

Semantically triggered verb doubling in Spanish unconditionals

Josep Quer
ICREA/Universidad Pompeu Fabra
josep.quer@upf.edu

Luis Vicente
Universität Potsdam
vicente@ling.uni-potsdam.de

April 1, 2009

1 Introduction

1.1 Basic data

A **conditional** is a clausal modification structure in which the proposition expressed by the consequent is true only in those worlds defined by the antecedent. In the standard theory of conditionality (Lewis 1973, 1975; Heim 1982; Kratzer 1977, 1981, 1986), the antecedent is a domain restrictor operating on the modal base of the consequent.

(1) If Amanda comes to Berlin, I'll be happy.

An **unconditional** is a type of conditional where the consequent is true in every possible world. English can express unconditionality through the *wh-ever* construction (2a), the *whether... or not* construction (2b), or a question embedded under *no matter*, *regardless of*, and similar predicates (2c)/(2d).

- (2) a. Whoever comes to Berlin, I'll be happy.
b. Whether Amanda comes to Berlin or not, I'll be happy.
c. No matter who comes to Berlin, I'll be happy.
d. Regardless of who comes to Berlin, I'll be happy.

We focus on unconditionals based on the *wh-ever* construction (2a). Spanish has a direct translation of the English example, with *-quiera* (a frozen form of *querer* 'to want') functioning as the free choice morpheme (SUBJ=subjunctive; contrary to standard orthography, *quien quiera* is written in two words for transparency).

- (3) Quien quiera que venga a Berlín, estaré contento.
who ever that comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
"Whoever comes to Berlin, I'll be happy"

Spanish also has a variant not attested in English, involving doubling of the free relative verb. Quite transparently, we call these *verb doubling unconditionals*.

- (4) **Venga** quien **venga** a Berlín, estaré contento.
comes.SUBJ who comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
"Whoever comes to Berlin, I'll be happy"

Main question we want to answer:
how come (3) and (4) are semantically equivalent?

Beyond semantic equivalency, there are three properties of this alternation that we also need to account for:

Extra property #1: doubling is required in the absence of free choice morphology

- (5) * Quien **venga** a Berlín, estaré contento.
who comes.SUBJ to Berlin, will.be happy
“Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”

This is a restriction particular to antecedents of conditionals, as free relatives without free choice morphology are grammatical in other environments.

- (6) Saldré a cenar con quien venga a Berlín.
will.go.out to dine with who comes.SUBJ to Berlin
“I will go out for dinner with whoever comes to Berlin”

Note also that this is a one-way generalization: if free choice morphology is present, then doubling can either happen or not (though some speakers find examples of this kind redundant).

- (7) **Venga** quien *quiera* que **venga** a Berlín, estaré contento.
comes.SUBJ who ever that comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
“Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”

Extra property #2: subjunctive mood is required on both verbs: ungrammaticality results if either verb (or both) appear in the indicative.

- (8) a. * **Viene** quien **viene** a Berlín, estaré contento.
comes.IND who comes.IND to Berlin will.be happy
“Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”
b. * **Viene** quien **venga** a Berlín, estaré contento.
comes.IND who comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
“Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”
c. * **Venga** quien **viene** a Berlín, estaré contento.
comes.SUBJ who comes.INDJ to Berlin will.be happy
“Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”

The use of the subjunctive is also necessary in *wh-ever* unconditionals.¹

- (9) * Quien *quiera* que **viene** a Berlín, estaré contento.
who ever that comes.IND to Berlin will.be happy
“Whoever that comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”

¹In fact, the subjunctive is also necessary in the Spanish equivalents of *whether...or not* unconditionals (...o no...) and *no matter* unconditionals (*no importa*), although we will not deal with these today.

Extra property #3: the doubled verbs have to be identical both lexically and inflectionally: we cannot use (near-)synonyms or different tenses (though see §5.2).

- (10) * **Venga** quien **viaje** a Berlín, estaré contento.
 comes.SUBJ who travels.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
 “Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”
- (11) * **Venga** quien **viniera** a Berlín, estaré contento.
 comes.SUBJ who came.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
 “Whoever comes to Berlin, I will be happy”

In sum, we need to account for the following facts:

- Free choice morphology and subjunctive verb doubling are semantically equivalent.
- Doubling is required in the absence of free choice morphology, but not vice versa.
- The use of the subjunctive is required throughout.
- In the case of doubling, strict lexical and inflectional identity between the two verbs is required.

1.2 Three arguments against a multiple pronunciation analysis

Gulli (2003) discusses a similar construction in various dialects of Italian and proposes that it is a case of movement of a verbal constituent plus multiple pronunciation of chain links (à la Nunes 2004). This analysis derives the strict identity effect.

- (12) a. Aundi vaju vaju, u viju.
 where goes goes him see
 “Whenever he goes, I see him” [Calabrian]
- b. Come la giri giri, è sempre la stessa cosa
 how it turn.2SG turn.2SG is always the same thing
 “However you look at it, it’s always the same” [Standard Italian]

(13) [Aundi vaju_{RC}] vaju, u viju

Whether Gulli’s analysis is appropriate for Italian or not, it cannot be extended to Spanish.

Argument #1: Locality effects Spanish has another verb doubling construction that can be reduced to movement plus multiple pronunciation of chain links: the predicate cleft construction (Vicente 2007). Crucially, the relationship between the two verbs of a predicate cleft is island sensitive (15).

- (14) *Spanish predicate clefts* (Vicente 2007)
- Leer,** Amanda ha **leído** un libro.
 read.INF Amanda has read a book
 “As for reading (something), Amanda has read a book”

- (15) * Leer, Amanda conoce [RC al estudiante que ha leído un libro].
read.INF Amanda knows the student who has read a book
“As for reading (something), Amanda knows the student who has read a book”

However, the two verbs of a verb doubling unconditional are also separated by an island (relative clause) boundary, yet no island effect arises.

Argument #2: nominal vs. clausal distribution *Wh-ever* and bare *wh-* free relatives are of category DP, as evidenced by the fact that they can appear in positions that subcategorize for DPs (e.g., complement of preposition). We assume the standard analysis that takes them to be relative CPs embedded under a D head (Caponigro 2003 and references).

- (16) *Free relatives in complement-of-P position*
- a. Hablaré con quien quiera que venga a Berlín.
will.talk with who ever that comes.SUBJ to Berlin
“I will talk to whoever comes to Berlin”
- b. Hablaré con quien venga a Berlín.
will.talk with who comes.SUBJ to Berlin
“I will talk to whoever comes to Berlin”

In contrast, verb doubling structures cannot appear in DP positions, despite being semantically equivalent to *wh-ever* and bare *wh-* free relatives. This suggests that the upper verb projects a clausal structure (arguably, a full IP).

- (17) * Hablaré con venga quien venga a Berlín.
will.talk with comes.SUBJ who comes.SUBJ to Berlin
“I will talk to whoever comes to Berlin”

Under a movement analysis, the change of category would require the moved verbal constituent to either (i) project from its landing site, in violation of standard assumptions about movement.²; or (ii) land in the specifier of a silent verbal head embedding the free relative, for which there is no evidence.

Argument #3: lack of explanatory power A movement analysis would explain the strict identity requirement as a corollary of the copy theory of movement, but it would have nothing to say about the other properties of unconditionals. Specifically:

- The semantic equivalence of *wh-ever* and verb doubling unconditionals needs to be explained independently.
- The necessity of verb doubling in the absence of FC morphology needs to be explained independently.
- The necessity of the subjunctive needs to be explained independently.

Our proposal: it is a mistake to tackle this construction by focusing on the doubling effect. Instead, if we focus on the semantic equivalence of *wh-ever* and verb doubling unconditionals, all the other properties follow, including the doubling effect.

²We ignore theories that allow moved items to project (Bury 2002; Donati 2006), as it is not clear to us that they offer any advantages over more conservative approaches to movement.

1.3 Plan of attack

We follow Rawlins (2008) in treating the antecedents of unconditionals as denoting sets of disjoint alternatives with a {world,individual} variable pair. The variables receive a different value in each alternative.

$$(18) \quad \llbracket \text{whoever comes to Berlin} \rrbracket = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_1 \\ \text{or } x_2 \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_2 \\ \text{or } x_3 \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_3 \\ \text{or } \dots \\ \text{or } x_n \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_n \end{array} \right\}$$

The antecedent and the consequent act as the restrictor and the nucleus, respectively, of a quantificational structure headed by a silent conditional operator COND.³ This operator composes the antecedent and the consequent via pointwise function application,⁴ creating a set of disjoint conditional statements.

$$(19) \quad \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{consequent} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{COND} \quad \text{antecedent} \end{array} \right] = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_1 \rightarrow \text{I am happy in } w_1 \\ \text{or } x_2 \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_2 \rightarrow \text{I am happy in } w_2 \\ \text{or } x_3 \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_3 \rightarrow \text{I am happy in } w_3 \\ \text{or } \dots \\ \text{or } x_n \text{ comes to Berlin in } w_n \rightarrow \text{I am happy in } w_n \end{array} \right\}$$

Therefore, our task reduces to showing that licit unconditional antecedents (free relatives with free choice morphology, verb doubling, or both) have a semantics equivalent to (18), whereas illicit unconditional antecedents (free relatives with neither free choice morphology nor verb doubling) have a different semantics. We will achieve this in the following way.

- We will show that the antecedents of Spanish unconditionals are free choice items –that is, indefinite expressions containing a variable over worlds on top of the usual variable over individuals.
- Being indefinites, free choice items adopt the quantificational force of the operator that binds their variable(s). Here, we are interested in the quasi-universal reading that arises when it is a universal modal operator that binds the world variable (Quer 1999; Giannakidou 2001).
- We show that both *wh-ever* and verb doubling unconditional antecedents contain a universal modal operator. In contrast, bare *wh-* antecedents only contain an existential operator, so they cannot produce the relevant reading.

³The operator COND is defined as follows (Rawlins 2008, 133) :

(i) $\llbracket \text{COND} \rrbracket^{g,c} = \{ \lambda p_{\langle st \rangle} . \lambda p'_{\langle c(st) \rangle} . \lambda w_s . p'(c + p)(w) \}$.

⁴Pointwise Function Application is defined as follows (Rawlins 2008, 137).

(i) If α is a branching node with daughters β and γ , and $\llbracket \beta \rrbracket^{g,c} \subseteq D_\sigma$, and $\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{g,c} \subseteq D_{\langle \sigma \tau \rangle}$, then $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{g,c} = \{ \alpha \in D_\tau \mid \exists b \exists c (b \in \llbracket \beta \rrbracket^{g,w,c} \wedge c \in \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket^{g,c} \wedge a = c(b)) \}$.

2 Free choice

2.1 Parallelisms between unconditional antecedents and free choice items

In order to derive the data from section 1.1, we are going to treat antecedents of Spanish unconditionals as free choice items. This is justified, given that they share various properties with more familiar free choice items like *cualquier* ‘any’.

Parallelism #1: incompatibility with episodic tenses This restriction is due to the fact that (i) FC items are only licensed in non-veridical contexts; and (ii) episodic tenses create veridical contexts (see Giannakidou 2001 for details).

- (20) Cualquier orador { *convenció / ✓convencía } a Amanda.
any speaker convinced.PERF convinced.IMPERF to Amanda
“Any speaker would convince Amanda”
- (21) Quien quiera que hablara, { *convenció / ✓convencía } a Amanda.
who ever that spoke.SUBJ convinced.PERF convinced.IMPERF to Amanda
“Whoever spoke, he would convince Amanda”
- (22) Hablara quien hablara, { *convenció / ✓convencía } a Amanda.
spoke.SUBJ who spoke.SUBJ convinced.PERF convinced.IMPERF to Amanda
“Whoever spoke, he would convince Amanda”

This is a property where Spanish and English differ: Rawlins (2008, 153) provides the following example to show that English unconditionals are compatible with episodic tenses.

- (23) Last year, whoever Alfonso dated, he had a bad time.

We take this contrast as further evidence that English and Spanish unconditionals have a substantially different syntax –in particular, antecedents of English unconditionals are not free relatives, but embedded questions (cf. Rawlins 2008).

Parallelism #2: licensing of donkey anaphora Free choice items are indefinites, therefore they license donkey anaphora.

- (24) Si llama cualquier cliente, le diré que no estás.
if calls any client CL.DAT will.tell that not are.2SG
“If any client calls, I’ll tell him that you aren’t here”

Unconditional antecedents, both of the *wh-ever* and verb doubling kind, also license donkey anaphora.

- (25) Este es un club de comedia con gustos raros: quien quiera que cuente el chiste de
this is a club of comedy with taste weird who ever that tells.SUBJ the joke of
la A de Eugenio, el público siempre se ríe. Y si encima *pro* lo cuenta con
the A by Eugenio the audience always SE laughs and if moreover CL tells with
gracia, también le aplauden.
fun also CL.DAT clap
“This is a comedy club with weird tastes: whoever tells Eugenio’s “It’s an A!” joke, the audience always laughs. Moreover, if he tells it in a funny way, they also cheer for him”

- (26) Este es un club de comedia con gustos raros: cuente quien cuente el chiste de la
 this is a club of comedy with taste weird tells.SUBJ who tells.SUBJ the joke of the
 A de Eugenio, el público siempre se ríe. Y si encima *pro* lo cuenta con
 A by Eugenio the audience always se laughs and if moreover CL tells with
 gracia, también le aplauden.
 fun also CL.DAT clap
 “This is a comedy club with weird tastes: whoever tells Eugenio’s “It’s an A!” joke, the
 audience always laughs. Moreover, if he tells it in a funny way, they also cheer for him”

An extra argument: the subjunctive Free choice items require quantification over worlds. In Spanish, quantification over worlds is signalled by the use of the subjunctive (Quer 1998, 2001). More specifically:

“Why are concessive conditionals invariably in the subjunctive? Mood shift is clearly at play here, in that it reflects a shift to an expanded version of the epistemic model of the speaker $M_E(\text{speaker})$. In order to strengthen the concessive component of the sentence, worlds that verify the unlikely antecedent condition are taken into account. Since those more far-fetched worlds, ranked according to a less realistic ordering source, are incorporated into the modal base, the model is enriched and thus expanded vis-à-vis the epistemic model of the speaker.” [Quer 2001, 96]

Therefore, the obligatoriness of the subjunctive can be taken as a consequence of the fact that unconditional antecedents are free choice items.

2.2 Notes on free choice items

We adopt the following hypothesis about free choice items (see Giannakidou 2001 and references):

- (27) *Free choice items*
 A free choice item is an intensional indefinite –i.e., an indefinite expression containing a variable over worlds (w) on top of the usual variable over individuals (x).

The individual variable must receive a different value in each of the worlds comprised under the world variable. The different values are called i (dentify)-alternatives (cf. Dayal 1997).

- (28) *i -alternatives*
 A world w_1 is an i -alternative wrt α iff there exists some w_2 such that $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w_1} \neq \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w_2}$.

Therefore, FC items are formally defined as below: in prose, a free choice item denotes a set of alternative propositions with co-varying variables over worlds and individuals.

- (29) *Free choice items (Giannakidou 2001, 706)*
 Let W_i be a non-empty set of possible worlds. A sentence with a free choice item $\llbracket \text{Op Det}_{FC}(P, Q) \rrbracket$ is true in w_0 with respect to W_i iff:
 a. Presupposition: $\forall w_1, w_2 \in W_i : \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w_1} \neq \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket^{w_2}$, where α is the free choice phrase.
 b. Assertion: $\llbracket \text{Op } w, x [P(w, x); Q(w, x)] \rrbracket = 1$, where x and w are the variables contributed by α .

(where Op is a non-veridical operator; P is the descriptive content of the FC-phrase; Q is the nucleus of the tripartite structure; and w_0 is the actual world.)

What is important to us is that FC items are indefinites (for extensive evidence, see Quer 1999; Giannakidou 2001). We know that indefinites pick up the quantificational force of the operator that binds them (Heim 1982). The following triplets are semantically equivalent.

- (30) a. *In most cases*, if a_i table has lasted for 50 years, it_i will last another for 50 years.
 b. *In most cases*, any $_i$ table that has lasted for 50 years will last for another 50 years.
 c. Most tables that last for 50 years will last for another 50 years.
- (31) a. If a_i person falls from a fifth floor, he_i *very rarely* survives.
 b. *Very rarely* does any $_i$ person who falls from a fifth floor survive.
 c. Very few people who fall from a fifth floor survive.

Therefore, if Op in (29) is a universal quantifier, the FC item itself will be interpreted universally. More precisely, it will create a *quasi-universal* reading (Quer 1999; Giannakidou 2001). The difference between a plain universal and a quasi-universal reading is crucial here:

- (32) *Universal vs. quasi-universal readings* (Giannakidou 2001, 707)
 “A universal quantifier like *every* exhausts the values that can be assigned to its variable within a single world. With a FC quantifier, however, the quasi-universal effect is delivered because we are forced to consider a value in each i -alternative, and not because we consider all values in a single alternative.”

Applying all of this, we get the following semantics for a sentence with a regular free choice item.

- (33) \llbracket Give them *any* excuse \rrbracket = let W_i be a non-empty set of possible worlds. This sentence is true in w_0 (the actual world) with respect to W_i iff:
 a. Presupposition: $\forall w_1, w_2 \in W_i : \llbracket$ Give them excuse(x) $\rrbracket^{w_1} \neq \llbracket$ Give them excuse(x) \rrbracket^{w_2}
 b. Assertion: $\llbracket \forall w, x [\text{excuse}(x, w) \rightarrow \text{give-them}(x, w)] \rrbracket$

Therefore, the quasi-universal reading of a free choice item (triggered by a universal quantifier) is the correct semantics for an unconditional antecedent.

3 The quantificational force of Spanish free relatives

Gutiérrez Rexach (2002) argues that the quantificational force of free relatives in Spanish correlates with the presence/absence of the free choice morpheme *-quiera*. More specifically:

- (34) *Gutiérrez Rexach's generalization*
 a. Free relatives with free choice morphology are headed by a silent universal quantifier.
 b. Free relatives without free choice morphology are headed by a silent existential quantifier.

Some of his arguments follow (see his paper for a full exposition).

Only free relatives without free choice morphology can appear as arguments to existential verbs

- (35) a. Siempre hay quien llega tarde.
always exists who arrives late
“There is always someone who arrives late”
b. * Siempre hay quien quiera que llega tarde.
always exists who ever that arrives late
“There is always someone who arrives late”

Only free relatives without free choice morphology allow unselective binding of the wh-variable by a higher operator This results in ambiguity.

- (36) a. Juan mayormente adora a quien adoras.
Juan mostly adores to who adore.2SG
Individual reading: Juan adores most of the traits of the person you adore
Situation reading: Juan adores most of the people you adore.
b. Juan mayormente adora a quien quiera que adores.
Juan mostly adores to who ever that adore.2SG
* *Individual reading:* Juan adores most of the traits of the person you adore
Situation reading: Juan adores most of the people you adore.

4 Technical analysis

4.1 Explaining the basic data

Wh-ever unconditionals As Gutiérrez Rexach (2002) showed, the presence of FC morphology entails the presence of a universal operator taking scope over the free relative. Therefore:

- (37) Quien quiera que venga a Berlín, estaré contento.
who ever that comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
“Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”
(38) \llbracket quien quiera que venga a Berlín $\rrbracket =$ let W_i be a non-empty set of possible worlds. This sentence is true in w_0 (the actual world) with respect to W_i iff:
a. Presupposition: $\forall w_1, w_2 \in W_i : \llbracket x$ comes to Berlin $\rrbracket^{w_1} \neq \llbracket x$ comes to Berlin \rrbracket^{w_2} .
b. Assertion: $\llbracket \forall x, w [\text{human}(x, w) \rightarrow \text{come-to-Berlin}(x, w)] \rrbracket$

In prose (38) denotes the exhaustive set of all possible {world,individual} combinations for the clause $\llbracket x$ comes to Berlin in $w \rrbracket$, which is the right semantics for an unconditional antecedent. When composed with the consequent through COND, (38) will result in a set of conditional statements –i.e., a well-formed unconditional.

Bare wh- unconditionals In contrast, free relatives without FC morphology are headed by an existential quantifier.

- (39) * Quien venga a Berlín, estaré contento.
who comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
“Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”

- (40) \llbracket quien venga a Berlín $\rrbracket =$ let W_i be a non-empty set of possible worlds. This sentence is true in w_0 (the actual world) with respect to W_i iff:
- Presupposition: $\forall w_1, w_2 \in W_i : \llbracket x \text{ comes to Berlin} \rrbracket^{w_1} \neq \llbracket x \text{ comes to Berlin} \rrbracket^{w_2}$.
 - Assertion: $\llbracket \exists x, w [\text{human}(x, w) \wedge \text{come-to-Berlin}(x, w)] \rrbracket$

This representation is not ill-formed *per se* (which is why bare *wh*-free relatives are grammatical elsewhere), but it does not correspond to a licit unconditional antecedent. The problem is that it does not correspond to a set of alternatives, but rather only to one such alternative. Hence, when composed with the consequent, the result will not be a set of conditional statements.

Verb doubling unconditionals With this much in place, the derivation of verb doubling unconditionals requires us to say that verb doubling signals the addition of the same universal modal quantifier that we see in *wh-ever* unconditionals.

- (41) Venga quien venga a Berlín, estaré contento.
 comes.SUBJ who comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
 “Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”
- (42) \llbracket venga quien venga a Berlín $\rrbracket =$ let W_i be a non-empty set of possible worlds. This sentence is true in w_0 (the actual world) with respect to W_i iff:
- Presupposition: $\forall w_1, w_2 \in W_i : \llbracket x \text{ comes to Berlin} \rrbracket^{w_1} \neq \llbracket x \text{ comes to Berlin} \rrbracket^{w_2}$.
 - Assertion: $\llbracket \forall x, w [\text{human}(x, w) \rightarrow \text{come-to-Berlin}(x, w)] \rrbracket$

This analysis is supported by the fact that, crosslinguistically, reduplication of indefinites is a relatively common way to signal high degree/universal quantification (cf. Haspelmath 2001).

- (43) *Latin* (Haspelmath 2001, 179)
- quis* ‘who’ vs. *quis-quis* ‘whoever’
 - ubi* ‘where’ vs. *ubi-ubi* ‘wherever’
 - quid* ‘what’ vs. *quid-quid* ‘whatever’

In Latin, a reduplicated *wh*-phrase can head the antecedent of an unconditional, suggesting that reduplication creates the quantificational structure we are after.

- (44) Quid-quid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.
 what-what that is I.fear Danaans even gift bringing
 “Whatever that is, I fear the Danaans even if they bring gifts” [Virgil, ‘Aeneid’: II, 49]

Importantly, we are not saying that the upper verb *is* the universal quantifier –rather, we are saying that the presence of a reduplicated verb *signals* the presence of a universal quantifier in the same way that free choice morphology does. Because of this, a combination of free choice morphology and verb doubling is possible ((7), repeated here as (45)). However, double marking of universal quantification feels redundant to most speakers.

- (45) **Venga** quien *quiera* que **venga** a Berlín, estaré contento.
 comes.SUBJ who ever that comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
 “Whoever comes to Berlin, I’ll be happy”

4.2 Extensions

Our analysis assumes that unconditionality only requires (i) a variable over worlds, and (ii) a universal modal quantifier. The presence of the quantifier can be signaled by FC morphology (-*quiera*) or verb doubling. As for the variable over worlds, we assume that it is contributed by the subjunctive verb, given that, in Spanish, subjunctive is a mood that signals that the model of evaluation has shifted away from the epistemic model of the speaker (Quer 2001). Therefore, the prediction is that verb doubling will also create an unconditional semantics with headed relatives, as long as they have a subjunctive verb.

(46) *Unconditionals with headed relatives*

- a. Venga la persona que venga a Berlín, estaré contento.
comes.SUBJ the person who comes.SUBJ to Berlin will.be happy
“No matter which person comes to Berlín, I’ll be happy”
- b. Leas el libro que leas, no conseguirás encontrar la información que
read.SUBJ the book that read.SUBJ not will.be.able find the information that
necesitas.
need
“No matter which book you read, you won’t be able to find the information you need”

5 Conclusions and prospects

We have shown that verb doubling unconditionals have an unexceptional semantics: they are free choice items under the scope of a universal modal quantifier. The syntactic and semantic properties of verb doubling and *wh-ever* unconditionals follow from this analysis.

- FC morphology, or verb doubling, or both, are necessary because they signal the presence of a universal quantifier over worlds, which is necessary to derive the correct semantics. This also explains why *wh-ever* and verb doubling unconditionals are semantically equivalent.
- The use of the subjunctive is necessary because it contributes a variable over worlds, thus turning the relative clause into a FC item.

On a larger scale, we have shown that some cases of verb doubling are not reducible to pronunciation of multiple links of a movement chain. This conclusion expands the empirical database of doubling constructions.

5.1 Some crosslinguistic considerations: German

Verb doubling unconditionals are not allowed in some languages (English, German...), even though these languages do allow a regular *wh-ever* unconditional.⁵

(47) *English*

- a. Whoever comes to the party, it’ll be a success.
- b. * Comes who(ever) comes to the party, it’ll be a success.

⁵Some languages have a handful of residual cases of verb doubling unconditionals (e.g., French *coûte que coûte* ‘whatever it takes’), although this construction is no longer productive. However, it is reasonable to assume that our analysis for Spanish could be extended to the prior stage where verb doubling unconditionals were productive.

(48) *German*

- a. Wer auch immer zur Party kommt, es wird ein Erfolg werden.
who also always to.the party comes it will a success become
“Whoever comes to the party, it’ll be a success”
- b. * Kommt wer (auch) (immer) zur Party kommt, es wird ein Erfolg werden.
comes who also always to.the party comes it will a success become
“Whoever comes to the party, it’ll be a success”

However, German has a productive construction involving a free relative containing the verb *wollen* ‘to want’ (Anja Kleemann-Krämer and Gisbert Fanselow, p.c.). This alternative reinforces our hypothesis that research on this construction should not focus on the doubling effect, but rather on deriving the correct semantics.

- (49) Komme wer da wolle, das Party wird ein Erfolg werden.
come who EXPL want the party will a success become
“Whoever comes, the party will be a success”

5.2 Further crosslinguistic considerations: Brazilian Portuguese

Brazilian Portuguese has a productive verb doubling unconditional largely equivalent to the Spanish one, except for the fact that strict identity of the two verbs is not always enforced. The generalization seems to be that present tense unconditionals allow a future subjunctive internal to the free relative. Elsewhere, strict identity is required (Jairo Nunes, p.c.).

(50) *Brazilian Portuguese*

- a. Venha quem vier, eu vou embora.
comes.SUBJ.PRES who comes.SUBJ.FUT I go away
“No matter who comes, I’m still leaving”
- b. Seja quem for, eu vou embora.
be.SUBJ.PRES who be.SUBJ.FUT I go away
“No matter who it is, I’m still leaving”

It is possible to find comparable examples in Spanish, although they sound quite archaic.

(51) *Spanish*

- Sea lo que fuere que has leído, deberás presentar un resumen.
be.SUBJ.PRES the that be.SUBJ.FUT that have read must hand.in a summary
“Whatever it is that you have read, you must hand in a summary”

In any case, these examples further confirm our hypothesis that verb doubling unconditionals do not involve multiple pronunciation of chain links.

References

- Bury, Dirk. 2002. Phrase structure and derived heads. Doctoral dissertation, University College London.
- Caponigro, Ivano. 2003. Free not to ask: on the semantics of free relatives and wh- words crosslinguistically. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1997. Free choice and *-ever*: identity and free choice readings. In *Proceedings of SALT VII*.
- Donati, Caterina. 2006. On wh- head movement. In *Wh- movement: moving on*, ed. Cheng and Corver, 21–46. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 24:659–735.
- Gulli, Antonino. 2003. Phrasal reduplication in syntax. Doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Gutiérrez Rexach, Javier. 2002. The semantics of Spanish free relatives. In *Current issues in Romance languages: selected papers from LSRL 29*, ed. Satterfield, Tortora, and Cresti, 111–127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heim, Irene. 1982. The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1977. What ‘must’ and ‘can’ must and can mean. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 1:337–355.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1981. The notional category of modality. In *Words, worlds, and contexts: new approaches in world semantics*, ed. Eikmeyer and Rieser, 38–74. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1986. Conditionals. In *Proceedings of CLS 22*.
- Lewis, David. 1973. *Counterfactuals*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lewis, David. 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In *Formal semantics of natural language*, ed. Keenan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and sideward movement*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Quer, Josep. 1998. Mood at the interface. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utrecht.
- Quer, Josep. 1999. The quantificational force of free choice items. Handout, CSSP’99.
- Quer, Josep. 2001. Interpreting mood. *Probus* 13:81–111.
- Rawlins, Kyle. 2008. (Un)conditionals: an investigation of the syntax and semantics of conditional structures. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Vicente, Luis. 2007. The syntax of heads and phrases: a study of verb (phrase) fronting. Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University.

Josep
Universidad Pompeu Fabra
Departament de Traducció i Ciències del Llenguatge
Roc Boronat 138
01818 Barcelona
Spain

Luis
Institut für Linguistik
Universität Potsdam
Karl Liebknechtstraße 24-25
14476 Golm
Germany

josep.quer@upf.edu

vicente@ling.uni-potsdam.de
<http://www.luisvicente.net>