

LICENSING FREE CHOICE ITEMS IN HOSTILE ENVIRONMENTS: THE ROLE OF ASPECT AND MOOD

JOSEP QUER

Universiteit van Amsterdam

1. Introduction

It is a well-established fact that Free Choice Items (FCI) are typically licensed in modal and generic contexts,¹ as in the English examples in (1) featuring FC *any*.

- (1) a. Any student could solve that problem
- b. Any owl hunts mice

At the same time, it has been established that free choice readings are incompatible with episodic tenses, as illustrated in (2).

- (2) a. *John talked to any woman
- b. *Any man didn't eat dinner
- c. *Any woman contributed to the fund

* This article is based on part of the material in Quer (1998: Chapter 4), which was presented to the audience of the 1999 SKY Symposium "The Relation between Syntax and Semantics in the Analysis of Linguistic Structure". For comments, criticism and suggestions, I would like to thank Anastasia Giannakidou, Anikó Lipták and Ildiko Tóth, as well as two anonymous referees. This research has partly been made possible through projects funded by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación y Cultura (PB96-1199-C04-02), and the Generalitat de Catalunya (CREL 99 and 1999SGR00113), as well as a travel grant from UAB-CIRIT.

However, some legitimate occurrences of FCIs in episodic contexts have been observed in English, as in the sentences under (3).²

- (3) a. John talked to any woman who came up to him
b. Any man who saw the fly in the food didn't eat dinner
c. Any woman who heard the news contributed to the fund

In this paper I offer a detailed discussion of such legitimate cases of FCIs in unexpected environments on the basis of an analysis of the corresponding Catalan data. Relying on disambiguating parallel evidence in this language, I argue that the cases such as (3) where FC *any* is apparently licensed by the presence of a relative clause (RC) do constitute modal contexts in that they involve the quantificational interpretation tied to characterizing sentences in the past, whereby a habitual or generic operator quantifies over worlds or situations (see Krifka et al. 1995). In English, simple past morphology is ambiguous between perfective and imperfective readings, which blurs the distinction between episodic sentences on the one hand and generic/characterizing sentences, on the other. I show that such aspectual distinctions play a decisive role and that only non-episodic sentences allow for felicitous occurrences of FCIs, as is expected if quantificational readings are at stake. Catalan displays such aspectual contrast overtly in

¹ On the issue of FCI-licensing, see for instance Carlson (1981), Dayal (1998), Kadmon & Landman (1993) for English, Giannakidou (1997a, b, c, 1998, 1999, 2000) for Greek, Bosque (1999) for Spanish and Quer (1998, 1999) for Catalan.

² These examples are borrowed from Dayal (1995b).

the past tense and thus provides the empirical clue to disentangle the licensing problem posed by English FC *any*.³

The main claim is that cases like (3) are examples of conditional-like sentences that get interpreted by means of tripartite structures headed by a generic or habitual operator. The FCI modified by the RC contributes the antecedent/restrictor of that operator. They *are* modal contexts in that we have quantification over worlds or situations. Most of the instances of FCIs in affirmative episodic statements which are discussed in the literature will be identified here as characterizing sentences in the past, thus being amenable to the conditional interpretation associated with generic/characterizing statements.

Moreover, I argue that only a subset of those instances constitute genuine examples of FCI licensing in an episodic context. Under the same generalization another set of data has been included that cannot be reduced to exactly the same account just sketched, because the main predication is really episodic. It features sentences like (4).⁴

- (4) At the end of his speech, the president thanked any soldier who had fought in the gulf war

Although the explanation of this type of FC licensing is apparently less straightforward, I show that it is related to modality in the sense that the domain of the individuals denoted by the subtriggered *any* Determiner Phrase (DP) is defined in a different model than the

³ I will not deal with the characterization of Polarity Sensitive/Negative Polarity Item *any* in English, as I will be concentrating exclusively on FC readings of *any* and on unambiguous FCIs in Catalan. For discussion on the unitary/dual analysis of English *any*, see the references in footnote 1, and Horn (1996).

⁴ Example borrowed from Dayal (1998).

default one where the main clause is evaluated. Catalan marks this overtly with subjunctive morphology on the verb in the relative clause, English solely with *any*. Subjunctive simply signals the introduction of a different model for the evaluation of the nominal description at hand. It is forcefully shown that (3) and (4) constitute different cases of FCI-licensing that have been lumped together due to the fact that the discussion has remained limited to English.

2. Background: Dayal (1995, 1998) on FC Subtriggering

It has been sometimes observed in the literature that FC *any* in English occasionally appears in non-modal contexts (LeGrand 1975, Davison 1980, Carlson 1981, Dayal 1995, 1998). Characteristically, those cases involve modification of the *any* DP by a RC, as we saw in (3) above.⁵ LeGrand (1975) discussed this sort of examples under the term ‘subtriggering’.

Dayal (1995b: 74) points out that subtriggered *any* clearly has a FC reading, as it passes Horn’s (1972) and Carlson’s (1981) diagnostics of taking modifiers that are compatible with universal quantifiers, i.e. modification with *almost/absolutely* and exception phrases.⁶ This is illustrated in (5).

- (5) a. John talked to almost/absolutely any woman who came up to him
b. John talked to any woman who came up to him except Sue

⁵ The English data in this section is borrowed from Dayal (1995b).

⁶ Horn (1996) demonstrates that these tests do not consistently single out universal quantifiers as a class, so they cannot be used as an argument in favour of the universal status of FCIs.

Taking into account this piece of empirical evidence, Dayal (1995b) proposes a comprehensive account of English *any* (both FC and Polarity Sensitive) as an inherently modal particle that signals lack of commitment to the existence of individuals instantiating a specific property. *Any* would indicate that quantification is over possible instantiations of nominalized properties, as opposed to quantification over actual individuals. Under this view, the exclusion of *any* from non-negative and non-modal contexts would be readily explained, as they entail the existence of the referent of the nominal description.

Dayal's (1995b) account imposes a semantic constraint and a pragmatic constraint on the occurrence of *any*: non-existence and contextual vagueness. The semantic constraint of non-existence establishes that an occurrence of an *any* DP in a statement ϕ is licit if it does not entail that there exist individuals that verify ϕ , irrespective of the fact that there might be particular situations including individuals that do so. The pragmatic constraint of contextual vagueness states that *any* is only appropriate in contexts where the speaker cannot identify the individual or individuals that verify ϕ .

According to Dayal, FC subtrigging in non-modal contexts overrides these constraints by virtue of the addition of a property-loaded relative clause that opens up the possibility of having an empty subset of the individuals denoted by the head noun. This is the way the FCI satisfies its licensing requirements despite the fact that it appears in a non-modal episodic context.

Dayal (1998) modifies her initial approach and abandons the unified account of English *any*. She defends that FC *any* is a generic universal determiner whose domain of quantification is not a set of particular individuals but the set of possible individuals of the relevant kind. According to her, a FC *any* phrase can be seen as having a universal quantifier binding the situation variable of the common noun. In this version, she drops the requirement of non-existence, but maintains the one about contextual vagueness.

Dayal extensively discusses two characteristics which are tightly linked to the licensing of subtriggered *any*, but at the same time can be seen as arguments for the proposed licensing condition for FC *any*. Firstly, the RC that renders its appearance possible must have an essential, property-loaded reading. Actually, Dayal's characterization of this reading is reducible to an attributive-only one, the one that crucially surfaces in *-ever* free relatives in English (cf. Dayal 1995a, 1997): unlike referential interpretations, an attributive reading picks out an individual that can vary from world to world as long as it meets the descriptive condition on the variable (see Donnellan 1966). It is easy to see that in a sentence like (3a) containing subtriggered *any* we can replace the latter with an *-ever* free relative, as in (6). Free relatives of this type yield an attributive-only interpretation.

(6) John talked to whichever woman came up to him

The FC reading of the free relative in (6) can be argued to basically be the same as the subtriggered *any* DP in (3a).

Secondly, Dayal shows that iterability of the main eventuality favours the licensing of subtriggered *any* because it supports contextual vagueness. If the iteration of the main event seems implausible or impossible, subtriggered *any* turns out to be excluded, as attested in the examples under (7): in the unmarked situation, *slip* involves a once-only eventuality (7a), and the progressive applies to a single event (7b).

- (7) a. *John slipped in front of anyone who was there
b. *At 4 p.m. I saw John lecturing to anyone who was near him

These two important factors for the licensing of subtriggered *any* clearly point to the alternative conclusion I would like to argue for next: the supposedly non-modal contexts where subtriggered FC *any* is attested are actually modal by virtue of their status as conditional-like, past habitual sentences.

3. FCIs in Past Characterizing Statements

The hypothesis I would like to defend is that the instances of allegedly episodic environments where subtriggered FC is felicitous do actually involve modal readings. In this type of contexts, it will be argued that FCIs are interpreted attributively in the worlds or situations quantified over by the operator heading a tripartite structure. The FC DP (namely, the FCI and the RC that modifies it) receives an attributive-only interpretation and it contributes the restriction of the sentential operator. For an example like (3a) this would mean that the main past predication is not episodic, but rather habitual, and we

would get a simplified logical form along the lines of (8), which features a habituality operator HAB that is restricted by the descriptive content of the FC and its relative modifier. For reasons of simplicity I ignore here the complications derived from the introduction of temporal operators. The prose corresponding to (8) would be the following: ‘It was habitually the case that situations in which a woman approached John extended into other situations in which he talked to her.’⁷

(8) HABs, s’ [woman (x, s) & approach (x, j, s)] [talk-to (j, x, s’)]

Given this representation we can readily understand a constellation of observations about subtriggered FC statements: the conditional reading ascribed to relatives modifying FCIs in Quer (1998),⁸ the dependency between matrix and embedded predication noted by Tovena & Jayez (1998), as well as the essential nature of the description diagnosed in Dayal (1995b, 1998). In such a tripartite structure representation of the quantificational statement, the subtriggered FC and its RC modifier contribute decisively to restrict the situations the operator quantifies over, yielding a conditional-like reading that establishes an essential link between the main and the subordinate predications through quantification.

From this analysis it follows that if the main eventuality cannot be quantified over, as with single-eventuality predicates or the progressive in (7), the quantificational, conditional-like interpretation (and subtriggering of course) is excluded. The two factors

⁷ In this representation I choose quantification over situations rather than over worlds, but nothing crucial hinges on this decision for the current discussion. There might be significant consequences of this choice, though. I put the issue aside here.

⁸ Davison (1980) also established the connection, but did not develop it.

Dayal (1995b) links to the licensing of subtriggered *any* are explained automatically in this alternative account without stipulations or extra machinery.⁹

Notice that in (8) I am assuming that FCIs are Heimian indefinites, and not universals, unlike Dayal. In this I follow Giannakidou (1997b, 1998, 1999), who makes the explicit claim that lexical FCIs like Catalan *qualsevol*, Italian *qualsiasi* or Greek *opjodhípote* are indefinites with the peculiarity that they lexically encode attributivity and unlike regular indefinites, they cannot be interpreted in a specific/referential fashion. FC readings are thus conceived of as attributive-only, where “attributive” is understood in the sense of Donnellan (1966). Inherent attributivity will be only satisfied in contexts that guarantee variation in the DP denotation.

Strong support for the view that subtriggering hinges on conditional-like interpretation comes from the empirical evidence provided by Catalan.¹⁰ In this language past morphology distinguishes between perfective and imperfective aspect. Next to this, there exist lexical items like *qualsevol* ‘any(one)’ characterized exclusively as FC. Whereas FCIs are excluded from past episodic sentences marked with perfective aspect, they are licensed in past characterizing sentences that display past imperfective aspect.¹¹ Hence, as

⁹ In addition, see Giannakidou (2000) for a criticism of Dayal’s choice of contextual vagueness as the licensing condition for FCIs.

¹⁰ Spanish patterns the same way, but I will offer the relevant evidence in Catalan.

¹¹ It is important to point out here that Catalan perfect does not align with past perfective tense as far as the episodicity property is concerned: the perfect can naturally appear in subtriggering cases such as (i) and (ii), featuring a subtriggered free choice item and a subtriggered subjunctive free relative, respectively.

- (i) {Sovint/sempré/normalment} ha convidat qualsevol que li {hagi/ha} agradat
often/always/normally have.PRS.3SG invited anyone that him have.(SUB/IND).PRS.3SG pleased
‘S/he has often/always/normally invited whoever s/he liked (SUB/IND).’
- (ii) {Sovint/sempré/normalment} ha convidat qui li {hagi/ha} agradat
often/always/normally have.PRS.3SG invited who him have.(SUB/IND).PRS.3SG pleased
‘S/he has often/always/normally invited whoever s/he liked (SUB/IND).’

counterparts to the English sentences in (3) we have two options: the choice of past perfective in the matrix yields an ungrammatical result (9a)-(11a), but past imperfective gives an impeccable sentence (9b)-(11b). The presence of the RC in the (a) cases does not have any impact on the licensing of the FCI, so subtriggering is surprisingly blocked. By contrast, in the (b) instances the FCI occurs felicitously even if the RC modifier is absent, which suggests that subtriggering by a RC might be an epiphenomenon.¹²

- (9) a. *(A mitjanit) va parlar amb qualsevol dona (que se li apropés)
at midnight AUX.3SG to-talk with any woman that REFL him/her approach.SUB.PST.3SG
 ('At midnight s/he talked (PERFECTIVE) to any woman who approached her/him.')¹³
- b. Parlava amb qualsevol dona (que se li apropés)
talk.IMP.3SG with any woman that REFL him/her approach.SUB.PST.3SG

Notice that the Q-adverbs are interpreted quantificationally in these examples and that the relevant interpretation is a conditional one such as the one in (iii):

- (iii) Si algú li ha agradat, {sovint/sempr e/normalment} l'ha convidat
if someone to-him have.IND.PRS.3SG pleased often/always/normally him-have.PRS.3SG invited
 'If s/he liked someone, s/he has often/always/normally invited him.'

This is only possible under the experiential reading of the perfect and it requires the presence of a Q-adverb, at least with non-stative predicates (on the perfect, see McCawley 1971, 1993, Mittwoch 1988, or Iatridou et al. 1999, among others). If this requirement is not met, the perfect creates an episodic context, thus excluding FCIs.

¹² At this point it is not clear to me why removing the RC from (10b) makes the sentence a bit more marked than the other examples. Still, such a change does not lead to ungrammaticality.

¹³ In order to facilitate the understanding of the Catalan data, I provide the English equivalent of the ungrammatical examples between brackets.

‘S/he talked (IMPERFECTIVE) to any woman who approached her/him.’

- (10) a. *Qualsevol client (que veïés una mosca a la sopa) no va començar a menjar en aquell moment
any client that see.SUB.PST.3SG a fly in the soup not AUX.3SG to-start to-eat at that moment
(‘Any client who saw a fly in the soup didn’t start eating (PERFECTIVE) at that moment.’)
- b. Qualsevol client ?(que veïés una mosca a la sopa) no se la menjava
any client that see.SUB.PST.3SG a fly in the soup not REFL it eat.IMPF.3SG
(‘Any client who saw a fly in the soup didn’t eat (IMPERFECTIVE) it.’)
- (11) a. *Qualsevol dona (que sentís la notícia) va contribuir a la campanya en aquell mateix moment
any woman that hear.SUB.PST.3SG the news AUX.3SG to-contribute to the campaign at that same moment
(‘Any woman who heard the news contributed (PERFECTIVE) to the campaign at that very same moment.’)
- b. Qualsevol dona (que sentís la notícia) contribuïa a la campanya

any woman that hear.SUB.PST.3SG the news contribute.IMPF.3SG to the campaign

‘Any woman who heard the news contributed (IMPERFECTIVE) to the campaign.’

The grammatical versions in (9b)-(11b) display the conditional readings we have discussed above: the conditional sentences in (12)-(14) constitute a close paraphrase of the examples (9b)-(11b), respectively.

(12) Si se li apropava una dona, hi parlava
if REFL him/her approach.IMPF.3SG a woman CL talk.IMPF.3SG
‘If a woman approached her/him, s/he talked to her.’

(13) Si un client veia una mosca a la sopa, no se la menjava
if a client see.IMPF.3SG a fly in the soup not REFL it eat.IMPF.3SG
‘If a client saw a fly in the soup, he didn’t eat it.’

(14) Si una dona sentia la notícia, contribuïa a la campanya
if a woman hear.IMPF.3SG the news contribute.IMPF.3SG to the campaign
‘If a woman heard the news, she contributed to the campaign.’

In addition, the Catalan grammatical counterparts to the English cases of subtriggered *any* in (9b)-(11b) are equivalent to subjunctive free relatives, which in Quer

(1998, 1999) are shown to yield a free choice, attributive-only reading. The relevant examples are (15)-(17). Interestingly, they are also closely paraphrased by conditionals like the ones under (12)-(14).

(15) Parlava amb qui se li apropés

talk.IMPF.3SG with who REFL him/ her approach.SUB.PST.3SG

‘S/he talked to whoever approached her/him.’

(16) Qui veies una mosca a la sopa no se la menjava

who see.SUB.PST.3SG a fly in the soup not REFL it eat.IMPF.3SG

‘Whoever saw a fly in the soup didn’t eat it.’

(17) Qui sentís la notícia contribuïa a la campanya

who hear.SUB.PST.3SG the news contribute.IMPF.3SG to the campaign

‘Whoever heard the news contributed to the campaign.’

Just like the cases of subtriggered FCIs examined above, the choice of episodic past in the main clause leads to ungrammaticality because the variation required for the free choice reading of the subjunctive free relative is not supported, as it involves a single event existentially quantified over. This is illustrated in (18)-(20), corresponding to (15)-(17).

(18) *Va parlar amb qui se li apropés

AUX.3SG to-talk with who REFL him/ her approach.SUB.PST.3SG

(‘S/he talked to whoever approached her/him.’)

- (19) *Qui veiéu una mosca a la sopa no se la va menjar

who see.SUB.PST.3SG a fly in the soup not REFL it AUX.3SG to-eat

(‘Whoever saw a fly in the soup didn’t eat it.’)

- (20) *Qui sentís la notícia va contribuir a la campanya

who hear.SUB.PST.3SG the news AUX.3SG to-contribute to the campaign

(‘Whoever heard the news contributed to the campaign.’)

One might be lead to think that subjunctive mood is a precondition for the licensing of this subset of subtriggered FCIs, but in fact the Catalan counterparts to the English cases of subtriggered *any* in (9b)-(11b) are equally grammatical if the RCs modifying the FCIs take the indicative (see (21)-(23)). Further supporting the parallelism between these cases and free relatives in this type of context, the free relatives in question can be in the indicative as well (see (24)-(26)).

- (21) Parlava amb qualsevol dona que se li apropava

talk.IMPF.3SG with any woman that REFL him/her approach.IMPF.3SG

(‘S/he talked to any woman who approached her/him.’)

- (22) Qualsevol client que veia una mosca a la sopa no se la menjava

any client that see.IMPF.3SG a fly in the soup not REFL it eat.IMPF.3SG

‘Any client who saw a fly in the soup didn’t eat it.’

- (23) Qualsevol dona que sentia la notícia contribuïa a la campanya
any woman that hear.IMPF.3SG the news contribute.IMPF.3SG to the campaign
‘Any woman who heard the news contributed to the campaign.’

- (24) Parlava amb qui se li apropava
talk.IMPF.3SG with who REFL him/her approach.IMPF.3SG
‘S/he talked to whoever approached her/him.’

- (25) Qui veia una mosca a la sopa no se la menjava
who see.IMPF.3SG a fly in the soup not REFL it eat.IMPF.3SG
‘Whoever saw a fly in the soup didn’t eat it.’

- (26) Qui sentia la notícia contribuïa a la campanya
who hear.IMPF.3SG the news contribute.IMPF.3SG to the campaign
‘Whoever heard the news contributed to the campaign.’

The role of aspect becomes decisive not only in the main predication, but also within the RC associated with the subtriggering cases. FC subtriggering is predicted to be impossible if the FCI is modified by a RC in an episodic tense, which precludes attributive interpretation. The grammaticality contrast in (27) clearly shows that this is indeed the case. If a free relative counterpart contains an episodic tense in the indicative

as in (28b) it is grammatical, but the conditional interpretation present in (28a) disappears and only a referential one is obtained, for in such a situation attributivity cannot be satisfied.

(27) a. La Iona li somreia a qualsevol que li {feia/fes} ganyotes
the Iona her/him smile.IMPF.3SG to anyone that her
make.(IND.IMPF/SUB.PST).3SG grimaces

‘Iona smiled at anyone who made (IND/SUB) faces to her.’

b. *La Iona li somreia a qualsevol que li va fer ganyotes el dia abans
the Iona her/him smile.IMPF.3SG to anyone that her AUX.3SG to-make
grimaces the before day

‘Iona was smiling at anyone who made faces to her the day before.’

(28) a. La Iona li somreia a qui li {feia/fes} ganyotes
the Iona her/him smile.IMPF.3SG to who her
make.(IND.IMPF/SUB.PST).3SG grimaces

‘Iona smiled at whoever made (IND/SUB) faces to her.’

b. La Iona li somreia a qui li va fer ganyotes el dia abans
the Iona her/him smile.IMPF.3SG to who her AUX.3SG to-make grimaces the
before day

‘Iona was smiling at the one who made faces to her the day before.’

On the basis of all this evidence, we can safely conclude that the typical cases of licensing of subtriggered FC examined thus far do involve modal contexts, namely characterizing sentences in the past with conditional-like interpretation: the FCI, together with the RC, provides the restrictor of the relevant sentential operator, which satisfies the inherent requirement of attributivity imposed by the FC description. This view also provides us with an explanation for a further observation about subtriggered free choice that to my knowledge has remained unnoticed so far: in all of the cases there is a strict temporal ordering between the embedded eventuality expressed by the relative and the matrix eventuality, the former being always anterior to or simultaneous with the latter.¹⁴ This can be straightforwardly derived from the sequencing of the eventualities imposed between antecedent and consequent by the conditional-like structure proposed here as a basic ingredient of the analysis.

From the perspective developed here, one would expect that FC *any* could be licensed in English in past sentences even in the absence of a RC, provided the imperfective reading of the past is made prominent. I think that the contrast in (29) confirms this prediction: the choice of temporal adjunct (durative vs. punctual) favours one or the other aspectual interpretation (imperfective in (29a) vs. perfective in (29b)), thus facilitating the licensing of FC *any* in one case but making it impossible in the other.

- (29) a. During his youth, Paul talked to any stranger without
embarrassment

- b. *Yesterday at midnight Paul invited any stranger to his party
without embarrassment

The partial conclusion we reach after the examination of these instances of subtriggered FC is that the licensing of the subtriggered FCI cases does not really depend on RC modification, but rather on a non-episodic reading that involves quantification over worlds or situations.

4. FCI in Episodic Statements

There is, however, one sort of subtriggered *any* mentioned at the outset that cannot be readily reduced to the account sketched so far. It is represented by examples like (4), repeated here for convenience.

- (30) At the end of his speech, the president thanked any soldier who had fought in the war

It does not seem plausible to argue that in (30) subtriggering is licensed by the imperfectivity of the past tense, for the relevant reading of the matrix sentence involves a single eventuality of expressing gratitude. In addition, a similar kind of example in Catalan requires perfective past on the main predicate, but a FCI modified by a subjunctive relative is well-formed, as shown in (31).

¹⁴ This observation holds for non-stative predications, of course, as stative ones allow for temporal

- (31) Van felicitar qualsevol voluntari que hagués participat en l'operació de rescat
*AUX.3PL to-congratulate any volunteer that have.SUB.PST.3SG participated in the-
operation of rescue*
'They congratulated any volunteer that had (SUB) taken part in the rescue
operation.'

I would like to claim that this type of example constitutes the genuine case of subtriggering, in that the presence of the RC is indeed crucial for the licensing of the FCI. Observe that, unlike in examples like (29a), removing the RC invariably leads to ungrammaticality, as in (32).

- (32) *Van enaltir qualsevol voluntari
AUX.3PL to-praise any volunteer
(‘They praised any volunteer.’)

In addition, in this kind of subtriggering the choice of mood turns out to be decisive, in contrast with the other alleged instances of subtriggered FC discussed so far: only subjunctive is licit, as demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of (33), where the sole modification with respect to (31) is the mood morphology of the embedded predicate, which has been turned to the indicative.

overlap.

- (33) *Van felicitar qualsevol voluntari que havia participat en l'operació de rescat
*AUX.3PL to-congratulate any volunteer that have.IND.IMPF.3SG participated in the-
operation of rescue*
(‘They congratulated any volunteer that had (IND) taken part in the rescue
operation.’)

Therefore, genericity/habituality has to be eliminated as a possible licensing factor for the FCI. I propose that the key to the interpretation of these facts has to be sought in the obligatoriness of subjunctive.

In accordance with the view developed in Quer (1998), mood shift to subjunctive should flag a change in model of evaluation of a clause (model shift). It seems unquestionable that the main sentence in (31) describes an episodic eventuality. If the domain of individuals the direct object denotes were to be evaluated in the epistemic model of the speaker $M_E(\text{speaker})$, indicative should not be excluded in the RC, contrary to fact. I claim that the combination of a FCI and a subjunctive RC signals the introduction of a different model of evaluation with quantification over possible worlds that are epistemically accessible to an individual anchor, in this case the subject of the matrix predicate: this allows the FCI to be interpreted attributively and to be potentially assigned different referents in each one of those worlds. It is a non-veridical model, significantly. As (31) makes clear, those epistemic alternatives are not limited to the future. The individual anchor of this model differs from the one in $M_E(\text{speaker})$: this is shown in (34) by the infelicitous result of adding a parenthetical like ‘I think’ in the relative that forces anchoring to the speaker.

- (34) *Van felicitar qualsevol voluntari que hagués participat, crec jo, en l'operació de rescat

AUX.3PL to-congratulate any volunteer that have.SUB.PST.3SG participated think.1SG I in the-operation of rescue

(‘They congratulated any volunteer that, I think/according to me, had taken part in the rescue operation.’)

Moreover, if there is no salient individual in the context to which the model can be anchored, the sentence becomes seriously degraded, as in (35).

- (35) a. *Va desaparèixer de sobte qualsevol que s’hagués manifestat contra el govern

AUX.3SG suddenly to-disappear anyone that REFL-have.SUB.PST.3SG manifested against the government

(‘Anyone who had (SUB) demonstrated against the government suddenly disappeared.’)

- b. *Va aprovar l’examen qualsevol que hagués subornat el tribunal

AUX.3SG the-exam to-pass anyone that have.SUB.PST.3SG bribed the committee

(‘Anyone who had (SUB) bribed the committee passed the exam.’)

This fact has to be interpreted as a consequence of the greater difficulty one encounters in accommodating the new model for evaluation introduced by the modified FCI. Arguably, the presence of a sentient individual in the main clause that can provide a possible anchor facilitates accommodation of the model in question. In a nutshell, the FC description is interpreted *de dicto* not in the epistemic model of the speaker, but rather in the implicit model anchored to the subject of the main predication, hence its reported-speech flavour.

The identification of these examples as real instances of subtriggering, as opposed to FCI licensed by habituality (see section 3), is confirmed by the possibility of cancelling the presupposition of existence in the former case but not in the latter one. The contrast is really sharp: (37) is a possible continuation for (36) because the domain of individuals of the object description is not defined in the epistemic model of the speaker, but rather in the model anchored to the referent of the matrix subject; on the other hand, (39) cannot be a follow up on (38) because there must be relevant individuals in the past model of evaluation for the sentence to be judged as true.

(36) Va felicitar qualsevol voluntari que hagués participat en l'operació de rescat,
AUX.3SG to congratulate any volunteer that have.SUB.PST.3SG participated in the operation of rescue
'S/he congratulated any volunteer that had (SUB) taken part in the rescue operation,'

(37) però en realitat no hi havia participat cap voluntari.

but in reality not LOC have.IMPF.3SG participated any volunteer

‘but actually no volunteer had taken part.’

(38) Parlava amb qualsevol dona que se li apropés,

talk.IMPF.3SG with any woman that REFL him/her approach.SUB.PST.3SG

‘S/he talked (IMPERFECTIVE) to any woman who approached her/him,’

(39) # però en realitat no va parlar amb cap dona.

but in reality not talk.PST.3SG with no woman

‘# but actually he talked to no woman.’

The lack of existential commitment in cases like (36)-(37) is what led Dayal (1995b, 1998) to postulate contextual vagueness as a licensing condition not only for subtriggering cases, but for all instances of FC *any*. This position can no longer be maintained, given the empirical and interpretive distinctions discussed here.

That cases like (31) constitute real FC readings is further confirmed by the legitimate occurrence of subjunctive free relatives in the same environment, as in (40).

(40) Van felicitar qui hagués participat en l’operació de rescat

AUX.3PL to-congratulate who have.SUB.PST.3SG participated in the-operation of rescue

‘They congratulated whoever had taken part in the rescue operation.’

The legitimacy of the free choice reading of subjunctive free relatives is expected after the relevant discussion in section 3.¹⁵

Why should unmodified FC DPs be excluded, though, as in (32)? The logical answer to this question is that in the absence of overt modality, FCIs simply do not carry enough descriptive content to motivate the introduction of an extra model of evaluation. Modification by a RC implies that an individual has to instantiate a property and properties are instantiated or not in worlds. Enriching the descriptive content of a FC DP with alternative means improves its status, as in (41), where the addition of a PP modifier gives a much better result than (32) and facilitates the intended FC interpretation.

(41) Van felicitar qualsevol voluntari amb un historial exemplar

AUX.3PL to-congratulate any volunteer with a record exemplary

‘They congratulated any volunteer with an exemplary record.’

It is not accidental, though, that partitive PPs do not ‘subtrig’ FC, as observed in (42): they do not contribute a property, but rather a set of individuals that is defined in the epistemic model of the speaker, thus blocking the necessary *de dicto* reading.¹⁶

(42) *Van donar les gràcies a qualsevol dels donants d’aquest any

¹⁵ For more details on this, see Quer (1998: Chapter 4).

¹⁶ If the partitive PP can be assigned a non-referential interpretation, subtrigging is licensed again, as with the addition of adjectives like *possible* ‘possible’ or *potencial* ‘potential’ in the partitive PP:

(i) Van donar les gràcies a qualsevol dels donants potencials d’aquest any

AUX.3PL to-give the thanks to any of the donors potential of this year

‘They thanked any of this year’s potential donors.’

AUX.3PL to-give the thanks to any of the donors of this year

(*They thanked any of this year's donors.)

As has become obvious from the discussion, the licensing of this second kind of subtriggering (from my perspective, the *only* real case of subtriggering) is linked to factors that are less easy to assess in purely grammatical terms like imperfective aspectual marking for genericity/habituality and its connection to conditional semantics. In any event, the recoverability of an individual anchor that facilitates the accommodation of a different model of evaluation remains an element that plays a crucial role in the semantic interpretation of such utterances (it obviously determines the domain of quantification) and the presence of such a model is marked with grammatical means.

5. Conclusions

In this paper I have tried to show that alleged cases of subtriggered FCIs instantiate two different ways of licensing that ultimately rely on modality:

(a) by habituality/genericity through a conditional-like interpretation, whereby past tense must be imperfective (morphologically and interpretively in Catalan);

(b) by shift to a model of evaluation which is different from the default one of the speaker: it is a model of epistemic alternatives anchored to another individual and

subjunctive necessarily marks modal shift in Catalan. It constitutes real subtriggering by a RC (or by predicative PP modification).

Such interpretive distinctions are not marked overtly in languages like English, where no perfective/imperfective distinction is realized for the simple past and no distinct subjunctive morphology is available. This had blurred the empirical map of subtriggering cases so far. Aspect and mood morphology in Catalan have been shown to draw a clear line between the two sets of cases that had previously been lumped together under the label of FC subtriggering. When we disambiguate the relevant English examples, the same behaviour surfaces.

REFERENCES

- Bosque, I. 1999. Sobre la gramática de los contextos modales. Entornos modales y expresiones inespecíficas en español. To appear in *Actas del XI Congreso de Alfal*.
- Carlson, G.N. 1981. Distribution of Free-Choice Any. In *Papers from the Seventeenth Regional Meeting of the CLS*, 8-23. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Davison, A. 1980. Any as Universal or Existential? In *The Semantics of Determiners*, ed. J. van der Auwera, 11-40. London: Croom Helm.
- Dayal, V. 1995a. Quantification in Correlatives. In *Quantification in Natural Languages*, eds. E. Bach et al., 179-205. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- 1995b. Licensing ANY in Non-Negative/Non-Modal Contexts. In *Proceedings of SALT V*, eds. M. Simons & T. Galloway, 72-93. Ithaca: Cornell University.

- 1997. Free Relatives and *Ever*: Identity and Free Choice Readings. Ms., Rutgers University.
- 1998. *Any* as Inherently Modal. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 21: 433-476.
- Donnellan, K. 1966. Reference and Definite Descriptions. *Philosophical Review* 75: 281-304.
- Giannakidou, A. 1997a. The Landscape of Polarity Items. Doctoral dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- 1997b. Linking Sensitivity to Limited Distribution: The Case of Free Choice. In *Proceedings of the 11th Amsterdam Colloquium*, eds. P. Dekker et al., 139-144. Amsterdam: ILLC/Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam.
- 1997c. Competing Constraints on Limited Distribution: Polarity Sensitive and Free Choice Items. Ms., ILLC/Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam.
- 1998. *Polarity Sensitivity as (Non)Veridical Dependency*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- 1999. Affective Dependencies. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22: 367-421.
- 2000. The Meaning of Free Choice. Ms., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- Horn, L. 1972. On the Semantic Properties of Logical Operators in English. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- 1996. Pick a Theory (Not Just Any Theory): Indiscriminatives and the Free Choice Indefinite. Ms., Yale University.
- Iatridou, S. et al. 1999. Some observations about the form and the meaning of the perfect. Ms., MIT, University of Crete & Georgetown University.

- Kadmon, N. & F. Landman. 1993. *Any*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16: 353-442.
- Krifka, M. et al. 1995. Genericity: An Introduction. In *The Generic Book*, eds. G.N. Carlson & F.J. Pelletier, 1-124. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- LeGrand, J. 1975. *Or* and *Any*: The Syntax and Semantics of Two Logical Operators. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- McCawley, J.D. 1971. Tense and Time Reference in English. In *Studies in Linguistic Semantics*, eds. C. J. Fillmore & D. T. Langendoen, 97-113. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- 1993. *Everything that Linguists Have Always Wanted to Know about Logic but Were Ashamed to Ask (Second Edition)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mittwoch, A. 1988. Aspects of English Aspect: on the Interaction of Perfect, Progressive and Durational Phrases. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 11: 203-254.
- Quer, J. 1998. *Mood at the Interface*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- 1999. Free Relatives and the Contribution of Mood Shift to Interpretation. In *Proceedings of the 14th Meeting of the Israeli Association for Theoretical Linguistics, Ben Gurion University, Beer-Sheva, Israel*, ed. Adam Z. Wyner, 69-89. Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev.
- Tovena, L. & J. Jayez. 1998. *Any*: from scalarity to arbitrariness. Ms. ITC-IRST (Trento) & EHESS (Paris). To appear in the Proceedings of CSSP '97.

*Romaanse Taalkunde/ Spaans
Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen
Universiteit van Amsterdam
P.C. Hoofthuis
Spuistraat 134
NL-1012 VB Amsterdam
The Netherlands*

Phone: +31.20.5254613

Fax: +31.20.5254429

e-mail: j.quer@hum.uva.nl