

Introduction

The interaction of durative temporal phrases with episodic telic predicates results in anomalous sentences whenever the object is not a bare plural.

- (1) a. Ana killed mosquitoes for an hour.
- b. # Ana killed the mosquitoes for an hour.

(Rioplatense) Spanish provides an interesting puzzle in this realm. At first sight, it behaves exactly as English in relation to bare and definite plurals:

- (2) a. Ana mató mosquitos durante una hora.
Ana killed mosquitoes for an hour.
'Ana killed mosquitoes for an hour.'
- b. # Ana mató los mosquitos durante una hora.
Ana killed the mosquitoes for an hour
'Ana killed the mosquitoes for an hour.'

However, the judgment of (2b) improves significantly when the definite phrase is differentially marked with the preposition-like element "a" (*i.e.*, a case of DOM).

- (3) a. Ana mató a los mosquitos durante una hora.
Ana killed DOM the mosquitoes for an hour
'Ana killed the mosquitoes for an hour.'

Two accounts

- According to Carlson (1977) and Dowty (1979), *a.o.*, the deviance of (1b) is due to the relative scope of the noun phrases and the durative phrase. For the sentence to be true, there has to be the case that for every t within the temporal phrase there has to be $P(x)$.
- Verkuyl (2005), Van Geenhoven (2004), and Van Geenhoven (2005, *a.o.*) claimed that given that bare plural are divisible and cumulative entities, they can be distributed in every t within the temporal phrase.

Relevance of the data

- It has been observed that indefinite DPs with DOM tend to induce wide-scope readings (Bleam 2005, Rodríguez-Mondoñedo 2007, López 2012, among many others), which reduces the plausibility of explaining this behavior in terms of the relative scope of the operators.
- (4) a. $\forall > \exists / * \exists > \forall$
Cada profesor reprobó un estudiante.
each professor failed a student
 - b. $\forall > \exists / \exists > \forall$
Cada profesor reprobó a un estudiante.
every professor failed DOM a student
'every professor failed a student.'
- Definite objects with DOM do not necessarily induce the reading of homogeneous entities, as would be expected according to the alternative analysis of the phenomenon.
- (5) a. Ana mató los mosquitos en diez minutos.
Ana killed the mosquitoes in ten minutes.
'Ana killed the mosquitoes in ten minutes.'
 - b. Ana mató a los mosquitos en diez minutos
Ana killed DOM the mosquitoes in ten minutes.
'Ana killed the mosquitoes in ten minutes.'
- (6) a. Ana estaba matando los mosquitos $\nrightarrow$ Ana mató los mosquitos
Ana was killing the mosquitoes $\nrightarrow$ Ana killed the mosquitoes
 - b. Ana estaba matando a los mosquitos $\rightarrow$ Ana mató a los mosquitos
Ana was killing DOM the mosquitoes $\rightarrow$ Ana killed the mosquitoes

Background

The literature on Spanish DOM observes that, in certain contexts, marked objects occurs in multiple event readings:

- (7) a. Laura escondió a un prisionero durante dos años.
Laura hid DOM a prisoner for two years
 - b. Laura escondió un prisionero durante dos años.
Laura hid a prisoner for two years
'Laura hid a prisoner for two years.'
- (Torrego, 1998)
- (8) a. El chico abrazó a las columnas.
The kid hugged DOM the columns
 - b. El chico abrazó las columnas.
The kid hugged the columns
'The kid hugged the columns.'
- (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, 2007)

DOM and individuation

Event multiplication

Uno a uno (One by one)

- (9) a. # Pedro mató los mosquitos uno a uno.
Pedro killed the mosquitoes one by one
'Pedro killed the mosquitoes one by one.'
- b. Pedro mató a los mosquitos uno a uno
Pedro killed DOM the mosquitoes one by one
'Pedro killed the mosquitoes one by one.'

Predicate quantification

- (10) a. # Cada vez que mato los sapos mi casa se llena de mosquitos.
each time that kill the toads my house REFL fills with mosquitoes
'Every time I kill the toads, my house fills with mosquitoes.'
- b. Cada vez que mato a los sapos mi casa se llena de mosquitos.
each time that kill DOM the toads my house REFL fills with mosquitoes
'Every time I kill the toads, my house fills with mosquitoes.'

(Non-)Maximality

Zombie reading

- (11) a. # Pedro mató los mosquitos pero lo volvieron a picar.
Pedro killed the mosquitoes but CL.ACC returned to bite
'Pedro killed the mosquitoes. But they bit him again.'
- b. Pedro mató a los mosquitos pero lo volvieron a picar.
Pedro killed DOM the mosquitoes but CL.ACC returned to bite
'Pedro killed the mosquitoes. But they bit him again.'

Except

- (12) a. # Juan mató las moscas que había en su casa excepto a esta.
Juan killed the flies that were in his house except DOM this
'Juan killed the flies that were in his house. Except for this one.'
- b. Juan mató a las moscas que había en su casa excepto a esta.
Juan killed DOM the flies that were in his house except DOM this
'Juan killed the flies that were in his house. Except for this one.'

Preliminary analysis

We argue that the contrast between (2b) and (3) is due to the semantic nature of marked objects.

Similarly to indefinite DOM DPs, 'a' mark is placed in D head inside αP , a projection above VP (López 2012). Unlike indefinite DOM DPs which select a certain individual through choice function (López 2012), definite DOM DPs allow access to the atoms (or sums of atoms) of the definite plural, resulting in a meaning similar to that of a partitive structure.

That is to say, 'a' mark takes properties and returns a subset of the maximal sum (*i.e.*, a part of the definite plural).

- (13) a. $\lambda P \lambda x [\leq (x, \iota P)](\text{mosquitoes})$
- b. $\lambda x [\leq (x, \iota \text{mosquitoes})]$

Then, since it occupies an argument position, it should be shifted into e via $\exists$ closure (following Chierchia 1997).

This explains the multiple event readings. In contexts where there is a sum of events of killing, each event of killing applies to an (unbounded) portion of the total sum, rather than to the entirety of the sum (*i.e.*, the maximal sum).

Conclusions

In this presentation we have shown that definite plural DOM DPs also allows for individualization.

We have presented evidence in support of this hypothesis. First, definite plural DOM DPs allows event multiplication. Second, these DPs does not express maximal sums.

We argue that, unlike indefinite DOM DPs, definite plural DOM DPs select a part of the maximal sum, which is then existentially closed.

Our analysis explains the multiple event readings and the fact that these DPs does not express maximal sums.

References

- Bleam, Tonia M. (2005). "The role of semantic type in differential object marking". In: *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 19.1, pp. 3–27.
- Carlson, Greg N. (Jan. 1977). "A unified analysis of the English bare plural". In: *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1.3, pp. 413–457. ISSN: 1573-0549. DOI: 10.1007/BF00353456. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00353456>.
- Chierchia, Gennaro (1997). "Partitives, reference to kinds and semantic variation". In: *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, pp. 73–98.
- Dowty, David R. (1979). "The semantics of aspectual classes of verbs in English". In: *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ*. Springer, pp. 37–132.
- López, Luis (2012). *Indefinite objects: Scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking*. MIT Press Cambridge.
- Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, Miguel (2007). "The Syntax of Objects: Agree and Differential Object Marking". PhD thesis. University of Connecticut.
- Torrego, Esther (1998). *The Dependencies of Objects*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, p. 193.
- Van Geenhoven, Veerle (2004). "For-adverbials, frequentative aspect, and pluractionality". In: *Natural language semantics* 12.2, pp. 135–190.
- (2005). "Atelicity, pluractionality, and adverbial quantification". In: *Perspectives on aspect*. Ed. by H J Verkuyl, H De Swart, and A Van Hout. Springer Science & Business Media, pp. 107–124.
- Verkuyl, Henk J (2005). "Aspectual composition: Surveying the ingredients". In: *Perspectives on aspect*, pp. 19–39.