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1 Cross-linguistic meaning variation

Observation: Languages differ the realization of comparable meanings.

1. Context: We see some children playing in the yard.
   Mitá’i o-v’ya-pa. [Paraguayan Guarani, Tupí-Guarani]
   ‘All the children are happy.’

Overarching research questions: What is the nature and extent of variation in how meaning is realized cross-linguistically? What are features of a cross-linguistically viable theory of meaning?

Three components of research that addresses these questions:

1. Detailed, theoretically-informed descriptions of meaning
   Nominal and verbal temporality (Tonhauser 2006, 2007, 2011a,b), modality (Tonhauser 2009, 2011a), information structure (Tonhauser and Colijn 2010; Shain and Tonhauser 2010), evidentiality (Tonhauser 2012c), contrastive topic marking (Tonhauser 2012a), projective content (Tonhauser et al. 2013), prosodic focus (Clopper and Tonhauser 2013),... 

2. Development and assessment of research methods
   Definitions of meaning categories (Tonhauser 2008; Tonhauser et al. 2013), development of diagnostics (Tonhauser 2012b,c; Tonhauser et al. 2013; Cover and Tonhauser to appear), data collection methods (Tonhauser 2014a,b)

3. Comparative theoretical analyses of meaning in context
   - The temporal interpretation of noun phrases is affected by nominal aspectual and modal markers, but no evidence exists (yet) for nominal tenses (Tonhauser 2006, 2007).
   - Conceiving of tense as presuppositional provides an explanation for why not all languages realize verbal tenses (Tonhauser 2011b).
   - Parallels observed in typologically unrelated languages motivate a conversational basis for (at least some) projective contents (Tonhauser et al. 2013).

Today’s talk:
English and Paraguayan Guarani differ in the form-to-meaning mapping in the domain of exclusivity. The discourse-functional analysis of exclusives (Beaver and Clark 2008) affords insights into this variation.

Talk outline:

§2 The Paraguayan Guarani expressions =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’ convey exclusive meanings:1,2

(2) a. [The Little Prince talks about a flower on his home planet]
   O-gueroko irundyu uesta =nte o-ñemu’lì apa-prè-gui!
   A3-have four thorn-only A3-defend world-from
   ‘She has only four thorns to defend herself against the world.’ (Saint-Exupéry 2005:52)
b. [The Little Prince talks to the switch man]
   Mitá-ngu’re-año-te o-i-kuawo o-heké-vá.
   child-pl-alone-very A3-know A3-search--sc
   ‘Only the children know what they are looking for.’ (Saint-Exupéry 2005:71)

§3 The meanings of =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’ differ from one another, and also from English exclusives (cf. Coppock and Beaver in press). The discourse-functional analysis of exclusives offers insight into this variation.

§4 Concluding remarks

2 Exclusive interpretations with =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’

Exclusives like only give rise to “nothing other than” entailments and the prejacent is not at-issue and projective (e.g. Horn 1972; Beaver and Clark 2008).

1 Paraguayan Guarani is a Tupí-Guarani language spoken by about four million people in Paraguay. The Guarani Guarani examples are given in the standardized orthography of the language used in Paraguay (Ministerio de Educación y Cultura 2004, Vélázquez-Castillo 2004:1421f.), except that all postpositions are attached to their host. Following this orthography, stressed oral syllables are marked with an acute accent and stressed nasal syllables are marked with a tilde; acute accents are not written for normally accented words (stress on the final syllable). The following glosses are used: 1/2/3 = first/second/third person, 12s = first person acting on second person singular, A/B = set A/B cross-reference marker, ac = ablative, compv = complete, cor = copula, nac = negation, nom = nominalization, m/pl = plural, pron03/s = object/subject pronoun, m/su = prospective aspect/modal, sg = singular, sc = relative clause.

2 I thank my language consultants for working with me, especially Ana Sabina Maciel de Cantero, Marí tet Maldonado, Ricardo Aranda Locio, and Robert Ariel Barreto Villalba. This research was partially supported by National Science Foundation grant BCS-0952571 to Craige Roberts and Judith Tonhauser, and by a fellowship from the American Council of Learned Societies. I gratefully acknowledge their support. I also thank David Beaver, Florian Jaeger, Beth Levin, Roger Levy, Craige Roberts, and Michael Wagner for helpful comments on aspects of this research.
2.1 Complement exclusion interpretations with \( =\text{nte} \) ‘only’ and \(-\text{año} \) ‘alone’

Complement exclusion interpretations of utterances with exclusives “give rise to nothing other than entailments” which “exclude everything in the complement of the set of things described by the focus”.

(10)

\[
\text{negative at-issue} \quad \text{the main point; the prejacent is not at-issue, i.e. not the main point.}
\]

\((7)\) I also agree that only one of my vehicles will be parked in any Yale University lot at any one time.

(Horn 2011, cited in Coppock and Beaver in press)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Prejacent: One of my vehicles will be parked in any lot at any one time.
  \item b. Negative: No more than one of my vehicles will be parked in any lot at any one time.
\end{itemize}

Tonhauser (2012b, 2013): Six commonly-used diagnostics for not-at-issue. Some of these diagnostics already suggest that the prejacent of utterances of sentences with \( =\text{nte} \) ‘only’ is not-at-issue:

\((8)\) Assent/dissent test, with continuation:

\begin{itemize}
  \item A: I'm speaking Guaraní, and I don't have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that we have to pay the $100 to a private person. I say: I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:
  \item B3: \#Heñu, ahete, Maléna\( =\text{nte} \) / mavaeṽa ambue.
  \quad yes true Maléna=only nobody other
  \quad 'Yes, true, only Malena / nobody else.'
  \item B3: \#Heñu, ahete, Maléna o-mba'apo.
  \quad yes true Malena A3-work
  \quad 'Of her friends, only Malena works.'
\end{itemize}

\((9)\) Context (9-1): I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say: I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((10)\) Assent/dissent test, with continuation:

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. A-\( \text{vy} \)'-\( \text{â} \)'-\( \text{é} \)'-\( \text{ẹ} \)'-\( \text{rupi} \) / because
  \quad Maléna\( =\text{nte} \) a-mba'apo.
  \quad Malena=only A3-work
  \quad 'Of her friends, only Malena works.'
  \item b. A-\( \text{vy} \)'-\( \text{â} \)'-\( \text{é} \)'-\( \text{ẹ} \)'-\( \text{rupi} \) / because
  \quad Maléna\( =\text{nte} \) o-mba'apo.
  \quad Malena=only nobody other
  \quad 'Yes, true, only Malena / nobody else.'
  \item c. A-\( \text{vy} \)'-\( \text{â} \)'-\( \text{é} \)'-\( \text{ẹ} \)'-\( \text{rupi} \) / because
  \quad Maléna\( =\text{nte} \) o-mba'apo.
  \quad Malena=only nobody other
  \quad 'Yes, true, only Malena / nobody else.'
\end{itemize}

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

\((9)\) Context (9-2): I'm traveling around the world with an international group. Whenever we get to a place, we pay those who speak the language $100 to translate: if there's more than one person who speaks the language, they have to split the $100. When we get to Paraguay, it turns out that I'm the only one that speaks Guarani, and so I don't have to share the $100 with anybody. I say:

In sum, \( =\text{nte} \) ‘only’ and \(-\text{año} \) ‘alone’ give rise to “nothing other than” entailments.

\footnote{Examples not marked with a source were judged by native speaker consultants. An example without a diacritic was judged to be acceptable in the context given; an example marked with ‘*’ or ‘#’ means that the example was judged to be unacceptable, and is hypothesized to be ungrammatical (‘*’), or grammatical but unacceptable for semantic/pragmatic reasons (‘#’).}

\footnote{My consultants judged (9b) to be better in (9-1) than in (9-2).}

In sum, the prejacent of utterances of sentences with \( =\text{nte} \) ‘only’ is not-at-issue content. (Comparable data with \(-\text{año} \) ‘alone’ have not yet been elicited.)
2.3 Projectivity

The prejacent of exclusive utterances (with complement exclusion interpretations) is projective (e.g. Beaver and Clark 2008, but Horn 2002):

(11) Only three rings were stolen. [Prejacent: Three rings were stolen.]
   a. It is possible that [only three rings were stolen].
   b. It is not the case that [only three rings were stolen].

Tonhauser et al. (2013): Diagnostics for projectivity that are applicable in research with theoretically untrained language consultants — but the negation variants were often not useful in Guaraní.

(12) [Clara sells expensive rings. One night, she receives a call from the police telling her that the store has been broken into. At the store, she takes a quick and cursory inventory to tell the police whether something is missing. She says [(12a-c)] about the thief.]

Consultants were asked how many rings were stolen. (adapted from Tonhauser et al. 2013:88,fn.19)

a. Mbohapýnte o-monda. [Consultants: "three rings were stolen"]
   three=only A3-steal
   ‘He stole only three.’

b. I-katu mbobapýnte o-monda. [Consultants: "at least three rings were stolen"]
   B3-possible three=only A3-steal
   ‘It’s possible that he stole only three.’

c. Mbohapýnte nd-o-mondá-i. [Consultants: "all but three rings were stolen"]
   three=only B1sg-sister-alone steal
   ‘Only three rings were not stolen.’

In negated copula sentences, negation has scope over the predicative noun phrase:

(13) Context (13-1): I’m pointing at a woman who is my sister.

(14) Context (13-2): I’m pointing at a woman who is not my sister.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(13-1)</th>
<th>(13-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Pe kuha ha’e che-ryke’y.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that woman cop B1sg-sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘That woman is my sister.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Pe kuha nda-ha’ê-i che-ryke’y.</td>
<td># ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that woman ng-co-cor B1sg-sister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘That woman is not my sister.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

If the prejacent projects over negation, a negated exclusive utterance should be rejected in a context in which the prejacent is false.

(15) a. Context: Pointing at the house in which I live, which belongs to my sister alone.
   # Ko ogá nda-ha’ê-i che-roga=nte. [Prejacent: This house is my house]
   this house ng-co-cor B1sg-house=only
   ‘This house isn’t only mine.’

b. Context: Pointing at the house in which I live, which belongs to my sister and me together.
   Ko ogá nda-ha’ê-i che-roga=nte. [Prejacent: This house is my house]
   this house ng-co-cor B1sg-house=only
   ‘This house isn’t only mine.’

(16) a. Context: I point at a woman who is not my sister. I have three sisters.
   #Pe kuha nda-ha’ê-i che-ryke’y-año. [Prejacent: That woman is my sister]
   that woman ng-co-cor B1sg-sister-alone
   ‘That woman is not my only sister.’

b. Context: I point at a woman who is my sister. I have three in total.
   Pe kuha nda-ha’ê-i che-ryke’y-año. [Prejacent: That woman is my sister]
   that woman ng-co-cor B1sg-sister-alone
   ‘That woman is not my only sister.’

In sum, the prejacent of an exclusive utterance with a complement exclusion interpretation projects.

2.4 Interim summary and analysis

Summary: =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’ are exclusives, defined as expressions that contribute ‘nothing other than’ entailments, and give rise to projective, not-at-issue prejacent implications.

Preliminary analysis: (to be revised below)

Beaver and Clark (2008): The meanings of an exclusive utterance is comment on the Current Question by weakening a salient expectation. In particular, such utterances convey that the prejacent is weaker than the expected answer to the Current Question on a salient scale.

(17) [I was at a party; you ask me who danced.]
   Ché=nte/-año a-jeroky.
   pron.S.1sg-only/-alone A1sg-dance
   ‘Only I danced.’
The meanings of exclusive utterances can be characterized by ‘at least’ and ‘at most’ implications.

(18) Only I danced.
   b. min: At least I danced. (presupposed content)
   c. max: At most I danced. (asserted content)

3.1 Rank order readings

1. =nte ‘only’ is acceptable, but -año ‘alone’ is not:

(22) [The Little Prince says to the lamplighter:]
   Nde-kuarahy ra’y-pe ára hi’are petel aravo\'i=nte / #-año!
   B2sg-sun little-on day B3-last one minute=only -alone
   ‘A day lasts merely/just/only one minute on your planet!’ (Saint-Exupéry 2005:48)

3.1.1 Syntactic category and distribution

=nte ‘only’ is an enclitic and -año ‘alone’ a nominal affix (or an adjective). Both can attach to noun phrases, as shown in (25a), but only =nte ‘only’ can attach to other constituents, as shown in (25b-d).

(25) a. [At a party, nobody but me danced. I tell a friend:]
   Ché=nte/-año a-jeroky.
   pron.S.1sg=only-alone A1sg-dance
   ‘Only I danced.’

These data suggest meaning variation not just between =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’, but also between the Paraguayan Guaraní and English expressions.

3 Variation in exclusive meanings

=nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’ differ from one another, and also from English exclusives.

1. =nte ‘only’ is acceptable, but -año ‘alone’ is not:

(22) [The Little Prince says to the lamplighter:]
   Nde-kuarahy ra’y-pe ára hi’are petel aravo\'i=nte / #-año!
   B2sg-sun little-on day B3-last one minute=only -alone
   ‘A day lasts merely/just/only one minute on your planet!’ (Saint-Exupéry 2005:48)
3.1.2 Only

with scale that orders elements by rank; with such interpretati

-ano ‘alone’ is not restricted to subject noun phrases:

(26) a. [The Little Prince crossed the desert and...]
   o-juhu pet el yvoty-año-ite.
   A3-find one flower-alone-very
   ‘he found only one flower.’ (Saint-Exupéry 2005:58)

b. [The Little Prince thought that his flower was unique]
   Ha ko`ápe o-i po su ... pet el yvoty-tý-ye-pa-año.
   and here A3-be five thousand one flower-field-in-alone
   ‘And here there were five thousand of them in one single garden.’ (Saint-Exupéry 2005:60)

So, the unacceptability of -año ‘alone’ in (22) cannot be attributed to its syntactic distribution.

3.1.2 Only =nte ‘only’ is compatible with rank-order interpretations

Rank-order interpretations of utterances with exclusives concern “the placement of the prejacent on a scale that orders elements by rank”; with such interpretations, “the negative component can be paraphrased with no more than”.

(27) Felipe is only a seminarist.
   Prejacent: Felipe is a seminarist.
   Negative: Felipe is no more than a seminarist.

Diagnosing rank-order interpretations:

(28) Diagnostic for rank-order interpretations

Let excl. be an expression that has a (complement exclusion) exclusive interpretation. Let expression XP convey a property P₁ that is outranked in a rank-order by property P₂.

Create:
- Context C in which entity x is denied to have property P₂.
- Positive sentence S in which XP is marked with excl. and P₁ is predicated of x.

Then: If S is judged to be acceptable in C, excl. is compatible with a rank-order interpretation. If S is judged to be unacceptable, excl. is incompatible with a rank-order interpretation.

Application of the diagnostic in (28) to =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’:

(29) Context: I want to get married right this moment. I drag myself to a priest there. I start pestering the first man I run into, saying: “I’m not a priest...”

   a. Pèa ha’e vitamín=ante.
   pron.S.3 these vitamins=only
   ‘These are only vitamins.’

   b. #Pèa ha’e vitamín-año.
   these coP vitamins-alone
   (Intended: These are only vitamins.)

(30) Context: My mother has back pain. We take her to the doctor and show him the medication she’s been taking so far. He looks at the bottles and says: “These aren’t medications...”

   a. Ha’e pa’i-rá=año.
   pron.S.3 priest-NOM.PROP=alone
   ‘He’s only a seminarist.’

   b. #Ha’e pa’i-rá=año.
   pron.S.3 priest-NOM.PROP-alone
   (Intended: He’s only a seminarist.)

In sum, =nte ‘only’ but not -año ‘alone’ is compatible with rank-order interpretations.
3.1.3 Analysis of the rank-order interpretation

(31) Current Question: What property does he have? Answer propositions are ordered in a rank-order:

Ha’e pa’i-râ=nte.
pron.S.3 priest-nom.prosf=only

‘He is a priest’

Ha’e pa’i-râ=nte.
pron.S.3 priest-nom.prosf=only

‘He is a bishop’

(32) Analysis of =nte ‘only’:

[(34a) entails that the house being pointed at belongs to nobody but the speaker; (34b) does not entail this and leaves open the possibility that the house is co-owned.

3.2 A difference in semantic type and question presupposition

2. -año ‘alone’ is acceptable in (23)/(33b), but =nte ‘only’ is not, and alone is marginal in the translation:

(33) Context (33-1): I own several houses. The house I’m pointing at belongs to me alone.

Context (33-2): I own just the one house that I’m pointing at; I co-own it with my sister.

(34) Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contexts</th>
<th>(33-1)</th>
<th>(33-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ko ōga che-róga=nte.</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this house B1sg-house=only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘This house is only my house.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ko ōga che-róga-año.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this house B1sg-house-alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘This house is my only house.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(34a) entails that the house being pointed at belongs to nobody but the speaker; (34b) does not entail this and leaves open the possibility that the house is co-owned.

3.3 Non-accompaniment interpretations with -año ‘alone’

3. -año ‘alone’ is acceptable, but =nte ‘only’ is not, and alone is not acceptable in the translation:

(24) [The Little Prince says about the fox he just tamed:]

ha ko’íga ha’e-ino-nte arapý-pe.
and now pron.S.3-alone-very world-in

‘and now he is unique in all the world.’

(Saint-Exupéry 2005:68)
3.3.1 Non-accompaniment interpretations with -año ‘alone’ and alone

Like English alone (Moltmann 2004), utterances with -año ‘alone’ can convey seemingly non-exclusive meanings:

(36) Context: All of the children in the playground we’re looking at are playing. They’re all playing together, except for Juan, who is playing by himself.

Juan ha’-e-ño o-juga.
Juan pron.S.3-alone A3-play

‘Juan is playing alone.’

(37) Context: Maria wants me to carry two boxes at the same time. I lift each of them and realize that each weights 10kg. The doctor said that I can’t lift more than 10kg, so I tell Maria, pointing at one of the boxes:

Pe kája hi-año o-guerekó-ma die kilo.
that box B3-alone A3-have-already ten kilo

‘That box alone already weighs ten kilo.’

The non-accompaniment interpretation differs from the exclusive interpretation:

(5) Context (5-1): At a party, the speaker was the only person who danced.

Context (5-2): At a party, many guests, including the speaker, danced.

(38) Context (38-1): At a party, I was the only person who danced alone; everybody else danced in pairs.

Context (38-2): At a party, Susi and I danced alone; everybody else danced in pairs.

(39) Examples | Contexts (5-1) (5-2) (38-1) (38-2)
--- | ---

a. Che=nte a-jeroky.
pron.S.1sg=only A1sg-dance
‘Only I danced.’

b. Che-año a-jeroky.
pron.S.1sg-alone A1sg-dance
‘I alone danced./’I danced alone.’

c. Che a-jeroky.
pron.S.1sg A1sg-dance
‘I danced.’

3.3.2 A unified analysis of -año ‘alone’


A unified analysis is desirable for Paraguayan Guaraní -año ‘alone’ since the same sentence is compatible with both interpretations.

Proposal: A unified analysis of these interpretations of -año ‘alone’ is possible under the analysis of -año ‘alone’ as an exclusive.

(5b) Che-año a-jeroky.
pron.S.1sg-alone A1sg-dance
‘I alone danced./’I danced alone.’

Boolean lattice of answers to the Current Question “Who accompanied the speaker in dancing?”

U = {sp, a, b}

Answer propositions:

sp: the speaker accompanied the speaker in dancing

a: a accompanied the speaker in dancing

b: b accompanied the speaker in dancing

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sp} & \lor \text{a} \lor \text{b} \\
\text{sp} & \lor \text{a} \\
\text{sp} & \lor \text{b}
\end{align*}
\]

MBC: At least the speaker accompanies the speaker in dancing

MAX: At most the speaker accompanies the speaker in dancing

An exclusive analysis of (39b) Che-año a-jeroky ‘I danced alone’:

(40) a. $[[\text{año}]_{\text{año}}]^{G} = \lambda R_{x}(x)\lambda.\lambda x.\lambda w:$

$\text{co}_{G} \subseteq \exists ! R(x)(\exists) \land$

$\text{ENTAILMENT}(\geq x) \land$

$\text{MIN} \leq R(x)(\exists)(w)$

$\text{MAX} \leq R(x)(\exists)(w)$

//Who R’s with x?

//strength: entailment

//at least x R’s with x

//at most x R’s with x
b. \[ \text{[(44b)]} = \text{[(=nte(wthm(dance)))(1)]} \]

\[= \text{aw} : \text{co}_{2} \in \{r^{*}(\text{wthm(dance')})(x)(p)(z)\} \wedge \]

\[\text{ENTAILMENT}(\geq 2) \wedge \]

\[\text{strength: entailment} \]

\[\text{MIN}_{\text{wthm(dance')}\text{(x(p))}(w)} \wedge \]

\[\text{at least the speaker danced with the speaker} \]

\[\text{MAX}_{\text{wthm(dance')}\text{(x(p))}(w)} \wedge \]

\[\text{at most the speaker danced with the speaker} \]

On this analysis, (39b) at w presupposes that the question under discussion is who accompanied the speaker in dancing, with answers ranked as a boolean lattice, and that the speaker was accompanied at least by herself (i.e. the speaker danced).

(39b) at w asserts that the speaker was accompanied in dancing at most by herself, i.e. she danced alone.

**So what about (24)?**

(24) [The Little Prince says about the fox he just tamed:]

\[\text{ha ko'aga ba'e-o-ite arap yap-pe} \]

and now \text{pron.S.3-alone-very world-in}

‘and now he is unique in all the world.’ (Saint-Exupéry 2005:68)

(24) does not mean that the fox is alone in the world, so the Current Question addressed by (24) is not “Who accompanies the fox in the world?”.

Instead, the Current Question is “Who accompanies to the fox?”:

\[\text{min: At least the fox compares to the fox.} \]

\[\text{max: At most the fox compares to the fox.} \]

### 3.4 Interim summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Only</th>
<th>Alone</th>
<th>Merely</th>
<th>Sole</th>
<th>=nte ‘only’</th>
<th>-año ‘alone’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Complement exclusion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not-at-issue prejacent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nothing other than/No more than entails</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rank-order</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-accompaniment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Uniqueness</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Relational</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** Exclusive meanings in English and Paraguayan Guarani

**Overall finding:** Although =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’ are remarkably similar in meaning to **only** and **alone**, respectively, detailed investigation reveals subtle cross-linguistic meaning variation.

### 4 Concluding remarks

Three components of research on cross-linguistic meaning variation:

1. **Theoretically-informed empirical generalizations:** Paraguayan Guarani and English both realize exclusives, but the relevant expressions differ in their meanings and uses (as described for English in e.g. Beaver and Clark 2008; Coppock and Beaver in press).

2. **Research methods:** =nte ‘only’ and -año ‘alone’ are argued in §2 to be exclusives because they contribute at-issue “nothing other than” entailments. But, by this definition, merely is not an exclusive!

3. **Theoretical analysis:** By the discourse-functional analysis of Beaver and Clark (2008); Coppock and Beaver (in press), (all?) languages realize exclusives to allow their speakers to dampen expectations of their interlocutors.

Exclusives cross-linguistically may vary by i) syntactic category, ii) constraints on ordering, and iii) constraints on the CQ.
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