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Goals of the talk:
- The particle až (Slovak, Polish, Russian) / čak (Bulgarian, Serbian) as a focus sensitive adverb.
- Analysis: a scalar opposite of scalar only composed of two meaning components:
  - Intensification (asserted/at-issue content) - VERY'
  - Exclusion of alternatives lower on the scale (Presupposed/not-at-issue content) - MERELY'
- Conclusion: The place of až/čak in the typology of focus-sensitive scalar adverbs:
  - Default scales - likelihood, prejacent low
  - Lexically or contextually determined scales - various dimensions, prejacent high/low

1. Focus sensitivity:
- The meaning contribution of až/čak is similar to that of even in some case, and to only/merely in others. Crucially, it is not always exchangeable with even or only/merely.

1.1 Like Even
The addition of the adverb až/čak modifies the meaning of the sentence in a way that superficially resembles the contribution of the equivalents of even in Bulgarian (daže) (1), in Polish (nawet) (2), in Slovak (dokonca) (3).

(1) Govorih čak s Mary. 
I talked čak with Mary
'I talked to Mary, who is a significant person.' (Cf. I even talked to Mary.)

(2) Rozmawialem až z Marią.
I talked až with Mary
'I talked to Mary, who is a significant person.' (Cf. I even talked to Mary.)

(3) Zajtra vydiskutujem až s Igorom.
Tomorrow I will discuss it až with Igor
'Tomorrow I will discuss it with Igor, who is a significant person.' (cf. I will even discuss it with Igor.)

(1)-(3) convey that there is something exceptional about talking to Mary/Igor. (1)-(3) are compatible with the equivalents of even: Bulgarian (daže) (1), Polish (nawet) (2), Slovak (dokonca) (3).

1.2 Like Only
In contrast, (4)-(7) are incompatible with even, but exchangeable with only/merely or the phrase 'no sooner than!'

(4) Zashto mi kazvash čak sega.
why me tell čak now
'Why are you telling me only now?' (Cf. 'Why are you telling me (#even) now?')

(5) Prepáčte, že odpisujem až teraz.
excuse that I answer až now
'I am sorry that I am replying only now.' (Cf. 'I am sorry that I am replying (#even) now.')

(6) Subudih se čak v 6.
I woke up refl čak at 6
'I woke up only at 6.' (Cf. I woke up (#even) at 6.)

(7) Daneček se vzbudil až v 6 rano.
Dan refl woke-up až at 6 morning
'Little Dan woke up only at 6 am.' (Cf. Little Dan woke up (#even) at 6.)

In (4)-(7) daže/dokonca/dokonc (even) would be infelicitous. In (1)-(3) only/merely would not work.

1.3 Focus association
- Až/čak can associate with different constituents in the sentence, with detectable changes in meaning.

1.3.1 Syntactic associates
Až/čak modifies different syntactic constituents, DPs, PPs, IPs.

Association with a PP in (1)-(3) [(1)repeated below):

(8) a. Govorih čak [žp s Mary].
I talked čak with Mary
b. Rozmawialem až [žp z Mary].
I talked až with Mary

Association with a VP in (9)-(12):

(9) Až [žp krzyzczaļa] (až ból)
'až she cried from pain
'She as much as cried (from pain).'
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The picnic with the Czech friends is coming up. You get a headache just from thinking about it.'

He even started breathing heavily, (being so emotional).

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

Janek did not talk to the dean but (merely) to the chancellor.'

Association with an IP:

The above suggests that aż/čak is similar in behavior to focus associating particles. Yet it could also be the case that aż/čak itself induces focus or that it does not obligatorily associate with focus.

1.3.2 Focus inducing environments

- The 'not ... but' structure marks the PPs as contrastive focus, (15). aż/čak can be placed in either of the conjuncts:

a. Janek nie rozmawiał [z dziekanem], tylko [z rektorem].

Janek not talked with dean but with chancellor

'Janek did not talk to the dean but to the chancellor.'

b. Janek nie rozmawiał [z dziekanem], tylko aż [z rektorem].

Janek not talked with dean but až with chancellor

'Janek did not talk to the dean but to the chancellor himself.'

c. Janek nie rozmawiał až [z rektorem], tylko (zaledwie) [z dziekanem].

Janek not talked až with chancellor but merely with dean

'Janek did not talk to the chancellor himself but (merely) to the dean.'

When focus is already present, až/čak cannot associate with the topic. [In (16) až cannot add the new information that the dean is noteworthy; the dean is backgrounded, Marek is the focus.]

(16) A: Janek rozmawiał z rektorem.

Janek talked with dean

'Janek talked to the dean.'

B: Nie. Tylko Marek rozmawiał (żąz) z rektorem i nikt inny.

No. Only Marek talked až with chancellor and nobody else

'No. Only Marek and nobody else talked to the dean.'

1.3.3 Aż/čak does not supply focus

- Aż/čak has to associate with the focus already present.

- Clicic pronouns force a wider domain reading. Weak pronouns cannot be focused: in (17)b čak has to associate with the adverbial or the verb (cf. Hoeksema and Zwarts 1997, Beaver and Bradley 2001 on focus association of only in Dutch):

a. [u Večerta] čak vidjah[go 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. [u Večerta] čak [u go [u vidjah]]

evening čak him I saw

'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.'

Aż/čak is focus sensitive similarly to even and only.

Next section: the meaning contribution of až/čak is a scalar presupposition and a scalar assertion, interacting with the presupposition contributed by focus.

2. Scality: Presupposition and Assertion

2.1 The informal meaning - intensification

We have a reading similar to *as X as* ("evaluative equative", where X exceeds a standard):

(18) ‘I talked to somebody as important as the chancellor’.

(19) ‘I woke up as late as 6’.

2.2 Presupposition tests

This meaning contribution 'as X as' of aż/ćok is built out of:

- an asserted intensification component and
- a presupposed scalar exclusive component

2.2.1 'Family of sentences'

negation, questions or antecedents of conditionals (Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 1990).

(21) Janek rozmawiał aż z dekanem.
Janek talked aż with dean
~ Janek talked to the dean.
~ Janek talked to somebody as important as the dean.
~ Nobody (in the context) is as important as the dean.

(22) Janek nie rozmawiał aż z dekanem.
Janek not talked aż with dean
~ Janek did not talk to the dean.
~ Janek did not talk to anybody as important as the dean.
~ Nobody (in the context) is as important as the dean.

(23) Czy Janek rozmawiał aż z dekanem?
whether Janek talked aż with dean
~ Did Janek talk to the dean?
~ Did Janek talk to anybody as important as the dean?
~ Nobody (in the context) is as important as the dean.

(24) Gdyby Janek rozmawiał aż z dekanem, to by mi powiedział.
if Janek talked aż with dean, then he would me tell
~ If Janek had talked to the dean, he would have told me.
~ If Janek had talked to anybody as important as the dean, ...
~ Nobody (in the context) is as important as the dean.

In (21)-(24) the presupposition that the dean is an important person projects.
- The prejacent proposition is asserted.
- Intensification is asserted
- Scalar exclusivity presupposed.

2.2.2 Reason clause test

Reason clause identifies the at-issue content (Dretske 1972, Beaver and Clark 2008) - intensification is at-issue, scalar exclusivity presupposed.

(25) Maria jest zadowolona, bo rozmawia, aż z menedżerem.
Polish
Maria is happy because talks aż with manager
~ Nobody (in the context) is as important as the chancellor.
(exclusivity presupposed)

(26) Impreza się udała, bo przyszło aż 15 osób.
party self succeed because came aż 15 people
~ No less than 15 people came.
(exclusivity presupposed)

- Presupposition: lower alternatives are excluded - aż/ćok works like the scalar opposite of merely but this component is presupposed (merely asserts exclusivity).

(27) Maria jest niezadowolona, bo rozmawia zaledwie z menedżerem.
Maria is unhappy because talks merely with manager
~ Maria is unhappy because she is not talking to somebody more important than the manager.

(28) Impreza się nie udała, bo przyszło zaledwie 15 osób.
party self not succeed because came only 15 people
~ 'The party was not a success because no more than 15 people came.'

2.2.3 Denial tests

Direct denial of (21) targets the asserted content (29)a:
- the prejacent
- the intensification component
  → the presence of aż is obligatory in the continuation in (29)a
  → merely is obligatory in the corrective continuation in (29)b.

not true Janek not talked aż with dean
  'That’s not true. Janek did not talk anybody as important as the chancellor.'

not true Janek not talked merely with dean
  'That’s not true. Janek merely talked to the dean.'

c. Nie prawda. Rektor niema ważnej funkcji na uczelni.
not true chancellor not has important function at university
  'That’s not true. The chancellor does not have an important function at the university.'

moment moment chancellor maybe not is most important
  'Wait a minute. The chancellor is not the most important, I guess.'
(29)c infelicitously denies the presupposition. In (29)d, the so-called ‘Wait a minute’ test for non-asserted content (von Fintel 2004), the presupposition is shifted to the topic under discussion in.

2.3 Interaction with negation

The intensification (exceeding a contextual standard, ‘high on the scale’) is at-issue. I suggest that this is what makes its behavior wrt negation similar to only/merely and different from even. \[\text{In the negated version of (30) in (31) there is no scale reversal. Cf. even (32)-(33).}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{only/merely} (34)-(35) – exclusivity (‘low on the scale’) is at-issue.
\end{itemize}

Ivan merely reached [Berlin].

\begin{itemize}
  \item Ivan got as far as Berlin (\textit{No relevant place is as far as Berlin}).
\end{itemize}

Ivan not reached čak to Berlin

Ivan did not get as far as Berlin (\textit{No relevant place is as far as Berlin}).

Ivan even reached [Berlin].

(reaching Berlin is \textit{low} on the likelihood scale, hard to reach)

Ivan didn’t even reach [Berlin].

(reaching Berlin is \textit{high} on the likelihood scale, easy to reach)

(34) Ivan merely reached [Berlin]. (\textit{easy to reach})

(35) Ivan didn’t merely reach [Berlin]. (\textit{easy to reach})

\[\text{The intensification contributed by až/čak is asserted.}
\]

\[\text{It cannot be subsumed under the notion of likelihood or noteworthiness, as has been claimed to be the case for even (next section).}
\]

3. Scalarity: Dimension of the scale

3.1 Incompatibility with likelihood scale

- \textit{Even} is always interpreted according to a scale of \textit{likelihood} (Karttunen & Peters 1979, or its dual, \textit{noteworthiness} Herburger 2000, Rullman 2007).
- Contrast between až/čak and even in (36)-(38). \[\text{There’s no likelihood implication. The scale in (36) can only be about distance.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Given that Janek was going to talk to the most important person at the university, it is not surprising that:
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Janek porozmawiał až/nawet z rektorem.
    \item Janek talked až/even with chancellor
    \item [Janek talked to as important a person as the rector]
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

In (36)-(38) \textit{even} is incompatible with the lack of ‘unlikelyhood’, while až/čak can still contribute a sense of intensification.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Intensification ‘as X as’ = contextual standard is exceeded}
  \item \textit{Presupposition} – lower alternatives are excluded
  \item The \textit{scale is contextually defined}, on the basis of the basis of the prejacent.
\end{itemize}

In (39) salient scale for až/čak specified by the context (‘users who can hack a Gmail account’) – the prejacent an average user can hack a Gmail account is pragmatically incompatible with being placed high on this scale. \[\text{Až/čak is infelicitous.} \textit{Even} which by default places the prejacent low on the likelihood scale.

\begin{itemize}
  \item [Nawet//haż [przeciętny użytkownik] jest w stanie wiadomość na konto Gmail.
  \item Every average user is in ability break self into account Gmail
  \item ‘Even an average user can hack a Gmail account.’
\end{itemize}

3.2 Až/čak – resemblance to very

The intensification with až/čak and with \textit{very}: exceeding a contextual standard on a scale.

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

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

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

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Very} is restricted to the intensification of \textit{gradable predicates} (indicates that the property exceeds a contextual standard for that property, e.g. Kennedy and McNally 2005).
  \item Až/čak cannot apply to gradable properties. With gradable predicates, (43), the alternatives are not different degrees of the same property:
\end{itemize}

(43) Ivan čak/monogo [pochvěřený] ot sranam.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Ivan was so ashamed that he blushed \[\text{only with až/čak}
  \item [Ivan blushed very much] \[\text{only with very}
\end{itemize}

The addition of \textit{very} to a non-gradable predicate = coercion into something gradable:

(44) This dish is very Polish.
Similarly, a\~n/a\~n can occur both with *natural scales*, i.e. those that are **context-independent**, and with *pragmatic scales* that need supporting context (accommodation is harder).

(45) Janek przebiegł a\~n 100 km.
Janek ran a\~n 100 km

(46) a. Janek pojechał a\~n do Doliny Małej Łaki.
Janek went a\~n to Valley Small Meadow

b. Janek pojechał a\~n do Doliny Śmiereci.
Janek went a\~n to Death Valley

A\~n/a\~n + [location denoting PP]:
- no contexts (46a) \rightarrow distance reading (The Small Meadow Valley is far).
- context (46b) (Death Valley is the hottest place on earth) \rightarrow distance reading *less* salient.

### 3.3 Scalar alternatives

- **A\~n/a\~n is non-additive:**
- in contrast to **even**, does not carry the existential presupposition that some alternative proposition distinct from the prejacent is also true in the context of utterance.

(47) Govorih da\~n s Mary.

\begin{center}
Bulgarian
\end{center}

talked.1Sg even with Mary

‘I talked even to Mary.’ \rightarrow implies that I talked to other people as well

(48) Govorih čak s Mary.

\begin{center}
Polish
\end{center}

talked.1Sg čak with Mary

‘I talked to Mary who is very important.’ \rightarrow does not imply that I talked to others

(49) Janek jest a\~n w Berlinie.

\begin{center}
Polish
\end{center}

‘Janek is as far as Berlin.’

(50) Janek jest #nawet w Berlinie.

\begin{center}
Polish
\end{center}

‘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 has been questioned (e.g. Rullman 1997), but there is a clear contrast between a\~n/a\~n and even in (51):

(51) We invited a\~n/a\~n/ever [Bill], but we didn’t invite anybody else.

### 4. Analysis:

Scalar focus associating particles fall into two classes – the scalar **exclusive** vs. even and also **additives**. – A\~n/a\~n: non-additive, exclusivity presupposed.


(52) "Even, q\~n presupposes that
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda w. &\exists p \ [p \in S \& p\{q\} \& p\{w\} = 1] \\
\lambda w. &\forall p \ [p \in S \& p\{q\} \rightarrow p \text{ unlikely} \{q\}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

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

(53) "only e\~n q\~n asserts that
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda w. &\exists p \ [p \in S \& p\{w\} = 1 \& [q\~n] <_S p] \\
\end{align*}
\]

- and presupposes that
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda w. &\in S \& [q\~n] \text{ is low on } S \\
\end{align*}
\]

where S is an ordered set C of contextually determined alternative propositions

- **A\~n/a\~n**: scales of variable dimensions constructed on the basis of the prejacent proposition with respect to the context. Excluding alternatives lower on the scale.

(54) "a\~n/a\~n are q\~n asserts that
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda w. &\in S \& p\{w\} > [q\~n] \quad \text{(intensifier - VERY)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

- and presupposes that
\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda w. &\in S \& p\{w\} > [q\~n] \quad \text{ where } S \text{ is an ordered set C of contextually determined alternative propositions} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda w. &\in S \& [q\~n] \text{ is very } q\~n \\
\end{align*}
\]

### 5. Conclusion:

The place of a\~n/a\~n in the typology of focus-sensitive adverbs follows a theoretically predicted asymmetry:

- Scales that are entirely pragmatically determined 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/grammatically determined (and not entirely by the pragmatics) we expect more types, as well as both the top and bottom of the scale available for the focus.
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