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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 grammatical 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 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 caffè tutti i giorni della settimana ma oggi non l’ha bevuto
drink.1SG some coffee every day 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 has 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 forgot them”
[+definite, +specific]
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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-Italian 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 (3) A in= ò arivè dàu Note that SF lacks most properties of discourse CLS seen in other GIGs (Poletto 2000). (For (2)*Ne hanno ballato due (4) A in= à runfè dàu analyses of pvS, see Rizzi 1982, Manzini & Savoia 2005, Cardinaletti & Starke 1999:87, Roberts2010, etc.)

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 √(*) by either IM or EM, (ii) that this doesn’t impact LF θ-relations, and (iii) that √(*) 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 projection (5a), and that CLS move as XPs to the Spec below the head where they cliticize by move X (5b).

(5) a. Extraction of PRT (= DP) from QP: DP ... [FP DP Q] [AgQP DP Q [Op (PP) Q [DP DP ]]] ] ]

b. Cliticization as XP then X movement: [ [ X0+F0] [GP XP] [G0 [VP XP ] ] ]]

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 (vA below) that must appear with pvS data like (3-4), and introduces an expl distinct from the default one, which triggers a 3MS S(subject) CL (e.g. al piòv ‘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 vA expands the opportunity for PRT to appear.

Analysis. Unaccusative roots √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(√UA,FP), (ii) ISM(PRT, {√UA,FP}) results in RP, (iii) ESM(v,RP), (iv) PRT cliticizes to v by (5b), (v) IPM(√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 √(*) host, but (v) renders the only one invisible. The derivation with EM(√UA,v) (6b) fails necessarily for the same reason: EM(√UA,v) before EM(<√UA,v>,FP) assures that v is never visible to PRT, whether it moves to Spec<√UA,v> or not. Bol has the same bolded sub-structures, but adds vA by ESM (and subsequently, the related non-default expl) (7a). With (6a) embedded in (7a), IPM(PRT<√UA,v>,vA) is the next head move toward V’s higher eventual position. Moreover, with (6b) in (7a), EM(√UA,v), which failed in (6b) for Ita, doesn’t fail for Bol. Instead, if PRT XP-moves to Spec of <√UA,v> in (6b) (with invisible
\(v\), it can then cliticize in (7a) to \(v_A\) as per (5b), before \(\sqrt{\mathit{U}A,v}\) 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): 
\[ [v_P \text{PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A,v} \quad [\text{RP} \text{ PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A} \quad [\text{FP} \text{ PRT} \quad Q \quad...] \quad ]] \]

b. Unaccusative with EM(R,v): 
\[ [v_P \text{PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A,v} \quad [\text{RP} \text{ PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A} \quad [\text{FP} \text{ PRT} \quad Q \quad...] \quad ]] \]

(7) a. \(v_P \text{PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A,v} \quad [\text{RP} \text{ PRT} \quad Q \quad...] \quad] \)

b. \(v_P \text{PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A,v} \quad [\text{RP} \text{ PRT} \quad Q \quad...] \quad] \)

(8) a. Unergative with IM(R,v*): 
\[ [v_P \text{PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A,v*} \quad [\text{RP} \text{ PRT} \quad Q \quad...] \quad] \]

b. Unergative with EM(R,v*): 
\[ [v_P \text{PRT} \sqrt{\mathit{U}A,v*} \quad [\text{RP} \text{ PRT} \quad Q \quad...] \quad] \]

Unergative roots \(\sqrt{\mathit{U}E}\) require merger with \(v^*\) for LF \(\theta\)-related interpretation, and no derivation with PRT converges for grammars like Italic, (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 \(\{<\sqrt{\mathit{U}E,v^*>,\text{RP}\}\} \) only after \(v^*\) becomes invisible. Similarly in (8b), EPM(\(\sqrt{\mathit{U}E,v^*}\)) renders \(v^*\) invisible before merger with FP, and the configuration for cliticization 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 \(\sqrt{\mathit{U}E,v^*}\) derives from IM (8a) or EM (8b), it \(\theta\)-marks FP and PRT may extract from FP to IM with \(\{\text{FP},<\sqrt{\mathit{U}E,v^*}>\}\) (In PoP, this arises under “the simplest form of” IM (Chomsky 2013:42). Since PRT moves further (and \(<\sqrt{\mathit{U}E,v^*},\text{RP}\), too), \(v^*\text{P}\) is labeled at LF.) From there, PRT cliticizes to \(v_A\) in (7b) before \(\sqrt{\mathit{U}E,v^*}\) 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 \(\eta\)-features of subjects, semantic properties beyond \(\theta\)-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) Dål dön, a in- à cáurs dâu inti Žarden Margaréttu pr un’âura.
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 Margareta Gardens.’

(10) Dål dön, a in- é cáurs a cà dâu 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 \(\theta\)-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-\(\theta\)-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.

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; Verbeekken 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.
   ‘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 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.
   ‘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.
   ‘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 o monte de lenha na cozinha era maior.
   ‘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 realmente importância em termos parlamentares (...).
   ‘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.
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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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interrogatives</th>
<th>‘if’ clauses</th>
<th>Comparatives</th>
<th>Free Relatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veneto Italian</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscan Italian</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Venetian</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Tuscan</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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:

(2) a. Hai visto nessuno per caso?
‘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 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 nigüna damisela de tuto lo mondo
‘…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
‘…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.
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] [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 nessuno] [NP ]?
     ‘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.
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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.
   ‘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 $\alpha$ will have a truth value iff:
      \[ \exists w_1, w_2 \in W: \square \alpha^{w_1} \neq \square \alpha^{w_2}; \text{where } \alpha \text{ is the referentially vague indefinite.} \]
   (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
   \[ [\text{algún NP VP}] \text{ is defined in a context } c \Rightarrow [\text{algún NP VP}] \text{ is not intended by the speaker } s \text{ to refer to exactly one individual } x \text{ in } c. \]

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. \[ [\text{algún NP VP}] \text{ will be defined in a context } c \text{ iff:} \]
   \[ \exists w_1, w_2 \in M(s): [\text{algún}]^{w_1} \neq [\text{algún}]^{w_2}; \text{and } w_1, w_2 \text{ epistemic or doxastic alternatives of the speaker, i.e., worlds compatible with the speaker's beliefs or knowledge.} \]

b. \[ [\text{algún}] = \lambda P<et> \lambda Q<et>. \exists x[P(x) \land Q(x)] \]

**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].
   Teacher A comes to teacher B running:’
   (a) Teacher A: ¿Te has enterado? [*Algunos niños*]$_{K,93}$ se han perdido en el bosque.
   (b) Teacher A: ¿Te has enterado? [*Unos niños*]$_{K,13}$ 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) \[ [\text{alg-}] = \lambda R<et>. \lambda P<et>. \lambda Q<et>. R(P \land C)(Q); \text{ Implicature: } R(P \land C)(\{x: Q(x) = 0\}) \]

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. Algunos 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 pronoun is present:

(10) $\llbracket{\text{algunos}}\rrbracket = \text{algunos} + \text{pro}_I$, where I is a familiar property variable, i.e. I must be in \text{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), 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 (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 $\alpha_{\text{PL}}$ will be felicitous iff:

$\exists w_1, w_2 \in M(s): \llbracket \alpha_{\text{PL}} \rrbracket^{w_1} \neq \llbracket \alpha_{\text{PL}} \rrbracket^{w_2}$

Here the alternatives to $\alpha$ 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 $\alpha$ is a singular, the values assigned to $\alpha$ will be individuals in $D$. If we have a plural $\alpha_{\text{PL}}$, the values assigned to $\alpha_{\text{PL}}$ 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.