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1. **Introduction**

I provide an analysis of the focus-sensitive adverb *až* (Slovak, Polish, Russian)/čak (Bulgarian, Serbian) and conclude that it is a **scalar opposite of scalar only**.

As far as I know, such an expression has not been previously noted in the literature; its existence adds to the available **typology of adverbs associating with focus**.

Proposal: *Až/čak* associates with a syntactic **focus** and carries a **scalar presupposition**: (i) focus alternatives are ranked on a scale of a contextually relevant dimension and (ii) the asserted proposition is placed high on the scale.

*Až/čak* is a scalar opposite of **only/merely**, and it differs from **even**.

2. **Data**

2.1 Like ‘even’?

The addition of the particle *až/čak* modifies the meaning of the sentence in a way that superficially resembles the contribution of **even** *(nawet in Polish, *daže* in Bulgarian, *dokonca* in Slovak):

(1) Govorih čak/daže [s Mary].
   I talked *čak/even* with Mary
   ‘I talked even to Mary.’

(2) Rozmawiałem až/nawet z Marią.
   I talked *až/even* with Mary
   ‘I talked even to Mary.’

(3) Zajtra vydiskutujem to až/dokonca [s Igorom].
   tomorrow I will discuss it *až/even* with Igor
   ‘Tomorrow I will discuss it even with Igor.’

Intuitively, (1-2) convey that there is something exceptional about talking to Mary/Igor, and this meaning clearly is induced by the adverbials.

Similarly, for (4-7) both *až* and *nawet ‘even’ contribute the meaning that crying/breathing heavily was somehow **noteworthy**.
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(4) Aż/ nawet [krzycała]$_f$ (z bólu).
   aż/even she.cried from pain
   ‘She even cried (from pain).’

(5) Ja som aż/dokonca kričala (od bolesti).
   I did aż/even cry from pain
   ‘I even cried (from pain).’

(6) Čak/daže se zaduha (ot vulenie).
   čak/even refl he.breathed-heavily from emotion
   ‘He even started breathing heavily, (being so emotional).’

(7) Aż/nawet się zasapał (z wrażenia).
   aż/even refl he.breathed-heavily from emotion
   ‘He even started breathing heavily, (being so emotional).’

Are then aż/čak and nawet/daže identical in their basic function?
Aż is found already in Old Slavic, cf. similarity to daže (even) in Bulgarian and Russian.

2.2 Like ‘only’?

Interestingly, in some contexts aż/čak tends to be more adequately translated as only or merely in English:

(8) Prepáčte, že odpisujem až [teraz]$_f$.
    excuse that I.answer až now
    ‘I am sorry that I am replying only/even now.’

(9) Zashto mi kazvash čak / edva sega.
    why me tell čak only now
    ‘Why are you telling me only/even now?’

(10) Subudih se čak / edva v 10.
     I.woke.up refl čak / only at 10
     ‘I woke up only/even at 10.’ (= I woke up as late as 10.)

(11) Obudzilem się aż po 10.
     I.woke-up refl aż after 10
     ‘I woke up only/even after 10.’

All of the above examples are incompatible with even. Similarly to only, they convey that now/10 o’clock is late. Other paraphrases: as late as/no sooner than.

2.3 As high as or as low as?

When combined with scalar expressions, aż/čak can contribute either an as high as or as low as reading. In (12), in contrast to (13), the 3rd place is lower than expected:
(12) Klasirahme se čak na 3to mjasto
placed-3pl refl čak at 3rd place
‘We were ranked only/merely at 3rd place’ (= as low as the 3rd place)

(13) Vjarno če sme velika nacija, imame veliki umove ama puk čak na 3to mjasto po členstvo ...
true that be-1pl great nation have-3pl great minds but particle čak at 3rd place in membership
‘It's true that we are a great nation, we have great minds, but to be ranked as high as 3rd place according to membership [is hard to believe]...’

This “switch” in the point of view is even more striking in the following naturally occurring examples: (14)(15) talking about what is desirable vs (16)(17) talking about what is not desirable.

(14) Zákazník je až na prvom mieste.
customer is až on first place
‘We place our customer as high as in first place’.

(15) Bezpečnost až na prvom mieste.
security až on first place
‘Security (should be placed) as high as in first place.’

(16) Spotreba je až na druhom mieste, kvalita je prvoradá.
usability is až on second place quality is paramount
‘Usability is be placed as low as the second place.’

(17) O bezpečnosti premýšľame až na druhom mieste.
about security we.think až on second place
‘We place security as low as the second place’.

In Polish, however, to get the ‘as low as’ reading, the additional presence of the adverb ‘dopiero’ seems to be required.

(18) Zespół był słaby i zajął až 30 miejsce.
team was poor and achieved až 30th place
‘The team performed poorly and earned only 30th place.’

(19) Zaklasfykowaliśmy się (dopiero) až na 3cim miejscu.
placed-3pl refl (only) až at 3rd place
‘We were ranked only/merely at 3rd place’ (= as low as the 3rd place)

(20) Susan Boyle nie wygrała. Zajęła dopiero/#až drugie miejsce.
Susan Boyle not won Achieved only až 2nd place
‘Susan Boyle did not win. She only took second place.’
2.2 Variable syntactic distribution

Aż/čak is cross-categorial, and can modify different syntactic constituents. As seen in the previous examples (repeated here) aż/čak can associate with a PP and VP:

(21) a. Govorih čak [PP s Mary].  
   Bulgarian

   b. Rozmawialem až [PP z Mary].  
   Polish

I talked až/čak with Mary

(22) a. Ivan čak [VP se zaduha ].  
   Bulgarian

   b. Ivan až [VP się zasapał ].  
   Polish

Ivan čak/ňaž refl he.breathed-heavily

The following contrast illustrates the difference in meaning depending on the domain of association, a DP in (23) and a V or VP in (24):

(23) Hanka poprosi o pomoc až [DP prezydenta]¹.  
   Polish

Hanka asked for help až president

‘Hanka asked for help such an important person as the president.’

   Russian

Hanka až asked for help president

‘Hanka went as far as asking the president for help.’ (VP-association)

‘What Hanka did wrt. the president was ask him for help.’ (V-associat., stress, less plausible)

The domain can also include the subject of the clause in the IP:

(25) Majóweczka u Pepików tuż... až [DP głowa boli] myśleć...  
   Polish

picnic with Czechs soon až head hurts to.think

‘The picnic with the Czech friends is coming up. You get a headache just from thinking about it.’

Až/čak can associate with the whole IP – The alternatives in (26)a are other less serious things that may have happened (e.g. the whole auditioning committee laughing).

(26) a. Anna śpiewała tak okropnie, že až [IP DP Maria] kazała jej przestać].  
   Polish

Anna sang so badly thataž Maria orderdher to.stop

b. Anna pela tak ploho, čto až [IP DP Maria] ej skazala ostanovit'sjia].  
   Russian

Anna sang so badly that až Maria her said to.stop

c. Anna peeše tolkova zle če čak [IP DP Maria] i kaza da spre].  
   Bulgarian

Anna sang so badly that čak Maria her said SUBJ stop

‘Anna sang so badly, that out of all things that could happen Maria told her to stop.’

‘Anna sang so badly, that out of all people, even Maria told her to stop.’

¹ Compare with the following example found online: Krywult poprosił až ministerstwo, zapewne wiecie jakie, o zwolnienie go z obowiązku konkursu ‘Krywult asked až the ministry, you probably know which ministry, for releasing him from the duty of running the competition’. (www.bielsko.biala.pl/forum/viewtopic.php?pid=17064)
The above show that *aż/čak* behave similarly to *even* and *only* – adverbials that *associate with focus*. The next section investigates the role of focus in providing the *set of alternatives*.

3. ***Aż/čak and focus sensitivity***

3.1 **Focus association – syntax**

Before I provide evidence for the semantic contribution of focus – *three syntactic arguments* for obligatory *association focus*:

- *Aż/čak can associate long distance with a particular constituent*
  (in the sentence final position it may receive a bit more stress than clause internally):

  (27) [Dostałam skurczy] *aż.*
  I.got cramps *aż*

  (28) [Mamy [trzy] lazienki *aż.*
  we.have three bathrooms *aż*

  (29) Shvanaha mi se Krakata čak.
  cramped me refl the-legs čak

  (30) Imamé tri bani čak.
  have-1pl three bathrooms čak

This *variable syntactic behavior* is typical of the so-called *'focus sensitive’ adverbs*. The constituent in focus determines what is considered as a set of alternatives.

*Aż/čak itself does not supply focus*. Consider: "not but" structure independently marks focus. *Aż* can be placed in either of the conjuncts:

  *Janek talked not with dean but with chancellor*
  ‘Janek talked not to the dean but to the chancellor.’

  *Janek talked not with dean but *aż* with chancellor*
  ‘Janek talked not to the dean but to the chancellor himself.’

  *Janek talked not *aż* with chancellor but with dean*
  ‘Janek talked not to the chancellor but to the dean himself.’

(31) shows that *aż/čak* can associate with focus. (32) and (33) show that it must do so.
When focus is already present, aż/čak cannot associate with the topic.

(32) A: Janek rozmawiał z rektorem.
Janek talked with dean
‘Janek talked to the dean’.

B: Nie. Tylik Marek rozmawiał (♯aże) z rektorem i nikt inny.
No. Only Marek talked aż with chancellor and nobody else
‘No. Only Marek and nobody else talked to the dean.’

In (32) aż cannot be used to add the new information that the dean is noteworthy, since the dean is backgrounded, while Marek is the focus.

Clitics force a wider domain reading for aż/čak.

Since aż/čak is sensitive to semantic focus it cannot associate with a weak pronoun in (33)b, it has to associate with the adverbial or the verb, which can be independently focused (Hoeksema and Zwarts 1997, Beaver and Bradley 2001):

(33) a. [Wieczorem aż [DP jego] zobaczylem.
evening aż him I.saw
a.’ Večerta čak vidjah [nego]
evening čak I.saw him
‘In the evening I saw him as opposed to other less important people.’
‘In the evening, as opposed to any other time, I saw him.’

b. [Wieczorem] aż [VP go zobaczylem].
evening aż him I.saw
b.’ [Večerta] čak [ go vidjah]
‘In the evening I saw him as opposed to only hearing him.’
‘In the evening, as opposed to any other time, I saw him.’
*‘In the evening I saw him as opposed to other less important people.’

3.2 Focus association - semantics

Evoking context alternatives is the standard effect of focus interpretation. The presence of focus is taken to be a property of syntactic constituents (Halliday 1967, Chomsky 1971, Jackendoff 1972), which are marked with a feature F (interpreted both semantically and phonologically).

The focus picks out one particular value out of a set of alternative values. Those alternatives are obtained by replacing the focused part with a variable and making all possible value assignments to that variable. Thus, focus structure triggers a presupposition that a set of alternatives is under discussion, i.e. a set of alternatives is evoked. (The sentence itself asserts that the denotation of the focus is a member of this set and makes the sentence true).

---

2 The following Dutch example from H&Z shows that ‘aallleen’ cannot associate with the weak pronoun ‘me’:
Ze toonden Piet en mij de Amazone, maar alleen mij (*me) toonden ze ook de STEDEN.
They showed Piet and me the Amazon, but only me/me showed they also the cities.
(34) Janek talked to [the dean],

focal presupposition: \{x \in D_e : \text{Janek talked to } x\} is under discussion
assertion: the dean \in \{x \in D_e : \text{Janek talked to } x\}

Rooth 1985: the choice of focus affects the pragmatic process of selecting the relevant domain of quantification. C is a contextually determined set that restricts the domain of quantification. Rooth 1985, 1992, von Fintel 1997, argue that focus-sensitive adverbs induce quantification over propositions. This way C can be identified with a focus semantic value of the IP and can also admit further restrictions by the context.

### 3.3 Scalar Presupposition

Focus sensitive adverbials *even* and *only* introduce scalar presuppositions.

**Even**: the associate is the **lowest** among the alternatives on a **likelihood scale**

**Only/merely**: the associate is **low** on a **contextually determined scale** of alternatives

#### 3.3.1 Presupposition

The meaning contribution of *aż/čak* is a **non-truth-conditional**, as revealed by standard tests (e.g., negation, questions, antecedents of conditionals, Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 1990, “wait a minute”, von Fintel 2004)

(35) Janek rozmawiał aż z Marią.
Janek talked aż with Maria
‘Janek talked to Maria’ (*Maria is an important/exceptional person*).

(36) Janek nie rozmawiał aż z Marią.
Janek not talked aż with Maria
‘Janek did not talk to Maria’ (*Maria is an important/exceptional person*).

(37) Czy Janek rozmawiał aż z Marią?
whether Janek talked aż with Maria
‘Did Janek talk to Maria?’ (*Maria is an important/exceptional person*).

(38) Jeśli Janek rozmawiał aż z Marią, to musi mu bardzo zależeć.
if Janek talked aż with Maria, then must him very care
‘If Janek talked to Maria, then he must care very much’ (*Maria is an important/exceptional person*).

Negation, questions, if-clauses are holes to the scalar presupposition (*Maria is an important/exceptional person*.) The prejacent proposition is asserted. Direct denial seems impossible: (39)a challenges the main content, (39)b is infelicitous. In (39)c the implication is cancelled.

(39) A: Janek rozmawiał aż z Marią.
Janek talked aż with Maria
‘Janek talked to Maria’ (*Maria is an important/exceptional person*).
a. B: Nie prawda.
   not true
   ‘That’s not true.’ (=> Marek did not talk to Mary.)

b. B: #Nie. Janek nie rozmawiał z nikim ważnym.
   no Janke not talked with nobody important
   ‘No. Janke did not talk to anybody important.’

c. B: Maria wcale nie jest taka ważna.
   Maria at.all not is so important
   ‘Mary is not so important.’

In (40) the presupposition is targeted directly and treated as primary information by speaker B
and thus shifted to the topic under discussion.

(40) A: Janek rozmawiał aż z Marią.
   Janek talked aż with Maria
   ‘Janek talked to Maria’ (Maria is an important/exceptional person).
   B: No co ty? A co to ona taka ważna?
   prt whatyou? and whatprt she so important
   ‘Hey, wait a minute! Is she that important?!’

(41) A. Maria aż krzyczała z bólu.
   Maria aż cried from pain
   ‘Maria even cried from pain.’
   B: No co ty? Przy takim bólu każdy by krzyczał!
   prt whatyou? with such pain everybody wouldcry
   ‘Hey, wait a minute! Anyone would cry if they were in so much pain!’

3.3.2 Scalarity

Under negation (43) there is no scale reversal with aż/čak.
Opposite to even (44-45). Similar to scalar only/merely (46-47).

(42) Ivan stigna čak do [Berlin].
   Ivan reached čak to Berlin
   Ivan got as far as Berlin (Berlin is exceptionally far).

(43) Ivan ne stigna čak do [Berlin].
   Ivan not reached čak to Berlin
   Ivan did not get as far as Berlin (Berlin is exceptionally far).

(44) Ivan even reached [Berlin].
   (reaching Berlin is low on the likelihood scale, hard to reach)

(45) Ivan didn’t even reach [Berlin].
   (reaching Berlin is high on the likelihood scale, easy to reach)

(46) Ivan merely reached [Berlin]. (easy to reach)
(47) Ivan didn’t merely reach [Berlin]. (easy to reach)
I link this to the fact that the contribution *aż/čak* cannot be subsumed under the notion of likelihood or noteworthiness, as has been claimed to be the case for *even*.

I thus suggest that:
- *aż/čak* always takes **propositional scope**, where the set of alternatives C is established with respect to the focal structure.
- *aż/čak* is associated with a **focal presupposition** = alternatives are evoked in accordance with the focus-induced interpretation.
- *aż/čak* is associated with a **scalar presupposition** = alternatives are ranked wrt. some contextually relevant scale (dimension varies with context)

### 3.4 Summing up the empirical facts about the semantics and syntax of *aż/čak*

- Focus association – syntactic behavior, alternative semantics.
- Similar meanings:
  - *aż/čak* and *even* – the focus associate is more noteworthy than alternatives (to be further specified)
  - *aż/čak* and *only* – in some contexts there is an implication of exclusivity
- The meaning contribution is a presupposition (context dependency: felicity conditions, switching “point of view”)

- What are the semantic components contributed by *aż/čak*?
- What is the place of *aż/čak* in the inventory of focus sensitive adverbials alongside *even* and *only*?

### 4. Scalar Presupposition and Contextual Standard

#### 4.1 Nature of the scale. Noteworthiness? (No.)

For focus-sensitive adverbs that have a scalar meaning component, the question arises what is the nature of the scales they associate with? Could *aż/čak*, just like *even*, be characterized in terms of noteworthiness and likelihood?

(48) John went even to Berlin.
  presupposition: Berlin is the most notable/least likely place for John to go to (because it is far or because he doesn’t speak German).

(49) John went *aż/čak* to Berlin.
  presupposition: Berlin is the most notable/least likely place for John to go to (because it is far)

*Even* is always interpreted according to a scale of **likelihood** (Karttunen & Peters 1979, or its dual, **noteworthiness** Herburger 2000, Rullman 2007). Perhaps, *aż/čak* is contextually more restricted – the usual interpretation of (49) is in terms of distance - but otherwise it is like *even* in that it contributes a presupposition of noteworthiness/likelihood? If it were, the contrasts between *aż/čak* and *even* in (50-53) would be unexplained.
The scale in (50) can only be about distance. There’s no non-likelihood implication in (50), (51a), (52a), (53).

(50) Given that Janek told me he would go to Berlin, I am certain that, 
Janek pójdzie aż/#nawet do Berlina. 
‘Janek reached as far as Berlin (and Berlin is exceptionally far)’

(51) a. Petr jezdil na kole aż do setmění, … Czech
Petr rode on bike až until dusk 
což nikoho nepřekvapilo, protože to dělá každý den. 
which nobody surprised because it does every day

b. Petr jezdil na kole dokonce do setmění, 
Petr rode on bike even until dusk

(52) a. Given how tall his parents are, Janek też jest aż/#nawet tak wysoki. Polish
Janek also is aż so tall

b. His parents are tall, but Janek jest wyższy nawet/#aż od swoich rodziców. 
Janek is taller even/#aż than his parents

(53) Given that Janek was going to talk to the most important person at the university, 
it is not surprising that Janek porozmawiał aż/#nawet z rektorem. 
Janek talked aż/even with president

I argue that the intuition that aż/čak adds a flavor of noteworthiness is not related to the notion of likelihood, but to the reference to a contextually salient parameter. Therefore, only in a subset of cases aż/čak are similar in meaning to even. Even is always about likelihood or noteworthiness, thus its use is infelicitous in (50), (52a), (53).

Aż/čak set apart from even and only – resemblance to the intensifier very:

(54) Janek would go to Berlin, so he would go very far.

(55) Petr rode his bike until dusk, so he rode his bike till very late.

(56) Janek’s parents are very tall, so he is very tall too.

(57) Janek talked the president, so he talked to a very important person.

The intensification found both with aż/čak and with very is about exceeding a standard on a scale. Very applies to gradable predicates and indicates that the property exceeds a contextual standard for that property (e.g. Kennedy and McNally, 2005).

Very is restricted to the intensification of gradable predicates, while aż/čak cannot apply to gradable properties. With gradable predicates the alternatives are not different degrees of the same property (58):

(58) Ivan čak/monogo [počervenja] ot sram. Bulgarian
Ivan čak/very reddened from shame
‘Ivan was so ashamed that he blushed’ → only with aż/čak
‘Ivan blushed very much’ → only with very

The addition of very to a non-gradable = coercion into something gradable:

(59) This dish is very Polish.

Similarly, aż/čak can occur both with "natural scales", i.e. those that are context-independent, and with "pragmatic scales" that need supporting context (accommodation is harder).

(60) Janek przebiegł aż 100 km.
Janek ran aż 100 km

(61) a. Janek pojechał aż do Doliny Małej Łąki.
Janek went aż to Valley Small Meadow

b. Janek pojechał aż do Doliny Śmierci.
Janek went aż to Death Valley

In (61a), aż/čak + [location denoting PP] without any context receives a reading of a ‘great distance’ (The Small Meadow Valley is far). However, knowing that Death Valley is the hottest place on earth makes the ‘distance reading’ in (61b) less salient.

Aż/čak + [Proper Name] out of the blue, by the principle of Quantity, receives an interpretation that there is something special (more than just focus) about the thing mentioned and context is need to specify what is special about it (He saw aż/čak Death Valley); i.e. what the alternatives are (next section).

Note: The Bulgarian čak seems to be an adaptation of the Turkish çok – very.

Aż/čak and only/merely vs. even interact with negation in different ways, because when the operator takes scope above negation with even the prejacent ~p is the least likely (= p is most likely), while with aż/čak and only/merely the prejacent ~p is high/low on the (contextually determined) scale of alternatives

(62) John didn’t go even to Berlin
presupposition: not going to Berlin is the least likely for John to do

(63) John didn’t go aż/čak to Berlin
presupposition: not going to Berlin is exceptional for John because Berlin is exceptionally far

The meaning contribution of aż/čak resembles that of the intensification added by very: a standard on a contextually relevant scale is exceeded.

4.3 Focus alternatives are ordered

Aż/čak is a lexical trigger of a scalar presupposition, similar to even or the scalar only (merely), i.e. the set of alternatives evoked by the focal presupposition is ordered on a scale.

Focus only evokes a contrast set, but there is no ordering:
(64) [Maria] told Anna to stop singing. (Maria and not somebody else)

(65) My son is [16]. (too old to play with this young kid / too young to drink alcohol.)

Even when there is a scale independently implied by the predicate (e.g. numerals associated with scalar implicatures), focus does not tell us whether we should be looking up or down that scale. The implicature that the number is high/low on the scale has to follow from the context:

(66) A: What animals do you have?
    B: I have four dogs. (= not more than four)

(67) A: We need somebody to show up with four dogs.
    B: (I can do it.) I have four dogs. (= maybe more than four)

Additional expressions place the prejacent low (I only have four dogs) or high on the scale. In (68) the equative ‘as many as’ carries the presupposition that eight is a large number, which is absent with ‘at most’ (Rett 2008).

(68) a. She provided foster care for as many as eight dogs at one time.
    b. She provided foster care for at most eight dogs at one time.

Presuppositions impose a requirement on the context as precondition for the felicitous use. If a sentence S presupposes A, the context has to take A for granted. In contexts where A is known not to hold, S is infelicitous (Chierchia & Mc-Connel-Ginet 1990, Kadmon 2001).

→ Aż/čak will be felicitous when:
   (i) alternatives are ranked on the scale and
   (ii) the prejacent is higher than the contextual standard

4.4 Contextual standard is exceeded

(69) Imame tri bani čak.  
    have-1pl three bathrooms čak
    ‘I have as many as three bathrooms’

(70) A: We need somebody to show up with four dogs (no more, no less).
    B: Janek ma (až) 4 psy.  
    Janek has až 4 dogs

(71) A: We need somebody to show up with as many as four dogs. (presupposes that 4 is a lot)
    B: Janek ma až 4 psy.
    Janek has až 4 dogs

This is opposite to the scalar only which excludes all the values higher on the scale (as its assertion) and presupposes that the actual values is low on the scale (lower than the standard) (Kleindienst 2004, Copock and Beaver 2011).

(72) Janek ma tylko/zaledwie 4 psy.
    Janek has only/merely 4 dogs

→ Až/čak is the scalar opposite of only/merely.
4.5 Focus alternatives are not existentially presupposed

Aż/čak does not carry a presupposition that other alternatives on the scale are true (additivity).

(73) Govorih  daže s Mary.
    talked.1Sg  even with Mary
    ‘I talked even to Mary.’ \(\rightarrow\) implies that I talked to other people as well

(74) Govorih  čak s Mary.
    talked.1Sg  čak  with Mary
    ‘I talked to Mary who is very important.’ \(\rightarrow\) does not imply that I talked to others

(75) Janek  jest  aż  w Berlinie.
    Janek  is  aż  in Berlin
    ‘Janek is as far as Berlin.’

(76) Janek  jest  #nawet  w Berlinie.
    Janek  is  even  in Berlin
    ‘Janek is even in Berlin.’ \(\rightarrow\) implies that Janek is in other places as well at the same time

The existential/additive presupposition of even (that some alternative proposition distinct form the prejacent is also true in the context of utterance) has been questioned (e.g. Rullman 1997), but (76) and (77) suggest that the additivity of even is more than just an implicature.

(77) We invited aż/čak/#even [Bill], but we didn’t invite anybody else.

4.6 Felicity conditions – role of alternatives

Alternatives, however, still need to be evoked. If the context does not allow for the satisfaction of the focal presupposition, the use of aż/čak is infelicitous:

(78) The camcorders were so badly ruined, that #aż they stopped renting them.

(79) The camcorders were so badly ruined, that aż they threw them away.

In the case of (78) the scale of alternatives cannot be constructed - when something is badly damaged, it can either (a) be repaired, or (b) be thrown away, and both (a) and (b) mean that the thing cannot be rented anymore.

Predicates that are not inherently associated with a scale require a supporting context:

(80) #Janek jest aż palaczem.
    Janek  is  aż smoker
    ‘Janek is a smoker and being a smoker is high on the scale of x. (\(\rightarrow\) infelicitous unless x is specified)

(81) Janek aż  jest  palaczem ze stresu.
    Janek  aż  is  smoker  from stress
    ‘Janek has become a smoker because of stress’ (\(\rightarrow\) which is more serious than other things that could have happened to him)
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(82) ?Janek jest aż takim palaczem.
   Janek is aż such smoker.
   ‘Janek is a significant type of smoker as opposed to other types.’

(83) Janek jest aż generalem.
   Janek is aż general.
   ‘Janek is a general and general is a high military rank.’

(84) Mężczyzna był aż czerwony ze złośći.
   man was aż red of anger
   ‘The man was angry he was red on his face.’

(85) #Aż czerwony ze złośći mężczyzna podszedł do nas.
   aż red of anger man approached to us

(86) Zdenerwowany i aż czerwony ze złośći mężczyzna podszedł do nas.
   nervous and aż red of anger man approached to us

(87) Janek aż pędził na spotkanie.
   Janek aż went fast to meeting
   ‘Janek was driving super fast to the meeting.’

(88) ?Janek aż jechał na spotkanie.
   Janek aż went to meeting
   ‘Janek was driving to the meeting.’

(89) Janek aż pożarł swojego kotleta.
   Janek aż devoured his cutlet
   ‘Janek as much as devoured his cutlet.’

(90) ?Janek aż zjadł swojego kotleta.
   Janek aż ate his cutlet
   ‘Janek as much as ate his cutlet.’

[(87) and (89) are ‘positive relative predicates’ as described by Umbach (2011) – gradable verbs that are compatible with intensifiers that operate on the “upper half” a scale, in contrast to their unmarked counterparts: e.g. Er ist so gerast. vs. *Er ist so gefahren. ‘He so raced’/*drove’,
Du sollst nicht so schlingen. vs. *Du sollst nicht so essen. ‘You shouldn’t so gorge’/*eat.’ Rasen
(‘race’) denotes a high degree of speed of fahren (‘drive’), schlingen (‘gorge’) denotes a high
degree of haste of essen (‘eat’) etc. In general, gradable verbs like rasen/schlingen denote an
“outstanding degree of intensity of an underlying unmarked activity’.

With aż/čak the scale is contextually defined, on the basis of the basis of the prejacent, while
with even the scale is always likelihood. Aż/čak wants to place the prejacent high on the
contextual scale, which is incompatible with an ‘average person’ in (91).

(91) Even/haftačak [an average person], can hack a Gmail account.
4.7 Exclusive implication

Aż/čak additionally carries an exclusive implication interfering with the cancellation of the quantity implicature in (92).

(92) Jan wypił aż butelkę wódki, #a właściwie to półtora butelki. Polish
Jan drank až bottle vodka and actually it was 1.5 bottle
‘John drank až a bottle of vodka, #in fact he drank 1.5 bottle’

(93) Jan wypił tylko butelkę wódki, #a właściwie to pół butelki.
Jan drank only bottle vodka and actually it was 0.5 bottle
‘John drank only a bottle of vodka, #in fact he drank 0.5 bottle’

(94) Jan wypił butelkę wódki, a właściwie to półtora/pół butelki.
Jan drank bottle vodka and actually it was 1.5 /0.5 bottle
‘John drank až/only a bottle of vodka, #in fact he drank 1.5/0.5 bottle’

Crucially, being the scalar opposite of only, aż/čak conveys that the focused element is high (as opposed to low) on the relevant contextually determined scale, and higher placed alternatives (in (92) more than one bottle) are excluded. (Without aż/čak in (94) the sentence continuation is felicitous and cancels the quantity implicature).

Similarly the continuation in (95)a sounds like a contradiction (unless even is added 95b):

(95) a. #Stać mnie až na Ferrari, a właściwie to na Lamborghini. Polish
afford me až on Ferrari but actually that on Lamborghini
‘I can afford as much as a Ferrari, but actually I could afford a Lamborghini.’

b. Stać mnie až na Ferrari, a właściwie to nawet na Lamborghini.
afford me až on Ferrari but actually that even on Lamborghini
‘I can afford as much as a Ferrari, but actually I could even afford a Lamborghini.’

The exclusive implication accounts for the only-like reading in (96) (later than now is excluded).

(96) Prepáčte, že odpisujem až [teraz]. Slovak
excuse that I answer only now

In Polish, the adverb dopiero (a ‘temporal only’, cf. German erst) contributes the (truth conditional) exclusive component so až readily combines with it. In (97) dopiero excludes all better places, and až indicates that the 3rd place is far from the winning position.

(97) Zakłasyfikowaliśmy się (dopiero) až na 3cim miejscu. Polish
placed-3pl refl only až at 3rd place
‘We were ranked only/merely at 3rd place’ (= as low as the 3rd place)

The exclusive implication can also explain the example in (52)b reapeated here as (98)b:

(98) a. Janek jest až/nawet tak wysoki jak jego rodzice. Polish
Janek is až/even so tall as his parents
b. Janek jest wyższy nawet/#aż od swoich rodziców.

Janek is taller even/#aż than his parents

Aż in (98)b places Janek's parents at the top of the scale of height, i.e. excluding all higher degrees, while the sentence is trying to convey that Janek's degree of height is among them. Aż/čak gives the prejacent a most extreme value on the scale (excluding all higher values), thus it is infelicitous when repeated (cf. Spanish hasta, Schwenter & Vasishth, 2001):

(99) Janek pojechał aż [do Tromsoe] i aż [na Nordkapp].
    'John, I went as far as Tromsoe and as far as Nordkapp.'

(100) Janek pojechał aż [do Tromsoe] a potem aż [na Nordkapp].
    'John, I went as far as Tromsoe and as far as Nordkapp.'

Only (100) is felicitous because it is clear that the trip consisted of two temporally separate legs.

5. Analysis

Scalar focus associating particles fall into two classes – the scalar only (exclusive) vs even and also (additives). Even is always interpreted according to a scale of likelihood (Karttunen & Peters 1979, or its dual, noteworthiness Herburger 2000, Rullman 2007) (combined with the focal presupposition, e.g. Rooth 1985, 1992).

(i) "even_c q" presupposes that
    \[ \lambda w. \exists p \ [ p \in C \& p(\lbrack q \rbrack) \& p(w) = 1 ] \] (additive presupposition)
    \[ \lambda w. \forall p \ [ p \in C \& p(\lbrack q \rbrack) \rightarrow p < \text{likely} \lbrack q \rbrack ] \] (scalar presupposition)

Slavic daże, dokonca, nawed all carry the additive presupposition.

Scalar only is linked to scales of variable dimensions (e.g. distance, importance) constructed on the basis of the prejacent proposition with respect to the context (Klinedinst, 2005).

(ii) "only_c q" presupposes that
    \[ \lambda w. \neg \exists p \ [ p \in S \& p(w) = 1 \& \lbrack q \rbrack \prec_S p ] \] (exclusivity asserted)
    \[ \lambda w. \lbrack q \rbrack \text{ is low on } S \text{ (scalar presupposition) } \]
    where S is an ordered set C of contextually determined alternative propositions

This division into two classes brings in a theoretically interesting question of how scales are constructed.

> Can the type of scale be always pragmatically determined or should it be lexically specified in the meaning of individual focus-sensitive particles (e.g. set to likelihood as in (i))?
> Is the position of the focused element with respect to its scalar alternatives lexically determined (ii) or whether it follows entirely from pragmatics (low on a likelihood scale/high on a noteworthiness scale for even)?
Cross-linguistically we find that scalar readings can emerge when the additivity is combined with the semantics of focus without the need for a lexical specification of even-type scalarity (Lahiri 1998, Koch and Zimmermann 2010). Thus, the reference to the likelihood/noteworthiness scale needs not be built in the lexical meaning of scalar also or even, it could be derived entirely pragmatically.

Moreover, we can expect that cross-linguistically additive scalar particles will always involve a scale of likelihood/noteworthiness and the focus will always be interpreted at the bottom of the likelihood/top of the noteworthiness scale.

In the case of scalar only and aż/čak, on the other hand, the scale is not always likelihood. The alternatives on the scale are determined on the basis of the prejacent.

If the “low on the scale” component of the scalar only does not follow from exclusivity, but is part of the presupposition (e.g. Klinedienst 2005), we should be able to find its dual that refers to a position a “high on the scale”.

Aż/čak is the scalar opposite of the scalar only in (8) – something to be expected if indeed the scale along which its focus associate is interpreted is not purely pragmatically determined (on the basis of focus and additivity) but is specified on the basis of the prejacent.

(ii) “aż/čak Cϕ” presupposes that
λw. [ϕ] is high on S (scalar presupposition)
where S is an ordered set C of contextually determined alternative propositions
λw.¬∃p [p ∈ S & p(w) & [ϕ] <s p] (exclusive implication)

6. Conclusion:

The place of aż/čak in the typology of focus-sensitive adverbs follows a theoretically predicted asymmetry:

- **Scales** that are entirely pragmatically determined on the basis of focus and additivity can be subsumed under the notion of likelihood and only the bottom of the scale will be the “target” of the focus.

- For scales that are lexically determined (and not entirely by the pragmatics) we expect more types of scales (dimension, importance, etc), as well as, both the top and bottom of the scale available for the focus.

References:


Klinedinst, N. 2005. Scales and Only, Ms., UCLA.


