

Free Choice and Aspect in Hungarian¹

The goal of this paper is to explore the interaction of verbal particles and FCIs in Hungarian. Our proposed solution is that sentences containing verbal particles and FCIs are interpreted as generics/habituals, where the FC-phrase (analyzed as a dependent indefinite) is bound (and thus, licensed) by a silent GEN operator carried by the verbal particle. This proposal is supported by independent evidence (both from Hungarian and cross-linguistic) and fits into current theories FCIs, genericity and the quantificational force of verbal particles. Beside finding that verbal particles in Hungarian are capable of generic quantification, we also show that 1) genericity in Hungarian is primarily a pragmatic phenomenon and that 2) languages differ in terms of the formal semantics of individual-level predicates (presence/absence of inherent GEN operator), and that the licensing of FCIs can be used as a diagnostic tool for this. Our paper also sheds light on the conundrum why FCIs are straightforwardly licensed in generics in many languages (e.g. English) but not in Hungarian. Our results also lend considerable further empirical support to the dependent indefinite analysis of FCIs.

0 Introduction

¹ I wish to thank Katalin É. Kiss, the editors of this volume and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and advice. All remaining errors are mine.

Our goal in this paper is to explore the relationship between verbal particles and FCIs in Hungarian. The solution we shall propose will make use of the formal semantics of FCIs, the semantics/pragmatics of genericity and the quantificational properties of verbal particles. Beside the finding that verbal particles in Hungarian are capable of generic quantification (by virtue of being/providing a locus for a silent GEN operator), we shall also show that 1) genericity in Hungarian is primarily a pragmatic phenomenon and that 2) languages differ in terms of the formal semantics of individual-level predicates (presence/absence of inherent GEN operator), and the licensing of FCIs can be used as a diagnostic tool here. Our paper also sheds light on the conundrum why FCIs are straightforwardly licensed in generics in many languages (e.g. English) but not in Hungarian.

1 The problem: FCIs and Aspect

Our starting observation is that verbal particles (and VMs in general) seem to license FCIs in hostile environments in Hungarian:

- (1) a. **Bármit* *olvasok.*
 anything-ACC read-1PSG
 I read anything.
- b. *Bármit* *el* *olvasok.*
 anything-ACC PRT read-1PSG
 I read anything. (telic)

1). a is a straight episodic sentence, which is a par excellence hostile environment for FCIs cross-linguistically. Nevertheless, the addition of a verbal particle makes the sentence fully acceptable. FCIs in Hungarian are made up of a lexical element with independent meaning and a wh-indefinite and come in two series (*bár-* and *akár-*) which are completely interchangeable in terms of their syntactic and semantic distribution (see Section 3 for more details). Verbal particles in Hungarian are standardly analyzed as secondary predicates predicated of the theme argument that which contribute a telic aspectual interpretation (É. Kiss 2006).

2 FCIs cross-linguistically, theoretical background

Intuitively, FCIs are elements that express free choice (Vendler 1967) and are further distinguished by their (non-)availability in a number of specific environments (the Greek examples are taken from Giannakidou 2001):

Affirmative episodic (Giannakidou 1997):

- (2) **Idha opjondhipote*
 saw.perf.1sg FC-person
 ‘*I saw anybody.’

Modal:

- (3) *Opjosdhipote fititis bori na lisi afto to*
 FC student can SUBJ solve.3sg this the
 provlima.
 problem

‘Any student can solve this problem.’

Generic:

(4) *Opjadhipote ghata kinigai pondikia.*

FC cat hunt.3sg mice

‘Any cat hunts mice.’

Negation²:

(5) **Dhen idha opjondhipote*

not saw.perf.1sg FC-person

‘*I saw anybody.’

One school of thought aimed to analyze FCIs as a class of polarity-sensitive items (Baker 1970), with Ladusaw (1979) distinguishing between two kinds of *any*: polarity-sensitive *any* (appearing in negative contexts) and free-choice *any* (appearing elsewhere). Kadmon-Landman (1993) proposed a uniform analysis of both kinds of *any* (see below).

FCIs have also been closely scrutinized in terms of their quantificational power. While some studies argued for FCIs having a (quasi-)universal quantificational force (Reichenbach 1947, Quine 1960, Horn 1972, ch.3, 2000, Lasnik 1972, Kroch 1975, and Eisner 1995), others aimed to accomodate both a universal and an existential reading of *any* (Horn 1972, ch.2, Ladusaw 1979, Carlson 1981, Linebarger 1981, and Dayal 1998).

The apparently variable quantificational force of indefinites and their special morphological composition in many languages have given rise to the

² Note that English *any* (which *is* licensed under negation) is properly analyzed as a NPI and has a fundamentally different semantics than bona fide FCIs.

analysis of FCIs as indefinites (Heim 1982, Partee 1986, Kadmon and Landman 1993, Lee and Horn 1994, Giannakidou 2001, Kratzer and Shimoyama 2001, Giannakidou and Quer 2012).

Other important factors considered relevant to the behaviour of FCIs include contextual vagueness (Dayal 1997), nonveridicality and nonepidodicity (Giannakidou 1997 and 2001), scalarity (Fauconnier 1975, Lee and Horn 1994, Rooth 1985, Hoeksema and Rullmann 2000, Krifka 1995, Lahiri 1998, Kadmon and Landman 1993) and domain widening (Kadmon-Landman 1993, Aloni 2002).

3 Morphology of FCIs in Hungarian

FCIs in Hungarian are morphologically complex, being made up of a lexical element with independent meaning and a wh-indefinite:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{akár- ('even')} \text{ or } \text{bár- ('even though')} \\
 & + \text{ wh-indefinite } \text{-ki ('who')}, \text{-mi ('what')}, \text{-hol ('when')} \\
 & = \text{ akárki ('anyone')}, \text{ akármi ('anything')}, \text{ akárhol} \\
 & \quad \text{ ('anywhere')}
 \end{aligned}$$

This is in fact a general pattern for quantifiers in Hungarian:

	- <u>ki</u> ('who')	- <u>mi</u> ('what')
akár- ('even')	akár <u>ki</u> ('anyone')	akár <u>mi</u> ('anything')
bár- ('even though')	bár <u>ki</u> ('anyone')	bár <u>mi</u> ('anything')
minden- ('every')	minden <u>ki</u> ('everyone')	minden <u>mi</u> ('everything')
vala- (-)	vala <u>ki</u> ('someone')	vala <u>mi</u> ('something')

Similar patterns have been identified in several languages such as Japanese and Lithuanian (Kratzer-Shimoyama 2002, Abrusán 2007).

A peculiarity of Hungarian is that there are in fact two families of FCIs: the *akár*- ('even') paradigm and the *bár*- ('even though') paradigm. As far as their syntactic distribution and semantics are concerned, these two versions of FCIs (*bár*- and *akár*-) are completely interchangeable. While Szabó (2012) does point out some frequency differences in certain constructions, we believe these are due to stylistic factors rather than grammaticality.

4 Licensing environments of FCIs in Hungarian

As far as licencing environments are concerned, FCIs are ungrammatical in plain episodic affirmative sentences:

- (6) *#Ismerek bárkit.*
 know-1PSG anyone
 'I know anyone.'

They are grammatical in possibility modal contexts:

- (7) *Akárhova (el) utazhatsz.*
 anywhere PRT travel-S2P-POSS
 'You can/may travel anywhere.'

Unlike in many other languages (e.g. English), FCIs in Hungarian are ungrammatical in generic statements:

- (8) **Bármelyik bagoly egerekre vadászik.*

any owl mice-onto hunts

‘Owls hunt mice.’

FCIs are ungrammatical in straight negative episodic sentences:

(9) a. *I did not see anybody.* (PS-*any* in English.)

b. **Nem láttam bárkit.*

Not saw-1PSG anybody.

‘I did not see anybody.’

c. *Nem láttam senkit.*

Not saw-1PSG nobody.

‘I did not see anybody/I saw nobody.’

However, FCIs are grammatical in weakly non-veridical (Tóth 1999)

constructions::

(10) a. *Kevesen mondtak bármit (is).*

few said anything too

‘Few people said anything.’

b. *Ki hallott bármit (is)?*

who heard anything too

‘Who has heard anything?’

c. *Bánom, hogy bármit (is) el mondtam.*

regret-1PSG that anything (too) PRT said-1PSG

‘I regret that I said anything (at all).’

d. *Nem hiszem, hogy bárki (is) el jön.*

NEG believe-1PSG that anyone (too) PRT said-1PSG

‘I do not think that anyone will come.’

In sum, FCIs in Hungarian behave similarly to those in other languages in classical free choice environments, however, they are not licensed in generic constructions. FCIs are not licensed in straight negative sentences but are grammatical in weakly non-veridical constructions. Their superficial absence under straight negation may be connected to Negative Concord, however, we will not pursue this topic any further in this paper.

5 Semantics of FCIs in Hungarian, FCIs and Focus in Hungarian

Abrusán (2007) provided the first and so far only (semantic) analysis of FCIs in Hungarian, concentrating on the FCI *akárki* ‘anyone’. In her account, the FCI *akárki* is composed of two elements:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \textit{akár} \text{ ‘strong even’}: \text{even (additive presupposition) + Exhaustive Operator} \\
 + \text{ -ki ‘who’}: \text{wh-indefinite} \\
 \hline
 = \textit{akárki} \text{ ‘whoever’}: \text{ FCI}
 \end{array}$$

The meaning of *akárki* is thus compositional based on the meanings of its two elements. Abrusán (2007)’s strategy is to first derive the distribution of the particle *akár* and then claim that the distribution of the FCI *akárki* falls out automatically from this. The two meaning components of *akár* (additive presupposition and exhaustivity) are stipulated to clash unless *akár* is situated in a suitable environment (e.g. possibility modal) which defuses this inherent tension.

Halm (2013) offers a critique of Abrusán (2007)’s approach and provides a compositional analysis of Focus+FCI constructions in Hungarian, where the interaction of the semantics of the FCI *bárki* 'anyone' and inferences of existence and exhaustivity that are associated with the focus position are shown to together produce free-relative (*wh-ever*)-like construction.

6 The problem and first approaches

As we have seen in the introduction, verbal particles seem to license FCIs in otherwise hostile environments in Hungarian:

- (11) a. **Bármit* *olvasok.*
 anything-ACC read-1PSG
 ‘I read anything.’
- b. *Bármit* *el* *olvasok.*
 anything-ACC PRT read-1PSG
 ‘I read anything.’ (telic)
- (12) a. **Bármit* *rúgok.*
 anything-ACC kick-1PSG-PRES
 ‘I kick anything.’
- b. *Bármit* *a kapuba* *rúgok.*
 anything-ACC into the goal kick-1PSG-PRES
 ‘I kick anything into the goal.’ (telic)

In this section, we shall outline several possible solutions to this problem and thus clear the way for the actual solution we shall argue for. As a first approach, one may consider the possibility that the sentences with verbal particle have a future reading, which introduces possible worlds and thus renders the FCI grammatical. However, the phenomenon seems to be immune to tense:

- (13) a. *Bármit* **(el) fogok* *olvasni.*
 anything-ACC PRT AUX-FUT-1PSG read-INF
 ‘I will read anything.’
- b. *Gyermekkoromban* *bármit* **(el) olvastam.*
 in my child age anything-ACC PRT read-1PSG -PAST
 ‘As a child, I read anything.’ (telic)

This signals that a future reading, if any, associated by the verbal particle has no role in licensing FCIs in these sentences.

Another approach worth briefly exploring is to consider that the grammatical sentences may contain an implicit subtriggering element (LeGrand1975, Quer 2000):

- (14) *Bármit* *el* *olvasok* *(, ami érdekel*
 anything-ACC PRT read-1PSG-PRES that interests
engem).
 me.
 ‘I read anything that I am interested in.’ (telic).

If this were indeed the case, however, we would erroneously expect (15) to be grammatical too:

- (15) **Bármit* *olvasok* *(, ami érdekel*

anything-ACC read-1PSG-PRES that interests

engem).

me.

‘I read anything that I am interested in.’

This rules out ‘implicit subtriggering’ as a solution to the problem at hand.

Another possible solution is that these sentences have a willingness or capability reading:

(16) *Bármit el olvasok.*

anything-ACC PRT read-1PSG-PRES

‘I read anything.’

~‘I am willing to read anything.’

~‘I can read anything.’

This quasi-modal, non-episodic environment could license FCIs (Aloni 2002). The capability reading may be triggered by the telicity introduced by the the verbal particle (É. Kiss 2006). In a telic event, the event described is carried out in its entirety (Tenny 1994), hence the non-episodic capability-willingness reading. This proposal is intuitively appealing but difficult to formalize.

A fourth, and, as we shall argue, more appropriate track is to assume that these sentences are interpreted not modally but generically/habitually:

(17) a. *#Bármit el olvastam.*

anything-ACC PRT read-1PSG -PAST

‘I read anything.’ (telic)

b. *Gyerekkoromban bármit el olvastam.*

in my child age anything-ACC PRT read-1PSG -PAST

‘As a child, I read anything.’ (telic)

The contrast between the two sentences may be motivated as follows.

(17) a. is ambiguous between an episodic and a generic reading; it is degraded on the episodic reading but grammatical/felicitous on the generic reading.

This means that in the absence of any contextual or grammatical cues directing the hearer to either the episodic or the generic reading, the acceptability of the sentence is questionable. In (17) b., the generic reading is facilitated by the presence of the adverb. Since this reading is favourable to the presence of an FCI, the sentence as a whole is perceived as grammatical/felicitous as the more prominent generic reading can readily accomodate an FCI.

This of course raises the question of how exactly the presence of the verbal particle is connected to a generic reading. The intuitive reasoning (to be made more specific later one) is that the verbal particle quantizes the predicate, which then can be interpreted iteratively, resulting in a habitual-generic reading, which licenses the FCI.

While this is an appealing explanation, it hits one major hurdle: as we have seen above, generics in general do not license FCIs in Hungarian.

(18) a. **Bármelyik bagoly egerészik.*

any owl mouse-hunts

‘Owls hunt mice.’

b. *A baglyok egerésznek.*

the owls mouse-hunt

‘Owls hunt mice.’

- c. *A bagoly egerészik.*
any owl mice-hunts
‘Owls hunt mice.’

A more formal account is needed for clarity. This account will have three ingredients:

- The formal semantics of FCIs
- The semantic/pragmatic treatment of generics in Hungarian and in other languages
- The analysis of verbal particles as quantifiers

7 Formal semantics of FCIs

The two currently preeminent schools of the formal semantics of FCIs are 1) the so-called dependent indefinite analysis (Giannakidou 1997, 2001, Giannakidou and Quer 2012) and 2) the universal free choice analysis (involving propositional alternatives and Hamblin sets) (Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002, Aloni 2007, Menéndez-Benito 2010).

In this paper, we adopt the dependent indefinite analysis. A key characteristic of this approach is that the distribution of FCIs is derived from their lexical semantics. FC phrases are represented as intensional indefinites, which are grammatical only in contexts providing alternatives (worlds or situations). FCIs are thus licensed in non-veridical and non-episodic contexts (e.g. modals, generics), and ungrammatical in extensional veridical contexts

(e.g. episodic sentences, negation, interrogatives). More formally, FC phrases are represented as:

$$[[\text{bárki}]] = \text{one}(x)(w) \text{ (or: } \text{one}(x)(s))$$

The world/situation and individual variable(s) cannot be bound by existential closure and need to be bound by an appropriate Q-operator (i.e. generic, habitual, modal, intensional) in order for the FC phrase to be licensed. Moreover, FCIs have the lexical semantic feature of exhaustive variation: the denotation assigned the FC-phrase must differ in each world/situation under consideration. Under this analysis, the universality of FCIs is derived from exhaustive variation: the FCI variable is to be assigned a distinct value in each world or situation under consideration (Dayal 1997: i-alternatives), unlike with true universals, where the universal quantifier exhausts the possible values that can be given to a variable in a given world.

8 The formal semantics of generics

The starting point for the study of genericity (Krifka et al. 1995) is to differentiate between particular sentences and characterizing sentences, where, on a more formal level, the latter are taken to contain a generic quantifier which quantifies over individuals or situations (occasions, cases) (Lawler 1972, Schubert and Pelletier 1989). This generic quantifier Q may be

realized as an adverb (*usually, typically, in general*) or as a phonologically null GEN operator. A generic sentence is then represented as a three-part structure:

$$Q[x_1, \dots, x_i; y_1, \dots, y_j] (\mathbf{Restrictor}[x_1, \dots, x_i]; \mathbf{Matrix}[\{x_1\}, \dots, \{x_i\}; y_1, \dots, y_j])$$

where x: variables to be bound by Q, y: variables to be bound existentially with scope just in the matrix

Thus, the generic sentence *Mary smokes when she comes home*. involves quantification over situations:

$$\mathbf{GEN}[x, s;] (x = \mathbf{Mary} \ \& \ x \ \mathbf{comes \ home} \ \text{in } s; \ x \ \mathbf{smokes} \ \text{in } s)$$

To phrase it somewhat intuitively, habitual sentences are derived through GEN/Q from episodic sentences. In episodic sentences, the main predicate has a situation argument bound by existential closure; whereas in habitual/generic sentences, the situation variable is bound by some generic operator other than existential closure (Q-Adverb, phonologically null GEN).

8.1 Excursus: HAB vs. GEN

It is important to note at this point that the class of generic operators is analysed as heterogeneous by many authors. In Rimell (2004) on genericity in English, the silent HAB operator (identified with an aspectual head within the IP domain) is taken to have different syntactic/semantic properties from overt Q-adverbs (cf. also Filip 1994, Filip and Carlson 1997, Dahl 1995: habitual morpheme in Czech and Slovak).

8.2 Excursus: individual-level predicates vs. stage-level predicates

An important distinction which we shall utilize heavily is that between individual-level predicates (expressing permanent and essential properties; properties of individuals) and stage-level predicates (expressing transitory and accidental properties, properties of stages of individuals) Carlson (1977).

In Kratzer (1995), the ILP-SLP distinction is located in argument structure, identified as the presence or absence of a Davidsonian argument for the spatio-temporal location of the eventuality described:

**Always when Mary knows French, she knows it well.*

ALWAYS[KNOW(M,FRENCH)] [KNOW_WELL(M,FRENCH)]

->vacuous quantification

Always when Mary speaks French, she speaks it well.

ALWAYS_s[SPEAK(M,FRENCH,s)][KNOW_WELL(M,FRENCH,s)]

In Chierchia (1995), both ILPs and SLPs are assumed to have a Davidsonian event / situation argument, which in the case of ILPs is inherently bound by GEN. Under this analysis:

- SLPs by themselves have a normal stage-level reading. In case a generic operator (phonologically null quantificational adverb) appears in the specifier position of an aspectual/habitual functional projection, a habitual individual-level reading arises.
- ILPs are ‘inherently generic’ in the sense that a lexically in-built generic feature forces the presence of GEN in their local environment.

It is important to note at this point that whether genericity is semantically coded in every language or is a matter of pragmatics is debated (cf. Behrens 2000, Vogel-McGillion 2002, Eszes 2006, Alberti 2009 for Hungarian). Alberti (2009) argues that genericity in Hungarian is a pragmatic

phenomenon, whereas Eszes (2006) provides a formal semantic analysis of habituals and generics but without especially focusing on Hungarian.

9 Verbal particles as quantifiers

The quantificational properties of verbal particles in several languages have been explored by numerous authors (Filip 1996, cf. Arsenijevic 2007, Di Sciullo-Slabakova 2005, Ramchand 2004, Svenonius 2004).

In Filip (1996), lexical V-operators (~verbal particles) in Czech are analyzed as lexical A-quantifiers (much like adverbs of quantification) quantifying over episodic situations specified by stage-level predicates, binding individual variables introduced by nominal arguments (e.g. incremental theme) and possibly the event variable too. (Or neither if neither is available.)

10 Generics and FCIs in Hungarian

With the 3 ingredients of our proposal in place, let us have a closer look at the interaction of FCIs and verbal particles in Hungarian:

- (19) a. *A sertések takarmányt esznek.*
 the pigs fodder eat

 A sertések esznek takarmányt.
 the pigs eat fodder

‘Pigs eat fodder.’ (generic)

- b. ??A *sertések bármit esznek.*

the pigs anything eat

?A *sertések esznek bármit.*

the pigs eat anything

‘Pigs eat anything.’ (generic)

- c. A *sertések bármit ehetnek.*

the pigs anything eat-POSS

A *sertések ehetnek bármit.*

the pigs eat-POSS anything

‘Pigs may eat anything.’ (modal)

- d. A *sertések bármit meg-esznek.*

the pigs anything PRT-eat

A *sertések meg-esznek bármit.*

the pigs PRT-eat anything

‘Pigs eat anything.’ (generic)

Unsurprisingly, FCIs are unproblematic in the clearly modal environment of (19) c. More intriguingly, while both (19) b. and (19) d. are generic statements, the former is clearly degraded why the latter is fully acceptable.

11 Pragmatic factors of genericity in Hungarian

We shall argue that the acceptability of FCIs in generics without the verbal particle is sensitive to pragmatic-contextual cues and world knowledge:

- Tense: the present more easily associated with a generic reading than the past

(20) a. ??A *sertések ettek bármit.*

the pigs ate anything

‘Pigs ate anything.’ (generic)

b. ?A *sertések esznek bármit.*

the pigs eat anything

‘Pigs eat anything.’ (generic)

- World knowledge: Pigs are known for their indiscriminate feeding habits. Guests as a kind have no known propensity for indiscriminate mowing/shearing of things.

(21) a. ???A *vendégek nyírnak bármit.*

the guests shear/mow anything.

‘Guests mow anything.’ (generic)

b. ?A *sertések esznek bármit.*

the pigs eat anything

‘Pigs eat anything.’ (generic)

Note that all these contrasts disappear with the verbal particle:

(22) a. A *vendégek megnyírnak bármit.*

the guests PRT-shear/mow anything.

‘Guests mow anything.’ (generic)

b. A *sertések megesznek bármit.*

the pigs PRT-eat anything

‘Pigs eat anything.’ (generic)

(23) a. A *sertések megettek bármit.*

the pigs PRT-ate anything

‘Pigs ate anything.’ (generic)

b. *A sertések megesznek bármit.*

the pigs PRT-eat anything

‘Pigs eat anything.’ (generic)

12 Genericity: syntax/semantics or pragmatics?

To summarize, the picture that emerges of the availability of FCIs in generics in Hungarian is as follows:

- FCIs without a verbal particle: the sentence is degraded, and the degree of degradedness is dependent on pragmatic factors.
- FCIs with a verbal particle: the sentence is fully acceptable, independently of pragmatic factors.

This leads us back to the question we already alluded to above: whether in any given language, genericity is a syntax/semantics-level phenomenon or a pragmatics-level phenomenon. While in many languages (Catalan, Greek etc.³) FCIs are unambiguously licensed, we have seen that in Hungarian, the acceptability is degraded and is heavily dependent on pragmatic factors of genericity. Based on this observation, we propose the following conjecture about the correlation of FCI-licensing in generics and the nature of genericity across languages:

³ Note that English *any* is a separate case as it lacks a world/situation variable (Giannakidou 2001) and is thus not in need of being bound by a GEN operator.

LANGUAGE	FCI-LICENSING IN GENERICS	NATURE OF GENERICITY
Catalan, Greek, ...	Strong ¹	Syntactic/semantic
Hungarian, ...	Weak ²	Pragmatic
1: unambiguously grammatical/felicitous, insensitive to pragmatic factors		
2: degraded, sensitive to pragmatic factors		

In support of this conjecture, one has to recall that under the dependent indefinite analysis, FC-phrases are supposed to be bound (and thus licensed) in generics by the silent generic operator GEN. This readily explains the clear availability of FCIs in generics in Catalan and Greek. The degraded acceptability of FCIs in generics in Hungarian can then, as a logical conclusion, be attributed to the lack of a silent generic operator GEN in Hungarian. The lack of such an operator would of course mean that genericity in Hungarian is coded not by syntactic/semantic but rather pragmatic means. To turn this conjecture into a well-supported thesis, we have to examine whether there is any independent evidence pointing to the pragmatic encoding of genericity in Hungarian

13 Genericity in Hungarian: a matter of pragmatics?

First of all, genericity has indeed been analysed in Hungarian as a matter of pragmatics in Alberti (2009). A second piece of corroborating evidence comes from examining the licensing of FCIs in individual-level predicateds (ILPs).

FCIs are licensed in ILPs in English and Greek (Giannakidou 2001) but ungrammatical in Hungarian:

- (24) a. *I Ariadne gnorizi opjondhipote sto tmima.*
the Ariadne knows anyone in-the department
‘Ariadne knows anybody in the department.’
- b. **Ariadné ismer bárkit a tanszéken.*
Ariadne knows anyone the department-on
‘Ariadne knows anybody in the department.’

Note that there is an exact correspondence between whether FCIs are licensed in generics and whether they are licensed in ILPs.

At this point, we should recall that while on Chierchia (1995)’s account, ILPs contain an inherent GEN operator, on Kratzer (1995)’s account, no such operator is assumed. Under our assumption that FCI-licensing in generics involves generic quantification (Giannakidou 2001), whether or not FCIs are licensed in ILPs depends on whether ILPs contain a generic operator. The fact that FCIs are licensed in English and Greek ILPs is strong evidence that it is correct to characterize them as Chierchia (1995)-style ILPs. On the contrary, the lack of FCI-licensing in Hungarian ILPs means that they are more properly characterized as GEN-less, i.e., Kratzer (1995)-style ILPs. This means that the absence/presence of FCIs in generics (incl. ILPs) in a given language can actually be used as a diagnostic as to the formal semantics of ILPs.

This result provides strong support to our hypothesis that the weak (pragmatic) licensing of FCIs in generics in Hungarian is due to the fact that Hungarian lacks a silent GEN operator (and thus, genericity is encoded pragmatically).

This state of affairs, however, raises the following question: if there is no GEN operator in generics in Hungarian, how exactly are FCIs licenced in

sentences with verbal particles? Since in Catalan and Greek, strong licensing of FCIs in generics is correlated with the presence of a GEN operator, a promising path to explore is whether verbal particles in Hungarian carry such an operator:

LANGUAGE	FCI-LICENSING IN GENERICS	NATURE OF GENERICITY
Catalan, Greek, ...	Strong	Syntactic/semantic
Hungarian w/o verbal p.	Weak	Pragmatic
Hungarian with verbal p.	Strong	Syntactic/Semantic

14 The licensing of FCIs by verbal particles

Thus, our proposal would be that verbal particles carry a GEN/HAB operator which can bind the situation argument of FC-phrases conceived as intensional indefinites. As a matter of fact, there are several pieces of independent corroborating evidence that point in this direction.

First, cross-linguistically, verbal particles are known in many languages to display quantificational properties (Filip 1996, cf. Arsenijevic 2007, Di Sciullo-Slabakova 2005, Ramchand 2004, Svenonius 2004).

Second, In Hungarian, the phenomenon of verbal particle reduplication (Piñón 1991, Kiefer 1995, Dékány-Márkus 2009) suggests that verbal particles have a quantificational role:

- (25) a. *Éva kinyitja az ablakot.*
 Eva PRT-opens the window.

‘Eve opens the window.’

b. *Éva ki-kinyitja az ablakot.*

Eva PRT-PRT-opens the window.

‘Eve opens the window every now and then / regularly.’

Dékány-Márkus (2009) specifically attribute an erratic meaning (repetition of the action at irregular intervals) to this construct. My proposal is that this construct simply carries a habitual-iterative meaning: irregularity/regularity is not part of the core meaning. (In corpora, one can find several instances of reduplication with adverbs expressing regularity such as *rendszeresen* ‘regularly’, *naponta* ‘on a daily basis’.)

Finally, recall that Rimell (2004)’s analysis on generics in English locates the HAB operator in AspP. Note that the verbal particle in Hungarian has been analysed as filler of Spec,AspP position (Piñon (1995), É. Kiss (2002), Alberti (2004), or den Dikken (2004), though cf. É. Kiss (2006) for a different analysis).

Put together, these are robust pieces of evidence that verbal particles in Hungarian can carry a generic operator, which in turn can license a FC-phrase represented as an intensional indefinite. It is important to note at this point that this account capitalizes heavily on the central features of the dependent indefinite analysis of FCIs (Giannakidou 1997, 2001, Giannakidou and Quer 2012) such as the quantification over the world/situation variable of a dependent indefinite as the licensing condition of FCIs. As far as other theories of FCIs such as the propositional framework (Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002, Aloni 2007, Menéndez-Benito 2010) are concerned, it is difficult to see how they could be made accommodate the phenomenon we are

examining. To this extent, our analysis supports the dependent indefinite model of FCIs.

15 Main conclusions

To summarize, the goal of this paper was to explore the interaction of verbal particles and FCIs in Hungarian. Our proposed solution is that sentences containing verbal particles and FCIs are interpreted as generics/habituals, and the FC-phrase (analyzed as a dependent indefinite) is bound (and thus, licensed) by a silent GEN operator carried by the verbal particle. This proposal is supported by independent evidence (both from Hungarian and cross-linguistic) and fits into current theories FCIs, genericity and the quantificational force of verbal particles. Beside the finding that verbal particles in Hungarian are capable of generic quantification, we have also shown that 1) genericity in Hungarian is primarily a pragmatic phenomenon and that 2) languages differ in terms of the formal semantics of individual-level predicates (presence/absence of inherent GEN operator), and the licensing of FCIs can be used as a diagnostic tool here. Our paper also sheds light on the conundrum why FCIs are straightforwardly licensed in generics in many languages (e.g. English) but not in Hungarian. Finally, our results lend considerable further empirical support to the dependent indefinite analysis of FCIs.

Literature

- Abrusán, Márta. 2007. Even and free-choice any in Hungarian. In Estela Puig-Waldmüller (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 11, 1-15. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Alberti, Gábor. 2004. Climbing for aspect: With no rucksack. In Katalin É. Kiss and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Verb Clusters. A Study of Hungarian, German and Dutch*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins 253-290.
- Alberti, Gábor. 2009. Genericity in Hungarian, Handout, ICSH9, Debrecen.
- Aloni, Maria. 2002. Free choice in modal contexts. In Matthias Weisgerber (ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 7, 25-37. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz.
- Arsenijevic, Boban. 2007. A unified analysis of two classes of Slavic verb-prefixes. In *Proceedings of ConSOLE XIV*. Leiden.
- Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara H. Partee, eds. 2007. *Quantification in Natural Languages*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Behrens, Leila. 2000. Typological parameters of genericity. (Arbeitspapier Nr. 37 (Neue Folge)). Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität zu Köln.
- Carlson, G. 1977. Reference to Kinds in English. University of Massachusetts/Amherst, dissertation.
- Chierchia, Gennaro (1995), 'Individual-level Predicates as Inherent Generics'. In Gregory N. Carlson and Francis J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*. University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London. 176–223.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1997. Free choice and ever: Identity and free choice readings. In Aaron Lawson (ed.), *Proceedings of SALT 7*, 99–116. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Dékány Éva – Márkus Andrea. 2009. Reduplication in Hungarian. The Third Scandinavian Ph.D. Conference in Linguistics and Philology in Bergen, abstract.
- Dikken, Marcel den 2004. 'Agreement and „clause union”.' In Katalin É. Kiss and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), 445-495.
- Di Sciullo, A.-M. & R. Slabakova 2005. Quantification and aspect. In Van Hout, A., H. de Swart & H. J. Verkuyl (eds.), *Perspectives on Aspect*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, 61-80.
- É. Kiss, Katalin 2002. *The Syntax of Hungarian*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. 2006. The function and the syntax of the verbal particle. In: É. Kiss K. (ed.) *Event structure and the Left Periphery*. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. Springer, Dordrecht.

- Eszes, Boldizsár. 2006. A habituális mondatok eseményszerkezete [The event structure of habitual sentences]. In: Gárgyán, G. and Sinkovics, B. (eds.) *LingDok 5* [Proceedings of the 8th Conference of Doctoral Students in Linguistics], Szeged.
- Filip, Hana. 1996. Quantification, aspect and lexicon. In Geert-Jan Kruijff, Glynn Morrill, and Dick Oehrle (eds.) 1996. *Proceedings of FORMAL GRAMMAR*. Eighth European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information. Prague, Czech Republic, 43-56.
- Filip, H., & Carlson, G. (1997). Sui generis genericity. In Proceedings of the 21st Penn Linguistics Colloquium (Vol. 4).
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1997. The Landscape of Polarity Items, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24. 659–735.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia and Josep Quer. 2012. Against universal free choice: free choice and referentially vague indefinites in Greek, Catalan, and Spanish. Ms. under submission.
- Halm, Tamás. 2013. Free choice and Focus: FCIs in Hungarian. In Balázs Surány (ed.) *Proceedings of the Second Central European Conference in Linguistics for Postgraduate Students*, Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest.
- Kadmon, Nirit, and Fred Landman. 1993. Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4. 353–422.
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 1996. Prefix reduplication in Hungarian. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 43, 175–194.
- Kratzer, A. 1995. "Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates". In Carlson, G. N. and F. J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*.
- Kratzer, Angelika, and Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese. In Yukio Otsu (ed.), *The Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, 1–25. Tokyo: Hituzi Publishing Company.
- Krifka, Manfred, et al. 1995. Genericity: An Introduction. In: G.N. Carlson and F.J. Pelletier (eds.), *The Generic Book*, 1-124. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Menéndez-Benito, Paula (2010): "On Universal Free Choice Items". *Natural Language Semantics* 18(1), 33-64.
- Piñón, Christopher 1991. Falling in paradise: verbs, preverbs, and reduplication in Hungarian. Handout for syntax workshop talk, Stanford University, 21 May 1991.

- Piñon, Christopher 1995. Around the Progressive in Hungarian. In István Kenesei (ed.), 153-190.
- Ramchand, G. (2005). Time and the event: The semantics of Russian prefixes. *Nordlyd*, 32(2).
- Rimell (2004)
- Szabó, Martina. 2012. A *bárki* nem *akárki*, avagy a *bár-* és *akár-* elemek eltérő nyelvi sajátosságai. [*Bárki* and *akárki* are not the same: grammatical differences of *bár-* and *akár-* words.] Paper presented at the Conference of Doctoral Students, University of Szeged, 31 May.
- Tenny, Carol 1994. Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Vogel, Carl – Michelle McGillion 2002: Genericity is Conceptual, not Semantic, in G. Alberti – K. Balogh – P. Dekker eds.: Proc's of the Seventh Symp. on Logic and Language, U. Pécs, 163–172.