



(including identity). The use of *-khi* in (4) indicates that the speaker doesn't know their friend John as well as they ought to, while (2) is felicitous in a scenario where the speaker knows the PM is Modi, but hasn't met him.

- (4) Ang **shar-khí** chor-gô lak mán-a lído. Pene mung Jon, thêbo pego kumún si-ya-ng.  
 1SG who-KHI friend-ACC meet-INF going his name John but him well know-NEG-1SG  
 'I'm going to meet some friend (of mine). His name is John, but I don't know him well.'

By contrast, *-khi* indefinites are not felicitous in contexts where the speaker is familiar with the witness in all contextually relevant ways (e.g. a situation where the speaker knows John as well as any friend, but doesn't know how many hats he owns, which is not relevant to the discourse).

Finally, the epistemic effects of Tiwa do not show classic implicature-style behavior: the epistemic effects cannot be canceled (5) and they always project (1). Obligatory projection suggests instead that *-khi* makes its epistemic contribution presuppositionally.

- (5) Maria **shar-khí-gô** lak man-ga, # arô shar-gô ang si-w.  
 Maria who-KHI-ACC meet-PFV and who-ACC 1SG know-NEUT  
 'Maria met someone, # and I know who.'

**Compositional analysis.** *-khi* indefinites consist of an indeterminate phrase and the suffix *-khi*. For syntactic reasons, I assume *-khi* is a head that takes a DP complement, headed by an indeterminate. Following K&S 2002's formulation of Hamblin semantics, indeterminate phrases denote sets of individuals, and verbal predicates denote singleton sets of properties. Indeterminates can compose directly with a verbal predicate through pointwise function application to yield a set of propositions, resulting in an in-situ wh-question denotation. In EIs, *-khi* composes with the DP, which denotes a set of individuals, through FA: *-khi* takes in the set of individuals ( $\alpha$ ) denoted by the DP, and carries the presupposition (formalized here using Beaver's (1992)  $\delta$  operator) that the speaker does not know a salient property Q about the individual selected by the choice function (6).

- (6)  $\llbracket -khi \rrbracket = \lambda\alpha \{f(\alpha) \ \& \ \delta(\text{IDK}(f(\alpha)))\}$ , where  $\alpha \subseteq D_e$ ,  $f$  is a CF, and  
 $\text{IDK} = \lambda x. \exists w \in \text{Dox-alt}(\text{speaker})[Q(x)(w)=1] \ \& \ \exists w' \in \text{Dox-alt}(\text{speaker})[Q(x)(w')=0]$

This choice functional analysis accounts for the exceptional wide scope of *-khi* indefinites (Kratzer 1998; Yanovich 2005), and the free variable Q in the presupposition captures the freedom and context dependency of the speaker's ignorance. It also follows from the analysis that *-khi* indefinites can range over singleton sets (7), since there are no restrictions on the cardinality of the choice function's domain. The analysis also allows for the infelicity of (5): the identity of the witness is salient in this context.

- (7)  $\llbracket -khi \llbracket \text{shar} \llbracket \text{Indiane PM} \rrbracket \rrbracket \rrbracket = \{f(\{\text{Modi}\}) \ \& \ \delta(\text{IDK}(f(\{\text{Modi}\})))\}$

**Aloni & Port 2015.** EIs in Tiwa are in line with Aloni & Port's view of EIs: that they impose a shift in the method of identification required by the context. Specifically, *-khi* indefinites signal that the speaker does not know something *contextually* relevant about the witness, though this can be much broader than identification of the witness. While a conceptual covers approach is appropriate for Tiwa, given how different *-khi* indefinites are from the canonical examples discussed in the literature, I claim they represent a different type of EI entirely, and do not bear on the status of the epistemic component of canonical EIs.

**Concl.** Tiwa's EIs are a new kind which can range over singleton sets and can signal speaker ignorance about any salient property of the witness, significantly broadening the typology.

**Selected references.** Aloni & Port. 2015. Epistemic indefinites and methods of identification. In AO&MB 2015. • Alonso-Ovalle & Menéndez-Benito. 2010. Modal indefinites. *NLS* 18 • AO&MB. 2015. *Epistemic indefinites: Exploring modality beyond the verbal domain*. OUP • Kratzer & Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese • Yanovich. 2005. Choice-functional series of indefinite pronouns and Hamblin semantics.