The paper first outlines the distribution of quantifiers in the “scope positions”, then singles out one such position for discussion: the Focus position. Detailed discussion of the general picture is to be found in Szabolcsi (1994b).

1. Quantifiers in Hungarian surface structure

A substantial body of work by Hunyadi, Kenesei, É. Kiss, Szabolcsi, and others since the early eighties has established that surface order and intonation disambiguate scope in Hungarian. For instance, the following sentences are unambiguous:

(2) (a) *Sok ember mindenkit felhívott.
    many men everyone-acc up-called
    ‘Many men phoned everyone’
    many men > everyone

(b) Mindenkit sok ember felhívott.
    everyone-acc many men up-called
    ‘idem’
    everyone > many men

(c) Hatnál több ember hívott fel mindenkit.
    six-than more men called up everyone-acc
    ‘More than six men phoned everyone’
    more than 6 men > everyone

1 For simplicity, I assume that in (2c) the postverbal universal is unstressed.
2 Independent (cumulative) quantification is also possible and requires a special word order, whose syntactic analysis is presently unclear to me:

(a) *Keves ember (mindig/gyakran) keveset végez.
    few men always/often little-acc accomplishes
    ‘Few men tend to accomplish little (between them)’

(b) *Keves ember végez keveset.
    few men accomplishes little-acc
    ‘Few men are such that they accomplish little’

(c) *Keveset végez kevés ember.
    little-acc accomplish few men
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(d) *Mindenkit hatnál több ember hívott fel.*
   everyone-acc six-than more men called up
   'idem'
   everyone > more than 6 men

Theoretically speaking, it is the occurrence in specific syntactic positions that
defines the quantifier's scope. Simple syntactic tests distinguish the positions
in (3); the postverbal position is assumed to be base generated. I use the tra-
ditional pretheoretical labels. See É. Kiss (1991, 1994) for recent discussion,
and Stowell-Beghelli (1994) for an interestingly similar proposal for Logical
Form in English.

(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Verb]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also well known that different noun phrases (DPs) occur in different
positions, e.g., a Topic must be specific, and universals do not occur in Topic or
Focus. However, no systematic investigation of these matters has been carried
out to date. In what follows I examine a representative sample. Note that
many DPs occur in more than one class; as we shall see, their interpretations
vary accordingly.

3 (i) Focus: strictly precedes the finite verb stem; if the verb has a prefix, prefix/verb
   inversion is triggered: fel-hív 'up-call' ⇒ hív fel; can be constituent-negated.
   (ii) Verbal Modifier: in complementary distribution with Focus; cannot be con-
        stituent-negated. (Might be called non-contrastive Focus.)
   (iii) Topic: sentence initial; can be followed by adverbials like tegnap 'yesterday'.
   (iv) Quantifier: none of the above; can follow Topic and precede Focus/V-Mod.

I omit the position of Contrastive Topic (Left Dislocation), because it is in every respect
like the Neutral position. Contrastive Topic is distinguished from Topic both by having a
"scooped" intonation and by needing to be followed by Focus or negation.
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(4) Type A: DPs that may occur in Topic and Focus positions: Péter, Péter és Mária ‘P and M’, a fiú(k) ‘the boy(s)’, hat fiú ‘six boys’.

(5) Type B: DPs that may occur in Quantifier position: minden fiú ‘every boy’, valamennyi fiú ‘each boy’, még Péter is ‘even Peter’, hat fiú is ‘as many as six boys’, Péter is ‘Peter, too’, Péter sem ‘Peter either’, semelyik fiú⁴ ‘none of the boys’, sok fiú ‘many boys’, több, mint hat fiú ‘more than six boys (1)’, legalább hat fiú ‘at least six boys’.

(6) Type C: DPs that must occur in V-Mod unless Focus is filled; may also be pied piped to Focus if they have a contrastive constituent: pontosan hat fiú ‘exactly six boys’, kevés fiú ‘few boys’, kevesebb, mint hat fiú / hatnál kevesebb fiú ‘less than six boys (1,2)’, legfeljebb hat fiú ‘at most six boys’, több, mint hat fiú / hatnál több fiú ‘more than six boys (1,2)’, KÉT fiú ‘TWO boys’, SOK fiú ‘MANY boys’.

(7) Leftovers: (i) DPs that may occur in Topic but not in Focus: a legtöbb fiú ‘most (of the) boys’ valamely fiú ‘some boy;’ (ii) DPs that may occur in V-Mod or Focus: fiú(k) ‘boy(s), existential’.

The three main classes are semantically coherent. In Kamp–Reyle’s (1993) sense, the noun phrases in Type A are set (group) denoters, and those in Types B and C, generalized quantifiers. However, Type B sides with Type A in English in supporting inverse scope and non-distributive de re readings (Farkas 1993; Stowell–Beghelli 1994), whence a three-way classification is needed:⁵

(8) (a) Some man or other hit two boys.
   ok ‘two boys > some man’

   (b) Some man or other hit every boy.
   ok ‘every boy > some man’

   (c) Some man or other hit few boys.
   ?? ‘few boys > some man’

⁴ Hungarian is a so-called negative concord language, and Szabolcsi (1981) argued that se-phrases are universals that must take immediately wider scope than negation. (Current literature on Italian makes comparable claims.) Similarly for Péter sem, the negative concord version of Péter is. The licensing negation may be preverbal or pre-Focus negation. Both their scope behavior and their ability to precede a filled Focus indicate that se-phrases, unlike real decreasing QPs, belong to Type B.

⁵ The label “ok” is used to indicate that the given reading is possible, though not necessarily the only reading of the sentence.
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(9) (a) *Some man or other imagined that two fools were smart.
   ok two fools de re; men do not vary
   (b) *Some man or other imagined that every fool was smart.
       ok every fool de re; men do not vary
   (c) *Some man or other imagined that few fools were smart.
       ?? few fools de re

The tests motivating the three-way classification can be replicated in Hungarian. Szabolcsi (1994b) argues in detail for the following characterization:

(10) (a) Type A items are set (group denoters).
   (b) Type B items are set (group) denoters that are prototypically associated with a distributive operator in their own clause.
   (c) Type C items are cardinality quantifiers (not necessarily intersective).

Striking support for the proposed interpretations of Types B and C comes from DPs that occur in both Quantifier and Verbal Modifier positions, e.g., több, mint hat fiú ‘more than six boys (1)’. In Quantifier position they offer up a set (group) for exclusively distributive predication; in V-Mod they count the atoms of the group / elements of the set denoted by the predicate:

(11) (a) Több, mint öt fiú felemelte az asztalt.
   more than five boy up-lifted the table-acc
   ‘More than five boys lifted the table (individually)’
   (b) *Több, mint öt birtok körülöleli a kastélyt.
       more than five estate around-embraces the the castle-acc
       ‘More than five estates surround the castle’

(12) (a) Több, mint öt fiú emelte fel az asztalt.
   more than five boy lifted up the table-acc
   ‘The number of boys who lifted up the table (individually) is five’
   or
   ‘It took more than five boys to lift the table (collectively)’
   (b) Több, mint öt birtok öleli körül a kastélyt.
       more than five estate embraces around the the castle-acc
       ‘The group of estates that surrounds the castle has more than five atoms’
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More generally, Szabolcsi (1994a,b) characterizes the mode of operation of Type A and Type B items as "predicate and ±distribute", and that of Type C items as "count". Note now that Types A and B contain only upward monotonic quantifiers. In the spirit of (1), the reason is that only these can define a group (set) that serves as a target of predication. With this background, let us focus on focus.

2. Group denoters in free focus

2.1. Groups and exhaustivity

In accordance with current literature, I will distinguish free focus and modification by csak ‘only’. When talking about the occurrence of DPs in the Focus position, I will by default have free focus in mind. Csak is discussed in section 3.

Let us now recap the pertinent observations of section 1. I was claiming that only two types of DPs show up in the syntactic Focus position: those belonging to Type A, on their own right (13), and those belonging to Type C, when they have a constituent set into contrast (14c). Recall that the normal habitat of Type C DPs is the Verbal Modifier (VM) position, which differs from Focus in not supporting constituent negation. Type B is excluded from Focus (15).

(13) (a) \[F \text{ Hat fiút} \]
\[\text{láttam.} \]
six boys-acc see-past-1sg
'It was six boys that I saw'

(b) \[Nem [F hat fiút] \]
\[\text{láttam.} \]
not six boys-acc saw-I
'It was not six boys that I saw'

(14) (a) \[VM \text{ Hatnál kevesebb fiút} \]
\[\text{láttam.} \]
six-than fewer boy-acc saw-I
'I saw fewer than six boys'

Semelyik fiú 'none of the boys' superficially contradicts the upward monotonic generalization. See note 4.

As is indicated in (6), bare numeral indefinites like hat fiú 'six boys' belong to Type C iff their head noun is deflected. In this case they mean 'exactly six boys'.
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(b) *Nem láttam hatnál kevesebb fiút.  
not saw-I six-than fewer boy-acc  
'I didn’t see fewer than six boys’

(c) Nem [*F HATNÁL kevesebb fiút] láttam, hanem  
not six-than fewer boys-acc saw-I but  
[F ÖTNÉL kevesebbet].  
five-than fewer-acc  
'It was not fewer than SIX boys that I saw but fewer than FIVE’

(15) *[F Minden fiút] láttam.  
every boy-acc saw-I  
'It was every boy that I saw’

Parallel to these distributional facts the following interpretive contrasts can be observed:

(16) (a) Type A DPs receive an exhaustive interpretation in Focus. E.g. (13a) cannot be true if I saw anyone beyond six particular boys.

(b) Type C DPs do not receive an exhaustive interpretation in Focus: at best their numeral part is affected.

(c) There is no exhaustive interpretation outside Focus.

The question I wish to address in this section is why this is so. Recall the heuristics proposed in (1):

(1) What quantifiers participate in a given process is suggestive of exactly what that process consists in.

Since we know that Type A DPs are set (group) denoters, this tells us that exhaustivity in the requisite sense must be applicable only to sets (groups). Below I show that this is indeed the case.

Prior to proceeding to the details, recall that there are two essentially different approaches to free focus in the literature. The first assumes that free focus makes a semantic contribution (affects the presupposition and/or assertion of the sentence). The second approach assumes that free focus does not make by itself a semantic contribution. All it does is provided an informational and/or syntactic structure that comes into play when a so-called focus
sensitive operator occurs in the sentence (e.g., an adverb of quantification). I believe that the data of the present paper confirm that, at least for Hungarian, the first approach is correct. The existence of the group denot constraint on DPs in Focus, which, as I argue below, follows straightforwardly from a particular formulation of exhaustivity, in turn confirms the reality of exhaustivity itself. This is not to deny, though, that free focus in Hungarian also introduces a partition that focus sensitive items can rely on.

2.2. Retrospective: Exhaustivity for GQs over individuals

Let us first briefly consider an early attempt to formulate exhaustivity ("and no one/nothing else"). Szabolcsi (1983) proposed an interpretation for free focus in Hungarian, and Groenendijk–Stokhof (1984) for short answers to interrogatives in English. Groenendijk–Stokhof (1984, 419) note that the two formulations are logically equivalent but theirs is more transparent, so I will stick with it.

This definition of EXH takes a generalized quantifier \( \Sigma \) and returns its minimal element(s):

\[
(17) \quad \text{Minimal element-EXH:} \\
\lambda \Sigma \lambda P[\Sigma(P) \land \neg \exists P'[\Sigma(P') \land P \neq P' \land \forall x[P'(x) \rightarrow P(x)]]]
\]

Does this notion of exhaustivity explain why only (set) group denoters are in Focus? Indeed, it turns out that (17) works well only with certain GQs. But what are they? They are the ones whose minimal elements are "characteristic" of them, e.g., every man, no man, John and Bill, exactly five men, but it misinterprets all GQs whose minimal elements are "uncharacteristic." E.g., EXH([[more than ten men]]) comes out the same as EXH([[exactly eleven men]]), and EXH([[fewer than ten men]]) as EXH-([[no man]]). Groenendijk–Stokhof address this problem and, wishing to provide a generally applicable definition, propose to remedy it by interpreting GQs with intersective determiners as follows:

\[
(18) \quad \{X : \{G\} \subseteq X, \text{ where } G \text{ is a group of girls having } n \text{ members}\}
\]

This proposal only derives certain "specific" readings, however, which may be acceptable for short answers but is not for Focus, which can be referentially dependent on wider scope quantifiers. Note also that whether or not we assume (18), the cases to which Minimal element-EXH applies correctly do not coincide with the GQs denoted by Type A DPs, therefore Minimal element-
EXH cannot be the answer to the question we are interested in. Prior to going further, let me note in passing that an initially quite plausible way to remedy (17) as a generally applicable definition would be to follow "Zwarts' Advice": If you get into trouble with minimal elements, switch to witness sets. The alternative definition is as follows:8

\[(19) \text{Witness-EXH: } \forall \Sigma \forall \mathcal{P}[\Sigma(\mathcal{P}) \land \mathcal{P} \subseteq SL(\Sigma)], \text{ where } SL(\Sigma) \text{ is the smallest set the generalized quantifier } \Sigma \text{ lives on:}\]
\[\cap \{ X : \forall \mathcal{P} [\mathcal{P} \in \Sigma \leftrightarrow (\mathcal{P} \cap X) \in \Sigma] \}\]

Let us see why this definition works where it does. Except for some principal filters, \(SL(\Sigma)\) is the DP's common noun set. So, Witness-EXH([\text{Det} \text{ girls}]) says that Det girls have property P and only girls have property P. If [\text{Det girls}] is decreasing or non-monotonic, Det already sets an upper limit for girls, so we are fine. If it is innocently increasing like more than six girls, then no limit needs to be set for girls, so we are fine again. If \(\Sigma\) is a principal filter like the six girls, then its smallest live-on set \(SL(\Sigma)\) may be smaller than the common noun set: it is the set consisting of the six individuals pointed at. This is exactly what we need. There is only one problem case: that of "non-innocent" increasing GQs, e.g., [two girls]. However we define it, the application of Witness-EXH to it will give the same result as its application to [at least two girls]. Thus this promising exercise eventually fails.9

2.3. Free focus: Presupposition versus assertion

I wish to argue now that the basic notion of exhaustivity in Szabolcsi (1981a,b, 1983) was misguided. Once it is amended, the question why only set (group) denoters express exhaustivity in Focus position is easily answered, too.

The problem with the notion proposed in my earlier work, technical details aside, is that it makes exhaustivity an asserted, rather than presupposed, part of meaning. The motivation for this decision came from the following type of contrasts:

---

8 In referring to the smallest live-on set I assume that the universe is not (crucially) infinite.

9 Construing two girls as a dynamic quantifier should help; this idea needs further work, however.
(20) *Nem [\( F \) Marit] veri János, hanem ...  
(a) ... [\( F \) Kati].  
(b) ... [\( F \) a porszívóval] játszik.  
(c) ... [\( F \) az ajtó] csapódott be.  

'János is not beating MARI, but ...  
(a) ... KATI.  
(b) ... is fooling with the VACUUM CLEANER.  
(c) ... the DOOR banged'

Clearly, the (b) and (c) continuations do not require that János beat anyone. Since these examples exhibit the same surface syntax as the ones discussed earlier, viz., have just DPs in Focus, I found it desirable to subsume them under the same interpretation rule. Now I believe that the cost of uniformity, i.e. the distortion of the interpretation of free focus, is too high, and these data should be given an independent account. Zsámboki (1995) proposes that the upward percolation of the focus feature gives rise to VP-focus and S-focus in the problematic cases.

Following Chomsky (1976), Kenesei (1986) proposed that free focus in Hungarian expresses, not exhaustive listing but, rather, exclusion by identification. Under this view, (21a) still requires that Mari and only Mari sleep, but does not assert all of this. In Kenesei’s (1986, 149f.) formalization:

(21) (a) [\( F \) Mari] alszik.  
Mari sleeps  
(b) \( \lambda x [\text{sleep}(x)] = m \)

On the intended interpretation (21b) presupposes that there is a unique individual who is asleep, and asserts that this individual is Mari. I believe that this is essentially correct. Nevertheless, the formalism is too restrictive, since it cannot handle plurals. Notice that simply assuming that \( x \) can range over i-sums is not enough. For instance, [\( F \) Mari és Kati] alszik cannot be formalized as \( \lambda x [\text{sleep}(x)] = [m \oplus k] \), since this would not allow the correct distributive inference that Mari is asleep. One obvious way to correct this is as follows:

(22) \text{EX-BY-ID: } \lambda z \lambda P[z = \lambda x [P(x) \land \forall y [P(y) \rightarrow y \subseteq x]]]

Van Leusen–Kálmán (1993), who discuss the pertinent presuppositions in fine detail, make the same proposal within their own framework:
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(23) (a) Exhaustivity condition: for some discourse referents $X$, $C$, s.t. $X \leq_{c/o} C$, $c/o \models \text{Max}(R, [X]_{c/o}, [C]_{c/o})$, where $\text{Max}(P,U,V) \\
\Leftrightarrow P(U) \land \forall U' \subseteq V[P(U') \Rightarrow U' \subseteq U]$

(b) Instruction to update context: $c/1 \models \text{Max}(R', [F]_{c/1}, [C]_{c/1})$

Note, by the way, that if there is someone who sleeps then, assuming cumulativity, there is always a unique i-sum of those who sleep, so we are really only committed to an existential presupposition. It is identification that does the real work here. For instance, interpreting two men as in (24), we get (25):

(24) two men $\Rightarrow \lambda P \exists g[\text{man}(g) \land |g|=2 \land P(g)]$ where $P$ is a vbl over sets of groups

(25) $[F \ Két\ ember] \ fut \Rightarrow \\
\exists g[\text{man}(g) \land |g|=2 \land g = \iota x[\text{run}(x) \land \forall y[\text{run}(y) \rightarrow y \subseteq x]]$

These formulations easily explain why only set (group) denoters are input to exclusion by identification: the definition only works for such DPs.

Of course, it would be possible to define group readings for DPs not in Type A, but then we would make incorrect predictions for either collective readings or anaphora or both. Or, we might leave the interpretation of those DPs intact but go out of our way to construct a group as part of the definition of exhaustivity (see Bonomi–Casalegno 1993 (15) for such an exercise); but why would we want to do that if there are no data to motivate it?

3. Csak ‘only’

3.1. Exhaustivity and association with Focus

Csak and csupán, both meaning ‘only’, can modify Type A noun phrases (26) and a subset of Type C ones: the non-monotonic or downward monotonic ones (27)–(29). The modification of Type B is excluded (30). As for interpretation,

10 In addition to attaching to the modified phrase, csak may also cliticize to the finite verb and associate with the Focus or Verbal Modifier. To my best knowledge, this does not make a difference. On the other hand, notice that phrases modified by még ... is ‘even’ occur strictly in Type B, which is excluded from Focus. This is of some interest since in English, even is assumed to be a focusing operator. I suspect that the phrase it associates with is merely intonationally prominent but not focused.
my judgment is that the same restriction applies here as with free focus: only Type A DPs get interpreted exhaustively. (On some variation in judgment, see the end of this subsection.)

(26) *Csak hat fiú ment el.
only six boy went away
‘Only six boys left (no one else did)’

(27) Csak hat és tíz közötti fiú ment el.
only six and ten between-six boy went away
*‘Only between six and ten boys left (no one else did)’
‘The number of boys who left is only between six and ten’

(28) Csak hatnál kevesebb fiú ment el.
only six-than fewer boy went away
*‘Only fewer than six boys left (no one else did)’
‘The number of boys who left was only fewer than six’

(29) *Csak hatnál több fiú ment el.
only six-than more boy went away

(30) *Csak minden fiú / sok fiú elment / ment el.
only every boy many boy away-went went away

Similar to (27) is Csak hat fiú ment el ‘The number of boys who left was only (exactly) six’ when fiú ‘boy’ is destressed. See note 7.

Let me first consider the issue of exhaustivity (the monotonicity contrast will be taken up in 3.3). Does the restriction to set (group) denoters follow from the semantics of csak, too?

Csak-sentences are true under the same circumstances as sentences with free focus (well, almost—I come back to some differences below), but they are false under quite different ones. That is, the division of labor between presupposition and assertion is different in the two cases. Consider:

(31) (a) Nem Mari ment el, hanem Kati (*is).
not Mari went away but Kati too
‘It is not Mari who left, but Kati (*too)’
(b) Nemcsak Mari ment el, hanem Kati *(is).
not-only Mari went way but Kati too
‘Not only Mari left, but Kati *(too)’

In (31a), Mari ment el with free focus presupposes that someone left and
asserts that it is Mari. In (31b), Csak Mari ment el presupposes (among other
things) that Mari left and asserts that no one else did.

The correct interpretation of csak is in fact rather close to what I pro-
posed (incorrectly) for free focus in earlier work, cf. 2.2. This already indicates
that the meaning of csak does not require the modified DP to be a set (group)
denoter. Indeed, Bonomi–Casalegno (1993) propose an event-semantic expli-
cation of only that applies successfully to all DP denotations (once some of
them are fixed a little) as well as to other focused categories (numeral, verb,
argument pair, etc.):\(^\text{11}\)

(32) If A,B are of type \(<\text{event},t>\), then only\(<A,B>\) =
\(\lambda e[B(e) \& \forall f[A^*(f) \rightarrow \exists g[B(g) \& f \subseteq E g]]]\), where A* is the
exist. closure of A, and A is obtained from B (roughly) by replacing
the focus category of B by the appropriate skeleton (variable).

This says: The focusless version of the sentence, B (say, Mary left) is true, and
for every event f of which A* (here: Someone left) is true, there is an event
g, such that B is true of g and f is part of g. That is, every event of someone
leaving is part of an event of Mary leaving. This could be improved by making
B a presupposition; a useful and easy move.

What explains the set (group) denoter constraint, then? The fact that
csak, just like English only, associates with Focus may be a good candidate.
That is, the restrictor of the universal quantifier over events is defined by
replacing the Focus phrase with a variable. Recall now that only Type A DPs
occur in Focus qua DPs; Type C DPs can at best be pied piped to Focus,
e.g., when e.g. their numeral is contrastive. It follows that the restrictor of the
universal is only definable using a DP-skeleton when DP happens to be a set
(group) denoter. In other words, this is more of a syntactic than a semantic
effect.

I wish to note that some speakers of Hungarian also allow for an exhaus-
tive interpretation of Type C DPs with csak. These speakers seem to allow

\(^\text{11}\) I thank Sara Inclán, Manuel Españó-Echevarría, and Matt Pearson for the
observations.
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defining the restrictor using a DP-skeleton even if DP got into Focus due to pied piping, not on its own right.

Crosslinguistically, there is an even more interesting contrast that calls for further research. Some speakers of English and Spanish judge that DP-modifier only and solo do not easily co-occur with Type C DPs, while VP-modifier only and solo do, and allow for an exhaustive interpretation.\[12\]

(33) (a) ??I have only fewer than ten chairs.
     (b) I only have fewer than ten chairs.
         ‘... and nothing else’

(34) (a) ??Hay solo menos de diez sillas en la habitación.
     have only fewer than ten chairs in the room
     (b) Solo hay menos de diez sillas en la habitación.
     only have fewer than ten chairs in the room
     ‘There are fewer than ten chairs in the room and nothing else’

3.2. Conservativity

Let me briefly comment on an important aspect of Bonomi–Casalegno’s (1994) schema for only. Only is the traditional example of a non-conservative operator, in view of the following paraphrase:

(35) Only John and Bill are Frenchmen ≠ Only John and Bill are Frenchmen who are either John or Bill

The precise semantic contribution of the word only remains unanalyzed here. What happens now if it is made explicit? Bonomi–Casalegno effectively translate only as a universal whose restrictor is the focus frame, and on this construal only is fully conservative. Compare the following simplified versions:

(36) Only John and Bill are Frenchmen
     ‘Every Frenchman is either John or Bill’ = ‘Every Frenchman is a Frenchman who is either John or Bill’

This suggests that conservativity may be way more pervasive than is generally assumed; it may be a general condition on the syntax/semantics inter-

\[12\] I thank Sara Inclán, Manuel Español-Echevarria, and Matt Pearson for the observations.
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face. Thus, if surface syntax does not bear it out, it serves as a good reason for assuming a more abstract syntactic structure that does. In our case the resulting “tripartite structure” ONLY(FOCUS FRAME)(FOCUS) coincides with standard logical forms.

See Herburger (1993) for related insights based on noun phrase internal focusing.

3.3. Two further aspects of csak

To conclude the discussion of csak, I briefly point out two further aspects of its meaning.

Bonomi–Casalegno’s (32) does not yet explain the infelicity of csak in the following text:

(37)  Senki sem szokott meglátogatni vacsoraidőben. De tegnap meghi-
tam Jánost és Marit, úgyhogy 8-kor (*csak) ők csönngették az ajtó-
mon.

‘Nobody tends to visit me at dinner time. But yesterday I invited
John and Mary, so at 8 p.m. (*only) they rang my bell’

The problem is that only requires for it to be possible and in some sense expected for more people to have rung my bell, but the context does not license this presupposition; rather, on the contrary.

Adding such an ingredient to the characterization of csak will, mutatis
mutandis, also explain the fact that csak can only modify the numeral part of a non-monotonic or downward monotonic Type C DP, cf. (26)–(27) and (28) above. With upward monotonic DPs, there cannot be “more”.

(38)  Csak hat és tíz közötti fiú ment el.

‘The boys who left were between six and ten; they could have been
more but were not’

(39)  Csak hatnál kevesebb fiú ment el.

‘The boys who left were fewer than six; they could have been more
but were not’

13 For some reason such a scalar use of only is marginal in English. This does not affect the argument concerning the contrast in Hungarian.
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(40) *Csak hatnál több fiú ment el.
   'The boys who left were more than six; they could have been more
   but were not'

   Another aspect of csak that Bonomi–Casalegno's (32) does not predict is
   borne out by (41):

   (41) Csak Mari és Kati emelte fel az asztalt (Juli nem).
   only Mari and Kati lifted up the table-acc Juli not
   'Only Mari and Kati lifted the table (Juli did not)'

   Even if lifting is understood collectively, (41) does not mean that Mari and
   Kati acted by themselves, rather than as part of a bigger group. It may only
   mean that there was not any other independent table-lifter (individual or
   collective). Similarly, the negation of (41) would not mean that Mari and Kati
   were part of a bigger group; it would mean that there was at least one more
   independent lifter.

   The reformulation of (32) to take care of these observations remains a
   task for further research.
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