

Alina REȘCEANU

**AMOUNT RELATIVE CLAUSES IN ENGLISH AND
ROMANIAN:
A MINIMALIST APPROACH**

Alina REȘCEANU

**AMOUNT RELATIVE CLAUSES IN
ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN:
A MINIMALIST APPROACH**



**Editura Universitaria
Craiova, 2015**

Referenți științifici:

Prof. univ. dr. Alexandra Cornilescu, Universitatea din București

Prof. univ. dr. Ioana Murar, Universitatea din Craiova

Copyright © 2015 Universitaria

Toate drepturile sunt rezervate Editurii Universitaria

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României

REȘCEANU, ALINA

Amount relative clauses in English and Romanian : a minimalist approach /

Alina Reșceanu. - Craiova : Universitaria, 2015

Conține bibliografie

ISBN 978-606-14-0961-7

811.111

811.135.1

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Professor Alexandra Cornilescu, for her careful reading of the draft manuscript and excellent suggestions, for her meticulous work and commitment, for challenging me, for believing in my work, for teaching me how to analyse the data correctly. Above all, I admired her devotion to bringing out the best in me.

I thank Larisa Avram for the excellent and intellectually rewarding Master's classes at the University of Bucharest and for accepting to be part of my thesis committee.

I first learned about generative grammar from Ilinca Crainiceanu, who is also responsible for my interest in Generative grammar and for my initial syntactic education. I thank her a lot for being with me all this way and I hope I can make her feel proud.

Last, but not the least, I would like to acknowledge the invaluable support and feedback I received from Professor Ioana Murar. She is a model of professionalism in my activities as a researcher and teacher.

My colleagues in Craiova were very supportive, so a big 'thank you' for them all: Ada, Aloisia, Ana-Maria, Claudia, Daniela, Emil, Elena, Florentina, Iulia, Mădălina, Mihaela, Mihai, Sorin, Titela, Victor.

I am extremely grateful to my closest friends, Anca, Maria and Liviu Dinu, for the confidence they showed in my work, for their unconditional support, for making my life and my stay in Bucharest easier and for being there when I needed them most. I particularly thank Anca for being a source of constant encouragement, as well as of 'sisterly' love.

I am also grateful to my parents, Ana and Alexandru Isvoranu, and to my parents-in-law, Marin and Georgica Resceanu, for their unvaluable support and for trying to make me have more confidence. The whole family were equally supportive, so I express my gratitude to Cristian, Diana, Marius, Daniela, Roxana, and Bogdan and to all the 'juniors'. I know they were all anxious to see this research work completed.

Finally, I want to thank my three 'musketeers', Ion, Andrei and Alexandru, for surrounding me with love and affection, for endless and countless hugs, and, most important of all, for their untiring 'All for one'.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This research work is based on my PhD thesis and is an investigation of amount relative clauses (ARs) in English and Romanian, carried out within the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1993, 1995 and subsequent work).

The overall goal is to provide more insight into Romanian ARs by a close examination of the properties and characteristics that this type of RC has in both languages. More specifically, we focus on the types of RC constructions with an ‘amount/cardinality’ reading and present new empirical evidence that would subsequently help us offer a suitable syntactic analysis.

The structure of this book is as follows:

In **chapter 2, *The Syntax of Relative Clauses***, our main goal is to find new empirical data that could provide the relevant background necessary to understand the recent developments in the analysis of postnominal restrictive relative clauses (RRs). Although relative clause constructions have been investigated for almost 50 years in the generative tradition, the debate over their correct analysis is still open. Particularly, two problems are still under debate:

1. Is there one single analysis that can account for the derivation of all types of RCCs?
2. In case there is, how can it capture the inconsistencies shown by the reconstruction effects that are observed even within one language?

In our attempt to provide a solution to the problems stated above, we bring into discussion the proposals that have been advanced in the literature for the analysis of relative clauses, which are discussed in the first part of the chapter.

There are different ways of relative clause generation, extensively discussed in the literature, and the difference between them lies in the way in which the head noun (in externally headed relative clauses) is related to the gap inside the clausal modifier: (i) via head noun raising, and/or (ii) operator raising and head noun ellipsis of an identical copy and relative clause adjunction to the head noun (Sauerland, 2002; Szczegielniak, 2012: 257).

Hence, the following proposals have been suggested for the syntax of relative clauses: the Complementation/Head Raising Analysis (HRA) and the Adjunction/Matching Analysis (MA). These analyses are discussed in **section 2.2** and are briefly illustrated below:

The Complementation/Head Raising Analysis (HRA)

(1) $[_{DP} \text{ the } [_{CP} \text{ book}]_j \text{ } [_{CP} \text{ [Op/which } t_j]_i \text{ John likes } t_i]$

This analysis, also known as the **head internal** analysis, was originally proposed by Schachter (1973) and Vergnaud (1974/1985) and has recently been revived by Afarli (1994), Kayne (1994), Bianchi (1999, 2000a/b), Bhatt (2002), Aoun & Li (2003), and de Vries (2002, 2006) among others. The central idea is that the *head* NP originates inside the Relative Clause CP and it is A'-moved to an operator position within the relative clause to become adjacent to the external determiner. The external determiner selects the relative clause CP as its complement. The final structural position of the head NP varies in different instantiations of the head raising analysis. Since the head NP originates inside the relative clause CP, it is possible to reconstruct it inside the relative clause and interpret it in a relative clause-internal position. We will summarize and evaluate this analysis based on the arguments proposed in Bianchi (1999: 49ff., 61–69), Bhatt (2002:46ff.), de Vries (2002: 76ff.).

The second analysis is the Adjunction/Matching (MA):

The Adjunction/Matching Analysis (MA)

(2) [DP the [NPbook] [CP [Op/which ~~book~~]_i John likes t_i]

This analysis was originally discussed by Lees (1960, 1961) and Chomsky (1965). Later on, it was adopted and slightly modified by Sauerland (1998), Citko (2001) and Szczegielniak (2012). Matching refers to the derivation in which the relative clauses are adjoined to the head NP. At the same time, there is a representation of the external head inside the relative clause, which is called the internal head. The internal head is generated as the complement of the relative operator (which may be zero) in an argument position; the entire relative DP undergoes movement to Spec, CP. Subsequently, the internal head NP is deleted under identity with the external head. Importantly, external head and internal head are not part of a movement chain as in the raising analysis. Rather, they are related via ellipsis.

The crucial difference between the two approaches is that in the Matching Analysis, there are two instances of the head of the relative clause: an external one and an internal one, and in the Raising Analysis, there is only one instance of the head: the internal one, which appears in an external position in the surface form. This difference is generated by the more general understanding that relative clauses represent a class of subordinate clauses where subordination is based on the fact that the matrix and the subordinate clause semantically share *a nominal constituent* (cf. Cornilescu 1980/1996, the coreference condition, whose overt reflex is the relative pronoun in the RC). One aspect which is particularly interesting is the fact that this nominal constituent, i.e. the relative “head”, plays a double role in the entire structure.

Therefore, in **section 2.3**, we focus on the advantages and disadvantages of the two analyses described above. In 2.3.1, we discuss the

arguments in favour of the HRA and in 2.3.2 the problems that this analysis still faces. Even if some of the obvious drawbacks pointed out in Borsley (1997) have been fixed in recent years, as described in 2.3.2.2 and 2.3.2.3, there remain a number of aspects where the HRA still faces some difficulties (cf. Sauerland 1998, 2003, Citko 2001, Hulsey&Sauerland 2006, Salzmann 2006). As will turn out, most of the arguments discussed also follow under the MA.

Thus, the two versions have their advantages and disadvantages and it is still hard to evaluate which one is superior. Even though the HRA has become almost the standard analysis of relative clauses in recent years, it still leaves a number of issues unsolved (i.e. extraposition, heavy pied-piping a.o.).

Most of the arguments that are used in this debate for choosing the most adequate analysis for RCs are based on reconstruction effects (as a result of movement). RCs are A-bar *wh*-constructions (Chomsky, 1977) and are characterized by *wh*-movement. *Wh*-movement implies a movement chain consisting of copies of the moved constituent, traces being copies which are not spelled out at PF, but which can be interpreted (i.e., reconstructed) at LF. Thus, there is *reconstruction* whenever the displaced copy of the moved element is pronounced and the base copy is interpreted (cf. Fox 1999). Reconstruction becomes thus a diagnostic for movement and one problem of the syntax of restrictive relative clauses is the origin of the copy. Consequently, a large part of the second chapter, namely **section 2.4** is devoted to reconstruction effects in English and Romanian relative clauses.

We will firstly discuss reconstruction effects with regard to the idiom interpretation (2.4.2). The interpretation of idioms (or of idiomatic expressions) is a case that provides clear evidence for the HRA. It has been shown that part of an idiom can occur as the Head of a relative clause that contains the other part of the idiom. Let us consider, for example, the [V + NP_{obj}] idioms in (3) for English and (4) for Romanian, in which the NP_{obj} is the head of the relative clause and the V is the verb of the relative clause. Given that the parts of an idiom need to be generated as a unit in the postverbal position of the object, such examples argue that movement is involved:

- (3) a. The *headway* that John *made t* was remarkable.
 b. The ~~*headway*~~ that John *made headway* was remarkable.
 c. *The *headway* was remarkable.
- (4) a. Mă amuză *aerele* pe care și le *dă t*. (Cornilescu, 1996:143)
 b. Mă amuză ~~*aerele*~~ pe care și le *dă aere*.
 c. **Aerele* mă amuză.

Other reconstruction effects discussed in this section refer to variable binding (2.4.3), scope (2.4.4) and the construal of superlative adjectives in subsection 2.4.5 (cf. Bhatt, 2002). Secondly, we will deal with Principles A and

B (2.4.6), and then with Principle C effects (2.4.7), which have turned out to be the most intricate ones.

The overall aim of this section is to show that the reconstruction behaviour of the relative clause head argues for Carlson's (1977) claim that relative clauses are ambiguous between a raising and a matching structure. Despite the fact the HRA proves to be more successful from the perspective of the reconstruction effects which can be modelled straightforwardly in a direct movement relationship (as in *wh* movement), the MA could also work. MA adopts the constituency and derivation of the external base-generated head, but employs a full relative clause-internal representation of the external head instead of just an operator. This will subsequently prove useful in our analysis of amount relative clauses in Romanian.

Section 2.5 discusses cases of obligatory non-reconstruction of the relative head inside the relative clause (with reference to idioms, variable binding and extraposition). These refer to the phenomena that remain problematic for both analyses of relative clauses.

Section 2.6 concludes the chapter and presents the main findings of the investigation.

Chapter 3 *Amount Relative Clauses in English* deals with amount relative clauses in English (also referred to as *degree relative clauses*, *maximalizing relatives*, *singleton definite/indefinite relatives*¹). This is a type of RC which exhibits interesting properties in both languages analysed here.

Given that “amount” relatives are typologically heterogeneous and that the presence of degree quantification is one of the shared properties, we will take a look at the original motivation for postulating a degree variable in “amount” relatives. The term ‘amount’ relative clause (AR) was first used by Carlson (1977) to refer to a “strange” or non-canonical construction which is different from the more traditional distinction between restrictive (RR) and non-restrictive or appositive relatives (NRR). One context in which ARs are distinct from RRs is illustrated in (5):

- (5) a. *Some man there was *t* on the life-raft died.
- b. Every man there was on *t* the life-raft died.

In (5a) the RR cannot relativize the logical subject of a context where *there*-insertion has applied, whereas in (5b), where the quantifier has been changed from *some* to *every*, the sentence is grammatical. Carlson claims that despite its similarity to the restrictive in (5a), the relative clause under (5b) is an AR.

The detailed explanation will be offered in **section 3.2**, which also includes an overview of the typology of relative clauses in English and the

¹We will adopt the name *amount relatives* throughout this research work.