

On *-ever*

Setayesh Dashti | Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

-ever free relatives cross-linguistically have three main readings: ignorance, indifference, and non-modal. With an *ignorance* reading, there is an inference that the speaker does not know what the free relative refers to (1). Under an *indifference* reading the uniqueness requirement of the EFR no longer holds (2). The third reading is a *non-modal* one where ignorance or indifference are not conventionalized.

- (1) Whichever movie is playing at Phoenix Picturehouse (#namely Blade Runner) is very popular.
- (2) Whichever movie plays at Phoenix Picturehouse is very popular.
- (3) In those days, whatever Parker wrote was always violent.

The literature on the semantics of *-ever* free relatives (henceforth EFRs) has mostly focused on the their semantics as a whole (e.g. variability between ignorance and indifference readings (Hirsch, 2016; Šimík, 2018), universal or definite semantic core (Iatridou and Varlokosta, 1998; Tredinnick, 2005)). The compositional contribution of the generalizing element (e.g *-ever*) in terms of how it relates to other uses of such elements is less well understood, with *-ever* sometimes even taken as non-compositional (reported by Šimík 2020, exceptions being Dayal 1995, 1997, von Fintel 2000; Lauer 2009; Condoravdi 2015). For instance, it is not clear whether English *-ever* is the same as the NPI *ever*, and if so, how the NPI meaning correlates with the *-ever* free relative.

In this talk, I present a cross-linguistic survey of counterparts of *-ever* in languages with *-ever* free relatives, examining how their semantic properties correlate with the range of readings available to *-ever* free relatives. I focus on three languages: Old Avestan, Hindi, and English. I show that the generalizing morpheme in Old Avestan *-ever* free relatives (and similar constructions) is a free choice item, composed from the NPI *ci-* and the additive morpheme *-ca*, which is responsible for pre-exhaustification of the alternatives of *ci-*, thereby licensing the NPI in a non-SDE environment following (Chierchia, 2013; Szabolcsi, 2017; Kirby, 2021; Mitrović, forthcoming).

- (4) [yōi mōi səraošəm dən **ciias=cā**] upā.jimən
REL.NOM.PL me respect.ACC give.3PL *ci*.NOM.PL=CONJ attain.3PL
hauruuātā
integrity.ACC
'Whosoever gives me respect will attain integrity.' (Y 45.5)
- (5) a. LF for EFR in 4: $O_{exh}[ca-[ci-[\lambda x[x \text{ gives me respect}]]]]$
b. $ALT_4 = \diamond(\{person_a, person_b, \dots, person_n\} \text{ gives me respect})$.
c. $ALT_4^{\text{Pre-Exh}} = \{\diamond(\text{only } person_a \text{ give me respect}), \dots, \diamond(\text{only } person_n \text{ gives me respect})\}$
d. $O(ALT_4^{\text{Pre-Exh}}) = [\diamond(person_a) \wedge \dots \wedge \diamond(person_n) \wedge \neg \diamond(person_a \wedge \dots \wedge person_n)]$

I then expand on a similar proposal for Hindi *bhii* by Dayal (2019), and explore how such ideas can unify the uses of *ever* as an NPI and the free relative-based *-ever* in English. Finally, I discuss ideas about how the choice of this generalizing morpheme can affect the possible readings of an *-ever* free relative across languages.

REFERENCES: | CHIERCHIA, GENNARO (2013). *Logic in Grammar: Polarity, Free Choice, and Intervention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. | CONDORAVDI, CLEO (2015). ‘Ignorance, indifference, and individuation with wh-ever’. In Luis Alonso-Ovalle and Paula Menéndez-Benito (eds.), *Epistemic Indefinites: Exploring Modality Beyond the Verbal Domain*, Oxford University Press, pp. 212–243. | DAYAL, VENEETA (1995). ‘Quantification in correlatives’. In *Quantification in natural languages*, Springer, pp. 179–205. | DAYAL, VENEETA (1997). ‘Free Relatives and “Ever”’: Identity and Free Choice Readings’. In Aaron Lawson (ed.), *Proceedings of SALT VII*, pp. 99—116. | DAYAL, VENEETA (October 2019). ‘The Multiple Faces of Hindi-Urdu *bhii*’. Presentation at SALA 35, INALCO, Paris. | VON FINTEL, KAI (2000). ‘Whatever’. In Brendan Jackson and Tanya Matthews (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 10*, Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, Cornell University, pp. 27–39. | HIRSCH, ARON (2016). ‘A compositional semantics for wh-ever free relatives’. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 20*, pp. 341–358. | IATRIDOU, SABINE and SPYRIDOULA VARLOKOSTA (1998). ‘Pseudoclefts Crosslinguistically’. *Natural Language Semantics* 6(1), pp. 3–28. | KIRBY, IAN L. (2021). ‘Exhaustification, free-choice, and additivity: Evidence from Sakha *da*(*yani*)’. In *Proceedings of the 95th Annual Meeting of the Linguistics Society of America (LSA 95)*, pp. 663–675. | LAUER, SVEN (2009). ‘Free relatives with -ever: Meaning and Use’. Manuscript, Stanford University. | MITROVIĆ, MORENO (forthcoming). ‘Dialectological-Diachronic Grammar of Conjunction in Archaic Indo-Iranian’. Manuscript under review. | SZ-ABOLCSI, ANNA (2017). ‘Additive presuppositions are derived through activating focus alternatives’. In Alexandre Cremers, Thomas van Gessel, and Floris Roelofsen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Amsterdam Colloquium*, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam, pp. 455–464. | TREDINICK, VANESSA ANNE (2005). *On the Semantics of Free Relatives with '-ever'*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. | ŠIMÍK, RADEK (2018). ‘Ever Free Relatives Crosslinguistically’. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 61. | ŠIMÍK, RADEK (2020). ‘Free Relatives’. In Daniel Gutzmann, Lisa Mathewson, Céline Meier, Hotze Rullmann, and Thomas E. T. Zimmermann (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Semantics*, John Wiley, pp. 1–38.