



(8) [An iguana has been dissected. Pointing to an unidentified body part:]

Au	s-taaea	kee	ta	iguana	lekina	a-mata	pe	sai,
I	NEG-know	NEG	COMP	iguana	have	A-eye	or	NEG
pe	<u>te-mata</u>	te-raa?						
but	TE-eye	TE-DEM						(cf. Coppock and Beaver 2015)

‘I don’t know whether iguanas have eyes or not, but is that the eye?’

Argumental *te-* phrases are DPs with a null D ((9)) (cf. Gillon 2006, Gillon and Armoskaite 2013) (for *f* a choice function variable, cf. Reinhart 1997, Kratzer 1998, Matthewson 1999, a.o., and *C* a contextual restriction variable, cf. von Stechow 1994, Martí 2003, a.o.):

(9)  $[[D^{\emptyset}_C]] = \lambda P. f(\lambda x. P(x) \ \& \ C(x))$

This analysis predicts no existence presuppositions for *te-* prefixes in argumental position, a prediction shown to be correct in (10), which questions existence:

(10) Au	s-taaea	kee	ta	iguana	lekina	te-ate	pe	sai,
I	NEG-know	NEG	COMP	iguana	have	TE-liver	or	NEG
pe	<u>te-ate</u>	epaku?						
but	TE-liver	black						(cf. Coppock and Beaver 2015)

‘I don’t know whether iguanas have a liver, but is the liver black?’

Because of the presence of *C* in (9), it also predicts that *te-* phrases in argumental position must refer to a previously introduced referent if this referent exists—if a continuation of (4), (11) is only about the previously mentioned snake, and (12) sounds contradictory (cf. (13), with a numeral that obviates the need for  $D^{\emptyset}_C$ ):

(11) ...Te-ngata sa.  
 TE-snake dangerous  
 ‘...The snake/#some other snake was dangerous’

(12) #Te-ngata ee-moe ngo te-ngata s-ee-moe kee.  
 TE-snake 3SG.NFUT-sleep and TE-snake NEG-3SG.NFUT-sleep NEG  
 ‘A snake was sleeping and the snake wasn’t sleeping’

(13) Te-ngata ee-tasi ee-moe ngo te-ngata ee-tasi s-ee-moe kee  
 TE-snake 3SG.NFUT-one 3SG.NFUT-sleep and TE-snake 3SG.NFUT-one NEG-3SG.NFUT-sleep NEG  
 ‘One snake was sleeping and one snake wasn’t sleeping’

If that referent does not exist (cf. (4)), *C*, in effect, does not work, and some individual or other is chosen by *f*—hence the indefinite flavor of these occurrences. These two possibilities for *C* can be shown to be relevant in the analysis of the scope of *te-* phrases with respect to negation, where both wide and narrow scope are possible (data not shown).

Finally, I follow Gillon in that uniqueness is an implicature triggered by *D*—as such, it is sometimes present with *te-* DPs ((14))(cf. Coppock and Beaver 2015), sometimes not ((15)):

(14) [An iguana has been dissected. Wondering what an unidentified body part is:]  
 #Au s-taaea kee ta iguana lekina a-mata pe sai, pe te-mata ðoulapa?  
 I NEG-know NEG COMP iguana have A-eye or NEG but TE-eye big  
 ‘I don’t know whether iguanas have eyes or not, but is the eye big?’

(15) Lekina a-sea ee-faa. Tourave e-nofo te-sea.  
 exist A-chair 3SG.NFUT-four Tourave 3SG.NFUT-sit TE-chair  
 ‘There were four chairs. Tourave sat down on a chair’ (one of the four)