Some notes on *outro* in Portuguese

Laura Brugè
laurabrg@unive.it

Giuliana Giusti
giusti@unive.it
Department of Linguistics and Comparative Cultural Studies (Italy)
Ca' Foscari University of Venice (Italy)

ABSTRACT.
This paper studies the syntactic behavior of *outro(s)* in Brazilian and European Portuguese. Starting from the syntax of its Italian counterpart *un altro/(degli) altri*, we argue that *outro(s)* in prenominal position is neither an adjective nor a determiner, but an existential quantifier and that the presence of the indefinite article, *um outro/uns outros*, gives rise to a complex existential quantifier, like the corresponding Italian form. We also argue that *outro(s)* and *um outro/uns outros* do not specialize for different interpretations since they both substantially show the same ambiguity (one/some more or a/some different one(s)) and behave in the same way in relation to possible semantic interpretations typical of existential quantifiers.

KEYWORDS.
Adjective; determiner; (complex) quantifier; scope; partitive.

1. Introduction[1]

The lexical item "other" is a context dependent word, in the sense that when a speaker utters a nominal expression modified by it he/she is aware that the interlocutor knows the previous context of communication. Furthermore, in many languages, including the Romance languages, it is ambiguous from both the interpretative and the categorial points of view.

---

[1] We thank for data and insightful comments Ana Maria Brito, Vanessa Castagna, Matilde do Santos Miguel Sarmento, António Leal, Monica Muiz de Souza Sima, Aquiles Tescari Neto, Igor Porsette, and other informants who wished to remain anonymous. All remaining errors are exclusively ours. This research is part of the Department of excellence project Multilingualism, multiculturalism, linguistic and cultural diversity for the well-being of persons and society. https://www.unive.it/pag/40760/ of the Department of Linguistics and Comparative Cultural Studies.

From the semantic-interpretative point of view, it may refer to alterity with respect to the description of the nominal expressed previously in the communicative context – its referent – meaning "different" or it may express an additional value with respect to its referent meaning "one/some more".[2] From the point of view of the morphosyntactic category, it can be an adjective or a determiner.

As an adjective, Italian *altro* maintains the ambiguous meaning of "different" or "one/some more" when it is in prenominal position. When it is postnominal or predicative, it can only be interpreted as modifying the description: it can only mean "different" and never "one/some more":

(1) a. Devo risolvere questi altri due problemi.

   I-must solve these other two problems

   b. Devo risolvere questi due altri problemi.

   I-must solve these two other problems

(2) a. Ho due problemi altri da quelli che mi aspettavo.

   I-have two problems other from those that I expected

   b. Questi problemi sono altri rispetto a quelli che mi avevi prospettato.

   These problems are other from those that I expected

This freedom of order in the position of *altro* with adjectival function is not always found in other Romance languages. Portuguese (3) admits *outro* in postnominal position even if it cannot select a PP (3b-c).[3] "Other" in postnominal position without modifier is not allowed in any of the other languages taken in consideration. French (4) appear as liberal as Italian. Only the prenominal position in either order with respect to a cardinal is possible in Catalan (5). Only the prenominal position preceding the cardinal and the predicative function is possible in Spanish (6). In Romanian, *alt*

---

[2] Thus, a sentence such as "I would like to have another beer" is ambiguous as regards the wish of one more beer of the same type or a beer of a different type. Cinque (2015) refers to these two readings as "further token(s) of x (where x is some substance/entity/measure)" and "further type(s)/kind(s) of x (where x is some substance/entity/ measure) respectively". Cinque claims that the two meanings derive from different points of merger in the structure which roughly correspond to the two positions with respect to a numeral in "these other two beers" (viz. these two more beers) vs. "these two other beers" (viz. these two different beers).

[3] The complement PP in the other languages helps accepting the adjective in postnominal position. This difference is irrelevant to our discussion here and will not be considered.

precedes the cardinal in prenominal position (7a) and is not fully acceptable in postnominal position (7b). In predicative position (7c), it is only possible if it is inflected with the definite article, which does not convey referential interpretation here:

(3) a. Eu tenho que resolver esses outros dois problemas/ esses dois outros problemas.

b. Eu tenho dois problemas outros (*dos que eu esperava).

c. Esses problemas são outros (*dos que você me propôs).

(4) a. Je dois résoudre ces autres deux problèmes/ ces deux autres problèmes.

b. J'ai deux problèmes autres que ceux auxquels je m'attendais.

c. ?Ces problèmes sont autres de ceux que tu m'as proposés.

(5) a. He de resoldre aquests altres dos problemes/ altres dos problemes.

b.*Tinc dos problemes altres dels que esperava.

c. ???Aquests problemes són altres dels que em vau dir.

(6) a. Tengo que resolver estos otros dos problemas/ *?estos dos otros problemas.[4]

b. *Tengo dos problemas otros de los que esperaba.

c. Estos problemas son otros con respecto a los que me habías propuesto

(7) a. Trebuie să rezolv alte două probleme / ?²două alte probleme.

b. ?²Am două probleme alte decât mă așteptam.

c. Aceste probleme sunt alte*(le) decât cele la care mă așteptam.

As often noted in the literature, "other" can also function as a determiner in that it can be the first element in the nominal expression, unlike almost all the other determiner-like adjectives (e.g. the ordinal numerals) which cannot. In Italian, when the definite article is missing in (8a), the nominal expression receives indefinite interpretation. Note that in (8b) the article cannot be missing:

---

[4] The order *Card* > *otro* is documented in old Spanish. As regards contemporary Spanish, this same order is possible in some areas of Spain and Latin America. RAE-ASALE (2009:971) considers the order *otro* > *Card* to be preferable.

(8) a. Devo risolvere (gli) altri due problemi.
  I-must solve (the) other two problems
 b. Devo risolvere *(gli) ultimi due problemi
  I-must solve (the) last two problems
 c. Devo risolvere difficili problemi
  I-must solve difficult problems

The ungrammaticality of (8b) when the article is missing suggests that in (8a) *altri* is not a determiner-like adjective like *ultimi* and that the whole nominal expression is not a modified bare plural like the object in (8c) but something more similar to an existentially quantified expression.

The quantifier function of "other" in Italian is limited to plural *altri*. In the singular, the indefinite article *un* must precede *altro* (9a). On the contrary, Spanish "bare" *otro* is not only possible but mandatory (9b):

(9) a. Devo risolvere *(un) altro problema.
 b. Tengo que resolver (*un) otro problema.
  I-must solve (an) other problem

In the plural, Italian *altri* can be preceded by the plural indefinite determiner *dei*, while in Spanish, again, it cannot be preceded by *uns*:

(10) a. Devo risolvere (degli) altri problemi.
  b. Tengo que resolver (*unos) otros problemas.[5]
   I-must solve (some) other problems

French presents a mirror image of Spanish, since *autre(s)* must be preceded by the indefinite article in the singular and by partitive *de/des* in the plural:

(11) a. Je dois résoudre *(un) autre problème.
  b. Je dois résoudre *(des/d') autres problèmes.

_____

[5] In Spanish, the presence of the indefinite article *un(os)* with *otro(s)* is documented in the medieval and classical stages of the language (cf. Brugè, 2018, fn.13).

Portuguese displays optionality in both singular and plural:

(12) a. Eu tenho que resolver (um) outro problema.
    b. Eu tenho que resolver (uns) outros problemas.

Catalan is like Italian, with mandatory *un* in the singular and optional indefinite determiner in the plural (13):

(13) a. He de resoldre *(un) altre problema.
    b. He de resoldre (uns) altres problemes.[6]

Romanian displays optionality only in the singular and impossibility of the indefinite determiner in the plural (14):

(14) a. Trebuie să rezolv (o) altă problemă.
    b. Trebuie să rezolv (*nişte) alte probleme.

The observed variation in the co-occurrence of "other" with the indefinite determiner across Romance languages and the optionality of determiner insertion found in some languages but not in others raise the following questions:

    i. Despite the differences with respect to the cooccurrence with an indefinite determiner, can the categorial status of "other" be unified across Romance languages?
    ii. What is the property that establishes the insertion of the determiner? What makes it (im)possible? What makes it necessary?
    iii. Does optionality convey different interpretations?

In this paper, we adopt Brugè's (2018) comparative analysis of Italian and Spanish and extend it to Portuguese, leaving Romanian and Catalan

---

[6] In some varieties of Catalan it is also possible to use *de* in contexts like the one in (13b):
(i) He de resoldre (d')altres problemes.
In this work we will not address the linguistic implications due to the presence of *uns* or *de* in Catalan. We will leave this point to subsequent research.

for future research. Section 2 claims that singular *un altro* as well as plural *altri due*, *molti altri* and *degli altri* are complex existential quantifiers. The diagnostics used for Italian are those that distinguish existential quantifiers from other determiners, that is *ne*-extraction and the cooccurrence with a definite partitive phrase referring to the superset from which the variable of the quantifier is picked. In section 3, the two diagnostics are *mutatis mutandis* applied to Portuguese which does not have a partitive clitic but has an elliptic nominal in the complement of an existential quantifier. Section 4 turns to the issue of whether presence or absence of the indefinite article with *outro(s)* gives rise to true optionality or creates two different quantifiers that specialize for different interpretations. Section 5 draws the conclusions.

2. Section 2 *Altro* as part of complex quantifiers

In Italian, plural *altri* has the properties of existential quantifiers. Like *molti/pochi/alcuni*, it can combine with a partitive PP and must cooccur with *ne* if the noun is missing and the quantified expression is in object position (15). This makes it different from other determiners, such as demonstratives (16):

(15) a. Ho letto altri/molti/pochi/alcuni dei suoi libri.
           I-have read other/many/few/some of-the his books
      b. Di libri, *(ne) ho letti altri/molti/pochi/alcuni.
           Of books, NE I-have read other/many/few/some
(16) a. Ho letto questi (*dei) suoi libri.
           I-have read these of-the his books
      b. Di libri, (*ne) ho letti questi.
           Of books, NE I-have read these

Cardinaletti and Giusti (2006, 2017) argue that the quantifiers *molti, pochi, alcuni* are diadic predicates that select an indefinite DP (the variable) and assign partitive case to it, which is detected on the genitive morphology displayed by *ne* and on the (apparent) preposition *di* preceding the dislocated bare nominal. Such quantifiers take a second optional argument, the partitive PP, which refers to the definite superset out of which the variable is picked. In (17) we give simplified structures of *ne*-extraction and of a partitive construction:

(17) a. Ne ho letti [$_{QP}$ [$_{Q'}$ altri/molti/pochi/alcuni [$_{DP}$ ~~ne~~]].[7]

NE I-have read.M.PL other/many/few/some.M.PL

b. Ho letto [$_{QP}$ [$_{Q'}$ altri/molti/pochi/alcuni [$_{DP}$ 0 [$_{NP}$ ~~libri~~]]] [$_{PP}$ de- [$_{DP}$ i suoi [$_{NP}$ libri]]]].[8]

I-have read other/many/few/some of-   -the his   books

'I read other/many/few/some of them/of his books'

When the quantifiers are preceded by a definite article, they are functioning as adjectives; they modify the nominal expression and do not have selectional properties. For this reason, they cannot occur with a partitive PP or allow *ne*-extraction.

Not all quantifiers can have adjectival function. *Altri* does, on a par with *molti, pochi* and cardinals, as shown in (18a). *Alcuni* ('some') does not, on a par with universal *tutti* ('all') and *entrambi* ('both'), as shown in (18b):[9]

(18) a. Ho letto gli altri / i molti / i pochi / i due romanzi in programma.

I-have read the other / the many / the few / the two novels on syllabus

b. *Ho letto gli alcuni / i tutti / gli entrambi romanzi in programma.

I-have read the some / the all / the both novels on syllabus

As said above, quantity adjectives do not have the properties of their homonymous quantifiers. Thus, they cannot occur with a partitive PP (19a) or with *ne*-extraction (19b):

---

[7] The claim that *ne* is a DP and not a PP is further supported by the fact that it triggers past participle agreement like accusative clitics and unlike prepositional clitics, cf. Giusti (to appear).

[8] That the PP is a second complement of the quantifier is shown by the fact that it cannot be adjoined to any nominal expression as in *questi dei tuoi libri* ('*these of your books'). Also cf. (19).

[9] The adjectival function is unrelated to the existential vs. universal interpretation of the quantifier. In German the dual universal *beide* ('both') is ambiguous between quantifier and adjectival status, as shown by the different morphology and the different position with respect to the determiner displayed in (i)-(ii):

(i) Beide diese Kinder sind angekommen

  Both these children have arrived

(ii) Diese beiden Kinder sind angekommen

  These both children have arrived

This is one of many pieces of evidence across language that show that the existential vs. universal semantics is irrelevant to the categorial status of the quantity item.

(19) a. *Ho letto gli altri / i molti / i pochi / gli alcuni dei suoi libri.

      I-have read the other / the many / the few / the some of his books

    b. *Di libri, ne ho letti gli altri / i molti / i pochi / gli alcuni.[10]

      Of books, I-have read the other / the many / the few / the some

When *altri* combines with cardinals and existential quantifiers the orders are not free. The unmarked orders are *altri* > Card and Q > *altri* (20a)-(21a). The reverse order Card > *altri* is only possible with the interpretation of *altri* as "different" and not as "additional" (20b). The order *altri* > Q is marginal with *molti/pochi* and ungrammatical with *alcuni* (21b):

(20) a. Ho risolto altri due problemi.

    b. ?Ho risolto due altri problemi.

(21) a. Ho risolto molti/pochi/alcuni altri problemi.

    b. ??Ho risolto altri molti/pochi/*alcuni problemi.

This suggests that in this order the two quantifiers are independently inserted and the second one is a quantity adjective.

Following an insight by Giusti (1993) (also cf. Brugè 2018), we claim that *altri* > Card in (20a) and Q > *altri* in (21a) are complex quantifiers. In other words, they are not separately stacked in the nominal spine, as is the case of the reverse orders in (20b) and (21b), but are merged as complex heads or complex constituents.[11]

This claim is supported by the fact that they allow *ne*-extraction in (22) and cooccur with a partitive PP in (23), while this is not the case with the reversed orders which we claim to be the result of the stacking of a quantifier and a quantity adjective in (24b) and (25b).

(22) a. Ne ho risolti altri due.

    NE I-have solved other two

---

[10] Note that a definite article does not block extraction of a genitive *ne*: *Ne ho visto la sorella* (NE(=of him) I saw the sister). It cannot therefore be the reason for the ungrammaticality of (19).

[11] It is not crucial here to decide whether we are dealing with a complex head Q or a Q modified by a concording modifier in Spec, what is crucial is that *altri* > Card and Q> *altri* can be quantifiers, as we argue in the text, and also quantity adjectives.

    b. Ne ho risolti pochi altri.

      NE I-have solved few others

(23) a. Ho risolto altri due di questi problemi.

      I-have solved other two of these problems

    b. Ho risolto molti altri di questi problemi.

      I-have solved many others of these problems

In (24), the quantifier *due* precedes the quantity adjective *altri*, which is part of its DP complement. For this reason, *altri* cannot be left in place when the DP is realized as the clitic pronoun *ne* (24a) or as a silent *pro* in the presence of the partitive PP (24b):

(24) a. Ne ho risolti due (*altri).

      NE I-have solved two others

    b. Ho risolto due (*altri) di questi problemi.

      I-have solved two others of these problems

In (25), the quantifier *altri* precedes the quantity adjectives *molti, pochi* and *alcuni* which are part of the DP complement. For this reason, *molti, pochi* and *alcuni* cannot be left in place when the DP is realized as the clitic pronoun *ne* (25a) or as a silent *pro* in the presence of the partitive PP (25b):

(25) a. Ne ho risolti altri (*molti / pochi / alcuni).

      NE I-have solved other many/few/some

    b. Ho risolto altri (*molti/pochi/alcuni) di questi problemi.

      I-have solved others many/few/ some of these problems

We expect complex quantifiers to be language specific. For example, Italian universal quantifiers coordinate with cardinals building complex universal quantifiers, which select a definite DP, as in (26a), allow the extraction of an accusative clitic, such as *le* in (26b), and can float, as in (26c). All these properties characterize the universal and are not shared with the cardinal, thus absence of *tutte e* gives ungrammaticality in (26):

(26) a. Ho visto *(tutte e) tre le ragazze.
        I-have seen (all and) three the girls
    b. Le ragazze, le ho viste *(tutte e) tre.
        The girls, CL.ACC I-have seen.F.PL (all and) three
    c. Le ragazze sono arrivate *(tutte e) tre.
        The girls have arrived.F.PL (all and) three

If the formation of complex quantifiers is language specific, we are not surprized that in French the order Card > *autre* also allows extraction of *en* and cooccurrence with a partitive PP:

(27) a. J'en ai deux autres.
        I EN have two others
    b. ....régulièrement associé à un facteur anxieux et un facteur psychotique,
        qui sont deux autres de ces spécifications."
        that are two others of these specifications
        (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0013700613701131)

As observed in section 1, singular *altro* cannot function as a quantifier with count nouns (cf. (9a) above). However, *un altro* and its plural *degli altri* (for some speakers) show the same quantifier behaviour as plural *altri*, *altri* > Card and Q > *altri*. They are compatible with *ne* extraction (28a) and cooccur with a partitive PP (28b), with lower acceptability in the case of *degli altri*:

(28) a. Di colleghi di Maria,   ne vorrei   conoscere un altro / (degli) altri.
        Of colleagues of Maria, NE I-would-like to-know an other / (some) others
    b. Vorrei   conoscere un altro / (%degli) altri dei colleghi di Maria.
        I-would-like to-know an other / (some) others of-the colleagues of Maria

Two factors may cause the lower acceptability of *degli altri* in (28b). On the one hand, the partitive determiner (*di* + article), which is part of the complex quantifier, may for some speakers be incompatible with a partitive

PP, parallel to what we observe when it functions as a true quantifier.[12] On the other hand, economy of insertion may favour the simple quantifier *altri* over the complex quantifier *degli altri*. This does not apply to (28a) where the complex quantifier *un altro* is not in competition with a simple quantifier.

Let us organize the results of this section in a "protocol" fashion.[13]

TABLE 1 - *altra*/*o*/*e*/*i* in Italian

	(i) introduce a full nominal expression	(ii) allow *ne*-extraction	(iii) occur with a partitive PP
molti /*pochi* / *alcuni*	+	+	+
Card	+	+	+
altri	+	+	+
altro	-	0	0
Card > *altri*	%	-	-
molti /*pochi* / *alcuni* > *altri*	+	+	+
un altro	+	+	+
degli altri	+	+	%
altri > Card	+	+	+
altri > *molti* /*pochi*	+	-	-

The protocol in Table 1 presents three sections: a) simple quantifiers, b) complex quantifiers formed by an element preceding "other", c) complex quantifiers formed by an element following "other". Column (i) tells us

---

[12] The diagnostics for quantifier status distinguish indefinite determiners from existential quantifiers in Italian. With the plural indefinite determiner (*di* + art) it is not possible to have *ne*-extraction or the partitive PP:

(i) *Ne conosco degli.
    NE I-know of-the
    intended reading: 'I know some of them'
(ii) *Conosco degli dei ragazzi.
    I-know of-the of-the boys
    intended reading: 'I know some of the boys'

[13] A "protocol" in science is an established procedure, which applies in the same way with the same tools in different situations to ensure comparability. General linguistics is used to expressing correlations across phenomena and languages in table charts that display a +/- value. Giusti (2011, 2021, to appear) and in collaboration with others (Giusti and Zegrean 2015; Giusti and Di Caro 2015), proposes to go one step further in the appropriate design of the table charts, presenting the features of the elements under investigation in a reflected way. In the streamline of the search for parameters or implicational universals, the features of the protocol can be organized in clusters of properties that contribute to the understanding of parameter hierarchy and parametric variation.

whether the sequence is found in a full nominal expression. Columns (ii)-(iii) report the results of the diagnostics for existential quantifier status: *ne*-extraction and partitive PP. The symbol [+] means that the property gives grammatical results, [-] that it is ungrammatical, [%] that it is accepted only by some speakers, [0] that the property is irrelevant, due to lack of the base condition indicated as a [-] in column (i):

   3. *Un outro / uns outros* in Portuguese

Mutatis mutandis, let us apply the protocol in Table 1 to Portuguese *outro(s)*.

First of all, recall that in (12) we observed that Portuguese is half-way between Italian (which cannot have singular *altro* as a self-standing quantifier, cf. (9a)-(10a)) and Spanish (which does not form complex quantifiers with *otro(s)* preceded by an indefinite determiner, cf (9b)-(10b)). Thus, unlike Italian and parallel to Spanish, Portuguese allows singular *outro* without the presence of an indefinite determiner on a par with plural, as repeated here in (29):

   (29) a. Eu conheci outro amigo da Maria.
           I met other friend of-the Maria
       b. Eu conheci outros amigos da Maria .
           I met other friends of-the Maria

The grammaticality of (29a) in the singular suggests that bare *outro* is a quantifier, and not a prenominal adjective because bare singular nominals are ungrammatical in this context.[14] In (30) we observe that both singular and plural *outro(s)* are found in elliptic constructions with or without a partitive PPs:

   (30) a. Eu conheci outro (dos amigos da Maria).
           I met other (of-the friends of-the Maria)
       b. Eu conheci outros (dos amigos da Maria).
           I met others (of-the friends of-the Maria)

---

[14] The possibility of bare singular nouns is restricted to Brazilian Portuguese and has the interpretation of reference to kind (de Oliveira and Rothstein 2011 and the copious references therein). This is clearly not the case of (27a).

The elliptic construction in the absence of the PP in object position will be used as a diagnostic parallel to *ne*-extraction. We therefore conclude from (30) that bare *outro(s)* is a quantifier.[15]

As observed in (12) above, Portuguese is like Italian in that it allows *outro(s)* preceded by an indefinite determiner both in the singular and in the plural:

(31) a. Eu conheci um outro amigo da Maria.
　　　　I met an other friend of-the Maria
　　 b. Eu conheci uns outros amigos da Maria.
　　　　I met some others friends of-the Maria

The question arises as to whether they form complex quantifiers, parallel to Italian *un altro / degli altri,* or whether *outro(s)* in (31) is a prenominal adjective preceded by the indefinite determiner *um/uns*.

Our informants judge elliptic constructions in (32) as fully grammatical but insertion of a partitive PP is controversial, especially with the plural:

(32) a. Eu conheci um outro (??dos amigos da Maria).
　　　　I met an other (of-the friends of-the Maria
　　 b. Eu conheci uns outros (*dos amigos da Maria).
　　　　I met some others (of-the friends of-the Maria)

The inconsistency of the results of the two diagnostics may suggest that the complex quantifier *um outro / uns outros* only selects an indefinite DP and not a partitive PP. However, a google search reports many cases of singular *um outro* with a partitive PP, while the plural is much more sporadic (33):[16]

---

[15] The possibility that it can be analyzed as a determiner is excluded, since it can express a partitive PP, as (30) shows vs., for example, *Eu conheci esse/esses dos amigos da Maria* "I met this/these of-the friends of-the Maria".

[16] In google we found few cases of uns outros > partitive PP, some of them dating back to the nineteenth century and others in some blogs:

　　(i) Gostei desse macacao e uns outros dos seus anúncios, se eu comprar mais de um da pra fazer frete gratis?
　　https://produto.mercadolivre.com.br/MLB-1353270416-macaco-de-trico-linha-menino-bordado-urso-gravata-cores-_JM
　　'I liked this newborn onesie and some others of your ads, if I buy more than one may I have free shipping?'

(33) a. ...o mesmo deverá escolher um outro dos cursos ofertados.

..the same [student] will have to choose another one of the courses offered.

https://www.faculdadealfa.com.br/noticias-e-eventos/regulamento-de-sorteio-de-bolsas-de-estudo-para-a-alfa-faculdade-de-almenara-mg-2%C2%BA-semestre-2020

b. Segundo Leonardo Oliveira, um outro dos organizadores do evento é um brasileiro que mora nos Estados Unidos...

According to Leonardo Oliveira, another of the event's organizers is a Brazilian who lives in the USA ...

(https://www.dn.pt/portugal/brasileiros-em-portugal-manifestam-se-contra-corrupcao-e-fraude-eleitoral-4409483.html)

c. Sob este último, destaca-se um outro dos elementos mais reveladores do estilo Arte Nova,...

Under the latter, stands out another of-the elements most revealing of-the Art New...

(https://www.cm-ilhavo.pt/viver/cultura/patrimonio-edificado/arte-nova)

Recall that the same contrast was also found in Italian (28) with the singular, more easily combinable with a partitive PP, and the plural, less acceptable with a partitive PP. The comparison with Portuguese confirms the two hypotheses suggested for Italian above. For economy reasons, simple quantifiers display canonical selectional properties, complex quantifiers may have a reduced argument structure and may not select a partitive PP. For some Portuguese speakers this is the case of both singular and plural. Other speakers allow the partitive PP more easily with *um outro* than with *uns outros*. This may also be due to economy, if [+plural] is a marked choice of the Number feature specification. The different nature of the plural indefinite determiners (*di*+art in Italian and plural *uns* in Portuguese) does not seem to make any difference between the two languages.

The combination of *outro(s)* with cardinals and existential quantifiers gives the same orders we found in Italian, the orders Card > *outros* and *outros* > Card are both acceptable in full nominal expressions, with different interpretations:

(34) a. Eu conheci outros dois amigos da Maria.
          I met other two friends of-the Maria
      b. Eu conheci dois outros amigos da Maria.
          I met two other friends of-the Maria

Applying the diagnostics, we observe that all speakers accept *outros* > Card as a complex quantifier in an elliptic construction and combined with a partitive PP. Only some speakers accept *outros* > Card in elliptic constructions and even less with a partitive PP:

(35) a. Eu conheci outros dois (dos amigos da Maria).
          I met other two (of-the friends of-the Maria)
      b. Eu conheci dois outros (%dos amigos da Maria).[17]
          I met two other (of-the friends of-the Maria)

The data in (35) suggest that Portuguese complex quantifiers may have the order *outros* > Card, like in Italian or Card > *outros* like in French. The selection of the partitive PP, which is a diagnostic for full lexicalization as a complex quantifier is not available to all speakers in the case of Card > *outros*.

With *muitos* the order Q > *outro(s)* is preferred (36a), as in Italian (21). The order *outro(s)* > Q is possible (36b) but due to independent insertion of *outros* as a simple quantifier and *muitos* as a quantity adjective:

(36) a. Eu conheci muitos outros amigos da Maria.
          I met many other friends of-the Maria
      b. ²Eu conheci outros muitos amigos da Maria.
          I met other many friends of-the Maria

In elliptic constructions the order *outros* > Q is less acceptable, while the partitive PP is judged as ungrammatical by all of our informants:

---

[17] Matilde do Santos Miguel Sarmento provides us with the following real sentence from Linguateca, Projeto AC/DC: corpo CETEMPúblico: *par=ext792449-clt-soc-93b-1*:

(i) Esta missão do Discovery já realizou duas outras das operações previstas:...
    This Discovery mission has already carried out two others of the planned operations

(37) a. Eu conheci muitos outros (dos amigos da Maria).
        I met many other (of-the friends of-the Maria)
    b. ??Eu conheci outros muitos (*dos amigos da Maria).
        I met other many (of-the friends of-the Maria)

This confirms our hypothesis that *muitos outros* is a complex quantifier, while *outros muitos* in (37b) is due to independent insertion of the quantifier *outros* and the quantity adjective *muitos*. Prenominal quantity adjectives cannot appear as modifiers of elliptic constructions, parallel to what we observed in Italian (24)-(25) above.

We are now able to draw a protocol for *outro(s)* in Portuguese in Table 2, where *ne*-extraction is replaced by elliptic constructions. The differences are highlighted in yellow.

Unlike Italian singular *altro*, Portuguese *outro* can function as a quantifier. Unlike Italian plural *altri*, Portuguese *outros*, at least for some speakers, forms a complex quantifier with a preceding cardinal that does not easily combine with a partitive PP. The competition with bare *outro(s)* both in the singular and in the plural makes *um outro* less acceptable with a partitive PP in grammaticality judgement tasks, although it is robustly attested in a google search, while plural *uns outros* is only possible in elliptic constructions but not with a partitive PP:

TABLE 2 - *outro(s)* in Portuguese

		(i) introduce a full nominal expression	(ii) appear in elliptic constructions	(iii) select a partitive PP
	muitos	+	+	+
	Card	+	+	+
	outros	+	+	+
	outro	**+**	**+**	**+**
	Card > *outros*	+	+	**%**
	muitos > *outros*	+	+	+
	um outro	+	+	+/%
	uns outros	+	+	%/*
	outros > Card	+	+	+
	outros > *muitos*	+	-	-

The differences between the two languages are minimal and can be considered as nano-parameters in the sense of Biberauer and Roberts (2012), that is properties that are associated to single lexical items. In both Italian and Portuguese, "other" is categorially ambiguous, appearing in the function of a quantifier and combining with cardinals, quantifiers, and indefinite determiners to form complex quantifiers. The formation of a complex quantifier is costly in the lexicon and displays cross-speaker variation.

It is interesting to note that in our discussion with linguist native speakers of European and Brazilian Portuguese and in google search, there was no hint at a difference between the two otherwise quite different varieties of Portuguese. Controversial judgements (marked with % in the protocols) were equally distributed across our informants irrespective of their native variety.

4. Interpretive and syntactic differences between *outro(s)* and *um/uns outro(s)*

Given the variation between two forms (a bare and a complex quantifier), the question arises as to whether they are semantically equivalent to one another (and we are facing true optionality) or whether either form specializes for some of the many different nuances of indefiniteness. This is the topic of this section.

At the beginning of section 1, we reported the general interpretive ambiguity of "other" with respect to the fact that it may refer to "further token(s) of x" and "further type(s)/kind(s) of x" (cf. Cinque 2015 and fn.2). The first hypothesis to check is whether *um/uns* disambiguates these two readings. According to our informants' judgments, in 'out-of-the-blue' contexts the two readings are available independently of the presence or absence of the indefinite determiner, as the examples in (38)-(39) show:

(38) a. Quero outro(s) café(s).
    b. Quero um outro café/uns outros cafés.
       [ok]*I want one more/some more coffe(s)*
       [ok]*I want a different type of coffe /some coffes of (a) different type(s)*

(39) a. Eu li outro(s) livro(s).

    b. Eu li um outro livro/uns outros livros.

       [ok]*He read one more/some more book(s)*

       [ok] *He read a different type of book/ some books of (a) different type(s)*

However, most of our informants did suggest that the two forms are not totally synonymous. In commenting examples such as those in (40)-(41), they found that any referent can satisfy the description of the NP *amigo(s) da Maria* in (40), while in (41), a particular referent is suggested whose identity could possibly be determined:[18]

(40) a. Eu conheci outro(s) amigo(s) da Maria.

       I met other(s) friend(s) of-the Mary

    b. Chegou outro(s) amigo(s) da Maria.

       Arrived other(s) friend(s) of-the Mary

(41) a. Eu conheci um/(uns) outro(s) amigo(s) da Maria.

       I met an/(some) other(s) friend(s) of-the Mary

    b. Chegou um/(uns) outro(s) amigo(s) da Maria.

       Arrived an/(some) other(s) friend(s) of-the Mary

Moreover, in agreement with this type of interpretative paraphrase, which coincides with the description that is generally proposed to differentiate specific and non-specific indefinite nominal expressions, António Leal (p.c.) suggested, as an example, that the elliptic nominal expression *outro* in (42) admits both (a) and (b) as sentence completion, while *um outro* in (43) favours (b) over (a):

(42) No ano passado, comprei um telemóvel. Este ano, quero comprar *outro*,

    a. … mas ainda não sei qual irá ser.

    b. … o iPhone8.

(43) No ano passado, comprei um telemóvel. Este ano, quero comprar *um outro*,

    a. … [???]mas ainda não sei qual irá ser.

    b. … o iPhone8.

---

[18] We are indebted to Aquiles Tescari Neto for discussing this issue at length.

In the linguistic literature "specificity" has always proved to be a complex and controversial issue and up to now no uniform definition has been proposed to motivate the specific/non-specific distinction in indefinite nominal expressions. In formal semantics, Hellan (1981), Kripke (1977) and Fodor and Sag (1982)[19] treated the specific/non-specific dichotomy as scope ambiguity, due to the interaction between the indefinite article or a weak quantifier with another logical operator –intensional verbs, subjunctive mood, strong quantifiers, etc. However, in cases like (40)-(41) the interpretive ambiguity cannot be ascribed to a scopal effect. In fact, in extensional contexts, such as that determined by the verbs *conhocer* 'to know' and *chegar* 'to arrive', the existential import is not affected, because the existential generalization applies in both readings.

Farkas (2002) and Farkas and Brasoveanu (2013) define this as *epistemic specificity*.[20] According to the authors, epistemic specificity depends on speaker's knowledge or on his/her intention to mark the descriptive content of the indefinite nominal expression as salient. It is for this reason that they suggest that it should be treated by Pragmatics and not Semantics. The same authors propose that what is crucial for a general characterization of specificity in Semantics is scopal effects and partitivity. Following their proposal, in the rest of this section we apply these diagnostics to the indefinite nominal expressions introduced by *outro(s)* and by *um/uns outro(s)*. As we will show, none of these properties allows us to restrict the interpretation of *outro* to a non-specific reading and of *um/uns outro(s)* to a specific one.

4.1. Existential sentences

In European Portuguese existential sentences are a diagnostic for weak indefinites,[21] as they are in Spanish and English (cf. Milsark 1974). In (44)

---

[19] Hellan characterized a nominal expression as specific when the speaker has an individual in mind as its referent, while Kripke proposed that indefinites can refer to a *speaker referent*. Again, Fodor and Sag (1982), suggested that the indefinite nominal expressions can be ambiguous between a quantificational value, associated with the non-specific reading, and a referential value, associated with the specific reading. Neale (1990) argues against this hypothesis.

[20] The authors distinguish three type of *specificity*: epistemic specificity, scopal specificity and partitive specificity. Scopal specificity and partitive specificity will be examined below in the text.

[21] Brazilian Portuguese does not display a systematic definiteness effects with neither of the two existential verbs *haver* and *ter* that are used in this variety.

we observe that both singular *outro* and *um outro* pass the test. In (45) we observe that in the plural only bare *outros* passes the test, while *uns outros* does not:

(44) a. Há outro homem na rua.
    b. Há um outro homem na rua.
       'There is another man on the street.'
(45) a. Há outros homens na rua.
    b. *Há uns outros homens na rua.[22]
       'There are other men on the street.'

Note that *uns outros* in (45a) behaves differently from *uns*, which can introduce indefinite nominals in existential constructions (46a) provided it is not combined with a partitive PP which forces specific interpretation (46b):

(46) a. Há uns homens na rua.
     'There are some men on the street.'
   b. *Há uns dos homens na rua.
     'There are some of the men on the street.'

At first sight, the ungrammaticality of (45b) may suggest that the complex quantifier *uns outros* only conveys specific interpretation and for this reason it fails the diagnostics of existential contexts. However, note that (45b) is ungrammatical even for Brazilian informants, who admit definite (and specific) descriptions in the domain of existential verbs (cf. fn. 21). Moreover, as we present later in this section, *uns outros* can also appear in contexts that force non-specific interpretation.

---

[22] Notice that in Italian *degli altri* can appear in the domain of the existential verb *esserci* "there be", but this is not to be taken as a diagnostic for existential status, since existential sentences in Italian allow specific and even definite descriptions:
    (i)   Ci sono degli altri uomini per strada.
          There are of-the other men on street
    (ii)   Ci sono molti degli uomini per strada
          There are many of the other men on street
    (iii)   Ci sono tutti i miei studenti per strada.
          There are all the my students on street

4.2. Scope.

As observed in the linguistic literature, an existential quantifier introduces a variable or variables which must be assigned values by a set of assignment functions. When this element interacts with a universal quantifier its semantic scope can be different. This explains the ambiguity that (47) shows which can be spelled out as in (47a) or (47b):

(47) Todos os estudantes viram outro(s) menino(s).
     All the students saw another(some other) boy(s)
   a. "For every student there is another/some other boy(s) such that he saw him/them."
   b. "There is another boy(some other boys) such that every boy saw him(them)."

In (47a) the existential *outro(s) menino(s)* is interpreted within the scope of the universal quantifier *todos*. The narrow scope interpretation corresponds to the non-specific reading. In (47b), the indefinite expression is interpreted out of the scope of the universal. The wide scope interpretation corresponds to the specific reading. Therefore, given the ambiguity in (47), we can assume that *outro(s)* is ambiguous with respect to specificity. More precisely, both in the singular and in the plural it can be specific, as shown by the full acceptability of the continuation in (48):

(48) a. Todos os estudantes viram outro menino. Era muito jovem.
     b. Todos os estudantes viram outros meninos. Eram muito jovens.
        All the students saw another boy/some other boys. He/they was/were very young

In (48) the null subject of the copular sentence *Era muito jovem / Eram muito jovens* can be anaphoric to *outro menino/outros meninos* only if the indefinite (existential) is interpreted out of the scope of the universal quantifier *todos*. Therefore, in these contexts only specific interpretation is possible.

Some of the informants suggested that in a sentence like (49) the preferred interpretation of *um outro menino* and *uns outros meninos* is out of the

scope of the universal quantifier *todos*. However, other informants did not rule out the possibility of narrow scope interpretation for the indefinite direct object:

(49) a. Todos os estudantes viram um outro menino.

    b. Todos os estudantes viram uns outros meninos.

Furthermore, if *um outro/uns outros* could only trigger wide scope interpretation, we would expect it to be ungrammatical when the nominal expression is modified by a restrictive relative clause in the subjunctive mood.

Vilela (1995) observes that the indefinite direct object of the verb *procurar* "to look for" does not receive the same interpretation in (50a) when modified by a relative clause in the indicative and (50b) when it is modified by a relative clause in the subjunctive: [23]

(50) a. Procuro um homem que fala português.

    I'm looking for a man who speaks-IND portuguese

    b. Procuro um homem que fale português. (Vilela, 1995, p. 298)

    I'm looking for a man who speaks-SUBJ portuguese

The mood contrast reveals an interpretive difference in terms of specific/non-specific reading. In fact, (50a) conveys an inference that a man that speaks Portuguese exists and that the speaker is looking for him, i.e., the existential generalization applies. The same inference is not provided in (50b). In semantic terms, this difference is represented through scopal effects, that is, due to the presence of the indicative mood (50a), the indefinite nominal expression would take scope over the intensional predicate *procurar* "to look for"; thus, the result is a specific reading for the object DP. On the other hand, the presence of the subjunctive mood in (50b) forces the indefinite to be interpreted within the scope of the intensional predicate, and this gives

---

[23] The mood contrast was already noted by Quine (1956). See Rivero (1975) and Leonetti (2012) for Spanish, a.o. Also cf. Brugè and Brugger (1996:31-32) and references cited there for the relevance of mood in the distribution of accusative *a* in Spanish.

rise to a non-specific reading.

As regards *outro(s)*, a google search provides sentences like (51a-b), where it introduces a nominal expression modified by a restrictive relative clause in the subjunctive mood, alongside sentences like (51c-d), where the same element introduces a nominal expression modified by a restrictive relative clause in the indicative mood:

(51) a. Por vezes, até atribuem incompetência aos médicos porque desvalorizou determinado sintoma e *procuram outro médico que o valide.*
(https://www.atlasdasaude.pt/publico/content/o-que-e-hipocondria)
...and they look for another doctor who validate-SUBJ him.

b. Nesse sentido, os profissionais [...] *procuram outros países que melhor remunerem e dêem um ambiente favorável* à ciência,...
(https://www.imaginie.com.br/enem/exemplo-de-redacao/a-desvalorizacao-da-ciencia-no-brasil/911324)
...they look for other countries that pay-SUBJ better and provide-SUBJ a favorable   environment...

c. ...quando um médico se recusa a aplicar o tratamento que o paciente quer, por acreditar que tal causará a sua morte, e este *procura outro médico que o aplica,...*
(https://comum.rcaap.pt/bitstream/10400.26/28973/1/Eutan%C3%A1sia%20-%20a%20fronteira%20entre%20o%20direito%20%C3%A0%20vida%20e%20o%2C%20eventual%2C%20direito%20a%20morrer.pdf)
... and this [patient] looks for another doctor who applies-IND it,...

d. ...diante disso *procuram outros países que* disponibilizam preços inferiores.
https://eg.uc.pt/bitstream/10316/31709/1/DISSERTA%C3%87%C3%82O%20COMPLETA%20LARISE.pdf
...because of that, they look for other countries that offer-IND lower prices.

This confirms that *outro(s)* is ambiguous with respect to specifity.

The same result is abundantly found with the complex quantifier *um outro* (52a-b). With *uns outros* are less frequent but possible, as shown by (52c):[24]

_____

[24] Thanks to Aquiles Tescari Neto for suggesting us this example.

(52) a. Nele, as seis personagens do título, rejeitadas pelo dramaturgo que as criou, *procuram um outro autor que possa encenar as suas vida*.
(https://repositorio.ul.pt/bitstream/10451/36685/4/ulfl255464_td.pdf)
…they are looking for another author who can-SUBJ stage their lives.

 b. …ele *vai procura um outro profissional que consiga atente as necessidades dele que você não supriu*.
http://www.uel.br/grupo-estudo/cemidefel/tccs/bacharelado/2011/2011-tccedfbach067.pdf
…he will look for another professional who can-SUBJ meet his needs that you did not meet

 c. Eu procuro *uns outros pedreiros que possam me ajudar no trabalho*.
I'm looking for some other masons who can-SUBJ help me in the work

The well formedness of examples (51c-d) and (52) proves that it is the nature of the relative clause that is responsible for the semantic contrast (wide scope/specific and narrow scope/non-specific) and not the specialization of *outro(s)* for non-specificity or *um outro*/*uns outros* for specificity.[25]

A comparison with Italian gives the same result with *un altro*, *altri* and *degli altri*. In (53a) the indefinite is ambiguous between wide scope and narrow scope with respect to the universal quantifier *tutti*, while in (53b), where only wide scope interpretation is available, all three forms can appear:

(53) a. Tutti gli studenti hanno visto un altro ragazzo/altri ragazzi/degli altri ragazzi.
  ok "For every student there is another/some other boy(s) such that he saw him/them."
  ok "There is another boy(some other boys) such that every boy saw him(them)."
  All the students saw another(some other) boy(s)

---

[25] Another evidence that *um outro* and *uns outros* not necessarily trigger a specific reading is that they can introduce a nominal modified by *qualquer/quaiquer* that, according to Farkas and Brasoveanu (2013), do not make wide scope (specific) interpretation possible:
 (i) a. O menino queria ler um outro livro qualquer.
   The boy wanted to read another book any
  b. O menino queria ler uns outros livros quaisquer.
   The boy wanted to read some other books any

b. Tutti gli studenti hanno visto un altro ragazzo/altri ragazzi/degli altri ragazzi.
    Era/Erano molto giovane/giovani.
    All the students saw another boy/some other boys. He/they was/were very
    young

The same ambiguity is found with restrictive relative clauses in (54)-(55):

(54) a. Cerca un altro avvocato che l'aiuta nella causa di divorzio.
     b. Cerca un altro avvocato che l'aiuti nella causa di divorzio.
        He is looking for another lawyer who helps-IND/SUBJ him in the divorce case
(55) a. Cerca altri/degli altri articoli che parlano di lui.
     b. Cerca altri/degli altri articoli che parlino di lui.
        He is looking for other/some other articles which speak-IND/SUBJ of him.

Therefore, regarding scopal effects, the only difference between the two languages concerns the plural *uns outros*, that some informants consider specific (only wide scope) when it appears in the domain of a universal quantifier, while *degli altri*, which is unanimously ambiguous in the same contexts.

4.3. Partitivity

Farkas (2002) and Farkas and Brasoveanu (2013), argue that partitive is another property to determine the specific reading of the indefinite nominal expressions. The reason is that a partitive imposes a constraint on the set of the assignment functions that give value to the variable introduced by the indefinite nominal expression. In other words, partitive limits the possibilities of variation, given that in this case the variable must choose a value from a contextually established set.[26] Partitivity would correspond to Pesetsky's (1987) *D-Linking* interpretation.

According to this proposal and the interpretive intuition of the informants regarding the contrast between indefinites introduced by *outro(s)* and *um/ uns outros*, we would expect with the extentional verb *ler* to find that in (56a)

---

[26] Enç (1991) calls this type of interpretation "presuppositional interpretation".

the speaker does not presuppose the existence of a contextually established set of books (e.g. "the books that are on the shelf"), that coincides with the partitive specificity in terms of Farkas (2002) and Farkas and Brasoveanu (2013), while in (56b) the speaker does:

(56) a. O menino leu outro(s) livro(s).
     b. O menino leu um outro livro/uns outros livros.
       The boy read another/some other book(s)

However, if we force the partitive reading, by expressing, for example, an overt partitive PP, we observe that the indefinite direct object can be introduced by both *outro(s)* (57a) and *um outro* (57b) but not *uns outros*, which is ungrammatical for independent reasons, as we discussed in section 3:

(57) a. O menino leu outro/outros desses livros.
     b. O menino leu um outro desses livros.
       The boy read another/some others of these books
     c. O menino leu uns outros desses livros.
       The boy read some others of these books

Table 3 presents the protocol of the semantic properties of *(um/uns) outro(s)*. *Outro(s)* displays all the properties of an existential quantifier, it is ambiguous with respect to specificity, it can have wide or narrow scope, and can be merged with a partitive PP. *Um outro/uns outros* basically display the same properties, but for some speakers it conveys specific/wide scope interpretations, even if it is perfectly grammatical in non-specific nominal expressions modified by a subjunctive clause. *Uns outros* is the only form which is ungrammatical with an overt partitive:

TABLE 3 - Semantic behavior

	Existential sentences	Scope				Partitivity
		Universal Q		Relative clause		Overt partitive
		w.s. [+spec]	*n.s.* [-spec]	*Indicative w.s.* [+spec]	*Subjunctive n.s.* [-spec]	*n.s.*
outro	+	+	+	+	+	+
outros	+	+	+	+	+	+
um outro	+	+	%	+	+	+
uns outros	-	+	%	+	+	-

According to what we argued so far, the intuitive difference between the use of *outro/s* and *um/uns outro(s)* that speakers perceive in general contexts do not comply with the criteria that formal semantics propose to characterize the *specific/non-specific* distinction. There is no difference in acceptability between European and Brazilian Portuguese in this respect.

Furthermore, comparison with Italian shows that complex quantifiers are endowed with the same property of simple quantifiers in being ambiguously specific or non-specific. In both languages the plural complex quantifiers *degli altri* / *uns outros* are incompatible with overt partitive PPs, we claimed, for independent reasons, that is a reduced argument structure.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we studied the syntax of Portuguese in a comparative perspective with Italian.

We established that "other" is a quantifier which can build complex quantifiers in both Italian and Portuguese, combining with cardinals, existential quantifiers and indefinite determiners.

Considering the detailed discussion of *otro* in Spanish by Brugè (2018) and the data of other Romance languages in section 1, we give a positive answer to our first research question above and claim that, despite the

lexical differences, it is possible to unify the categorial status of "other" as a quantifier alongside its adjectival function.

We proposed that the mandatory / possible / impossible insertion of an indefinite determiner preceding "other" is to be reduced to nano-parameters associated to each of these lexical items. In Italian, Catalan and Romanian bare "other" is not specified as a quantifier in the singular, while it is in the plural. Determiner insertion gives rise to a complex quantifier, which must be specified as such in the lexicon. Complex quantifiers formed of an indefinite determiner and "other" are present in all Romance languages except Spanish. Such complex quantifiers may be the only possibility in French for both singular and plural, no optionality is present in this language. In Catalan and Italian, they are mandatory in singular and optional in plural, while in Romanian the optionality is limited to the singular. Optionality between simple and complex quantifiers in both singular and plural is only displayed by Portuguese:

TABLE 4 - Simple and complex 'other' in Romance

	singular		plural	
	other	det + other	others	det + others
Portuguese	+	+	+	+
Spanish	+	-	+	-
Catalan	-	+	+	+
French	-	+	-	+
Italian	-	+	+	+
Romanian	+	+	+	-

Our answer to the second research question resorts to lexical feature specifications on simple and complex quantifiers. The nano-parametric hypothesis also derives the different orders found in complex quantifiers formed of "other" and cardinals or existential quantifiers.

Portuguese has provided the most relevant empirical field to give an answer to our third question, that is whether optionality between a simple and a complex quantifier gives rise to different interpretations. Despite the classic ambiguity of "other" and the different possible semantic

interpretations typical of existential quantifiers, we concluded that both simple and complex quantifiers formed with the indefinite determiners are substantially ambiguous and do not specialize for any of the possible interpretations.

We analyzed the ungrammaticality of *uns outros / degli altri* with a partitive PP to a reduced argument structure associated to this quantifier in the Portuguese and the Italian lexicon.

More research is needed to confirm our proposal in the pan-Romance perspective applying the protocols in a detailed fashion to French, Catalan and Romanian.

REFERENCES

Biberawer, T. & Roberts, I. 2012. Towards a parameter hierarchy for auxiliaries: diachronic considerations. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 6: 267-294, https://www.mmll.cam.ac.uk/files/copil_6_9_biberauerroberts.pdf.

Brugè, L. 2018. *Otro*: Consideraciones a favor de su no inclusión en la categoría Determinante. *Borealis*, 7/2: 109-134.
https://septentrio.uit.no/index.php/borealis/article/view/4582

Brugè, L. & Brugger, G. 1996. On the accusative *a* in Spanish. *Probus* 8: 1-51.

Cardinaletti, A. & Giusti, G. 2006. The syntax of quantified expressions and quantitative clitics. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol 5. Oxford: Blackwell, 23-94.

Cardinaletti, A. & Giusti, G. 2016. The syntax of the Italian indefinite determiner *dei*. *Lingua* 181: 58-80.

Cardinaletti, A. & Giusti, G. 2017. Quantified expressions and quantitative clitics. In Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Second Edition, Wiley online library, DOI:10.1002/9781118358733 (1-42).

Cardinaletti, A. & Giusti, G. 2018. Indefinite determiners, variation and optionality in Italo-Romance. In Roberta D'Alessandro and Diego Pescarini (eds.) *Advances in Italian Dialectology,* Sketches of Romance Grammars vol 1. Amsterdam: Brill, 135-161

Cardinaletti, A. & Giusti, G. 2020. Indefinite determiners in informal Italian. A preliminary approach. *Linguistics* 58.3: 679-712.

Cinque, G. 2015. A note on 'other'. In Guglielmo Cinque (ed.) *Charting the Landscape of Linguistics*. *Webschrift for Josef Bayer*. Konstanz: Universität Konstanz, 22-27.

Chierchia, G. 1997. Partitives, reference to kinds and semantic variation. In: Aaron L. (ed.) *Proceedings of Semantics And Linguistic Theory*, Volume VII, Ithaca, NY. Cornell University: CLC Publications, 73-98. .

Di Caro, V. & Giusti, G. 2015. A protocol for the Inflected Construction in Sicilian Dialects. *Annali di Ca' Foscari Serie Occidentale* 49: 293-322.

Enç, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 1-26.

Farkas, D. 2002. Specificity distinctions. *Journal of Semantics* 19: 1-31.

Farkas, D. & Brasoveanu, A. 2013. "A Typology of Specificity". *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 58.4: 355-369.

Fodor, D. & Sag, I. 1982. "Referential and quantificational indefinites". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5: 355-398.

Giusti, G. 1993. *La sintassi dei determinanti*. Padova, Unipress.

Giusti, G. 2011. Structural Protocols for linguistic awareness enhancing language identity. Research project at CRASSH, University of Cambridge, October-December 2011. http://www.crassh.cam.ac.uk/people/profile/giuliana-giusti

Giusti, G. 2021. A protocol for indefinite determiners in Italo-Romance. In Tabea Ihsane (ed.) *Disentangling Bare Nouns and Nominal Introduced by a Partitive Article*, Syntax and Semantics vol. 43 Leiden: Brill, 262-300.

Giusti, Giuliana. (to appear). "Partitivity in Italian. A protocol approach to a multifaceted phenomenon". In: Giuliana Giusti and Petra Sleeman (eds.) *Partitive determiners, partitive pronouns and partitive Case*. Berlin, De Gruyter.

Giusti, G. & Zegrean, L. 2015. "Syntactic Protocols to enhance inclusive cultural identity. A case study on Istro-Romanian clausal structure". *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali* 1: 117-138.

Hellan, L. 1981. "On Semantic Scope". In Frank Heny (ed.) *Ambiguities in Intensional Contexts*. Reidel, Dordrecht, 47-81.

Keenan, E. L. 1987. A semantic definition of "indefinite NP. In Eric J. Reuland and Alice G. B. ter Meulen (eds.) *The Representation of (In)definiteness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 286-317.

Kripke, S. 1977. Speaker's reference and semantic reference. In Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling Jr and Howard K. Wettstein, (eds.) *Midwest Studies in Philosophy vol. II: Studies in the philosophy of language*. Morris, MN, University of Minnesota, 255-276.

Leonetti, M. 2012. Indefiniteness and Specificity. In José Ignacio Hualde, Antxon Olarrea and Erin O'Rourke (eds.) *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics*. Hoboken NJ, Wiley-Blackwell, 285-305.

Milsark, G. 1974. *Existential sentences in English*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. MIT, Cambridge.

Neale, S. 1990. *Descriptions*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D. 1987. Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In Eric J. Reuland and Alice G. B. ter Meulen (eds.) *The Representation of (In)definiteness*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 98-129.

Quine, W. van Orman. 1956. Quantifiers and propositional attitudes. *Journal of Philosophy* 53. (Reprinted in W. Quine, *The ways of paradox*, 185-196). Harvard University Press, 1976.)

Rivero, M. 1975. Referential properties of Spanish noun phrases. *Language* 51: 32-48. (Revised Spanish version: Referencia y especificidad, in *Estudios de gramática generativa del español*, (pp. 123-158). Madrid: Cátedra, 1978.)

Vilela, Mário. 1995. *Gramática da língua portuguesa*. Coimbra, Almedina.

Zamparelli, R. 2008. *Dei ex-machina*: a note on plural/mass indefinite determiners. *Studia Linguistica* 63.3: 301-327.