

On free choice-like *wh*-based expressions in Czech

Radek Šimík
University of Groningen
r.simik@rug.nl

September 2008

Czech *wh*-expressions serve as derivational bases for a whole range of indefinites, determiners, and quantifiers. The goal of this pilot study is to give an overview of the basic meanings and distribution of *wh*-based quantifier-like expressions which are closely related to *free choice items (FCI)*. We will see that there is a range of items in Czech that are capable of serving what I will call the *indiscriminative function/meaning* of FCIs, in English expressed by the determiner (*just*) *any*.

(1) I didn't sleep with just anyone.

We will show that the basic meaning of all these items is one of a weak quantifier 'many'. In addition, these items express speaker-oriented implicatures.

The analyzed data come from the Czech National Corpus (Český národní korpus, ČNK), particularly the corpus SYN, which contains synchronic texts of all styles (altogether 500 million word forms). The reason for using corpus data rather than relying on native-speaker intuitions is that the meaning differences between the items under discussion are rather miniscule and therefore very hard to pinpoint. Furthermore, a corpus analysis will tell us something about the distribution, which, as we know, can play a key role in theorizing about FCIs.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 1 we give an overview of *wh*-affixes (i.e. affixes attaching to *wh*-words) in Czech. In section 2 we describe the basic meaning and distribution of the core FCI in Czech, *wh-koli(v)*. Sections 3 to 6 are the core of this study as they discuss the properties of the FC-like items. Section 7 concludes the discussion.

1 Czech *wh*-affixes

In this paper I will only be concerned with items derived from 'who', but for completeness I give an overview of the basic Czech *wh*-words, which are based on a *k*-morphemes, which takes several possible allomorphs/allophones: *k*-, *c*-, *č*-, and *j*-.

<i>kdo</i>	'who'
<i>co</i>	'what'
<i>kde</i>	'where'
<i>kdy</i>	'when'
<i>proč</i>	'why'
<i>jaký</i>	'what _{DET} ' ('what kind of')
<i>který</i>	'which'

Table 1 gives a more or less exhaustive overview of the forms and basic meanings of affixes that can

attach to *wh*-bases.¹ Only some of the affixes can be used as free morphemes. The morpheme *leda* is close to ‘only’ in meaning but much more limited in distribution than *jen*, the basic Czech ‘only’. The morpheme *kde* means ‘where’. Finally, the morpheme *málo* means ‘few’ and is the only one which retains the meaning when used as an affix. All the others are exclusively bound morphemes attaching to *wh*-bases.²

Tabulka 1: *Wh*-affixes in Czech

AFFIX	EXAMPLE	BASIC FUNCTION	COMMENTS
<i>ně-</i>	Včera jsem si <i>něco</i> koupil ‘I bought <i>something</i> yesterday’	Indefinite	Default (elsewhere) indefinite, with very few distributional restrictions (PPI, allergic to some postverbal focus positions).
<i>-si</i>	Petr si <i>cosi</i> koupil ‘Peter bought something’	Indefinite	Scopally specific indefinite expressing speaker’s ignorance. Distributional restrictions so far unknown.
<i>ni-</i>	<i>Nic</i> jsem si nekoupil. ‘I didn’t buy anything’	Negative indefinite	Strong NPI, licensed only by sentential negation (a negative concord item)
<i>-koli(v)</i>	Tu vraždu mohl spáchat <i>kdokoli(v)</i> ‘Anyone could have committed the murder’	Free choice item	Apart from free choice contexts, this item is also licensed in some downward entailing contexts and behaves thus as a weak NPI.
<i>leda-</i>	My nejsme jen tak <i>ledakdo!</i> ‘We are not just anyone.’	Indiscriminative FCI	Limited to negative contexts and mostly accompanied by <i>jen tak</i> ‘only so’.
<i>lec-</i>	<i>Leckdo</i> pochybuje o významu toho opatření ‘Many have doubts about the sense of the precaution’	‘many’	No strict distributional restrictions, but mostly appears in generic contexts.’
<i>ledas-</i>	Nechtěli přijmout (<i>jen tak</i>) <i>ledaskoho</i> ‘They didn’t want to accept just anyone’	= <i>leda-</i> or <i>lec-</i>	An item ambiguous between <i>lec-</i> and <i>leda-</i> .
<i>kde-</i>	Dnes už mluví anglicky <i>kdekd.</i> ‘Today many people speak English.’	Derrogatory ‘(m)any’	Core meaning similar to <i>lec-</i> . Expresses a derogatory attitude of the speaker.
<i>málo-</i>	Takový kousek se podaří (<i>jen</i>) <i>málokomu.</i> ‘(Only) few people can do such a thing.’	‘few’	Possibly the opposite to <i>lec-</i> .

There are a few restrictions concerning which affixes can attach to which *wh*-words:

- *proč* ‘why’ cannot be connected with any *wh*-affixes at all;
- *ni-* cannot be attached to determiner-like *wh*, namely *jaký* ‘what kind of’ and *kteřý* ‘which’; the negative concord determiner is lexicalized by a suppletive form: *žádný* ‘no/any’;

¹Universal and definite/demonstrative determiners like ‘everywhere’ and ‘there’ are also morphologically related to *wh*-words in Czech but the degree of morphological fusion is greater. A good example is the triple *kdy* ‘when’, *vždy* ‘always’, and *tehdy* ‘then/at the time’, which apparently contain the quantifier/determiner morphemes *uš-* and *t-*, respectively, but the presence of the *kdy*-base is somewhat blurred.

²See Błaszczak (2008) for some discussion on the Polish *wh-kolwiek* indefinites, which are directly related in both form and meaning to the Czech *wh-koli(v)*. Błaszczak argues that they are historically derived from a morpheme meaning ‘or’.

- *kde-* cannot be attached to adverbial *wh*, with the exception of (some rare cases of) *kam* ‘where-to’.

This manuscript only deals with the *wh*-word ‘who’ (in any syntactic position) and with the affixes *-koli(v)*, *leda-*, *lec-*, *ledas-*, and *kde-*. The following table gives the numbers of these *who-affix* occurrences in the SYN corpus:

Tabulka 2: Numbers of affixed-‘who’ in SYN

AFFIX	NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES
<i>-koli(v)</i>	15661
<i>leda-</i>	13
<i>lec-</i>	3181
<i>ledas-</i>	133
<i>kde-</i>	4586

2 *Wh-koli(v)*: the core FCI

The core FCI in Czech is formed by attaching the suffix *-koli(v)* to *wh*-words.³ The suffix attaches at the very end of the word, i.e. even after grammatical (case/number/gender) endings.

Wh-koli items appear in three basic functions: (i) as a core FCI, (ii) as a weak NPI, and (iii) in free relatives. These three functions correlate fairly well with a particular distribution: (i) modal contexts, (ii) downward entailing contexts, and (iii) relative clause contexts (by definition); a particular meaning: (i) universal quantifier, (ii) existential quantifier, (iii) definite determiner, and the availability of certain modifiers (i) almost/else, (ii) *almost/else, (iii) *almost/*else.⁴

(2) CORE FCI FUNCTION

- podle dosavadního šetření mohl vraždu spáchat (*téměř*) **kdokoli** (*jiný*).
 according.to so.far investigation could murder commit (almost) who_{KOLI} (else)
 ‘according to the investigation done so far, (almost) anyone (else) could have committed the murder.’
- $\forall x[C(x)] : [\exists w.w \in W \wedge \text{commit.murder}(x, w)]$ (where *C* is a contextual restriction)

(3) WEAK NPI FUNCTION

- Rusko nedopustí, aby (**téměř*) **kdokoli** (*jiný*) rozbíjel kvůli bosenské krizi
 Russia not.allow that (almost) who_{KOLI} (else) break because.of Bosnian crisis
 naše strategické partnerství se zeměmi Západu a s USA.
 our strategic partnership with countries West and with USA
 ‘Russia will not allow that (almost) anyone (else) breaks our strategic partnership with the Western countries and the USA because of the Bosnian crisis.’
- not.allow*(Russia, $\exists x.\text{break.partnership}(x)$)

³ *Wh-koli* and *wh-koliv* are in free variation—there is no detectable meaning difference. The relative frequency of use is 5:4 in favor of the former, no matter what kind of *wh*-word the morphemes connect with. In the rest of the text, I will use the former for the sake of simplicity and will gloss it as wh_{KOLI}. An analogous glossing convention is used for all other affixes.

⁴ I should mention that I am not making any theoretical and analytical claims. The representations below and my assumptions about the quantificational status of certain items should be understood descriptively.

(4) FREE RELATIVE FUNCTION

- a. (**téměř*) **kdokoli** (**jiný*) s tímto závěrem tedy nesouhlasí, je motivován
 (almost) who_{KOLI} (else) with this conclusion so not.agrees is motivated
 sobectvím či hrabivostí
 selfishness or greediness
 ‘so, (almost) whoever (else) does not agree with this conclusion is motivated by selfishness or greediness’
- b. *motivated.by.s/g(ιx[not.agree.with.conclusion(x)])*⁵

Apart from these three (basic) functions, *wh-koli* can be used in what we will call an *ať už*-construction (5), in direct negation contexts, with the indiscriminative ‘just any’ meaning (cf. Horn 2000) (6), and in cases of subtrigging (7):⁶

(5) *Ať už*-CONSTRUCTION

- a. ať už se stane ředitelem (**téměř*) **kdokoli** (**jiný*), nebude zrovna
 let already REFL becomes director (almost) who_{KOLI} (else) not.will.be particularly
 v nejzáviděnější situaci.
 in most.enviable situation
 ‘(almost) whoever (else) becomes the director won’t be in a very enviable situation’
- b. *not.in.enviable.situation(ιx.become.director(x))*

(6) INDISCRIMINATIVE USE

- a. nebudu psát články pro **kohokoli** na jakákoli témata.
 not.will.write articles for who_{KOLI} on what.kind.of_{KOLI} topics
 ‘I won’t write articles for just anyone on just any topic’
- b. $\forall x[\textit{article}(x) \wedge \textit{will.write}(\text{I}, x)] : [\neg(\textit{for.arbitrary.person}(x) \wedge \textit{on.arbitrary.topic}(x))]$

(7) SUBTRIGGING

- a. ty služby se dostanou ke **komukoli**, kdo o ně bude mít zájem.
 the services REFL get to who_{KOLI} who in them will have interest
 ‘the services will reach anybody who will be interested in them’
- b. $\forall x[\textit{have.interest}(x, \textit{the.services})] : [\textit{reach}(\textit{the.services}, x)]$

The *ať už*-construction appears to be just a variant of the free relative construction, as is apparent from the English paraphrase and the fact that the *wh-koli* cannot be modified by ‘almost’ and ‘else’.

Two more things should be noted about the *ať už*-construction. First, the *wh-koli* constituent is obligatorily focused and appears sentence-finally. Second, in place of *wh-koli*, an explicit disjunction can be used.

- (8) ať už se {** kdokoli*} stane ředitelem {*kdokoli*}, ...
 let already REFL who_{KOLI} become director who_{KOLI}
 ‘whoever becomes the director...’

⁵This is a simplified, Jacobson-style representation (Jacobson 1995). The free-choice/ignorance/indifference component should be incorporated, presumably in the form of a presupposition, along the lines of Dayal (1997) or von Stechow (2000).

⁶*Ať* will be glossed as ‘let’, since it prototypically appears in third-person imperative/wish contexts (*Ať přijde Petr* ‘Let Peter come’/‘I wish Peter came’). *Už* is a word for ‘already’ in Czech and will be glossed as such. It should also be noted that *už* is optional in *ať už*-constructions, even though in my personal intuition its presence is strongly preferred over its absence.

- (9) *ať už se stane ředitelem Petr nebo Pavel, ...*
 let already REFL become director Petr or Pavel
 ‘No matter if Petr or Pavel becomes the director...’

The following table shows the frequency of the particular uses of *who-koli*. The measures are based on a random set of 100 sentences containing *who-koli*.

Tabulka 3: Overview of the use of *who-koli* in SYN

TYPE OF FCI		LICENSING ENVIRONMENT	
Core FCI	33	Epistemic possibility	10
		Deontic possibility	9
		Ability	4
		Subtriggering	4
		Other	6
Weak NPI	49	Negative matrix predicates	22
		Comparatives	13
		Without [-CP]	6
		Other	8
Free relatives	12	True FR	2
		<i>Ať už</i> -construction	10
Indiscriminative	1		
Unclear	5		

It is interesting to note that only 1 out of 100 uses of *who-koli* has the indiscriminative meaning (‘just any’). The low frequency of occurrence can be explained in two ways: either it is the case that the indiscriminative meaning is simply scarcely needed, or the *-koli* items are not quite appropriate for serving this function. There are two arguments that favor the latter view. First, there are other morphemes that are capable of, or even specialized in expressing the indiscriminative meaning (see Table 1 and the discussion below). Second, if a hundred of occurrences is a representative sample, one would expect 1% of all the *who-koli* items in SYN to have indiscriminative meaning, which makes it 157 in absolute terms (cf. the Table 2). Out of these 157 expected indiscriminative *who-koli* items, there should be a significant number (say around 30%, cf. the discussion of *leda-who* and *ledas-who* below) of those supported by the *jen tak* ‘only so’ morpheme, specialized for this function (corresponding to the *just*-part of *just any*). However, there are only five hits for the *jen tak who-koli* sequence in SYN, which makes it 3,2% out of the ‘expected’ indiscriminatives and 0,032% out of the actual 15661 *who-koli* items in SYN, presumably a negligible amount. We conclude that the indiscriminative function is only marginally carried by the core FCI in Czech. Apparently, the reason is that there are other items that serve this function.

3 *Lec-wh*

The core meaning of *lec-who* is very close to ‘many (people)’.

- (10) *Z hudby Groove Collective je zřejmé, že na jejich živých vystoupeních už*
 from music Groove Collective is apparent that on their life performances already
leckdo protancoval boty.
 kdo_{LEC} danced shoes

‘From the music of Groove Collective it is apparent that many (people) have worn down their shoes at their performances’

In addition to meaning ‘many (people)’, *lec-who* incorporates a speaker-oriented implicature that there is nothing exceptional about the property expressed by the predicate, call it a *non-exceptionality implicature*. This implicit speaker’s comment on the property makes *lec-who* a stylistically marked expression, avoided in texts which are expected to be perspective-neutral (which have no ‘speaker’). As an example, consider the newspaper headline in (11), which makes use of the neutral *mnozí* ‘many (people)’. The substitution by *lec-who* results in a pragmatically inappropriate language use.

- (11) Mnozí /# leckdo věří, že na odvrácení klimatických změn už je pozdě.
 many who_{LEC} believe that for stopping climate change already is late
 ‘Many believe it is too late to stop climate change.’

Note also that the non-exceptionality implicature is fairly close to the implicatures/presuppositions associated with free choice items, since it can be reformulated in the following way: no matter which individual you choose, it is very probable that it will satisfy the predicate.

The relation between *lec-wh* and FCI is also supported by the fact that *lec-wh* can serve the indiscriminative function.

- (12) Jágr dokázal vyhrát kanadské bodování v NHL a to se nepovede jen tak
 Jágr managed win Canadian pointing in NHL and that REFL not.work.out only so
leckomu
 who_{LEC}
 ‘Jágr managed to be the best in the Canadian pointing system(???) and not just anybody can do that’

However, the indiscriminative use of *lec-who* is rather limited (as in the case of *who-koli*). There was no single occurrence in my random sample of 100 occurrences from SYN. The search for *jen tak lec-who*, i.e. “overtly marked” indiscriminatives, gives only 6 hits out of the complete 3181 occurrences of *lec-who* in SYN. That is 0,2%.

The last remark pertains to the distribution of *lec-who*. Out of the 100 studied occurrences, in 73 cases *lec-who* functions as an attitude/emotion holder or attitude-/emotion-change undergoer. That is, it is an argument of attitude/emotion predicates like ‘think/consider/mind/expect/find-Adj’, ‘seem (to someone)’, ‘be surprised/impressed/afraid’, or attitude-/emotion-change predicates like ‘realize’, ‘surprise/impress/shock/satisfy (someone)’, etc. In effect, sentences with *lec-who* implicate the non-exceptionality (from the speaker’s point of view) of holding a certain attitude/emotion towards something (often a fact/proposition) in a certain situation/world. It is also worthwhile mentioning that 38 of the *lec-who* clauses contain epistemic modal markers, mostly verbs, sometimes adverbs and virtually all the predications in the sample are non-episodic, i.e. mostly characterizing and/or generic-like. It is unclear why *lec-who* bears such semantic roles and why it displays precisely this kind of distribution. However, at least on the part of the latter, we can trace a similarity to FCIs, which also depend on non-episodic contexts.

Below, I give a few representative examples of sentences with *lec-who*.

Lec-who AS ATTITUDE HOLDER

- (13) **leckdo** si myslí, že by bez funkce rektora těžko mohl do některých
who_{LEC} REFL thinks that AUX without function rector hardly could in certain
událostí zasahovat
events interfere
'many think that he could hardly ever interfere in certain events without being a rector'
- (14) Devět nebo osm procent – to **leckdo** ani nevnímá jako velký rozdíl.
nine or eight percent that who_{LEC} even not.perceives as big difference
'Nine or eight percent – many don't even consider it to be a big difference'

CASES INVOLVING EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY

- (15) Čin odvážného chlapce může **leckdo** z nás obdivovat.
deed brave boy can who_{LEC} of us admire
'Many {can / will (probably)} admire the deed of the brave boy'
- (16) Dvoutisícový náklad atraktivní a pečlivě připravené knihy možná **lecko**ho
two.thousand impression attractive and carefully prepared book maybe who_{LEC}
zaskočí.
surprises
'Many may be surprised by the two-thousand-impression of the attractive and carefully
prepared book'

CASES WITH A GENERIC FLAVOR

- (17) Vojtěcha Jasného zaujala myšlenka, že **leckdo** se ve vězení cítí líp
V. J. found.interesting thought that who_{LEC} REFL in prison feels better
než na svobodě
than in freedom
'Vojtěch Jasný found interesting the thought that many (people) feel better imprisoned
than free'
- (18) Člověk se v životě potká s **leckým** a leccím, ale nerada bych to
human REFL in life meets with who_{LEC} and what_{LEC} but not.like would it
specifikovala
specify
'One meets many kinds of people and many kinds of things in his life, but I wouldn't like
to go in details'

To sum up, we observed three points in which *lec-wh* items bear similarities to FCIs: (i) the non-exceptionality implicature, (ii) the ability to serve the indiscriminative function, and (iii) sensitivity to episodicity.

4 *Leda-wh*

Leda-who occurs very rarely—there are a total of 13 occurrences in the whole SYN.⁷ And what functions does *leda-who* play? Four of the 13 cases match the function of *lec-who*. Nine of the cases are used indiscriminatively, three of which with the support of *jen tak* ‘just’. See the examples below:

Lec-LIKE USE

- (19) Takové řešení připadá **ledakomu** poněkud nedomyšlené.
such solution seems who_{LEDA} a bit immature
‘Many consider such a solution immature.’

INDISCRIMINATIVE USE

- (20) My nejsme **jen tak ledakdo**, my na to máme!
we not.are only so who_{LEDA} we on it have
‘We are not just anyone, we can make it!’
- (21) Haakon Magnus totiž přece jen není **ledakdo**, ale budoucí král
H. M. that.is yet not.is who_{LEDA} but future king
‘Yet, Haakon Magnus is not (just) anyone, but the future king’

Even though the sample of available *leda-who* occurrences is very small, my personal intuition supports the tendency for its indiscriminative use. In fact, examples like (19) are unacceptable for me. A more definitive conclusion about the meaning and use of the *leda*-affix could be reached after the investigation of *leda-what kind of* NP, of which there are 734 occurrences in SYN.

5 *Ledas-wh*

Ledas-who appears to be ambiguous between *lec-who* and *leda-who*. 35 out of the 100 investigated occurrences have the indiscriminative function, 10 of which are supported by *jen tak* ‘just’. The rest (65) is *lec*-like in that most of the occurrences (51) take the role of attitude/emotion holder. I give some examples below:

Lec-LIKE USE

- (22) Nejen v Británii se dnes **ledaskdo** ptá, kam bude EU nyní směřovat.
not.only in Britain REFL today who_{LEDAS} asks where will EU now head
‘Not only in Britain many people wonder where the EU is heading for’

INDISCRIMINATIVE USE

- (23) Těmi “postiženými” není **jen tak ledaskdo**: František Benda, Josef Lux a Ivan
those affected not.is only so who_{LEDAS} F. B. J. L. and I.
Kočárník – samí ministři!
K. all ministers
‘Those affected people are not just anyone: [names] – all of them are ministers!’

⁷ *Leda-wh* is relatively infrequent across the board, not only in *leda-who* cases. It is interesting to note, however, that while there are 734 occurrences of *leda-what kind of* NP, there are only 2 occurrences of *leda-which* NP (compare to the relation 492:2220 of *lec*-). This seems to suggest that *leda*- easily modifies *kinds* but not *individuals*. If ‘who’ preferably denotes individuals, the low frequency of *leda-who* would be explained.

- (24) Vyprodat zlínskou sportovní halu se nepodaří **ledaskomu**, slovenská kapela Team ale
 sell.out Zlin sports hall REFL manage who_{LEDAS} Slovak band Team but
 měla vyprodáno už dva týdny před koncertem
 had sold.out already two weeks before concert
 ‘Not just anybody manages to sell out the sports hall in Zlin but the Slovak band Team
 had sold it out two weeks before the concert’

6 *Kde-wh*

The last affix that I want to discuss here is *kde-*. This affix, unlike most others has a meaning as a free morpheme, too, namely ‘where’. Also, it is special in being allergic to adverbial *wh*-phrases (**kdekde* ‘where_{KDE}’, **kdekdy* ‘when_{KDE}’, **kdejak* ‘how_{KDE}’). I leave these idiosyncracies aside. The core meaning of *kde-who* is, again, ‘many (people)’. As opposed to *lec-who* and *ledas-who*, however, it does not tend towards the role of attitude/emotion holder so heavily. Only 16 out of 100 occurrences are of this type (compare to 73% of *lec-who* and 78% of *ledas-who*). I give an example below, for illustration:

Lec-LIKE USE

- (25) Mluvil jsem o svobodné vůli, kterou **kdekdo** považuje za samozřejmost.
 spoke REFL about free will which who_{KDE} considers for obviosity
 ‘I spoke about free will, which many consider to be just an obviosity’

In the remaining cases *kde-who* is an argument to non-attitude/emotion verbs. How can this be explained? Intuitively, the non-exceptionality implicature is stronger in the *kde*-affix than in the previously discussed ones. Remember that the non-exceptionality implicature is speaker-oriented—it conveys the speaker’s view of the property (expressed by the predicate) as something that is not exceptional. In the *kde*-affix, this implicature is often intensified by pushing the non-exceptionality towards its extreme and in result expresses speaker’s non-interest, negative opinion, or even contempt towards whatever is expressed by the respective predicate. This is very close to what has been called a ‘derogatory use’ of FCI. Let me give you some examples before discussing some details:

- (26) čeledín Bill to vyprávěl **kdekomu** a zejména zákazníkům
 stable.boy Bill it told who_{KDE} and mainly customers
 ‘stable boy Bill told it to many people/anybody and mainly to the customers’
- (27) V Čechách **kdekdo** píše. **Kdekdo** je básník a **kdekdo** je spisovatel.
 in Czechia who_{KDE} writes who_{KDE} is poet and who_{KDE} is writer
 ‘Many (people)/anybody write(s) in Czechia. Anybody is a poet and anybody is a writer.’

In (26), the speaker denounces the action of telling some particular thing to some people and by transitivity, he denounces the ‘stable boy Bill’, since he is the one being active in it. In (27), the speaker denounces the property of being a writer or a poet and by transitivity, many of the individuals that have this property. Note that in both cases the speaker’s contempt targets the predicate, possibly together with whatever individuals are its external arguments (agents, property-bearers) and *not* the individuals expressed by *kde-who*. For example in (26) it is quite probable that the speaker (say the person in charge of the stable) has a very positive relation to the customers and these happen to belong to the set denoted by *kde-who*. In this respect, the morpheme *kde-* behaves

almost like an agreement marker—agreeing with a (speaker-oriented) property of the predicate.⁸ The agreement-story would be supported by the existence of multiple occurrences of *kde-who* in one clause:

- (28) V neblahých dobách reálného socialismu taky **kdekdo** kontroloval **kdeko**, bohužel
 in unfortunate time real socialism also who_{KDE} controlled who_{KDE} unluckily
 málokdo pracoval a výsledky této “socialistické dělby práce” sklízíme dodnes
 who_{MÁLO} worked and results this socialist division labor harvest till.today
 ‘In the unfortunate times of real socialism anyone controlled anyone but unluckily, few
 people worked and the results of this “socialist division of labor” are being harvested up
 till now’

In (28), the contempt is not necessarily expressed towards the individuals who were active in controlling or who were being controlled, it is mainly the fact/activity of controlling (and the political system by which it was imposed) that the speaker denounces. This is then expressed in the form of multiple agreement on the arguments of the verb ‘control’.

My last remark concerns the use of *kde-who* indiscriminatively. In my random sample of 100 occurrences there were three examples of this use, one of which I give below:

- (29) Oni nepůjčovali **kdekomu**. Půjčovali svým přátelům.
 they not.lent who_{KDE} lent their.own friends
 ‘They didn’t lend (money) just to anyone. They lent (it) to their friends.’

However, this use of *kde-who* appears to be rather exceptional (as in the case of *who-koli* and *lec-who*), since the search for *jen tak kde-who* gives the incredible number of 0 hits (out of 4586). I leave open the question whether this is by some sort of incompatibility of *kde-who* with *jen tak* ‘just’ or whether it is by pure coincidence.

7 Conclusion and prospects

We investigated the properties of four Czech FC-like *wh*-affixes: *lec-*, *leda-*, *ledas-*, and *kde-*. We saw that all of them relate to FCI by serving the indiscriminative function ‘just any’. The two that seem to be specialized in this function are *leda-* and *ledas-*. All of the discussed items were shown to have the core meaning of a weak quantifier ‘many’, most transparent in *lec-*. The items were also argued to incorporate a pragmatic component, which we called *non-exceptionality implicature*. This implicature surfaces most obviously in *kde-*, where it gives rise to more extreme versions of it, including the ‘derogatory’ flavor, observed in some uses of FCIs. In connection with *kde*-items, we discussed the hypothesis that the *kde*-affix is only a marker expressing some sort of pragmatic agreement.

The issues that arise are the following:

- How should the indiscriminative use of FCIs (and related expressions) be analyzed? What has been argued to be a presupposition/implicature in “normal” uses of FCI, appears to be in the assertion in the indiscriminative use (cf. the example/representation in (6) above).
- How should we deal with the fact that not only true FCIs, but also other items express the indiscriminative meaning? How significant is the fact that the core meaning of the other items is one of a weak quantifier ‘many’? How significant is the fact that all these items are *wh*-based?

⁸This would be quite close to negative and modal concord, cf. Zeijlstra (2004, 2007)

- How about the other relations that the discussed items bear to FCIs, mainly the distribution in non-episodic (often modal) contexts? With Aloni (2007), we could hypothesize that some or all of these items represent a pre-FCI developmental stage, having an FCI-like distribution, but lacking the grammatically encoded properties that actually force this distribution. An argument in favor of such a view is the fact that some of the occurrences of the discussed items actually match the FCI-use almost perfectly (they can be substituted by a true FCI). With the examples below, I finish this discussion.

- (30) Je Escobar opravdu tak mocný, nebo jsou to spíše legendy? Má velký vliv,
 is E. really so powerful or are that more.likely legends has great influence
 dokáže **leckoho** / kohokoli koupit, nemá skrupule.
 is.capable who_{LEC} who_{KOLI} buy not.has scruple
 ‘Is Escobar really so powerful, or is that just a legend? He is very influential, he can buy anyone, he sticks at nothing’
- (31) A pak přišla studená sprcha – Savannah může být dcerou **ledaskoho** / kohokoli,
 and then came cold shower S. can be daughter who_{LEDAS} who_{KOLI}
 jen ne jeho!
 only not his
 ‘And then came the cold shower – Savannah can be a daughter of anyone, only not himself!’
- (32) Sliby jsou univerzálním druhem potravy, protože nakrmit s nimi můžeme
 promises are universal kind food because feed with them can
kdekoho / kohokoli.
 who_{KDE} who_{KOLI}
 ‘Promises are a universal kind of food because we can feed anyone with them’

Reference

- Aloni, Maria. 2007. Indefinites and beyond: Evolutionary pragmatics and typological semantics. Research proposal, ILLC, University of Amsterdam.
- Błaszczak, Joanna. 2008. The puzzle of *kolwiek*-pronouns in Polish. In *Workshop on Free Choiceness: Facts, Models, and Problems*, ed. Jacques Jayez and Lucia Tovena, 3–12. Hamburg: ESSLLI.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 1997. Free relatives and -ever, identity and free choice readings. In *Proceedings of SALT*, ed. Aaron Lawson, 99–116. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- von Fintel, Kai. 2000. Whatever. In *Proceedings of SALT*, ed. Brendan Jackson and Tanya Matthews, volume 10, 27–39. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Horn, Laurence R. 2000. Any and -ever: Free choice and free relatives. In *Proceedings of IATL*, ed. Adam Zachary Wyner, volume 15, 71–111. Haifa: University of Haifa.
- Jacobson, Pauline. 1995. On the quantificational force of English free relatives. In *Quantification in natural languages, Vol II*, ed. Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Partee, 451–486. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2004. *Sentential negation and negative concord*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Zeijlstra, Hedde. 2007. The meaning of being meaningless: The how and why of uninterpretable features. Lectures at the EGG Summer School, Brno.