

HEBREW EXCLUSIVE PARTICLES AND THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ROTHIAN AND ‘INTERNAL’ ALTERNATIVES¹

Yael Greenberg
Dina Orenstein
Bar Ilan University

1 Introduction

In this paper we discuss three Hebrew exclusives: *rak* (*≈only*), *stam* (*≈merely*), and *be-sax ha-kol* (*≈all in all*), which in many cases seem to lead to an identical semantic effect. Consider (1) (capitals indicate nuclear pitch accent):

- (1) rina rak/stam/be-sax ha-kol PKIDA
Rina rak/stam/be-sax ha-kol CLERK
‘Rina is only /merely /all in all a CLERK.’

With all three expressions, (1) has the reading that Rina is a clerk, but not more than that. E.g., she is not a doctor, or a lawyer.

However, alongside the similarity observed in (1) and in many other sentences, we also find interesting differences between these expressions with respect to their interpretation and distribution. Some of these differences were already described in previous work (see Orenstein & Greenberg 2010, 2012A, 2012B). In this paper we discuss some more data regarding differences between these expressions, and in addition attempt to account for the full range of data by suggesting the following: First, the similarities between the three particles are due to their shared **core meaning**. In particular, all three expressions are ‘scalar exclusives’, i.e., they reject stronger alternatives than the prejacent on a salient scale. Second, the interpretational and distributional differences between the three particles are due to three **varying parameters**, namely, the position of the prejacent in the scale (*low* or *unrestricted*), the type of scale (*entailment* or

¹ Research on this project was supported by ISF grant # 490 / 09 on the semantics, pragmatics and focus sensitivity of focus sensitive particles in Hebrew. Thanks also to the audience of IATL 29 for instructive comments.

evaluative), and the type of alternatives in the scale (*Roothian* / ‘external’ or ‘internal’)². We will devote most of our attention to the characterization and discussion of the third parameter.

The paper is structured as follows: in section 2 we briefly present and motivate the core definition of exclusives, which is inspired by previous scalar theories of exclusives with some modifications. In section 3 we discuss the position of the prejacent on the scale. In section 4 we discuss the type of scale the exclusive particles can operate on. Section 5 examines the type of alternatives the exclusive particles can operate on (namely ‘external / Roothian’ vs. ‘internal’). In this section we examine in detail the different strategies that *be-sax ha-kol* and (accented) *stam* employ to operate on ‘internal’ alternatives, and compare these two particles to *rak*, which cannot operate on ‘internal’ alternatives at all. Finally, in section 6, we summarize our main conclusions regarding the similarities and differences between the three particles, and further discuss the ‘external’ / ‘internal’ alternatives distinction, focusing on directions for further research that this distinction raises.

2 The core meaning of exclusives

The definition we suggest in (2) is in the spirit of scalar accounts of *only* (e.g., Beaver & Clark 2008, Kadmon & Sevi 2011, Coppock & Beaver (in press) and mainly Roberts 2011) with some modifications.³ Note that q_c is a salient alternative to p (in a sense to be clarified below). In addition, the underlined part is ‘not at issue’, whereas the non-underlined part is the assertion / the ‘at issue’ content.⁴ The definition, then, has two ‘not at issue’/ ‘backgrounded’ components, and one ‘at issue’ component:

$$(2) \lambda p. \lambda w. \forall q_c \in \text{ALT}(p) \ q_c \succ_s p \wedge p = T \text{ in } w \wedge \forall q \ q \succ_s p \rightarrow q = F \text{ in } w$$

Given this definition, an exclusive particle is a sentential operator (following Beaver & Clark (2008), Roberts (2011)),⁵ which combines with a proposition, p , and a world, w . It has two ‘not at issue’ components requiring (a) that every salient alternative to the prejacent on a salient scale is stronger than it, and (b) that the prejacent is true in w . It asserts that every alternative stronger than the prejacent (on the salient scale) is false in w .

The ‘scale’ we refer to in (2) can be either entailment based, or non-entailment / evaluative based (Beaver & Clark 2008). In an entailment scale stronger elements asymmetrically entail weaker elements, e.g., {*Mary arrived* < *Mary and Susan arrived* < *Mary and Susan and Ann arrived* < ...}. In contrast, in a non-entailment / evaluative (sometimes also called ‘rank order’) scale strength is determined by significance, noteworthiness, or other pragmatic ranking, but higher ranked alternatives do not entail lower ones, for example: {*He is a student* < *he is a professor*}, {*He spoke with Mary* < *He danced with Mary* < *he hugged Mary*}. Notice that in a non-entailment/evaluative scale some elements can have the same strength. For example, in a

² Cf. Coppock & Beaver (in press) for varying parameters for English exclusives.

³ Notice that this version of the definition is also modified relative to previous versions we suggested, in e.g., Orenstein & Greenberg (2012).

⁴ In arguing that the underlined part is ‘not at issue’ and not ‘presupposed’ we follow Roberts et al. 2011 (see Orenstein & Greenberg (2012) for a detailed discussion).

⁵ But see Coppock & Beaver (in press) for a non-sentential analysis. This analysis takes different exclusives to differ along the type parameter, in addition to other parameters

scale of professions ranked by prestige, salary, etc., some professions may be ranked at the same level: {*John is a cleaning person* < *John is a clerk* = *John is a dentist assistant* < *John is a doctor* = *John is a lawyer*}. Similarly, in a scale which orders rooms in a hotel in terms of their quality, different rooms can be ranked at the same level: {*John got a single room with a shower* < *John got a double room with a shower* = *John got a single room with a bath* < *John got a double room with a bath*}.

Let us now briefly illustrate the contribution of each of the three components using sentences with the typical exclusive *only* (cf. Orenstein & Greenberg 2012 for a detailed motivation).

The first 'not at issue' component requires that "all salient alternatives to *p* are stronger than it". This requirement accounts for the contrast in (3) and (4) (cf. B&C 2008).

- (3) I expected ten students to arrive, and eventually only FIVE / #FIFTEEN / #TEN arrived.
- (4) a. I thought he is a clerk, but it turns out he is only a CLEANING PERSON / #a LAWYER / # a DENTIST ASSISTANT
 b. John expected to get a double room with a shower, but eventually he only got a SINGLE room with a shower / # a single room with a BATH / #a double room with a BATH.

In both (3) and (4), if the salient alternatives are weaker than or as strong as the prejacent, we get infelicity (relative to the sets of alternatives in the previous paragraph). The salient alternatives, then, must be **stronger** than the prejacent.

Notice that the 'salient alternatives' to *p* are not always identical to salient propositions in the environment of *p*. In (5), for example, the salient alternative to *p* (*Esti has three children*) is not the preceding sentence (*Danny has four children*) but rather *Esti has four children*. This latter sentence is a member of the focus alternatives (the 'focus semantic value', in Rooth (1985) terminology) of *p*, and although it does not itself appear in the context, it is constructed from using salient material (namely the VP of the preceding sentence):⁶

- (5) Context: My mother and I are organizing a weekend for the whole family. We discuss where each sub family will stay:
 Danny (my brother) has four children so he will stay in this apartment, but Esti (my sister) has only three children, so she can stay in the smaller apartment.

This sentence also illustrates the fact that the stronger salient alternatives are not necessarily 'expected', i.e. that, unlike what is sometimes assumed (e.g., Beaver & Clark 2008) mirativity, or expectation rejection is not encoded into the semantics of exclusives. In (5), (from Orenstein

⁶ To systematically allow for salient material which is not itself part of a member of the focus alternatives of *p* to construct these alternatives, we can follow Fox & Katzir (2011), Katzir (2013) who characterize the focus alternatives of *p*, $ALT_f(p)$, as in (i)-(iii), and in particular clause *c* in (iii):

- (i) $ALT_f(p)$: {*p'*: *p* is derived by replacing focused items *X* in *p* with allowable substitutions *X'* in the context}
 (ii) *X'* is an allowable substitution for *X* in a context *C* if *X'* can be derived from *X* by successive steps in which a subconstituent *z* of *X* is replaced with an element of the substitution source for *z* in *C*, $SS(z, C)$
 (iii) $SS(z, C)$, the substitution source for *z* in context *C*, is the union of: a. The lexicon b. The sub-constituents of *z* c. The set of salient constituents in *C* (that is, constituents of the structures of utterances made in recent discourse)

2011) *only* can be used felicitously without rejecting expectations, since in this context the number of children my sister has is well known (see also Roberts 2011 for a similar argument).

Notice also that the universal quantification over salient stronger alternatives in the first 'not at issue' component is indeed needed. This is motivated by the felicity contrast between (6) and (7). (7) is infelicitous because one of the salient alternatives is weaker than p.

- (6) Mira has three kids, Paul has four kids, but Jim has only TWO kids.
 (7) #Mira has two kids, Paul has four kids, but Jim has only THREE kids.⁷

The second 'not at issue' component requires the prejacent p to be true in w. This component simply accounts for the entailment of the prejacent in positive sentences (unlike Beaver & Clark 2008 and Coppock & Beaver (in press), but like Roberts 2011). E.g., "*Only JOHN arrived*" entails that "*John arrived*". Similarly, "*John is only a CLERK*" entails that "*John is a clerk*".

Finally, the 'at issue' component requires all alternatives stronger than p to be false in w. Thus, for example, "*Only JOHN arrived*" asserts that stronger alternatives on an entailment scale are false (e.g., John and Mary didn't arrive, John and Mary and Susan didn't arrive, etc.), and thus, indirectly that nobody other than John arrived. Similarly, "*John is only a CLERK*" asserts that stronger alternatives on a non-entailment evaluative scale are false, (e.g., John is not a doctor, not a lawyer, etc.).

Though all three Hebrew exclusives mentioned above share the core meaning in (2), we suggest that they differ along three parameters. The first is the position of the prejacent in the scale (*low vs. neutral*). The second is the type of scale (*entailment-based vs. non-entailment / evaluative*). The third parameter, to which we devote most of our attention, is the type of alternatives in the scale (*Roothian / 'external' vs. 'internal'*). In what follows we present each of the parameters and show how they account for various differences between these exclusives.

3 Varying parameter #1: The position of the prejacent on the scale

Given the definition in (2), a sentence with an exclusive asserts that any alternative stronger than the prejacent is false. Consequently, an exclusive cannot felicitously associate with a maximal element in a scale, as in (8), because in such a case, there isn't a stronger alternative to reject, and the use of the exclusive will be uninformative:

- (8) #Only ALL children arrived

But nevertheless, the prejacent of *only* and *rak* can be very high on the scale, with both entailment and evaluative scales, as illustrated in (9)-(10):

- (9) ha-sefer ole mea šekel, ve-li yeš rak TIŠ'IM VE-TEŠA
 The-book cost 100 shekel, and-I have rak ninety and-nine
 'The book costs a hundred shekel and I have only NINETY NINE.'

⁷ Thanks to Malte Zimmerman for pointing this to us.

- (10) (Context: We need the signature of the president of the company)
 aval Rina hi rak SGANIT HA-NASI
 But Rina she rak vice the-president
 ‘But Rina is rak the VICE PRESIDENT.’

In contrast, the prejacent of *stam*, and to some extent *be-sax ha-kol*, needs to be ‘low’ on the scale, as illustrated by the infelicity of *stam*, and by the questionable status of *be-sax ha-kol* in (11), because “being the vice president” is clearly high on the scale:

- (11) (Context: We need the signature of the president of the company)
 aval Rina hi #stam/?be-sax ha-kol SGANIT HA-NASI
 But Rina she #stam/?be-sax ha-kol vice the-president
 ‘But Rina is #stam/?be-sax ha-kol the VICE PRESIDENT.’

To formally capture the requirement that *p* is located in a low position on the scale, we can require that the number of alternatives stronger than *p* on the scale is higher than the number of alternatives below it, i.e. require that $|\{q:q>sp\}| > |\{q:q<sp\}|$.

4 Varying parameter # 2: Type of scale: *entailment* vs. *evaluative (non-entailment)*

Another parameter along which exclusives differ is the type of scale the particle operates on: an entailment based scale or a non-entailment evaluative scale (cf. Coppock & Beaver (in press) on *only* and *merely*).

In Orenstein & Greenberg (2010, 2012) we have already discussed the difference in the type of scale between *rak* and *stam* (e.g., based on the projective behavior of their prejacent). In what follows we provide three new pieces of data supporting this difference, and discuss *be-sax ha-kol* as well. In particular, we argue that *rak* and *be-sax ha-kol* can operate on both entailment scales and with non-entailment /evaluative scales, while *stam* can only operate on non-entailment / evaluative scales, similarly to the English *merely*, under Coppock & Beaver’s (in press) analysis.

To support these generalizations, consider first (12). Here we find a felicity difference between *stam* and the other two exclusives:

- (12) kol ha-yeladim ba-gan kvar bnei 6, ve-danny rak/be-sax ha-kol
 All the-kids in-kindergarten already are 6, and-Danny rak/be-sax ha-kol
 /#stam BEN XAMEŠ
 /#stam SON FIVE
 ‘All the kids in the kindergarten are already 6 years old, and Danny is rak/be-sax ha-kol/#stam FIVE years old.’

Assuming an ‘at least’ interpretation of numerals (either as part of their semantics or by scalar implicatures), in (12), the scaled set of alternatives the exclusive particle operates on is clearly entailment based: $\{Danny\ is\ at\ least\ 5\ years\ old; Danny\ is\ at\ least\ 6\ years\ old; Danny\ is$

at least 7 years old}. We suggest that *stam* is infelicitous in (12), then, because it cannot operate on an entailment scale, while *rak* and *be-sax ha-kol* are fine.

Further support for this claim comes from (13), where the sentence is felicitous with all three exclusive particles, but there are interpretational differences between them:

- (13) Danny hu rak/be-sax ha-kol/stam STUDENT
 Danny he rak/be-sax ha-kol/stam student
 ‘Danny is rak/be-sax ha-kol/stam a STUDENT.’

The prejacent “Danny is a student” can in principle be both a member of an entailment scale, as in e.g., {*Danny is a student; Danny is a student and a research assistant; Danny is a student and a research assistant and a waiter*}, and of a non-entailment evaluative scale as in e.g., {*Danny is a student; Danny is a post doc; Danny is a professor*}. In (14) with *rak* and *be-sax ha-kol* we can get both an entailment scale reading and an evaluative reading, as seen by the fact that the sentence can be continued by explicitly rejecting a stronger alternative both on a non-entailment evaluative scale, and on an entailment scale.

- (14) Danny hu rak/be-sax ha-kol STUDENT, hu lo profesor/ ein lo od
 Danny he rak/be-sax ha-kol student, he no profesor/there.isn't him more
 isukim
 occupations
 ‘Danny is rak/be-sax ha-kol a STUDENT, he isn't a professor/he doesn't have other occupations.’

But (15) with *stam* can only have an *evaluative, non-entailment* reading, as seen by the fact that it cannot be continued by “he does not have other occupations”, thereby rejecting a stronger alternative on an entailment scale.

- (15) Danny hu stam STUDENT, hu lo profesor / # ein lo od isukim
 Danny he stam student, he no profesor/ #there.isn't him more occupations
 ‘Danny is stam a STUDENT, he isn't a professor/#he doesn't have other occupations.’

Finally, as we showed above, exclusives, by definition, cannot felicitously associate with maximal elements on a scale, because their main function is to reject stronger alternatives. Thus, in (16), *stam* is infelicitous because the prejacent “Danny won the Nobel Prize” is the maximal element on an evaluative scale, e.g., {*John won the Israel prize < John won the Nobel Prize < ?????*}, so the operation of *stam* becomes non-informative:

- (16) #Dani stam zaxa be-pras NOBEL
 Dani stam won in-prize nobel
 ‘Danny stam won the NOBEL Prize.’

But notice that with such maximal elements *rak* can be felicitous and *be-sax ha-kol* is questionable:

- (17) Dani rak / ?be-sax ha-kol zaxa be-pras NOBEL
 Dani rak/?be-sax ha-kol won in-prize nobel
 ‘Danny rak/?be-sax ha-kol won the NOBEL prize.’

The felicity of *rak* and the relative felicity of *be-sax ha-kol* in (17) can indicate that for them ‘winning the Nobel prize’ is not a maximal element on a scale. This can hold if the scale they can operate on is not an evaluative scale (ordered by the significance / prestige of the prize), but an entailment scale (ordered by the number of prizes one wins). This is clarified in (18). Notice that here too *stam* is infelicitous:

- (18) Yosi won all possible prizes: The Nobel, the Wolf prize, the Israel prize.
 And Danny?
 hu rak / ?be-sax ha-kol / #stam zaxa be-pras NOBEL
 he rak/?be-sax ha-kol / #stam won in-prize nobel
 ‘He rak/?be-sax ha-kol / *stam* won the NOBEL prize.’

The infelicity of *stam*, indicates that unlike *rak* it can indeed only work with an evaluative scale. Finally, the questionable status of *be-sax ha-kol* seems to indicate that it prefers the evaluative scales. More research is needed here.

5 Varying Parameter #3: Types of Alternatives in the Scale: Roothian / ‘External’ vs. ‘Internal’ Alternatives

We now turn to the third parameter, to which we devote most of our attention. It is standardly assumed that focus sensitive expressions operate on alternatives which are identical to the prejacent, besides the focused (usually the stressed) element. This element is replaced by an element of the same semantic type. These alternatives constitute the ‘Focus semantic value’ of the sentence (Rooth 1985, 1992). For example, the focus semantic values of (19a,b) are in (20a,b):

- (19) a. Even / also / only JOHN arrived
 b. John even / also / only / DANCED
 (20) a. {John arrived, Mary arrived, Susan arrived, John and Mary arrived.....}
 b. {John danced, John sang, John drank beer.....}

But it seems that in addition to expressions which are sensitive to such ‘Roothian’, or what we will call ‘**external**’ alternatives, some expressions can also operate on non-Roothian, or ‘**internal**’ alternatives, namely on various interpretational versions of the prejacent itself. As we will more precisely argue below, unlike the standard Roothian, or ‘external’ alternatives, ‘internal’ alternatives are derived by varying *covert* elements in the prejacent, while keeping all *overt* material fixed.

In the following sub-sections we show that while *rak* can only operate on standard, ‘external’ alternatives, both *be-sax ha-kol* (\approx all in all) and accented *stam* can operate on ‘internal’ alternatives, though they use different strategies and triggers to do that. The claims about *be-sax ha-kol* are basically the ones made in Orenstein (2011) ;Orenstein & Greenberg (2012), whereas

those regarding *stam* are novel. In section 6 below we further discuss the ‘external’ / ‘internal’ alternatives parameter, focusing on questions and directions for further research.

5.1 *be-sax ha-kol* with Internal Alternatives (based on work in Orenstein & Greenberg (2012))

In many cases *be-sax ha-kol* is similar in meaning to *rak*, as illustrated in (1), repeated here as (21):

- (21) Rina rak /be-sax ha-kol PKIDA
 Rina rak/be-sax ha-kol CLERK
 ‘Rina is rak /be-sax ha-kol a CLERK.’

But in other cases we find interpretational differences between sentences with *rak* and *be-sax ha-kol*. In particular, there are cases where *be-sax ha-kol*, but not *rak*, gives rise to an ‘approximative’ effect (similar to e.g., *more or less*)⁸. Consider the example in (22):

- (22) Context: John and Mary booked a room in a hotel for their important guests and asked that the room will be clean, large, with view to the sea. After John checks the room he tells his wife either (a) or (b):
- a. ha-xeder rak NAKI
 The-room rak clean
 ‘The room is rak CLEAN.’
- b. ha-xeder be-sax ha-kol NAKI
 the-room be-sax ha-kol clean
 ‘The room is be-sax ha-kol CLEAN.’

The implication of (a) is that the room is clean, but not more than that. It is not large, and does not have view to the sea (similarly to what we would get with *The room is only CLEAN*). In (a), then, the alternatives to *The room is clean* are {*The room is clean and large* < *The room is clean and large and has a view to the sea*}, i.e. standard Roothian alternatives.

In contrast, (b) may have two implications. The first implication is identical to the implication obtained with *rak*: “Not more than that = *not clean & large & has view to the sea*”. The second, and in fact more salient implication is: “Not more than that = *not maximally/ very clean*”. I.e., the degree to which the room is clean is high enough to be considered ‘clean’, but is not maximally clean. Under this reading of (b), the alternatives to “*The room is clean*” are intuitively {*The room is very clean* < *The room is maximally clean*}.

We assume, then, that even with this ‘approximative’ reading *be-sax ha-kol* still functions as an exclusive operator, i.e., it rejects higher alternatives, but crucially, all alternatives are ‘**internal**’, i.e. they are different interpretational versions of the prejacent.

⁸ Notice: *be-sax ha-kol* can also lead to another reading that for space reasons we do not discuss here, namely, the ‘precise’ reading, in (i), which is typically found with numerals:

(i) *higiu be-sax ha-kol 50 studentim*- (“50 students arrived. Not more and not less”)

More specifically, we take the prejacent of (23) to be (24), and more formally (25) (following, e.g., Kennedy & McNally 2005), saying that there is a degree which is at least as high as the standard for cleanness, and the room is clean to this degree:

- (23) The room is *be-sax ha-kol* clean
 (24) The room is *pos* clean
 (25) $\exists d d \geq \text{stand}(\text{clean}) \wedge \text{clean}(\text{the room})(d)$

The different alternative interpretations of (23) result from the potential variability in the value given to the *stand* in (25).⁹ In particular, remember that the first backgrounded component in the lexical entry for exclusives (in (2) above) requires that all salient alternatives to *p* are stronger than it. In our case, q_c should be a salient proposition of the form of the prejacent, as in (25). What could such a salient proposition be?

The answer lies in the scale associated with *clean*. Kennedy & McNally (2005) observe that *clean* associates with an U(pper) closed scale, in which the maximal endpoint is salient. Consequently, they suggest, the contextually given standard with U(pper) closed adjectives is this maximal endpoint of the cleanness scale.¹⁰ Following their suggestion, then, we can take q_c to be as in (26):

- (26) $\exists d d \geq \max(\text{clean}) \wedge \text{clean}(\text{the room})(d) = \text{clean}(\text{the room})(d_{\max})$
 ‘The room is maximally clean’

That is, taking q_c to be *clean (the room) (d_{max})* can indeed satisfy the ‘saliency’ requirement, as the maximal endpoint in the scale is clearly salient.

However, given Kennedy & McNally (2005) and Kennedy (2007), satisfying the requirement that this salient proposition q_c is higher than the prejacent *p* may seem problematic, because these theories seem to suggest that the standard for upper closed adjectives is *always* the maximal endpoint of the scale. If this is indeed the case, then the first backgrounded component seems self-contradictory, because the salient proposition *clean (the room) (d_{max})* is required to be stronger than the interpretation of the prejacent which is again *clean (the room) (d_{max})*, i.e. stronger than (what appears to be) itself.

We suggest that it is this potential problem which forces a re-interpretation of the backgrounded prejacent, where the standard is lower than maximal. Put in other words, the prejacent is now re-interpreted as in (27):

- (27) Backgrounded (re-interpreted) prejacent: $\exists d d \geq \text{stand}(\text{clean}) \wedge \text{stand}(\text{clean}) < \max(\text{clean}) \wedge \text{clean}(\text{the room})(d)$

⁹ Alternatively, we can keep *stand* fixed, and assume that the different alternatives are derived by using (25) with different precision standards, which can be modeled using e.g., sets of ‘similar’ alternatives (Morzycki 2011), different granularities (Sauerland & Stateva 2007). See Orenstein & Greenberg 2012 for an explication of this direction.

¹⁰ However, our theory is also compatible with the assumption that the standard of U(pper) closed adjectives can be (also) contextually given, based on a rule-based characterization (McNally 2011), or a comparison with potential counterparts of the object (Sassoon & Toledo 2011).

Interpreting the prejacent as in (27) can be justified in several ways. First, although the maximal endpoint is clearly the most salient in the scale, there are recent theories (e.g., McNally (2011), Sassoon & Toledo (2011)) which independently propose that U(pper) closed adjectives like *clean* can be many times interpreted with respect to contextual standards (lower than the maximal endpoint). Second, even given Kennedy & McNally (2005) and Kennedy (2007) the fact that U(pper) closed adjectives are interpreted w.r.t. to the maximal endpoint results from the “principle of interpretive economy”, i.e. the fact that when information encoded in the lexical semantics of the adjective (i.e. the fact that the scale has a maximal endpoint) competes with contextually supplied information (e.g., a contextually supplied standard), language users will choose the former. Thus, even if we continue to follow these theories, we can assume that the exclusive semantics of *be-sax ha-kol* forces the language user to ignore the principle of “interpretive economy”, and to re-interpret *The room is pos clean* w.r.t. to a contextual standard, lower than the maximal, as in (27).

Finally, let us consider the contribution of the assertion, requiring all stronger alternatives to the prejacent to be false. Remember that given the approach developed here, all alternatives are of the form in (25), and the variation is due to the difference in the characterization of *stand* (*clean*). The prejacent *p*, now interpreted as in (27), says that the degree to which the room is clean is equal to or higher than the standard for cleanness, and this standard is lower than the maximal degree of cleanness. The assertion now adds the information that any proposition of the form of (25), where the standard of cleanness is higher than the one used for the prejacent, is false.

Suppose now that there are two standards we are considering: the maximal endpoint, according to which the room is 100% clean, and a lower standard, according to which the room is clean if it is at least 90% clean. Given this lower standard, the room is considered clean if it is 90% clean, and of course, also when it is 100% clean (given the ‘equal to or higher than the standard’ component in the interpretation of *pos*).

But given the contribution of the assertion, interpreting (25) using the higher standard must be false in *w*. Since using this higher standard dictates that the room is 100% clean, we indirectly get the result that the degree to which the room is clean is at least 90%, but NOT 100%. Thus, by lowering the standard of cleanness of the room and at the same time requiring that the sentence interpreted under a higher standard is false, we indirectly lower the actual degree of cleanness of the room, while at the same time keeping it high enough to be considered ‘clean’. This captures the interpretational effect of *be-sax ha-kol* in (23).¹¹

¹¹ In Orenstein & Greenberg (2012) we also show that this analysis correctly accounts for the infelicity of *be-sax ha-kol* with L(ower) closed adjectives.

5.2 Accented *stam* (STAM) with 'Internal' Alternatives

The second case of operating on 'internal' alternatives is found with accented *stam* (STAM). As we will demonstrate now, though, the strategy through which internal alternatives are triggered with STAM differs from what found with *be-sax ha-kol* examined above.

5.2.1 Data: differences between (unaccented) *stam* and (accented) STAM

Remember that (unaccented) *stam* is an exclusive which operates on evaluative, non-entailment scales, and hence triggers 'rank order' interpretations only, similar to *merely*, as analyzed in Coppock & Beaver (in press). Thus, for example, (28), with (unaccented) *stam* implicates that (a) Rina bought a watch and that (b) she did not buy anything more evaluative / expensive than a watch (e.g., not a dishwasher, not a car, not a house, etc.), unlike what might be expected:

- (28) ze ma še-rina kanta? ze stam ŠAON!
 This what that-rina bought? This stam watch
 'That's what Rina bought? It's stam a WATCH.'

But with (accented) STAM, as in (29), we end up with a different interpretation:

- (29) ze ma še-rina kanta? ze STAM šaon!
 This what that-rina bought? This stam watch
 'That's what Rina bought? It's STAM a watch.'

Unlike (28), (29) implicates that (a) Rina bought a cheap / simple watch, and (b) that she did not buy any more evaluative watch, i.e. not any more expensive / special watch (unlike what was expected perhaps).

Similar differences between *stam* and STAM are found in the following examples, where the main predicate is verbal and not nominal:

- (30) a. dani stam RAKAD im rina
 Danny stam danced with Rina
 'Danny stam DANCED with Rina.'
 b. dani STAM rakad im rina
 Danny stam danced with Rina
 'Danny STAM danced with Rina.'
- (31) a. dani stam zaxa be-pras OFIR
 Danny stam won in-prize ofir
 'Danny stam won the OFIR prize.'
 b. dani STAM zaxa be-pras ofir
 Danny stam won in-prize ofir
 'Danny STAM won the Ofir prize.'

In (30a) and (31a), with *stam* we get the standard implication of an evaluative exclusive, e.g., that dancing with Rina is considered less significant / noteworthy than other activities with Rina

(e.g., kissing Rina), and that winning the Ofir prize is less significant / noteworthy than winning another cinema prize (e.g., the Golden Palm, or the Oscar prize).

In contrast, the versions in (30b) and (31b), with *STAM*, lead to different implications. (30b) can have at least two potential implications: (a) that John's *manner* of dancing with Rina was simple or not noteworthy (b) that John's dancing with Rina was unintended and casual, or at least, that this was not done due to achieve any specific goal. A slightly different reading is found with *STAM* in (31b). Here the implication is that John won the Ofir prize unjustly, e.g., he did not really deserve the prize (cf. Ziv's (in print) observations about other potential readings with (accented) *STAM*).

Crucially, and in sharp contrast to the versions with *stam* in (30a) and (31a), neither (30b) nor (31b) with *STAM* implicates that dancing (with Rina), or that winning the Ofir prize are insignificant, non noteworthy, or in general low on an evaluative scale.

The different readings found with *stam* and *STAM* sometimes lead to felicity differences. For example, remember that, unlike *rak*, *stam* is infelicitous when its associate denotes an entity on the maximal endpoint of an evaluative scale, as in (32a). Interestingly, however, *STAM* is felicitous in such a case:

- (32) a. dani rak / #stam kibel pras NOBEL
 Dany rak / stam got prize nobel
 'Danny stam got the NOBEL prize.'
 b. dani STAM kibel pras nobel
 Dany stam got prize Nobel
 'Danny STAM got the Nobel prize.'

In particular, whereas (32a) with *stam* seems to implicate that winning the Nobel prize is not very high / noteworthy on a scale of winning academic awards (which clashes with the common assumptions), (32b) seems felicitous because it implicates instead that John won the Nobel prize accidentally, or unjustly (similar to the reading in (31b)).

We need to understand, then, what underlies the different readings with *stam* and *STAM*, and in particular, how the differences in accent placement lead to such different readings.

5.2.2 Internal Alternatives with *STAM*

To account for the different readings of sentences with *stam* vs. *STAM*, we propose that whereas *stam* operates on standard 'external' alternatives, *STAM* operates on 'internal' alternatives. That is, similarly to the approximative reading with *be-sax ha-kol*, examined in section (5.1) above, the alternatives that *STAM* operates on are not derived by substituting the focused element in *p* with a distinct element of the same semantic type, but by manipulating *p* in such a way that we end up with two distinct interpretations of it. Similarly to what we find with *stam*, in the case of accented *STAM* the alternatives are ranked on an evaluative scale, but the alternatives are 'internal', rather than 'external'. In addition, and again similarly to the situation with *be-sax ha-kol*, in such a case the prejacent itself must be re-interpreted.

To illustrate, consider the scaled sets of alternatives which are active in the case of the minimally contrasting sentences above. The alternatives in (a) are the standard Roothian / external alternatives (found with unaccented *stam*), whereas those in (b) are 'internal' (found

with accented *STAM*). In all cases the underlined alternative is taken to be true, and the other, ‘higher’ alternatives are rejected:

- (33) a. {this is a watch < this is a car < this is a house....}
- b. {this is a simple / cheap watch < this is a special / expensive watch}
- (34) a. {Danny danced with Rina < Danny kissed Rina < Danny proposed marriage to Rina}
- b. {Danny danced with Rina in a simple manner / unintentionally < Danny danced with Rina in a special or unique manner / intentionally}
- (35) a. {Danny won the Israel prize < Danny won the Wolf prize < Danny won the Nobel}
- b. {Danny won the Nobel prize accidentally / unjustly < Danny rightly / justly won the Nobel prize}

Thus, for example, in uttering (28) with *stam* we claim that Rina bought a watch and reject the higher alternative in (33a), namely that she bought a car or an apartment (as was expected). In contrast, with (29) with *STAM* we claim that Rina bought a cheap / simple watch and reject the higher alternative in (33b), namely that she bought an expensive / unique watch (as was expected).

Thus, although with both *stam* and *STAM* we end up with “and not more than that”, or, more technically with “all higher alternatives are false” assertion, typical to scalar exclusives, the higher alternatives differ. In addition, whereas with *stam* the prejacent remains intact, with *STAM* we end up with a modified version of the prejacent.

What leads to these two differences between *stam* and *STAM*? Since the only surface difference between the two versions in (28)-(32) is the placement of (nuclear) Pitch Accent, we should look at the interaction of focus and pitch accent to find the answer.

5.2.3 A proposal: Givenness of the Associate, Resulting with Accent Shift, Leads to Internal Alternatives with *STAM*

Following Egg & Zimmermann’s (2011) analysis of unaccented and accented *doch* / *DOCH* in German, we propose that in sentences like (28-32) we get accent on *STAM* because the associate of this operator is de-accented, due to its givenness. In such cases accent shifts from the given associate to *STAM* (cf. Wagner 2010). In contrast, with *stam* accent naturally falls on the (new) associate.

For example, (29), where we get the ‘internal-alternatives’ reading (“This is a simple / cheap watch”) is only felicitous in a scenario where buying a watch was already under consideration in the context. In contrast (28), with (unaccented) *stam* and the accented *WATCH* is infelicitous in such a scenario, and is instead felicitous in a context where buying a watch is new. This is more explicitly illustrated by the contrasts in (36)-(37), confirmed by many informants:

- (36) lo haya li musag ma rina metaxnenet liknot, ve-az pataxti et ha-kufsa ve-not had I clue what Rina plan to.buy and-then I.opened acc the-box and-ra’iti še-ze stam ŠAON / #STAM šaon.
I.saw that-this stam watch / stam watch
‘I had no idea as to what Rina was planning to buy, and then I opened the box and saw that it was stam a WATCH /#STAM a watch.’

- (37) yadati she-rina metaxnenet liknot šaon ve-az pataxti et ha-kufsa ve-
 I.knew that-Rina plan to.buy watch and-then I.opened acc the-box and
 raiti še-ze #stam ŠAON / STAM šaon.
 I.saw that-this stam watch / stam watch
 ‘I knew that Rina was planning to buy a watch, and then I opened the box and saw that
 it was #stam a WATCH / STAM a watch.’

The descriptive generalization, then, seems to be that the internal alternatives reading (i.e. the reading where we end up with different interpretations of the prejacent) arises when the associate of the operator is de-accented due to being given (resulting in the accent shifting to *STAM*).

How can we explain this generalization? Why does the givenness of the associate of *STAM* force it to operate on ‘internal’ alternatives? The answer seems to lie in the first backgrounded component of *stam*, requiring all salient alternatives to be stronger than the prejacent.

In case the associate of the operator is given, as in (37), it is salient in the context. In such a case we end up with a salient alternative which is identical to the prejacent, and hence, equally strong. In particular, in this case the salient alternative to the prejacent *It’s a watch* seems to be identical to it, i.e. *It’s a watch* as well. However, if this identical proposition is indeed taken as a salient alternative to *p*, then the first backgrounded component in the lexical entry for exclusives in (2) above, requiring all salient alternatives to be *stronger* than *p* cannot be met. This is illustrated in (38):

- (38) # {It’s a watch < It’s a watch }

To satisfy the first backgrounded component, the alternatives are re-interpreted in such a way that they end up in different positions in an evaluative scale. This can be done, for example, by assuming that the nominal associate is modified by two covert modifiers, *MOD*₁ and *MOD*₂, as in (39):

- (39) { It’s a MOD₁ watch < It’s a MOD₂ watch }

The values for these two modifiers can vary with context, e.g., they can be *Cheap* < *Expensive*, *Simple* < *Unique*, *In a regular manner* < *In a unique manner*, *non-deliberately* < *deliberately*, or *unjustly* < *justly*. What seems to be shared in all cases is the fact that we indeed end up with two interpretational versions of the prejacent, which can be ranked on an evaluative, non-entailment scale.

Thus, the ‘internal alternatives’ with *STAM* result from the interpretation of the prejacent and the identical salient alternative with two distinct covert modifiers.

Notice that while using covert modification may seem like an ad hoc move, such a move seems justifiable in our case, for two reasons. First, the existence of similar covert evaluative modifiers has been independently proposed in the literature for the interpretation of e.g., exclamatives (Rett 2008), and *The same* (Barker 2012). For example, Rett proposes that the exclamation in (40) involves a **covert** gradable predicate *P* which receives its value from context (in the context of (40) *P* can be *exotic*, while in other contexts it can be *easy* or *difficult*):

- (40) What languages Mimi speaks! (Rett, pp. 604)

Indeed, exclamation can serve as appropriate salient antecedents to sentences with accented *STAM*:

- (41) a. eize oto hu betax kana!
 What car he surely bought
 ‘What a car he must have bought!’
 b. at toa, hu kana STAM oto
 You wrong, he bought stam car
 ‘You are wrong, he bought STAM a car.’

In (41), for example, the noun ‘oto’ (‘car’) in A’s exclamative utterance seems to be interpreted as modified with adjectives like ‘rare’, ‘unique’, ‘expensive’, etc. Accordingly, in B’s utterance we seem to employ a covert ‘low’ modifier, such as ‘simple’, ‘cheap’, etc.

A second kind of motivation for the covert modification proposal with *STAM* comes from cases where the salient antecedent contains an overt modifier, as in (43)-(44):

- (43) le-dani yeš šaon yakar/meyuxad, ve-le-yosi yeš STAM šaon
 To.Danny there.is watch expensive/special, and-to-yosi there.is stam watch
 ‘Danny has an expensive/special watch, and Yossi has STAM a watch.’
 (44) dani yašav leyad ruti be-kavana, ve-yosi STAM yašav le-yada
 Danny sat next to ruti in-intention, and-yosi stam sat next to.her
 ‘Danny sat next to Ruti intentionally, and Yossi STAM sat next to her.’

In such a case, we end up again with a salient alternative which is different from the prejacent, and again the strategy of interpreting the two versions of the prejacent differently is being used. Unlike the cases in (37) above, however, in this case we can use the explicit modifier in the preceding sentence for the interpretation of the stronger alternative, and insert a covert modifier (e.g., *cheap* and *unintentionally* in (43) and (44)) for the prejacent only.

5.2.4 An Alternative Approach: Accented *STAM* as a Modifier

Our analysis of *STAM*, then, assumes that it has the same semantics as its unaccented counterpart, *stam*, and derives the differences between them from the interaction of this semantics with independent information –structural and prosodic considerations (similar to Egg & Zimmermann’s analysis of *doch* / *DOCH*).

But there is a potential alternative hypothesis which we should consider, namely that *stam* and *STAM* do not have the same semantics. Instead, whereas *stam* is indeed an evaluative exclusive, *STAM* is not an exclusive at all, but rather a modifier which roughly assigns its modifyee the property of being ‘simple’, ‘unspecified’ or ‘not noteworthy’. This alternative proposal is supported by the close paraphrase between sentences with *STAM* and those with the morphologically similar adjective *stami* (The suffix *-i* is a common adjectival suffix), as in (45) an (46) (notice that *stami* is accented as well):

- (45) rina rakda be-cura mamas meanyenet. yosi, le-umat zot, rakad be-ofen
 Rina danced in-form really interesting. Yossi, on the other hand, danced in-manner

STAMI / STAM rakad
simple/ stam danced

‘Rina danced in a really interesting fashion, Yossi, on the other hand, danced in a SIMPLE manner/ STAM danced.’

- (46) yosi kana le-rina šaršeret kesef yekara ve-meyuxedet. le-sara hu kana
Yossi bought to-Rina necklace silver expensive and-special. to.Sara he bought
šaršeret kesef STAMIT / STAM šaršeret kesef
necklace silver simple/ stam necklace silver
‘Yossi bought Rina an expensive and special silver necklace. To Sara he bought a SIMPLE silver necklace/ STAM a silver necklace.’

We may try to argue, then, that *STAM* is a modifier with a similar function to *STAMI* (*SIMPLE*). Accent on both of these modifiers can then be accounted for by Wagner’s (2012) approach to accent shifting within NPs. In particular, Wagner suggests that accent shifts to a modifier of a noun on two conditions (a) when the noun is given (and hence de-accented) and (b) when the modifier has a mutually exclusive alternative in the context (or an accommodated one). Consider the following example from Wagner’s paper (2012):

- (47) Sally’s uncle, who is incredibly rich and produces high-end convertibles, came to her wedding. I wonder what he brought as a present.
Guess what: He brought a# BLUE/ CHEAP convertible.

Wagner’s intuition is that shifting prominence to the adjective *blue* fails, because it is not mutually exclusive with *high-end*. In contrast, *cheap* is mutually exclusive with *high-end*, so it can get accented.

Considering now (45) and (46), we could assume that *STAM* modifies *danced* and *silver necklace*, respectively: It indicates that Sara’s silver necklace is standard, not interesting. In such a case, the accent on *STAM*, similar to that on *STAMI* can be said to result from two factors. First, *danced* and *silver necklace* are given, so they are de-accented. Second, *STAM*, which indicates that its modifier has the property of being unspecified or not noteworthy, has a salient antecedent in the discourse –*special / interesting* – which is mutually exclusive with such modification.

The main advantage of the *STAM*-as-a-modifier hypothesis is its simplicity. Unlike the *STAM*-as-an-exclusive hypothesis, using it there is no need to employ covert modifiers in the semantic representation. *STAM* itself is the modifier. In contrast, the advantage of the *STAM*-as-an-exclusive hypothesis is that it enables a unified characterization of *stam* and *STAM*, which captures the intuitive similarity in their interpretational effects (rejecting higher alternatives), and locates the difference between them only in the type of alternatives involved (‘external’ vs. ‘internal’).

A closer consideration seems to indicate that the *STAM*-as-a-modifier hypothesis is problematic, and consequently, that the *STAM*-as-an-exclusive hypothesis is the one which should be adopted. In particular, with standard modifiers, accent placement does not change their denotation. E.g., no matter whether *blue* in (48) is accented or not, its meaning does not change. The same holds for the adjective *stami*, as in (49) and (50). In all these cases the effect of accent is purely information –structural (e.g., to indicate givenness, and / or focus):

(48) Mary bought a blue PEN / Mary bought a BLUE pen.

(49) sara kanta ET stami. / Sara kanta et STAMI
 Sara bought pen simple / Sara bought pen simple
 ‘Sara bought a simple PEN/ Sara bought a SIMPLE pen.’

(50) dani RAKAD be-ofen stami / dani rakad be-ofen STAMI
 Danny danced in-manner simple / Danny danced in-manner simple
 ‘Danny DANCED in a simple manner/ Danny danced in a SIMPLE manner.’

In contrast, as already claimed above, *stam* and *STAM* differ in their semantic effect. This is illustrated again in (51)-(52):

(51) yosi stam RAKAD / yosi STAM rakad.
 Yosi stam danced / Yosi stam danced
 ‘Yosi stam DANCED/Yossi STAM danced.’

(52) ze stam ET / ze STAM et
 This stam pen / this stam pen
 ‘This is stam a PEN/ This is STAM a pen.’

In particular, the presence or absence of accent on *stam*, although affected by *information – structural* consideration (namely givenness), correlates with a different *interpretational* effect: With *stam* we get an implication which is absent with *STAM*, namely that *John danced* or *This is a pen* are considered low on an evaluative scale. With *STAM* we get an implication which is absent with *stam*, namely that this pen is a very simple one and that Yossi danced in a simple manner, or with no clear intention. Such interpretational differences are unexpected if *STAM* were a simple modifier (notice that we do not get these interpretational differences with the minimal pairs in (49), with *stami* / *STAMI*).

We conclude, then, that *STAM* is indeed an exclusive operator, similar to *stam* except that it operates on ‘internal’ alternatives, as suggested above.¹²

6 Summary and Discussion: Operating on ‘External’ vs. ‘Internal’ Alternatives

In this paper we have suggested that the Hebrew exclusives *rak*, *stam* and *be-sax ha-kol* all have the semantics of scalar exclusive operators, as defined in (2) above. We have further claimed that the various differences between them are derived from the different specification of three

¹² In addition, assuming that *STAM* in sentences like (52) is a modifier is also problematic since in Hebrew adjectival modifiers follow their nominal modifyees, and do not proceed them, as seen in (i):

(i) *et adom* / #*adom et*
Pen red / *red pen*
 “Red pen”

parameters (neutral or low): the position of p on the scale, the type of scale (entailment or evaluative-non entailment), and the type of alternatives ('internal' or 'external').

The specification of these three parameters is summarized in the table below:

The particle	Position of p on the scale	Type of scale	Type of alternatives
<i>rak</i>	Neutral	Entailment Or Evaluative	External only
<i>stam</i>	Low	Evaluative (non-entailment) only	-External -Internal (when accented)
<i>be-sax ha-kol</i>	Tends to be low	Entailment and evaluative (with preference for evaluative)	-External -Internal (with degree-based constructions)

The observations and claims made in this paper leave many empirical and theoretical questions open, which deserve further research. Assuming that the characterization of the three exclusives summarized in this table is along the right track, two natural questions which arise are first, to what extent are the parametric differences in this table found with other exclusive particles in Hebrew and cross linguistically (cf. Coppock & Beaver's work on parametric differences between exclusive particles in English) and second, should these parametric differences be taken as lexical differences between the different particles, or can they be further reduced to other lexical differences, or derived from other independent factors. These two questions seem most relevant when the 'internal / external' alternatives parameter is being considered.

We would like to finish the paper by discussing in more depth the more general implications of the observations and analysis regarding this parameter. In particular, comparing the two particles which can operate on internal alternatives, namely *stam* and *be-sax ha-kol* to each other, and comparing these two particles to *rak*, which cannot operate on such internal alternatives at all, highlights interesting points.

Starting with the similarities between *stam* and *be-sax ha-kol*, with both particles the difference between the adjacent and its alternative(s) lies in covert elements. This is, in fact, exactly what makes the alternatives different from the standard Roothian alternatives, where an overt element is replaced by another element in the alternative. In the case of 'internal' alternatives, i.e. different interpretational versions of the prejacent, the overt material in the prejacent remains intact in the alternative (e.g., in (23), with *be-sax ha-kol* two versions of *The room is clean* are being considered, and in (29), with *STAM* two versions of *This is a watch*). Instead, the difference between the alternatives, in both cases, lies in covert material.

But here we also find a difference between *be-sax ha-kol* and *STAM*. With *be-sax ha-kol* the difference lies in the values assigned to a covert variable which independently exists in the semantic structure, namely the standard variable in the semantics of gradable adjectives. In contrast, with *STAM* the difference between the prejacent and its alternative lies in the identity of the covert modifier of the original associate of *STAM*, and the (covert or overt) modifier in

the salient alternative. Unlike what happens with *be-sax ha-kol*, then, in this case we do not exploit an independent covert variable, but need to insert a covert element in order to keep the prejacent lower (on an evaluative scale) than the salient alternative.

Another point of comparison between *be-sax ha-kol* and *STAM* concerns the trigger or source for operating on internal alternatives. In both cases the trigger is the presence of a salient proposition which is originally identical to the (overt material in the) prejacent, and hence apparently as strong as it. Given the first backgrounded component of exclusives, requiring all salient alternatives to be stronger than the prejacent, in both cases we use a repair strategy in which the prejacent is re-interpreted as weaker than that salient alternative (again, by assigning the standard variable a new value, or by inserting a covert ‘low’ modifier).

Here too we find a difference between the two operators: With *be-sax ha-kol* the salient ‘identical’ alternative seems to be salient due to the lexical semantics of the adjective that the exclusive particle associates with, namely the Upper-closed scale, which dictates a salient maximal standard of e.g., *cleanness* (in the case of *The room is be-sax ha-kol clean*, in (23) above). In contrast, with *STAM* the salient alternative, identical to the prejacent, is triggered due to givenness of the prejacent. This difference also leads to the prosody difference between sentences with the two particles, namely the accentuation of *STAM*, due to de-accentuation of its associate, and accent shift to it, as opposed to the more standard accentuation pattern with *be-sax ha-kol*.

These similarities and difference deserve, of course, a closer examination and raise many questions. One such question is what the real associate of these exclusive particles is when they operate on ‘internal alternatives’, and what is really in focus. In the standard case, of ‘Roothian’ alternatives, the focused element, which is the associate of the operator, is the one which is substituted in the set of alternatives. If it is the covert element which is substituted in the case of ‘internal alternative’, then perhaps this is the one which the operator associates with, and perhaps this is the one which is focused. In particular, perhaps what *be-sax ha-kol* and *STAM* associate with in (23) and (29) is the *standard* variable and the covert ‘low’ *modifier*, respectively, and not the adjective *clean* and the noun *watch*, which remain constant. We leave the question of whether this is indeed the right direction to take to further research, which among other things should examine more generally the question of whether covert (and other prosodically reduced) elements can be focused, and whether focus sensitive operators can associate with covert elements (see e.g., Earlwine 2014 on association of *even* and *only* with traces).

Another important question concerns the reason for the different triggers and strategies for operating on internal alternatives with *be-sax ha-kol* and *STAM*. Can these differences be derived from other differences between the two exclusive particles, or should they be considered lexical differences.

And, of course, how should we explain and evaluate the fact that unlike both *be-sax ha-kol* and *STAM*, *rak* is not able to operate on internal alternatives at all? For example, as illustrated in (22a) above, and repeated here, *rak* differs from *be-sax ha-kol* in that it cannot get an approximative reading, even when associated with a gradable adjective. Similarly, *rak* differs from *stam* in that it cannot associate with internal alternatives even when it is accented due to the givenness of its associate. This is illustrated in the minimal pairs in (53), with gradable adjectives, and (54), with accented *STAM* and *RAK* due givenness of the associate and accent shift (following an example cited in Kadmon & Sevi 2011):

- (53) a. ha-xeder rak NAKI
The-room rak clean
'The room is rak CLEAN.' (≈ "The room is only clean")
- b. ha-xeder be-sax ha-kol NAKI
the-room be-sax ha-kol clean
'The room is be-sax ha-kol CLEAN.' (≈ 'The room is more or less clean')
- (54) a. yadati še-hi roca liknot li šaon. ha-beayya hayta še-ze haya
I.knew that-she wants to.buy me watch the-problem was that-this was
RAK šaon
rak watch
'I knew she wanted to buy me a watch. The problem was that it was RAK a watch.'
(≈ '... the problem was that it was ONLY a watch')
- b. yadati še-hi roca liknot li šaon. ha-beayya hayta še-ze haya STAM šaon
I.knew that-she want to.buy me watch the-problem was that-this was stam watch
'I knew she wanted to buy me a watch. The problem was that it was STAM a watch.'
(≈ '...the problem was that it was a SIMPLE watch')

Why, then, can *STAM* and *be-sax ha-kol* operate on 'internal' alternatives (despite the different strategies in which this is done), while *rak* cannot? Should this fact be taken indeed as another parametric differences in the characterization of exclusive particles, as suggested above, and be encoded in their lexical entries, or can it be derived from other independent features? Can the difference be reduced to the fact that *stam* and *be-sax ha-kol* can associate with covert elements while *rak* cannot?

To better answer these interesting questions, we should examine more particles and operators which can (and cannot) operate on 'internal alternatives', and for those which can, compare the obligatoriness of such association, the strategies by which such alternatives are constructed, and the triggers for the existence of such alternatives.

For example, in addition to the exclusives examined in this paper, two more such 'internal-alternatives' sensitive operators are the approximator *more or less* and the exclusive *just*. *More or less*, as in *The room is more or less CLEAN*, seems to operate on alternatives differing from each other only in the precision standard under which the associate (e.g., *clean*) is interpreted (see Amaral & del Prete (2011), Greenberg (2014)). As observed by D. Beaver (p.c.), and as illustrated in (55), *just* differs from *only*, in that it can operate on such alternatives (yielding a similar effect to the one with *STAM*) in case an explicit Question Under Discussion makes reference to such alternatives. Notice that in such a case it is *DANCED* which is being accented, despite being given:

- (55) a. How did Mary dance in the party?
b. B: She just / #only DANCED.

Two other candidates for 'Internal-Alternative-Sensitive operators' are the Hebrew unaccented and accented *bixlal* / *BIXLAL* particles, examined in Greenberg & Khrizman (2011) and Greenberg (2014), and the German unaccented and accented *doch* / *DOCH*, examined in Egg & Zimmermann (2011). Finally, Ramchand's (2012) analysis of epistemic and circumstantial necessity modals seems to independently suggest the existence of what we call

‘internal’ alternatives as well, though not in direct relation to focus sensitivity. In particular, Ramachand makes the accessibility relation sensitive to alternatives which vary from each other in the value assigned to the situation variable. She writes that “a modal element combines with a description of situations and quantifies over a set of alternatives constructed from that situation. I mean ‘alternatives’ in a generalized Roothian sense (Rooth 1985, 1992), whereby the alternatives to the topic situation are constructed by **keeping the specified elements fixed and filling in the possible values of elements whose values have been left unspecified**” (p. 16-17, our emphasis).

We believe, then, that the typological and parametric differences between various particles and constructions which can, must or cannot operate on ‘internal alternatives’, and the various strategies being used by such particles, should be examined in more depth. Such an examination can contribute to our understanding of important questions in the study of focus, and more generally - alternative sensitivity, and information / discourse structure.

References

- Amaral, P., and Del Prete, F. 2011. Approximating the limit: The interaction between quasi ‘almost’ and some temporal connectives in Italian. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 33:51–115.
- Barker, Chris. 2012. The same people ordered the same dishes. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics, Theories of Everything*, Volume 17, Article 2:7–14
- Beaver, David, and Brady Z. Clark. 2008. *Sense and sensitivity: How focus determines meaning (Explorations in semantics)*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Coppock, Elizabeth, and David Beaver. (in press). Principles of the Exclusive Muddle. *Journal of Semantics*.
- Earlwine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2014. Explaining leftward focus association with even but not only. *Proceedings of SuB 19*.
- Egg, Markus and Malte Zimmermann . 2011. ‘Stressed Out! Accented Discourse Particles – the Case of ‘Doch’. A talk given in S&B 16, Utrecht.
- Fox, Danny and Roni Katzir. 2011. On the characterization of alternatives. *Natural Language Semantics* 19:87–107.
- Greenberg, Yael. 2014. External and internal alternative-sensitive operators. A paper presented at “Focus sensitive expressions from a cross linguistic perspective workshop”, Bar Ilan University.
- Greenberg, Yael, and Keren Khrizman. 2011. *The Hebrew bixlal: A General Strengthening Operator*. A paper presented at IATL 27.
- Kadmon, Nirit, and Aldo Sevi. 2011. Without focus. In *The Baltic International Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication*, Vol. 6, *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics: Discourse, Context, and Models*.
- Katzir, Roni. 2013. On the roles of markedness and contradiction in the use of alternatives. To appear in *Semantics, Pragmatics, and the Case of Scalar implicatures*, ed. Salvatore Pistoia Reda. Palgrave.
- Kennedy, Christopher. 2007. Vagueness and grammar: The semantics of relative and absolute gradable adjectives. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 30:1–45.
- Kennedy, Christopher, and Louise McNally. 2005. Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. *Language* 81:345–381.

- McNally, Louise. 2011. The relative role of property type and scale structure in explaining the behavior of gradable adjectives. *Vagueness in Communication*, 151–168.
- Morzycki, Marcin. 2011. Metalinguistic comparatives in an alternative semantics for imprecision. *Natural Language Semantics* 19:39–86.
- Orenstein Dina. 2011. *be-sax ha-kol*: An exclusive account of an approximative reading. In *Proceedings of IATL 27, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 121–138.
- Orenstein, Dina, and Yael Greenberg. 2010. The Semantics and Focus Sensitivity of the Hebrew (unstressed) *stam*. In *Proceedings of IATL 26, Bar Ilan University*.
- Orenstein, Dina, and Yael Greenberg. 2012 A. *Exclusivity across domains with the Hebrew be-sax ha-kol*. Paper presented at IDL 12, Barcelona.
- Orenstein, Dina, and Yael Greenberg. 2012 B. A flexible exclusive operator: the case of the Hebrew *be-sax ha-kol*. In *Proceedings of SuB 17*.
- Ranchand, Gillian. 2012, Indexical vs. anaphoric modals. Manuscript, University of Tromsø /CASTL.
- Rett, Jessica. 2008a. A degree account of exclamatives. In *Proceedings of SALT XVII*.
- Roberts, Craige. 2011. *Only*: A case study in projective meaning. In *The Baltic International Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication*, 6: *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics: Discourse, Context, and Models*.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with Focus*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A Theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.
- Sauerland, Uli, and Penka Stateva. 2007. Scalar vs. epistemic vagueness: Evidence from approximators. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 17*, ed. Masayuki Gibson & Tova Friedman. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Sassoon, Galit, and Asaf Toledo. (to appear). *Absolute and relative adjectives and their comparison classes*.
- Wagner, Michael. 2012. Focus and givenness: A unified approach. In *Contrasts and Positions in Information Structure*, ed. I. Kucˇerova´ & A. Neeleman. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Ziv, Yael. In print. 'Staam': Shmirat ikviyut basiach [Hebrew 'Staam': maintaining consistency in discourse] In *Asufot umuvaot belashon* [Collection of articles on Language] ,*Volume in Memory of Shaul Alon*.