

Low-level versus Indiscriminate Reading in Korean Free Choice (FC) *amwu-na*

Data Free choice (FC) *amwu-na* in Korean conveys a low-level reading in protases of conditionals, as in (1), which can be roughly paraphrased as ‘just anyone’ (cf. Horn 2000, Lee 2000, Jayez and Tovena 2005, Vlachou 2007).

- (1) **Amwu-na** wa-se date sinchengha-myen, ne kecelhay-ya han-ta. (‘if’ conditional)
anyone-NA come-and date ask-if you refuse-should-DEC
‘If **just anyone** comes and asks you out, you should refuse (it).’

In (1), *amwu-na* refers to ‘a lowly qualified person’ or ‘an unqualified person’ (i.e., existential quantifier reading).

However, *amwu-na* in the object (i.e., theme) position of the volitional predicate, as in (2), does not necessarily convey the low-scalar reading. Rather, it conveys an indiscriminate reading, which can be roughly paraphrased as ‘anyone indiscriminately/randomly’ (LeGrand 1975, Horn 2000, Choi 2005, Kim and Kaufmann 2007, Vlachou 2007)

- (2) ne **amwu-hako-na** ca-myen, sengpyeng-ey kelli-l swu.iss-e. (protasis of conditionals)
you anyone-with-NA sleep-if STD-to be.caught-can-DEC
‘If (you) sleep with **just anyone**, you can get an STD (sexually transmitted disease).’
i.e., ‘If you sleep with anyone indiscriminately, you can get an STD.’

The aim of this paper is to address the difference between low-level and indiscriminate readings in FC *amwu-na* in Korean, which has shown in (1) and (2) respectively. I will incorporate these components into the FC semantic domain in Korean, adapting Vlachou (2007), and present a criterion that distinguishes between these two readings.

Low-level reading FC *amwu-na* conveys a low-level reading usually in a subject position in non-modal contexts as in (3) (or as in already observed example (1) above).

- (3) Yocum-un **amwu-na** chayk-ul nay-lyekohan-ta. (characterizing sentence)
these.days-TOP anyone-NA book-ACC publish-try.to-DEC
lit. ‘These days, **just anyone** tries to publish a book.’

In (3), *amwu-na* can be roughly paraphrased as ‘even a lowly qualified person’ or ‘even an unqualified person.’ In this characterizing sentence *amwu-na* involves the domain widening (Kadmon and Landman 1993, Horn 2000, Vlachou 2007 among many others), which is contrasted with FC *amwu-na* in a ‘if’ conditional clause in (1). The domain widening of FC *amwu-na*, as in (3), is attributed to the universal quantificational force (\forall -QF) of a characterizing sentence, which is contrasted with the existential quantificational force (\exists -QF) of ‘if’ conditional sentence in (1). The different quantificational forces of contexts give rise to quantificational variability of FC (Dayal 1998, Giannakidou 2000, and others). The low-level reading of FC *amwu-na* can be presented as follows adapting Vlachou (2007):

(4) Reading of low-level

Low-level implies that an entity is in low-level of qualification (or quality) in a context c . Suppose a set $A \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m, \dots, a_n\}$ is ranked by a contextually relevant relation $<$ implicating degree of qualification. If a_m indicates an entity that is average in a context c , $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{m-1} < a_m$ indicate entities that are below an average of qualification from the point of view of a speaker.

(Revised from Vlachou 2007)

Low-level reading of FC *amwu-na* is generally involved in a subject position in non-modal context (e.g., characterizing sentence): The relevant entity by FC *amwu-na* was/is not chosen neither by a speaker nor by an agent. Here, freedom of choice (i.e., power to choose an entity) is relevant neither for a speaker nor for an agent; in this case, only the low-level reading becomes relevant as an attitudinal value.

Indiscriminate reading of FC *amwu-na* is usually involved in an object (i.e., theme) position of a volitional predicate as in (2) (i.e., controllable event in Jayez and Tovená 2005) (Lee 2000, Choi 2005, Kim and Kaufmann 2007, Vlachou 2007). In this case, freedom of choice (i.e., power to choose) is involved on the part of an agent; *amwu-na* conveys indiscriminacy an attitudinal value. The indiscriminate reading of *amwu-na* can be summarized as in (5) following Vlachou (2007) (cf. Choi 2005):

(5) Indiscriminacy

Indiscriminacy implies the agent's random selection of an entity out of a set of alternatives. Consider a set A of alternatives $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$. An agent chooses randomly iff the probability of the agent to choose an alternative a_n is $1/n$, where n is the amount of alternatives. (following Vlachou 2007)

It needs to be stressed that the choice is made in a random/indiscriminate way does not necessarily mean that the chosen entity is low-level qualification (i.e., quantity), which is distinguished from the low-level reading of *amwu-na* in the subject position usually in non-modal context.

Conclusion It has shown that low-level and indiscriminate readings are distinguished in FC *amwu-na* in Korean, focusing in non-modal context (cf. modal context). It has shown that these (at least) two attitudinal values are incorporated in the FC semantic domain along with the domain widening reading in FC *amwu-na* in a relevant context. I have proposed that a criterion to distinguish between these two readings is on whether freedom of choice (i.e., power to choose an entity or to allow freedom of choice to someone) was/is involved on the part of an agent or a speaker. If the answer is no, *amwu-na* conveys only the low-level reading. If the answer is yes, it is closely related with the indiscriminate reading; however, volitional agent is sufficient but not necessary condition for an indiscriminate reading. This study supports that FC *amwu-na* in Korean involves at least two attitudinal values: low-level and indiscriminate readings (cf. LeGrand 1975, Horn 2000, Jayez & Tovená 2005, Vlachou 2007).

Selected References Choi 2005. Dayal 1998. Giannakidou 2000. Horn 2000. Kadmon and Landman 1993. Kim and Kaufmann 2007. Lee 2000. LeGrand 1975. Jayez and Tovená 2005. Vlachou 2007.