

- (9) a. $\bar{k}\bar{i}$ - \bar{i} $\bar{s}\bar{e}$ [German]_F (**nikan**) ni John **kàn** $\bar{s}\bar{e}$ __. b. [German]_F (**nikan**) ni John $\bar{k}\bar{o}$ **kàn** $\bar{s}\bar{e}$ __. [YO]
 NEG do German only FOC John only do German only FOC John NEG only do
 ‘It is not only German that John takes.’ (\neg >only) ‘It is only German that John didn’t take.’ (only> \neg)

④ **Wide scope under ellipsis.** Adverbial *only* cannot associate into ellipsis site unless itself is also elided (Beaver and Clark 2008). Bassi et al. (2022) suggest that null OP_{EXCL} behaves alike, and that *only*_{adloc}’s wide scope reading in (10a) come from OP_{EXCL} , hence wide scope is unavailable under ellipsis in (10b). (D-)quantifiers, in contrast, pervert the wide scope under ellipsis (Sag 1976; Fox 2000; Bassi et al. 2022), as in (11).

- (10) a. Jill may bring **only**_{adloc} WINE. (\diamond >only, only> \diamond) b. ... Bill may, too. (\diamond >only, *only> \diamond)
 c. ^{OK}[Bill [may $\leftarrow EXCL$ [bring only WINE] >]] d. *[Bill [EXCL [may \leftarrow bring only WINE] >]]

(11) a. A boy is standing on **every** building. (every>a) b. A girl is, too. (every>a) (Bassi et al. 2022:816,818,820)
 Turning to Vietnamese, while *mỗi* may have wide scope above a modal like ‘may’, it is not available under ellipsis in (12), indicating the presence of OP_{EXCL} . In Yoruba, in contrast, both wide and narrow scope of ‘only’ are retained when *nikan* and the focus are elided, as in (13), which patterns with D-quantifiers (cf. (11)).

- (12) a. Nam có thể mang **mỗi** [rượu vang]_F. b. ... Lan cũng có thể.
 Nam may bring only wine Lan also may
 i. ‘It’s allowed that Nam only brings wine.’ (may>only) ONLY: ‘... It is also allowed that Lan only brings
 ii. ‘Nam may only bring wine.’ (only>may) wine.’ (may>only, *only>may) [VN]
 (13) a. Olùkò náà gba John láàyè [láti $\bar{s}\bar{e}$ German]_F **nikan**. b. ... Olùkò gba Mary náà láàyè.
 teacher the permit John give.chance to do German only teacher permit Mary as.well give.chance
 i. ‘The teacher allows John to only take German.’ (permit>only) i. ‘The teacher also allows M. to only take Ger.’
 ii. ‘The teacher only allows John to take German.’ (only>permit) ii. ‘The teacher also only allows M. to take Ger.’

Parametric variations in exclusive doubling. I propose that whether a language adopts D- or A-quantification for exclusives is parameterized. Adverbial *chi* in Vietnamese is an exclusive A-quantifier (one-place propositional operator) as in (14), whereas adfocal *nikan* in Yoruba is a two-place D-quantifier as in (15).

- (14) $\llbracket \text{chi} \rrbracket (ALT) = \lambda p \lambda w : p(w) . \forall q [(q \in ALT \wedge q(w)) \rightarrow p \subseteq q]$ (A-quantification, after Rooth 1992, QH17)
 (15) $\llbracket \text{nikan} \rrbracket = \lambda x . \lambda P . \forall y [P(y) \rightarrow y = x]$ (D-quantification, after Rooth 1985)

Under this view, ①-④ fall out. *Chi* is an exclusive operator that establishes its own association, which requires c-commanding the focus, and controls the scope with negation. *Kàn* is not a true operator and does not associate with focus, thus free from the backward association restriction and also cannot determine scope. Instead, *nikan* is a D-quantifier responsible for focus association (its sister) and scope, and its wide scope survives ellipsis.

Towards a four-way typology. Extending the parameterization, we expect some languages to have both types particles semantically exclusive, and some other to have neither of them exclusive, giving a four-way typology:

- (16) a. **Type I: doubling, adverbial particle**= OP_{EXCL} c. **Type III: doubling, OP_{EXCL} =null**
 OP_{EXCL} [VP ... **Prt**-XP_F] (Vietnamese) $OP_{EXCL}-\emptyset$... **Prt** [VP ... **Prt**-XP_F] (Kasem)
 b. **Type II: doubling, adfocal particle**= Qu_{EXCL} d. **Type IV: no doubling, having both OP_{EXCL} & Qu_{EXCL}**
Prt [VP ... Qu_{EXCL} -XP_F] (Yoruba) OP_{EXCL} [VP ... Qu_{EXCL} -XP_F] (Mandarin)

I suggest that Kasem manifests Type III (pace Aremu 2024). In (17), adverbial *weeni* allows backward association. On the other hand, multiple adfocal *yerane* does not give rise to a multi-‘only’ reading: (18) has a single-‘only’ reading associating a ordered pair <Adam, rice>, the only pair that satisfies the eating relation.

- (17) [Chworo]_F (**yerane**) mo Adam **weeni** o goa __. (18) [Adam]_F **yerane** mo di [mumuna]_F **yerane**. [KS]
 fowl only FOC Adam only 3SG kill.COMPL Adam only FOC eat rice FOC
 Lit. ‘A fowl, Adam only slaughtered. (and nothing else)’ ‘No one ate anything, except that Adam ate rice.’

Finally, I suggest that Mandarin exemplifies Type IV, where both particles are exclusive (pace Sun 2021). Hence, no doubling is possible (=19), and scope is determined by adverbial *zhi* (=20) and adfocal *zhiyou* (see Sun 2021:333).

- (19) *Ta **zhi/zhishi** **zhiyou** [niurou]_F cai chi. (20) Zhangsan {**a. zhi**} **keyi** {**b. zhi**} chi [niurou]_F.
 3SG only/only.be only beef just eat Zhangsan only may only eat beef
 Int.: ‘S/he only/just eats beef.’ ‘Zhangsan may eats only beef.’ (a. only> \diamond ; b. \diamond >only)

References

- Aremu, Daniel. 2024. "Towards a propositional concord approach for exclusives in Kasem." In *Proceedings of 42nd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project (To appear).
- Bassi, Itai, Aron Hirsch, and Tue Trinh. 2022. "Pre-DP *only* is a propositional operator at LF: a new argument from ellipsis." In *Proceedings of SALT 32*, 814–830.
- Beaver, David I., and Brady Z. Clark. 2008. *Sense and Sensitivity: How Focus Determines Meaning*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Branan, Kenyon, and Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine. 2023. "Anti-pied-piping." *Language* 99 (3): 603–653.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2014. "Movement out of focus." PhD diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- . 2017. "Vietnamese focus particles and derivation by phase." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 26 (4): 325–349.
- Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and semantic interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hole, Daniel. 2017. "A crosslinguistic syntax of scalar and non-scalar focus particle sentences: the view from Vietnamese and Chinese." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 26 (4): 389–409.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2005. "Indefinites and the Operators they depend on: From Japanese to Salish." In *Reference and quantification: The Partee effect*, edited by Gregory N Carlson and Francis Jeffrey Pelletier, 113–142. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Quek, Yihui, and Aron Hirsch. 2017. "Severing focus form and meaning in Standard and Colloquial Singapore English." In *Proceedings of North East Linguistic Society 47*, edited by Andrew Lamont and Katerina Tetzloff, 15–24.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. "Association with Focus." PhD diss., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- . 1992. "A theory of focus interpretation." *Natural Language Semantics* 1 (1): 117–121.
- Sag, Ivan. 1976. "Deletion and logical form." PhD diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Sun, Yenan. 2021. "A bipartite analysis of *zhiyou* 'only' in Mandarin Chinese." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 30:319–355.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 2017. "Disembodied or phonetically null operators." In *Biolinguistic Conference on Interface Asymmetries*.
- . 2024. "Cross-linguistic insights in the theory of semantics and its interface with syntax." *Theoretical Linguistics* 50 (1-2): 125–133.
- Tancredi, Chris. 1990. "Not only EVEN, but even ONLY." Ms., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Yip, Ka-Fai. 2023. "Agreeing with 'only'." In *Proceedings of 41st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project (To appear).
- Yip, Ka-Fai, and Olabode Adedeji. 2024. "A quantifier-particle approach to exclusive focus particles in Yorùbá." Ms., Yale University.