'Alone' semantics, but not semantics alone

The study of the Romance element *seul/solo/da solo/sozinho* 'alone' is relevant for a number of issues in semantics and morpho-syntax; yet, this element is still underinvestigated. In this talk, we focus on the Italian (It) *da solo* and its Brazilian Portuguese (BP) counterpart *sozinho*, which can lead to various interpretations: in (1i) Bruno is physically alone; in (1ii) no one is sharing the bread with Bruno; in (1iii) Bruno eats the bread without other food.

- (1) Bruno mangia il pane **da solo** [It], Bruno come o pão **sozinho** [BP] 'Bruno eats the bread ALONE'
 - i. Bruno is alone while eating spatial interpretation
 - ii. Bruno eats the bread by himself argument sensitive (Bruno is the only agent)
 - iii. Bruno does not combine other food with the bread argument sensitive (the bread is the only theme)

'Alone' has been explored with respect to 'focus' interpretations in English [1,2] – unavailable in (1) - and its cross-linguistic spatial reading [3], but without focus on Romance. In Italian, some attention has been drawn to the anaphor *da sé* [4]. However, unlike *da solo*, this element lacks spatial interpretations and is solely subject-oriented, thus disallowing (1i) and (1iii).

We propose a twofold treatment of *da solo/sozinho* as an indexical referring to the spatial-social environment of the event - as in (1i) - and as a function applying to predicate arguments resulting in an exclusive interpretation - as in (1ii)-(1iii). Although distinct, these two interpretations share the same core meaning $\neg \exists y \neq x$, in line with [3].

Spatial-alone – This interpretation is restricted to predicates that denote an event happening in a physical space; e.g., events that cannot be associated to the question 'where?' disallow the spatial-alone (2). The spatial reading largely relies on socially and pragmatically relevant contexts [3]: (3) is acceptable in a scenario where no one contextually relevant is in Rome with Bruno. Similarly, (1i) can be true if Bruno is eating in a crowded restaurant, but none is sitting at his table. These interpretations are captured by our analysis in (4): the R predicate selects contextually relevant entities, excluded from the location l and time t where the subject (x) is located.

- (2) Bruno ha paura dei ragni [- #dove? # Bruno ha paura dei ragni da solo] [It] Bruno tem medo de aranha [- #onde? #Bruno tem medo de aranha sozinho] [BP] 'Bruno is afraid of spiders' [- #where? # Bruno is afraid of spiders ALONE]
- (3) Bruno è a Roma da solo [It], Bruno está em Roma sozinho [BP] 'Bruno is in Rome ALONE'
- (4) [[spatial-da solo]] = $\lambda l \lambda x \lambda t$: (loc_t(x) $\subset l \land \neg \exists y (R(y) \land loc_t(y) \subset l \land y \neq x)$)

Argumental-*alone* – Argumental-*alone* accounts for the exclusive interpretations that are not linked to spatial factors, such as (1ii) and (1iii).

With transitive verbs, *da solo/sozinho* may apply to the subject (1ii) or to the object (1iii), where no other entity is to be understood as agent or theme, respectively.

With intransitive verbs, *da solo/sozinho* applies to the entity denoted by the subject, excluding the existence of an(other) entity as agent/cause of the event. Thus, as the possible negation statements below show, *da solo/sozinho* leads to different interpretations with unergatives (5) or unaccusatives (6) – classified here based on auxiliary selection, *ne*-partition and reduced relatives [5,6].

- (5) Bruno ha lavorato da solo Bruno trabalhou sozinho 'Bruno worked ALONE'
 - no, Bea also worked
 - -#no, Bea caused him to work
- (6) Bruno è caduto da solo Bruno caiu sozinho 'Bruno fell ALONE'
 - #no, Bea also fell
 - no, Bea caused him to fall

[It]

[BP]

Reflexives get a similar interpretation to unaccusatives (7). As (8) shows, argumental-*alone* may also apply to passive constructions, restricting the interpretation of the subject as the only theme of the predicate.

(7) Bruno si ringrazia da solo
Bruno se agradece sozinho
'Bruno thanks himself ALONE'
- #no, Bea also thanks herself
- no, Bea thanks Bruno

(8) Il vino deve essere bevuto da solo
O vinho deve ser bebido sozinho
(The wine must be drank ALONE'
- no, it must be drunk with water
- #no, it must be drunk in company

We account for this pattern proposing that the interpretation of the argumental-*alone* relies on two main factors: argumental position and agentivity. Firstly, when *da solo/sozinho* applies to a theme, it excludes the existence of an agent acting upon it (6)-(7), unless there is an entity (different from the theme) that is already understood as the agent of the event (1iii),(8). Secondly, with non-agentive predicates, the argumental-*alone* excludes the possibility of an identifiable cause for the event (6).

The possible argumental interpretations of *alone* are summarized in (9):

(9) a. $\lambda P \lambda e \lambda x$: (P(e) \wedge Agent(e, x) $\wedge \neg \exists y$ (Agent(e,y) $\wedge y \neq x$) b. $\lambda P \lambda e \lambda x \lambda z$: (P(e) \wedge Agent(e, z) \wedge Theme(e, x) $\wedge \neg \exists y$ (Theme(e,y) $\wedge y \neq x$) c. $\lambda P \lambda e \lambda x$: (P(e) \wedge Theme(e, x) $\wedge \neg \exists y$ ((Agent(e,y)) \vee Cause(e,y)) $\wedge y \neq x$)

The distribution and interpretations emerging with *da solo/sozinho* can shed light on different theoretical questions in semantics or morpho-syntax. For instance, the analogous interpretations of (6) and (7) lend support to an unaccusative treatment of Romance reflexives. Unlike under the focus interpretation of the French *seul* [7], reflexive verbs with argumental-alone match with unaccusatives.

Argumental-alone can also provide insights on the semantic characterization of natural reflexives (10), for which da solo/sozinho rules out the disjoint reference interpretation which may be exhibited by this class of verbs [8]. In (6) Bruno is understood as the agent of the event regardless of the presence of da solo/sozinho. With the natural reflexive 'to depilate', however, a co-reference between agent and patient is obligatory only in (10b). This contrast is evident both in Italian and BP, although only the latter presents a morpho-syntactic difference between the verbs in (7) and (10).

(10) a. Bruno si è depilato b. Bruno si è depilato da solo [It]
Bruno depilou Bruno depilou sozinho [BP]
'Bruno depilated (himself)' 'Bruno depilated (himself) ALONE'
[context: he went to the beautician] [context:#he went to the beautician]

Conclusion – Our account sets the grounds for the study of *da solo/sozinho* and its Romance counterparts, an under-researched domain. We present a treatment of *da solo/sozinho* as a social-spatial indexical and as an argumental function that share the same core meaning $\neg \exists y \neq x$ proposed by [3]: it excludes any entity other than its referent from a social-spatial environment or from an argumental position. The different interpretations emerging from this core meaning depend on argument structure and thematic roles associated with the arguments, providing a possible diagnostic for the underlying structure of different constructions.

References: [1] Moltmann (2004). The semantics of together. *NLS*. // [2] Coppock & Beaver (2014). Principles of the exclusive muddle. *JoS*. // [3] Cisneros, Grinsell, Grove, Saebo, Vardomskaya & Zhang (2013). "Alone": an analysis. *Ms*. // [4] Chierchia (2004) A Semantics for Unaccusatives. *The unaccusativity puzzle*. // [5] Burzio (1986). *Italian syntax*. Springer. // [6] Embick (2004). Unaccusative syntax and verbal alternations. *The unaccusativity puzzle*. // [7] Sportiche D. (2014) Assessing Unaccusativity and Reflexivity. *LI*. // [8] Spathas, Alexiadou & Schäfer (2015). Middle Voice and reflexive interpretations. *NLLT*.