

Korean *-lato* as additive free choice

Sukchan Lee

-Lato in Korean combines with indefinite expressions to form ‘emphatic’ Free Choice Items (FCIs), whose meaning and distribution are distinct from those of pure FCIs. I argue that *-lato* constitutes an instance of “additive free choice” (Fălăuș & Nicolae, 2022); that is, *-lato* can be further decomposed into the disjunction *-la(-na)* and the additive *-to*.

Introduction

In Korean, *wh*-indefinites can combine with particles such as *-to*, *-(i)na*, and *-(i)lato*, forming what are now commonly known as Polarity Sensitive Items (PSIs).

- (1) a. Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey an w-ass-ta.
who-ADD school-to NEG come-PST-DECL
‘No one came to school.’
b. Nwukwu-na hakkyo-ey o-l swu iss-ta.
who-DISJ school-to come-REL way exist-DECL
‘Anyone can come to school.’
c. Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey o-l swu iss-ta.
who-DISJ-ADD school-to come-REL way exist-DECL
‘Anyone can come to school.’

Nwukwu-to exhibits the semantics of a Negative Polarity Item (NPI), licensed in anti-morphic contexts (cf. Zwarts, 1996), whereas *nwukwu-na* exhibits the semantics of a Free Choice Item (FCI), licensed in modal contexts. An increasing body of recent work aims to derive the semantics and distribution of PSIs from their morphological structure: cross-linguistically, they are made up of an indefinite plus either an additive (e.g. Hindi *ek bhii*) or disjunction (e.g. Hungarian *akárki*) (see, e.g., Chierchia, 2013, among others). Korean also fits this paradigm, as *-to* and *-na* function as plain additive and disjunction markers, respectively:

- (2) a. Mina-to hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.
Mina-ADD school-to come-PST-DECL
‘Mina came to school, too.’
b. Mina-na Chelswu-ka hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.
Mina-DISJ Chelswu-NOM school-to come-PST-DECL
‘Mina or Chelswu came to school.’

Alternatives & exhaustification

Chierchia (2013), drawing on prior work by Kadmon & Landman (1993), Lahiri (1998), Fox (2007), and Gajewski (2011), among others, shows how the semantics of Polarity Sensitive Items (PSIs) are compositionally derived from their morphological structure. The key assumption is that these items activate subdomain alternatives that must be obligatorily exhaustified.

$$(3) \quad \llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = p_w \wedge \forall q \in \text{Alt} : p \not\subseteq q \rightarrow \neg q_w$$

The exhaustification operator EXH asserts p (prejacent) and negates all alternatives q in the alternative set Alt if not entailed by p . EXH also plays a role in deriving what are commonly known as scalar implicatures (cf. Chierchia et al., 2011).

- (4) Some student came to school.
- a. $p: \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$
 - b. $\text{Alt}: \{\exists x \in D : \text{come}(x), \forall x \in D : \text{come}(x)\}$
 - c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x) \wedge \neg \forall x \in D : \text{come}(x)$

Negative polarity items

Let us first see how the alternatives-&-exhaustification theory predicts the semantics of an NPI. Exhaustifying NPIs with respect to their subdomain alternatives in affirmative episodic contexts results in a contradiction, explaining their ungrammaticality.

- (5) *Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.
 who-ADD school-to come-PST-DECL
 'Anyone came to school.'
- (6)
- a. $p: \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$
 - b. $\text{Alt}: \{\exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x) \mid D' \subseteq D\}$
 - c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x) \wedge \neg \exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x),$
 for all $D' \subseteq D$

(6c) is equivalent to saying "there exists some individual who came to school in D , but there is no individual who came to school in D' , for every subdomain D' of D ." This is a clear contradiction. An easier way of seeing this is by assuming that there are three contextually relevant individuals, Shrek, Fiona, and Donkey.

- (7)
- a. $p: s \vee f \vee d$
 - b. $\text{Alt}: \{s \vee f \vee d, s \vee f, s \vee d, f \vee d, s, f, d\}$
 - c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = (s \vee f \vee d) \wedge \neg(s \vee f) \wedge \neg(s \vee d) \wedge \neg(f \vee d) \wedge \neg s \wedge \neg f \wedge \neg d = \perp$

Let us now see what happens in negative episodic contexts. Exhaustifying NPIs with respect to their subdomain alternatives in negative episodic contexts turns out just fine. This is because, due to the presence of negation, the entailment relationship between the prejacent and its alternatives is reversed.

- (8) Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey an w-ass-ta.
 who-ADD school-to NEG come-PST-DECL
 'No one came to school.'
- (9) a. $p: \neg \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$
 b. $\text{Alt}: \{\neg \exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x) \mid D' \subseteq D\}$
 c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = p = \neg \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$

Notice that p entails all its alternatives in this case; if there is no individual who came to school in D , it naturally follows that there is no individual who came to school in D' , a subdomain of D . Given the semantics of EXH (3), no alternative propositions will be negated (vacuous exhaustification). Therefore, the felicity of NPIs in negative contexts is predicted.¹

Free choice items

The FC effect was first observed with disjunction in the scope of a possibility modal:

- (10) You may eat an apple or a blueberry.
 a. $\Diamond(a \vee b)$
 b. FC effect: $\Diamond a \wedge \Diamond b$

Fox (2007), building on insights from Sauerland (2004), famously proposed that the FC effect arises from pre-exhaustified domain alternatives.²

- (11) a. $p: \Diamond(a \vee b)$
 b. $\text{Alt}: \{\text{EXH } \Diamond a, \text{EXH } \Diamond b\} = \{\Diamond a \wedge \neg \Diamond b, \Diamond b \wedge \neg \Diamond a\}$
 c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \Diamond(a \vee b) \wedge \neg(\Diamond a \wedge \neg \Diamond b) \wedge \neg(\Diamond b \wedge \neg \Diamond a)$
 $= \Diamond(a \vee b) \wedge (\Diamond a \rightarrow \Diamond b) \wedge (\Diamond b \rightarrow \Diamond a)$
 $= \Diamond a \wedge \Diamond b$

Similar analysis can be extended to so-called FCIs:

- (12) Nwukwu-na hakkyo-ey o-l swu iss-ta.
 who-DISJ school-to come-REL way exist-DECL
 'Anyone can come to school.'
- (13) a. $p: \Diamond \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$
 b. $\text{Alt}: \{\text{EXH } \Diamond \exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x) \mid D' \subseteq D\} =$

¹ Notice that this account wrongly predicts *nwukwu-to* to exhibit the distribution of a weak NPI like English *any*. I argue that the crucial difference between weak and strong NPIs lies in the fact that the latter are subject to a locality constraint — an issue I elaborate on in the following sections.

² In the following presentations, I focus on pre-exhaustified domain alternatives to illustrate the derivation of the FC effect. However, to prevent existentials from incorrectly surfacing as universals in non-modal contexts, scalar alternatives must also be taken into account (cf. Chierchia, 2013).

- $$\{\Diamond \exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x) \wedge \neg \Diamond \exists x \in D \setminus D' : \text{come}(x) \mid D' \subseteq D\}$$
- c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \Diamond \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x) \wedge [\Diamond \exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x) \rightarrow \Diamond \exists x \in D \setminus D' : \text{come}(x)], \text{ for all } D' \subseteq D$
 $= \forall x \in D : \Diamond \text{come}(x)$

Again, an easier way of seeing this is by assuming that there are three contextually relevant individuals, Shrek, Fiona, and Donkey.

- (14) a. $p: \Diamond(s \vee f \vee d)$
 b. $\text{Alt}: \{\Diamond(s \vee f \vee d), \Diamond(s \vee f) \wedge \neg \Diamond d, \Diamond(s \vee d) \wedge \neg \Diamond f, \Diamond(f \vee d) \wedge \neg \Diamond s, \Diamond s \wedge \neg \Diamond f \wedge \neg \Diamond d, \Diamond f \wedge \neg \Diamond s \wedge \neg \Diamond d, \Diamond d \wedge \neg \Diamond s \wedge \neg \Diamond f\}$
 c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \Diamond(s \vee f \vee d) \wedge \neg[\Diamond(s \vee f) \wedge \neg \Diamond d] \wedge \neg[\Diamond(s \vee d) \wedge \neg \Diamond f] \wedge \neg[\Diamond(f \vee d) \wedge \neg \Diamond s] \wedge \neg(\Diamond s \wedge \neg \Diamond f \wedge \neg \Diamond d) \wedge \neg(\Diamond f \wedge \neg \Diamond s \wedge \neg \Diamond d) \wedge \neg(\Diamond d \wedge \neg \Diamond s \wedge \neg \Diamond f)$
 $= \Diamond(s \vee f \vee d) \wedge [\Diamond(s \vee f) \rightarrow \Diamond d] \wedge [\Diamond(s \vee d) \rightarrow \Diamond f] \wedge [\Diamond(f \vee d) \rightarrow \Diamond s] \wedge [\Diamond s \rightarrow (\Diamond f \vee \Diamond d)] \wedge [\Diamond f \rightarrow (\Diamond s \vee \Diamond d)] \wedge [\Diamond d \rightarrow (\Diamond s \vee \Diamond f)]$
 $= \Diamond s \wedge \Diamond f \wedge \Diamond d$

A new paradigm: -lato

While *nwukwu-to* and *nwukwu-na* may receive straightforward analyses under the alternatives-&-exhaustification theory of PSIs, the case of *nwukwu-lato* remains less clear. Below, I outline several empirical puzzles that any theory of *nwukwu-lato* must account for.

Distribution

Nwukwu-lato exhibits a distribution that resembles FCIs in some respects, but NPIs in others (cf. Lee et al., 2000; Choi, 2005).

- (15) *Affirmative episodic contexts*
 a. *Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.
 who-ADD school-to come-PST-DECL
 b. *Nwukwu-na hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.
 who-DISJ school-to come-PST-DECL
 c. *Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.
 who-DISJ-ADD school-to come-PST-DECL
- (16) *Negative episodic contexts*
 a. Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey an w-ass-ta.
 who-ADD school-to NEG come-PST-DECL
 'No one came to school.'
 b. *Nwukwu-na hakkyo-ey an w-ass-ta.
 who-DISJ school-to NEG come-PST-DECL

- c. *Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey an w-ass-ta.
who-DISJ-ADD school-to NEG come-PST-DECL
- (17) *DE environment I: Conditional antecedent*
- a. *Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey o-myen...
who-ADD school-to come-COND
- b. *Nwukwu-na hakkyo-ey o-myen...
who-DISJ school-to come-COND
- c. Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey o-myen...
who-DISJ-ADD school-to come-COND
'If anyone comes...'
- (18) *DE environment II: Restrictor of every*
- a. *Nwukwu-to o-n motun hakkyo-nun...
who-ADD come-REL every school-TOP
- b. *Nwukwu-na o-n motun hakkyo-nun...
who-DISJ come-REL every school-TOP
- c. Nwukwu-lato o-n motun hakkyo-nun...
who-DISJ-ADD come-REL every school-TOP
'Every school to which anyone came...'
- (19) *Modal contexts*
- a. %Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey o-l swu iss-ta.
who-ADD school-to come-REL way exist-DECL
- b. Nwukwu-na hakkyo-ey o-l swu iss-ta.
who-DISJ school-to come-REL way exist-DECL
- c. Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey o-l swu iss-ta.
who-DISJ-ADD school-to come-REL way exist-DECL
'Anyone can come to school.'

	<i>nwukwu-to</i>	<i>nwukwu-na</i>	<i>nwukwu-lato</i>
affirmative	✗	✗	✗
negative	✓	✗	✗
DE	✗	✗	✓
modal	✓	✓	✓

1. If *nwukwu-lato* is an FCI, why is it grammatical in DE environments (except negation) where *nwukwu-na* is infelicitous?
2. If *nwukwu-lato* is an NPI, why is it grammatical in DE environments (except negation) where *nwukwu-to* is infelicitous, but ungrammatical in the scope of negation where *nwukwu-to* is felicitous?

Semantics

3. Why is *nwukwu-lato* interpreted existentially in DE environments but universally (FC effect) in modal contexts?
4. When attached to regular NPs, *-lato* is known to yield a ‘concessive’ interpretation (cf. Lee et al., 2000; Kim, 2020). How is this meaning compositionally derived?

I leave question 4 for future research. I believe the empirical picture illustrated above points to a clear generalization: *-lato* is *locally* an FCI but *globally* an NPI. Fălăuș & Nicolae’s (2022) discussion of “additive free choice” is shown to bear a close connection to my analysis.

Additive free choice: Fălăuș & Nicolae (2022)

Fălăuș & Nicolae (2022) introduce a novel class of free choice items in Romanian, which they refer to as additive FCIs (ADD-FCIs).

- (20) a. ADD-FCIs (e.g. *orișicine*): *ori* ‘DISJ’ + *și* ‘ADD’ + *wh*-word
 b. FCIs (e.g. *oricine*): *ori* ‘DISJ’ + *wh*-word

In contrast to *oricine*, *orișicine* is shown to be felicitous in an unconditional structure only when the antecedent is marked with the conditional mood.

- (21) a. {Oricine/*orișicine} va suna azi, sunt ocupată.
 FCI/ADD-FCI FUT.3SG call today am busy
 ‘Whoever is going to call today, I’m busy.’
 b. {Oricine/orișicine} ar suna azi, sunt ocupată.
 FCI/ADD-FCI COND.3SG call today am busy
 ‘Whoever may call today, I’m busy.’

Fălăuș & Nicolae’s (2022) analysis of ADD-FCIs builds on two assumptions: (i) the additive *și* signals exhaustification of the assertion with respect to its pre-exhaustified variant (EXH_{ADD}), and (ii) EXH_{ADD} takes scope over EXH_{FCI} .

- (22) Și Ana a venit la petrecere.
 ADD Ana has come to party
 ‘Even Ana came to the party.’

- (23) a. p : $\text{come}(\text{Ana})$
 b. Alt : $\{\text{EXH } \text{come}(\text{Ana})\}$
 $= \{\text{come}(\text{Ana}) \wedge \forall x \in D : x \neq \text{Ana} \rightarrow \neg \text{come}(x)\}$
 c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \text{come}(\text{Ana}) \wedge \neg[\text{EXH } \text{come}(\text{Ana})]$
 $= \text{come}(\text{Ana}) \wedge \exists x \in D : x \neq \text{Ana} \wedge \text{come}(x)$

The pre-exhaustified variant of the assertion, “Ana came,” is shown in (23b), which can be roughly paraphrased as “only Ana came.” Since the assertion does not entail this alternative, EXH negates it, resulting in the additive interpretation shown in (23c).

What happens when *și* associates with a quantifier? Fălăuș & Nicolae (2022) argue that in those cases the pre-exhaustified alternative of the assertion takes the form ‘ $\exists x \in D P(x) \wedge \neg \exists x \in D' \setminus D P(x)$,’ for some superset D' of D . This explains the ‘emphatic’ component of ADD-FCIs: on top of universal quantification derived from the application of EXH_{FCI}, EXH_{ADD} results in a domain-widening effect.

$$(24) \quad \exists x \in D P(x) \rightarrow \boxed{\text{EXH}_{\text{FCI}}} \rightarrow \forall x \in D P(x) \rightarrow \boxed{\text{EXH}_{\text{ADD}}} \rightarrow \forall x \in D' P(x), \text{ where } D \subset D'.$$

The ungrammaticality of *orișicine* in (21a) is attributed to its emphatic nature; it quantifies over larger domains, which renders it incompatible with the indicative mood. The intuition behind this contrast is that the use of a conditional mood expands the modal base, thereby introducing a larger set of accessible worlds.

Analysis

I argue that Korean *-lato* can also be decomposed into the disjunction *-la(-na)* and the additive *-to*, placing it within the novel class of the FC paradigm: additive free choice. Its combination with a *wh*-indefinite, *nwukwu-lato*, has been repeatedly reported by Korean researchers to convey a kind of ‘emphasis’ in comparison to its pure FCI counterpart, *nwukwuna* (Lee et al., 2000; Choi, 2005).

Locally FCI

In affirmative/negative episodic contexts, the application of EXH_{FCI} leads to ungrammaticality.

- (25) a. *Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey w-ass-ta.
 who-DISJ-ADD school-to come-PST-DECL
 b. LF: EXH_{ADD} EXH_{FCI} $\exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$
- (26) a. *Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey an w-ass-ta.
 who-DISJ-ADD school-to NEG come-PST-DECL
 b. LF: EXH_{ADD} EXH_{FCI} $\neg \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$

This can be straightforwardly explained, under the assumption that *nwukwu-lato* is *locally* an FCI. The local application of EXH_{FCI} results in a contradiction, which is reflected in the ungrammaticality of *nwukwu-na* in the same contexts.³

³ This, however, requires consideration of scalar alternatives (see footnote 2).

In modal contexts, on the other hand, the application of EXH_{FCI} results in an FC effect. On top of this, EXH_{ADD} yields a domain-widening effect.

- (27) a. Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey o-l swu iss-ta.
 who-DISJ-ADD school-to come-REL way exist-DECL
 ‘Anyone can come to school.’
 b. LF: $\text{EXH}_{\text{ADD}} \text{EXH}_{\text{FCI}} \Diamond \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$
- (28) *Application of EXH_{FCI}*
 a. $p: \Diamond \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)$
 b. *Alt*: $\{\text{EXH} \Diamond \exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x) \mid D' \subseteq D\}$
 c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \forall x \in D : \Diamond \text{come}(x)$
- (29) *Application of EXH_{ADD}*
 a. $p: \forall x \in D : \Diamond \text{come}(x)$
 b. *Alt*: $\{\text{EXH} \forall x \in D : \Diamond \text{come}(x)\}$
 $= \{\forall x \in D : \Diamond \text{come}(x) \wedge \neg \forall x \in D' \setminus D : \Diamond \text{come}(x)\}$ for
 some $D \subset D'$
 c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket(\text{Alt})(p) = \forall x \in D' : \Diamond \text{come}(x)$, where $D \subset D'$

This explains why *nwukwu-lato* behave like FCIs in *local* contexts.

Globally NPI

My analysis crucially hinges on the fact that strong NPIs require exhaustification within their immediate scope.

- (30) a. *Nwukwu-to hakkyo-ey o-myen...
 who-ADD school-to come-COND
 b. LF 1: $\text{EXH} [\exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)] \rightarrow q$ (consequent)
 c. LF 2: $\text{EXH} [\exists x \in D : \text{come}(x) \rightarrow q]$

In the case of conditionals⁴, there are two potential sites for exhaustification: antecedent (LF 1) or the entire conditional (LF 2). LF 1 will be ruled out for familiar reasons — for within the antecedent the NPI is in a UE context — whereas LF 2 wrongly predicts (30a) to be grammatical. Therefore, we need a constraint to rule out LF 2:

⁴ This analysis easily extends to the case of *every*, too.

- (31) *Immediate Scope Constraint*
 The additive *-to* requires exhaustification in its immediate scope.

Nwukwu-lato requires two layers of exhaustification, EXH_{FCI} and EXH_{ADD} . This allows a configuration in which EXH_{FCI} satisfies the immediate scope constraint while leaving room for EXH_{ADD} to operate on a higher level.

- (32) a. Nwukwu-lato hakkyo-ey o-myen...
 who-DISJ-ADD school-to come-COND
 b. LF: $\text{EXH}_{\text{ADD}} [\text{EXH}_{\text{FCI}} \exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)] \rightarrow q$
- (33) a. $p: [\exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)] \rightarrow q$
 b. *Alt*: $\{[\exists x \in D' : \text{come}(x)] \rightarrow q \mid D' \subseteq D\}$
 c. $\llbracket \text{EXH} \rrbracket (\text{Alt})(p) = p = [\exists x \in D : \text{come}(x)] \rightarrow q$

This explains why *nwukwu-lato* behave like NPIs in *global* contexts.⁵

Conclusion & Implications

In this paper, I argued that *-lato* can be decomposed into the disjunction *-la(-na)* and the additive *-to*, constituting an instance of “additive free choice” (Fălăuş & Nicolae, 2022). I demonstrated how a compositional analysis of *-lato* accounts for the puzzling distribution and semantics of *nwukwu-lato*, in comparison with *nwukwu-to* and *nwukwu-na*. Before concluding this paper, I would like to highlight a few important implications of my analysis.

Korean provides an ideal testing ground for a range of polarity sensitive phenomena, as it attests to the full paradigm predicted in the literature: $\exists + \text{ADD}$, $\exists + \text{DISJ}$, and $\exists + \text{DISJ} + \text{ADD}$.⁶ Korean ADD-FCI *nwukwu-lato* also transparently conforms to the scope configuration stipulated in Fălăuş & Nicolae (2022) — $\text{EXH}_{\text{ADD}} \gg \text{EXH}_{\text{FCI}}$ — in contrast to the Romanian *orişicine*. Moreover, Fălăuş & Nicolae’s (2022) account of “additive free choice” is shown to interact with a locality condition on EXH in Korean to explain the puzzling distribution and dual nature of *nwukwu-lato*.

⁵ However, this analysis assumes that the apparent failure of the local application of EXH_{FCI} is somehow tolerated in the presence of a higher exhaustification layer, i.e. EXH_{ADD} . I leave this issue open for future investigation.

⁶ According to Fălăuş & Nicolae (2022), Romanian lacks the first option.

References

- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2013. *Logic in grammar: Polarity, free choice, and intervention*. OUP Oxford.
- Chierchia, Gennaro, Danny Fox & Benjamin Spector. 2011. Scalar implicature as a grammatical phenomenon. In *Semantics; an international handbook of natural language meaning*, 2297–2331. de Gruyter.
- Choi, Jinyoung. 2005. Another type of free choice effect: Korean amwu N-lato. In *Proceedings of the 24th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 88–96.
- Crnič, Luka. 2017. Free choice under ellipsis. *The Linguistic Review* 34(2). 249–294.
- Fălăuş, Anamaria & Andreea C. Nicolae. 2022. Additive free choice items. *Natural Language Semantics* 30(2). 185–214.

- Fox, Danny. 2007. Free choice and the theory of scalar implicatures. In *Presupposition and implicature in compositional semantics*, 71–120. Springer.
- Fox, Danny & Roni Katzir. 2011. On the characterization of alternatives. *Natural Language Semantics* 19(1). 87–107.
- Gajewski, Jon R. 2011. Licensing strong NPIs. *Natural Language Semantics* 19(2). 109–148.
- Giannakidou, Anastasia & Suwon Yoon. 2016. Scalar marking without scalar meaning: Nonscalar, nonexhaustive even-marked NPIs in Greek and Korean. *Language* 92(3). 522–556.
- Kadmon, Nirit & Fred Landman. 1993. Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16(4). 353–422.
- Kim, Jieun. 2020. On the semantics of an even-based polarity sensitive item, *wh*-(N)-*lato*. *Linguistic Research* 37(2). 147–186.
- Lahiri, Utpal. 1998. Focus and negative polarity in Hindi. *Natural Language Semantics* 6(1). 57–123.
- Lee, Chungmin, Daeho Chung & Seungho Nam. 2000. The semantics of *amwu*-N-*to*/-*irato*/-*ina* in Korean: Arbitrary choice and concession. In *Proceedings of the 14th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 413–424.
- Liu, Mingming. 2023. Additivity, scalarity and Mandarin universal *wh*'s. *Natural Language Semantics* 31(2). 179–218.
- Park, So-young. 2014. *Ita* and focus constructions in Korean. *Journal of Korean Linguistics* 71. 3–32.
- Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1(1). 75–116.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2004. Scalar implicatures in complex sentences. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(3). 367–391.
- Sauerland, Uli & Kazuko Yatsushiro. 2023. Domain size matters: An exceptive that forms strong NPIs. *The size of things II: Movement, features, and interpretation* 363–387.
- Zwarts, Frans. 1996. A hierarchy of negative expressions. *Negation: A notion in focus* 169–194.