

WH-FCI IN KHALKHA MONGOLIAN*

YAXUAN WANG

Michigan State University

1 Introduction

In Khalkha Mongolian, there are two ways to form universal Free Choice Items (henceforth, FCIs) using *wh*-words. The first method involves using a *wh*-word combined with the additive particle *ch* (1), the second method uses a combination of a *wh*-word with the particles *l* and *bol*, followed by a repetition of the *wh*-word. The first method is more commonly used in both written and spoken contexts, and the construction, a *wh* plus a focus additive or scalar particle, is cross-linguistically well-observed (e.g. Mandarin: Xiang, 2020; Greek: Giannakidou, 2020; Japanese: Nishigauchi, 1986; Dutch: Rullmann, 1996; etc.). Although the second method is less frequently used in Mongolian, examples in (2) demonstrate that it is a productive strategy. This paper focuses on analyzing this second method.

A comparison of examples (2) with (3) shows that *wh*-FCIs in Khalkha Mongolian are compatible with present habitive, durative, and possibility modals, but ungrammatical in non-habitual episodic descriptions and with necessity modals. Additionally, when *wh*-FCIs are used with possibility modals, speakers reported that the particle *l* can optionally overtly appear after the second *wh*-word, as shown by (2e-f).

(1) *Gemt-heregten hen ch bai-j bol-no.*
criminal who CH be-CVB allow-DUR
Anyone may be a criminal.

(2) a. *Bat hen-tei l bol hen-tei yari-dag.*
Bat who-COM L BOL who-COM talk-HAB
Bat talks to anyone.

b. *Yamar l bol yamar hel-eer oilgo-lc-dog.*
what.kind L BOL what.kind language-INSTRU understand-each.other-HAB
(Ones) understand each other by using any language.

*I would like to thank my Khalkha Mongolian consultants at The National University of Mongolia, Brian Buccola, Chigchi Bai, Haoze Li for their valuable comments and suggestions.

- c. *Haana l bol haana unt-na.*
 where L BOL where sleep-DUR
 (One) will sleep anywhere.
- d. *Bat-d yu l bol yu bai-na.*
 Bat-DAT what L BOL what have-DUR
 Bat has anything.
- e. *Hezee l bol hezee zogsolt hii-j (l) magadgui.*
 when L BOL when stop do-CVB (L) may
 (It) may stop anytime.
- f. *En-iig ya-j l bol ya-j (l) hii-j bol-no.*
 this-ACC how.to.do-CVB L BOL how.to.do-CVB (L) do-CVB allow-DUR
 (You) can do this anyhow.
- (3) a. **Bat hen-tei l bol hen-tei yari-j duuga-v.*
 Bat who-COM L BOL who-COM talk-CVB finish-PST
 Lit.: Bat finished talking to anyone.
- b. **Hezee l bol hezee zogsolt hii-j heregtei.*
 when L BOL when stop do-CVB must
 Lit.: (It) must stop anytime.

This paper aims to provide an analysis for the linguistic facts described above. Section 2 presents the semantics of each particle in the construction. Section 3 examines the habitual aspect associated with finite markers *-dag* and *-na*. Section 4 develops analyses. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 Semantics of particles

2.1 Particle *l*

l serves multiple functions, with its most common role being that of an exclusive focus marker. As displayed in (4a-b), the associate of *l* is its immediately preceding constituent. The sentence with *l* asserts the truth of its prejacent and the falsity of all the contextually relevant alternatives of the prejacent. This is shown by (4c), where the negation of (4b) does not preserve the truth of the prejacent¹.

¹The Khalkha Mongolian counterpart for English *only* is *zövhöñ* which presupposes its prejacent. *zövhöñ* has the leftward focus association, the same as in English.

- (i) *Bi margaash zövhöñ kino uz-ne.*
 I tomorrow only movie watch-DUR
 I will only watch a movie tomorrow (not watch other stuff).
- (ii) *Bi margaash zövhöñ kino uz-ne ge-deg tiim bish*
 I tomorrow only movie watch-DUR say-HAB that.way NEG
 It is not the case that I will only watch a movie tomorrow (not watch other stuff).
 ↗ I will watch a movie tomorrow.

- (4) a. *Bi margaash l kino uz-ne.*
 I tomorrow L movie watch-DUR
 I will watch a movie tomorrow (not at other times).
- b. *Bi margaash kino l uz-ne.*
 I tomorrow movie L watch-DUR
 I will watch a movie tomorrow (not watch other stuff).
- c. *Bi margaash kino l uz-ne ge-deg tiim bish.*
 I tomorrow movie L watch-HAB say-DUR that.way NEG
 It is not the case that I will watch a movie tomorrow.
 → I will not watch a movie tomorrow.

l can also be used to express the continuity of an event (5) or the consecutive relationship between two different events (6). In these cases, the associate of *l* is always a converb preceding it.

- (5) *Boroo or-soor l bai-na.*
 Rain come-CVB L be-DUR
 It is still raining.
- (6) *Ted nap op-j ir-eed l boroo or-son.*
 They PL come-CVB come-CVB L rain come-PRF
 As soon as they came in, it rained.

I analyze the *l* in *wh*-FCI construction as taking its exclusive focus function, as its associate *wh*-words is not always the converb. The semantics of *l* is given in (7): it asserts that its preadjacent proposition is true and that all its contextually relevant focus alternatives are false.

- (7) $[[L]] = \lambda p \lambda w. p(w) = 1 \wedge \forall q \in \text{Alt}(p)[q(w) = 0]$, where $\text{Alt}(p)$ is a set of contextually relevant focus alternatives.

2.2 Particle *bol*

bol has two main functions in declaratives. First, it serves as a topic marker. In Khalkha Mongolian, matrix subjects are marked with the nominative case, while embedded subjects take the accusative case. Thus, when *bol* functions as a topic marker, it always follows a constituent in either the nominative or accusative case, but never any other case (8).

- (8) a. *Dorj bol manai zahiral.*
 Dorj-NOM TOP our principal
 As for Dorj, he is our principal.
- b. *Dorj-iig bol manai zahiral bai-h-iig bi med-ne.*
 Dorj-ACC TOP our principal be-INF-ACC I know-DUR
 I know Dorj is our principal.

bol can also function as a conditional marker that appears at the right periphery of the antecedent clause (9). *bol* is haplogogized from *bol-bol*, where the verb root *bol* means ‘to become’, ‘to be allowed’, ‘to be possible’, and the suffix *-bol* is the condition marker.

- (9) *Bich-j chada-h bol bich dee.*
 write-CVB able-INF COND write PTCL
 If you are able to write, then write.

As displayed by (2a, e), *bol* does not always follow the nominative or accusative case, it is thus inappropriate to treat it as a topic marker in *wh*-FCIs. Instead, I assume it with its conditional meaning. I follow the standard approach to conditionals by restricting the domain of a modal or a temporal operator in the consequent (Kratzer, 2012, Von Stechow, 1994). I further assume that *bol* introduces the possibility modality into the antecedent.

3 Imperfective aspect

Khalkha Mongolian has two simple forms for non-past tenses, which are the only two finite tense markers that appear consistently with *wh*-FCIs. One is *-dag*, usually seen as a habitive participle. It carries an aspectually marked habitive general indefinite present tense reference (10). The other one is *-na*, and it is considered as a durative of the finite paradigm. It functions as an aspectually neutral present or future tense but with conditions (Janhunen, 2012, Brosig, 2009). It usually indicates the future when used alone (11a). It expresses the actual present only when combined with the progressive (11b). When the verb it attaches to is a semantically imperfective static, such as *med* ('know'), *bol* ('allow'), and *bai* ('have'), *-na* indicates the habitual present (11c-e).

- (10) *Bat jil bur mongol-d yav-dag.*
 Bat year every Mongolia-DAT go-HAB
 Bat goes to Mongolia every year.
- (11) a. *Bat daraa-giin jil mongol-d yav-na.*
 Bat next-GEN year Mongolia-DAT go-DUR
 Bat will go to Mongolia next year.
- b. *Bat ogoo mongol ruu yav-j bai-na.*
 Bat now Mongolia to go-CVB be-DUR
 Bat is traveling to Mongolia now.
- c. *Bat mongol hel med-ne.*
 Bat Mongol language know-DUR
 Bat knows Mongolian.
- d. *Bat ciher id-j bol-no.*
 Bat candy eat-CVB allow-DUR
 Bat is allowed to eat candies.
- e. *Bat-d uzeg bai-na.*
 Bat-DAT pen have-DUR
 Bat has a pen.

Since *wh*-FCIs are only compatible with the imperfective habitual, as illustrated in the first section, I follow Erlewine (2020) and citations there to model the habitual imperfective as a type of

universal modal that quantifies over a set of “usual or normal” sub-situations of the topic situation, represented as $s' \leq s$.

$$(12) \quad \llbracket \text{if } \phi, \text{IMPF } \psi \rrbracket = \{ \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge \phi(s') \rightarrow \psi(s')] \}$$

4 Analysis

In examples (2a) and (2e), we observed that in a *wh*-FCI, the *wh*-words are reduplicated, including not only the *wh*-word stem, but also any attached affixes. There are two possible interpretations of the LF of *wh*-FCIs. The first possibility is that the vP in the antecedent and the consequent are identical at LF, with everything except the *wh*-word being elided in the antecedent at PF (13a). The other possibility is that the *wh*-word is duplicated with the attached affixes, but the attached affixes are only at PF and not interpreted at LF (13b).

- (13) a. LF: If $[\phi \text{ L } [\diamond \text{ p}(\text{wh}_i)]]$, $[\psi \text{ IMPF } [\text{p}(\text{wh}_i)]]$
 b. LF: If $[\phi \text{ L } [\diamond \text{ wh}_i]]$, $[\psi \text{ IMPF } [\text{p}(\text{wh}_i)]]$

Take (2a) as an example. According to the hypothesis in (13a), (2a), repeated in (14a), has an LF in (14b). Suppose a context with two individuals, Dorj and Ceceg.

- (14) a. Bat who-COM L BOL who-COM talk-HAB
 b. LF: If $[\phi \text{ L } [\diamond \text{ Bat talk to who}_i]]$, $[\psi \text{ IMPF } [\text{Bat talk to who}_i]]$

The exclusive focus marker *l* takes scope over the antecedent clause and operates on each alternative in the set denoted by *who* pointwisely. In plain English, the result in (15) is a set of two alternative propositions: that Bat can talk to Dorj and that Bat cannot talk to Ceceg, that Bat can talk to Ceceg and that Bat cannot talk to Dorj. This equals to state that Bat can talk to only Dorj, that Bat can talk to only Ceceg.

$$(15) \quad \llbracket \text{L} \rrbracket ([\diamond \text{ Bat talk to who}_i]) \\
= \{ \llbracket \text{L} \rrbracket (\diamond \text{ Bat talk to Dorj}), \\
\llbracket \text{L} \rrbracket (\diamond \text{ Bat talk to Ceceg}) \} \\
= \{ \diamond \text{ Bat talk to Dorj} \wedge \neg \diamond \text{ Bat talk to Ceceg}, \\
\diamond \text{ Bat talk to Ceceg} \wedge \neg \diamond \text{ Bat talk to Dorj} \}$$

Given (15), we yield the alternative set denotation for the antecedent ϕ in (16a). ϕ restricts the modal base of the consequent ψ 's modal quantification (16b), yielding the denotation for *if* ϕ , ψ in (16c). The ordinary value of the set conditionals is derived from the disjunction of its sister's alternative set (16d) (Erlewine, 2019). It states that in all normal sub-situations s' of the topic situation s where Bat can talk to only Dorj, he talks to Dorj; in different normal sub-situations where Bat can talk to only Ceceg, he talks to Ceceg. But Bat is not required to talk with anyone in the actual topic situations, since we are merely considering what Bat does in different normal situations. Hence, the universal free choice reading is derived.

- (16) a. $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket = \{ \lambda s. L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj})(s), \lambda s. L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg})(s) \}$
 b. $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket = \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to who}_i]$
 c. $\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket = \{ \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s')], \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s')] \}$
 d. $\llbracket \exists \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket = \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge (L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s')) \vee \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s')]]$

However, the hypothesis (13a) is faced with a problem. As (2d-e) exhibit, when possibility modal scopes over the matrix clause, the exclusive particle *l* optionally arises. This seems to be an overt realization of Xiang's (2020) hypothesis that the modal verb mandatorily embeds an *O*-exhaustifier, which has the same semantics as the particle *l*. I follow Xiang's hypothesis and assume that the modal verb in the consequent introduces an exclusive marker that operates on the alternatives of its prejacent (17b).

- (17) a. Bat who-COM L BOL who-COM (L) talk-CVB can
 b. LF: L [If $[\phi \text{ L } [\diamond \text{Bat talk to who}_i]]$, $[\psi \diamond [\text{Bat talk to who}_i]]$]

The alternative set denotation of the prejacent of the matrix exclusive marker, shown in (18a), reads that in situation *s* where Bat can talk to only Dorj, he can talk to Dorj; in situation *s* where bat can talk to only Ceceg, he can talk to Ceceg. Notice that in this case, each alternative is constantly true because the antecedent logically entails the consequent. Consequently, applying the exclusive marker at the matrix level to each alternative in (18a) results in contradictions. As illustrated in (18b), the negation of the alternative conditional consistently yields a false value, which in turn makes the conjunction false.

- (18) a. $\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket = \{ \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)], \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \}$
 b. $L(\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket) = \{ \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \wedge \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \neg \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)], \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \wedge \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \neg \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \}$
 $= \{ \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \wedge \perp, \lambda s. [L(\diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \wedge \perp \}$

Now let's consider the second hypothesized LF in (13b). The same sentence from example (2a) has an LF represented by (19b), which informally states that if who is possible/available, Bat talks to who. The derivation for the imperfective description follows the same logic, ultimately leading to a universal free choice interpretation: in all normal sub-situations *s'* of the topic situation *s* where only Dorj is available, Bat talks to Dorj; in different normal sub-situations where only Ceceg is available, Bat talks to Ceceg. Hence, Bat is allowed but not required to talk to anyone.

- (19) a. Bat who-COM L BOL who-COM talk-PRS
 b. LF: If $[\phi \text{ L } [\diamond \text{ who}_i]]$, $[\psi \text{ IMPF } [\text{Bat talk to who}_i]]$
 c. $\text{L } [\diamond \text{ who}_i]$
 $= \{\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj}), \text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})\}$
 $= \{\diamond \text{ Dorj} \wedge \neg \diamond \text{ Ceceg}, \diamond \text{ Ceceg} \wedge \neg \diamond \text{ Dorj}\}$
- (20) a. $\llbracket \phi \rrbracket = \{\lambda s. \text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s), \lambda s. \text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s)\}$
 b. $\llbracket \psi \rrbracket = \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to who}_i]$
 c. $\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket = \{\lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge \text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s')],$
 $\lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge \text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s')]\}$
 d. $\llbracket \exists \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket = \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge (\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s')) \vee$
 $\lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge \text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s')]$

The possibility modal in the matrix level does not result in contradictions with the LF in (13b), as in this case, the antecedent does not logically entail the consequent. Applying l to the set of alternatives produces a consistent set in (21b). This set includes the proposition that in situation s with one person, Bat can talk to the person only if the person is Dorj; and that in situation s with one person Bat can talk to the person only if the person is Ceceg.

- (21) a. $\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket = \{\lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)],$
 $\lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)]\}$
 b. $\text{L}(\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket) = \{\lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \wedge \lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \neg \diamond \text{Bat}$
 $\text{talk to Ceceg}(s)],$
 $\lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \wedge \lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \neg \diamond \text{Bat talk to}$
 $\text{Dorj}(s)]\}$

I follow Fox (2007) to assume that the covert exhaustifier defined in (22) is used whenever the sentence has an undesirable ignorance inference. The ordinary semantics of (21a) is the disjunction of alternatives, as in (23). EXH applies to the ordinary semantics of the preadjacent with alternatives pre-exhaustified by L (24), giving rise to the strengthened inference that in situation s with one person, Bat can talk to the person only if the person is Dorj; and that in situation s with one person Bat can talk to the person only if the person is Ceceg. Hence, Bat can talk to anyone.

- (22) $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket = \lambda p \lambda \text{Alt}(p) \lambda w. p(w) = 1 \wedge \forall q \in \text{IE}(p, A) [q(w) = 0]$
 $\text{IE}(p, A) = \bigcap \{\text{Alt}' \subseteq \text{Alt} : \text{Alt}' \text{ is a maximal set in } \text{Alt} \text{ such that } \{\neg p : p \in \text{Alt}'\} \cup \{p\} \text{ is}$
 $\text{consistent}\}$

- (23) $\llbracket \exists \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket = \lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \vee$
 $\lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)]$

- (24) $\text{EXH}(\exists(\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket))(\text{L}(\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \psi \rrbracket)) =$
 $\lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \vee \lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \wedge$
 $\neg (\lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \wedge \lambda s. [\text{L}(\diamond \text{ Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \neg \diamond \text{Bat talk to}$
 $\text{Ceceg}(s)]) \wedge$

$$\begin{aligned} & \neg (\lambda s.[L(\diamond \text{Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \wedge \lambda s.[L(\diamond \text{Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \neg \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)]) \\ & = \lambda s.[L(\diamond \text{Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)] \wedge \lambda s.[L(\diamond \text{Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \diamond \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \end{aligned}$$

The conditional structure easily bears out the unavailability of *wh*-FCIs in the necessity modality and the episodic descriptions. As shown in (25), the antecedent is quantified by a possibility modal whereas a necessity modal quantifies the consequent. Logically, having a universal quantification entailed by an existential one is problematic. Similarly, the truth of the episodic consequent in (26) requires in situation *s* the event it describes to have happened at a particular time prior to the utterance time, which presupposes the goal individual to exist in every possible situation *s'* that is accessible from *s*. But the antecedent quantified by the possibility modal fails to satisfy such a presupposition requirement.

- (25) a. $\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \text{ must } \psi \rrbracket = \{ \lambda s.[L(\diamond \text{Dorj})(s) \rightarrow \square \text{Bat talk to Dorj}(s)], \lambda s.[L(\diamond \text{Ceceg})(s) \rightarrow \square \text{Bat talk to Ceceg}(s)] \}$
 b. $\llbracket \diamond \rrbracket = \lambda p \lambda s. \exists s' [Acc(s)(s') \wedge p(s')]$
 c. $\llbracket \square \rrbracket = \lambda p \lambda s. \forall s' [Acc(s)(s') \wedge p(s')]$

- (26) $\llbracket \text{if } \phi, \text{ episodic } \psi \rrbracket = \{ \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge L(\diamond \text{Dorj})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat finished talking to Dorj}(s')], \lambda s. \forall s' [s' \leq s \wedge L(\diamond \text{Ceceg})(s') \rightarrow \text{Bat finished talking to Ceceg}(s')] \}$

Erlewine (2020) discusses the *wh*-FCI in Tibetan which involves a *wh*-word, copula, conditional marker, and a scalar particle, as illustrated in example (27). Similar to Khalkha Mongolian, the universal quantification force of the *wh*-FCI in Tibetan comes from the imperfective temporal operator whose modal base is restricted by the conditional. However, unlike Khalkha Mongolian, which uses a focus exclusive marker to establish an individual concept in the antecedent referenced by the consequent, Tibetan employs a specificational copular to achieve the same effect, as shown by the proposed LF in (27b). This indirect method of universal quantification over individuals within the FCI's domain appears to be a productive strategy for constructing universal FCIs, as attested in generically different languages.

- (27) a. *Padma (phru.gu) su yin.na'ang-la skad.cha bshad-kyi-red.*
 Pema child who COP.COND.EVEN-DAT speech talk-IMPF-AUX
 Pema talks to any child.
 b. LF: EVEN [if {the child}_{*i*} is who, Pema talks to them_{*i*}]

5 Summary and Remaining issues

This study has examined the patterns of *wh*-FCIs in Khalkha Mongolian, with a particular focus on the construction involving the particles *l* and *bol*. The particle *l* functions as an exclusive focus marker, operating on each alternative to establish the specific individual concept referenced in the consequent. Meanwhile, the particle *bol* acts as a conditional marker, allowing for a modal reading that suggests a flexible or contingent scenario. Imperfective aspect markers, such as *-dag* and *-na*, express habitual actions, introducing a universal force over a range of possible situations. Together, these elements combine compositionally to produce a universal free choice interpretation.

Across languages, FCIs in episodic sentences can be repaired by adding a modifier, the phenomenon known as the ‘subtriggering effect’ (LeGrand, 1975, Dayal, 2013). For example, in English, (28a) is unacceptable on its own but becomes acceptable when a post-nominal PP modifier is added. This subtriggering effect is also observed in Tibetan (29) (Erlewine, 2020), as well as in the *wh*+additive FCI construction in Khalkha Mongolian (30a). However, the subtriggering effect in the *wh*-FCI construction discussed in this paper (30b) is reported to be significantly weaker compared to (30a). This difference may be due to the inherently spoken nature of the construction. In a corpus analysis I conducted, the *wh+l+bol+l* construction is consistently used in short and simple sentences without sub-clauses. Thus, I hypothesize that in theory (30b) is grammatical but the pragmatic and stylistic factors discourage the use of complex modifiers with the *wh+l+bol+l*.

- (28) a. *Bill finished talking to any student.
 b. Bill finished talking to any student at the meeting.
- (29) *Sman.pa sprad-pa-'i samn ga.re yin.na'ang za-dgos-red.*
 doctor give-REL-GEN medicine what COP.COND.EVEN eat-must-AUX
 You must take any medicine that the doctor gives you.
- (30) a. *ci emch-iin ög-sön yamar ch em uuh yostoi.*
 you doctor-GEN give-PST what.kind CH medicine drink must
 You must take any medicine that the doctor gave you.
 b. *?ci emch-iin ög-sön yamar l bol yamar em uuh yostoi.*
 you doctor-GEN give-PST what.kind L BOL what.kind medicine drink must
 You must take any medicine that the doctor gave you.

Moreover, future studies could further investigate the interaction of *wh*-FCIs with other modals and aspectual forms across different Mongolian dialects. One audience reported that Chahar Mongolian prefers the *wh*-FCIs to be used with an intensive suffix *-cih* on the matrix verb in imperfective descriptions. This derivational suffix expresses completed (rapid, momentaneous) action. I do not have an answer at the moment as to why an intensive marker makes the free choice reading more natural, but this cross-dialectal comparison could offer a broader perspective on the strategies to FCIs in the Mongolic language family.

- (31) *Bat hen-tei l bol hen-tei yari-cih-dag.*
 Bat who-COM L BOL who-COM talk-INTENS-PRS
 Bat talks to anyone.

References

- Brosig, Benjamin. 2009. The function of the suffix-na in khalkha mongolian. *Altai Hakpo* 19:87–112.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2013. A viability constraint on alternatives for free choice. In *Alternatives in semantics*, 88–122. Springer.
- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2019. Wh-quantification in alternative semantics. *GLOW in Asia XII, Dongguk University, Seoul*.

- Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2020. Universal free choice from concessive copular conditionals in tibetan. In *Monotonicity in Logic and Language: Second Tsinghua Interdisciplinary Workshop on Logic, Language and Meaning, TLLM 2020, Beijing, China, December 17-20, 2020, Proceedings 2*, 13–34. Springer.
- Fox, Danny. 2007. Free choice and the theory of scalar implicatures. In *Presupposition and implicature in compositional semantics*, 71–120. Springer.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. The meaning of free choice. *Linguistics and philosophy* 24:659–735.
- Janhunen, Juha. 2012. *Mongolian*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2012. *Modals and conditionals: New and revised perspectives*, Vol. 36. Oxford University Press.
- LeGrand, Jean Ehrenkranz. 1975. Or and any: The semantics and syntax of two logical operators. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Chicago.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1986. *Quantification in syntax (logical form, japanese, wh-constructions)*. University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Rullmann, Hotze. 1996. Two types of negative polarity items. In *North East Linguistics Society*, Vol. 26, 24.
- Von Stechow, Kai-Uwe. 1994. *Restrictions on quantifier domains*. University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Xiang, Yimei. 2020. Function alternations of the mandarin particle dou: Distributor, free choice licenser, and ‘even’. *Journal of Semantics* 37:171–217.