

THE INTERACTION BETWEEN FOCUS AND THE Q'ANJOB'AL PARTICLE *K'AL*

Junwen Lee
Brown University

1. INTRODUCTION

- Q'anjob'al is spoken in the northwest of Guatemala – about 100,000 speakers (Gordon 2005), and about 11,000 Q'anjob'al immigrants in the United States (IOM 2004).

- Member of the Mayan language family:

- ▶ Western division; Q'anjob'alan branch (England 1992: 21).

- Brief overview of Q'anjob'al grammar (Mateo Toledo 2008):

- ▶ VSO word order

- 1) (Context: *Xhuwin works in a pet store. She is in charge of the dogs in the store and so is the one always giving them food.*)

s-lo-w-te-j ix Xhuwin no tx'i'.¹
3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV² CL Xhuwin CL dogs
'Xhuwin feeds the dogs.'

- ◆ Head-marking language following an ergative-absolutive system.

- ▶ Focused expressions occur before the main verb, and may be marked by the focus marker *a*.

- 2) (Context: *Maltixh attends a dinner party that takes place every month, during which people sometimes dance. Xhuwin was not at the party yesterday.*)

a. Xhuwin: Who danced last night?

Maltixh: [**a** naq Yakin]_F x-∅-kanalwi
FOC CL Yakin COM-3SG.B-dance
'[Yakin]_F danced.'

¹ I would like to thank my language consultant, Catarina Lorenzo, for her time and patience during the many elicitation sessions during this research, as well as Eli Sharf for contributing some of the data on Q'anjob'al focus constructions.

² The notation used in this paper mostly follow Mateo Toledo (2008) and are as follows: 1SG/2SG/3SG (first-/second-/third-person singular), 1PL/2PL/3PL (first-/second-/third-person plural), suffixed by A or B to indicate ergative or absolutive form respectively; AF (Agent Focus marker); AP (Antipassive marker); CL (classifier); COM (completive aspect marker); DER (derivation); DM (dependent marker); FOC (focus marker); INT (interrogative); PRE (preposition); and TV (transitive verb ending).

- b. Xhuwin: Did anyone dance last night?
 Maltixh: ja, [naq Yakin]_F x-Ø-kanalwi³
 yes CL Yakin COM-3SG.B-dance
 ‘Yes, [Yakin]_F danced.’

- In this presentation, I lay out the different variant constructions of the Q'anjob'al particle *k'al* and their differing felicity conditions and interpretations, and propose a preliminary semantic characterization of *k'al* and how it interacts with focus.

2. DISTRIBUTION OF *K'AL*

- Directly after the focused expression, both with and without the focus marker ((A+)FOC *K'AL*):

- 3) (Context: *Xhuwin is working in a pet store, where each employee is in charge of taking care of one type of animal. Xhuwin loves dogs, so she is the one who is in charge of feeding and taking care of them.*)

- a. [(a) no tx'i']_F **k'al** s-lo-w-te-j ix Xhuwin
 (FOC) CL dogs **K'AL** 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Xhuwin
 ‘Xhuwin always feeds [the dogs]_F.’
- b. [(a) ix Xhuwin]_F **k'al** s-lo-w-te-n no tx'i'
 (FOC) CL Xhuwin **K'AL** 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-AF CL dogs
 ‘[Xhuwin]_F always feeds the dogs.’

- Directly after the focus marker (A+*K'AL* FOC):

- 4) (Context: *Xhuwin works in the pet store. She is in charge of the dogs in the store and so would only give them food.*)

- [**a k'al** no tx'i']_F s-lo-w-te-j ix Xhuwin
FOC K'AL CL dogs 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Xhuwin
 ‘Xhuwin only feeds [the dogs]_F.’

- 5) (Context: *Maltixh and Xhuwin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. No one else besides him talks to her at the parties.*)

- [**a k'al** naq Maltixh]_F s-q'ajab'-Ø b'ay ix Xhuwin (b'ay q'in)
FOC K'AL CL Maltixh 3SG.A-talk-AF PRE CL Xhuwin (PRE party)
 ‘Only [Maltixh]_F talks to Xhuwin (at the party).’

³ *a* seems to be obligatory in answers to *wh*-questions – *naq Yakin xkanalwi* is infelicitous as an answer to (2a).

- Directly after the main predicate (*K'AL*):

6) (Context: *Xhuwin works in a pet store, and always gives the dogs food.*)

s-lo-w-te-j **k'al** ix Xhuwin no tx'i'
 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV **K'AL** CL Xhuwin CL dogs
 'Xhuwin always feeds the dogs.'

7) (Context: *Fido is a dog that is always dirty.*)

tz'il **k'al** jun (no) tx'i' ti
 dirty **K'AL** one (CL) dog this
 'This dog is always dirty.'

3. GENERALIZATIONS

- *k'al* is interpreted non-exhaustively only in non-focus constructions:

8) (Context: *Maltixh, Xhuwin and Yakin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. He always talks to her the entire duration of the parties, but sometimes includes other people in their conversation.*)

Lucia: [tom]_F wtx' yaq'on Maltixh y-etoq Xhuwin
 INT good friends Maltixh 3SG.A-with Xhuwin
 'Are Maltixh and Xhuwin good friends?'

Yakin: teqan.
 'I think so.'

► Continuations:

a. *K'AL*

s-q'ajab' k'al naq b'ay ix (b'ay q'in)
 3SG.A-talk **K'AL** CL PRE CL (PRE party)
 'He always talks to her (at the parties).'

b. *A+K'AL FOC*

[a k'al b'ay ix]_F s-q'ajab' naq (b'ay q'in)
 FOC **K'AL** PRE CL 3SG.A-talk CL (PRE party)
 'He only talks [to her]_F (at the parties).'

c. *A+FOC K'AL*

[a b'ay ix]_F k'al s-q'ajab' naq (b'ay q'in)
 FOC PRE CL **K'AL** 3SG.A-talk CL (PRE party)
 'He always talks [to her]_F (at the parties).'

d. FOC K'AL
 ? [b'ay ix]_F k'al s-q'ajab' naq (b'ay q'in)
 PRE CL K'AL 3SG.A-talk CL (PRE party)
 'He always talks [to her]_F (at the parties).'

◆ My consultant rejects the (b-d) continuations as she interprets them as indicating that Maltixh did not talk to anyone other than Xhuwin during the dinner parties, which is inconsistent with the stated context.

9) (Context: *Xhuwin works in a pet store. She is in charge of feeding the dogs and the birds.*)

a. K'AL
 s-lo-w-te-j k'al ix Xhuwin no tx'i'
 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV K'AL CL Xhuwin CL dogs
 'Xhuwin always feeds the dogs.'

b. A+K'AL FOC
 # [a k'al no tx'i']_F s-lo-w-te-j ix Xhuwin
 FOC K'AL CL dogs 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Xhuwin
 'Xhuwin only feeds [the dogs]_F.'

c. A+FOC K'AL
 # [a no tx'i']_F k'al s-lo-w-te-j ix Xhuwin
 FOC CL dogs K'AL 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Xhuwin
 'Xhuwin always feeds [the dogs]_F.'

d. FOC K'AL
 ? [no tx'i']_F k'al s-lo-w-te-j ix Xhuwin
 CL dogs K'AL 3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Xhuwin
 'Xhuwin always feeds [the dogs]_F.'

◆ Similarly, my consultant rejects the (b-d) continuations here as she interprets them as indicating that Xhuwin did not feed any other animals other than the dogs, which is again inconsistent with the stated context.

► Even though English *always* has also been observed to allow non-exhaustive interpretations (Beaver & Clark 2003), the two are not semantic cognates:

10) (Context: *Maltixh and Xhuwin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. He talks to her at least once in each of the parties, but also leaves her sometimes to have conversations with other people.*)

a. English *always*:
Maltixh always talks to Xhuwin (at the parties).

b. Q'anjob'al *k'al*:
s-q'ajab' k'al naq Maltixh b'ay ix Xhuwin
3SG.A-talk K'AL CL Maltixh PRE CL Xhuwin
Intended: 'Maltixh always talks to Xhuwin (at the parties).'

- The exhaustive interpretation of *k'al* after a focused constituent seems to be an implicature that can be cancelled:

11) (Context: *I met Xhuwin, Lucia and Maltixh at a party and became friends with them. Lucia finds my name hard to remember, but Xhuwin and Maltixh always remember my name when we meet. Yakin knows these people, and made a bet with me about who he thinks always remembers my name when we meet.*)

- ▶ My consultant thinks Yakin wins the bet if he had phrased it as follows:

a. K'AL

Yakin: s-na-teq k'al naq Maltixh a-b'i.
3SG.A-think-DIR K'AL CL Maltixh 2SG.A-name
'Maltixh always remembers your name.'

b. FOC K'AL

Yakin: [naq Maltixh]_F k'al s-naq-on-teq a-b'i.
CL Maltixh K'AL 3SG.A-think-AF-DIR 2SG.A-name
'[Maltixh]_F always remembers your name.'

c. A+FOC K'AL

Yakin: [a naq Maltixh]_F k'al s-naq-on-teq a-b'i.
FOC CL Maltixh K'AL 3SG.A-think-AF-DIR 2SG.A-name
'[Maltixh]_F always remembers your name.'

- ▶ According to her, Yakin does not win the bet if he had used the *A+K'AL* FOC construction:

d. A+K'AL FOC

Yakin: [a k'al naq Maltixh]_F s-naq-on-teq a-b'i
FOC K'AL CL Maltixh 3SG.A-think-AF-DIR 2SG.A-name
'[Maltixh]_F only remembers your name.'

- ◆ The *A+K'AL* FOC construction conveys an exhaustivity *entailment* rather than an implicature.

- While *A+K'AL* FOC constructions are felicitous in single-event scenarios, *A+FOC K'AL* constructions are not:

12) (Context: *Lucia is new in the pet store. She fed the dogs once and got bitten, so she now works as the cashier and does not feed the animals anymore.*)

a. *A+K'AL* FOC

[a k'al no tx'i']_F x-s-lo-w-te-j ix Lucia.
 FOC K'AL CL dogs COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Lucia
 'Lucia only fed [the dogs]_F.'

b. # [a no tx'i']_F k'al x-s-lo-w-te-j ix Lucia.
 FOC CL dogs K'AL COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Lucia
 Intended: 'Lucia always fed [the dogs]_F.'

c. # [no tx'i']_F k'al x-s-lo-w-te-j ix Lucia.
 CL dogs K'AL COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Lucia
 Intended: 'Lucia always fed [the dogs]_F.'

d. # x-s-lo-w-te-j no tx'i' k'al ix Lucia.
 COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL dogs K'AL CL Lucia
 Intended: 'Lucia always fed the dogs.'

4. ANALYSIS

- Similarities between Q'anjob'al *k'al* and English *always*:

- ▶ Both expressions seem to be optionally focus-sensitive.

- ◆ Association with focus is not obligatory for English *always*:

13) Mary always managed to complete her [exams]_F.

- a. ? 'Whenever Mary completed something, it was invariably an exam.' (Association with focus reading)
- b. 'Whenever Mary took exams, she completed them.'
 (Beaver & Clark 2003: 335)

- ◆ *k'al* in non-focus constructions seems to also allow its restrictor to be pragmatically determined:

14) s-q'ajab' k'al naq Maltixh b'ay ix Xhuwin
 3SG.A-talk K'AL CL Maltixh PRE CL Xhuwin
 'Maltixh always talks to Xhuwin.'

- *Acceptable Context 1*: Maltixh and Xhuwin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. He always talks to her the entire duration of the parties, but sometimes includes other people in the conversation.
 - Restrictor is the set of events such that Maltixh is talking to someone.
- *Acceptable Context 2*: Maltixh attends a dinner party that takes place every month. Xhuwin attends the party only sometimes. He talks to other people if she is not present, but talks to her whenever she is there.
 - Restrictor is the set of events such that someone is talking to Xhuwin.
- *Unacceptable Context*: Maltixh and Xhuwin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. He always talks to her at least once in each of the parties, but also leaves her sometimes to have conversations with other people. ➤ As previously stated, this context would be acceptable with English *always*.

▶ Both expressions allow non-exhaustive interpretations:

- ◆ *k'al* is felicitous in (14) above even though Maltixh sometimes includes other people in his conversations with Xhuwin at the dinner parties.
- ◆ English *always*:

15) A: Does Sandy feed Nutrapup to her dogs?

- a. B: Yes, Sandy always feeds Nutrapup to [Fido]_F, and she also always feeds Nutrapup to [Butch]_F.
- b. B: * Yes, Sandy only feeds Nutrapup to [Fido]_F, and she also only feeds Nutrapup to [Butch]_F.
 (Beaver & Clark 2003: 327)

- While (15b) is contradictory because *only* indicates that Sandy fed Nutrapup to Fido and no other animal, (15a) is not because *Sandy always feeds Nutrapup to [Fido]_F* does not exclude her from feeding other animals Nutrapup.

■ Semantic meaning of *always* in English (Beaver & Clark 2003):

- ▶ *Always* is analyzed in terms of *eventualities*, which are situations or partial models of the world (cf. Krifka's (1989) *events*).

- ◆ *Maltixh eats chicken* is expressed as $\lambda e[\text{eating}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{chicken}]$, where e is an eventuality.
- ▶ $[[\text{always}]] = [\lambda P_{\langle e, \varepsilon \rangle} [\lambda x_e [\forall e_\varepsilon \sigma(e) \rightarrow \exists e' \rho(e, e') \wedge P(x)(e')]]]$, where σ and ρ are contextual variables, x is the focused element and e is an event of semantic type ε .
- ◆ *Mary always takes [John]_F to the movies* – Setting σ as $\lambda e[\exists x \text{person}(x) \wedge \text{take-to-the-movies}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{mary} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = x]$ and ρ as the identity function, every e in which $\exists x \text{person}(x) \wedge \text{take-to-the-movies}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{mary} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = x$ is one in which $\text{take-to-the-movies}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{mary} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{john}$ is true.
- ◆ Setting σ contextually accounts for why association with focus is not obligatory for *always*:

13) Mary always managed to complete her [exams]_F.

- a. ? ‘Whenever Mary completed something, it was invariably an exam.’ (Association with focus reading)
- b. ‘Whenever Mary took exams, she completed them.’ (Beaver & Clark 2003: 335)

○ In (13), σ is set to $\lambda e[\text{sat-for}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{mary} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{exam}]$.

- ◆ Setting ρ contextually accounts for why *always* allows non-exhaustive interpretations:

15) A: Does Sandy feed Nutrapup to her dogs?

- a. B: Yes, Sandy always feeds Nutrapup to [Fido]_F, and she also always feeds Nutrapup to [Butch]_F.
- b. B: * Yes, Sandy only feeds Nutrapup to [Fido]_F, and she also only feeds Nutrapup to [Butch]_F. (Beaver & Clark 2003: 327)

○ (15a) is not contradictory because ρ can be set to *temporal-and-physical-part-of*, so if σ is set to $\lambda e[\exists \text{some-number-of-}x \text{animal}(\text{some-number-of-}x) \wedge \text{feeding}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{sandy} \wedge \text{GOAL}(e) = \text{some-number-of-}x \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{nutrapup}]$, (15a) states that within an event in which Sandy feeds some dogs, she feeds Nutrapup to Fido, and also Nutrapup to Butch.

■ **Proposed meaning of *k'al* (preliminary):**

16) $[[k'al]] = \lambda p_{\langle e, t \rangle} [\forall e_\varepsilon \sigma(e) \rightarrow p(e)]$

- ▶ While Beaver and Clark's (2003) characterization of English *always* involves existential quantification over temporal or physical subparts of events, Q'anjob'al *k'al* requires $p(e)$ in (16) to be true iff for all e' that are sub-parts of e , $p(e')$ is true.
- ▶ However, Q'anjob'al *k'al* also seems to require $p(e)$ to be non-exhaustive, i.e. if $p = \lambda e[\text{talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{xhuwin}]$, $p(e)$ is still true if e is an event in which Maltixh is in a conversation with both Xhuwin and Lucia.

■ Analysis of (14):

14) s-q'ajab' k'al naq Maltixh b'ay ix Xhuwin
 3SG.A-talk K'AL CL Maltixh PRE CL Xhuwin
 'Maltixh always talks to Xhuwin.'

- ▶ *Acceptable Context 1*: Maltixh and Xhuwin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. He always talks to her the entire duration of the parties, but sometimes includes other people in the conversation.

Setting σ as $\lambda e[\exists y \text{ talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = y]$, for every e such that $\exists y \text{ talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = y$ is true, $\text{talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{xhuwin}$ is true.

In prose: Every event in which Maltixh talks to someone (at the parties) is an event in which minimally he talks to Xhuwin, i.e. in every conversation that Maltixh has with someone (at the parties), Xhuwin is a part of that conversation.

- ▶ *Acceptable Context 2*: Maltixh attends a dinner party that takes place every month. Xhuwin attends the party only sometimes. He talks to other people if she is not present, but talks to her whenever she is there.

Setting σ as $\lambda e[\exists y \text{ talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = y \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{xhuwin}]$, for every e such that $\exists y \text{ AGENT}(e) = y \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{xhuwin}$ is true, $\text{talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{xhuwin}$ is true.

In prose: Every event in which someone talks to Xhuwin (at the parties) is one in which minimally Maltixh talks to her, i.e. in every conversation that someone has with Xhuwin (at the parties), Maltixh is a part of that conversation.

- ▶ *Unacceptable Context*: Maltixh and Xhuwin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. He talks to her at least once in each of the parties, but also leaves her sometimes to have conversations with other people.

- ◆ **English *always*:** Setting σ as $\lambda e[\text{AGENT}(e) = \textit{maltixh} \wedge \text{LOCATION}(e) = \textit{dinner-parties}]$ and ρ as the *temporal-or-physical-part-of* relation, for every e such that $\text{AGENT}(e) = \textit{maltixh} \wedge \text{LOCATION}(e) = \textit{dinner-parties}$ is true, there is some e' that is a temporal or physical part of e such that $\text{talk}(e') \wedge \text{AGENT}(e') = \textit{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e') = \textit{xhuwin} \wedge \text{LOCATION}(e') = \textit{dinner-parties}$ is true.

In prose: For every event in which Maltixh is in a dinner party, there is at least one temporal or physical part of that event in which Maltixh talks to Xhuwin.

- ◆ **Q'anjob'al *k'al*:** Setting σ as $\lambda e[\text{AGENT}(e) = \textit{maltixh} \wedge \text{LOCATION}(e) = \textit{dinner-parties}]$, for every e such that $\text{AGENT}(e) = \textit{maltixh} \wedge \text{LOCATION}(e) = \textit{dinner-parties}$ is true, $\text{talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \textit{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \textit{xhuwin} \wedge \text{LOCATION}(e) = \textit{dinner-parties}$ is true.

In prose: Every event in which Maltixh is in a dinner party is one in which minimally Maltixh talks to Xhuwin. However, this is not true in this context as there are temporal subparts in these events in which Xhuwin is not a part of Maltixh's conversations with other people.

- Accounting for the exhaustivity implicature of the (A+)FOC *K'AL* constructions:

- ▶ The exhaustivity implicature is also present in focus constructions without *k'al*:

17) (Context: *There was a party the previous night that Yakin attended but Lucia did not. At the party, Yakin saw Xhuwin, whom Lucia also knows, and other people whom Lucia does not know.*)

Lucia: mak-txel x-h-il b'ay q'in?
 who-INT COM-2SG.A-see PRE party
 'Who did you see at the party?'

a. Yakin: [a ix Xhuwin]_F x-w-il-a'
 FOC CL Xhuwin COM-1SG.A-see-TV
 'I saw [Xhuwin]_F.'

b. Yakin: tay x-w-il-on k'ax jun-tzan-xa anima.
 and COM-1SG.A-see-DM CL IND-PL-other people
 'I also saw other people.'

- ◆ (17a) conveys that Yakin did not see anyone else other than Xhuwin at the party, although this implicature can be cancelled in (17b).

- ▶ **Proposal:** The exhaustivity implicature of the (A+)FOC *K'AL* constructions is supplied by the focus construction itself.

- 18) (Context: *Maltixh, Xhuwin and Yakin attend a dinner party that takes place every month. Maltixh always talks to Xhuwin the entire duration of the parties, but may include other people in the conversation.*)

Lucia: tom watx' yaq'on Maltixh y-etoq Xhuwin
 INT good friends Maltixh 3SG.A-with Xhuwin
 'Are Maltixh and Xhuwin good friends?'

Yakin: teqan. [a b'ay ix]_F k'al s-q'ajab' naq (b'ay q'in)
 I think so. FOC PRE CL K'AL 3SG.A-talk CL (PRE party)
 'I think so. He always talks [to her]_F.'

- ◆ Focus on *b'ay ix* 'to her' sets σ to $\lambda e[\exists y \text{ talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = y]$, so Yakin indicates in (18) that for every e such that $\exists y \text{ talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = y$ is true, $\text{talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{xhuwin}$ is true.
 - However, the exhaustivity implicature that focus conveys suggests that $\text{talk}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e) = \text{maltixh} \wedge \text{THEME}(e) = \text{xhuwin}$ is maximally true, i.e. that no one else is included in Maltixh's conversations with Xhuwin.

■ **Preliminary work:** Accounting for the $A+K'AL$ FOC constructions:

- ▶ As stated previously, only $A+K'AL$ FOC constructions are felicitous in single-event scenarios:

- 19) (Context: *Lucia is new in the pet store. She fed the dogs once and got bitten, so she now works as the cashier and does not feed the animals anymore.*)

a. $A+K'AL$ FOC

[a k'al no tx'i']_F x-s-lo-w-te-j ix Lucia.
 FOC K'AL CL dogs COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Lucia
 'Lucia only fed [the dogs]_F.'

b. # [a no tx'i']_F k'al x-s-lo-w-te-j ix Lucia.
 FOC CL dogs K'AL COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Lucia
 Intended: 'Lucia always fed [the dogs]_F.'

c. # [no tx'i']_F k'al x-s-lo-w-te-j ix Lucia.
 CL dogs K'AL COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL Lucia
 Intended: 'Lucia always fed [the dogs]_F.'

d. # x-s-lo-w-te-j no tx'i' k'al ix Lucia.
 COM-3SG.A-eat-AP-DER-TV CL dogs K'AL CL Lucia
 Intended: 'Lucia always fed the dogs.'

- ▶ **Possible approach to a solution:** Different sets of objects are quantified over in A+FOC *K'AL* and (A+) *K'AL* FOC constructions.
 - ◆ In (19b-d), *k'al* involves the set of different *events* in which Lucia fed some animal(s). Since she had only fed the dogs once, there are no possible alternatives to the single event of Lucia feeding the dogs.
 - ◆ In (19a), however, *a k'al* involves the set of focus alternatives to *no tx'i'*. Even though she had only fed the dogs once, there are possible alternatives to the animals she could have fed, e.g. she could have fed the birds instead of the dogs.
 - The exhaustivity entailment may thus be accounted for by the fact that the focus alternatives in the set are mutually exclusive, i.e. there are no subparts in the alternative that Lucia fed the dogs in which she also fed other animals.

5. CONCLUSION/FINAL THOUGHTS

- In this presentation, I propose a semantic characterization of Q'anjob'al *k'al* as involving quantification over events, similar to Beaver and Clark's (2003) characterization of English *always*.
 - ▶ While Beaver and Clark's (2003) characterization of English *always* involves existential quantification over physical and temporal subparts of events, Q'anjob'al *k'al* seems to require universal quantification over these subparts.
 - ◆ It is also not clear if σ can be contextually set even if *k'al* is used in focus constructions. ➤ σ may be determined by focus in such cases.
 - ▶ This presentation also looks at the interaction between *k'al* and focus:
 - ◆ An exhaustivity implicature that is present when *k'al* is in focus constructions is proposed to arise from the focus construction itself.
 - ◆ *k'al* may also directly compose with the focus marker *a* in A+*K'AL* FOC constructions, which strengthens the exhaustivity implicature to an entailment. However, more work is required to work out the details of this composition.
- However, this presentation did not look at cases involving the compound words *tok'al* or *echk'al*:
 - 20) tok'al tz'il an q'apej
 TOK'AL dirty CL clothes
 'The clothes are **only** dirty.'

21) echk'al (ay)-in x-in ch'i no kaxhlan
 ECHK'AL (FOC)-1SG.A COM-1SG.A eat CL chicken
 'I **only** ate chicken.'

► *Tol* appears in Mateo Toledo's (2008) examples as a complementizer and as an intensifier; *ech* was not found in the dissertation, but was elicited as part of *ech ch'an*, which also means *only* – it is thus unclear without additional data what *tol* and *ech* contributes to the compounds.

◆ However, they are similar to *a k'al* in that a non-individual semantic type appears to the left of *k'al*, and all convey the meaning of *only*, which is suggestive that there is some underlying pattern across the three examples.

- 22) a. [echk'al b'alonwan anima]_F x-ul b'ay q'in
 ECHK'AL nine people COM-visit PRE party
 'Only/Exactly [nine people]_F attended the party.'
- b. * [tok'al b'alonwan anima]_F x-ul b'ay q'in
 TOK'AL nine people COM-visit PRE party
 Intended: 'Only [nine people]_F attended the party.'
- c. * [a k'al b'alonwan anima]_F x-ul b'ay q'in
 A+K'AL nine people COM-visit PRE party
 Intended: 'Only [nine people]_F attended the party.'

○ Only *echk'al* seems to be felicitous in cases involving numbers.

REFERENCES

Beaver, David, and Brady Clark. 2003. "Always" and "Only": Why not all focus sensitive operators are alike. *Natural Language Semantics* 11. 323-362.

England, Nora C. 1992. *La Autonomía de los Idiomas Mayas: Historia e Identidad*. 2nd edition. Guatemala: Cholsamaj.

Gordon, Raymond G. Jr., (ed.). 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, 15th edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.

IOM (International Organization for Migration). 2004. *Encuesta sobre impacto de remesas familiares en los hogares guatemaltecos: Año 2004. Cuadernos de Trabajo Sobre Migración 19*. Guatemala City: IOM.

Mateo Toledo, Eladio. 2008. *The Family of Complex Predicates in Q'anjob'al; Their Syntax and Meaning*. PhD dissertation, The University of Austin at Texas.