قود that he is wearing.’
- iii. Intended: ‘... that it is only [shorts]قود that he is wearing.’
  \[\text{/documentation} = \text{Bill}, \text{cúk}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود} ... \]
  \[\text{قود} = \text{stat-wear-3-o-3b} \ (\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}[\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}=	ext{cut.pants} \ ... \]
  ‘... that is wearing shorts.’

\[(36)\]  
  \[\text{/documentation} = \text{Tom}, \text{ʔe}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود} ... \]
  \[\text{قود} = \text{know-caus-3-o-3b} \ (\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}[\text{قود}=\text{ʔu?} \ \text{قود}=	ext{salmon} \ ... \]
  ‘It is even Tom that knows that it is only fish that Monique eats.’

(literally: ‘It is even Tom that knows that it is only fish that Monique eats.’)
Finally, if focus-sensitive 2CLs are proposition-taking operators, then they should behave like other proposition-taking operators, such as modal evidential markers. This appears to be the case. Modal evidentials are also realized as 2CLs (1b, 1d), and operate at the propositional level in Salish (Matthewson et al. 2007). The scope of modal/evidential markers is also clause-bounded, except for when they double the matrix verb of saying/hearing (Matthewson et al. 2007, Davis p.c.):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{qe} & \text{ʔni-}m-0-\text{ne=}\text{xe} \quad k=s=x^"u^y"=s=\text{ek}^u \\
\text{hear-TR-3O-1SG.S=} & \text{DEM COMP=NOM=FUT=}3\text{PoCl=}\text{EVID} \quad \text{rodfish-MDL} \\
\text{tēkm=} & \text{us} \quad e=\text{seytkmnx}.
\end{align*}
\]

\(\text{all=}3\text{CnCl} \quad \text{DET=} \text{people}
\)

‘I heard that [reportative] everyone was going to go fishing.’

Thus, Nłeʔkepmxcin surface structure mirrors the semantic relations between operator and propositional complement in a fully transparent way. This is unlike English, where the semantic relations of operator and complement are not visible at surface structure (on some analyses). For such cases, LF-movement of the focus particle to a high left-peripheral position is typically assumed (e.g. Rooth 1996).

6 Exclusives ≠ Additives: Two kinds of focus-sensitivity?

In this final section, we take up recent work by Beaver and Clark (2008), who suggest that exclusive, scalar AND additive particles belong to a natural class of focus-functional items that conventionally associate with focus. This contrasts with freely associating Q-adverbials like always. We show that, in Nłeʔkepmxcin, only exclusive 2CL ƛ̓uʔ requires syntactic focus-marking, whereas the additive/scalar particle ʔełƛ̓uʔ is more flexible in its syntactic distribution and its association behaviour, on a par with the Q-adverbial ƛ̓eʔkmíx ‘always.’

Beaver and Clark primarily show the focus-functional nature of exclusive particles in Germanic, but suggest that their account should extend to scalar and additive particles. Under their Conventionalized Association with Focus, the focus particles only AND even are anaphoric on the current question under discussion (QUD). The particles mark assertions as weaker (only) or stronger (even) than the expected answer to the current QUD. In Germanic, the current QUD is indicated by focus accent. Thus, focus-functional particles require a focus-marked constituent to associate with.

In Nłeʔkepmxcin, we saw that the QUD is marked by a syntactic strategy rather than by focus accent (Koch 2008a, to appear). We saw in (14) that the exclusive 2CL ƛ̓uʔ can only associate with a syntactically marked focus, in line with Beaver and Clark’s (2008) account of English only. While the data that we have seen so far for additive ʔełƛ̓uʔ (17) are also consistent with a conventional focus association account, additional data show that, in fact, additive ʔełƛ̓uʔ patterns with the Q-adverbial ƛ̓eʔkmíx ‘always,’ and associates freely.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{excl. } & \text{ƛ̓uʔ:} \quad \text{conventional association + FOC-marking} \\
\text{add. } & \text{ʔełƛ̓uʔ & Q-adverbials:} \quad \text{free association}
\end{align*}
\]

Syntactically, exclusive ƛ̓uʔ must be realized as a 2CL, whereas additive ʔełƛ̓uʔ can also occur in the sentence-final adverbial position (the canonical adjunct position) (39a), sharing this property with the Q-adverbial ƛ̓eʔkmíx ‘always’ (39b).
(39) a. \[\text{\textit{et}} [\text{nés}=\text{ek}''\text{u}]=\text{x̌e} \quad \text{mil}''\text{-m-}\text{O-s} \quad \text{e}=\text{smuk}''\text{nu̞k}''\text{e}?'\text{-s}]_{\text{FOC}} \quad \text{\textit{etA}u}?'\text{.}
\]
   \begin{align*}
   &\text{and} \quad \text{go}=\text{EVID}=\text{DEM} \\
   &\text{visit-tr}=\text{3o-3s} \quad \text{DET}=\text{friend[RED]-3-poss} \quad \text{\textit{etA}u}?'
   \\
   &\text{‘And she [visited her friends]}_{\text{FOC}} \text{ too.’}
\end{align*}

b. \[\text{\textit{[\text{ex}=\text{x̌e}?'\text{e} \quad \text{yemít}]_{\text{FOC}}} \quad \text{e}=\text{Jón} \quad \lambda\text{c}''\text{kr̃íx}.\]
\begin{align*}
   &\text{IMP}=\text{DEM} \quad \text{pray} \quad \text{DET}=\text{John} \quad \text{always}
   \\
   &\text{‘John} \quad \text{always [goes to church]_{FOC}.}’
   \\
   &\text{‘(If there is something that John always does, it’s go to church.)’}
\end{align*}

In terms of association behaviour, we saw that exclusive 2CL λu? must associate with the sentence-initial focus constituent under all three focus-marking strategies (14, 40a). In contrast, both the additive 2CL/adverbial \textit{etA}u? and the Q-adverbial \lambda\text{c}''\text{kr̃íx} can freely associate with \textit{in situ} arguments (in the absence of clefted DP-foci) (40b-e). Note that (40b-e) come within the speaker’s discourse turn, rather than a conversational exchange; thus, there is no explicit QUD and the contrastive DP focus is not obligatorily marked via clefting (compare to the data in §3).

(40) a. \textit{V-initial:} Mandatory association of exclusive \lambda\text{u}?' with V(P)-focus:
\begin{align*}
   &\text{ni''}=\text{tn}''\text{-nám}=\text{k̖n}=\lambda\text{u}?' \quad \text{n̓c}=\text{he}''\text{ʔuse}?'\text{.}
   \\
   &\text{boil}\text{-}\text{MDL}=\text{1SG.}\text{InCl}=\lambda\text{u}?'=\text{DEM} \quad \text{OBL}=\text{DET}=\text{egg}
   \\
   &\text{‘I only [boiled an egg]_{FOC}.’} \quad \text{‘I only [boiled]_{FOC} an egg.’}
   \\
   &\text{(NOT * ‘Only [I]_{FOC} boiled an egg.’) * ‘I boiled only [+an egg]_{FOC}.’}
\end{align*}

\textit{V-initial:} Association of additive \textit{etA}u?' and Q-adverbial with \textit{in situ} DPs possible!
\begin{align*}
   &\text{wik-t-O-s}=\text{ek}''\text{u}?=\lambda\text{u}?'=\text{x̌e}?'\text{c} \quad \text{[c=\text{Tóm}]_{FOC}} \quad \text{e}=\text{səx}''\text{súx}''\text{.} \quad \text{[SUBJ]}
   \\
   &\text{see-tr}=\text{3o-3s}=\text{EVID}=\text{\textit{etA}u}?'=\text{DEM} \quad \text{DET}=\text{Tom} \quad \text{DET}=\text{grizzly.bear}
   \\
   &\text{(Bill saw the grizzly and ...) ‘[Tom]_{FOC} also saw the grizzly bear.’}
   \\
   &\text{wik-t-O-s}=\text{\textit{etA}u}?'=\text{x̌e}?'\text{c} \quad \text{[e=\text{səx}''\text{súx}'']_{FOC}\text{.} \quad \text{[OBJ]}
   \\
   &\text{see-tr}=\text{3o-3s}=\text{\textit{etA}u}?'=\text{DEM} \quad \text{DET}=\text{grizzly.bear}
   \\
   &\text{(Tom saw some other animals and ...) ‘He also saw a [grizzly bear]_{FOC}.’}
   \\
   &\text{\textit{et} \quad w̃xúm}=\text{\textit{ex}e}=\text{n̓c} \quad \text{[t=\text{e}=\text{k̖h}]_{FOC}} \quad \text{\textit{etA}u}?\text{.}
   \\
   &\text{[OBLIQUE]}
   \\
   &\text{and} \quad \text{have}=\text{DEM}=\text{DEM} \quad \text{OBL}=\text{DET}=\text{car} \quad \text{\textit{etA}u}?'
   \\
   &\text{(Penny has a dog, and she has a table, ...) ‘And she has a [car]_{FOC} too.’}
   \\
   &\text{c. k̓iye? \quad [c̃i̇]_{FOC} \quad \lambda\text{c}''\text{kr̃íx}. \quad \text{[SUBJ]}
   \\
   &\text{precede 3SG.EMPH always}
   \\
   &\text{‘[She]_{FOC} always went first.’ (‘If someone went first, it was always her.’)}
\end{align*}

Finally, observe that, even in the absence of an explicit QUD, exclusive \lambda\text{u}?' requires syntactic focus marking of the DP-argument that it associates with (41). In contrast, with additive \textit{etA}u?'\text{, no DP-clefting is required (}40b-d\text{), even when the associate of \textit{etA}u?' does not match the QUD (i.e. is not a syntactically marked focus) (}42\text{). In (}42\text{), the syntactically marked focus is the initial verb (matching the QUD), while \textit{etA}u?' associates with in situ \textit{John} (shown by the numerical index).}

(41) \textbf{CONTEXT:} Several people are each making soup. The consultant remarks that some of them are smiling, because they have a lot of things to put in their soup. Next she notes that Pam looks upset, and goes on to offer the following observation:
\begin{align*}
   &\text{cúk}''=\lambda\text{u}?'=\text{x̌e}?'\text{.} \quad \text{[s=\text{tométos}]_{FOC} \quad e=w̃=\text{ex-s-t-O-és} \quad ...}
   \\
   &\text{CLEFT}_{\text{only}}=\lambda\text{u}?'=\text{DEM} \quad \text{DET}=\text{tomato} \quad \text{COMP}=\text{IMPF}\text{-}\text{tr}=\text{3o-3s}
   \\
   &\text{‘She has only [tomatoes]_{FOC} (to put in her soup) ...’}
   \\
   &\text{(more literally: ‘It is only [tomatoes]_{FOC} that she has.’)}
\end{align*}
To conclude, exclusive 2CL ƛ̓uʔ and the additive particle ?ełƛ̓uʔ differ syntactically and semantically, and, in Nłeʔkepmxcin, do not belong to the same class of focus-sensitive items. Exclusive 2CL ƛ̓uʔ is focus-functional in the sense of Beaver and Clark (2008), since it must associate with a syntactically marked focus; it is therefore possible to analyse the exclusive particle as directly relating to the current QUD (Beaver and Clark 2008: ch.10). On the other hand, additive ?ełƛ̓uʔ patterns like the Q-adverbial Ḋeʔkmíx ‘always:’ both show free association behaviour and should not make direct reference to the focus value in their lexical semantics. As a result, the strong reading for additive ?ełƛ̓uʔ in (27) should be weakened to the Q-adverbial reading in (43), according to which ?ełƛ̓uʔ expresses the fact that there is at least one event satisfying a comparable (∼) proposition to p, where comparability is governed by syntactic focus marking.

(43) \[ \text{[}\text{ʔełƛ̓uʔ]} = \lambda p: \exists q \exists e [q(e) \land q \neq p \land q \approx p]: q(e) \cdot p \]

7 Conclusion: Towards a typology of focus markers

In Nłeʔkepmxcin, focus particles are adverbial (corresponding to the general predicative focus marking strategy). Exclusives rely on syntactic focus marking, and hence are (like in English) anaphoric on the QUD. Q-adverbials do not rely on syntactic focus marking (again like English), but neither do additive particles, with both showing free association behaviour. Finally, scalar ‘even’ readings are expressed through the use of the additive focus marker, and are not explicitly coded in the grammatical system.

Cross-linguistically, then, we suggest the following possible dimensions of variation for focus particles.

First, in terms of syntactic status, focus markers may be strictly adverbial in some languages, as we have suggested for Salish (arguably also for German, Jacobs 1983, Büring and Hartmann 2001). This corresponds nicely to the more general predicative/verbal focus marking strategy observed in this language (and as noted by Davis 2007 for St’át’imcets Salish, Benner 2006 for Sencóthen Salish). On the other hand, languages with a nominal focus marking strategy may employ strictly adnominal focus particles. This has been observed for the West Chadic languages Tangale, Bole, Gurumtum, and Hausa, and for Bura (Central Chadic), in Hartmann and Zimmermann (2007a, 2007b, 2008, 2009). Finally, mixed languages like English (Rooth 1985) and arguably German (Reis 2005), may have both adverbal and adnominal focus markers, possibly correlating with a flexible prosodic focus marking system via pitch accent.

Second, we have seen variation in the degree of focus association by different focus particles, and in different languages. Exclusives seem to display the most stability cross-linguistically, associating with focus conventionally (Nłeʔkepmxcin, English, Hausa (Zimmermann 2006), Tangale (Hartmann and Zimmermann 2007b) Bura (Hartmann and
In contrast, additive markers may be a less uniform class, cross-linguistically. The additive marker in Nłeʔkepmxcin shows free association. While Beaver and Clark (2008) suggest that English additives associate conventionally with focus, stressed additives in English/German (Krifka 1999) and Bura (Hartmann and Zimmermann 2008) have been argued to associate with contrastive topics instead. This would leave only unstressed additives in English as conventionally associating with focus, though this conclusion certainly merits further work.
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