

Semantically triggered verb doubling in Spanish unconditionals

Josep Quer (ICREA & Universidad Pompeu Fabra) & Luis Vicente (Universität Potsdam)

Intro — English (1a) and Spanish (1b) can express unconditionality through a free relative with free choice (FC) morphology in the antecedent of a concessive-like structure. In addition, Spanish can express the same meaning through subjunctive verb doubling in the antecedent (2a). Doubling is required in the absence of FC morphology (2b), subjunctive mood is required on both verbs (2c), and identical verb forms need to be used (2d). Further, (2a) is *not* a case of multiple link pronunciation in a long verb movement chain: Vicente 2007 shows that, while such chains exist in Spanish, they are island-sensitive –yet (2a) is fine despite a relative clause boundary intervening between the two verbs. In this talk, we propose instead that no syntactic relation holds between the boldfaced verbs in (2a); rather, doubling obtains as a means to derive the semantics of unconditionality.

Plan of attack — We start from the observation (Rawlins 2008) that the antecedents of unconditionals can be characterized as disjunctive sets of alternatives to a proposition (3). The conditional operator COND (Kratzer 1986 *et seq*) composes (3) with the consequent via pointwise function application, deriving a disjunctive set of conditional statements (4). This configuration derives the meaning of unconditionality. Therefore, in order to derive (1b) and (2), we must show that antecedents with FC morphology or subjunctive verb doubling have a semantics equivalent to (3), whereas antecedents based on bare *wh*-free relatives without doubling do not.

Analysis — In order to derive the semantics in (3), we treat the antecedents of Spanish unconditionals as FC items, given that they share various properties with more familiar FC items like *cualquier* ‘any’ –e.g., incompatibility with episodic tenses (5), see Quer 1999 for more. FC items are intensional indefinites contributing an {individual,world} pair of variables (Giannakidou 2001). In particular, we propose that the world variable is provided by the relative clause verb, where the subjunctive is required in order to obtain the correct semantics (see Quer 1998 for discussion). We also adopt Gutiérrez-Rexach’s 2002 observation that the quantificational force of Spanish free relatives depends on the presence/absence of FC morphology: specifically, he shows that free relatives with FC morphology are headed by a silent universal quantifier over worlds. When this quantifier binds the world variable, it creates a quasi-universal reading (6) equivalent to (3) –cf. Quer 1999, Giannakidou 2001–, thus deriving the grammaticality of (1b).

In contrast, Gutiérrez-Rexach shows that free relatives without FC morphology are headed by a silent existential quantifier. This kind of quantification creates an existential semantics (7) that is not equivalent to (3). This explains why free relatives without doubling and without FC morphology are not licit unconditional antecedents (2b). The grammaticality of (2a), on the other hand, is explained if verb doubling creates the desired quantificational structure. To capture this intuition, we propose that the upper verb introduces a domain-widening modal quantifier over possible worlds. This is evidenced by the fact that this upper verb also needs to be subjunctive (2c), which in Spanish is a mood that signals quantification over worlds. As for the identity requirement between verbs (2d), we propose that doubling is a grammaticalized device to signal that this modal operator has universal force. We support this hypothesis by showing that this configuration is attested in several languages, both in the verbal domain (Catalan, Sardinian, Calabrian, Dutch) and in the nominal domain (e.g., Latin *quisquis*) –see Haspelmath 1997.

Extensions — Note that our analysis only requires (i) subjunctive verbs to provide a FC world variable, and (ii) an upper verb to introduce a universal modal operator. Other features of relative clauses are not relevant. Therefore, we correctly predict that FC free relatives and headed relatives will also allow doubling, as long as the subjunctive is used (8).

Conclusions — Our analysis makes three contributions: first, it sheds light on a little-studied aspect of Spanish syntax; second, it can be directly applied to other languages that exhibit this construction, given that it only requires the presence of the subjunctive and of an upper verb; and third, it expands the typology of doubling constructions, by showing that some of them do not arise from multiple pronunciation of chain links (à la Nunes 2004).

Examples

- (1) a. Whoever goes to the party, I will go too.
 b. **Quienquiera** que vaya a la fiesta, yo también iré
 whoever that goes.SUBJ to the party I also will.go
- (2) a. ✓ **Vaya** quien **vaya** a la fiesta, yo también iré
 goes.SUBJ who goes.SUBJ to the party I also will.go
 “Whoever goes to the party, I will go too”
 b. * **Quien vaya** a la fiesta, yo también iré
 who goes.SUBJ to the party I also will.go
 c. * **Va** quien **va** a la fiesta, yo también iré
 goes.IND who goes.IND to the party I also will.go
 d. * **Vaya** quien **acuda** a la fiesta, yo también iré
 goes.SUBJ who attends.SUBJ to the party I also will.go

$$(3) \llbracket \text{whoever goes to the party} \rrbracket = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 \text{ goes to the party in } w_1 \\ \text{or } x_2 \text{ goes to the party in } w_2 \\ \text{or } \dots \\ \text{or } x_n \text{ goes to the party in } w_n \end{array} \right\}$$

$$(4) \left[\begin{array}{c} \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{COND} \quad \text{antecedent} \quad \text{consequent} \end{array} \right] = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 \text{ goes to the party in } w_1 \rightarrow \text{I go to the party in } w_1 \\ \text{or } x_2 \text{ goes to the party in } w_2 \rightarrow \text{I go to the party in } w_2 \\ \text{or } \dots \\ \text{or } x_n \text{ goes to the party in } w_n \rightarrow \text{I go to the party in } w_n \end{array} \right\}$$

- (5) a. Cualquier orador { * convenció / ✓ convencía } a Mauricio
 any speaker convinced.PERF convinced.IMPERF to Mauricio
 b. Quienquiera que hablara, { * convenció / ✓ convencía } a Mauricio
 whoever that spoke.SUBJ convinced.PERF convinced.IMPERF to Mauricio
 c. Hablara quien hablara { * convenció / ✓ convencía } a Mauricio
 spoke.SUBJ who spoke.SUBJ convinced.PERF convinced.IMPERF to Mauricio

(6) $\llbracket \text{Quienquiera que vaya a la fiesta} \rrbracket = \forall w' [w' R w \rightarrow \exists x [\text{go-to-the-party}(x)(w')]]$
 where R is a relation that defines all alternative worlds w' to world w in the epistemic model of the speaker.

(7) $\llbracket \text{quien vaya a la fiesta} \rrbracket = \exists [\lambda x. \lambda w [\text{go-to-the-party}(x)(w)]]$

- (8) a. **Vaya** quienquiera que **vaya** a la fiesta, yo también iré
 goes.SUBJ whoever that goes.SUBJ to the party I also will.go
 b. **Vaya** la persona que **vaya** a la fiesta, yo también iré
 goes.SUBJ the person that goes.SUBJ to the party I also will.go

REFERENCES:

- Giannakidou 01** The meaning of free choice, *L&P 24* **Gutiérrez-Rexach 02** The semantics of Spanish free relatives *Proceedings of LSRL 29*, Benjamins **Haspelmath 97** *Indefinite pronouns* Claremont Press **Kratzer 86** Conditionals, *CLS 22* **Nunes 04** *Sideward movement and linearization of chains*, MIT Press **Quer 98** *Mood at the interface* PhD Utrecht **Quer 99** The quantificational force of FCIs, *handout CSSP'99* **Rawlins 08** *(Un)conditionals*, PhD UCSC **Vicente 07** *The syntax of heads and phrases*, PhD Leiden.