

FREE CHOICE ITEMS AND DEFINITENESS: EVIDENCE FROM GREEK

Dimitra Lazaridou-Chatzigoga,
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Dimitra.Lazaridou@uab.es, dimitrala_cha@yahoo.gr

Abstract¹

In this paper I defend an indefinite analysis for Greek Free Choice *opjosdhipote* ‘any’ and I illustrate three different constructions where this item is used: (i) *opjosdhipote* + Noun, (ii) indefinite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun and (iii) definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun. I argue that bare *opjosdhipote* or *opjosdhipote* co-appearing with the definite article is a determiner, while *opjosdhipote* co-appearing with the indefinite article is an adjective and that the definite article in the construction in question does not contribute definiteness, as would be expected, but acts as a slack regulator in the sense of Lasnik (1999).

1 Introduction

In a recent paper, Giannakidou & Cheng (2006, G & C from now on) argue that there exist both indefinite and definite Free Choice Items (FCIs henceforth). On the one hand, the authors claim that there are indefinite FCIs, which are FC nominals like *any* as in *Take any candy* and they provide evidence for their indefinite nature following the indefinite analysis, which treats FCIs as Heimian indefinites (see Kadmon & Landman 1993, Lee & Horn 1994, Giannakidou 2001, Kratzer & Shimoyama 2002). On the other hand, definite FCIs are claimed to be the ones that build FC-F(ree)R(elative) clauses. G & C employ the notion of definiteness discussed by Jacobson (1995) in her treatment of English FRs and argue that the distinction between indefinite and definite FCIs depends on whether there is an active definiteness function contributing maximality. Although one of the languages under discussion in their paper is Greek, a relevant construction is totally ignored, despite the fact that at first look it would be a perfect candidate for being a “definite FCI”. This construction involves Greek FCI *opjosdhipote* ‘any’ (for masculine singular²) co-appearing with the definite article *o,i,to* ‘the’ for masc. fem. and neuter respectively, as can be seen in (1) below:

- (1) **O** *opjosdhipote* **ixos** ine musiki.
the FC sound is music
‘Any sound is music.’

¹ I am grateful for insightful comments, suggestions and questions especially to Louise McNally, as well as to a number of other people, including Josep Maria Brucart, M. Teresa Espinal, Sergi Garcia, Josep Macià, Maribel Romero and Josep Quer.

² Throughout the paper I will use the masculine singular *opjosdhipote* to refer to the whole paradigm of this Free Choice Item. I will use examples in all genders, but only in the singular in order for the comparison to be easier, since examples with the (in)definite article are going to be crucial and the indefinite article in Greek is only found in the singular. See the Appendix for the declination of *opjosdhipote* and of the (in)definite articles.

The aim of this paper is twofold: on the one hand, after providing further evidence for *opjosdhipote* being an indefinite in the sense of Heim (1982), I discuss in more depth one of the pieces of evidence used in indefinite analyses of FCIs, which is the fact that they can co-occur with the indefinite article. This fact holds for various Romance languages like Spanish, Catalan and Italian³ (see Garcia 2003, Quer 1999, Chierchia 2005, respectively) and also for Greek (see Giannakidou 2001). *Opjosdhipote* co-occurs with the indefinite article *enas, mia, ena* ‘a’ for masc., fem. and neuter respectively, as attested in (2) and (3) below:

(2) Pekse opjadhypote nota./ Pekse **mia opjadhypote nota.**
play.imper.2sg FC note / play.imper.2sg a FC note
 ‘Play any note.’/ lit. ‘Play an any note.’

(3) Afto to Savatokiriako dhen dhiavasa **ena opjodhipote vivlio,**
this the weekend not read.1sg a FC book,
 ala ena vivlio tu Cummings.
but a book the.GEN Cummings
 ‘This weekend I didn’t read just any book, but a book of Cummings.’

On the other hand, this paper discusses constructions such the one in (1), where we have [definite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun]. Assuming for the sake of the argument that, as G & C claim, in addition to indefinite FCIs, there also exist definite FCIs, I will pursue this line of thought in order to test whether the above-mentioned construction fulfills the conditions to be called definite and I will come to the conclusion that the definite article involved here does not act as a regular definite article, but as a slack regulator in the sense of Lasersohn (1999).

2 Indefinite and definite Free Choice Items: Giannakidou & Cheng (2006)

A crucial point in the discussion of FCIs by G & C is the claim that semantic and even morphological definiteness is a prerequisite for some FCIs in Greek and Chinese. As a consequence, they argue for the existence of both indefinite, following the analysis of Giannakidou (2001), and definite FCIs. This distinction is supposed to be evident in English as a lexical distinction: FC *any* is indefinite, while FC *wh-ever* is definite. The contrast is reflected basically syntactically: *any* selects N(oun)P(hrase)s, while *wh-ever* selects clausal complements and builds F(ree) R(elatives)⁴. In Greek it is supposed to be obscured lexically since both indefinite and definite FCIs make use of the same lexical item, namely, of *opjosdhipote*. The distinction is claimed to be syntactic here as well: indefinite FCIs are formed by FC + NP and definite FCIs by FC + C(omplement)P(hrase). In Mandarin Chinese, the definiteness effect is obtained via *dōu*, which is a particle that may appear with the wh-phrase *nǎ-CL* ‘which’ that has a free choice reading. Their approach treats FCI indefinites as Heimian indefinites and is augmented with the notion of definiteness discussed by Jacobson (1995) in her treatment of English FRs, which is employed in order to account for the definite FCIs. Indefinite and definite FCIs depend on whether there is an active definiteness function,

³ For illustration of this point see further on, examples (19) through (21).

⁴ A Free Relative sentence is one of the following sort:

(i) Whoever danced last night will get an ice cream.

i.e. a closure under the iota operator, which operates on the FCI contributing maximality and building a maximal plural entity. They give the following two examples of indefinite and definite FCIs (illustrated by (4) and (5) respectively) in Greek:

(4) (enas) opjosdhipote fititis
a FC student
 ‘any student’

(5) Opjosdhipote fititis irthe sto parti, efxaristithike.
FC student came.3sg to.the party was.pleased
 ‘Whichever student came to the party was pleased.’

What will be relevant from their analysis for the discussion in this paper is the fact that G & C acknowledge the existence of definite FCIs and no further evaluation of their analysis will be given.⁵

3 The indefinite analysis of Free Choice Items

I will first focus on the indefinite analysis of Free Choice Items, according to which, on the basis of a number of similarities between indefinites like *a* and FCIs, it is claimed that FCIs are Heimian indefinites, i.e. items that have no quantificational force of their own and that take on the quantificational force of the operator they appear with. I will now review the arguments that support the indefinite analysis based mostly on the analyses of Kadmon & Landman (1993), Lee & Horn (1994), Horn (2005) and Giannakidou & Cheng (2006).

3.1 Arguments in favor of the indefinite analysis of FCIs

One of the most salient characteristics of indefinites in the sense of Heim (1982) is the fact that they present quantificational variability, a characteristic shared by FCIs. Regular indefinites like *a*, as well as FCIs, do not have inherent quantificational force, but their interpretation varies according to the operator available in the utterance: *Opjosdhipote* can be interpreted existentially, as in (6), universally, as in (7), or generically, as in (8):

(6) a. Pekse opjadhipote nota.
play.imper.2sg FC note
 ‘Play any note.’

b. $\Box/\Diamond^6 \exists x (\text{note}(x) \wedge \text{play}(\text{you},x))$

(7) a. Afto to tragudi mbori_{ability} na to peksi opjosdhipote musikos.
this the song can.3sg subj. it play.3sg FC musician
 ‘Any musician can play this song.’

b. $\forall x(\text{musician}(x)) \rightarrow \Diamond (\text{play}(x,\text{this song}))$

⁵ See Lazaridou-Chatzigoga (in progress) for further criticism of their analysis.

⁶ I remain agnostic as to whether we should represent imperatives with the necessity or the possibility operator, since utterance (6) could be uttered for expressing both forces, i.e. for expressing a command or permission. See Dayal (2004) for some discussion on imperatives.

(8) a. *Opjosdhipote ixos ine musiki.*

FC sound is music

‘Any sound is music.’

b. $\text{Gen}_x [\text{sound}(x)] [\text{is.music}(x)]$

Another characteristic of indefinites is the fact that they are able to be unselectively bound, which means that some operator binds more than one variable (see Lewis 1975), and that they license donkey anaphora, as attested in example (9), where the indefinite is bound by a universal quantifier and donkey anaphora arises. In utterance (10) it is shown that FCIs can also be bound unselectively and give rise to donkey anaphora:

(9) a. Every mother that has a child_i loves it_i.

b. $\forall_{x,y} [\text{mother}(x) \wedge \text{child}(y) \wedge \text{have}(x,y)] [\text{love}(x,y)]$

(10) a. *Ola ta pedhia pu pezun opjodhipote pnesto₁, to₁ exun*
all the children that play.3pl FC wind instrument, it have.3pl
panda mazi tus.

always with them

‘All the children who play any wind instrument always carry it with them.’

b. $\forall_{x,y} [\text{child}(x) \wedge \text{wind.instrument}(y) \wedge \text{play}(x,y)]$
 [always.carry.with.them(x,y)]

Indefinites are also characterized by the fact that they allow anaphoric relations to be established at the discourse level as can be seen in (11). In example (12) we see that *opjosdhipote* can also license discourse anaphora (subindices are used in order to express the anaphoric relations):

(11) *Pare ena xarti₁. Dhiplose to₁ sta dhio*
take.imper.2sg a card fold.imper.2sg it in.the.ACC. two

ke dhos’ to₁ mu.

and give.imper.2sg it me.GEN

‘Take a card. Fold it in two and give it to me.’

(12) *Pare opjodhipote xarti₁. Dhiplose to₁ sta dhio*
take.imper.2sg FC card fold.imper.2s it in.the.ACC two

ke dhos’ to₁ mu.

ke give.imper.2sg it me.GEN

‘Take any card. Fold it in two and give it to me.’

Another distinctive characteristic that indefinites and FCIs share is the fact that they are felicitous within predicative nominals (see Giannakidou 2001 and Horn 2005):

- (13) a. He is not a friend of mine.
b. He could be anyone.
- (14) a. Tha mboruse na ine enas filos mu.
fut. could subj. be a friend me.GEN
'He could be a friend of mine'
b. Tha mboruse na ine opjosdhipote.
fut. could subj. be anyone
'He/It could be anyone.'

A construction that further supports the indefinite nature of FCIs, is the *supplementary* FCI, which involves a regular indefinite like *a* or *some* and a FCI like *opjosdhipote* added afterwards, as a supplement. This is described by Horn (2005:188) as *dilation* of the existential that precedes the FCI. The following examples serve to illustrate the point:

- (15) I am looking for a bicycle, *any* bicycle, that works.
- (16) Mipos gnorizi kamia kapjo vivlio, opjodhipote vivlio, pu na
maybe knows nobody.fem. some book FC book that subj.
perixi ikones pinguinon?
contains pictures penguins.GEN
'Does anyone know some book, any book, that contains pictures of penguins?'

Finally, another fact that strengthens the analysis of FCIs as indefinites is the possibility of co-occurrence with the indefinite article as already mentioned in the introduction. The FCI with the indefinite article can be within a predicative nominal as in (17) or in argumental positions such as object position as in (18):

- (17) I Astipalea dhen ine ena opjodhipote nisi, ine to pio omorfo.
the Astipalea not is a FC island, is the more beautiful
'Astipalea is not just any island; it is the most beautiful one.'
- (18) Dhen efera ena opjodhipote krasi, ala ena Rioja.
not brought.1sg a FC wine, but a Rioja
'I didn't bring just any wine, but a Rioja.'

This fact is also attested in many Romance languages such as Spanish, Catalan and Italian respectively:

- (19) Ponte un vestido cualquiera.
put.on a dress FC
'Put on just any dress.'
- (20) L'acció es situa en la perifèria d'una ciutat qualsevol.
the action refl. situate.3sg in the periphery of a city FC
'The action is situated in the periphery of a city, any city.'

- (21) Trovare un lavoro qualsiasi a Londra é facile.
find a job FC in London is easy
 ‘It is easy to find whatever kind of job in London.’

I will return to the co-appearance of FCIs with the indefinite article in section 5.

3.2 A note on some differences between indefinites and FCIs

Up to this point we have seen that there is strong evidence for the indefinite analysis of FCIs on the basis of the characteristics they share with regular indefinites. Nevertheless, it needs to be noticed that FCIs are not to be seen as fully identical to regular indefinites like *a*, because there are also some differences between them, which get reflected in the more limited distribution of FCIs. These differences concern the fact that FCIs cannot occur either in *there*-insertion contexts or in episodic contexts⁷, but I take it that satisfactory answers have been given in the literature to account for these facts (see footnote 7 for examples and references). A more intriguing difference is the one having to do with quantificational variability, which seems to be restricted to vary between \forall , \exists and Gen when FCIs are concerned, while regular indefinites like *a* can also gain other quantificational forces such as the forces of quantificational adverbs like *usually*, *rarely*, *often* etc. Here is an example of an indefinite and the representation of the tripartite structure it is involved in (based on Lewis 1975, Heim 1982):

- (22) a. Children usually go to concerts of improvised music.
 b. This could be paraphrased as follows: Most children go to concerts of improvised music.
 c. Usually x [children(x)] [go.to.concerts.of.improvised music(x)]

An example of a FCI with a Q-adverb allows only for the frequency reading of the adverb and does not give rise to a paraphrase like the one in (22b). This is attested in (23):

⁷ Regular indefinites like *a* occur freely in episodic contexts and are licit in *there*-insertion contexts, while FCIs do not occur in these environments:

- (i) A cat came in.
 (ii) *Any cat came in.
 (iii) Mbike mesa mia gata.
came.3sg inside a cat
 ‘A cat came in.’
 (iv) *Mbike mesa opjadhipote gata.
came.3sg inside FC cat
 (v) There is a kitten on the sofa.
 (vi) *There is any kitten on the sofa.

For discussion and possible solutions to these differences see Giannakidou (2001) and Horn (2005).

- (23) Ta pedhia sinithos akun opjodhipote ixo me periergia.
the children usually hear FC sound with curiosity
 ‘Children usually listen to whatever sound with curiosity.’

In line with Dayal (1998) and in contrast with Giannakidou (2001) I argue that FCIs are not felicitous with Q-adverbs. This point is further illustrated with individual-level predicates, since these predicates exclude frequency readings of the adverbs. This has to be accounted for if we want to continue defending the indefinite analysis of FCIs, but at this point I can only make the observation that FCIs, unlike regular indefinites, do not form felicitous sentences with Q-adverbs, as attested in the examples below:

- (24) A lion is usually majestic.
 (25) *Any lion is usually majestic.
 (26) ?Enas krokodilos ine sinithos tromaxtikos.
a crocodile is usually scary
 ‘A crocodile is usually scary’
 (27) *Opjodhipote krokodilos ine sinithos tromaxtikos.
FC crocodile is usually scary

4 FCI *opjosdhipote* and the puzzle in Greek

I will present now data that illustrate three uses of the Greek FCI *opjosdhipote*. These three constructions will be discussed and it will be shown that they have different distributions, and, as a consequence, they will not be interchangeable. The constructions in question are the following⁸:

[*Opjosdhipote* + Noun]

[Indefinite article + *opjosdhipote* +Noun]

[Definite article + *opjosdhipote* +Noun]

The descriptive labels I will use from now on, for convenience, are ‘bare FCIs’, ‘indef-art FCIs’ and ‘def-art FCIs’, respectively.

4.1 The data

Ability or possibility modals like *mboro* ‘can’ are contexts that permit all three constructions as can be seen in examples (28) a,b:

⁸ The order in the above constructions is crucial since the order [*opjosdhipote* + (in)definite article + Noun] is not attested. I leave aside occurrences of *opjosdhipote* as a pronoun, as well as occurrences of *opjosdhipote* with other indefinites such as *kapjo* ‘some’ to be dealt with in future research. Here is an example with *kapjo* ‘some’:

- (i) An enas pektis pi oti vlepi kapjo opjodhipote lathos stamatai to pexnidi.
 ‘If a player says that he sees whatever kind of error he stops the game.’

- (28) a. Afto mbori_{ability} na to peksi **{opjosdhipote/enas opjosdhipote/**
this can.3sg subj. it play.3sg FC /a FC /
o opjosdhipote} musikos.
the FC musician
 ‘This can be played by any musician.’
- b. Ta dora afta mbori_{possibility} na tixun se **{opjodhipote/**
the presents these can.3sg subj. happen.3pl to FC
ena opjodhipote/ to opjodhipote} zevgari.
a FC / the FC couple
 ‘Any couple may win these presents.’

Generics allow bare and def-art FCIs, but indef-art FCIs are not acceptable in this context as seen in (29):

- (29) **{Opjosdhipote/*Enas opjosdhipote/O opjosdhipote}** ixos ine musiki.
FC /a FC /the FC sound is music
 ‘Any sound is music.’

The fact that indef-art FCIs are not accepted in generics is expected, since Greek generics are normally expressed with definite singulars or plurals. Some of my informants regard (29) with the indefinite article grammatical with the assumption that there is some modification of the noun phrase as in the utterance below- here, an adjective modifying the noun:

- (30) Enas opjosdhipote omorfos ixos ine musiki.
a FC beautiful sound is music
 ‘Any beautiful sound is music.’

This modification is though not obligatory for the licensing of bare or def-art FCIs, so the difference in the distributions attested is significant.

In the context of imperatives bare and indef-art FCIs are allowed, while def-art FCIs are not:

- (31) Pekse **{opjadhhipote/mia opjadhhipote/*tin opjadhhipote}** nota.
play.imper.2sg FC /a FC /the FC note
 ‘Play any note.’

In the antecedent of conditionals bare and def-art FCIs are allowed, while indef-art FCIs are accepted only by a few speakers. Episodic negation presents the opposite distribution: it allows indef-art FCIs, while it does not allow bare FCIs, and judgements vary across speakers as regards def-art FCIs:

- (32) An exete {**opjadhipe/%⁹mia opjadhipe/tin opjadhipe**} pliroforia,
if have.2sg. FC /a FC /the FC information,
 kaleste mas.
call us
 ‘If you have any information, call us.’
- (33) Dhen efera {***opjodhipote/ena opjodhipote/% to opjodhipote**} krasi,
not brought.1sg FC /a FC /the FC wine,
 ala ena Rioja.
but a Rioja
 ‘I didn’t bring just any wine, but a Rioja.’

As was pointed out before in footnote 7, affirmative episodic and *there*-insertion contexts do not allow bare and def-art FCIs, while indef-art FCIs in these contexts are acceptable for some speakers:

- (34) Irthe {***opjosdhipote/% enas opjosdhipote/*o opjosdhipote**} pelatis.
came.3sg FC / a FC /the FC client
 ‘*Any client came’
- (35) Ipirxe {***opjodhipote/% ena opjodhipote/*to opjodhipote**} vilvio pano
existed.3sg FC /a FC /the FC book on
 sto trapezi.
in.the table
 ‘*There was any book on the table’

On the basis of the distributions of these three constructions the relevant observation is that there is a split: bare and def-art FCIs pattern, in general, alike, and indef-art FCIs behave differently. This split will be reflected in the proposal I am going to present in the next section in the assumption that *opjosdhipote* in bare and def-art FCIs is a determiner and in indef-art FCIs an adjective.

5 The proposal

Following previous indefinite analyses of FCIs (see references above) I argue that *opjosdhipote*, i.e. the bare FCI + N, is a Heimian indefinite that additionally involves *domain widening* (see Kadmon & Landman 1993:361):

⁹ I use the symbol % to refer to differences reported across speakers and not to marginal acceptance in one speaker, that is, whenever I use % it indicates that the judgements varied between acceptable, marginal and not acceptable depending on the speaker in question.

- (36) *Widening* is defined as follows: *in an NP of the form any CP, any widens the interpretation of the common noun phrase (CP) along a contextual dimension.*

This means that in order to interpret an utterance involving a FCI, we need to widen the domain in order to include individuals that were not taken previously into account. For example, in (37) the speaker includes even musicians that are not very good or even people that would marginally be considered musicians:

- (37) Afto mpori^{ability} na to peksi {**opjosdhipote/enas opjosdhipote/**
this can.3sg subj. it play.3sg FC /a FC /
o opjosdhipote} musikos.
the FC musician
 ‘This can be played by any musician.’

As regards now the [indefinite article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun] construction, given that indef-art FCIs do not display any quantificational variability, I claim that they are inherently existential. The claim for their existential-only nature is supported by the following facts: First, by the fact that they occur only in contexts that allow for or only give rise to existential quantification such as ability or epistemic modals, episodic negation and, for some speakers, also in there-insertion contexts. An even more strong argument for their existential nature is the fact that indef-art FCIs cannot occur in constructions that show the ‘subtriggering’ effect. Subtriggering (LeGrand 1975) is caused by constructions that involve modification of the FCI by a relative clause yielding only universal readings of the FCI. An episodic utterance like (38), without any modification, is ungrammatical, but gains grammaticality when modified by a relative clause as in (39):

- (38) *Xtes efaga opjodhipote gliko.
yesterday ate.1sg FC sweet
 ‘*Yesterday I ate any sweet’
- (39) Xtes efaga opjodhipote gliko ipirxe sto psigio.
yesterday ate.1sg FC sweet existed.3sg in.the.ACC fridge
 ‘Yesterday I ate any sweet there was in the fridge’

The interpretation of (39) can only be universal and the bare FCI is licensed. Indef-art FCIs cannot be involved in ‘subtriggering’ and thus are resistant to being interpreted universally, as seen below:

- (40) *Xtes efaga ena opjodhipote gliko ipirxe sto psigio.
yesterday ate.1sg a FC sweet existed.3sg in.the fridge

Let’s consider again example (18), repeated here as (41):

- (41) Dhen efera ena opjodhipote krasi, ala ena Rioja.
not brought.1sg a FC wine, but a Rioja
 ‘I didn’t bring just any wine, but a Rioja.’

Here we have an anti-indiscriminative reading of the FCI, which is a reading always constructed with negation. In English this reading is expressed via the *not just any* construction. As Horn (2005:186) puts it:

Such anti-indiscriminative assertions respond to propositions salient in (or accommodated to) the common ground, namely that the corresponding positive existential holds (for our example, ‘I brought a wine’, DLC) and that the specific identity of the objects in question (for our example, among the set of wines, DLC) is largely immaterial. It is this latter assumption that the anti-indiscriminative any claim refutes.

The same pattern, i.e. the FCI plus the indefinite article, for expression of *anti-indiscriminative* readings is also observed in Spanish (see Quer 1999) and in Catalan:

- (42) No es una revista cualquiera.
not is a magazine FC
 ‘It’s not just any magazine.’

- (43) Aquesta no és una bicicleta qualsevol.
this not is a bicycle FC
 ‘This is not just any bicycle.’

In the above examples, as well as in the examples (19) and (20), we observe that the FCIs involved, i.e. *cualquier(a)* and *qualsevol*, appear postnominally and, in fact, this is the only possible order for these constructions, whereas *cualquier(a)* and *qualsevol* without the indefinite article must appear prenominally as in (44) and (45):

- (44) Coge cualquier pastel.
take.imper.2sg FC sweet
 ‘Take any sweet.’

- (45) Si teniu qualsevol dubte, contacteu amb les nostres oficines.
if have.2pl FC dubte contact.2pl.imper. with the ours offices
 ‘If you have any doubt, contact our offices.’

Given the fact that, in general, adjectives in Spanish and Catalan appear postnominally, I propose that in the Greek construction [indefinite-article + *opjosdhipote* + Noun], *opjosdhipote* is not a determiner, but an adjective. This hypothesis correctly accounts for the different distribution of indef-art FCIs compared to bare and def-art FCIs, as we saw in section 4.1.

Further support for my claim for the existential-only nature of indef-art FCIs comes from the cross-linguistic evidence we find in Italian as discussed in Chierchia (2005), where he argues for the existential nature of the construction [*un N qualunque/qualsiasi*] ‘a N any’.

As regards now the [definite article + FCI + Noun] construction and the quantificational force of def-art FCIs we notice that def-art FCIs present quantificational variability as attested for example in (1) and in (28), where they get generic and universal interpretations, respectively. In contrast with the behaviour of *opjosdhipote* in indef-art FCIs, I claim that *opjosdhipote* is not an adjective here, but a determiner just like in bare FCIs. Empirical evidence supporting this claim is provided by the fact that no *determiner spreading* is attested with def-art FCIs. *Determiner spreading/Polydefiniteness* is the phenomenon observed in Greek (see Androutsopoulou, 1994; Alexiadou and Wilder, 1998), where in modified DPs, the default order Det>Adj>N changes giving rise to an additional definite article:

- (46) to podilato *(to) kokino
the bicycle (the) red
 ‘the red the bicycle’

In the default order an additional definite article is also possible:

- (47) to kokino (to) podilato
the red (the) bicycle
 ‘the red bicycle’

We observe though that (48) and (49) are ungrammatical and no determiner spreading is allowed when *opjosdhipote* is involved:

- (48) *to opjodhipote to podilato
the any the bicycle

- (49) *to podilato to opjodhipote
the bicycle the any

This fact is not only relevant for showing that *opjosdhipote* here is not an adjective, at least not a qualitative one like *kokino* ‘red’, but it is also important in determining the role of the definite article involved in this construction. If we had here a regular definite article we would expect it to spread, as it is normal in Greek, but this is not attested.

Let’s turn now to the contribution of the definite article in the construction in question. We just saw that it cannot spread when co-occurring with *opjosdhipote*. Another fact that is crucial is that the definite article involved in this construction does not show typical characteristics of *definiteness* considering them to be reference to an old discourse referent (*familiarity* in Heim’s terms) and uniqueness presupposition. Let’s turn to a relevant example involving a def-art FCI to check whether the claim that no definiteness is attested is verified:

(50) Oxi...sas eksomologume oti dhen thimame pote onira pu idha
no... you.ACC confess.1sg that not remember.1sg never dreams that saw.1sg
 ti nixta.. To ksero oti afto to kusuri mu tha ekane **ton opjodhipote**
the.ACC night it know.1sg that this the defect mine fut make.3sg the FC
psixanaliti na pethani tis pinas! Dhen tha mborusa na tu dhigitho
psychoanalyst subj. die the.GEN hunger not fut. could.1sg subj. him tell
 tipota apo ton kosmo ton oniron mu!
nothing from the.ACC world the.GEN dreams mine

‘No, I confess to you that I don’t ever remember dreams I saw at night... I know that this defect of mine would make any psychoanalyst die from hunger! I couldn’t tell him anything from the world of my dreams!’

In the context of (50), there is no previous reference to a specific psychoanalyst and we cannot pick up a previous discourse referent by uttering *ton opjodhipote psixanaliti* ‘lit. the FC psychoanalyst’. There is furthermore no presupposition that there exists such an entity (though knowledge of the nowadays’ world tells us that are such entities as psychoanalysts) nor that this entity is unique. So, we conclude that *ton opjodhipote psixanaliti* does not pick up the unique individual that satisfies the property denoted by the noun and no *iota* operator à la G & C is involved.

After having seen what the definite article in this construction does not do, we turn our interest to whether it has some contribution after all: Comparison of examples where both, bare and def-art FCIs are licit brings up differences in interpretation:

(51) Opjosdhipote ixos ine musiki. vs. O opjosdhipote ixos ine musiki.
FC sound is music / the FC sound is music
 ‘Any sound is music’¹⁰

The difference observed is that in the first utterance, with the bare FCI, the speaker allows for exceptions, so she regards, for instance, the sound of the washing machine as an exception to her claim, but in the second utterance, with the def-art FCI, no exceptions are allowed: the speaker involves in her statement even washing machines, doorbells or sine waves as sounds that are music.

What this difference suggests is that the definite article in def-art FCIs acts as a *slack regulator* in the sense of Lasersohn (1999). According to Lasersohn people tend to speak loosely, making use of what he calls *pragmatic slack*. Pragmatic slack is a pragmatically licensed deviation from truth and there exist expressions in language that regulate the pragmatic slack allowed in the interpretation of utterances. These expressions are called *slack regulators* and Lasersohn’s examples include adverbs like *exactly*, degree scalar adjectives like *round* and universal quantifiers like *all*. I suggest to treat the definite article in the construction in question also as a kind of slack regulator, that, resembling *all*, widens up even more the domain of quantification.

¹⁰ In order to show the difference attested in Greek, we could translate the one with the definite article as ‘Absolutely any sound is music’.

6 Conclusions

In this article I showed that there is strong evidence in favor of the indefinite analysis of FCIs. I provided data that show that the FCI *opjosdhipote* in Greek is involved in three different constructions and I have claimed that the bare, indef-art and def-art FCIs differ with respect to their quantificational variability: bare and def-art FCIs present quantificational variability, while indef-art FCIs are inherently existential. I have further claimed that *opjosdhipote* involved in bare and def-art FCIs is a determiner, whereas *opjosdhipote* in indef-art FCIs is an adjective. I finally addressed the question of whether the definite article co-appearing with *opjosdhipote* forms a definite FCI in the sense of G & C and have claimed that the definite article in this construction does not contribute definiteness but acts as a slack regulator in the sense of Lasersohn (1999).

Appendix

The Greek FCI *opjosdhipote* is declined as follows:

singular				plural			
	masculine	feminine	neuter		masculine	feminine	neuter
Nom.	opjosdhipote	Opjadhipote	opjodhipote	Nom.	opjidhipote	opjesdhipote	opjadhipote
Gen.	opjudhipote	Opjasdhipote	opjudhipote	Gen.	opjondhipote	opjondhipote	opjondhipote
Acc.	opjondhipote	Opjadhipote	opjodhipote	Acc.	opjusdhipote	opjesdhipote	opjadhipote

The definite article *o,i,to* in Greek is declined as follows:

singular				plural		
	masc.	fem.	neuter	masc.	fem.	neuter
Nom.	o	i	to	I	i	ta
Gen.	tu	tis	tu	ton	ton	ton
Acc.	ton	tin	to	tus	tis	ta

The indefinite article *enas,mia,ena* in Greek is declined as follows:

	masculine	feminine	neuter
Nom.	enas	mia	ena
Gen.	enos	mias	enos
Acc.	enan	mia	ena

References

- Alexiadou, A. & Wilder C. (1998). Adjectival Modification and Multiple Determiners, in A. Alexiadou & C. Wilder (eds.) *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 303-332.
- Androutsopoulou, A. (1994). The distribution of the definite determiner and the syntax of Greek DPs, *Proceedings of the 30th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.
- Chierchia, G. (2005). Broaden your views. Implicatures of domain widening and the “Logicality” of language, last draft (September 2005) forthcoming in *Linguistic Inquiry*
- Dayal, V. (2004): " The Universal Force of Free Choice *Any*", *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 4, 5-40
- Garcia, S. (2003). *Los Términos de Elección Libre en Español: el caso de cualquier(a)*. Trabajo de investigación. UAB
- Giannakidou, A. (2001). The Meaning of Free Choice. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 24.6: 659-735.
- Giannakidou, A. and Cheng L. (2006). (In)Definiteness, Polarity, and the Role of wh-morphology in Free Choice. *Journal of Semantics* 23: 135-183.
- Heim , I. (1982). *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. PhD. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Garland Publishing Inc., 1988.
- Horn, L. R. (2005). Airport '68 Revisited: Toward a unified indefinite any. In Carlson G. and Pelletier J. F. (eds.). 179-205.
- Jacobson, P. (1995). On the Quantificational Force of English Free Relatives. *Quantification in Natural Language* ed. by Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer and Barbara Partee. 451-86. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kadmon, N. and Landman F. (1993). Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 15: 353-422.
- Kratzer, A. and Shimoyama J. (2002). Indeterminate Pronouns: The View from Japanese. In Y. Otsu (ed) *Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, Hituzi Syobo, Tokyo.
- Lasnik, P. (1999) Pragmatic halos. *Language* 75:522–551
- Lazaridou-Chatzigeorgaki, D. (in progress) On the notion of definite Free Choice Items.
- Lee, Y.-S. & Horn L. (1994). Any as an indefinite Plus Even. Ms., Yale University.
- Lewis, D. (1975). Adverbs of quantification. En E.L. Keenan (ed.). *Formal semantics of natural language*. 3-15, CUP.
- Quer, J. (1999). The quantificational force of free choice items. Unpublished MS. University of Amsterdam.