<div align="center">

RESCUING EXISTENTIAL FREE CHOICE ITEMS IN EPISODIC SENTENCES
Jinyoung Choi and Maribel Romero (University of Pennsylvania)

</div>

Subtrigging as a strategy to amend ∀-FCIs in episodic sentences. Universal free choice items (∀-FCIs) like English *any* are not licensed in episodic sentences like (1), while they can occur in generic contexts like (2). If a relative clause is added, episodic sentences like (1) are improved, as in (3). This strategy has been called "Sugtrigging" since LeGrand (1975) and has received full attention in Dayal (1995,1998).

(1)   ***Anyone** contributed to the fund.   (2)   **Any bird** flies.
(3)   **Anyone** <u>who heard the news</u> contributed to the fund.

However, this subtrigging strategy does not work for all types of FCIs. As Chierchia (2006) observes for Italian, subtrigging amends the ∀-FCI *qualsiasi* in (4), but not the ∃-counterpart, *uno qualsiasi* in (5).

(4)   a. ?? Ieri ho parlato con **qualsiasi filosofo**   √**subtrg.+ ∀**_{FCI}
        b. Ieri ho parlato con **qualsiasi filosofo** <u>che fosse interessato a parlarmi</u>
(5)   a. ?? Ieri ho parlato con **un qualsiasi filosofo**   *****subtrg.+ ∃**_{FCI}
        b. ?? Ieri ho parlato con **un qualsiasi filosofo** <u>che fosse interessato a parlarmi</u>

The same contrast obtains in other languages that distinguish ∀-FCIs from ∃-FCI, eg. Spanish and Korean. Korean ∀-FCI *wh-(N)-na* in (6a) is very marginal if uttered out-of-the-blue, but it is rescued by subtrigging in (6b). ∃-FCI *amwu-(N)-na* remains ungrammatical regardless of the presence of subtrigging in (7).

(6)   a. *John–un   **nwukwu-**hako-**na** macuchi-ess-ta
            J.-Top   who-with-or   run.into-Past-Dec
            '(Lit.) John ran into anyone.'

        b. John-un <u>ke-ipkwu-lo   tuleo-nun</u>   **nwukwu-**hako-**na** macuchi-ess-ta   √**subtrg.+ ∀**_{FCI}
            J.-Top   the-entrance-by enter-Rel   who-with-or   encounter-Past-Dec
            '(Lit.) John ran into anyone who was coming in by the entrance.'
(7)   a. *John–un   **amwu-**hako-**na**   macuchi-ess-ta
            J.-Top   anyone-with-or   encounter-Past-Dec
            '(Lit.) John ran into anyone.'

        b. *John-un <u>ke-ipkwu-lo   tuleo-nun</u>   **amwu-**hako-**na** macuchi-ess-ta   *****subtrg.+ ∃**_{FCI}
            J.-Top   the-entrance-by enter-Rel   anyone-with-or   encounter-Past-Dec
            '(Lit.) John ran into anyone who was coming in by the entrance.'

This paper presents the novel observation that a different strategy is used to rescue ∃-FCIs in episodic sentences: Agentivity. We then provide an analysis –parallel to Free Relatives with –*ever* (*ever*-FRs)– that accounts for agentivity with ∃-FCIs and merges with Dayal's (1998) analysis of subtrigging for ∀-FCIs.

Another way of amendment – Agentivity for ∃-FCI. We note that ∃-FCIs improve when they occur under the scope of a volitional agent: (8)-(9). Intuitively, the sentences convey indifference of the agent of the sentence: John was indifferent w.r.t. the identity of the book he took and acted indiscriminately.

(8)   John-un **amwu-chaek-ina**   <u>cip</u>-ese ku-uy-ey   olienoh-ass-<u>ta</u>   √**Agent+ ∃**_{FCI}
        J.-Top   anyone-book-or   take-and the-top-Loc put-Past-Dec
        '(Lit.) John took any book and put it on the top (of the pile).'
(9)   John aveva bisogno di un peso, perciò <u>prese</u> **un libro qualsiasi** dalla mensola e
        lo mise in cima alla pila.   √**Agent+ ∃**_{FCI}
        'John needed a paperweight, so he took a random book from the shelf and put it on top of the pile.'

Following the literature on argument structure (e.g., Pustejovsky, 1998), not all subjects are agents as in (6-7), and not all agents appear in the subject position as in (10). The ∃-FCI in (10) is licensed by the agent in the postpositional phrase. Therefore, what plays a role is not syntactic subjecthood but semantic agentivity.

(10)   **amwu-na**   <u>John-eykey</u>   mac-ass-ta   √**Agent+ ∃**_{FCI}
        any-or   John-by   hit-Pase-Dec
        '(Lit.) Anyone was hit by John.'

The analysis. We argue that the Korean particle –*na* 'or', common to both the ∀-FCI and the ∃-FCI, does not induce domain widening; rather, it triggers an essential relation between the property expressed by the restrictor of the NP with –*na* and the main predicate of the sentence (cf. Dayal 1998). Formally, this is captured by adding to the plain assertion (11a) a presupposition of variation with a counterfactual modal base

F, as in (11b). This is completely parallel to von Fintel's (2000) analysis of *ever*-FRs, thus arguing that the "free-choiceness" of –*na* and the indifference flavor of *ever*-FRs have the same source.

(11) *wh- / amwu–na* (P) (Q) (w)
    a. Asserts: $\forall$ / $\exists$ (P) (Q) (w)   "Every / Some P is Q in the actual world w"
    b. Presupposes: $\forall w' \in \min_w [F \cap \lambda w".P(w")\neq P(w)]$: $\forall/\exists$ (P) (Q) (w') $= \forall/\exists$ (P) (Q) (w)
    "In all the counterfactual worlds w' such that the set of individuals that have property P in w' does not equal the set of individuals that have P in w and w' differs minimally from w otherwise: what is asserted for w also holds for w'."

Application to $\exists$-FCI and the need of Agentivity. Consider first the FRs in (12). Both (12a) and (12b) assert that Zack voted for the person who was at the top of the ballot. In contrast to (12a), the *ever*-FR (12b) has an additional meaning component, i.e., the presupposition of variation (13). To satisfy this presupposition, indifference of the agent is inferred, yielding the indifference reading in (14).

(12)   a. Zack voted for who was at the top of the ballot.
     b. Zack voted for whoever was at the top of the ballot.
(13) Presupposition of variation: If the person who was at the top of the ballot had been different, Zack would have voted for that person.
(14) Agent Indifference: Zack was indifferent as to the identity of the person at the top of the ballot.

Likewise, –*na* 'or' in (15) introduces the presuppositions of variation (16). If the presupposition can be satisfied by inferring that the agent acted indifferently (17), the sentence will be grammatical, as in (15) and (8)-(10). If there is no agent to plausibly attribute indifference to, the sentence is deviant, as in (7).

(15)   John-un   **amwu**-hako-**na**   deyith-ass-ta   √**Agent+ $\exists_{FCI}$**
       J.-Top   anyone-with-or   date-Past-Dec
       '(Lit.) John dated $\exists$-anyone.'
(16)   Presupposition of variation: If the set of people had been different, John would have dated someone.
(17)   Agent Indifference: John was indifferent as to the identity of the person(s) he dated.

Application to $\forall$-FCI and subtrigging. Consider (18). As noted by Dayal (1997), plain universal sentences like (18a) do not necessarily convey an essential link between the NP property and the main predicate, whereas *ever*-FRs like (18b) do. This link (20) follows from the presupposition of variation (19).

(18)   a. Those days, everything Bill cooked surprised / pleased Mary.
     b. Those days, whatever Bill cooked surprised / pleased Mary.
(19) Presupposition of variation: In every occasion, if the thing cooked by Bill had been different, it would had surprised / pleased Mary.
(20) External indifference / essential link: It doesn't matter what Bill actually cooked in each occasion. There was an essential link between being cooked by Bill and surprising / pleasing Mary.

Likewise, –*na* in (6a-b) gives rise to the presupposition of variation (21). This presupposition can be satisfied by establishing an essential link between "coming in through the entrance" and "being encountered" by John, making the subtrigged (6b) felicitous. But, for the unsubtrigged (6b) to be acceptable, we'd need an essential link between "being a person" and "being encountered by John". As Dayal (1998) notes, this is too strong, the presupposition is doomed to be false, and thus unsubtrigged $\forall$-FCIs in an episodic sentence are bad.

(21) Presupposition of variation: In each occasion during that episodic interval, if the set of people (coming in through the entrance) had been different, John would have run into them.
(22) External indifference / essential link: There is an essential link between being people (coming through entrance) and being encountered by John.

Conclusion. While substrigging rescues $\forall$-FCIs in episodic sentences, agentivity rescues $\exists$-FCIs in episodic environments. We have proposed a unified analysis of both rescue effects by extending von Fintel's (2000) analysis of *ever*-FRs to free choice in Korean, Italian and Spanish (and possibly other languages) while preserving Dayal's (1998) analysis of subtrigging.

REFERENCES **Chierchia, G.** 2005."Broden your views: Implicatures of domain widening and the logicality of language". ms. **Dayal, V.** 1997."Free Relatives and Ever: Identity and Free Choice Readings", *SALT 7*. **Dayal, V.** 1998."ANY as Inherently Modal". *L&P* 21. **von Fintel, K.** 2000."Whatever", *SALT 10*. **LeGrand, J.** 1975.Or *and* Any*: The Syntax and Semantics of Two Logical Operators*, Ph.D. dissertation, U. Chicago.