The Semantics of Floating Mind 'All' in Old Hungarian

This contribution presents a uniform formal semantic analysis of the various uses of floating *mind* 'all' in Old Hungarian (OH, henceforth). *Mind* is claimed to operate on pluralities, and its chief role is "pragmatic strengthening" (Dowty, Brisson), indicating that the main predicate of the sentence holds of the greatest collective individual corresponding to the plurality in question. *Mind* was (and is, to this day,) used as a conjunction as well; this use is derived from a coerced sum-formation operation.

This contribution is a report on ongoing investigation concerning quantification in Old Hungarian. For reasons of space it is confined to floating *mind*. In fact the analysis of *mind* will serve as the starting point for the analysis of the determiner/DP mind-en (roughly, 'every', 'everyone', everything). Minden, which appears in all OH texts except the oldest (the Funeral Sermon, ca 1290–1295) exhibits a number of systematic differences from *mind*, from which it was in fact derived. For many of the properties of *mind*, discussed here, the opposite can be safely taken to hold for *minden*. A detailed analysis of OH floating *mind* can also be relevant for a better understanding of quantifier float crosslinguistically: First, floating *mind* can be attested earlier than determiner quantification with *minden*; for Hungarian at least it makes sense to take floating quantifiers to be generated in their surface position. Second, OH *mind* was ontologically unspecified, in that it could combine with individual-denoting expressions, mass terms, spatial or temporal expressions alike. It is conjectured therefore that the semantic analysis of mind can be extended, for instance, to Romance tot/tous.

Old Hungarian mind (roughly, 'all') is analysed as a floating adverbial operator base-generated outside the phrase (DP or PP) it 'associates' with. It could be adjoined to verbal projections or to DPs, PPs. Mind is assumed to operate on plural individuals contributed by definite expressions; these can be explicitly mentioned or inferred via bridging, but they can also be 'constructed' by means of free relatives. A dynamic semantics for plurals (Nouwen, Braşoveanu) is assumed, where atomic and plural individuals are uniformly of type (e,t) (Bennet, Winter). Mind is said to presuppose a definite, non-atomic expression; presuppositions are assumed to be resolved as in DRT, with anaphoric equations. The presuppositional status of mind is supported by its affinity toward demonstratives (e.g. OH, MH mind ezek 'all these'), and its role in OH codices to maintain disocurse coherence. (A prerequisite for the analysis of mind is a weak semantics for plurals in the sense of Brisson, so that a szentek 'the saints' should contribute to weaker truth-conditions than mind a szentek 'all the saints'.)

In a nutshell, *mind* is a polymorphic operator that yields either a maximal individual, a maximal quantity or the endpoint of a scale. When *mind* combines with a distributivity operator the output is equivalent to universal quantification in the usual sense.



• Floating *mind* was (and still is) unspecified w.r.t. potential associates. (Fordollatoc en hoziam *mend* tū zūuèteckèl (Vienna Codex 206) "You should *all* follow me your hearts", or "You should follow me with *all* your hearts".) • *Mind* was (and still is) compatible with collective and reciprocal predication (unlike *minden*). (Tehat *mind* az zentók *egetómbe* mondanak (Kazinczy Codex 9v) "Thus *all* the saints said *together*.)

 \circ Mind did not express contextually unrestricted universal quantification (after the emergence of minden). It operated on sets familiar from discourse or on sets constructed on the fly.¹ An indirect argument that mind, unlike minden, was 'parasitic' on set denoting expressions is provided by the fact that mind did not mean 'always'; mindenkor(-on) 'at all times' is derived from minden.

 \circ Mind could (and still can) associate with mass terms (sf az te testodet en mind el zagattattatom (Kazinczy Codex 15v) 'I'll tear your entire body to pieces').

In OH it could also associate with count nouns or abstract nouns in a nonstandard way (c.f. the earlier example from the Vienna Codex). In the latter case OH *mind* corresponds to MH *teljes, egész* ('entire', 'complete').

 \circ Unlike *minden*, *mind* could be exempt from scope interactions, when it operated on temporal or spatial scales, or on scales associated with eventualities (as in (1-d) below).

 \circ *Mind* could associate with temporal or spatial expressions, with expressions denoting quantities, or with expressions denoting incremental change.²

a. mēd o hozia fvtanac a kýsédtol fogvā meēd annaggiclan. (Vienna Codex 38)
 "from small shildren (all the way, all age growne) to adulte they

"from small children (*all the way*, *all age groups*) to adults, they *all* ran to him"

- b. *mend* napnugtaiglan munkalkodec (Vienna Codex 146) "He worked (*all* the time) until sunset"
- c. tahat az wtat mínd be vontat bíboral es barsoníal mínd azenteghazíglan (Lobkowicz Codex, 7)
 "Thus the road was all covered in purple and velvet, all the way to the cathedral"
- d. tetemit megegette mind hamuiglan (Vienna Codex 2/Amos/221/2/) "He burned his bones *completely* to ashes.

Mind as a conjunction can be taken as a special case of sum formation This is supported by OH examples of the type *mind Ádámmal...egyetemben* 'together with Adam'. The conjecture is that a singular expression associating with *mind* triggered a form of coercion: *mind* operated on the *join* of that singular expression *and* another, suitable expression.

