Paths to exceptional wide scope: Choice functions in Tiwa

Virginia Dawson · University of California, Berkeley

Indefinites and disjunction in English can take exceptional wide scope from within scope islands. This has presented a challenge to analyses that treat indefinites as generalized quantifiers and disjunction as the boolean join: such readings cannot be derived by standard covert movement. Reinhart (1997) proposed an elegant solution to this problem for indefinites, illustrated in (1): indefinites, rather than denoting generalized quantifiers, introduce a choice function variable that ranges over individuals, and that is existentially closed higher in the structure. Because indefinites are interpreted *in situ*, their exceptional wide scope can be derived without positing island-violating covert movement.

(1) a. If Amelia talks to some professor, she'll be able to enroll.

b. $\exists$f[CH(f) & [Amelia talks to f(professor) $\rightarrow$ Amelia can enroll]]

In subsequent years choice functional analyses of indefinites were modified (e.g. Kratzer 1998), adopted to account for wide-scope-only indefinites cross-linguistically (e.g. Matthewson 1999), and extended to wide scope disjunction (e.g. Schlenker 2006). This elegant solution to the problem of wide scope indefinites and disjunction, however, has been shown to make the wrong predictions in certain contexts, namely, in downward entailing environments when the indefinite's restrictor (or the disjuncts) contains a bound pronoun (Schwarz 2001, Chierchia 2001). Specifically, existential closure of the choice function variable results in truth conditions that are too weak in sentences like (2a): the CF analysis in (2b) predicts that this sentence is true just in case no candidate submitted *all* her papers. However, this sentence can only mean that no candidate submitted *any* of her papers.

(2) a. No candidate submitted a paper that she had written.

b. $\exists$f[CH(f) & $\neg\exists$x[x is a candidate & x submitted f(paper x wrote)]]

In response, a variety of other analyses to for wide scope indefinites and disjunction in English have been proposed which do not suffer from the same problem (see e.g. Schwarzschild 2002, Brasoveanu & Farkas 2011, and Charlow 2018). In this talk, I provide evidence that a choice functional analysis, while not appropriate for the English data, makes exactly the right predictions for wide scope indefinites and disjunction in Tiwa, a Tibeto-Burman language of India. This finding has implications for theories of scope phenomena cross-linguistically, specifically, that languages vary in how they derive exceptional wide scope.

In Tiwa, indefinites and disjunctions formed with the particle *khí* take obligatory wide scope, including from within islands (Dawson 2018; to appear). Crucially different from English wide scope indefinites and disjunctions, an analysis of *khí* as introducing a choice function variable that is existentially closed high (as in (3b)) makes exactly the right predictions in downward-entailing environments. The sentence in (3a) is judged felicitous in a context in which no one killed *all* their dogs, but, in contrast to the English analogue, is not accepted in a context in which no one killed *any* their dogs. Similar facts hold for wide scope disjunctions in Tiwa.

(3) a. Sharbo$_i$ [**pakha-khí** othê$_i$ pre la-wa khugrí-gô] mare ton-ya-m.
nobody some own buy AUX-NMLZ dog-ACC kill AUX-NEG-PST
'No one killed a dog that they bought.'.
✓: Each person bought several dogs. (Because of a rabies outbreak,) each person killed all their dogs, except for one: every person kept one of the dogs that they bought
#: Each person bought several dogs. A rabies outbreak meant that all the dogs had to be killed. However, each person refused to kill their own dogs.

b. $\exists$f[CH(f) & $\neg\exists$x[x killed f(dog x bought)]]