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1. Introduction

The discussion of Free Choice Items (FCIs) in the literature has been primarily concerned with English *any* taking a universal-like interpretation (Dayal 1998; Giannakidou 2001; Sæbø 2001, among others). For instance, in (1), *any* apple among all the apples in the discourse is a permitted option for the addressee to pick. The addressee’s freedom of choice to pick an unrestricted apple can be seen as being inherited by the speaker’s permission or indifference. That is, because the speaker does not care the identity of an apple the addressee would pick, every apple in a given set can be a permitted choice.

(1) You can pick any apple.

Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002) suggest that speaker’s indifference is a key notion for free choice (FC) effects of German *irgendein*, although it always reads existentially, rather than universally. Example (2) shows that *irgendein* conveys speaker’s indifference as for the identity of the invitee, so that anyone in the domain of discourse can be an option for invitation, hence FC effect. In this regard, the simple indefinite *jemand* is infelicitous.

(2)  Hans: Wen soll ich einladen?  
Who shall I invite?  
Maria:  **Irgendjemand** / #Jemand.  
Somebody or other.  
Somebody.

K&S further observe that the FC effect of *irgendein* is canceled under downward entailing (DE) contexts, as in (3). A special focus particle or emphatic stress is needed to keep it, as in (4).

(3) Ich bezweifle, dass sie je irgendjemand einladen durfte.  
I doubt that she ever irgend-one invite could  
‘I doubt that she was ever allowed to invite anybody.’

(4) Sie darf nie einfach nur IRGENDjemand einladen.  
She may never just only irgend-one invite  
‘She is never allowed to invite just ANYbody (by choosing indiscriminately/indifferently).’

K&S’ analysis is as follows: first, the source for *irgendein*’s FC effect is its domain-widening action, as proposed by Kadmon and Landman (1993) for English *any*. FC indefinite *irgendein*, unlike simple *ein*, induces maximal widening of the domain. So, while DPs headed by *ein* denote subsets of their common noun set, *irgendein Mann* denotes the set of all men, as shown in (5) and (6).

(5) $g(D) \subseteq D$  
(D is the set of possible individuals)  
$[\{\text{ein}_{\mathfrak{g}} \text{mann}\}]^{\text{w}\mathfrak{g}} = \{x: x \text{ is man in w} \& x \in g(D)\}$

*I am truly grateful to Maribel Romero for valuable comments and discussions. I also thank Chung-Hye Han, Arthur Merin, Hotze Rullmann, Satoshi Tomioka, and the audience at WCCFL for questions and comments.*
For \( [\alpha]^{w,g} \subseteq D_e: [\text{irgend-} \alpha]^{w,g} = \{x: \exists g'[x \in [\alpha]^{w,g}']\} \)
\( [\text{irgend-}[\text{einz}_0 \text{ mann}]^{w,g} = \{x: \exists g'[x \text{ is a man in } w \& x \in g'(D)] = \{x: x \text{ is a man in } w\} \)

Second, since modals like ‘may’ only select propositions Hamblin-style semantics for indefinites is adopted to make a compositional link between FC indefinites and modals: indefinites create Hamblin sets, namely set of propositional alternatives, as illustrated in (7).

Third, the FC effect of irgendein is now formalized as so-called “distribution requirement”, as in (8). That is, for every alternative created by irgendein, there should be an accessible world introduced by a modal. The distribution requirement is derived as a conversational implicature since it disappears in DE contexts, as we saw in (3).

Distribution Requirement
\( \{\lambda w'. \forall p[\text{p} \in [\text{IP}]^{w',g} \rightarrow \exists w' [w' \text{ is accessible from } w' \& \text{p}(w') = 1]\}\} \)

A crucial fact that K&S fail to capture is that the FC effect in (4) is oriented not to the speaker but to the agent of inviting action, i.e. she. The two types of FC effects with respect to orientation are similar to the two distinct interpretations of –ever Free Relatives, as von Fintel (2000) and Tredinnick (2003) note. –ever FRs can convey either speaker indifference or agent indifference, as shown in (9).

\[ a. \text{Zack voted for whoever was at the top of the ballot.} \]
\[ \text{Agent’s Ind.} \]
\[ = \text{Zack didn’t care who was at the top of the ballot and indifferently voted for that person.} \]
\[ b. \text{Whatever John writes is provocative.} \]
\[ = \text{The speaker does not care which one of John’s writings is considered; he indifferently considers them all provocative.} \]

In sum, the FC effect of irgendein has the following properties: i) it comes from domain widening of irgendein, ii) it is canceled in DE contexts as a conversational implicature, and iii) it can be attributed to either the speaker or an agent.

This paper aims to show that there is a source for FC effects in Korean other than domain widening and to discuss the differences between FC effects that arise from different sources. Section 2 displays basic data for Korean free choice items. Section 3 introduces the contribution of Korean domain-widening indefinite amwu-, which Choi (2005a) has observed. Section 4 argues that the scalar focus particle –lato ‘even’ can induce FC effects, no matter whether its associate is a domain widening indefinite or not. It is also shown that the FC effects from –lato ‘even’ have different semantic properties than those originating from domain widening with respect to cancelability and orientation. Section 5 is concerned with a compositional analysis of –lato-associated FCIs, based on Guerzoni’s (2005) treatment of ‘even’.

2. Free Choice Items in Korean

Korean FCIs are composed of an indefinite and a particle. Basically, there are two indefinites (i.e., wh- and amwu- ‘no matter what...’ \(^1\)) and two particles (i.e., -lato ‘even’ and –na ‘or’) that can combine. Table (10) shows the distribution and interpretation of each combination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>Amwu-lato</th>
<th>Wh-lato</th>
<th>Amwu-na</th>
<th>Wh-na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?FC-\forall</td>
<td>\forall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE other than negation</td>
<td>FC-\exists</td>
<td>FC-\exists</td>
<td>FC-\forall</td>
<td>\forall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal, Imperative etc.</td>
<td>FC-\exists/\forall</td>
<td>FC-\exists/\forall</td>
<td>FC-\forall</td>
<td>\forall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>?FC-\forall</td>
<td>\forall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DE for downward entailing context; FC for free choice)

\(^1\) Amwu-based polarity sensitive items are discussed in Lee et al. (2000) and Choi (2005a).
The first two items based on –lato ‘even’, i.e., amwu/wh-N-lato take an existential quantification in DE contexts while being interpreted as a universal-like generic or an existential in so-called FC contexts including generics, imperatives, and modals, among other contexts. By contrast, the third item, the combination of amwu ‘no matter what’ and –na ‘or’, i.e., amwu-na is interpreted as a universal-like free choice across the board. The contrast is very clear in the translation of English example in (11), provided by Horn (2000).

(11) a. If you eat ANY meat, you are not a vegetarian. (NPI use)
    b. If you eat ANY meat, you are not a kosher Jew. (FC use)

Horn (2000) observes that any in conditional can be ambiguous between its negative polarity (NPI) incarnation and FC incarnation. In (11a) any is construed as a non-specific existential while in (11b) it is interpreted universally. Such an ambiguity is resolved by two different lexical items in Korean, as shown in (12).

(12) Translation of Horn’s (2000) examples

a. amwu/etten koki-lato mek-umyen, ne-nun chaysikcuuyca-ka ani-ta.
   ‘No matter what meat it may be, if you eat it, you are not a vegetarian.’

b. amwu koki-na mek-umyen, ne-nun yutayin-i ani-ta.
   ‘If you eat just ANY meat (no matter what meat it may be), you are not a kosher Jew.’

NPI use of any can be translated into amwu/wh-lato whereas FC any can be realized by amwu-na in Korean. Note, however, that although amwu/wh-lato in (12a) takes an existential quantification, it does involve FC flavor such as the speaker’s indifference concerning the identity of meat you eat, that is, “no matter what...” reading. In imperative statements like (13), amwu/wh-lato and amwu-na also deliver FC flavor, coming either from the speaker’s indifference (13a) or agent’s indifference (13b). They differ in terms of quantificational force, parallel to (12).

(13) a. (ne cikum nai-ka myech-intey acikto kyelhon-ul an ha-e?)
   ‘Why are you still not married in spite of being such an old woman? (rhetorical)’
   amwu/nwukwu-lato man-napwa-la
   anyone/who-even meet-try-Imp
   ‘Meet any one person: I don’t care who you meet.’

b. (namca-tul-un ta ttokkhat-ay.)
   man-Pl-Top all same-Decl
   ‘Guys are all the same.’
   kunyang amwu-na man-napwa-la
   just anyone-or meet-try-Imp
   ‘Go and meet just ANYbody, not caring about who to meet.’

While disjunction –na combined with amwu is a FCI, as we have seen, disjunction –na associated with wh- is simply a universal quantifier in Korean. Thus, there is no FC reading with wh-na in (14b), in contrast to amwu-na in (14a).

    J.-Top top-any-with-or sleep-Past-Decl
    ‘John slept with just ANYbody by acting indifferently/indiscriminately.’

b. John-un nwukwu-hako-na ca-ass-e
    J.-Top who-with-or sleep-Past-Decl
    ‘John slept with everybody.’

From the fact that wh- with –na ‘or’ does not induce FC effects, one can easily infer that it is either amwu ‘no matter what’ or –lato ‘even’ that induce FC effects in Korean, as schematized in (15). To
tease apart their respective contribution of \textit{amwu} and \textit{lato}, we need to compare \textit{amwu-lato} and \textit{wh-lato}. In the next section, it will be shown that while \textit{amwu-lato} and \textit{wh-lato} are the same in terms of distribution, q-force, and introduction of FC flavor, \textit{amwu} in \textit{amwu-lato} (and in general) gives rise to some stronger semantic effects.

\begin{equation}
\text{amwu} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{\textit{lato} `even_{SPI}'}
\end{equation}

\text{wh} \quad \text{---} \quad \text{\textit{na} `or'}

\section{Domain widening of \textit{amwu}}

Choi (2005a) argues that Korean \textit{amwu} induces a domain widening, as K&L (1993) and K&S (2002) have proposed for English \textit{any} and German \textit{irgendein}, respectively. The domain widening function of \textit{amwu} is responsible for several ways in which it differs semantically from other indefinites such as wh-indefinites: wh-indefinites range over a regular domain of individuals whereas \textit{amwu} induces maximal widening of this domain. The effects generated by domain widening fall into the following two types: (i) emphatic effects similar to \textit{even}-like behavior and (ii) restriction on scope taking.

\subsection{Rhetorical question}

As proposed in van Rooy (2003) for NPIs like \textit{lift a finger}, domain widening (together with \textit{`even`}) gives rise to the rhetorical effect in (16). In Korean, rhetorical questions with the rhetorical-Q morpheme \textit{-kessni} can be formed with \textit{amwu-N} but not with \textit{wh-N}, as in (17).

\begin{enumerate}
\item Did John \textit{lift a finger} to help Mary? (-rhetorical reading only.)
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. John-i \textit{amwu} towum-ilato cwu-ess-kessni?
\hspace{1cm} ‘Did John give any help to Mary?’ (John must have done nothing to help Mary.)
\item b. *John-i \textit{etten} towum-ilato cwu-ess-kessni?
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\subsection{Non-accidental Generalization}

\textit{Amwu-N} cannot be used to express an accidental generalization, but \textit{wh-N} can, as shown in (18b). Note that Rullmann (1996) argues that in Dutch, emphatic NPIs with wider domain can only be used in non-accidental generalizations, as in (19) (see also Heim 1984; Dayal 1995). Thus, \textit{amwu-N} can be seen as equivalent to emphatics (or minimizers), but \textit{wh-N} can’t.

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. nwukwu-/\textit{amwu-lato} ttayli-n aytul-un motwu pel-ul pat-ass-ta
\hspace{1cm} ‘Every kid who beat anyone was punished.’
\item b. nwukwu/\#\textit{amwu-lato} ttayli-n aytul-un motwu phalan os-ul ip-ko.iss-ess-ta
\hspace{1cm} ‘Every kid who beat anyone was wearing blue clothes.’
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. leedereen die \textit{wat dan ook} gegeten had werd ziek
\hspace{1cm} ‘Everyone who ate anything got sick.’
\item b. *edereen die \textit{wat dan ook} gegeten had droeg een spijkerbroek.
\hspace{1cm} ‘Everyone who ate anything was wearing blue jeans.’
\end{enumerate}
3.3. Scope behavior

*Wh*-N can take wide scope over a modal, but *amwu*-N cannot, as shown in (20). *Wh-lato* in (20a) yields ambiguity between taking wide and narrow scope with respect to the modal while *amwu-lato* can only take narrow scope, hence no ambiguity. This is in a way similar to Musolino and Gualmini’s (in press) observation that NPs with a specific domain (e.g., partitives) can take wide scope more easily. For instance, in (21a), two of the birds with a partitive is construed as a wide scope indefinite more easily whereas two birds in (21b) is hard to interpret as taking wide scope.

(20)  

a.  Jane-un **nwukwu-hako-lato** kyelhonha-yahan-ta
   J.-Top **who-with-lato** marry-must-Decl
   
   [Reading A] ∃□> : ‘There is some man Jane has to marry, the speaker doesn’t care who it is.’
   [Reading B] √□∃ : ‘Jane has to marry a man, any man is a permitted marriage option for her.’

b.  Jane-un **amwu-hako-lato** kyelhonha-yahan-ta
   J.-Top **any-with-lato** marry-must-Decl
   
   [Reading B] only: √□>∃ : ‘Jane has to marry a man, any man is a permitted option for her.’

(21)  

a.  The Smurf didn’t catch two of the birds.  
   b.  The Smurf caught all the cats but she didn’t catch two birds.

So far, we have observed differences between *amwu*-N and *wh*-N. The three contrasts, that is, rhetorical effect, non-accidental generalization, and restriction on scope taking are created by the domain widening function of *amwu*.

4. Another Source for Free Choice Effect: *Amwu/wh–lato*

In this section, I show that FC effects in Korean can stem from the scalar focus particle –lato ‘even’.

4.1. Basic Data

Example (22) shows that both *amwu* and *wh* that are associated with –lato convey the speaker’s (i.e. Tom’s) indifference regarding the identity of the caller. Therefore, Sue’s response inquiring the caller’s identity is not felicitous. Only if the –lato part is omitted, the FC flavor goes away, as in (23).

(22)  

Tom:  **amwu/nwukwu-lato** cenhwa-myen, na-hanthey allye-cwe.
Anyone/who-even call-if I-Dat notice-Imp  
‘If anyone calls, please let me know; I don’t care the identity of the caller.’
Sue:  #nwukwu?  ‘Who?’

(23)  

Tom:  **nwukwu-ka** cenhwa-myen, na-hanthey allye-cwe.
who-Nom call-if I-Dat notice-Imp  
‘If someone calls, please let me know.’
Sue:  nwukwu?  ‘Who?’

The type of FC effect derived from –lato ‘even’ differs from the one coming from domain widening in two ways. Recall that *irgendein*’s FC flavor created by domain widening i) is canceled in

---

2 Note that *amwu*-N cannot associate with case markers while *wh*-N can.
DE contexts, and ii) can be either speaker-oriented or agent-oriented. I observe that the FC effect coming from –*lato* ‘even’ i) is not canceled in DE contexts, and ii) can only be speaker-oriented. Let us see this in more detail.

4.2. Cancelability

First, in contrast to German, the FC effect is not canceled in DE contexts, but projected higher up as a presupposition. For instance, “no matter who…” reading is still alive under a DE context like the complement of *doubt* in (24). Here again, if –*lato* is omitted, the FC effect goes away, as seen in (25).

(24) Na-nun Mary-ka amwu-lato chotayhassta-nunkey uysimsulepta
    I-Top M.-Nom anyone-*LATO* invited-that doubt
     ‘I doubt that Mary invited anyone, no matter who may be considered as a possible invitee by Mary.’

(25) Na-nun Mary-ka nwukwu-lul chotayhassta-nunkey uysimsulepta
    I-Top M.-Nom who-Acc invited-that doubt
     ‘I doubt that Mary invited someone.(lit.)’

4.3. Orientation

Second, The FC effect induced by –*lato* is always expresses the speaker’s indifference, never the agent’s. Only *amwu* with -*na* ‘or’ can introduce the FC effect for the agent.3 K&S suggest that *irgendein* in (26) can be ambiguous in three ways depending on its scope and the orientation of FC effect. When *irgendein* takes wide scope over the modal and yields speaker’s indifference, reading (27A) obtains. Reading in (27B) comes about with narrow scope and speaker’s indifference. The third reading in (27C) is derived by agent’s indifference coming with emphatic stress on *irgendein*.

(26) Mary musste irgendeinen Mann heiraten.
    Mary had-to irgend-one man marry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. ⊃□,</td>
<td>Speaker: There was some man Mary had to marry, the speaker doesn’t know or care who it was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. □⊃∃,</td>
<td>Speaker: Mary had to marry a man, any man was a permitted marriage option for her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ⊐∃,</td>
<td>Agent: Mary had to marry just ANYman, acting indiscriminately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Korean, the three readings in (27) are realized by three different FCIs, as follows. First, speaker’s indifference is induced by –*lato*-FCIs while agent’s indifference is created by *amwu* with -*na* ‘or’. Second, as we have seen in section 3, only *wh*-N can take wide scope, but *amwu*-N cannot. Thus, (28A) reading of speaker’s indifference and wide scope is realized by *wh-lato*, and (28B) reading of speaker’s indifference and narrow scope can be generated by both *amwu-lato* and *wh-lato*. Agent’s indifference, as in (28C), can only be realized by *amwu-na*.

3 *Amwu-na* can also induce speaker’s indifference in some contexts like the following. However, the crucial distinction is that the FC effect of –*lato* FCIs must be attributed to the speaker while the one of *amwu-na* can be oriented to the agent or the speaker. For more detailed analysis of *amwu-na*, see Choi (2005b).

Amwu say-na na-l.swu.iss-ta.
Any bird-or fly-can-Decl
‘Any bird can fly.’

4 Agent’s indifference seems not to be compatible with wide scope of FC indefinites inherently. See Tredinnick (2004) for more on this.
A natural question at this point is, given that –lato ‘even’ can induce FC effects in Korean which are derived as a presupposition and oriented only to the speaker, how can the semantics of –lato ‘even’ in general contribute to FC effects? That is the main concern of the next section.

5. Focus semantics of –lato ‘even_{NPI}’

5.1. Ambiguity of ‘even’

The English focus particle even is ambiguous in NPI contexts (i.e. DE contexts) as observed for sentences like (29) by Karttunen and Peters (1979) and Rooth (1985). Rooth (1985) argues that the ambiguity is lexical. Namely, apart from normal even, there is an NPI-even that occurs in the same contexts that license NPIs. The presuppositions for each of the two meanings of even are given in (30) and (31) respectively.

(29) It’s hard to believe that John even understands [Syntactic Structures].

(30) Normal even

a. scalar-P: Syntactic Structures is the least likely book for John to understand.
b. existential-P: There is some book other than Syntactic Structures that John understood.

(31) Negative Polarity even

a. scalar-P: Syntactic Structures is the most likely book for John to understand.
b. existential-P: There is some book other than Syntactic Structures that John didn’t understand.

As the contrast between (32) and (33) shows, the ambiguity of English even is lexicalized by two different even’s in Korean: -lato seems parallel to NPI-even denoting the most likely entity while –to denotes the least likely entity as a normal-even or PPI (positive polarity item)-even.

(32) -To as Normal/PPI-even

John-i i mwuncey-to phwul-myen, swuhak swuep-ul tut-cianh-ato.tointa J.-Nom this problem-even solve-if math.class-Acc take-not-be_allowed

‘If John solves even this problem, he can skip math course.’

a. scalar-P: This problem is the least likely problem for John to solve.
b. existential-P: There is some problem other than this problem that John solved.

(33) -Lato as NPI-even

John-i i mwuncey-lato phwul-myen, ku-lul honnay-ci.ahn-ulkkey. J.-Nom this problem-even solve-if he-Acc admonish-Neg-Decl

‘If John solves even this problem, I will not admonish him.’

a. scalar-P: This problem is the most likely problem for John to solve.
b. existential-P: There is some problem other than this problem that John didn’t solve.
However, the existential presupposition of \(-lato\) is not derived correctly on Rooth’s approach, as opponents to lexical theory have argued (see Willkinson 1996; Guerzoni 2002). Sentence (33) does not convey the factive presupposition such that John did not solve some other problems. Intuitively, the alternatives to the focused element looks like the following: there are some other problems such that I will not admonish John if he solves them. Thus, the existential presupposition must be computed more globally, not just within the antecedent of conditional. Recent work by Guerzoni (2005) can capture both scalar-P and existential-P for \(-lato\) in the right way.

5.2. Guerzoni (2005) for Most-Likely/NPI-'even'

NPI-even in German is realized by a combination of auch ‘also’ and nur ‘only’\(^5\). It shows NPI-like distribution, introducing most likely-presupposition, as in (34). Guerzoni (2005) proposes that existential-P is derived by auch and scalar-P by nur in a compositional manner. Importantly, the existential-P of auch is formulated globally by (covertly) moving auch to the top at LF to avoid presupposition clash between existential-P of auch and exclusive-P of nur, as illustrated in (35). The most-likely-presupposition arising from nur is formulated locally with no movement.

(34) Niemand hat auch nur die Maria getroffen.
   ‘Nobody didn’t even meet Mary.’

(35) LF1: \([\text{niemand}_1 [\text{x auch [nur } [t_1 \text{ hat [\{die Maria\}_i getroffen\}]]]])
   a. existential-P of auch at node K: g(1) met somebody different from M.
   b. exclusive-P of nur at node K: g(1) didn’t meet anybody different from M. (⊥)

Thus, the proper LF should be like (36) where auch scopes over niemand. It yields more global existential-P than scalar-P. No presupposition clash arises.

(36) LF: \([\text{auch [niemand}_1 [\text{[nur } [t_1 \text{ hat [\{die Maria\}_i getroffen\}]]]])]
   a. scalar-P: Mary is the most likely person to meet.
   b. existential-P: There is other (amount of) meat (y) such that if you eat y, you’re not a vegetarian.

5.3. Compositional analysis of ‘amwu/wh-lato’

In this paper, scalar focus particle \(-lato\) is considered to be an “NPI”-even à la Guerzoni (2005). Also, the paper assumes that amwu-/wh- are existential quantifiers, following Lahiri (1998). That is, amwu koki ‘any meat’ denotes “some meat”, as opposed to “a lot of meat” or “all meat”. Now, the scalar-P and existential-P of \(-lato\) in (37) can be analyzed as in (38a) and (38b) respectively.

(37) amwu koki-lato mek-umyen, ne-nun chaysikcuyya-ka ani-ta.
   ‘No matter what meat it may be, if you eat it, you are not a vegetarian.’

(38) a. Amwu koki (x), i.e., some meat (x) is the most likely/insignificant (amount of) meat you eat.
   b. There is other (amount of) meat (y) such that if you eat y, you’re not a vegetarian.

Sentence (37) can be paraphrased as follows: if you eat even the smallest amount of meat or even the most likely/insignificant (amount of) meat, then you’re not a vegetarian. The FC effect, namely, speaker’s indifference is easily predicted by the combination of the two presuppositions. That is, even the most likely/insignificant/trivial meat (x) (e.g., crabmeat) may be taken into account as an option for you, although there are other more considerable alternatives (y) (e.g., beef) to it, so that the speaker does not care about the identity of meat. Hence, FC effects arise.

---

\(^5\) Similar combination can be found in other languages, such as Dutch and Italian. See Guerzoni (2005) and Rullmann (1996).
5. Conclusion

In this paper, I argue that in Korean amwu, unlike wh-indefinites induces domain widening, which is responsible for several semantic effects including free choice effects, as observed for German irgendein in Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002). More importantly, I show that the scalar focus particle –lato ‘even\textsubscript{NPI}’ also gives rise to FC-like effects in Korean. However, the FC effect induced by –lato is different from the one caused by domain widening with respect to cancelability and orientation. The –lato FC is not cancelable, and always oriented towards the speaker. Finally, I propose a compositional analysis of –lato FCIs: –lato is characterized as “NPI”-even à la Guerzoni (2005), and its most-likely presupposition together with existential presupposition yields the FC effects.
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