

Evidence for FMG 3 German has modal verbs that are not auxiliaries; the FMG predicts that when these occur in non-finite form, they cannot obtain wide-scope over a disjunction via covert ATB. This prediction is also borne out:

- (9) Hans soll singen müssen oder tanzen müssen
 Hans REP_{3SG} sing-INF must-INF OR dance-INF must-INF
Reportedly, Hans must sing or he must dance
 * pseudo-FC reading: REP \square [sing or dance]&¬ \square sing&¬ \square dance;
 ✓ uncertainty reading: REPORT [\square sing or \square dance]

Accounting for the FMG Hulsev (2006) argues that gapped modals as in (10-a) give rise to scope-ambiguities; the parallel construction with negation doesn't exhibit the same ambiguity (Johnson 2014):

- (10) a. The Sox must beat the Yankees, or the Angels lose to the Mariners ($\vee \gg \square, \square \gg \vee$)
 b. Kim didn't play bingo, and Sandy sit at home all evening ($\neg \gg \vee, * \vee \gg \neg$)

We propose that the $\square \gg \vee$ reading of (10-a) is derived from overt ATB of the modal, building on proposals by Lechner (2006) and Iatridou & Zeijlstra (2013), who provide independent evidence for the movement of finite modals. Thus, we argue for the null hypothesis that the independently attested movement of *must*, *may* etc. is not subject to further restrictions which would prevent (c)overt ATB movement. Under this proposal non-finite modal expressions as in (5), (6) are *ipso facto* excluded from movement, accounting for the missing FC readings with *it is ok*, *allowed*, *required* etc. shown above. What remains to be accounted for is the possibility for the modal to be pronounced again in the second disjunct (indicated here by underlining):

- (11) John \diamond_{may} [John may sing or he may dance]

(11) represents our analysis of seemingly wide-scope FC disjunctions like (2) (movement of the subject is forced by independent conditions on linearization). In other words, seemingly wide-scope FC as in (2) is analyzed as (11) where the ATB-moved modal is pronounced again in the second disjunct. Importantly, this analysis seems to violate (12):

- (12) If an item is pronounced in one position, it must not be pronounced in another position
 (e.g., Johnson 2012)

We maintain (12) and argue that pronouncing the modal in the second disjunct is licensed via Richards' (1998) Principle of Minimal Compliance (PMC), which translates as follows for our purposes :

- (13) **Principle of Minimal Compliance** For any dependency D that obeys (12), any elements that are relevant for determining whether D obeys (12) can be ignored when checking whether another dependency D' obeys (12)

For (11) it follows that once the head and tail of the dependency in the first disjunct is checked for (12) (and found to obey it), the head *may* can be ignored when checking whether *may* in the second disjunct obeys (12), thus licensing its pronunciation.

Our proposal makes further testable predictions: In sentences with three coordinated clauses, the pronunciation of the modal is predicted to be optionally licensed in either the 2nd or the 3rd disjunct; this is what we observe (similarly with *must*):

- (14) a. John may sing or Bill whistle or they may dance
 b. John may sing or he may whistle or dance

In sum we offer new evidence for, and give substance to, the controversial assumption that covert ATB-movement exists, and propose an explicit account of (seemingly) wide-scope FC disjunctions based on independently needed syntactic mechanisms.

Selected References Bošković & Franks (2000) *Syntax* 3, 107-128. den Dikken (2006) *NLLT* 24. Meyer (2016) *Free Choice Disjunction* Ms., Hebrew U. Fox (2007) *Free Choice and the Theory of Scalar Implicature*, in Sauerland&Stateva

(eds.). Simons (2005) *NLS* 13(3). Hulsey (2006) *NELS* 37. Johnson (2014) *Gapping Ms.*, UMass Amherst. Lechner (2006) *An interpretive effect of head movement*, in Frascarelli, M. (ed.). Iatridou & Zeijlstra (2013) *Ling Inquiry* 44(4). Richards (1998) *LI* 29(4). Johnson (2012) *Lingua* 122(6).