

The smoking gun: The Romanian connection

Alexander Grosu* and Ion Giurgea**

* Tel-Aviv University

** The “Iorgu Iordan - Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics
of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest

The literature on ‘amount’ relatives initiated by Carlson (1977) has widely, albeit not exclusively, entertained the view that the analysis of constructions like (1) and (2) needs to involve some form of abstraction over degrees within the relative CP.

- (1) a. It will take us a lifetime to drink [the (amount of) wine they spilled last night].
b. We will need a century to recruit [the (number of) soldiers that the Chinese paraded _ last May Day].

(2) [The three students (that) there are now in the office] arrived an hour ago.

The amount status of data like (1), where the bracketed DP denotes an amount/number of stuff/entities that is identical to the amount/number of entities defined within CP, without (necessarily) assuming identity of the very stuff/entities, has not, as far as we know, been challenged. In contrast, some scholars, in particular McNally (2008), have expressed skepticism that the analysis of data like (2), where the individuals denoted by the complex DP are the very individuals defined within CP, needs to involve degrees in any way, rejecting the analysis of such data in Grosu & Landman (1998, forth.), which appeals to degrees. The goal of this talk is to provide evidence that individual-denoting complex DPs that have the semantic properties of the DP in (2) and make incontrovertible use of abstraction over degrees exist in at least one natural language (Romanian), and must thus be allowed by UG.

This demonstration is made possible by the fact that Romanian possesses inflected relative pronouns specialized for abstraction over quantities (*cât/câți*, wh-forms that can also be used as interrogatives, in which case they are translatable by ‘how much/many’), which may be used, under certain circumstances, in counterparts of both (1) and (2). It will be demonstrated that such Romanian counterparts of (2) exhibit two crucial properties of the latter which Grosu & Landman proposed to trace to a process of Maximalization within CP: [i] infelicity of existential force of the complex DP, and [ii] infelicity of stacking or coordination of multiple such CPs with proper intersective import. Examples of felicitous Romanian data comparable to (2) are provided in (3), and the effects [i]-[ii] are demonstrated in (4)-(5), where the Romanian data exhibit the relevant properties of the corresponding English translations. We stress that the relative CPs are **not** construed appositively, the students waiting at the door in, say, (3) being not merely as numerous as those who are losing patience, but necessarily the very same individuals.

(3) [Cei zece studenți *câți* așteaptă la ușă] își pierd răbdarea.
the.M.PL ten students *how-many* wait at door REFL lose patience-the
‘The ten students that are waiting at the door are losing patience.’

(4) [#(Cei) zece soldați *câți* sunt acum pe baricadă] n-au mâncat de trei zile.
the ten soldiers *how-many* are now on barricade not-have eaten of three days
‘[#(The) ten soldiers there are now on the barricade] have not eaten for 3 days.’

(5) [Toți turiștii *câți* se aflau pe vapor la 3 pm #(și) all tourists-the *how-many* REFL found on boat at 3 pm (and) *câți* se aflau pe insulă la 2 pm] au ajuns târziu acasă.
how-many REFL found on island at 2 pm have arrived late home
‘[All the tourists that *there* were on the boat at 3 pm #(and) that *there* were on the island at 2 pm] returned home late.’

Regarding (4), we note that without the article *cel*, the relative is necessarily interpreted appositively - “ten soldiers, which is the number of soldiers that are now on the barricade,

haven't eaten for 3 days". Crucially, it cannot mean "ten of the soldiers that are now on the barricade", an interpretation available for a run-of-the-mill restrictive relative (e.g., one introduced by *care* "which").

Regarding (5), we note that if the tourists a, b, c were on the boat and b, c, d were on the island, the complex DP in the full (coordinate) version can only denote the sum of a, b, c, d, obtained by union, but not the sum of c, b, obtained by intersection.

A similar treatment of the types in (2) and (3) is supported by another property they share, the necessary 'reconstruction' of the CP-external (numeral/quantitative)+noun constituent inside the relative clause. Evidence for reconstruction comes from examples where relativization takes place from an existential construction, where the gap necessarily scopes below negation:

(6) [The five children {who are not/ # that there aren't} in the room] are having lunch.

A diagnostic contexts for a weak/existential reading in Romanian is the object of *avea* 'have' when it takes relational nouns or is i-level; a weak (narrow scope) reading is also strongly favored for an indefinite subject of *a-i lipsi* 'lack+Dative'. (7) shows that a *cât*-relative in these cases necessarily involves reconstruction:

(7) #[Cei 5000 de admiratori *câți* {n-a avut actrița /
the 5,000 of admirers how-many not-has had actress-the
i-au lipsit actriței}] au votat pentru alta.
CL.DAT-have lacked actress-the.DAT have voted for another-one(F)

'#The 5,000 admirers that the actress {didn't have, lacked} voted for another.'

Examples of the type in (6) and (7) can be salvaged by embedding in modal contexts, which allow the existence in a possible world of the (plural) entity whose existence in the real world is denied:

(8) a. [The fifty soldiers that there weren't on the barricade when the enemy attacked] would have sufficed to check its advance.

b. [Cei 5000 de admiratori *câți* {n-a avut actrița / i-au lipsit
the 5,000 of admirers how-many not-has had actress-the CL.DAT-have lacked
actriței}] ar fi putut să-i asigure un Oscar.
actress-the.DAT would be could SBJV-CL.3SG.DAT ensure an Oscar

'The 5,000 admirers that the actress {didn't have, lacked} could have got her an Oscar.'

Finally, we will present and discuss some differences in distribution between *cât/câți* and the English \emptyset and *that* relativizers, which are related to the featural differences between *cât/câți* and Engl. \emptyset /*that* (the former are pronouns or determiners specified as +quantity, the latter are an underspecified operator/complementizer respectively): *cât/câți* require an overt specification of the quantity in the matrix DP (see *zece, 5000* in the examples (3)-(4), (7), (8)b) or the universal *tot/toți* 'all' (see (5)) (therefore they are impossible in the Romanian counterparts of (1)), or else they head free relatives (something impossible in English):

(9) *Câți* (oameni) au ieșit din ascunzătoare au fost împușcați.
how-many (people) have got-out from hiding-place have been shot
'All those who got out of the hiding place were shot'

References: Carlson, G., 1977a. Amount relatives. *Language* 53, 520-542.

Grosu, A. & F. Landman. 1998. Strange relatives of the third kind. *Natural Language Semantics* 6, 125-170.

Grosu, A. & F. Landman, forth. Amount relatives. *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* II, Chapter 7.

McNally, L. 2008. DP-internally *only*, amount relatives, and relatives out of existentials. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39, 161-169.