

## The syntactic derivation of low-scope indefinites in Inuktitut

In this paper, we provide a model for some of the surprising morphosyntactic contexts which are responsible for particular interpretations of indefinite nominals in Inuktitut. In Inuktitut, incorporated objects (1) and objects of antipassivised verbs (2) are obligatorily construed as narrow-scope indefinites:

- (1) *Pani-qaq-tunga*  
daughter-have-1sABS  
'I have a daughter/daughters.'
- (2) *Akittiq iqalung-mik taku-∅-ngngit-tuq*  
A. (ABS) fish-MOD see-AntiP-neg-[-tr].3sABS  
i. 'Akittiq didn't see any fish.'  
ii. #'There is a particular fish that Akittiq didn't see.'

In contrast, objects of non-incorporating verbs which have not undergone antipassivisation are obligatorily interpreted as 'specific':

- (3) *Akitti-up iqaluk taku-ngngit-taa*  
A. -ERG fish (ABS) see-neg-[+tr].3sERG.3sABS  
i. #'Akittiq didn't see any fish.'  
ii. 'There is a particular fish that Akittiq didn't see.'

The central proposal is that D is *deleted* in specific contexts, given Chomsky's (2013,2014) labelling theory; D-deletion results in a semantically sensible output only as long as the semantic content of the appropriate predicate compensates for the deletion by providing a variable to which a nominal predicate can apply. The obligatory very narrow scope found with many incorporated nouns and antipassive objects is a consequence. We show that this model accommodates not only the general case of (1)-(3), but also scopally ambiguous incorporated locative arguments: (4).

- (4) *Illu-mi-i-juk*  
house-in-BE-3sABS  
'(s)he's in a house'