Non-Maximal Definite Articles in Romance

Elisabeth Stark (University of Zurich) & David Paul Gerards (University of Leipzig)

The aim of our talk is to discuss a hitherto underresearched and at first glance puzzling non-maximal use of the definite article documented in several – but not all – Romance varieties. As noted by Cardinaletti/Giusti (2018), among others, many varieties of Italian allow definite articles with indefinite (i.e. non-maximal) interpretations ([1a], available also with plural count nouns), in variation with so-called partitive articles and bare nominals (1b). A similar situation holds true, e.g., of Francoprovençal (with the exception of bare nouns being banned in this variety; cf. Stark & Gerards 2021). In French, on the contrary – just as in (Modern) Spanish, Portuguese, and Romanian – the morphological equivalent of Italian (1a) can only yield a strongly definite reading, i.e., refer to a maximal sum of wine portions (2a). The triggering of an indefinite reading in French, in turn, crucially hinges upon the presence of the partitive article (2b):

(1) **It.**   a. Ho bevuto il vino.
  'I drank (the) wine.'

  b. Ho bevuto (del) vino
  'I drank wine.' (Cardinaletti/Giusti 2018: 142)

(2) **Fr.**   a. J'ai bu le vin.
  'I drank *(the) wine.'

  b. J'ai bu *(du) vin.
  'I drank *(the) wine.'

We will defend the view that Romance non-maximal definites of type (1a) come with so-called *representative object interpretations* (ROI) in the kind-oriented mode of talk (Krifka 1995; Müller-Reichau 2013). Being weakly referential (= non-maximal), they denote inherently non-specific, semantically number-neutral regular objects that are relevant only as representative instantiations of their corresponding kind, without, however, being kind-denoting themselves (cf. also the non-specific direct objects in Kupisch/Koops 2007 and Leonetti 2019). By proposing an ROI-analysis for non-maximal definites of type (1a), we extend Gerards' (2020) analysis of Old Spanish and Old Portuguese non-maximal definites in (*d)el*-constructions, available until the beginning of the 16th century. We will, furthermore, show that at least in Francoprovençal, non-maximal definites of type (1a) are particularly frequent with prepositional complements as well as in habitual (cf. Rimell 2004) and characterizing sentences with a 'generic flavor'. We conclude our talk with a cursory look beyond Romance, which suggests that non-maximal definites of type (1a) may be available in other language families, too.

References

Cardinaletti, A., and G. Giusti. 2018. "Indefinite Determiners: Variation and Optionality in Italo-Romance." In: *Advances in Italian Dialectology*, ed. by D. Pescarini and R. D'Alessandro, 135–161. Language and Linguistics E-Books Online.

Gerards, D. P. 2020. *Bare Partitives in Old Spanish and Old Portuguese*. PhD dissertation, University of Zurich.

Krifka, M. et al. 1995. "Genericity: An Introduction." In: *The Generic Book*, ed. by G. Carlson & F. J. Pelletier, 1–124. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kupisch, T., and C. Koops. 2007. "The Definite Article in Non-Specific Direct Object Noun Phrases. Comparing French and Italian." In: *Nominal Determination. Typology, Context Constraints and Historical Emergence*, ed. by E. Stark, E. Leiss, and W. Abraham, 189–213. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Leonetti, M.. 2019. "On Weak Readings of Definite DPs." In: *Proceedings of the IX NEREUS Internatoinal Workshop "Morphosyntactic and semantic aspects of the DP in Romance and beyond"*, ed. by N. Pomino, Arbeitspapier 131, 1–25. Fachbereich Linguistik, Universität Konstanz.

Mueller-Reichau, O. 2013. *Sorting the World. On the Relevance of the Kind/Object-Distinction to Referential Semantics*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Rimell, L. 2004. "Habitual Sentences and Generic Quantification." In: *Proceedings of WCCFL*, vol. 23. 663-676.

Stark, E., and D. P. Gerards. 2021. "Partitive Articles in Aosta Valley Francoprovençal – Old Questions and New Data". In: *Bare Nouns vs. 'Partitive Articles': Disentangling Functions*, ed. by T. Ihsane, 301–334. Leiden/Boston: Brill (*Syntax and Semantics*).

Partitive *ne* and semantic features processing by monolingual and bilingual speakers

Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes[1] and Francesco Romano[2]
[1]**Universitat de les Illes Balears and** [2]**Halmstad University**

Framed with current generative linguistic theory *(*Biberauer et al., 2014 and references thereafter) that have investigated the nature of parameters against the properties of the linguistic computational system of human language C_{HL} which do not vary and thus "come for free"*,* this paper aims to contribute to current central issues in linguistics within a new approach to bilingual language acquisition. To that end, we focus on (morpho-)syntactic micro-variation in Italian and Spanish. Spanish permits arguments to be omitted when they are recoverable from the linguistic context and the semantic features definiteness and specificity are involved. In Spanish, it is possible to omit arguments corresponding to objects purely based on semantic features (contrast (1a) and (2a) -specific, -definite with (1b) and (2b) +definite +specific), while in Italian the partitive *ne* is required to recover the semantic content of the null argument in equivalent sentences (3a) and (4a) (Clements, 2006, a. o.). This contrast was, thus, exploited in an experiment testing 20 Spanish speakers of Italian, as well as native Italian and Spanish control groups (*n*= 60 in total) via a structural priming task. Such a design enabled us to compare the representations of the bilinguals in both languages to those of monolinguals in each language in order to address the following research questions:

1. Do monolingual and bilingual speakers construct a syntactic representation for null objects? If so, how is it mitigated by the effects of semantics?
2. To what extent do monolingual and bilingual speakers' syntax resemble one another when the representation of null objects is not shared by the two languages of the bilingual?
3. To what extent both acquisition and change are operative in small steps in bilingualism, as cross-linguistic influence and/or convergence are in force?

By priming missing-argument vs. full-form sentences (examples (1) and (2)) in Spanish and in Italian (examples (3) and (4)), we tested whether the comprehension of a sentence with a missing element could prime the production of an otherwise syntactically similar full-form sentence. 12 primes, 6 for each of the 2 specific/definite conditions were used along with 12 baseline *si*-passives and 18 filler restructuring primes which bear no resemblance to the critical items. While the bilinguals were tested in both Spanish and Italian, the native controls completed only the version specific to their language. The analyses, where the data was fit to mixed-effect logistic regression with group and def/spec as fixed effects and clitic/partitive *ne* versus clitic omission as a binomial dependent outcome, showed that comprehension of a sentence with a missing object as in (1a) and (2a) did not prime the production of a full-form sentence and comprehension of full-form sentences as in (1b) and (2b) primed a corresponding full-form sentence in both the native Spanish and bilingual groups. In Italian, however, while the native Italian showed similar priming effects to the native Spanish, the bilingual group was not primed by Italian partitive *ne* sentences (3a) and (4a) equivalent to missing object sentences in Spanish ((1a)-(2a)) in the same way. Our results suggest native and bilingual speakers represent structure for missing-argument sentences and full-form sentences similarly but only insofar as the bilingual speakers' representation in the language they are less proficient in does not interfere. Our findings improve our understanding of the human language faculty and the building blocks of language *à la* Kayne (2005). Alternatively, we assume that the earlier a parameter is activated, the wider scope it may have in the grammar, since it may have an effect on items acquired later. This is not wholly unpredicted if parameters are considered universal and differences among languages arise from differences in the activation of such parameters (Roberts & Roussou 2003, i.a). We also discuss our findings against factors affecting the acquisition of gramatical structure such as complexity, frequency and economy.

Examples from Spanish:

(1) a. Bebe   café   todos los días   de la semana, pero hoy   no   ha   bebido.
     Drink.3SG coffee every the days   of the week,   but today not have.3SG drunk.
     " He/she drinks coffee everyday of the week, but today he/she has not drunk any".

                                                             [−definite, −specific]

     b. Bebe   el café   todos los días de la semana, pero hoy no lo ha   bebido.
     Drink.3SG the coffee every the days of the week,   but today not it have.3SG drunk.
     "He/she drinks the coffee everyday of the week, but today he/she has not drunk it"

                                                             [+definite, +specific]

 (2) a. Compra   periódicos   todas las semanas, pero esta semana ha   olvidado comprar.
     Buy.3SG   newspapers all   the weeks,   but   this week   have.3SG forgotten buy.
     "He/she buys some newspapers all weeks, but this week he/she has forgotten to buy some".

                                                          [-definite, -specific]

     b. Compra   los periódicos   todas las semanas, pero esta semana los ha   olvidado   comprar.
     Buy.3SG   the newspapers   all   the weeks,   but this week   them have.3SG forgotten   buy.
     "He/she buy the newspapers all weeks, but this week he/she forgot to buy them".

                                                           [+definite, +specific]

Equivalents in Italian:
 (3) a. Beve   del   caffè   tutti i giorni della settimana ma oggi   non ne ha   bevuto
     drink.3SG some coffee every day   of the week,   but today not it have.3SG drunk
     "He/she drinks coffee every day of the week but today he/she has not drunk any"

                                                            [−definite −specific]

     b. Beve   il caffé   tutti i giorni della settimana ma oggi non l'ha   bevuto
     drink.1SG some coffee every day   of the week,   but today not it have.3SG drunk
     "He/she drinks coffee every day of the week but today he/she has not drunk it"

                                                            [+definite +specific]

 (4) a. Compra   dei   giornali   ogni   settimana ma questa settimana se   ne é dimenticato
     Buy.3SG   some newspapers every week   but this   week   himself it have.3SG forgotten
     "He/she buys some newspapers every week but this week he/she have forgotten some"

                                                            [−definite −specific]:

     b. Compra   i   giornali   ogni   settimana ma questa settimana se   li   é dimenticati
     Buy.3SG   the newspapers every week   but this   week   myself them have.3SG forgotten
     "He/she buys some newspapers every week but this week he/she have forgotten them"

                                                            [+definite +specific]:

(Selected) References:

Biberauer, T., A. Holmberg, I. Roberts & M. Sheehan (2014). Complexity in comparative syntax: the view from modern parametric theory. In: F. J. Newmeyer & L. B. Preston (Eds.) *Measuring Grammatical Complexity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 103-127.

Cai, Z. G., Pickering, M. J., Wang, R., & H.P. Branigan (2015). It is there whether you hear it or not: Syntactic representation of missing arguments, *Cognition*, *136*, 255–267.

Clements, J. C. (2006). Null direct objects in Spanish. In J. C. Clements and J. Yoon (eds.), *Functional approaches to Spanish syntax*, 134–150. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cummins, S., & Roberge, Y. (2005). A modular account of null objects in French. *Syntax*, *8*, 44–64.

Kayne, R. 2005. Some notes on comparative syntax. In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax* G. Cinque & R. S. Kayne (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, I. & Roussou, A. (2003). *Syntactic Change: A Minimalist Approach to Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Partitive Clitics with Bolognese Unergative Verbs

Edward J. Rubin - University of Utah

The (in)ability to extract a partitive (PRT) clitic (CL) (e.g. Ital(ian) *ne*) from a quantified postverbal subject (*pvS*) of intransitives has long been used to distinguish *unaccusatives* (UAs) from *unergatives* (UEs) (Belletti & Rizzi 1981, Burzio 1986, et seq). UAs, like objects of transitives, permit it, and UEs, like transitives' subjects, forbid it, as seen in Ital (1-2). This usually correlates with other patterns, e.g. AUX(iliary) selection. This paper presents and analyzes data from Bol(ognese), the Gallo-Italic grammar (GIG) of Bologna, that breaks this pattern in an unattested and generally unpredicted way. (3-4) are typical *pvS* examples drawn from copious fieldwork. In particular, the *pvS* of Bol UEs (by other diagnostics) readily generate PRT (4),(9). We propose that this is due to structure underlying the Bol CL glossed SF that is absent in grammars like Ital, without PRT in UE data.

(1) Ne= sono arrivate due
    PRT be.3P arrived.FP two
    'Two of them arrived.'

(2)*Ne= hanno ballato due
    PRT have.3P danced two
    'Two of them arrived.'

(3) A= in= é arivè dåu
    SF PRT be.3S arrived two.F
    'Two of them are arriving.'

(4) A= in= à runfè dåu
    SF PRT have.3S snored two.F
    'Two of them snored.'

Note that SF lacks most properties of discourse CLs seen in other GIGs (Poletto 2000). (For analyses of *pvS*, see Rizzi 1982, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Cardinaletti 2018, and many others).

We adopt the framework of Chomsky 2013, 2015 (PoP) extended in Epstein et. al. 2016, using previous theories' terms/etc, e.g. X' labels, movement, Spec, subscripts, only to ease exposition. These hold that structure is built by external and internal set and pair merge (E/I(S/P)M), freely applied and ordered; and that failure to label nodes by minimal search causes a derivation to crash. Note (i) that a root may combine with $v^{(*)}$ by either IM or EM, (ii) that this doesn't impact LF θ-relations, and (iii) that $v^{(*)}$ affixes to the root, and is then no longer a phase head nor visible to syntactic operations other than labeling. We adopt that PRT, a quantified DP, extracts from Spec of its extended pojection (5a), and that CLs move as XPs to the Spec below the head where they cliticize by move X (5b). Finally, we build on Roberts' 2010:154 suggestion that PRT cliticizes to $v^{(*)}$.

(5)   (a. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2006:67 – b. Cardinaletti & Starke 1999:87, Roberts2010, etc.)
    a. Extraction of PRT (= DP) from QP: DP ... [FP D̶P̶ Q [AgrQP D̶P̶ Q̶ [QP (PP) Q̶ [DP D̶P̶]]]]
    b. Cliticization as XP then X movement: [[X_i^0+F^0] [GP XP_i [G^0 [VP XP_i]]]]

Standard analyses of data like (1-4) involve null expletive *pro* (*expl*). **We propose** that Bol has a lexical item not present in grammars like Ital: a light *v* (v_A below) that must appear with *pvS* data like (3-4), and introduces an *expl* distinct from the default one, which triggers a 3MS S(ubject)CL (e.g. *al piôv* 'it rains'). A SCL.3MS is impossible in (3-4). This Bol non-default *expl* instead triggers SF. Ital (etc) has only a default *expl*. The presence of v_A expands the opportunity for PRT to appear.

Analysis. <u>Unaccusative</u> roots $\sqrt{UA}$ could combine with *v* by IM or EM. The IM derivation (6a), leading to (1), is: (i) FP is built as in (5a), then ESM($\sqrt{UA}$,FP), (ii) ISM(PRT,{$\sqrt{UA}$,FP}) results in RP, (iii) ESM(*v*,RP), (iv) PRT cliticizes to *v* by (5b), (v) IPM($\sqrt{UA}$,*v*) (move X) results in (6a) (with *v* now an affix, visible only for labeling), and (vi) the derivation continues. If steps (iv) and (v) reverse their order, the derivation fails, since PRT needs a $v^{(*)}$ host, but (v) renders the only one invisible. The derivation with EM($\sqrt{UA}$,*v*) (6b) fails necessarily for the same reason: EM($\sqrt{UA}$,*v*) before EM($<\sqrt{UA}$,*v*$>$,FP) assures that *v* is never visible to PRT, whether it moves to Spec$<\sqrt{UA}$,*v*$>$ or not. Bol has the same bolded sub-structures, but adds v_A by ESM (and subsequently, the related non-default *expl*) (7a). With (6a) embedded in (7a), IPM(PRT=$<\sqrt{UA}$,*v*$>$,v_A) is the next head move toward V's higher eventual position. Moreover, with (6b) in (7a), EM($\sqrt{UA}$,*v*), which failed in (6b) for Ital, doesn't fail for Bol. Instead, if PRT XP-moves to Spec of $<\sqrt{UA}$,*v*$>$ in (6b) (with invisible

v), it can then cliticize in (7a) to v_A as per (5b), before $<\sqrt{UA},v>$ raises. The LF-states of the two derivations in (7a) are identical, though the one with (6b) is shorter than the one with (6a).

(6) a. Unaccusative with IM(R,v): $[_{vP}$ PRT=$<\sqrt{UA},v>$ $[_{RP}$ ~~PRT~~ $\sqrt{UA}$ $[_{FP}$ ~~PRT~~ Q [...]]] $]$
    b. Unaccusative with EM(R,v): *$[_{vP}$ (PRT) $<\sqrt{UA},v>$ $[_{FP}$ PRT Q [...]] $]$

(7) a. $[_{v_AP}$ *expl* $<$PRT=$<\sqrt{UA},v>,v_A>$ $[_{vP}$]]   b. $[_{v_AP}$ *expl* $<$PRT=$<\sqrt{UE},v^*>,v_A>$ $[_{v^*P}$]]

(8) a. Unergative with IM(R,v^*): *$[_{v^*P}$ (PRT) $[_{v^*P}$ $[_{FP}$ PRT Q] $<\sqrt{UE},v^*>$ $[_{RP}$ $\sqrt{UE}$]] $]$
    b. Unergative with EM(R,v^*): *$[_{v^*P}$ (PRT) $[_{v^*P}$ $[_{FP}$ PRT Q] $<\sqrt{UE},v^*>$] $]$

Unergative roots $\sqrt{UE}$ require merger with v^* for LF θ-related interpretation, and no derivation with PRT converges for grammars like Ital, (2). In (8a), extraction of PRT from FP as in (5a) cannot lead to a configuration (5b) for cliticization to v^*, and the FP containing PRT merges with $\{<\sqrt{UE},v^*>,RP\}$ only after v^* becomes invisible. Similarly in (8b), EPM($\sqrt{UE},v^*$) renders v^* invisible before merger with FP, and the configuration for clicitization never arises. In Bol (4), however, its v_A is an additional light v available for cliticization, and PRT can access it, as it did with (6b) embedded in (7a). Specifically, whether $<\sqrt{UE},v^*>$ derives from IM (8a) or EM (8b), it θ-marks FP and PRT may extract from FP to IM with $\{FP,<\sqrt{UE},v^*>\}$ (In PoP, this arises under "the simplest form of" IM (Chomsky 2013:42). Since PRT moves further (and $<\sqrt{UE},v^*>$, too), v^*P is labeled at LF.) From there, PRT cliiticizes to v_A in (7b) before $<\sqrt{UE},v^*>$ head-moves to it, rendering it invisible. In summary, PRT is subject to strict configurational constraints given its properties, and Bol provides more structure to satisfy PRT's needs than is typical.

A full analysis of AUX-selection is beyond the scope of this paper, but it clearly isn't as purely configurational as the emergence of PRT. Ackema & Sorace 2017 survey relevant factors in various grammars, e.g. specific φ-features of subjects, semantic properties beyond θ-roles, and others. Consider Bol (9-10). These differ in AUX (but not PRT), though they contain the same root but differ in the sort of event specified. This contrast in AUX is maintained when PRT isn't present (with unextracted nouns in (non-)quantified nominals in pre- or post-verbal subjects). However AUX-selection is characterized, it is a complex phenomenon involving (the interpretation of) parts of structure higher than (6-8). This shows that the licensing of PRT and AUX-selection are independent, though this may be obscured in the best studied grammars, which lack an element like Bol's v_A.

(9) Däl   dòn,   a= in= à   cåurs dåu   int i Żarden Margarétta pr un'åura.
     of.the.FP women SF PRT have.3S run   two.F in the gardens M.   for an hour
     'Of the women, two ran for an hour in the Margaretta Gardens.'

(10) Däl   dòn,   a= in= é   cåurs a cà   dåu in 10 minûd.
     of.the.FP women SF PRT be.3S run   to home two.F in 10 minutes
     'Of the women, two ran home in 10 minutes.'

In conclusion, we showed that FP's θ-relation to (a merger of $v^{(*)}$ with) a root and the need to extract PRT from FP to a position suitable for cliticization to $v^{(*)}$ combine to forbid PRT's origin in *pvS*s of UEs in most grammars. Bol, however, requires its v_A in *pvS* structures, and that adds a non-θ-related head suitable to PRT, making it possible with UEs. This paper predicts that such data could be found in other grammars that have a (similar) suitable additional v available.

Ackema & Sorace 2017 doi.org/10.1002/9781118358733.wbsyncom072. Belletti & Rizzi 1981 *Linguistic Review* 1:117-154. Burzio 1986 *Italian Syntax*. Cardinaletti 2018 *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 30:79-106. Cardinaletti & Giusti 2006 in *Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Cardinaletti & Starke 1999 in *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Chomsky 2013 *Lingua* 130:33-49. Chomsky 2015 in *Structures, Stategies and Beyond*. Epstein et. al. 2016 *Linguistic Review* 33:87-102. Poletto 2000 *The higher functional field*. Manzini & Savoia 2005 *I dialetti italiani e romanci*. Roberts 2010 *Agreement and head movement*.

Un mucchio di libri and *uma pilha de papéis*: Binomial constructions in Italian and European Portuguese

Alessia Lacroce & Silvia Brambilla
Università degli Studi Roma Tre / Università La Sapienza di Roma

Binomial constructions are a family of constructions taking the form N1 of N2. These constructions have been studied within various frameworks and take different labels, such as *pseudo-partitives* (e.g., Tănase-Dogaru 2007; Grestenberger 2015) and *classifier constructions* (e.g., Allan 1977; Lehrer 1986; McEnery & Xiao 2007). Following the latter denomination, in her study on English, Lehrer (1986) provides an eight-class taxonomy of the nouns filling the N1 slot, based on the semantic information they convey. Building on the proposal by Lehrer, in this paper, we focus on classifiers in Italian and European Portuguese. Indeed, while considerable work has been done for English and other languages (e.g., Brems 2010; Kim & Sells 2010 for English; Brems 2015 for French; Verveckken 2015 for Spanish; Tănase-Dogaru 2007 for Romanian; Alonso & Santos 2017 for Brazilian Portuguese), little literature exists on Italian (e.g., Masini 2016; Giacalone Ramat 2019) and European Portuguese (e.g., Brito 2006). Our starting point is the class of arrangement classifiers, namely those nouns (N1s) providing information on a not-inherent spatial distribution of another noun (N2). See for example (1-2):

1) *Indicò   una   **pila di fascicoli** sul   pavimento   vicino alla   finestra.*
pointed.3s a   pile of dossiers on.the floor   near   to.the window
'He pointed to a pile of dossiers on the floor near the window.'

2) *Eis   a   **pilha de fraldas**   que   um   bebé   suja   por   mês...*
Here   the   pile   of nappies   that   a   baby   dirties per   month
'Here is the pile of nappies that a baby dirties each month.'

However, the analysis will also include other categories of Lehrer's taxonomy. According to the literature (e.g., Corver & van Riemsdijk 2001; Giacalone Ramat 2019), the binomial constructions are ambiguous between a referential and a quantifier-like meaning depending on the context. Here is an example of both cases in Italian (3) and European Portuguese (4):

3) a. *Si   trovò   a un tratto su un **mucchio di frasche** e   la caduta cessò.*
himself found.3s suddenly on a heap   of branches and the fall   stopped
'He suddenly found himself on a heap of branches, and the fall stopped.'

   b. *Sono   solo un **mucchio di cazzate**. Lea può avere tutti gli uomini che vuole.*
are.3p only a   heap   of craps. Lea can have all the men   that wants
'It is just a heap of craps. Lea can have all the men she wants.'

4) a. *Ao   contrário   do   que   sempre   acontecia,   naquela   noite*
to.the contrary   of.the that   always   happened   in.that   night
*o   **monte   de   lenha**   na   cozinha   era   maior.*
the   mountain   of   firewood   in.the kitchen   was   bigger
'Contrary to what usually happened, that night, the heap of firewood in the kitchen was bigger.'

   b. *Vemo-nos   com   um   **monte   de   diplomas**   que têm*
see-ourselves with   a   mountain   of   diplomas   that have.3p
realmente   importância   em   termos parlamentares (...).
really   importance   in   terms parliamentary
'We found ourselves with a heap of diplomas that have great importance for the Parliament.'

In (3a) and (4a), the construction has a literal meaning – the N1 refers to an actual hump. Conversely, in (3b) and (4b) the N1, expresses a large quantity of N2. The semantically ambiguous status also affects the agreement patterns with the main verb (Veselovská 2001; Rodrigues 2011; Grestenberger 2015; Mazzaggio et al. 2020). When the binomial construction is the subject, the verb can agree either with N1 (4a) or N2 (3b and 4b).

In this paper, we aim to show that agreement correlates with the semantic interpretation of the construction in context. Hence, we discuss the semantic-pragmatic and syntactic properties of the classifiers under a broad constructionist approach, i.e., we consider both form and function as equally important in the definition of the construction at stake. To this purpose, we carried out a corpus-based analysis on written corpora of Italian and European Portuguese, namely the CORIS (*Corpus di Riferimento dell'Italiano Scritto*) and the CRPC (*Corpus de Referência do Português Contemporâneo*), and particularly its sub-corpus *Portugal only*. We will consider several parameters, including the semantic and syntactic information provided by N1 (number, definiteness) and N2 (number, shape, animacy), as well as the verbal agreement.

The preliminary results show that verbal agreement varies in accordance with the semantic function of the construction: the verb agrees with N1 when the binomial construction has a literal interpretation, while it agrees with N2 when it conveys a quantifier meaning.

References:

Allan, K. (1977). Classifiers. *Language*, *53*(2), 285–311.

Alonso, K. Sampaio Braga, & Santos, C. (2017). Construções binomiais do tipo SN1 de SN2. *Revista Do GEL*, *14*(1), 157–185.

Brems, L. (2010). Size noun constructions as collocationally constrained constructions: Lexical and grammaticalized uses. *English Language and Linguistics*, *14*(1), 83–109.

Brems, L. (2015). Some binominal size noun constructions in English and French: A contrastive corpus-based perspective. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, *14*(1), 90–115.

Brito, A. M. (2006). Categorias sintácticas. In M. H. M. Mateus, A. M. Brito, I. Duarte, & I. Hub Faria (Eds.), *Gramática da língua portuguesa* (7. ed, pp. 324–432). Caminho.

Corver, N., & van Riemsdijk, H. C. (Eds.). (2001). *Semi-lexical categories: The function of content words and the content of function words*. de Gruyter.

Giacalone Ramat, A. (2019). Degrees of grammaticalization and measure constructions in Italian. *Revue Romane. Langue et Littérature. International Journal of Romance Languages and Literatures*, *54*(2), 257–277.

Grestenberger, L. (2015). Number marking in German measure phrases and the structure of pseudo-partitives. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, *18*(2), 93–138.

Kim, J.-B., & Sells, P. (2010). The English Binominal NP as a Nominal Juxtaposition Construction. □ □ □ □ □ [*English Language and Linguistics*], *16*(2), 135–162.

Lehrer, A. (1986). English classifier constructions. *Lingua*, *68*, 109–148.

Masini, F. (2016). Binominal constructions in Italian of the N1-di-N2 type: Towards a typology of Light Noun Constructions. *Language Sciences*, *53*, 99–113.

Mazzaggio, G., Franco, L., & Manzini, R. (2020). Pseudopartitives and Agreement Attraction: An Experimental Study. *Lingue e Linguaggio*, *19*(2), 159–190.

McEnery, T., & Xiao, R. (2007). Quantifying Constructions in English and Chinese: A Corpus-Based Contrastive Study. *Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics Conference 27–30 July 2007*.

Rodrigues, E. dos Santos. (2011). Concordância verbal com construções partitivas – uma proposta de análise. *Veredas-Revista de Estudos Linguísticos*, *15*(1), 93–107.

Tănase-Dogaru. (2007). Pseudo-partitives and (silent) classifiers in Romanian. *Proceedings of ConSOLE XV*, 295–320.

Verveckken, K. D. (2015). *Binominal quantifiers in Spanish*. de Gruyter.

Veselovská, L. (2001). Agreement patterns of Czech group nouns and quantifiers. In N. Corver & H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *Semi-lexical Categories* (pp. 273–320). de Gruyter.

Living on the edge: On bare and non-bare NCIs across Italo-Romance
Jacopo Garzonio (University of Padua) – Cecilia Poletto (Goethe University Frankfurt)

1. In this talk we will investigate the occurrence of NCIs (Negative Concord Items (Giannakidou 2000; 2006), like the negative indefinites *nessuno* 'nobody' and *niente* 'nothing') in non-negative non-veridical contexts in old and modern Italian varieties (spoken regional varieties as well as local Italo-Romance dialects). We will argue in favor of the idea that bare and complex NCIs have a different internal structure and can thus be interpreted as real negative quantifiers or not depending on this internal difference. We will start by showing that Italian varieties are sensible to the following implicational scale in the licensing of NCIs with a non-negative meaning:

(1)   Interrogatives   'if' clauses   Comparatives   Free Relatives
        Veneto Italian   Tuscan Italian Old Venetian   Old Tuscan

We will illustrate the implication scale by showing that a) in some dialects NCIs completely lack the possibility to be licensed in any of these contexts (e.g. in modern Venetian, and in the modern Southern Italo-Romance varieties), b) some only allow for interrogative contexts (for example in regional Italian spoken in Veneto). c) Some varieties allow for interrogatives and if-clauses (regional Italian spoken in Tuscany). d) Old Italo-Romance varieties (like Old Venetian) allow for NCIs in interrogatives, if-clauses and comparatives, and e) finally Old Tuscan have the whole scale.

(2) a.   Hai   visto ***nessuno***   per   caso?
          have.2sg   seen   nobody   for   chance
          'Have you seen anybody, by chance?'
          Regional Italian in Veneto: OK / Regional Italian in Tuscany: OK
     b.   %Avvertimi   se   vedi   ***nessuno***   in piazza.
          warn=me   if   see.2sg   nobody   in square
          'Warn me if you see someone in the square.'
          Regional Italian in Veneto: * / Regional Italian in Tuscany: OK
(3) a.   la   qual savea molto (…) de medisine plui cha ***niguna*** damisela de tuto lo mondo
          the which knew much   of medicines more than no   lady   of all   the world
          '…who knew about medicines more than any lady in the world'
          (*Tristano Veneto*, 118; Old Venetan, 1310 ca.)
     b.   chi   aveva ***niente***   di grano   el   serbava
          who   had   nothing   of wheat   it=   kept
          '…and who had some wheat retained it.'
          (*Cronaca senese*, p. 139; Old Sienese, 1362)

This distribution can be interpreted as a trend moving from weak to strong NPIs, i.e. towards a loss of non-veridical contexts or in the opposite direction as a scale depicting the acquisition of the value of a negative quantifier. It proceeds in a similar way to the semantic map of lexical indefinites already singled out in Haspelmath (1997), where conditional, comparative and free-choice contexts are found in this order, while interrogative is closer to negative contexts.
2. However, once we factor out the variable provided by the non-veridical type of context, another new factor ruling the distribution of NCIs emerges, namely internal complexity of the NCI. Complex NICs phrases containing a lexical N restrictor are intrinsically "more negative" than simple NCI words: keeping the context as a constant, bare NCIs are possible while complex ones are not. We provide here just an example, and we will provide evidence for the whole scale in the talk:

(4)   a.   %Ha   invitato   nessun parente?
         has   invited   no   relative
         'Has s/he invited any relative?'
         Regional Italian in Veneto: *
      b.   Ha   invitato   nessuno?
         has   invited   nobody
         'Has s/he invited anybody?'
         Regional Italian in Veneto: Ok

This distinction in non-veridical contexts, which to our knowledge has gone unnoticed in the literature, actually replicates distinctions between bare and non-bare quantifiers found in other domains. (See Authors 2018 on the same type of split for universal quantifiers).

3. Our analysis of the split between complex and simple NCIs capitalizes on Déprez's (2018) idea that negative quantifiers have to be marked as negative at the edge of their DP phase, i.e. the negative feature/item must be visible from the outside. Complex items, which possess a fully-fledged nominal structure with a lexical N restrictor at its bottom, have a negative determiner, which can indeed be located at the highest edge of the nominal phase and therefore visible from the outside. Thus, they cannot occur other than in anti-veridical (i.e. negative) contexts.

(5)   Non ho invitato [DP/QP ***nessun***   [NP ***parente***]]
         'I have invited no relatives.'

On the contrary, NCI words do not have a lexical restrictor and the only lexical item in their internal structure does not necessarily occupy the highest position at the edge, hence the negative feature is not visible at its edge. Thus, they can be interpreted as non-negative indefinites, and we find variation.

(6)   a.   Non ho visto [DP ***nessuno***   [nP]].
         'I saw nobody.'
      b.   Hai invitato [DP   [nP ***nessuno***]]?
         'Have you invited anyone?'

This means in turn, that the internal structure of NCIs does not contain a lexical empty N, but a different "smaller" category (most probably some sort of classifier-like category, as it is the case for universal bare quantifiers) and that the lexical item does not necessarily reach the edge of the nominal phase. This can be compared to other phenomena that have already been pointed out in the literature on different types of quantifiers (see the above mentioned case of universal quantifiers) and can provide a first insight into the internal structure of bare quantifiers, notably a rather thorny problem due to the lack of tests that can help us figure out what the internal layering of complex and bare quantifiers is.

References
Déprez, V. 2018. Micro-Variation in French Based Creole Negative Concord. Ms, Rutgers University.
Giannakidou, A. 2000. Negative... concord? Natural Language & Linguistic Theory 18: 457-523.
Giannakidou, A. 2006. N-words and negative concord. The Blackwell companion to syntax 3:327-391.
Haspelmath, M. 1997. Indefinite Pronouns. Oxford: OUP.

Referential vagueness, plurality, and discourse dependence

Urtzi Etxeberria (CNRS-IKER) & Anastasia Giannakidou (University of Chicago)

THE PROPOSAL. The Spanish *alg*-indefinites determiners *algún* and *algunos*, the singular and the plural version of each other, are known to exhibit conflicting behavior. In the singular, it is cited as an anti-specific, referentially vague indefinite (Giannakidou & Quer (GQ) 2013, Alonso Ovalle & Menendez-Benito (AM) 2010), requiring that the speaker has more than one value in mind. In the plural, on the other hand, *algunos* appears to be discourse dependent and partitive-like (Gutiérrez-Rexach 2001, 2010, Martí 2008, 2009). This results in an ambiguity analysis, which is undesirable. In this paper, we document thoroughly the distribution and interpretation of the two variants, and propose that the *alg*-indefinite remains anti-specific in both uses. We offer a unified analysis of anti-specificity as *referential vagueness* following GQ (2013), Giannakidou and Yoon (2016), and present new data showing that apparent differences between the singular and the plural follow from NP-ellipsis, topicality of the domain, and the way vagueness interacts with plurality.

THE PUZZLE. Singular *algún* is an anti-specific determiner conveying referential vagueness (similar indefinites can also be found in Italian, Greek, Catalan, Korean, Romanian, German, Basque, etc.):

(1)   Ha   llamado algún estudiante. #Era Pedro.
        have called   some student   was Pedro
        'Some student called. #It was Pedro.'

The use of *algún* conveys that the speaker cannot identify who the student is (in opposition with the Spanish run-of-the-mill indefinite *un*), and considers varying possibilities. AM treat this as a presupposition; GQ formulate it as referential vagueness:

(2)   *Referential vagueness as minimal variation*
        (i)   A sentence containing a referentially vague indefinite α will have a truth value iff:
                $\exists w_1, w_2 \in W$: $[\![\alpha]\!]^{w1} \neq [\![\alpha]\!]^{w2}$; where α is the referentially vague indefinite.
        (ii)   The worlds w_1, w_2 are epistemic alternatives of the speaker.

AM talk about 'anti-singleton condition'. The idea in both AM and GQ is that *algún* can only be used if there are more than one epistemically accessible values to the speaker. Unlike the referential vagueness condition, this account does not tie the anti-uniqueness requirement to the speaker, but rather places it to the common ground. This appears to be too strong, given that there may be partial improvements.

Referential vagueness can also be formulated as the direct opposite of Ionin (2006)'s felicity condition on specificity, as follows:

(3)   Referential vagueness as intention of anti-uniqueness
        $[\![\text{algún NP VP}]\!]$ is defined in a context c $[\![\text{algún NP VP}]\!]$ is not intended by the speakers to refer to exactly one individual x in c.

In both formulations, we are dealing with conditions anchored to the speaker's doxastic state and intention. In our view, referential vagueness is a precondition on the context of use of indefinites such as *algún*:

(4)   a. $[\![\text{algún NP VP}]\!]$ will be defined in a context c iff:
                $\exists w^1, w^2 \in M(s)$: $[\![\text{algún}]\!]^{w1} \neq [\![\text{algún}]\!]^{w2}$; and w1, w2 epistemic or doxastic alternatives of the speaker, i.e., worlds compatible with the speaker's beliefs or knowledge.
        b. $[\![\text{algún}]\!] = \lambda P{<}et{>} \lambda Q{<}et{>}.\exists x[P(x) \& Q(x)]$

Plural *algunos* has been claimed to be partitive like in that it must be linked to an antecedent set (cf. Gutiérrez-Rexach 2001, 2010; Martí 2008, 2009). Consider the following scenario, from Martí (2009):

(5)   {Teachers A and B are on an excursion with [a group of children, of whom they are in charge]$_K$. Teacher A comes to teacher B running:}
        (a) Teacher A: ¿Te has enterado? [*Algunos* niños]$_{K, \#J}$ se han perdido en el bosque.
        (b) Teacher A: ¿Te has enterado? [*Unos* niños]$_{K, J}$ se han perdido en el bosque.
                    'Have you heard? *Unos/algunos* children got lost in the forest.'

Martí claims that in choosing *algunos*, the speaker intends to refer to the set of children that were salient previously (i.e. indicated as K); and argues that *alg-* gives rise to a partitivity implicature:

(6) $[\![\text{alg-}]\!] = \lambda R_{<et,<ett>>}.\lambda P_{<et>}.\lambda Q_{<et>}.R(P{\cap}C)(Q)$; Implicature: $R(P{\cap}C)(\{x: Q(x) = 0\})$

But if the *alg-* element creates the contextual dependency via C in the plural, why not also in the singular? Why isn't the singular discourse dependent? Martí would have to argue that there are two *alg-*, one that contributes C and combines only with the plural, and one that contributes referential vagueness and

combines only with the singular. But without having an explanation of why the C effect is lost in the singular, and why it is lost with some plurals (in postverbal position, in existentials, such an explanation cannot be convincing. AM, on the other hand, suggest that the anti-specificity effect ('epistemic' effect in their terminology) is lost in the plural. This is empirically not true. Take the following example.

(7)   Algunos alumnos han llegado tarde. #Eran María, Pedro y Mónica.
          Some students arrived late. They were María, Pedro y Mónica.

In this case, the speaker knows exactly who the students are, as the subset {María, Pedro y Mónica} is invariable, and it therefore violates vagueness. However, as we note above, referential vagueness is real with the plural. To see this point further, take the following example, similar to the one in (7):

(8)   Algunos alumnos han llegado tarde. Eran María, Pedro y no sé quién más.
          Some students arrived late. They were María, Pedro, and I don't know who else.

The reason why the sentence in (8) improves when compared to the one in (7) is due to the addition of *no sé quién más* 'I don't know who else' which signals speaker ignorance, and now allows the students to be proper subsets of the total set of students that arrives late.

OUR ANALYSIS. The null hypothesis is that *alg-* is the element introducing referential vagueness in both the singular and the plural. For the discourse dependent reading, we show that it matters (i) whether what *algunos* combines with is an elliptical plural or not, or (ii) whether it is in the topic position. In ellipsis, the plural is anaphoric, responsible for the familiar indexing. The discourse dependence effect, in this case, thus, is not due to *alg-* but to the presence of an elliptical anaphor, see example (9):

(9)   Se han salvado doce   *pasajeros*$_K$. *Algunos*$_K$ estaban durmiendo en el momento del accidente.
          Cl aux saved   twelve passengers algunos   were   sleeping   in the moment of.the accident
          Twelve passengers were saved. Algunos were sleeping at the time of the accident.

In the second sentence of this example, the NP [pasajeros `passengers'] is not overt, but we can assume that it is elided under *algunos*. We have, then, NP ellipsis which requires an antecedent. Following standard assumptions about NP ellipsis we argue that an anaphoric pronominal is present:

(10)   [[algunos]] = algunos + pro$_I$, where I is a familiar property variable, i.e. I must be in dom(g).

The elliptical *pro* is an NP anaphor, indicated here with a familiar index, on a par with English one-anaphora (*Mary bought the yellow T-shirts, and Ariadne the blue ones*$_I$, cf. Kester 1996b,a; Saab 2018; cf. also Alexiadou & Gengel 2011; Corver & van Koppen 2011). The presence of this familiarity indexed *pro* forces *algunos* to pick up the index that comes with it. In Spanish, nominal ellipsis is licensed with a null *pro*$_I$ (not with *one*) and it is possible with both adjectives and indefinite determiners. Since null *pro*$_I$ is allowed with indefinite determiners generally, it seems only reasonable to assume it in the case of *algunos* in (9). In other words, the context dependency of *algunos* has nothing to do with *alg-*, but everything to do with the elliptical NP anaphor. The domain for *algunos* is fixed because of *pro*, but the vagueness variation requirement still holds:

(11)   Referential Vagueness condition for plural algunos:
          A sentence containing plural *algunos* designated here as αPL will be felicitous iff:
          $\exists$ w$_1$, w$_2$ $\in$ M(s): [[α$_{PL}$]]^{w1} $\neq$ [[α$_{PL}$]]^{w2}

Here the alternatives to α are plural entities; a consequence of referential vagueness for plurality is that the speaker needs to consider at least two pluralities. Given that the domain is fixed, this creates the partitive effect: in the domain D previously introduced (via pro) of possible values, if α is a singular, the values assigned to α will be individuals in D. If we have a plural α$_{PL}$, the values assigned to α$_{PL}$ will be pluralities in D, which means that with *algunos* we are looking at subdomains D' in D (D' $\subset$ D).

Without ellipsis, in the case of *algunos NP* where we have an overt domain (as in (7) and (8), the idea of anaphoric pro is not applicable. Here, we argue, discourse dependency will depend on whether the NP domain is topical or not. Details aside, saying that a domain is `topical' implies that the domain is discourse given, i.e., a set under discussion, or familiar (the precise understanding of givenness is not crucial here). A topical/given NP domain is a familiar one, just as in the elliptical case we showed above.

SUMMARY: In this paper, we propose a unified analysis of the Spanish *alg-*-indefinites, without denying its anti-specific nature in both the singular and the plural. We show that domain givenness and vagueness co-exist in this indefinite, and that the two properties are not mutually exclusive.