Overview. In this paper, we provide novel evidence in support of a choice functional (CF) analysis of the Sinhala Q-particle \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) (Cable 2010, Slade 2011), and extend this analysis to \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) disjunction outside of questions. This evidence for a CF approach comes from the behavior of \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) in certain downward-entailing contexts, which have been shown to be problematic for CF analyses of English. We show that where a CF analysis overpredicts wide scope readings in English, it makes the right predictions for Sinhala \( \ddot{\text{o}} \). This finding mirrors that of Dawson 2018 for the Tiwa (Tibeto-Burman; India) particle \( \ddot{khi} \), which shows similar behavior.

Sinhala \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) and choice functions. The Sinhala particle \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) is used to form questions, indefinites and disjunctions. (It has been claimed in the literature that \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) is not used in disjunction outside of alternative questions (Slade 2011), however Weerasooriya (2017) provides evidence that it is. Our data are consistent with Weerasooriya’s findings.) In this paper, we will focus on \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) indefinites and disjunction, illustrated in (1) and (2) respectively:

(1) hæmomom \( \text{monowa}-\ddot{\text{o}} \) biiwa.
   everyone what-\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) drank
   “Everyone drank something.” (Weerasooriya 2017:573)

(2) John bath-\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) paan-\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) illənəwa. (mamə danne nə mokak-\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) kiyəla.)
   John rice-\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) bread-\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) request (I know not what-\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) COMP)
   “John is asking for rice or bread. (I don’t know what.)” (Weerasooriya 2017:573)

\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) indefinites take wide scope with respect to other operators, including quantifiers, modals, and negation (Weerasooriya 2017). For instance, (1) is infelicitous in a context in which everyone drank a different sort of drink at the party, but is felicitous if everyone drank a single sort of drink. Scope data like these, and the fact that \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) questions are not sensitive to scope islands, led Cable (2010) and Slade (2011) to propose that \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) denotes a CF variable that ranges over a Hamblin-style alternative set. For indefinites, this set is contributed by the Wh word it attaches to. The CF variable is existentially closed above other operators, deriving wide scope, as in (3).

(3) \[
\exists f[[CH(f) \& \forall x[human(x) \rightarrow x \text{ drank } f(\{y: \text{ thing}(y)\})]]
\]

\( \ddot{\text{o}} \) disjunction shows similar wide-scope behavior to \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) indefinites. For instance, the \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) disjunction in (2) above cannot be felicitously used in a context in which John would be satisfied with either option. Instead, it must mean that he is asking for rice, or he is asking for bread, but the speaker cannot remember which. This pattern is expected if, like \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) indefinites, \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) disjunction is required to scope above other operators (in this case the intensional verb illənəwa ‘request’). Similar facts hold for other operators. (Note that Weerasooriya describes this behavior for disjunction in terms of exclusivity. We make the simplifying assumption that the behavior of both \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) disjunction and \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) indefinites is to do with disjunction scope (e.g. Rooth & Partee 1982)). A CF analysis can be straightforwardly extended to capture the disjunction facts: \( \ddot{\text{o}} \) introduces a CF variable that ranges over a set made up of the individual disjuncts, and which is existentially closed high, as in (4).

(4) \[
\exists f[[CH(f) & John is asking for f(\{\text{rice, bread}\})]]
\]

Downward-entailing contexts. CF analyses of wide scope readings of indefinites and disjunction have been shown to face problems in certain downward-entailing contexts in English (Chierchia 2001, Schwarz 2001, Charlow 2014). Specifically, the CF analysis overpredicts wide scope readings in downward-entailing context when there is a bound pronoun in the indefinite restrictor or the disjuncts. For example, a CF analysis predicts (5a) should have (among others) the truth conditions
in (6a), which predict the sentence is true just in case no candidate submitted all his papers. (5a) does not have this reading; it only has the narrow scope reading in which no candidate submitted any of his papers. The same problem arises for disjunction (5b).

(5)  
a. No candidate submitted a paper he had written. (Schwarz 2001)  
b. No candidate submitted his, vita or his portfolio. (After Charlow 2014)

(6)  
Choice function analysis incorrectly predicts:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[(5a)] = ∃f[CH(f) &amp; ¬∃x[x is a candidate &amp; x submitted f({y: y is a paper x wrote})]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[(5b)] = ∃f[CH(f) &amp; ¬∃x[x is a candidate &amp; x submitted f({x’s vita, x’s portfolio})]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These sorts of data have been taken to show that wide scope readings of English indefinites and disjunction are likely not choice functional (e.g. Brasoveanu & Farkas 2011, Charlow 2014).

\(\text{ðó in downward-entailing contexts.}\) Sinhala \(\text{ðó}\) does not face the same problems. The data that show this were collected through semantic fieldwork with three native speakers of Sinhala in the US. First consider the indefinite in (7a), and note that the English translation is misleading. The CF analysis predicts it should have the reading in (7b), which is true so long as there is a way of selecting among toys that each baby likes such that the baby cannot reach that toy. (7a) is judged felicitous in such a context.

(7)  
a. Hæma babaatamì [DP [RC e ayaì kæmithì] monawa-ðó ] ganna bæ. Every baby 3SG like something-ðó reach not “Every baby can’t reach a toy that she likes.”
   ✔ There are three babies. Each baby can reach several toys that she likes, but for each baby there is a toy that she likes that she cannot reach.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>∃f[CH(f) &amp; ∀x[baby(x) → ¬[x can reach f({y: toy(y) &amp; x likes y})]]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar facts hold for the disjunction in (8a), which is predicted to have the truth conditions in (8b). That is, it should be judged felicitous in a context in which nobody lives with both their parents. This is what we find. We conclude from these data that the CF analysis does not overpredict wide scope readings of \(\text{ðó}\) like it does in English.

(8)  
a. Kawuruwathì eyaageì amma-ðó eyaageì thattha-ðó ekka.jeevath.wenne næ. everybody 3SG.GEN mother-ðó 3SG.GEN father-ðó live.with not “No one lives with his/her mother or his/her father.”
   ✔ There are three people: X, Y, Z. X lives with her mother, but not her father. Y lives with her father, but not her mother. Z lives with his mother, but not his father.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>∃f[CH(f) &amp; ∀x[human(x) → ¬[x lives with {f(x’s mother, x’s father)}]]]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and direction. Sinhala \(\text{ðó}\) gives rise to the predicted wide scope readings in downward-entailing contexts. This fact provides further support for the CF analysis proposed by Cable 2010 and Slade 2011, which can easily be extended to uses of \(\text{ðó}\) in disjunction. These findings mirror those of Dawson 2018 for Tiwa, which has a similar particle wide scope particle used in indefinites and disjunction. Finally, we discuss a point of variation between Sinhala and Tiwa. While Tiwa \(\text{khí}\) is never accepted in narrow scope contexts, some (but not all) of our consultants also accepted (7a) and (8a) in such contexts (e.g. if no baby could reach any toy that she liked). We discuss possible sources of this variation.