1 Introduction

• Free choice items (FCIs) have received much attention in the semantic literature. (Carlson 1981, Kadmon and Landman 1993, Dayal 1998, von Fintel 2000, Chierchia 2013, Condoravdi 2015 among many others).

• English FC *any* seems to have two types of quantificational interpretations: a universal-like reading as in (1a), and an existential-like interpretation as in (1b).

(1) a. Any student can solve the problem.
≈ Every student, even a dull one, can solve the problem.
b. Pick any card.
≈ Pick a card, whatever it is.

• What characterizes FCIs compared to universal and existential quantifiers is the “intensionality”: FCIs are licensed only in intensional contexts and FCIs have intensional interpretations.

• It is well known that unlike genuine universal quantifiers or indefinite articles, FCIs are licensed in intensional contexts such as under the scope of modals, but not in episodic contexts, as shown in (2).

(2) a. Any student can solve the problem. (intensional)
b. *Any student solved the problem yesterday. (episodic)
c. Every student solved the problem yesterday. (Non-FCI)

• The intensionality in interpretation can be further decomposed into three components: counterfactuality, ignorance inference, and indifference inference.2

1. Counterfactuality: FCIs quantify over individuals that are not in the extension of the restrictor at the actual world (cf. (2a) vs. (2c)).

2. Ignorance inference: it is implicated that the speaker does not know the identity of the individuals in the domain: in the case of (2a), if the speaker is talking about students in a university, s/he does not (have to) know each student in that university.

3. Indifference inference: it is implicated that the speaker does not care about the identity: this is found in (1b), where the speaker does not care about what card the hearer picks up.

⇒ The literature has tried to understand where these FC properties come from.

• In this paper, I will examine how these FC properties are encoded in the Japanese FCIs.

• Japanese FCIs are morphologically more complex than English *any*, because they are typically composed of wh-items and a scalar focus particle -demo, as shown in (3).

(3) Dono-gakusei-demo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.
which-student-even that-problem-nom solve-can
‘Any student can solve the problem.’

⇒ This indicates that whatever analysis has been proposed to indefinite FCIs like English *any* (e.g., Dayal 2013, Chierchia 2013) cannot be extended to Japanese FCIs, because Japanese FCIs are not single lexical items but are built up from parts that are also used outside of FCIs.

• Interestingly, FCIs are morphologically very similar to universal quantifiers (UQs) in Japanese: Japanese UQs are composed of wh-items and an additive particle *mo*, as in (4).

(4) Dono-gakusei-mo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.
which-student-also that-problem-nom solve-can
‘Every student can solve the problem.’
The only surface morphological difference between FCIs and UQs in Japanese is whether \textit{de} is present or not.

\implies I will argue that \textit{de} in Japanese \textit{wh-demo} is a copula which is tied with subjunctive mood, which contributes to the FC interpretation, especially the counterfactuality.

In this sense, \textit{wh-demo} is not a free choice “item”, but a free choice “clause”, since it involves a clausal structure and hence not a single item.

\implies I will thus argue that the whole sentence which involves \textit{wh-demo} is essentially an unconditional construction.

This is similar to Kim and Kaufmann’s (2006) analysis of Korean FCIs, which consist of a wh-item and a disjunctive particle: They propose under the dynamic semantics framework that Korean FCIs involve a conditional semantics.

However, our proposal derives the conditional semantics in a more compositional way.

In addition, I will discuss a phrase \\textit{ii-kara}, which is used with \textit{wh-demo} to obtain an existential-like interpretation.

\implies I will argue that this phrase ‘closes’ the domain of quantification of \textit{wh-demo} and gives rise to an existential-like interpretation as a default option. I will also propose that this phrase contributes to the indifference inference of \textit{wh-demo} somewhat directly.

2 \textit{Wh-demo} as an FC Expression in Japanese

In this section, I show basic properties of \textit{wh-demo} in Japanese and argue that \textit{wh-demo} is indeed a Japanese counterpart of an FCI.

In section 2.1, I review Oda’s (2013) work on the distribution of \textit{wh-demo} and show that \textit{wh-demo} shows (almost) the same distribution as FCIs in other languages. This means that \textit{wh-demo} is sensitive to intensionality in terms of licensing contexts.

In section 2.2., I show that \textit{wh-demo} has a counterfactual implication like FCIs in other languages.

These two points lead us to conclude that \textit{wh-demo} is a genuine FC expression in Japanese.

2.1 Licensing contexts of \textit{wh-demo}

Oda (2013) observes that \textit{wh-demo} is licensed in intensional contexts like FCIs in other languages: \textit{wh-demo} is licensed by ability modals (5), future tense (6), habituals (7), generics (8), and stative verbs (9), and has a universal-like reading.\footnote{To be precise, stative verbs are not necessarily intensional contexts, but can be understood as a sort of generic context. Here I simply follow Oda (2013), who adopts the classification of licensing contexts in the literature.}

(5) Dono-gakusei-demo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru. (= (3))
\begin{verbatim}
which-student-demo that-problem-nom solve-can
\end{verbatim}
‘Any student can solve the problem.’

(6) Dono-otoko-demo kono-tsukue-o mochiageru daroo.
\begin{verbatim}
which-student-demo this-table-acc lift will
\end{verbatim}
‘Any man will lift this table.’ (Oda 2013)

(7) Taro-wa taiitei dono-hon-demo chuui-bukaku yomu.
\begin{verbatim}
Taro-top usually which-book-demo carefully read
\end{verbatim}
‘Taro usually reads any book carefully.’ (Oda 2013)

(8) Dono-fukurou-demo nezumi-o karu.
\begin{verbatim}
which/owl-de\textsubscript{mo} mouse-acc hunt
\end{verbatim}
‘Any owl hunts mice.’ (Oda 2013)

(9) Dono-seito-demo sono-sensei-o sonkeishiteiru.
\begin{verbatim}
which-student-demo that-teacher-acc respect
\end{verbatim}
‘Any student respects the teacher.’ (Oda 2013)

Unlike FCIs in other languages, however, \textit{wh-demo} is not licensed in comparatives (10). Instead, a UQ has to be used in comparatives as in (11).

(10) * Taro-wa (hokano) {dono-kurasumeeto yori demo}
\begin{verbatim}
Taro-top other which-classmate than demo
/dono-kurasumeeto-demo yori} hayaku hashiru.
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
/which-classmate-than fast run
‘Taro runs faster than any other classmate.’ (Adapted from Oda 2013)
\end{verbatim}

(11) Taro-wa (hokano) {dono-kurasumeeto yori mo}
\begin{verbatim}
Taro-top other which-classmate than mo
/*/dono-kurasumeeto-mo yori} hayaku hashiru.
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
/which-classmate-than fast run
‘Taro runs faster than any other classmate.’
\end{verbatim}

\implies I will argue in section 3 that the unavailability of \textit{wh-demo} in comparatives stems from the syntactic properties of \textit{wh-demo} and \textit{yori}, so that the argument for \textit{wh-demo} being an FC expression is intact.

For diagnostics of the universal-like reading, see Appendix.

There is another context which licenses FCIs in other languages: imperatives. As shown in (12), which is repeated from (1b), imperatives host an FC \textit{any}.

(12) * Taro-wa (hokano) \{dono-kurasumeeto yori\}
\begin{verbatim}
Taro-top other which-classmate than
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
/dono-kurasumeeto yori} hayaku hashiru.
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
/which-classmate-than fast run
‘Taro runs faster than any other classmate.’
\end{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
\textsubscript{Oda (2013)}
\end{verbatim}
• Wh-demo, however, is degraded in imperatives, as shown in (13).

\[ \text{(13)} \quad \text{?? Dono-kaado-demo tori-nasai.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-card-demo take-IMP} \]
\[ \quad \text{Pick any card; lit. Pick some, whichever card it is.} \]
\[ \quad \text{(Adapted from Oda 2013)} \]

• Interestingly, (13) becomes perfectly acceptable when a phrase \textit{ii-kara} 'good-because' is added, as in (14).

\[ \text{(14)} \quad \text{Dono-kaado-demo ii-kara tori-nasai.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-card-demo good-because take-IMP} \]
\[ \quad \text{Pick any card.} \] (Oda 2013)

• In the case of imperatives, \textit{wh-demo} seems to have an existential-like interpretation like FCIs in other languages, in the sense that the hearer can pick up at least one card and does not have to (but can) pick up all the cards.

- Oda (2013) points out that an existential quantifier can co-occur with \textit{wh-demo} in this case, as shown in (15).

\[ \text{(15)} \quad \text{Dono-kaado-demo ii-kara doreka tori-nasai.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-card-demo good-because something take-IMP} \]
\[ \quad \text{Pick any card; lit. Pick some, whichever card it is.} \]
\[ \quad \text{(Adapted from Oda 2013)} \]

• In addition, numeral 'one' can co-occur with \textit{wh-demo} as shown in (16).

\[ \text{(16)} \quad \text{Dono-kaado-demo ii-kara ichi-mai tori-nasai.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-card-demo good-because one-cl take-IMP} \]
\[ \quad \text{Pick any card; lit. Pick one, whichever card it is.} \] (Oda 2013)

• Note that neither an existential quantifier nor numeral 'one' can co-occur with \textit{wh-demo} in contexts where \textit{wh-demo} has a universal-like interpretation, as illustrated in (17) and (18).

\[ \text{(17)} \quad \text{a. * Dono-gakusei-demo doreka sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-student-demo good-because that-problem-nom solve-can} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any student can solve the problem.} \]
\[ \text{b. * Dono-otoko-demo doreka kono-tsukue-o mochiageru daroo.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-student-demo good-because this-table-acc lift will} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any man will lift this table.} \] (Oda 2013)
\[ \text{c. * Taro-wa taitei dono-hon-demo doreka chuubibukaku yomu.} \]
\[ \quad \text{Taro-top usually which-book-demo something carefully} \]
\[ \quad \text{Read ‘Taro usually reads any book carefully.’} \] (Oda 2013)

\[ \text{(18)} \quad \text{a. * Dono-gakusei-demo hito-ri sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-student-demo one-cl that-problem-nom solve-can} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any student can solve the problem.} \]
\[ \text{b. * Dono-otoko-demo hito-ri kono-tsukue-o mochiageru daroo.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-student-demo one-cl that-problem-acc lift will} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any man will lift this table.} \] (Oda 2013)
\[ \text{c. * Taro-wa taitei dono-hon-demo is-satsu chuubibukaku yomu.} \]
\[ \quad \text{Taro-top usually which-book-demo one-cl carefully} \]
\[ \quad \text{Read ‘Taro usually reads any book carefully.’} \] (Oda 2013)
\[ \text{d. * Dono-fukurou-demo ichi-wa nezumi-o karu.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-owl-demo one-cl mouse-acc hunt} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any owl hunts mice.} \]
\[ \text{e. * Dono-seito-demo hito-ri sono-sensei-o sonkeishiteiru.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-student-demo one-cl that-teacher-acc respect} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any student respects the teacher.} \]

⇒ These data thus show that \textit{wh-demo} can have an existential-like reading in imperatives like FCIs in other languages (but only in the presence of \textit{ii-kara}).

• Moreover, \textit{ii-kara} cannot be used in contexts where \textit{wh-demo} receives the universal-like reading, as shown in (19).

\[ \text{(19)} \quad \text{a. * Dono-gakusei-demo ii-kara sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-student-demo good-because that-problem-nom solve-can} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any student can solve the problem.} \]
\[ \text{b. * Dono-otoko-demo ii-kara kono-tsukue-o mochiageru daroo.} \]
\[ \quad \text{which-student-demo good-because this-table-acc lift will} \]
\[ \quad \text{Any man will lift this table.} \] (Oda 2013)
\[ \text{c. * Taro-wa taitei dono-hon-demo ii-kara chuubibukaku yomu.} \]
\[ \quad \text{Taro-top usually which-book-demo good-because carefully} \]
\[ \quad \text{Read ‘Taro usually reads any book carefully.’} \] (Oda 2013)
Thus, the presence of *ii-kara correlates with the existential-like reading of *wh-demo.*

In section 4, I will argue that actually *wh-demo* itself does not have an existential-like reading (i.e., *wh-demo* is always universal quantificational), and that *ii-kara* introduces two clauses, in one of which quantification of *wh-demo* is completed and in the other of which there is an existential/singular interpretation as a default option.

• Lastly, *wh-demo* cannot be used in episodic contexts, as shown in (20).

   I-TOP yesterday which-book-DEM read-pst
   ‘*I read any book yesterday.’ (Oda 2013)

   I-TOP yesterday which-book-DEM read-not-pst
   ‘*I didn’t read any book yesterday.’ (Oda 2013)

Thus, *wh-demo* shows the same distribution with FCIs in other languages except for comparatives: *wh-demo* is licensed in intensional contexts, but not in episodic contexts, and the interpretations that *wh-demo* receives vary depending on the contexts (i.e., imperatives vs. the others).

2.2 Counterfactuality

• As we saw in section 1, English FC *any* carries a counterfactual implication, as illustrated in (21). This counterfactual implication is not observed with a UQ as in (22).

(21) *Any student can solve the problem.
  ↳ If there were more students, they would also be able to solve the problem.

(22) *Every student can solve the problem.
  ↳ If there were more students, they would also be able to solve the problem.

• Crucially, Japanese *wh-demo* also carries the same implication. Thus, in (3), which is repeated as (23) here, it is implicated that if there were more students, they would also be able to solve the problem.

(23) **Dono-gakusei-demo** sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.
    which-student-DEM that-problem-nom solve-can
    ‘Any student can solve the problem.’
  ↳ If there were more students, they would also be able to solve the problem.

• This counterfactual implication is not observed with a universal quantifier *wh-mo,* as shown in (24), which is repeated from (4).

(24) Dono-gakusei-mo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.
    which-student-mo that-problem-nom solve-can
    ‘Every student can solve the problem.’
  ↳ If there were more students, they would also be able to solve the problem.

• It is worth noting here that *demo* can be attached to non-wh items.

• As shown in (25a), *demo* can be attached to non-wh items, and can be translated as ‘even’, which has a concessive interpretation. This contrasts with *mo* in (25b), which can also be attached to non-wh items but does not involve concessiveness.

    Taro-DEM that problem-nom solve-can
    ‘Even Taro can solve the problem.’

b. *Taro-mo* sono mondai-ga tok-eru.
    Taro-mo that problem-nom solve-can
    ‘Taro can solve the problem, too.’

• Crucially, (25a) does not involve FC-ness in that it does not talk about all possible individuals: rather the statement is about *Taro.*

This in combination with (24) means that neither wh-items nor *demo* is responsible for FC-ness by themselves. It should rather be concluded that *wh-items and demo conspire to derive the FC-ness of *wh-demo.*

• In the following sections, I will propose a compositional semantics that captures the conspiracy of these elements.

3 A Compositional Analysis of *Wh-demo* in Japanese

3.1 Clausal structure of *wh-demo*

• In this section, I propose a compositional analysis of *wh-demo.*

• In order to do so, we start from decomposing *wh-demo* morpho-syntactically.

• Apparently, *wh-demo* has two ingredients: wh-items and the scalar focus particle *demo.* It seems that *demo* is responsible for *wh-demo* having to be licensed in intensional contexts, because *demo* as a scalar focus particle, which is translated as ‘even’ in English, cannot be licensed in episodic contexts either just like FCIs, as shown in (26).

(26) a. **Dono-gakusei-demo** sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.
    which-student-DEM that-problem-nom solve-can
    ‘Any student can solve the problem.’ (FC, intensional)
b. *Kinoo dono-gakusei-demo sono-mondai-o toita. yesterday which-student-DEMO that-problem-ACC solved ‘Any student solved the problem yesterday.’ (FC, episodic)

c. John-demo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru. John-DEMO that-problem-NOM solve-can ‘Even John can solve the problem.’ (scalar demo, intentional)

d. *Kinoo John-demo sono-mondai-o toita. yesterday John-DEMO that-problem-ACC solved ‘Yesterday even John solved the problem.’ (scalar demo, episodic)

• Thus, one might conclude that the scalar focus particle demo as a single morphological unit plays an important role in compositional semantics of wh-demo.

• However, I would like to take a step further. More specifically, I propose that the demo-part should be further decomposed into two ingredients, the copula de and the additive particle mo, and that the copula de (or its non-contracted form as we will see below) is crucial for the FC/intensional interpretation.

• There are two pieces of evidence to support this proposal.

1. When demo is replaced with an additive (focus) particle mo in (26), even episodic sentences are grammatical and do not have the FC interpretation, as shown in (27).

   (27) a. Dono-gakusei-mo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru. (UQ, intentional) which-student-mo that-problem-NOM solve-can ‘Every student can solve the problem.’

   b. Kinoo dono-gakusei-mo sono-mondai-o toita. (UQ, episodic) yesterday which-student-mo that-problem-ACC solve-can ‘Every student solved the problem yesterday.’

   c. John-mo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru. (additive mo, intentional) John-mo that-problem-NOM solve-can ‘John can solve the problem, too.’

   d. Kinoo John-mo sono-mondai-o toita. (additive mo, episodic) yesterday John-mo that-problem-ACC solve-can ‘Yesterday John solved the problem, too.’

• Since the only morphological difference between the FCI/scalar focus particle in (26) and the UQ/additive particle in (27) is the presence/absence of de, it is not implausible that the de-part contributes to the FC/intensional nature.

2. De can be replaced with other forms of copula without changing the truth condition, as in (28a) and (28b).5

(28) a. dono-gakusei-deat-te-mo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru. which-student-cop-INF-MO that-problem-NOM solve-can ‘Any student can solve the problem.’

   b. dono-gakusei-dear-oo-to-mo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru. which-student-cop-SUBJ-C-MO that-problem-NOM solve-can ‘Any student can solve the problem.’

(29) a. Quali che siano le sue protezioni, dovrà scontare la pena. which that be.3PL.SUBJ the his protections must.FUT serve the sentence ‘Whatever his protections are, he will have to serve his sentence. (Haspelmath 1997:137)

   b. No abras la puerta, quien-quiera que sea. Not.open.IMP the door, who-want that be.3SG.SUBJ ‘Don’t open the door, whoever it may be.’ (Haspelmath 1997:137)

• Here I adopt an analysis by Oda (2016), who proposes, based on Nishiyama (1999), Miyama (2011), and Watanabe’s (2013) analysis of the Japanese copula under the Distributed-Morphology framework (Halle and Marantz 1993), that wh-de-mo is a morpho-phonologically contracted form of wh-deat-te-mo or wh-dear-oo-to-mo.

• The structure is illustrated in (30), where dear-oo is contracted as deat-te or de at PF.

(30)
• In (30), the wh-phrase is a complement of Pred de, and pro, which can be optionally realized as a demonstrative pronoun sore, is base-generated in Spec,vP and then moves to Spec,TP as a subject.

• Under this proposal, all the three forms share the same syntactic structure so that there should be no syntactic or semantic difference.

• As for semantics, we have already seen that the three forms have the same FC interpretation.

• In addition, neither wh-deat-te-mo nor wh-dear-oo-to-mo are licensed in episodic contexts, as shown in (31).

\[
\begin{align*}
(31) & \quad \text{a. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-te-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-inf-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’} \\
 & \quad \text{b. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-oo-to-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-will-c-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

⇒ This indicates that these three forms share the same semantic properties, and hence the same licensing conditions.

• As for syntax, Oda (2016) shows that these two long forms can host an additional subject, as illustrated in (32).

\[
\begin{align*}
(32) & \quad \text{a. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-te-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-inf-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’} \\
 & \quad \text{b. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-oo-to-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

• Crucially, an additional subject is also allowed with wh-demo, as shown in (33).

\[
\begin{align*}
(33) & \quad \text{a. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-te-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-inf-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’} \\
 & \quad \text{b. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-oo-to-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that this additional subject is not a subject of the matrix verb tok(u) ‘solve’. Tok(u) takes a human subject, but sore is inanimate, so that sore itself cannot occur as a subject of tok(u), as shown in (35).

\[
\begin{align*}
(34) & \quad \text{a. } \text{dare-demo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Anyone can solve the problem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

⇒ This means that sore in (32) and (33) is hosted by wh-demo, i.e., is licensed by the copular structure involved in wh-demo.

⇒ We can thus conclude with Oda (2016) that wh-demo involves a clausal structure composed of a wh-item, the additive particle mo, the copula de, and the subjunctive mood -oo, which is contracted at PF and gives rise to the FC interpretation.

• It is worth mentioning here that this pattern regarding the additional subject is also observed with N + demo.

• (36) shows that the inanimate demonstrative sore can be optionally used with N + demo. Note that N + mo does not allow this additional subject as in (37), which pattern with the contrast between wh-demo and wh-mo discussed above.

\[
\begin{align*}
(36) & \quad \text{a. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-te-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-inf-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Every student can solve the problem.’} \\
 & \quad \text{b. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-oo-to-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-will-c-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Every student can solve the problem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

⇒ This indicates that wh-demo and N + demo share the same clausal structure, the difference being the element combined with the copula.

6This being said, there is a stylistic difference among wh-demo, wh-deat-te-mo, and wh-dear-oo-to-mo: wh-demo can be used colloquially or formally, but wh-deat-te-mo has a more formal flavor, and wh-dear-oo-to-mo sounds even more formal, or even a little archaic. An investigation of this difference is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is worth mentioning here that non-contracted forms in general have a more formal flavor than their contracted counterparts (e.g., cannot vs. can’t).

7To be more precise, Oda (2016) observes that there are two accent patterns with wh-demo: one with a falling accent after de, and the other with a flat intonation (no accent). Oda argues that only the former involves a clausal structure, and the latter is a grammaticalized form which has demo as a single morphological unit attached to wh-items. He shows that only the former accent pattern allows an additional subject, as illustrated in (i) (The apostrophe in the wh-item means a falling accent).

\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad \text{a. } \text{sore-ga } \text{deat-te-mo } \text{sono-mondai-ga } \text{tok-eru.} \\
 & \quad \text{that-nom which-student-cop-inf-mo that-problem-nom solve-can} \\
 & \quad \text{‘Anyone can solve the problem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

b. *Sore-ga dare-demo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru. (flat intonation) \\
that-nom which-student-cop-mo that-problem-nom solve-can \\
‘Anyone can solve the problem.’

Throughout this paper, I focus on wh-demo with the falling accent and I do not indicate the accent pattern.
I argue that the structural analysis given in (30) explains two idiosyncratic properties of wh-demo as an FC expression.

1. Case-marking: wh-demo, unlike the universal quantifier wh-mo, resists case marking, as illustrated in (38).

(38) a. Dare-de-mo(*-ga) sono mondai-ga tokeru. (FC)
   who-cop-mo-nom that problem-nom solve-can
   ‘Anyone can solve the problem.’
   
   b. Dare-mo(*-ga) sono mondai-ga tokeru. (UQ)
      who-mo-nom that problem-nom solve-can
      ‘Everyone can solve the problem.’

Case particles in Japanese are typically attached to nominal elements, but not a CP headed by to, as in (39).

(39) John-wa [CP Mary-ga kita to]*(-o) omotteiru.
   John-top Mary-nom came c-acc think
   ‘John thinks that Mary came.’

⇒ Since wh-demo involves a CP headed by to under the current proposal, it follows that case particles cannot be attached to wh-demo.8

2. As noted in section 2, wh-demo cannot be licensed in comparatives unlike FCIs in other languages. Recall from section 2 that demo cannot be used as a complement of yori ‘than’, as repeated in (40).

(40) a. *Taro-wa (hokano) dono-kurasumeeto-demo yori hayaku hashiru.
       Taro-top other which-classmate-demo than fast run
       ‘Taro runs faster than any other classmate.’
   
   b. *Taro-wa (hokano) dono-kurasumeeto yori demo hayaku hashiru.
       Taro-top other which-classmate than demo fast run
       ‘Taro runs faster than any other classmate.’

Although it has been controversial whether the Japanese counterpart of ‘than’, which is yori, takes a clausal complement or just a nominal complement, Beck et al. (2004) and more recently Sudo (2015) argue that yori only takes a nominal complement.

If this is on the right track, the current proposal for the structure of wh-demo can explain the unacceptability of (40).

Let us first consider (40a). In this case, the complement of yori is dono-kurasumeeto-demo, which is clausal (FP which dominates CP), not nominal. Thus, the sentence is ungrammatical.

Turning to (40b), the complement of yori is dono-kurasumeeto, which is nominal, so that there is no problem in terms of selection by yori. However, the remaining part of the FCI, demo is separated from the wh-part and takes yori as its complement, and as (41) shows, yori cannot be a complement of a copula. Consequently, (40b) is ungrammatical.9

(41) * John-wa Bill yori da.
    John-top Bill than cop.pres
    ‘*John is than Bill.’

⇒ Thus, the present analysis of the structure of wh-demo combined with Beck et al.’s (2004) and Sudo’s (2015) claim that yori only takes a nominal complement explains the observation that wh-demo cannot be licensed in comparatives unlike FCIs in other languages.

⇒ This means that the unavailability of wh-demo in comparatives is deduced from its internal structure and hence it does not serve as a counterexample of wh-demo being an FC expression.

To summarize this subsection, I have introduced Oda’s (2016) analysis of the internal structure of wh-demo, which involves a clausal structure: more precisely, the specifical copula de and the subjunctive mood -oo, which is contracted at PF.

I have then argued that this analysis explains the optional presence of the demonstrative pronoun sore, the incompatibility of case particles with wh-demo, and the unavailability of wh-demo in comparatives despite that wh-demo is an FC expression.

3.2 Compositional semantics of wh-demo

Based on the structural analysis proposed above, I propose a compositional semantic analysis of Japanese FCIs.

*N + demo patterns with wh-demo in this respect, too, as in (i). Instead of demo, mo has to be used as in (ii)

(i) a. * Taro-wa Hanako-demo yori hayaku hashiru.
       Taro-top Hanako-demo than fast run
       ‘Taro runs faster than Hanako.’
   
   b. * Taro-wa Hanako yori demo hayaku hashiru.
       Taro-top Hanako than demo fast run
       ‘Taro runs faster than Hanako.’

(ii) Taro-wa Hanako yori demo hayaku hashiru.
    Taro-top Hanako than demo fast run
    ‘Taro runs faster than Hanako.’
1. **The wh-item**: Following Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002), Shimoyama (2006), I assume that wh-phrases such as *dare* ‘who’ denote a set of individuals as in (42) and the semantic composition proceeds with the Pointwise Functional Application (Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002, Shimoyama 2006).

\[(42) \quad \| \textit{dare} \| = \{ x \in D_e : x \text{ is a human} \}\]

2. **The copula *de***: I argue that the copula *de* involved in the FC clause is a specificational copula rather than a predicational one.

- **Mikkelsen (2005)** shows that in the case of specificational clauses the animate DP in the dislocated/preverbal position can be referred to by an inanimate personal pronoun (*it*) or demonstrative (*that*), as shown in (43).\(^{10}\)

\[(43) \quad \text{a. (As for) the tallest girl in the class, } \{\textit{it}/\textit{that}\} \text{ is Molly.} \]
\[(43) \quad \text{b. The tallest girl in the class is Molly, isn’t it?}\]

- This contrasts with a predicational clause, in which the dislocated/preverbal animate DP can be referred to by an animate personal pronoun but not by an inanimate personal pronoun or demonstrative, as shown in (44).

\[(44) \quad \text{a. (As for the tallest girl in the class, } \{\textit{she}/\textit{it}/\textit{that}\} \text{ is Swedish.} \]
\[(44) \quad \text{b. The tallest girl in the class is Swedish, isn’t } \{\textit{she}/\textit{it}\}?\]

- Crucially, the same effect is observed in the Japanese FC clause. As shown in (45), the human third person pronouns *kare* and *kanojo* are incompatible with the FC clause. Rather, the optional subject has to be the inanimate demonstrative *sore*.

\[(45) \quad \text{a. } * \textit{kare/kanojo-ga} \text{ dono-gakusei-de-mo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.} \]
\[\text{he/she-NOM which-student-COP-mo that-problem-NOM solve-can} \]
\[\text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’} \]
\[(45) \quad \text{b. } * \textit{kare/kanojo-ga} \text{ dono-gakusei-deat-te-mo sono-mondai-ga}\]
\[\text{he/she-NOM which-student-COP-INF-mo that-problem-NOM tok-eru.}
\text{solve-can} \]
\[\text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’} \]
\[(45) \quad \text{c. } * \textit{kare/kanojo-ga} \text{ dono-gakusei-dear-oo-to-mo sono-mondai-ga}\]
\[\text{he/she-NOM which-student-COP-mo that-problem-NOM tok-eru.}
\text{solve-can} \]
\[\text{‘Any student can solve the problem.’} \]

→ This indicates that the copula in *wh-demo* is specificational rather than predicational.

- Regarding the semantics of the specificational clause, I adopt Romero’s (2005) and Arregi et al.’s (2018) analysis and propose that the specificational copula in *wh-demo* takes the wh-item as its first argument and the demonstrative pronoun as its second argument. The denotation of *de* is given in (46).\(^{11}\)

\[(46) \quad \| \textit{de}_{\text{specificational}} \| = \{ Ay_e.Ag_{<s,e>} Aw_x.g(w) = y \}\]

3. **The demonstrative pronoun *sore***: I propose that *sore*, which can be optionally pronounced, denotes an individual concept, being a pronoun that refers to a property of type \(<s,<e,t,\tau>\) in the matrix clause. This is illustrated in (47), where \(f\) is a variable whose referent is a property of type \(<s,<e,t,\tau>\) in the matrix clause.\(^{12}\)

\[(47) \quad \| \textit{sore} \| = \{ Aw_x.\{ix_e.f(x,w)\}\}\]

4. **The subjunctive mood *-oo***: I propose, following Izvorski (2000), that this subjunctive mood contributes a presupposition that individuals denoted by the wh-item in the FC clause vary across worlds.

→ This presupposition ensures the counterfactual reading of *wh-demo*, which is not observed with *wh-mo* that lacks the copula *de*, in that *wh-demo* quantifies over individuals in different possible worlds.

- Here I implement this idea as in (48), where *-oo* takes a set of propositions (*v*P) and adds the presupposition that there are at least two propositions that are not identical to each other.

\[(48) \quad \text{For } \| \alpha \| \subseteq D_{<s,t>}, \]
\[(48) \quad \| \alpha \cdot -oo \| = \exists p_{<s,t>,q_{<s,t>}}[p \in \| \alpha \| \wedge q \in \| \alpha \| \wedge p \neq q].\| \alpha \| \]

→ Since different propositions involve different sets of individuals, this implementation of the presupposition has the same effect as the one proposed by Izvorski (2000).

- Interestingly, this sort of presupposition is similar to the one proposed by von Fintel (2000) for the ignorance inference of the English FCI *whatver*. Since individuals vary across worlds (modal base for von Fintel), the speaker cannot specify the exact identity of the individual.

⇒ Thus, both the counterfactuality and the ignorance inference of *wh-demo* are derived from the same presupposition, which is encoded by the subjunctive mood *-oo*.

\(^{10}\)Mikkelsen (2005) observes that an animate personal pronoun is marginally possible in (43). But she suggests that in this case the clause is an equative clause, not a specificational clause (see Mikkelsen 2005 for discussion).

\(^{11}\)See Romero (2005) and Arregi et al. (2018) for arguments against Mikkelsen’s (2005) and Moro’s (1997) predicate-inversion analysis.

\(^{12}\)In fact, this optional subject can be a non-pronominal noun phrase that denotes an individual concept, as illustrated in (i). (The optional subject in (i) sounds redundant, though.)

(i) \textit{Tok-ootosuru hito-ga} dare de-mo sono mondai-ga tok-eru.
\text{solve-try person-NOM who COP-mo that problem-NOM solve-can} \]
\[\text{‘Whoever the person who tries to solve the problem is, he can solve the problem.’} \]
• At this point, it is worth discussing Izvorski’s (2000) analysis of wh-ever adjunct free relatives: according to her, a set of alternatives has to be involved in wh-ever adjunct free relatives to derive the FC interpretation.

• Crucially, she argues, based on languages such as Bulgarian, Greek, Spanish, English, Polish, and Hebrew, that either an interrogative wh-item or subjunctive mood has to be used, but not both at the same time.

→ This is obviously incompatible with the current proposal on wh-demo, which involves both an interrogative wh-item and subjunctive mood.

• Recall from the previous subsection that both wh-demo and wh-mo in Japanese have a wh-item. However, only the former have the FC interpretation. Note also that wh-items in Japanese are used in interrogatives.

→ This means that interrogative wh-items themselves are not sufficient to derive the FC interpretation. If wh-items were to suffice to derive the FC interpretation, UQs in Japanese, which also involve wh-items, would carry a counterfactual implication.

• In fact, what the wh-items themselves contribute is a set of individuals, not a set of worlds or propositions.

• Recall also from section 2.2 that demo by itself is not sufficient to derive an FC interpretation either, since it can co-occur with a non-wh-item and does not have an FC interpretation, as in (49).

(49) Taro-de-mo sono mondai-ga tok-eru.
    Taro-cop-mo that problem-nom solve-can
    ‘Even Taro can solve the problem.’

• Since demo includes a copula and subjunctive mood, Izvorski’s (2000) proposal predicts that (49) would involve an FC-interpretation, which is not borne out.

⇒ Thus, from the view point of Japanese wh-demo, we are led to conclude that Izvorski’s (2000) original theory of the typological distribution of wh-items for FCIs is untenable, and that both interrogative wh-items and subjunctive mood are necessary for the FC-interpretation.

⇒ This is even desirable when we think about English wh-ever adjunct free relatives, which Izvorski assumes involve only interrogative wh-items.

• Although English has lost a distinct form of subjunctive unlike other Germanic languages, we can still observe some versions of subjunctive. As illustrated in (50), an infinitival form and so-called “concessive may” can be used in wh-ever adjunct free relatives.

(50) a. Wherever he be, I will find him.
    b. Whichever you may choose, you will like it.

⇒ Thus, it is not implausible to conclude that even English wh-ever adjunct free relatives involve subjunctive mood, and that this subjunctive mood combined with a wh-item is crucial to derive the FC interpretation, just like in Japanese.

5. The additive particle mo: I follow Shimoyama (2006) in proposing that mo is a sort of universal quantificational determiner that takes a set of alternatives as its first argument.

• In terms of the technical detail, however, I propose, following Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002) and Rawlins (2013), that mo for wh-demo takes a set of propositions as its restrictor, unlike mo for wh-mo which takes a set of individuals as its restrictor. Thus, the denotation of mo for wh-demo is given in (51).

(51) For \( \|a\| \subseteq D_{s,t} \),
    \( \|a_{\text{mo}}\| = \{\lambda q_{s,t} \cdot \lambda w_s . \forall p_{s,t}, q \in \|a\| \to (p > q)(w) = 1\} \)

⇒ This means that the whole sentence is an unconditional.

• Now, let us look at how the semantic composition proceeds. Let us take the sentence (52) as an example.

(52) (Sore-ga) dare-de-mo sono mondai-ga tok-eru.
    that-nom who-cop-mo that problem-nom solve-can
    ‘Anyone can solve the problem.’

1. The copula de and the wh-item dare are combined via Pointwise Functional Application, which gives (53).

(53) a. \( \langle \text{dare de} \rangle = \{\lambda g_{s,e} . \lambda w_s . [g(w) = x]_{\text{human}(x)}\} \)
    b. \( \langle \text{dare de} \rangle (\text{PredP}) \)
       \( \{\lambda g_{s,e} . \lambda w_s . [g(w) = x]_{\text{human}(x)}\} \)
    \( \langle \text{dare} \rangle (\text{Pred}) \)
       \( \langle \text{de} \rangle (\text{Pred}) \)
  \( \{x \}_{\text{human}(x)} \) \quad \{\lambda y_e . \lambda g_{s,e} . \lambda w_s . [g(w) = y]\}

2. The pronoun sore is combined with (53), which returns (54). (I assume that ar is semantically vacuous. I also assume that sore is reconstructed into the base position for simplicity.)\(^{13}\)

(54) a. \( \langle \text{sore-ga dare de-ar} \rangle = \{\lambda w_s . tz_e . f(z, w) = x]_{\text{human}(x)}\} \)

\(^{13}\)It should be noted that there can be more than one individual who has the property f, but those individuals are checked one by one.
3. The subjunctive mood -oo is combined, which adds the presupposition on the variation of individuals across worlds, as in (55).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(55) a.} & \quad [[\text{sore-ga dare de-ar(o(P)}]] \\
& = \exists p, q[p \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land q \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land p \neq q]. \\
\text{sore-ga dare de-ar-ar(TP)} & \\
& \exists p, q[p \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land q \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land p \neq q]. \\
\text{sore-ga dare de-ar-o-to-mo(FP)} & \\
& \exists p, q[p \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land q \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land p \neq q].
\end{align*}
\]

b. 

4. (55) is combined with mo, which gives (56). (I assume that to is semantically vacuous.)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(56) a.} & \quad [[\text{sore-ga dare de-ar-to-mo}]] \\
& = \exists p, q[p \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land q \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \land p \neq q], \forall p[p \in \{\lambda w, [iz.e.f(z, w) = x|\text{human}(x)]\} \rightarrow (p > q)(w) = 1].
\end{align*}
\]

5. Finally, the matrix sentence sono mondai-ga tok-eru is combined with (56). Here I assume that the matrix clause sono mondai-ga tok-eru ‘can solve the problem’ involves a null pronominal subject which refers to the subject in the FC clause.

- In fact, Nishigauchi (1990) and Oda (to appear) observe that a demonstrative pronoun that (roughly) refers to the FC clause can optionally appear in the matrix clause, as illustrated in (57).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(57) [Sore-ga dare de-mo], sono-hito-wa} & \quad \text{sono mondai-ga tok-eru.} \\
& \quad \text{that-nom who cor-mo that-person-to that problem-nom solve-can ‘lit. Whoever it is, that person, can solve the problem.’}
\end{align*}
\]

- I give the denotation of sono-hito in (58), and that of the matrix clause in (59).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(58) [[sono-hito]]} & = \{\lambda z, [iz.e.f(z, v) \land \text{human}(z)]\} \\
\text{(59) a.} & \quad [[\text{sono-hito-wa sono mondai-ga tok-eru}]] \\
& = \{\lambda w, [\text{can-solve-the-problem}(iz.e.f(z, w) \land \text{human}(z))(w)]\} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{sono-hito-ga sono mondai-ga tok-eru(TP)} \\
& \{\lambda w, [\text{can-solve-the-problem}(iz.e.f(z, w) \land \text{human}(z))(w)]\}
\end{align*}
\]

- The demonstrative in the FC clause refers to the predicate in the matrix clause, which is ‘solve the problem’ in this example. 14 Now, the semantic composition of the entire sentence is given in (60).

14In Japanese, the non-past/perfective form of the verb can be interpreted as future. Thus, here mondai-o toku ‘solve the problem’ is interpreted as ‘attempts to solve the problem/tackles the problem’.
Ii-kara

4 On Ii-kara

In section 2, we saw that when wh-demo occurs in environment where FCIs typically receive an existential-like interpretation, it requires a phrase ii-kara, which is composed of ii ‘good’ and karā ‘so/because’, as repeated in (62).

(60) a. \[\{sore\-ga dare de-ar-o-o-to-mo sono hito-ga sono mondai\-ga tokeru\} = \exists p, q [p \in \{\lambda w_x, t\zeta_e, \text{tackle-the-problem}(z, w) = x[\text{human}(x)] \wedge q \in \{\lambda w_x, t\zeta_e, \text{tackle-the-problem}(z, w) = x[\text{human}(x)] \wedge p \neq q\}. \{\lambda w_x, \forall p [p \in \{\lambda w_x, t\zeta_e, \text{tackle-the-problem}(z, w) = x[\text{human}(x)] \wedge (p > \text{can-solve-the-problem}(t\zeta_e, \text{tackle-the-problem}(w) \wedge \text{human}(w))(w) = 1]\}

b. sore-ga dare de-ar-o-o-to-mo sono mondai-ga tokeru
\[\exists p, q [p \in \{\lambda w_x, t\zeta_e, \text{f}(z, w) = x[\text{human}(x)] \wedge q \in \{\lambda w_x, t\zeta_e, \text{f}(z, w) = x[\text{human}(x)] \wedge p \neq q\}. \{\lambda w_x, \forall p [p \in \{\lambda w_x, t\zeta_e, \text{f}(z, w) = x[\text{human}(x)] \wedge (p > \text{can-solve-the-problem}(t\zeta_e, \text{f}(w) \wedge \text{human}(w))(w) = 1]\}

\]

(61) a. Dare-mo-ga sono mondai\-ga tok-eru,
who-MO-NOM that problem-NOM solve-can
‘Everyone can solve the problem.’

b. \[(61a) = \{\forall x [x \in \{y [\text{human}(y)] \rightarrow \text{can-solve-the-problem}(x)]]\]

Notice, however, that what is involved in wh-mo is quantification over individuals, not propositions, unlike wh-demo.

⇒ It is now obvious that this difference between wh-demo and wh-mo follows from the presence or absence of the copula with the subjunctive mood, which contributes the presupposition that there are at least two non-identical propositions and hence individuals denoted by the wh-item vary across worlds.

4 On Ii-kara

In section 2, we saw that when wh-demo occurs in environment where FCIs typically receive an existential-like interpretation, it requires a phrase ii-kara, which is composed of ii ‘good’ and karā ‘so/because’, as repeated in (62).

which-card-DEMO good-because take-IMP
‘Pick any card.’

⇒ Two questions to be addressed here:

1. Why can wh-demo itself not have the existential-like reading?

2. Why does the presence of ii-kara give rise to the interpretation in question?

• The answer to the first question is self-evident under the current proposal in this paper: the particle mo contributes universal quantification over propositions, and there is no element that contributes existential quantification, so that wh-demo cannot have the existential-like interpretation alone.

⇒ Thus, the fact that wh-demo by itself cannot have the existential-like interpretation follows from the current proposal.

• As for the second question, I argue that the domain of quantification of mo is ‘closed’ at the point where ii-kara is merged with wh-demo.

• As mentioned above, ii-kara is composed of the adjective ii and the subordinating complementizer kara ‘so/because’.

• In Japanese, a class of adjectives (so-called i-adjatives, or keiyoushi in the traditional Japanese grammar) are used as a predicate of a sentence without an overt copula, as shown in (63).15

(63) Kono hon-wa ii.
this book-RO good
‘This book is good.’

⇒ It is, then, natural to analyze (62) as involving two sentences: one is dono-kaado-demo ii ‘Any card is good’ and the other is tori-nasai ‘pick (one)’. Then these two sentences are combined by means of kara. So (62) can be translated as ‘Any card is good, so pick one.’

• In fact, the numeral ‘one’ can be optionally used after the ii-kara clause, as repeated from section 2 in (64), which supports the argument that there are two sentences involved in the presence of ii-kara.

(64) Dono-kaado-demo ii-kara ichi-mai tori-nasai.
which-card-DEMO good-because one-CL take-IMP
‘Pick any card.’ (Oda 2013)

15 Alternatively, this class of adjectives in Japanese include a copula which is morpho-phonologically contracted: see Nishiyama (1999) and Watanabe (2013) for discussion.
• In (64), the first clause dono-kaado-demo ii-kara sets up a context in which any card is good (for the purpose of picking one).

• Then the second clause ich-mai tori-nasai expresses that the addressee must pick up one out of any card.

⇒ Thus, the reason why the presence of ii-kara gives rise to the existential-like interpretation is that the sentence with ii-kara involves two clauses, one being a clause in which universal quantification by mo is completed and it is expressed that anything is fine for the purpose of the action after this clause, and the other being a clause which gives a command that involves the numeral ‘one’.

• This analysis leaves the possibility that the second clause can in principle have other numerals like ‘two’ or ‘three’, since the clause after ii-kara is independent of the clause before it in terms of quantification, and there is no constraint that prohibits numerals larger than ‘one’ from occurring in the second clause.

• In fact, those numerals can be used under specific contexts. For example, in a context of a game where the addressee is required to take two cards, the numeral ‘two’ can be used, as shown in (65).

\[(65) \text{Dono-kaado-demo ii-kara ni-mai tori-nasai.}\]
\[\text{which-card-demo good-because two-cl take-imp}\]
\[\text{‘Pick any two cards.’}\]

• Moreover, even a universal quantifier ‘all’ can be used in the presence of ii-kara under a specific context. Suppose that the addressee is required to take each card that is presented one by one, whatever card it is. In this case, (66) is felicitous.

\[(66) \text{Dono-kaado-demo ii-kara subete tori-nasai.}\]
\[\text{which-card-demo good-because all take-imp}\]
\[\text{‘Pick all cards, whatever they are.’}\]

⇒ Thus, these data support the current proposal that there are two clauses involved in the presence of ii-kara, which are independent of each other in terms of quantification.

⇒ The reason why the presence of ii-kara gives rise to the existential-like interpretation would, then, be that the default interpretation of an empty argument in the second clause is singular rather than plural or ‘all’.

• It is worth mentioning here that sentences like (62) carry the indifference inference: the speaker does not care about the identity of the card, so any card ‘suffices’ for the purpose of picking a card.

• This is not surprising once we consider the meaning of ii-kara: as noted above, ii means ‘good’, so the clause dono-kaado-demo ii means ‘any card is good’, which obviously expresses that any card is ‘sufficient’ for the purpose of picking a card.

⇒ Thus, we can directly see the element that contributes the indifference inference with wh-demo.

5 Concluding Remarks

• I have argued that the FC interpretation of wh-demo can be derived in a compositional way.

• More specifically, I have shown that wh-demo involves a clausal structure, in which de is a copula and there is a morpho-phonologically contracted subjunctive marker, which is -oo in a non-contracted variant.

• I have then proposed that this subjunctive mood combined with wh-items give rise to the FC interpretation in the way that the subjunctive mood poses a requirement that there be at least two non-identical propositions, which results in individuals denoted by a wh-item varying across worlds.

⇒ Under the current proposal, a sentence with wh-demo is an unconditional construction.

• In the course of discussion, I have also claimed that Izvorski’s (2000) proposal that either (interrogative) wh-items or subjunctive is necessary for FC-ness is untenable and that actually both of them are necessary to derive FC-ness.

⇒ In addition, I have discussed the phrase ii-kara, which gives rise to an existential-like interpretation with wh-demo.

• What is crucial is that wh-demo itself does not have an existential-like reading even in the presence of ii-kara: rather, ii-kara introduces two clauses, one being the domain of universal quantification over propositions by wh-demo and the other being an independent clause that involves a null argument which is by default understood as singular.

⇒ Thus, there is no need to add special interpretational mechanism to derive the existential-like reading to the proposed semantics of wh-demo.

Appendix: On Diagnostics of the Universal-like Reading

• The universal reading of wh-demo is diagnosed with hotondo ‘almost’. It has been remarked in the literature (e.g., Horn 1972, Dayal 1998 a.o.) that FC any but not NPI any can be modified by almost, as exemplified by (67).

\[(67) a. \text{Almost any student can solve the problem. (FC any)}\]
\[b. * \text{I don’t like almost anyone. (NPI any)}\]

• As shown in (68), hotondo, which is the Japanese counterpart of ‘almost’, is compatible with wh-demo in the environment of ability modals, future tense, habituals, generics and stative verbs.\(^{16}\)

\[(68) a. \text{Hotondo dono-gakusei-demo sono-mondai-ga tok-eru.}\]
\[\text{almost which-student-demo that-problem-nom solve-can}\]
\[\text{‘Almost any student can solve the problem.’}\]
b. **Hotondo** dono-otoko-demo kono-tsukue-o mochiageru daroo. *Almost any man will lift this table.* (Oda 2013)

c. Taro-wa taitei **hotondo** dono-hon-demo chuuibukaku yomu. ‘Taro usually reads almost any book carefully.’ (Oda 2013)

d. **Hotondo** dono-fukurou-demo nezumi-o karu. ‘Almost any owl hunts mice.’ (Oda 2013)

e. **Hotondo** dono-seito-demo sono-sensei-o sonkeishiteiru. ‘Almost any student respects the teacher.’ (Oda 2013)

16 In fact, **hotondo** is compatible with genuine universal quantifiers like **wh-mo** and ‘all’, as in (i) and (ii).

17 Oda (2013) observes that ‘all’ is compatible with **wh-demo**, which he takes to be another diagnostic for the universal reading of **wh-demo**. See Oda (2013) for the data.
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