

# Semantic Functions of *Wh-ever- FRs* Constructions

Arnold Ross Falvo

## Overview

Randolph Quirk and Sydney Greenbaum, noted grammarians, state in *A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English* (1973) that the role of the *-ever* morpheme in *free relatives* (FR) henceforth referred to in this article as *Wh-ever- FRs*, are associated with definite meaning and that these *Wh-ever- FRs* are also associated with universal meaning. A good example of this usage appears in the lyrics of a very popular song by Shakira, titled *Wherever, Whenever* (Appendix One). In another section of their book, Quirk and Greenbaum refer to these *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions as used in a special way to mark a concessive reading.

However, there were certain *Wh-ever- FRs* usages that could not be accounted for in Quirk and Greenbaum (1973). The most famous kind is the “*Whatever*” usage found in a famous television series of the 1970’s known as *Archie Bunker* and more recently in the lyrics of a song by Liam Lynch called, *The United States of Whatever* (Appendix Two). This use of “*Whatever*” by either of these speakers indicates the speakers’ intention to show no interest in a topic with the intention of ending it abruptly. In terms of pragmatics, it is clear that there are areas of the *Wh-ever- FRs* usage that cannot explain the contrast between following two types of response to the same question.

(1a) Speaker: How do you like my dress?

このドレスはどう？

(1b) Listener: *Whatever* you wear always looks good on you.

何でも君にはよく似合うよ

何を着ても君にはよく似合うよ

When one reduces the response of the listener through ellipsis, the pragmatic effect is quite dramatic.

(2a) Speaker: How do you like my dress?

このドレスはどう？

(2b) Listener: *Whatever*.

(*It doesn't matter to me.*)

良いんじゃない

The response in the example (2b) clearly signals a pragmatic function that will be referred to in this analysis of *Wh-ever FRs* as the semantic concept of *irrelevance/unconcern/unimportance/insignificance*. Example (2a) expectations would more than likely consider Example (2b) as a negative attitude towards the statement. Even von Stechow (2000) does not even make specific reference to this distinction in his meticulous Analysis I (Indifference) of *Wh-ever FRs*. This article endeavors to shed more light on the distinction between what English second language learners might simply view in Example (2b) as the reduced form of Example (1). These uses of *Wh-ever FRs* with distinctly different meanings are witnessed in Example (3a-b) both of which paraphrase Example (1b).

(3a) Whatever you wear looks good on you.

何でも君にはよく似合うよ

(3b) Anything you wear looks good on you.

どれを着ても君には良く似合うよ

Inversely, *Wh-ever FRs* constructions often are equivalent semantically at the deep level to the “*no matter*” construction of a concessive reading Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) although there is a surface level negative nuance in the “*no matter*” construction

(4a) No matter what you wear looks good on you.

どんなものでも君にはよく似合うよ

(4b) No matter what you wear, it looks good on you!

どんなものでも君にはよく似合うよ

As is often the case among linguists, one’s particular intuitions may find “No matter” constructions acceptable as a topic in (4a) while others seeing it as forcing embedding as seen in (4b). By contrast it is clear that *Wh-ever FRs* in the example (3a) above does not require embedding. However, since that is not the scope of this article, we will save this area of research for a future article. For the purposes of our discussion we will focus on the areas of concessive usage and definite/universal usage, which are in conflict with the semantic concept of *irrelevance/unconcern/unimportance* of *Wh-ever FRs*.

In summary, the implications of these distinctions of *Wh-ever FRs* usage are of great importance to the second language learner. The study of grammar alone by well-respected grammarians like Randolph Quirk and Sydney Greenbaum simply is not enough to deal either with these semantic issues or their pragmatic consequences.

In this paper I will present my observations about the properties of *Wh-ever FRs* and discuss their usages and restrictions. Furthermore, I strive to establish criteria to predict when the *Free relatives* forms or *any* quantifiers are preferred over the *Wh-ever FRs* constructions. I will

develop basic reference types for situations in which we find these word compounds used. Throughout the discussion I have focused on the crucial role of context in considering alternative constructions for *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions, *wh- relatives* forms or *any* quantifiers in a sentence. Finally I will present my analysis of the acceptability of *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions as a paraphrase of both *Free relatives* or *any* quantifiers in the following sentence environments:

- ① Nominal relative clauses
- ② Free relatives in pseudo cleft sentences
- ③ Appositives
- ④ Adverbial clauses
- ⑤ Embedded questions

### Definite/Universal

In Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) the authors suggest that there are certain sentences in which there is an alternation of FRs with *Wh-ever- FRs* in nominal relative clauses. Observe the following:

- (5) What he is looking for is a wife.  
(That which he is looking for is a wife.)  
彼が探しているのは、妻だ。
- (6) Quality is *what /whatever* counts most.  
(Quality is *that which /anything that* counts most.)  
クオリティーが何より大事だ。
- (7) I want to see whoever deals with complaints.  
(I want to see the person, *anyone who, it doesn't matter whom*) *that* deals with complaint.)  
苦情（を扱う）係の誰かと会いたい。
- (8) Vote for *which/whichever* presidential candidate you like.  
(Vote for *the* presidential candidate/ *any* presidential candidate you like.)  
どちらでも、好きな候補者に投票しなさい。

Although the use of *Wh-ever- FRs* are possible in (6) and (8), in the following example (5b) the *Wh-ever- FRs* construction *whatever* would not be interchangeable with Example (5). Observe:

- (5b) \*Whatever he is looking for is a wife.  
(\**Anything* that he is looking for is a wife)

Conversely, the use of *Wh-ever FRs* in Example (7) is constrained since the speaker presupposes there is a person who handles complaints but they cannot be specific as to which person that is. Note the scale of possible usage of four related semantic functions witnessed in the paraphrases of Example (7):

- (7a) I want to see the person *that* deals with complaints!
- (7b) I want to see the person *that* deals with complaints, *it doesn't matter whom!*
- (7c) I want to see the person *that* deals with complaints, *it doesn't matter whom, anyone (of them)!*
- (7d) I want to see the person *that* deals with complaints, *it doesn't matter whom, anyone (of them), whomever!*

These four semantic functions are complimentary. Thus, ever greater emphasis on specificity can be imposed on the listener through the embedding of these linguistic constructions depending on the speaker intentions. Quirk and Greenbaum maintain the basic notion that if FRs are used, they have a definite meaning. Observe:

- (9) Quality is *what* counts most.  
(*the thing that..*)  
クオリティーが何より大事だ。

On the other hand, when the *Wh-ever FRs* compound is used, it conveys a universal meaning:

- (10) Quality is *whatever* counts most.  
(*anything that..*)  
クオリティーが何より大事だ。

No mention is made in Quirk and Greenbaum of a distinction between the definite from the specified. Therefore, in example (10) when the speaker perceives that the listener shares a concept of quality, one can refer to it with the FR form. In fact, the speaker does not specify the concept of quality although he alludes to it in a presupposition that the listener shares his particular internal notions of the concept of quality. By contrast, when the speaker uses the

*Wh-ever FRs*, the speaker may presuppose that the listener may not share his notions of what is particular to the concept of quality. Consequently, the speaker may tend to use a *Wh-ever FRs* form that is less assertive in terms of what he considers to be quality. Stated in other terms, since the speaker has no idea what serves as a criteria for the notion of quality he is less likely to use the FR *what* which might sound rather categorical. Since *whatever* paraphrases as *anything that* in (10) it is a more general and less assertive expression. Consequently, it can encompass the criteria that are particular to the listener. If we extend this line of reasoning based on Example (8), we get the following:

- (11) Vote for which candidate you like in 2008.  
2008年の大統領候補のどちらでも好きな方に投票しなさい。
- (12) Vote for *whichever* candidate you like in 2008.  
(*any* candidate...)  
2008年の大統領候補のどちらでも好きな方に投票しなさい。

In this case one can posit that the use of the FR form indicates a presupposition on the speaker's part that the listener already has a particular person in mind that he will vote for. It just happens that the speaker has no presuppositions about idea of the identity of the person in question. On the other hand, in Example (12) if the speaker uses the *Wh-ever FRs* form, the speaker might presuppose that the listener has no particular candidate in mind. We can imagine this line being used by a political campaign worker who would append the following phrase to Example (12).

- (13) Vote for whichever candidate you like but let me tell you a few things about Barack Obama who is running for President of the United States.  
どちらでも好きな大統領候補者に投票すれば良いが、まず民主党代表候補者のバラク・オバマについて、少し紹介がしたい。(紹介をさせてくれ。)

Since the political campaigner has used the *Wh-ever FR* form he might feel that since the listener is undecided about a choice for a particular person then the listener might be persuaded to vote for the campaigner's choice. The focus will now shift to the notion of a specific referent with free relatives. First, one should consider what would paraphrase well with the FR *What* in Example (5)

- (14) *The thing that* he is looking for is a wife  
(*What* he is looking for is a wife.)  
彼が何を探しているかという、それは妻だ。  
彼が探しているのは、妻だ。

Although the speaker has no presuppositions of the identity of the person who he is looking for, *the thing* specifically refers to the concept of wife, which is particular to the subject. *Whatever* is equivalent to *anything* which is classified according to (Smith, 1964) as an unspecified determiner (*any*) as opposed to the specified<sup>1)</sup> reference determiner, *the*. Thus, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

- (15) \*Whatever he is looking for is a wife.  
彼が探しているのか、妻だ。

One possible explanation for the ungrammaticality of *Wh-ever FRs* constructions in pseudo-cleft sentences may be due to a linguistic constraint for determiners that cover the scope of the entire subject-copula-subject complement. Again as stated previously, we will save this area of research for a future article.

Example (15) can, however, be paraphrased by the following:

- (16) That which he is looking for is a wife.  
彼が探しているのは、妻だ。

From the perspective of my linguistic intuitions, I believe that it is usually if not always the case that free relative *what* can be paraphrased by *that which*. As we observed in Example (15) *Wh-ever FRs* constructions are not possible in a pseudo-cleft sentence, however, in the following examples (17-19 and 21) *Wh-ever FRs* constructions can occur in the subject nominal position.

- (17) That which grows slowly endures.  
ゆっくり育つものは、忍耐強い。
- (18) What/Whatever grows slowly endures.  
ゆっくり育つものは、忍耐強い。
- (19) Anything that grows slowly endures  
ゆっくり育つものならば、何であろうと忍耐強い。  
ゆっくり育つものならば、何でも、忍耐強い。
- (20) A thing that grows slowly endures.  
ゆっくり育つものは、忍耐強い。

In Example (14) the sentence is grammatical with FRS or —*Wh-ever FRs* when the reference is unspecified.

- (14) *The thing that he is looking for is a wife*

(*What...*)

彼が何を探しているかという、それは妻だ。

彼が探しているのは、妻だ。

Furthermore, it is not necessarily the case that *what* is always marked for specific reference because of what is observed in Example (18).

- (18) *What/Whatever grows slowly endures.*

ゆっくり育つものは、忍耐強い。

As in Example (14) the same pattern occurs with the free relative *where*.

- (21) *Where he is living is dismal.*

彼の住んでいるところは、陰気だ。

- (22) *The place where he is living is dismal.*

彼の住んでいるところは、陰気だ。

- (23) \**Wherever he is living is dismal.*<sup>2)</sup>

どこだったか、彼の住んでいるところは陰気だ。

- (24) \**Anywhere he is living is dismal.*

どこだろうが、彼の住んでいるところは陰気だ。

The ungrammaticality of Examples (23-24) may be considered the logical extension of the analysis of Example (15). By contrast with Examples (21-24), when the structures in the paradigm are changed to a subject nominal expression, grammatical as they may be, they are hardly the same in meaning as was the case for Examples (17-20); nor do their meanings lend themselves any easier for analysis.

- (25) *There where he lives smells bad.*

彼の住んでいるその場所は、悪臭がする。(変な匂いがする。)

- (26) *Where he lives smells bad.*

彼が住んでいるところは、悪臭がする。(変な匂いがする。)

- (27) *Wherever he lives smells bad.*

どこだったか、彼の住んでいるところは悪臭がする。(変な匂いがする。)

- (28) Anywhere he lives smells bad.  
どこであろうと、彼の住む所は悪臭がする。(変な匂いがする。)
- (29) The place where he lives smells bad.  
彼の住んでいる場所は、臭い。

If we turn to the use of *who* or *whoever* in Example (7) we find that the use of *who* in object position or subject position is no longer acceptable. Observe the following:

- (30) \*I want to see who deals with complaints.  
誰が苦情の問い合わせを担当しているのか知りたい。  
苦情の問い合わせを担当している者の顔が見てみたい。
- (31) \*Who told you that was lying.  
誰が、それは嘘だ、と言った？

Unless we refer to a somewhat archaic form then we cannot achieve grammaticality with *who* in this syntactic position:

- (32) I want to speak to he who deals with complaints.  
苦情の問い合わせを担当している者と話がしたい。
- (33) He who told you that was lying.  
それは嘘だ、と言った彼だ。

In this case with *whoever* Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) purport that because of a possible historical change the two meanings of definite and universal have come to be used with the *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions.

- (34) I want to speak to *whoever* deals with complaints  
(...*anyone* who.../*...the person* who...)  
誰でも良いから、苦情の問い合わせを担当する者と話がしたい。
- (35) *Whoever* told you that was lying.  
(*The person* who told you that was lying.)  
(*Anyone* who told you that was lying.)  
誰だろうが、それが嘘だ、と言った者だ。  
誰だろうが、それは嘘だと言ったのだ

However, it is possible to get the two readings with other *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions as well

as *whoever*:

- (36) If you get the chair you prefer, learn to sit proper  
 (on *whatever* chair you get.)  
 (on *any* chair that you get/ on *the* chair that you get)  
 好みのイスを手に入れたならば、それがどんなイスであろうと、  
 きちんと座るようにしなさい。

In the definite reading, although the speaker presupposes that there is a chair, she or he cannot make a specific reference to that chair. Just as in Examples (34–35) although the speaker presupposes the existence of a person he just cannot specify who that person is. In the other reading for Example (36) it is not necessary to specify the chair in question just as long as it is a member of the class, *CHAIR*.

This principle can apply to such *Wh-ever* FRs constructions as *however* and *wherever*. Imagine a rich mother who could care less about money.

- (37) I'll give you however much you need for school.  
 (...*the amount* that you need for school/ ...*any amount* that you need)  
 いくらであろうと、学費は必要なだけ出してあげよう。

In the definite reading we must assume that the speaker has no idea of the precise figure of the school fees but she presupposes that there is one. As for the other reading, being a rich woman she could care less if the amount referred to were \$200, \$2,000 or \$20,000. Unfortunately there is ambiguity as to which reading is operant here. Nor can one assert whether the semantic concept of irrelevance/*unconcern/unimportance/insignificance* is more salient than the definite reading. von Stechow (2000) clearly presents an ambiguity between the I analysis or N analysis depending on the nature of the embedding.

In regards to the *wherever* construction, observe this usage that was taken from the actual back of a General Mills Breakfast Squares package.

- (38) Take them along for camping, boating, bicycling or for wherever you are.  
 (for any place that you are/ for the place that you are.)  
 キャンプだろうが、ボートだろうが、サイクリングだろうが、どこにでも連れて (持って) 行きなさい。

What the company is trying to emphasize with this sentence is, first of all, that it does not matter where you go, this food is ideal for any place, whether you are in the woods camping, on the lake while boating or on the move on a bicycle. In the other reading, they are good at the place itself, whether specified or not. One should note that nothing is beyond the scope of an advertising agency executive on Madison Avenue. They will reinforce the hard sell by using a

linguistic form such as the *Wh-ever FRs* constructions that make their product look universally appealing which, of course means appealing in more than one way. Hopefully, it is possible to see that the definite meaning usage of the FRs is not restricted to just those forms presented up to now. Definite meaning usage can apply to *Wh-ever FRs* constructions as illustrated above.

The analysis will now proceed to appositives, another area of focus to expand the perspective of the nature of *Wh-ever FRs* constructions. Observe the following example from Langendoen (1970):

(39) John's murderer must have been insane.

ジョンの殺人犯は狂っていたに違いない。

It is possible for one to make the following three assumptions:

- A. The speaker presupposes that the listener shares the same reference that the words *John's murderer* refers to and they share a certain amount of recognition ability of the physical attributes of *John's murderer* but they do not know his name.
- B. One can only know his name but we have no ability to recognize him.
- C. One can only surmise from the evidence that the person who murdered him was insane.

The distinction in the reference to the identity of John's murderer and the attribution of *John's murderer* is neutralized when the *Wh-ever FRs* appositive is used so that one cannot clearly distinguish whether Assumption A or B is being referred to in the following:

(40) John's murderer, whoever he was, must have been insane.

ジョンの殺人犯は、誰であろうが、狂っていたに違いない。

The insertion of the appositive *Wh-ever FRs* with Assumption A serves the same function as if the speaker were asking the name of the person. Even if a name is inserted, then the appositive reference still holds its validity because now the speaker is asking for clarification about the profile of the named person working from the perspective of Assumption B. One can assume that the speaker still does not know the reference even though a name has been attributed to the profile<sup>3)</sup>. Observe the following:

(41) John's murderer, Tom Jones, whoever he was, must have been insane.

ジョンの殺人犯、トム・ジョーンズは、誰だか知らないが狂っていたに違いない<sup>4)</sup>。

Although the above sentence paraphrases with the following, it is logical to assume that the speaker of Example (41) meets the conditions of the B reading. However it could also be someone who first knew the attribution of *John's murderer* as seen in Example (42):

- (42) Tom Jones, *the person who* murdered John must have been insane.  
(\* *anyone who* murdered John must have been insane.)  
トム・ジョーンズ、ジョンの殺害者は、狂っていたに違い。

When we use the relative pronoun *what* the results are similar:

- (43) The murder weapon that was used must have been blunt.  
殺害に使われた凶器は、鈍器だったに違いない。
- (44) The murder weapon, whatever it was, that was used must have been blunt.  
殺害に使われた凶器、それが何であろうと、鈍器であることに違いない。

The preceding Example (44) can be paraphrased as such:

- (45) The murder weapon, *the thing* that was used to kill John.  
(\* *anything* that was used to kill John)  
ジョンを殺害するために使われた、その凶器…

It should be noted that in Examples (42) and (45) the *any*-compound clearly is ungrammatical as a paraphrase because the preceding co-referential noun phrase is definite although unspecified. As was stated previously, when a *Wh-ever- FRs* nominal pronoun is used rather than either definite or indefinite reference with an embedded appositive then the distinction disappears or is neutralized

- (46) *Whatever* was used to murder John must have been blunt.  
(\* *Anything* that was .../ *The thing, whatever* it was, that was used  
ジョンを殺害するために使われた凶器は、何であれ鈍器だったに違いない。

It is reasonable to assume that this can apply to other *Wh-ever- FRs* compounds as well.

- (47) I can give you *however many* apples as you want.  
(\* *any amount* that / *the amount, however much* it is that you want)  
ジョンを殺害するために使われた凶器は、何であれ鈍器だったに違いない。

- (48) Home is *wherever* your family and friends are.  
 (*the place, wherever* it is, *where...*)  
 (*any place where...*)  
 故郷とは、家族と友達の居るところだ。  
 家族や友達が居るところならばどこでも故郷だ。

In Kuroda (1968) the author mentions the fact that the Example (49) can be paraphrased by Example (50).

- (50) Anything which surprised Mary, pleased John.  
 それがなんであろうと、マリーを驚かせられれば、ジョンは嬉しかった。
- (51) Whatever surprised Mary pleased John.  
 マリーを驚かせた何かを、ジョンは嬉しく思った。

Even so such as paraphrase is possible, supposedly, Example (52) cannot be paraphrased by Example (51) particularly if the speaker does not want to reveal his source of information.

- (52) Something which surprised Mary pleased John.  
 マリーを驚かせた何かを、ジョンは嬉しく思った。

However, if one presupposes the reference to be unspecified in Example (53) when the *Wh-ever FRs* is inserted in the appositive, this generates the following:

- (53) Something, whatever it was, which surprised Mary pleased John.  
 何だかわらないが、何かがマリーを驚かせ、ジョンは嬉しく思った。

Consequently the co-referential appositive can be deleted and the same paraphrase is achieved. It may be necessary to employ the appropriate intonation variation in order to get the meaning across; however, when it does along with the information provided by the context then, Examples (52) and (53) can be paraphrases with unspecified referents.

It is also possible that the choice of *FRs* rather than *Wh-ever FRs* involves whether or not the speaker in one's own mind considers it necessary to assert the specificity of the action although one does presuppose that the *FRs* referring to time, manner, and place do exist. Depending on the circumstances of the individual, they determine if it is necessary to be assertive, non-assertive or neutral about the time, manner, place or identity of what is being predicated. Consequently the use of the *Wh-ever FRs* constructions will also come into play. In any case the individual still presupposes that such a place, time, manner, etc. do exist for either the *FR* or *Wh-ever FRs* constructions. This perspective leads us to analyze *Wh-ever FRs* usage

in one of two ways. From one perspective the *FR* is substituted with its corresponding definite marker paraphrase:

- (54) He's coming in at some time today. I don't know when but you can talk to him *when* he comes in,  
 (*at the moment..*)  
 彼は今日中に来る (予定だ)。いつだかわからないが、来た時点で彼と話したら良いだろう。<sup>5)</sup>

- (55) ..., you can talk to him *whenever* he comes in.  
 (*at the moment, whenever it is.*)  
 (*anytime* he comes in..)  
 彼が来た時点で話したら良いだろう。

In the above sentences we note that the speaker depends on the listener's presuppositions to provide the appropriate contextual information as a means to compensate for one's inability to specify the moment of the other person's arrival. In another analysis, it is possible that the speaker shirks responsibility for an arrival time by letting the listener assume the ETA through personal presuppositions. In Example (55) the speaker focuses on the fact that the time of arrival cannot be specified. Notice in Example (58) that when the time is specified then the *Wh-ever- FRs* reading is unacceptable. As Petersen (1974) states, it is necessary to look at the embedded clause to determine the specificity of the noun phrase. Observe the following:

- (56) You can talk to him when he comes in at 5:00 p.m.  
 午後5時に彼が来たときに話したら良いだろう。
- (57) \*You can talk to him whenever he comes in at 5:00 p.m.  
 \*午後5時に彼が来たときに、いつでも話せば良いだろう。

Conversely, the ungrammaticality of (56) that would arise from the insertion of the *Wh-ever- FRs* appositive is apparent in the following:

- (58) You can talk to him *when* he comes in at 5:00 P.M.  
 (*\*at the time, \* whenever* it is at 5:00 P .M.)  
 午後5時に彼が来たときに話したら良いだろう。

This is consistent with the basic claim that *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions are used only with unspecified reference whether the context is definite. If we consider *wherever*, the same principle as in Examples (54- 57) may hold true. Observe the following:

- (59) Proactiv clears up the acne *where* you need it to the most.  
 (*at the place, where*)  
 プロアクティブは肌の一番必要な場所から、アクネをキレイに取り除いてくれる。
- (60) Proactiv clears up the acne *wherever* you need it to the most.  
 (*at the place, wherever it is, that*)  
 (*anywhere you need it to.*)  
 プロアクティブは肌のどこでも必要な場所から、アクネをキレイに取り除いてくれる。

In neither (59) nor (60) does the speaker intend to specify where the acne medicine would be effective. Note as well that the exact location on the body could not be specified in a general sense; so that even with a specified location, the reference is nonetheless *unspecified* to the speaker (in his mind). Note the following two examples:

- (61) Proactiv clears up the acne where you need it to the most on your body.  
 プロアクティブは肌の一番必要な場所からアクネをキレイに取り除いてくれる。
- (62) Proactiv clears up acne wherever you need it to the most on your body.  
 プロアクティブは肌のどこでも必要な場所から、アクネをキレイに取り除いてくれる。

*Wh-ever- FRs* constructions in this linguistic environment operate effectively with a supplied reference and are rather similar in behavior to *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions in linguistic environments such as in the following:

- (40) John's murderer, whoever he was, must have been insane.  
 ジョンの殺人犯は、誰であろうが、狂っていたに違いない。

To sum it all up, presuppositions play a critical role in determining the meaning of the *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions. The concept of definite but unspecified as opposed to definite and specified is another area of focus that helps to achieve a better understanding of what are the interactions, points of commonality and variances with the FRs and the *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions. Semantic function cannot be generated by grammar rules alone, the presupposition of the speaker and the listener are crucial in a better understanding when principles of Universality / Definite and Specified are interconnected. I submit that there is a

remarkable amount of research that still needs to be pursued into the variance between definite and specified versus definite but not specified semantic functions of *Wh-ever FRs* constructions and their equivalent FRs and any- compounds.

### Universal-Conditional Concessive Clauses

There is another function that the *Wh-ever FRs* constructions serve. Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) refers to it by the title, *universal conditional concessive clause*. It is universal because it serves to signal a *free choice from among any number of conditions*. Observe the following:

- (63) She looks pretty in *whatever* she wears  
(...*in jeans or a dress or a bathrobe, etc.*)  
彼女は何を着ても綺麗だ。

- (64) If she wears anything such that it can be worn, she looks pretty in it.  
彼女は、衣類なら何を着ても綺麗だ。

This is a necessary structure since, if it were not stated, then we would infer something like the following *reductio ad absurdum* example:

- (65) ?If she wears egg on her face, she looks pretty in it.  
?もし彼女の顔に生卵がついていても、きっと綺麗だろう。

At any rate, example (64) can be transformed to:

- (66) If she wears anything, she looks pretty in it  
彼女は何を着ようと、綺麗だ。

Quirk and Greenbaum's explanation of the concessive aspect of this kind of clause comes from the fact that the concession, in their terminology, is a semantic notion that involves – as Quirk and Greenbaum (1973) would suggest – a *contrast between two circumstances, i.e. the main clause is surprising in the light of the dependent one*. This concession can be paraphrased by the subordinator *even if*. Thus, (64) can be paraphrased into the following:

- (67) Even if she wears a scuba diving outfit, or a spacesuit or a burlap sack, she looks pretty in it.  
スキューバ・ギアを着ていようが、宇宙服を着ていようが、ゴミ袋をま  
とっていようが、彼女なら綺麗に見えるだろう。

Because this use of *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions implies a concessive notion, the following two forms can paraphrase it:

(A.) *No matter wh—*

(B.) *It doesn't matter wh—.*

(68) She looks pretty in no matter what she wears.

彼女は何を着ようと、綺麗だ。

(69) It doesn't matter what she wears, she looks pretty in it.

何を着ようが関係なく、彼女は綺麗に着こなす。

The analysis of these two kinds of clauses in Examples (63-64) yielded at least two other semantic environments in which *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions appear. Surprisingly, Quirk and Greenbaum offer no explanation for their occurrence, nor what function they serve. They are listed below.

A) The use of *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions as a platform at the end of a series of nouns conjoined by *or*.

Observe the following example:

(70) ... at any rate, discrete—point items generally aim at testing one and only one

point of grammar, (or) phonology (or) vocabulary, or whatever, at a time

翻訳無し

B) The use of a one word pro—form—like *Wh-ever- FRs* construction is similar to the kind that Archie Bunker used to respond to the proposition of the other party with a one word *Wh-ever- FRs* construction, *WHATEVER!* as did Liam Lynch more recently in his song, *The United States of Whatever*. Both speakers used a rather dismissive, abrupt, curt, final tone of voice. However the following examples are more accommodating and show a willingness to agree with the speaker depending on the contextual tone of voice:

(71a) When shall I explain what I'll be testing for on the final exam?

私が期末試験で何を出題するかについて、いつ話そうか？

(71b) Whenever

いつでもいいです。

- (72a) Let's go out to dinner tonight.  
今夜は外食しよう。
- (72b) Where do you want to go? To a French (or) , Spanish (or) , Italian (or), Thai (or), Chinese or Japanese restaurant?  
どこに行こうか?  
どこに行きたい?  
フランス料理、イタリア料理、タイ料理、中華料理それとも日本の料理店?
- (72a) Wherever.  
どこでも (いいよ) 。
- (73a) Let's do something really different tonight.  
今夜は普段しないような事をしようよ。
- (73b) Okay, shall we go bowling, (or) attend a concert, (or) go for a free Hot Yoga class or play Monopoly?  
よし、じゃあボーリングにしようか、コンサートに行こうか、無料のホットヨガ教室に参加しようか、それともモノポリーでもして遊ぼうか?
- (73a) Whatever.  
なんでもいいよ。  
どうでもいいよ

In the Examples (70 & 72-73) we notice that the response given to a series of conjoined nouns is the *Wh-ever FRs* construction pro-form. Furthermore, in Example (71) there is no series of conjoined nouns. This may suggest that the basic semantic notion that unifies<sup>6)</sup> examples as von Stechow (2000) suggests may involve the ability to adapt to a certain sentence environment. We can, of course, paraphrase (71b, 72a and 73a) with the respective responses, *Anytime*, *Anywhere* and *Anything*.

In summary, although the response to a series of conjoined nouns elicits a *Wh-ever FRs* construction pro-form, the role of context as expressed in the tone of voice clearly indicates whether the semantic concept of *irrelevance/unconcern/unimportance* is operant here or simply the concessive construction suggested by Quirk and Greenbaum (1973). Simply stated, there are context specific cues at work here that cannot be explained by surface level constraints alone whether the semantic function of *Wh-ever FRs* constructions are Shakira's concessive usage or Liam Lynch's dismissive usage.

## Conclusion

It would be linguistic elegance to find an underlying principle that would be perceivable in all the different kinds of *Wh-ever FRs* environments that we have analyzed. Intuitively, there is the basic underlying notion of a universal choice, if one may call it that. This could encompass the universal quantifier *all* due to the universal choice. It could also encompass the notion of *any* since *any-constructions* are a discrete way of viewing the *all* continuum: this is carried out by the semantic notion's being stated in a string of *or-or-or conjunction* such as was apparent in the soothing lyrics of Shakira's song, *Whenever, Wherever*. As we have already seen the use of *whatever* in Example (70) functions as the pro-form. Furthermore, if we can establish that the *definite* reading of *the- or Wh-ever FRs* constructions it is, then we have the basis for the adaptability of the *Wh-ever FRs* constructions to change from discrete—to—continuum focus. Since any of the universal choices is valid, then we could break new ground in exploring the fact that *Wh-ever FRs* constructions are a neutral form that can be marked for a continuum—like focus in the forms like *No matter wh-* or discrete—like focus in forms like *any chair*, etc. This is just the tip of the iceberg. Further exploration in this as yet uncharted area of research will certainly reveal new and exciting findings into *whatever*.

## Acknowledgements

*I am extremely indebted to Dr. Thomas Hill, Professor Emeritus, Dr. John Wendel, Professor of English Language, both of whom are from the English Language Department at Dokkyo University and Dr. Richard Falvo, Professor of Speech Communication at El Paso Community College. Their critical comments on certain aspects of this paper were invaluable for a deeper understanding of the study.*

*I am also greatly indebted to Mici Falvo, translator (formerly at Knowledge Accelerators) and Media specialist (currently at Humoring the Fates) for her translations of the Examples (1- 74). Moreover, as a Japanese- English bilingual, her comments and keen insights on the distinctions between Japanese and English pragmatics were invaluable in the course of this article.*

## References

- Dayal, Veneeta, Free Relatives and *Ever*: Identity and Free Choice Readings, *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 7, 1997
- von Stechow, Kai, Whatever, Proceedings of the 10th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference, at Cornell University, edited by Brendan Jackson and Tanya Matthews, June 2-4, 2000.
- Kuroda, Shigeyuki, English relativization and certain related problems. *Language* 44. 244-266. Reprinted in S. Schane and D. Reibel (eds.), *Modern Studies in English: Reading in Transformational Grammar*. 264-289. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Langendoen, D. Terence, *Essentials of English Grammar*, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970

Petersen, David John, Noun Phrase Specificity, University of Michigan, 1974

Quirk, Randolph and Greenbaum, Sidney, A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973

Smith, Carlota S., Determiners and Relative Clauses in a Generative Grammar of English, Language, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 37-52, Linguistic Society of America, (Jan. - Mar., 1964)

### End Notes

- 1) The concept of that which is stated as the specified is related with the speaker's beliefs and the reasons why one wishes to state certain beliefs rather than others. This concept has to be investigated at greater length. Nonetheless since it begs the question of what are the differences between *Wh-ever- FRs*, *FRs* and *any* compounds which all have has a crucial role in promoting a greater understanding of the semantics functions of what is being analyzed in this article.
- 2) von Stechow (2000) presupposes that the speaker is ignorant (N analysis) as to whether the entire assertion of a sentence is truly universally quantified in the usage of *Wh-ever- FRs*. However, his analysis of the grammaticality of this pseudo-cleft form from this analysis is not clear. In fact, he chooses to *steer clear of the issue* by not dealing with the pseudo-cleft form. Undoubtedly, there will be those whose intuitions will lead them to insist that Example (23) it is grammatical. This issue will certainly elicit future discussion.
- 3) The entire issue of the attributive versus the referential occurs when there are examples of embedded questions with *Wh-ever- FRs* constructions. Observe the contrast between the following examples:

(A) I know a lot about whomever the murderer is.

殺人犯が誰なのか、私は、良く知っている。

(B) \*I know whoever the murderer is.

\*殺人犯が誰か、私は知っている。

In the above sentence the *Wh-ever- FRs* construction refers to the fact that the speaker knows the attributive features black hair, over 5 feet, green eyes, etc. but very often one presupposes the *who* in question to render the identity of the *Wh-ever- FRs* construction referent. In this case identity refers specifically to the particular name of the *Wh-ever- FRs* construction referent. In (A) the name is unspecified so the *Wh-ever- FRs* construction refers to the specified distinguishing features. The same principle may be operant when one knows someone who calls on the telephone and identifies himself as *Joe*. He is unknown and unspecified because he is not part of listener's cognitive network. When he says that he will call the listener's sister back at 10:00 P.M., the listener does not say that they know who is calling because even though the listener may have a name to refer to the voice the speaker is still unspecified. In another context, if a Secret Service agent leads an entourage of reporters, photographers, and security agents behind him and if those present hear one of the handlers say:

A: Clear the way for Huma Abedin!

ヒューマ・アベディンのために、準備を整えよう!

It would be totally natural for the listener to respond with the following:

B: Yeah, okay, but who is she, really?

はい、いいよ、わかったけど、本当に彼女は一体誰だ?

referring to the attributization of such a woman that is allowed to travel around in such grand ceremony.

Even if the Secret Service agent responds with:

A: She is Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton's Deputy Chief of Staff at the State Department.

彼女はヒラリー・クリントン米国務長官の(国務省の)補佐官だ。

It is still grammatically appropriate for the listener, B to reply with a response such as:

(B) I still don't know whoever she is.

そういわれても、彼女が一体誰なのか見当がつかない。

because this person is as yet unspecified to the listener until there is some attribute of Huma Abedin that one can really relate internalize as part of their cognitive system.

- 4) Mici Falvo, the translator with the company, *Humoring the Fates* made this very appropriate comment for this translation, *Why would you say "whoever he was" if you know its "Tom Jones"?* This clearly illustrates the important and subtle distinction between definite and specified vs. definite but unspecified which is witnessed in interactions of the various semantic functions of *Wh-ever FRs* constructions. If a bilingual translator/interpreter needs the know presuppositions or contextual reference, imagine how totally lost these subtle distinctions will be on second language learner!
- 5) Mici Falvo also made this comment, *予定だ is insinuated*. There being a difference between 来る and 予定だ is what the pragmatics of this usage requires is investigation indicate once again whether the use of 予定だ is more non-assertive or neutral compared to 来る when a receptionist chooses to use the one expression over another in response to a caller. The judgment call here certainly will be associated with the tone of voice of the caller, the receptionist's past knowledge of the caller and the receptionist's presuppositions about the person being called about, the relationship to the caller, etc.
- 6) von Stechow (2000) discusses this unification analysis in great detail and attempts to connect the N analysis (Ignorance) with I Analysis (Indifference) unfortunately the results are still a can of worms that will be untangled as more researchers go fishing in the murky waters of *Whatever*.

## Appendix One

*Whenever, Wherever*

Shakira

Lucky you were born that far away so  
We could both make fun of distance  
Lucky that I love a foreign land for  
The lucky fact of your existence

Baby I would climb the Andes solely  
To count the freckles on your body  
Never could imagine there were only  
Ten Million ways to love somebody

Le ro lo le lo le, Le ro lo le lo le  
Can't you see  
I'm at your feet

Whenever, wherever  
We're meant to be together  
I'll be there and you'll be near  
And that's the deal my dear

There over, hereunder  
You'll never have to wonder  
We can always play by ear  
But that's the deal my dear

Lucky that my lips not only mumble  
They spill kisses like a fountain  
Lucky that my breasts are small and humble  
So you don't confuse them with mountains  
Lucky I have strong legs like my mother  
To run for cover when I need it  
And these two eyes that for no other  
The day you leave will cry a river

Le ro le le lo le, Le ro le le lo le  
At your feet  
I'm at your feet

Whenever, wherever  
We're meant to be together  
I'll be there and you'll be near  
And that's the deal my dear

Thereover, hereunder  
You'll never have to wonder  
We can always play by ear  
But that's the deal my dear

Le ro le le lo le, Le ro le le lo le  
Think out loud  
Say it again

Le ro lo le lo le lo le  
Tell me one more time  
That you'll live  
Lost in my eyes

Whenever, wherever  
We're meant to be together  
I'll be there and you'll be near  
And that's the deal my dear

Thereover, hereunder  
You've got me head over heels  
There's nothing left to fear  
If you really feel the way I feel

Music Video at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=weRHyjj34ZE>

Lyrics available at: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V1NwRK3Gzr8>

## Appendix Two

### *United States Of Whatever*

Liam Lynch

I went down to the beach and saw Kiki  
She was, like, all “ehhhh”  
And I was, like, “whatever!”  
Then this chick comes up to me and she’s all, like,  
“Hey, aren’t you that dude?”  
And I’m, like, “yeah, whatever!”  
So later I’m at the pool hall  
And this girl comes up  
And she’s, like, “awww”  
And I’m, like, “yeah, whatever!”

Cause this is my  
United States of Whatever!  
And this is my  
United States of Whatever!  
And this is my  
United States of Whatever!

And then it’s three A.M.  
And I’m on the corner, wearing my leather  
This dude comes up and he’s, like, “hey, punk!”  
I’m, like, “yeah, whatever!”  
Then I’m throwing dice in the alley  
Officer Leroy comes up and he’s, like,  
“Hey, I thought I told you...”  
And I’m, like, “yeah, whatever!”  
And then up comes Zafu  
I’m, like, “yo, Zafu. What’s up?”  
He’s, like, “nothin”  
And I’m, like, “that’s cool.”

Cause this is my  
United States of Whatever!  
And this is my  
United States of Whatever!—

Music Video available at: <http://youtu.be/q3nDQFickqY>

Lyrics available at: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jx\\_ycu6PJ7E](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jx_ycu6PJ7E)