

## Unconditionals and Free Choice

Anna Szabolcsi  
Rutgers colloquium; NYU Semantics Group; etc.  
November 2018  
Comments appreciated

Negative polarity	I don't think that anyone called. (I don't think that either Kate or Mary called.)
Free choice	Anyone may call. (Either Kate or Mary may call.)
Unconditional adjunct	Whoever called, we chatted. Whether Kate or Mary called, we chatted.

All three cases crucially involve alternatives. The first two have a unified account. The third stands apart, although Rawlins (2013: 160) notes,

"Since orthogonality is a generalization of a distribution effect, more classical free choice effects ... can be meta-characterized using orthogonality."

The morpho-syntactic shape of unconditionals in Hungarian calls for a direct (non only meta-level) unification with free choice and negative polarity. This talk makes several steps towards that goal. It extends Chierchia 2013 and Dayal 2013 to unconditionals, focusing on Hungarian.

Basic data	<u>akár</u> + wh-pronoun	} existential	(Szabolcsi 2018)
	<u>akár ... akár ...</u>		

Negative polarity	Nem hiszem, hogy <u>akárki</u> telefonált. [nem `not'] 'I don't think that anyone called' Nem hiszem, hogy <u>akár Kati, akár Mari</u> telefonált.
Free choice	<u>Akárki</u> telefonálhat. [-hat `may'] 'Anyone may call' <u>Akár Kati, akár Mari</u> telefonálhat.
Unconditional adjunct	<u>Akárki</u> telefonált, elbeszélgettünk. 'Whoever called we chatted' <u>Akár Kati, akár Mari</u> telefonált, elbeszélgettünk.
Unacceptable elsewhere	* <u>Akárki</u> telefonált. * <u>Akár Kati, akár Mari</u> telefonált.

Rawlins 2013 recognizes three flavors of unconditionals (exx below are mine). Hungarian unconditionals have the same flavors, so they are directly comparable.

In Hungarian, the three flavors can take recognizably different shapes (focus-related bejött vs. jött be; plus optional is that I will not discuss).

### Multiple events, circumstantial modal base, at-issue relational indifference

{ Whoever / whether K or M } entered, we chatted.  
{ Akárki / akár K akár M } jött be, elbeszélgettünk.

### Single event, epistemic modal base, presupposed speaker ignorance

{ Whoever / whether K or M } entered a minute ago, I didn't recognize her.  
{ Akárki (is) / akár K akár M } jött be az imént, nem ismertem meg.

### Material unconditional [≈ totally realistic modal base, empty ordering source], multiple events, no ignorance or indifference effects

{ Whoever / whether K or M } entered, the floor squeaked.  
{ Akárki / akár K akár M } bejött, nyikorgott a padló.

Rawlins 2013 and, after him, Hirsch 2016 refer to the **question / free-relative-like** syntax of the unconditional adjunct:

- (i) Disjunction or a wh-ever item introduces alternatives into the composition.
- (ii) The question operator introduces exhaustiveness and mutual exclusivity presuppositions.
- (iii) Alternatives compose pointwise with the main clause via Hamblin pointwise functional application – one modal claim for each alternative.
- (iv) A conditional adjunct (whatever its content) restricts the domain of a main clause modal.
- (v) The modal imposes an existence presupposition or entailment on its domain, leading to a distribution effect.
- (vi) A default Hamblin universal operator collects alternatives.

**Not only questions present alternatives. Existentials/disjunctions do that in general.**

**Hungarian unconditional adjuncts bear no resemblance to interrogatives or relatives.**

Interrogatives have bare wh-pronouns (ki 'who'); relatives have definite+wh-pronouns (aki). They do not contain akár. On the other hand, akár forms NPIs and FCIs (p.1).

**This talk offers a "proof of concept" for unifying unconditionals with FCIs and NPIs, based on Hungarian. Telugu (Balusu 2017a,b + p.c.) and to some extent Finnish (Lohiniva 2018) point in a similar direction.**

**A “proof of concept” for unifying unconditionals with FCIs and NPIs, based on akár.**  
**Strategy: Obtain the components of Rawlins’s analysis differently**

(i) Disjunction or a wh-ever item introduces alternatives into the composition.

☞ Yes, but as **domain-alternatives**, as in Chierchia 2013 for Free Choice.  
 See pp. 5-6 of this handout.

(ii) The question operator introduces exhaustiveness and mutual exclusivity presupp’s.

☞ Where partition effects are seen in Hungarian, they come from syntactic **focus**  
 and associated semantics. See pp. 11-12 of this handout.

(iii) Alternatives compose pointwise with the main clause via Hamblin pointwise functional application – one modal claim for each alternative.

☞ **Overt scope taking.** See pp. 4, 9 of this handout (plus Telugu, p. 10).  
 AKÁR overtly takes widest scope inside the adjunct. Akárki moves overtly, as is characteristic of Hungarian quantifiers (Szabolcsi 1997), and free-standing akár is merged high. The adjunct is then quantified in right above “if.”

(iv) A conditional adjunct restricts the domain of a main clause modal.

☞ No modal; **universal quantification over <w,e> pairs.**  
 When event-component varies, we get circumstantial/non-modal flavor.  
 When event-component is fixed, the world-component varies, and we get epistemic flavor. See p. 6 of this handout.  
 $\forall w,e: p(w,e). q(w,e)$  itself may come from strengthening  $\exists w,e: p(w,e). q(w,e)$ , modeled after Bassi & Bar-Lev 2016 for **conditionals** in general. That would hold out the hope of explaining someday how “unconditionals are conditionals” in the absence of “conditional syntax.” See p. 4 of this handout.

(v) The modal imposes an existence presupposition or entailment on its domain, leading to a distribution effect.

☞ A modified version of **Fluctuation** à la Dayal. See pp. 5-8 of this handout.  
 In both  $\forall$ -FC and UNC.ADJ, each bare AKÁR-clause (=no modal or main clause yet) must be true at some but not all <w,e>. “Only some” may be another case of strengthening.

(vi) A default Hamblin universal operator collects alternatives.

☞ **Free-choice implicature:** existential/disjunction strengthened to universal / conjunction. By recursive exhaustification of subdomain-alternatives for the whole sentence (not just the bare AKÁR-clause), exactly as in Chierchia 2013 for [anyone; [may [t<sub>i</sub> call]]]: (K may call)  $\vee$  (M may call) is strengthened to (K may call)  $\wedge$  (M may call). Analogously, here: (if K called, we chatted)  $\vee$  (if M called, we chatted) is strengthened to (if K called, we chatted)  $\wedge$  (if M called, we chatted). See pp. 5-6 of this handout.

**One derivation is laid out below; identificational focus is not folded in, so as to remain neutral between the flavors.**

• **Akár**      **Kati (telefonált), akár Mari telefonált, elbeszélgettünk.**  
 Whether Kate (called) or Mary called, we chatted.

(1) akár K akár M telefonált  $\Rightarrow \{ \lambda w,e. K \text{ call}(w,e), \lambda w,e. M \text{ call}(w,e) \} =$   
 $\lambda p [ p = \lambda w,e. K \text{ call}(w,e) \vee p = \lambda w,e. M \text{ call}(w,e) ]$

(2) *Check Fluctuation for (1) in your model*  
 $\forall q [ q \in \lambda p [ p = \lambda w,e. K \text{ call}(w,e) \vee p = \lambda w,e. M \text{ call}(w,e) ] ] [ \exists w,e. q(w,e) \wedge \exists w,e. \neg q(w,e) ]$

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  lift (1) to  $\lambda P [ P(\lambda w,e. K \text{ call}(w,e)) \vee P(\lambda w,e. M \text{ call}(w,e)) ]$

(4) elbeszélgettünk prepped  $\Rightarrow \lambda r [ \text{if } (r) (\lambda w,e. \text{ chat}(w,e)) ] = \lambda r [ \exists w,e [ r(w,e) ] [ \text{ chat}(w,e) ] ] \Rightarrow$  *strengthen to*  $\lambda r [ \forall w,e [ r(w,e) ] [ \text{ chat}(w,e) ] ]$   
 specifics as in Bassi & Bar-Lev 2016

(5)  $\lambda P [ P(\lambda w,e. K \text{ call}(w,e)) \vee P(\lambda w,e. M \text{ call}(w,e)) ] [ \lambda r [ \forall w,e [ r(w,e) ] [ \text{ chat}(w,e) ] ] ] =$   
 $\forall w,e [ K \text{ call}(w,e) ] [ \text{ chat}(w,e) ] \vee \forall w,e [ M \text{ call}(w,e) ] [ \text{ chat}(w,e) ]$

(6) *strengthen (5) to*  $\forall w,e [ K \text{ call}(w,e) ] [ \text{ chat}(w,e) ] \wedge \forall w,e [ M \text{ call}(w,e) ] [ \text{ chat}(w,e) ]$

### Background assumptions about negative polarity and $\forall$ free choice

- NPIs and FCIs come in multiple subtly different flavors. I use portions of **Chierchia 2013** as a starting point. I am not arguing that this is the best NPI+FCI theory, or that it is specifically suited to Hungarian NPIs and FCIs with akár.

- NPIs are existentials/disjunctions** with active domain alternatives, so proposition must be exhaustified by  $O_c = \lambda p \lambda w [p(w) \wedge \forall q \in C [p \text{ doesn't entail } q \rightarrow \neg q(w) ]]$

		<i>exhaustified</i>	
$A \vee B$	assertion	$A \vee B$	
A    B	domain alts	$\neg A$ $\neg B$	

Contradiction, when assertion doesn't entail domain alts and so they are negated. Contradiction is averted if assertion entails domain alts and so they are left alone. E.g. when assertion is  $\neg(A \vee B)$ , and so it entails  $\neg A$  and  $\neg B$ .

- $\forall$ -FCIs have universal force; start out as  $\exists > \diamond$  with pre-exhaustified domain alts.**

		<i>exhaustified</i>	
$A \vee B$	assertion	$A \vee B$	
OA    OB	domain alts	$\neg OA$ $\neg OB$	

any dish<sub>i</sub> [ can [ you have t<sub>i</sub> ] ]

D=dish, H=you-have. The universe contains just two dishes, **a** and **b**.

**Assert:**  $[Da \ \diamond Ha] \vee [Db \ \diamond Hb]$   
**Exh. alts:**  $\{ [Da \ \diamond Ha] \ \& \ [Db \ \neg \diamond Hb], \ [Db \ \diamond Hb] \ \& \ [Da \ \& \ \neg \diamond Ha] \}$   
**Negate each exh. alt.:**  $\neg([Da \ \diamond Ha] \ \& \ [Db \ \neg \diamond Hb])$   
 $= [Da \ \& \ \diamond Ha] \rightarrow [Db \ \diamond Hb]$   
 (ditto for the other alt)  
**Assert+Neg'd alts**  $[Da \ \diamond Ha] \vee [Db \ \diamond Hb] \ \& \ ([Da \ \diamond Ha] \leftrightarrow [Db \ \diamond Hb])$   
**= FC-implicature**  $= [Da \ \& \ \diamond Ha] \ \& \ [Db \ \diamond Hb] = \forall x [Dx \rightarrow \exists w. Hx(w)]$

- + Fluctuation** (Dayal) "The dish(es) you have are not kept constant across worlds." Two recent implementations below.

**Chierchia 2013:** FCIs also have SCalar alternative  $A \wedge B$ , to be negated for SC-impl. Now FC-implicature  $(A \vee B) \wedge \neg OA \wedge \neg OB = A \wedge B$  contradicts SC-implicature  $\neg(A \wedge B)$ , unless they are true in different sets of worlds, such that **SC worlds**  $\subset$  **FC worlds**.

**Dayal 2013:** Forget SC. Instead: assertion plus FC-implicature **plus Viability:** [...FCI...] is felicitous iff  $\exists M, w$ , conv. backgr.  $g(w)$  such that each exhaustified alternative is true at  $w$ , wrto to some subset of  $\cap g(w)$ .

### Unconditional adjuncts as a special case of free choice items

**Universality from FC-exhaustification. Distribution from some version of Fluctuation. Conditional semantics out of thin air, as in Rawlins's theory, alas.**

- $\wp = \lambda p. \exists x[\text{human}(x) \ \& \ p = \lambda \langle w, e \rangle. \text{entered}(x)(w, e)]$  cf. akár-wh  
 $\wp = \{ \lambda \langle w, e \rangle. \text{Mari entered}(w, e), \lambda \langle w, e \rangle. \text{Kati entered}(w, e) \}$  cf. akár-akár

- if  $p, q = \forall \langle w, e \rangle: p(w, e). q(w, e)$

- Why  $\langle w, e \rangle$ ?** Pure speaker ignorance obtains iff the antecedent has a single event (Rawlins). Each alternative must be true somewhere. If the event-component of  $\langle w, e \rangle$  varies, the world-component doesn't have to. If the event-component is fixed, the world-component must vary, i.e. the same event must present itself in different worlds. In the absence of a modal, assume they are epistemically accessible ones.

- { Akárki / akár Kati akár Mari } telefonált, elbeszélgettünk / nem ismertem meg. { Whoever / whether Kati or Mari } called, we chatted / I didn't recognize her'

**Assert:** (if Mari entered, maincl)  $\vee$  (if Kati entered, maincl)

**Exh. alts.:**  $\{ (\forall w, e: \text{Mari entered}(w, e). \text{maincl}(w, e) \ \& \ \neg \forall w, e: \text{Kati entered}(w, e). \text{maincl}(w, e)),$   
 $(\forall w, e: \text{Kati entered}(w, e). \text{maincl}(w, e) \ \& \ \neg \forall w, e: \text{Mari entered}(w, e). \text{maincl}(w, e)) \}$

**Negate each exh. alt.:**  $\neg ( \forall w, e: \text{Mari entered}(w, e). \text{maincl}(w, e) \ \& \ \neg \forall w, e: \text{Kati entered}(w, e). \text{maincl}(w, e) )$   
 ditto for the other alt

**Assert+negs** (if Mari entered, maincl)  $\vee$  (if Kati entered, maincl)  $\ \& \ \neg$  (if Mari entered, maincl)  $\ \& \ \neg$  (if Kati entered, maincl)  $\ \& \ \neg$  (if Kati entered, maincl)  $\ \& \ \neg$  (if Mari entered, maincl)  
**= FC impl:** = (if Mari entered, maincl)  $\ \& \$  (if Kati entered, maincl)  
 $= \forall p \in \wp \ \forall w, e: p(w, e). \text{maincl}(w, e)$

- For the distribution effect, we need some version of **Fluctuation** that says that each conditional antecedent is true at some  $\langle w, e \rangle$ , but each is false at some  $\langle w, e \rangle$ .
- Dayal's 2013 Viability is attractive, but requiring exhaustified alts to be true is problematic, already for free choice.** Exhaustified alts are similar to minimal situations known from donkey-anaphora literature. There, minimal situations are required for unique antecedents, but the problem is independent of the needs for singular definite anaphora.

- **Minimal situations / exhausted alternatives clash with symmetrical predicates**

*If a farmer owns a donkey, he beats it.*

‘There is a minimal situation involving a farmer and a donkey he owns as thin particulars, such that it extends to one where the unique farmer there beats the unique donkey there’ (Elbourne 2005)

*If a bishop meets a bishop, he blesses him.*

donkey anaphora

**There is no minimal situation with a single bishop!**

*Any bishop may meet a(nother) bishop.*

free choice

*Akármelyik püspök találkozhat egy püspökkel.*

**There is no world in which only bishop-A meets a bishop!**

Elbourne offered a syntacticized solution: distinguished vs. undistinguished bishop. Could we avoid going there with free choice and unconditionals?

- **Chierchia 2013 (FC-implicature + negated SC-implicature +  $SC \subset FC$ ) would work fine for a symmetrical predicate:**

$\exists w[\text{ACC-FC}(w^*, w) \ \& \ \exists x[\text{bishop-A meets bishop-x in } w] \ \& \ \exists w'[\text{ACC-FC}(w^*, w') \ \& \ \exists x[\text{bishop-B meets bishop-x in } w']] \ \& \ \neg(\exists w''[\text{ACC-SC}(w^*, w'') \ \& \ \exists x[\text{bishop-A meets bishop-x in } w'']] \ \& \ \exists w'''[\text{ACC-SC}(w^*, w''') \ \& \ \exists x[\text{bishop-B meets bishop-x in } w''']])$

bishops = {A,B,C}

FC = {w1, w2, w3, w4}

SC = {w4}

w1 meet(A⊕B)

w2 meet(C⊕A)

w3 meet(C⊕B)

w4 ¬meet(A⊕B)

¬meet(A⊕C)

¬meet(B⊕C)

- **Good news, but...**

[i] I’d like to steer clear of the two modal bases and their explanation, at least for unconditionals: “Since modals are highly context-dependent, we conjecture that there occurs a small context shift between the first and the second formulas; in consequence of it, we wind up with two related but (minimally) different modal bases and we conjecture/stipulate that this difference is regulated by MC [=Modal Containment,  $SC \subset FC$ ].

One way of unpacking MC further might be, in the case of epistemic modalities, in terms of evidence. The broader set of modality ( denoted as FC) may indicate something like the worlds that constitute live possibilities according to the intersubjective evidence available to the illocutionary agents. This would be the evidence that agents

are willing to mutually accept. On the other hand, the smaller set of worlds (SC) might be those compatible with the subjective, "private" evidential source of the speaker. I.e. the speaker has access to evidence that casts some doubt on what is commonly maintained.” (Chierchia 2013: 316-317)

[ii] In Chierchia 2013, the positive part of distribution (every alternative is true somewhere) is guaranteed by the possibility modal.

In unconditionals, where the possibility modal is replaced by a conditional, the requirement that every antecedent is true somewhere needs to be stated directly. In this respect, Dayal’s 2013 Viability is better for us.

- **Proposal for both classical FC and unconditionals**

“Bare akár-clause,” same in classical FC and as unconditional adjunct, modulo (w) vs. (w,e), neutralized using the  $\wedge$  notation:

$\exists \wp, \text{ where } \wp = \lambda p. \exists x[\text{human}(x) \ \& \ p = \wedge \text{entered}(x)]$  cf. akár-wh

$\exists \wp, \text{ where } \wp = \{ \wedge \text{Mari entered}, \wedge \text{Kati entered} \}$  cf. akár-akár

**FC-implicature = universal force**, based on akár-clause plus modal or conditional:

For  $\exists > \diamond$ :  $\forall p \in \wp \exists w.p(w)$

For unconditionals:  $\forall p \in \wp \forall w,e: p(w,e). \text{maincl}(w,e)$

**Viability**, based just on “bare akár-clause.”

Combine techniques from Chierchia 2013 and Dayal 2013:

In classical FC:  $\forall p \in \wp \exists w.p(w)$   $\forall p \in \wp. \exists w. \neg p(w)$

As unconditional adj.  $\forall p \in \wp \exists w,e. p(w,e) \ \& \ \forall p \in \wp. \exists w. \neg p(w)$

**Further improvements may be possible...**

*Big thanks to Veneeta Dayal, Jess Law, Haoze Li, and Yimei Xiang for discussion and suggestions regarding Viability in unconditionals!*

- **Akárki** and (single) **whoever** overtly move to A-bar positions. The scope of overtly A-bar moved operators is typically frozen (a fact, whatever the theory).

\*Kértem, hogy akárkivel táncolj, nemet mondtál. \* unconditional

\*I requested that you dance with whoever, you said no.

\*I requested that whoever you dance with, you said no.

Akárkivel kértem, hogy táncolj \_, nemet mondtál.

Whoever I requested that you dance with, you said no.

Same for FCI akárki. FCI any NP seems more willing than whoever to scope out of a tensed indicative clause.

# Pali megtudhatja, hogy akármelyik lányt bemutattam Zolinak. # FCI

# Pali may learn that I introduced any of the girls to Zoli.

Pali akármelyik lányt megtudhatja, hogy bemutattam \_ Zolinak.

ca. Pali may learn about any of the girls that I introduced her to Zoli.

- **Why is the territory of Hungarian akár divided between any-items and wh-ever items in English?**

Conjecture: The reason is syntactic.

It appears that **the existential/disjunctive particle in unconditionals must scope overtly at the edge of the antecedent clause.**

**Hungarian akárki** / akár-akár can move to or be merged in a high spell-out position.

**Telugu wh-ai-naa** and SFP -naa provide convergent evidence (Appendix 1).

**English whoever** / whether move to or are merged in a high spell-out position; they are recruited to carry the particle up. Standard any has no way to get there.

Although, any and wh-ever don't part ways so completely...

Mary didn't buy anything whatsoever.

Mary may buy anything what(so)ever.

Anything (that) Mary bought, we were happy. [that thanks to A. Warstadt]

?? Mary bought anything, we were happy.

Open question: How do these work?

NB Anything (that) unconds and Telugu -naa unconds lack the epistemic reading.

## Appendix 1: Telugu (ai)-naa builds NPIs, FCIs, and uncond. adjs (Balusu 2017a,b & p.c.)

The syntax of naa is very similar to that of Japanese ka (Cable 2010, a.o.)

wh {ai-naa / ka}	`anything'
DP <sub>1</sub> {ai-naa / ka} DP <sub>2</sub> {ai-naa / ka}	`either DP <sub>1</sub> or DP <sub>2</sub> '
[ <sub>FocP</sub> ... wh ... V] {naa / ka}	`uncond. naa / quest. ka'
[ <sub>FocP</sub> ... DP <sub>1</sub> ... V] {naa / ka} [ <sub>FocP</sub> ... DP <sub>2</sub> ... V] {naa / ka}	`uncond. naa / quest. ka'

**In contrast, Hungarian \*particle [... wh-pronoun...]. Akár and ki never come apart.**

**Telugu** [Note: ainaa and -naa with lexical foci have further uses that akár does not, and so observationally the "cf." cases are not dedicated NPIs, FCIs, or unconditionals.]

NPI ravi ee-pustakam-ainaa cadiveeDu ani neenu ana-leedu  
Ravi which-book-AINAA read that I said-not  
'I didn't say that Ravi read any book'

cf. ravi kuura-ainaa (vanDeeDu) caaru-ainaa vanDeeDu ani neenu ana-leedu  
Ravi curry-AINAA cooked sambar-AINAA cooked that I said-not  
'I didn't say that Ravi cooked either curry or sambar'

FCI bhushan eemi-ainaa tinnaa-Vaccu  
Bhushan what-AINAA eat-may  
'Bhushan may eat anything'

cf. bhushan kuura-ainaa (tinnaa-Vaccu) caaru-ainaa tinnaa-Vaccu  
Bhushan curry-AINAA eat-may sambar-AINAA eat-may  
'Bhushan may eat either curry or sambar'

UNC [uma eemi vanDi]-naa vanTillu manci vaasana vastundi  
Uma what cooks-NAA kitchen good smell come-will  
'Whatever Uma cooks, the kitchen will smell good'

cf. uma [kuura vanDi]-naa [caaru vanDi]-naa vanTillu manci vaasana vastundi  
Uma curry cooks-NAA sambar cooks-NAA kitchen good smell come-will  
'Whether Uma cooks curry or sambar, the kitchen will smell good'

uma [kuura-oo caaru-oo vanDi]-naa vanTillu manci vaasana vastundi  
Uma curry-DISJ sambar-DISJ cooks-NAA kitchen good smell come-will  
'Whatever Uma cooks by way of curry or sambar, the kitchen will smell good'

**Appendix 2: Hung. unconditionals with circumstantial/epistemic readings involve syntactic focus. (This was not figured into the schematic demonstration on p.4.)**

MARI jött be. V Pfx order, Mari is in syntactic focus  
Mari came in

Mari be jött. Pfx V order, Mari is not in syntactic focus  
Mari in came

(The +/- syntactic focus distinction is always there, but only verbs with separable prefixes or other similar accompaniments make it visible in isolated written sentences.)

Syntactic focus relies on intonational focus, but goes beyond it both in form and in content. It expresses **exclusion-by-identification** (SEM: Szabolcsi 1994; SYN: Horvath 2010).

SYN:  $[_{EI-P} [EI-Op\ MARI\ [EI^0\ [_{TP}\ come+T_{past}\ [MARI\ come\ in\ ]]]]]$

SEM:  $\iota x[\text{entered}(x) \ \& \ \forall y[\text{entered}(y) \rightarrow y \leq x]] = m$

ca. 'It was Mari who entered (among a contextually salient set of people)'

The iota operator carries the presupposition that its scope is true; effectively, someone entered. (In a join semi-lattice, unique max of enterers is guaranteed.) If defined, the sentence asserts that the max enterer is identical to Mari. The assertion is false if Kati also entered. But if the sentence had Mari és Kati, interpreted as  $m \oplus k$ , in focus, then both entered(m) and entered(k) would be entailed, under distributivity.

**In circumstantial/epistemic readings, identity is at-issue (and is deemed to be orthogonal to the main clause issue). I believe this is why they obligatorily have focus.**

Given SEM, in { Akárki / akár Kati akár Mari } jött be, only alternatives with exhausted enterers are under consideration. This fact might be relevant to Viability, but not on my analysis, which hopes to extend to focus-less material unconditionals.

**Caveat regarding focus:** Szabolcsi 1994 observes that only DPs that denote singular/plural individuals occur in exclusive focus in their own right; SEM is tailored to them. Other DPs only occur in syntactic focus when "piped" by a contrastive sub-constituent. They are allowed in unconditional adjuncts, and likewise require syntactic focus.

\* MINDEN GYEREK jött be. vs. ok Minden GYEREK jött be, nem minden SZÜLŐ.  
every child came in every CHILD came in not every PARENT

ok Akár minden GYEREK jött be, akár minden SZÜLŐ jött be, ...

'Whether it was every child or every parent that came in, ...'

These require an id-by-excl rule that is slightly different from SEM above. Not in this talk.

**Appendix 3: Material unconditionals do not have syntactic focus. (Nor do NPIs or FCIs.)**

Without focus, we only get (what I believe corresponds to) the "material unconditional" reading: identity is not only orthogonal to the main clause issue, it is not even under discussion.

Nem tudtam aludni. { Akárki / akár K akár M } bejött, nyikorgott a padló.  
'I couldn't sleep. {Whoever / whether K or M} entered, the floor squeaked'

Presupposes that there was some entering, which shows that this is not a plain (if-) conditional. Could be paraphrased with a when-conditional with indefinites/disjunctions.

I couldn't sleep. Whenever {someone / K or M} entered, the floor squeaked.

Given the lack of focus, in { Akárki / akár Kati akár Mari } bejött, alternatives with multiple people entering are also okay. Dayal remarks on free choice:

"It is sometimes thought that English sentences like (22a) [=Bill may read any of these books] do not have a reading in which the permission extends to the full set of books. I believe this is incorrect. If one utters (22a) and Bill reads all the books, he has not exceeded his mandate. The present account allows for this" (Dayal 2013)

For the purposes of this talk, I set the precise analysis of material unconditionals aside, but their existence is important. We must not rely on focus-related exclusion-by-identification in the generic formalization of unconditionals, because only some of them have it. Recall also that NPI akárki and FCI akárki are never in syntactic focus.

\*

**Appendix 4: Hungarian interrogatives and relatives never contain akár, not even as an "enhancement".** Interrogatives have bare wh-pronouns (ki 'who'). Relatives have definite+wh-pronouns (aki).

Ki jött be?  
who came in  
'Who came in?'

\*Akár-ki jött be?  
akár-who came in  
intended as wh-quest.

(az) a gyerek a-ki be jött  
that the child the-who in came  
'the child who came in'  
Headed Relative

a-ki (csak) be jött  
the-who only in came  
'who(ever) came in'  
Free Relative,  $\forall$  reading

\*akár(-a)-ki  
akár-the-who  
intended as  
relative pron.

## References

- Abrusán 2007, EVEN and free choice ANY in Hungarian  
<https://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/TVkNTE2O/sub11proc.pdf>
- Balusu 2017a, PPI effects with an NPI/FCI in Telugu <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003940>
- Balusu 2017b, Free-choice relatives in Telugu <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003941>
- Cable 2010, The Grammar of Q. Q-particles, Wh-movement, and Pied Piping. OUP.
- Charlow 2018, The scope of alternatives: Indefiniteness & islands <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003302>
- Chierchia 2013, Logic in Grammar. OUP.
- Dayal 2013, A viability constraint on alternatives for free choice  
<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.225.2499&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Elbourne 2005, Situations and Individuals. MIT Press.
- Giannakidou & Cheng 2006, Wh-morphology in free choice <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffl001>
- Halm 2015, Free choice and aspect in Hungarian. Approaches to Hungarian 14.
- Hara 2015, Questions are immediate issues  
[https://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/iNINDI3N/hara\\_questions.pdf](https://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/iNINDI3N/hara_questions.pdf)
- Hirsch 2016, A compositional analysis of wh-ever free relatives  
<https://semanticsarchive.net/sub2015/SeparateArticles/Hirsch-Sub20.pdf>
- Horvath 2010, "Discourse features", syntactic displacement and the status of contrast  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024384109001399>
- Kiss 1991, Logical structure in linguistic structure... in Huang & May, eds.
- Kratzer 1998, Scope or pseudo-scope? In Rothstein, ed.
- Kratzer & Shimoyama 2002, Indeterminate pronouns  
[http://people.umass.edu/partee/RGGU\\_2004/Indeterminate%20Pronouns.pdf](http://people.umass.edu/partee/RGGU_2004/Indeterminate%20Pronouns.pdf)
- Lewis 1988. Relevant implication. *Theoria* 54: 161–237.
- Lohiniva 2018, Two strategies for forming unconditionals: Evidence from disjunction, NELS 49  
<http://cornell2018.nelsconference.org/program.html>
- Menéndez-Benito 2005, The Grammar of Choice  
<https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AAI3193926/>
- Rawlins 2013, (Un)conditionals <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11050-012-9087-0>
- Šimík 2018, Ever free relatives crosslinguistically <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003919>
- Szabolcsi 1994, All quantifiers are not equal: The case of focus  
[https://www.academia.edu/24415929/All\\_quantifiers\\_are\\_not\\_equal\\_The\\_case\\_of\\_focus\\_1994](https://www.academia.edu/24415929/All_quantifiers_are_not_equal_The_case_of_focus_1994)
- Szabolcsi 1997, Strategies for scope taking. In Ways of Scope Taking.
- Szabolcsi 2017, Additive presuppositions are derived through activating focus alternatives  
<https://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/DZhY2NhN/>
- Szabolcsi 2018, Two types of quantifier particles: Quantifier-phrase internal vs. heads on the clausal spine <https://www.glossa-journal.org/articles/10.5334/gjgl.538/>
- Xiang 2018, Alternations of logical functions: Mandarin *dou* ...  
<https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/003598>