

## RESOLVING AMBIGUITIES IN TRANSLATION: AMOUNT RELATIVE CLAUSES IN ROMANIAN

Alina Resceanu  
University of Craiova  
Romania

### ABSTRACT

In this paper, we discuss potentially ambiguous relative clauses (RCs) in English. The ambiguity refers to the fact that these RCs may be interpreted either as restrictive relatives (RRs) or as amount relatives (AR) (identity of substance vs. identity of quantity, cf. Carlson, 1977; Heim, 1987 a.o). We compare the English RCs used in such contexts with their Romanian equivalents and we observe that this ambiguity does not exist in Romanian. The interpretation of the RCs in Romanian depends on the type of the relative determiner used to introduce the RC. Thus, the use of the degree relative determiner *cât* ('how-much' and its variants *câtă* 'how much<sub>Fsg</sub>', *câți* 'how much<sub>Mpl</sub>', *câte* 'how much<sub>Fpl</sub>', *câtoră* 'how much<sub>Genpl</sub>') signals a context of amount or a reference to cardinalities (being an operator abstracting over degrees), whereas the RC with *care* ('which') is mostly restrictive. Therefore, it is the use of a certain relativizer that helps us get the meaning and the interpretation right. This paper is structured in three parts. In the first part, we define what an amount relative clause is in English and demonstrate how it differs from a restrictive relative (RR). We point to the descriptive characteristics of English amount relatives in comparison with restrictive relative clauses, focusing on their structural similarity, but their different interpretation. In the second part, we bring into discussion the RCs in English with 'identity of substance' vs 'identity of quantity' interpretation and discuss the analyses proposed in the literature (cf. Heim, 1987). The third part is aimed at discussing the Romanian *cât* 'how much/many' vs. *care* relative clauses with an amount interpretation, concluding that the (syntactic/semantic) properties that these have are determined by the relativizer used in the construction.

## KEYWORDS

amount relative clauses, restrictive relative clauses, semantic ambiguity, degree words, cardinality.

---

### 1. AMOUNT RELATIVE CLAUSES IN ENGLISH: ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The term ‘amount’ relative clause (AR) was first proposed by Greg Carlson (1977) to refer to a third class of headed relative clauses (actually included in the class of restrictive relative clauses) or to a 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 (1):

- (1) a. \*Some man there was t on the life-raft died. (RR)  
b. Every man there was on t the life-raft died. (AR)

In (1a) the RR cannot relativize the logical subject of a context where *there*-insertion has applied, whereas in (1b), where the quantifier has been changed from *some* to *every*, the sentence is grammatical.

This means that the RC in (1b) is compatible with certain quantifiers and determiners that allow relativization in *there*-contexts, like definite or universals (this property of AR is known as determiner restriction, cf. Carlson, 1977). Despite its similarity to the ordinary restrictive in (1a), the relative clause under (1b) is quite different, which led Carlson to claim that it is an AR.

One important difference between RR and AR is that amount relatives are relativizations over degrees, rather than over individuals (like restrictive).

*There*-relatives are difficult to account for, since they seem not to automatically provide a true amount reading. Instead, they can only have the identity of individuals reading. In other words, the example in (1b) does not mean ‘the same number of men as there were on the life-raft died.’ Rather it can only mean ‘all the men who were actually on the life-raft died.’

Other contexts labelled as ‘amount relatives’ by Carlson (1977: 525, 530) are given in (2 a-d):

- (2) a. Any beer (that/\*which) there may be t left in the cooler is all mine.  
b. That’s all (that/\*which) there is t.

c. Marv put everything (that/\*which) he could t in his pockets.

d. Every hour (that/\*which) this movie lasts beyond my bedtime means more aggravation for me.

By examining these examples, all RCs above involve contexts in which abstraction over amounts or degrees rather than on individuals applies (see the ungrammatical use of the relative pronoun ‘which’, a definite relative pronoun ruled out in existential contexts and in the contexts where abstraction over degree, not individuals applies) and all are ARs.

In (3a-c), we exemplify the types of ARs identified in (Heim, 1987) and in (Grosu and Landman, 1998 and 2013):

(3) a. It will take us the rest of our lives to drink the champagne that they spilled that evening. (Heim, 1987)

b. We will never be able to recruit the soldiers that the Chinese paraded last May Day.(Grosu and Landman, 1998)

c. The money it cost could have fed 1,000 hungry children. (Grosu and Landman, 2013)

Despite the initial consideration that in degree relativization abstraction on a set of degrees denotes only an identity of quantity reading (quantity /degree denoting ARs), the evidence in (3) indicate that abstraction over degrees within ARs is also compatible with an individual denotation of the complex noun phrase containing the AR (substance/entity denoting ARs).

To solve the puzzle raised by the degree/entity interpretations of this category of ARs (Carlson, 1977 and Heim, 1987), a new concept of degree was proposed by Grosu and Landman (1998), in fact a richer notion of degree, which keeps track of what it is a degree of (based on the idea that degrees always measure something). In their opinion, the expression of degree for a given sortal predicate is a triplet consisting of the cardinality of a plural index, the sortal (or something that functions as a measure domain), and the plural index itself (which is equal to the classical notion of degree). This contrasts with the classical degree notation which consists only of the cardinality. This set of degrees undergoes the operation of Maximalization, which essentially picks the unique maximal degree from the set created by degree relativization. Finally, the amount relative clause may undergo an optional operation of SUBSTANCE. This operation is used to provide the individual denotation from the complex degree notation. This is an interesting notion of degree, but the details of the analysis are beyond the scope of this paper. For the complete description of how such a richer notion of degree is a suitable analysis for ARs in English, we refer the interested reader to Grosu and Landman (1998).

Despite the fact that ‘amount’ relatives are structurally heterogeneous, the presence of degree quantification is one of the shared properties. In the following section, we will take a look at the original motivation for postulating a degree variable in ARs.

ARs have offered a rich ground for investigation, both syntactically and semantically. The questions linguists have been trying to answer for the last 30 years is why they are called ‘amount’ relatives and how they are different from ordinary (restrictive/non-restrictive) relatives.

As mentioned in the introductory part above, ARs are relativizations over degrees, rather than over individuals (like restrictive), and despite their apparent unitary interpretation, there is a lot of variation with regard to naming such a category (Carlson (1977) called these constructions ‘amount relatives’, Heim (1987) identified them as ‘degree relatives’, Grosu and Landman (1998) as ‘maximalizing relatives’ and later on, refining the typology, Grosu (2009) and Kotek (2009) deal with the singleton definite/indefinite relative clauses<sup>1</sup>).

## 2. DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH AMOUNT RELATIVES

We discuss in this section the descriptive characteristics of amount relatives as initially proposed in Carlson (1977) and Heim (1987).<sup>2</sup> Let us examine the relative clauses exemplified in (4 a-b):

(4) a. I took with me the books that/ $\emptyset$  there were *t* on the table.

b.\*I took with me the books which there were *t* on the table.

The example under (4a) has an amount reading and lacks the ordinary restrictive relative reading since the gap in the relative clause refers to a degree measuring the cardinality of the objects, which are in our case the books.

As far as the relative in (4b) is concerned, Carlson draws attention to the following facts concerning the interaction between relativization and *there*-insertion contexts. If the relative clause contains a *there*-insertion context and

---

<sup>1</sup> The justification for calling the relative clauses of this type singleton definite/indefinite RCs is that an operation of maximalization takes place in the semantic derivation of these relatives, turning the predicate denoted by the relative clause into a singleton predicate (ARs necessarily denote a set with exactly one member, which may be either an atom or a plurality, cf. Grosu, 2013: 609).

<sup>2</sup> These analyses were subsequently refined in Grosu and Landman (1998, 2013) and McNally (2008). For instance, McNally (2008) argues that there are problems with this analysis and that, despite the superficial similarities between amount relatives and relativization in *there*-insertion contexts, it cannot be concluded that the latter is necessarily amount relativization.

the relativization gap is in the position which is open to the definiteness effect, the relative clause is fine with the relativizer *that* or with the empty relativizer  $\emptyset$  as in (4a), but not with the relativizer *which* as in (4b).

The explanation Carlson gives for the infelicity of the example in (4b) is based on the syntactic structure that he adopts in deriving relative clauses in English, and thus (4a) is interpreted as in (5):

(5). I took with me the books that there were [THAT AMOUNT books] on the table

Another interesting explanation is offered by Heim (1987): since ARs denote sets of degrees, an operation of degree abstraction takes place in the sense that the gap in (4a) contains a null degree expression, *d many books*, as illustrated in (6) in which only the variable *d* is bound by the relativizer.

(6) I took with me the books that there were *d many books* on the table.

This analysis brings forth the first case of ambiguous interpretation that a context such as that in (4a) creates in which the question is if we have an identity of substance or an identity of quantity reading. We give an answer to this question in the next sections.

## 2.1 ARS IN AMBIGUOUS CONTEXTS (IDENTITY OF SUBSTANCE VS. IDENTITY OF QUANTITY INTERPRETATION): EXAMPLE 1

If we go back to example (4a) and analyse it based on Heim's proposal, we would have an identity of quantity reading and not an identity of substance reading, due to the presence of the *d many books* variable. We repeat below the two examples in (4 a-b), this time with Heim's (1987) interpretation:

(7) a. I took with me the books that/ $\emptyset$  there were *d many books* on the table.

b.\*I took with me the books which there were *d many books* on the table.

However, the facts are exactly the opposite: (7a) cannot mean that I took with me from the library as many books as there were books on the table in the kitchen; it only means that I took those actual books on the table. That is, (7a) only has an identity of substance reading.

Carlson (1977) points out that relatives can be interpreted as denoting degrees even if they are headed by entity denoting nouns. The explanation he offers is that amount relatives interact with the rest of the sentence in the same way as comparatives do, so the AR in (7a) is given the same interpretation as the comparative in (8):

(7) a. the books that there were *d many books* on the table

(8). as many books as there were on the table

In Romanian, the interpretation of such RCs is less problematic since a specialized relative determiner *cât/câți* (how much/many) can be used to introduce the RC in order to obtain an amount/degree reading.<sup>3</sup>

For example, in (9) the relative clause contains a degree expression *d many books*, in which only the variable *d* is bound by *cât*:

(9) Am luat cu mine (atâtea) cărți câte erau *d many books* pe masă.

Have taken with me that-many books how-many<sub>FemPl</sub> were on table

‘I took with me the books that there were on the table’.

Thus, (9) is interpreted as referring to the (maximum) number of books, rather than to the actual objects (due to the semantic interpretation of *câte* which acts as a maximalising operator, binding the degree variable inside the AR *d many books* and selecting the maximum number of books in the example above).

## 2.2 ARS IN AMBIGUOUS CONTEXTS (IDENTITY OF SUBSTANCE VS. IDENTITY OF QUANTITY INTERPRETATION): EXAMPLE 2

There is a second example of ambiguity between ‘identity of substance vs. identity of quantity’ reading, as far as ARs in English are concerned. Heim (1987) adopts Carlson’s view (the similarity with comparatives mentioned above) and further points out that there are other contexts in which the similarity is not only visible, but it also plays an important role in differentiating an amount relative from a restrictive one. Let us take a look at the examples in (10 a-b) and (11 a-b):

(10) a. It will take us the rest of our lives to drink the champagne that they spilled that evening.

b. It will take us the rest of our lives to drink as much champagne as they spilled that evening.

(11) a. We will never be able to recruit the soldiers that the Chinese paraded last May Day.

b. We will never be able to recruit as many soldiers as the Chinese paraded last May Day.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Cât* is a wh-operator that binds the degree variable and also acts as a maximalizing operator (for a more detailed analysis of *cât* in Romanian ARs, see Kotek, 2009; Resceanu, 2015).

We notice that (10a) allows a reading which requires only identity of quantity, not identity of substance, thus having the same interpretation as the comparative in (10b). (11a) and (11b) make the same point with a count noun.

Now, let us suppose that the relative in (10a) can be either a restrictive or an amount relative. If it were a restrictive, it would receive an identity of substance reading (cf. Heim, 1987), and thus it would illogically refer to the actual champagne that was spilled that evening.

The most natural reading of the sentence in (10a) has to do with the amount of champagne spilled, since it will take us a long time to drink as much champagne as they spilled: it does not refer to how long it would take us to slurp the champagne they spilled off the ground. The interpretation referring to the amount of champagne also justifies its similarity with the comparative in (10b).

When it is given this interpretation, we get the identity of quantity reading and the sentence is an amount relative. It also gets a maximal interpretation, since it refers to the total amount of champagne. The same explanation is valid for (11) as well.

Once more, Romanian resorts to the use of *cât* to clarify the interpretation in translating the English examples:

(12) a. Nu vom putea niciodată să bem (atâta) șampanie câtă au vărsat ei ieri seară.

Not will be able never to drink (that much) champagne how-much have spilled they yesterday evening

‘We will never be able to drink as much champagne as they spilled that evening.

b. Nu vom putea niciodată să bem la fel de multă șampanie câtă au vărsat ei ieri seară.

Not will be able never to drink the same of much champagne how-much have spilled they yesterday evening

‘We will never be able to drink as much champagne as they spilled that evening.

c. Nu vom putea niciodată să bem șampania pe care au vărsat-o ei ieri seară.

Not will be able never to drink the champagne PE which have spilled-  
CL<sub>Fem.sg.Acc</sub> they yesterday evening

‘We will never be able to drink the champagne which they spilled that evening.

By examining the examples above, we observe that the use of *cât* (‘how-many’ with its inflected form *câtă/câți/câte*) only allows for an amount interpretation (i.e. identity of quantity reading) and disambiguates the interpretation. The use of *care* ‘which’ might give a rather nonsensical interpretation of drinking the actual champagne that was spilled that evening (just like the RR in English analysed above). However, this nonsensical interpretation is never adopted by the speakers.

As shown in these two sections of the second part, the existence of degree-denoting (quantity) and entity-denoting (substance) ARs has been a field of debate starting with Carlson (1977) and Heim (1987). The recent contributions made by Grosu (2002, 2005), Grosu and Landman (1998, 2013), Heim (2000) and Kotek (2009) offer detailed explanation, new empirical data and complex formalized analyses in order to clear up the ambiguity. Others, like McNally (1998), objected to the idea that entity-denoting ARs involve abstraction over degrees (she considers these cases as illustrating restrictive relatives).

### 3. *CÂT* VS. *CARE* ROMANIAN ARS

In this part, we discuss ARs in Romanian, which are types of relative clause constructions (headed or headless (free) relative clauses) that have an ‘amount’ reading and denote properties of amounts/cardinalities. They are mainly introduced by the specific relative word *cât* used as either a degree word or as a relative determiner with  $\varphi$  features (its inflected forms for number and gender are *câtă* ‘how much<sub>Fsg</sub>’, *câți* ‘how much<sub>Mpl</sub>’, *câte* ‘how much<sub>Fpl</sub>’), which is semantically interpreted as a maximalizing operator abstracting on a set of degrees. It has no counterpart in English relative clauses and it secures the amount reading in all the contexts in which it is used.

It is interesting to note that the complex DPs which are modified by RCs headed by *cât/câți* may denote amounts/cardinalities or individual entities.<sup>4</sup> Due to the presence of *cât/câți*, abstraction over degrees is possible even when the DPs denote entities.

We illustrate Romanian AR in the example below:

(13). Am luat cu mine atâtea cărți câte erau pe masă.

---

<sup>4</sup> This distinction between degree denoting ARs and entity denoting ARs was discussed in details in Kotek (2009) and Grosu and Landman (2013).

Have taken with me that-many books how-many were on table

‘I took me as many books as there were on the table’.

By examining the example under (13), we notice that the use of *câte* confers an amount interpretation to the relative clause headed by the indefinite DP. The relative clause denotes not only the maximal number of books that I took with me, but also the maximum number of books that were on the table. The interpretation is based on the fact that the two sets are equated: the number of books I took with me is equal to the number of books that there were on the table (representing also the total number of books). This equivalence is reflected in the correlative-like structure of this construction due to the presence of the correlative terms *atâtea...câte*. In this case, the indefinite AR has only an amount reading (referring to the number of books), not a substance reading (referring to the fact that I took with me the actual books that were on the table).

Let us compare the AR in (13) with the RCs in (14), in which *câte* ‘how many<sub>FemPl</sub>’ was replaced with *care* ‘which’.

(14). Am luat cu mine atâtea cărți care erau pe masă.

Have taken with me that-many books which were on table

‘I took me so many books that were on the table’.

The interpretation of (14) is different, in the sense that the relative clause introduced by *care* is interpreted as a restrictive relative clause, based on co-reference, i.e. an identity of substance interpretation (I took with me the many books that were on the table) and not as denoting amount (I took with me as many books as there were on the table).

Another example of Romanian AR is given in (15):

(15) Am luat cu mine cărțile câte/care erau pe masă.

Have taken with me books-the how-many/which were on table

‘I took me the books that there were on the table’

In this example, the (entity denoting) DP modified by the relative clause is definite and so the definite relative can have both an amount reading, where it denotes properties of amounts/degrees, and a substance reading, where it denotes properties of entities (the books on the table). Thus, both *câte* ‘how-many<sub>FemPl</sub>’ and *care* ‘which’ are possible with a maximal interpretation (mainly due to the presence of the definite article).

Moreover, alongside ARs with *cât*, there are also relative clauses with *care* and *ce* that have only an amount interpretation, and this interpretation is obtained due to additional mechanisms external to the RC (such as the use of the

universal *tot* in (16) or of a definite quantitative nominal head, i.e. *vinul* ‘wine-the’ in (17)). If we take, for example, the relative clauses in (17), we consider them genuine ARs since they could only refer to the same quantity of wine (identity of quantity), excluding the nonsensical interpretation of drinking the exact same wine (identity of substance) in both *care* (17a) and *cât* (17b) constructions. These ARs are similar to the English ARs discussed in the previous part.

(16). La petrecere o să beau tot ce mi se dă.

At party will drink<sub>ISG</sub> all what me<sub>DAT</sub> SE give

‘At the party, I will drink all that I am given’.

(17) a. *Îmi ia o lună să beau vinul pe care-l bei tu într-o oră.*

To me takes a month to drink wine-the PE which/what CL<sub>III sg</sub> drink you in an hour

‘It takes me a month to drink the wine that you drink in an hour’.

b. *Îmi ia o lună să beau atâta vin cât bei tu într-o oră.*

To me takes a month to drink wine how-much drink you in an hour

‘It takes me a month to drink the wine that you drink in an hour’.

(18). La Paște, o să beau și eu vinul pe care-l bea toată lumea.

At Easter will drink and me wine-the PE which-CL drink all people

‘At Easter, I will drink the wine that everybody drinks’.

The same interpretation is given to the example in (18). On the one hand, the restrictive reading, according to which ‘At Easter, I will drink the same wine that everybody drinks’, is ruled out, whereas the amount reading (drinking the same amount of wine) is acceptable.

Another interesting case are the Romanian ARs of the form illustrated in (19a-f). These are ARs in which the external material contains a (modified) numeral or a numeral phrase.

(19) a. *Zece câți sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.*

ten *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘The ten that there are in the classroom now will pass the exam’.

b. *Zece studenți câți sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.*

ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘The 10 students that there are in the classroom now will pass the exam’.

c. Exact zece studenți *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.

exactly ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘The exactly 10 students that are in the classroom now will pass the exam’

d. Nu mai mult de zece studenți *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.

Not much more than ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘Not more than 10 students that are in the classroom now will pass the exam’

e. Doar zece studenți *câți* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.

Not much more than ten students *how-many* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘Not more than 10 students that are in the classroom now will pass the exam’

f. Unsprezece jucători buni *cât* formează o echipă de fotbal sunt greu de găsit.

Eleven players good *how-much* form a team of football are hard to find

‘Eleven good players that form a football team are hard to find’.

We point out that the use of *care* in these examples indicates coreference and infers a substance reading, which is a more preferred reading if we want to emphasize the identity of substance or reference to individuals. Hence the optimal acceptability of RCs with *care* as illustrated in (20):

(20). Zece studenți *care* sunt acum în clasă vor promova examenul.

ten students *who* are now in classroom will pass exam-the

‘The 10 students that there are in the classroom now will pass the exam’.

However, the case in (20) is interesting, since its acceptability is conditioned by a partitive interpretation where [*zece studenți care...*] (*ten students who...*) should be interpreted as [*zece dintre studenții care...*] (*ten of the students who*).

On the contrary, the ARs with *cât* could not receive a partitive interpretation (*zece dintre studenții câți sunt acum în clasă*). The presence of *cât* confers a maximal interpretation (the total number of students is ten and there are no other students in the classroom except those ten) and as a consequence it would be impossible to continue with a sentence such as the one in (21):

(21) Zece studenți *câți/cât* sunt acum în clasă ne ajută să promovăm examenul. \*Restul care sunt în clasă nu vor promova.

ten students *how-many* are now in classroom  $us_{CLIP}$  help to pass exam-the

‘The 10 students that there are in the classroom now will help us pass the exam’.

Moreover, the AR above is also a pure degree denoting AR, in which the alternation between *cât/câți* is possible. The degree word *cât/câți* is semantically used as an anaphoric quantifier and in all the cases illustrated above it refers to the cardinality of the antecedent. The amount denotation is even more obvious if we consider examples like (22).

(22). Din cauza a cinci studenți câți au lipsit am pierdut examenul.

Because of five students how-many have missed have lost exam-the

‘Because of the 5 students that had not come we lost the exam’.

The same explanation could also be used to account for the constructions discussed in two recent papers by Grosu (2009a, 2013). These constructions, which are called the ‘Romanian Unexpected Relative constructions’ (RUR), are similar to the ones above, except that the RURs illustrate the possibility of abstraction over degrees when the gap is in a ‘nominal’ position that is the complement of verbs such as *weigh*, *measure* or *last* (Grosu 2013: 615).

According to Grosu, RURs are of the type illustrated below:

(23) a. Patru ore cât durează filmul depășesc durata medie a unui film.

‘Four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie’.

b. Cele patru ore cât durează filmul depășesc durata medie a unui film.

‘The four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie’.

(24) a. Nouă kilograme cât cântărește bagajul tău de mână te pot împiedica să te urci în avion.

‘Nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.’

b. Cele nouă kilograme cât cântărește bagajul tău de mână te pot împiedica să te urci în avion.

‘The nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.’

(25) a. Zece kilometri cât se întinde șoseaua dincolo de peșteră sunt o distanță mai mare decât mă așteptam.

‘Ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected’.

b. Cei zece kilometri cât se întinde șoseaua dincolo de peșteră sunt o distanță mai mare decât mă așteptam.

‘Ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected’.

Unlike their deviant English counterparts illustrated in (26a-c), the indefinite constructions in Romanian are grammatical.

(26) a. \*Nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.

b. \*Four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie.

c. \*Ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected.

Based on the analysis of these examples proposed in Grosu (2013), these constructions are called non-intersective singleton relatives, since the relative clause and nominal constituent cannot be combined by intersection. Additionally, it is clear though that the ARs in (23-25) do not have a partitive interpretation. Rather, they denote the total weight of the luggage at issue, the total duration of the movie and the total length of the road, respectively.

The only possible explanation is the presence of the degree word *cât*, and not necessarily the presence of the numeral or of the definite article like in English. The definite counterparts of the English examples provided in (23-25) are grammatical ARs:

(27) a. The nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs may prevent you from boarding the plane.

b. The four hours that this movie lasts exceed/exceeds the average duration of a movie.

c. The ten kilometres that the road runs on far beyond the cave are a greater distance than I expected.

As demonstrated above, both a definite (23-25a) and an indefinite version (23-25b) are made available in Romanian due to the presence of the degree determiner *cât* and of the numeral (the definite article indicates only the discourse referent here) with different properties: the definite relative can have both an *amount reading*, where it denotes properties of amounts or

degrees, and a *substance reading*, where it denotes properties of entities. The indefinite relative can only have an amount reading (cf. Kotek, 2009).

## CONCLUSIONS

Firstly, we conclude by stating that the relative determiner *cât* is the key word for obtaining the correct interpretation in all the examples of ARs in Romanian analysed here. *Cât/câți* ('how much/many') is a specialized item that is used in order to obtain an amount/degree/cardinality reading (it is a wh- (degree) operator that binds the degree variable inside the RC).

Secondly, besides this specialized relativizer that introduces degree/amount relatives, other wh-forms, such as *care* 'which' and *ce* 'what' introduce ARs. However, in this case, we need additional mechanisms external to RC to obtain the amount/cardinality reading (i.e. the presence of a maximalizing marker outside the RC, such as the definite quantitative nominal head, i.e. *vinul* 'wine-the' in (17) above, for example).

Thirdly, taking into consideration our initial aim and the facts analysed in this paper, the ARs in Romanian are semantically similar to the amount relatives in English, but morpho-syntactically different. It is this difference in the use of relativizers that disambiguates the meaning and the interpretation in Romanian.

## REFERENCES

- Butler, A. (2001), 'Relatives and There-Insertion' in *Proceedings of CONSOLE IX*. 28-40.
- Carlson, G. (1977), 'Amount Relatives'. In *Language*, 53:520-542.
- Cornilescu, A. (1980/1996), *Montague Grammar and the Analysis of Relative Clauses*. Editura Universitatii din București, București.
- Grosu, A. (2013), 'Relative Clause Constructions and unbounded dependencies'. In Sorin, C., Giurgea I. (eds.), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*, vol. 1: The Noun Phrase. John Benjamins.
- Grosu, A. (2009a), 'Two kinds of degree-denoting relatives: Hebrew versus Romanian'. *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics*, vol. 1, available at [http://www.tau.ac.il/~grosua/papers/Grosu\\_2009b.pdf](http://www.tau.ac.il/~grosua/papers/Grosu_2009b.pdf) [August 10th 2017]
- Grosu, A. (2009b), 'Romanian 'unexpected' relatives', *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, vol. LIV, No 1, January-March 2009.

- Grosu, A. (2005), 'Unbounded dependencies' (ms). In *The Essential Grammar of the Romanian Language*, available at: <http://www.linguist.univ-paris-diderot.fr/~essromgram/> [March 15th 2015]
- Grosu, A. (2002), 'Strange relatives at the interface of two millennia. State-of-the-Article', *GLOT International* 6,6, 145-167.
- Grosu, A., Landman, F. (2013), *Amount relatives*. *Natural Language Semantics*.
- Grosu, A.; Kotek, H. (2009), *Degrees/Intervals as restricted entities*. Handout of talk given at NELS 40, held at MIT, on November 13, 2009. Available at [http://www.tau.ac.il/~grosua/papers/Grosu\\_2009g.pdf](http://www.tau.ac.il/~grosua/papers/Grosu_2009g.pdf) [August 10th 2017]
- Grosu, A.; Landman, F. (1998), 'Strange Relatives of the Third Kind'. *Natural Language Semantics*, 6, 125-170.
- Heim, I. (2000), *Degree operators and scope*. ms. MIT, available at [http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/heim/Heim\\_Degree\\_Operators\\_and\\_Scope.pdf](http://lingphil.mit.edu/papers/heim/Heim_Degree_Operators_and_Scope.pdf) [July 10<sup>th</sup> 2017].
- Heim, I. (1987), 'Where does the definiteness restriction apply? Evidence from the definiteness of variables', in *The representation of (in)definiteness*, eds. E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen, 21-42. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Herdan, S. (2008), *Degree and amounts in Relative Clauses*, PhD thesis, University of Connecticut, ProQuest LLC.
- Kotek, H. (2009), 'Degree Relatives, Definiteness and shifted Reference', *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society (NELS) 40*. MIT, 13 November 2009.
- McNally, L. (2008), 'DP-internal only, amount relatives, and relatives out of existentials', *Linguistic Inquiry* 39: 161-169.
- Resceanu, A. (2015), *Amount Relative Clauses in English and Romanian: a Minimalist Approach*. Craiova: Universitaria.
- Szczegielniac, A. (2005), 'Relativization that you did...'. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, 24. (PhD dissertation defended at Harvard in 2004 under the title Relativization and Ellipsis), available at [https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/26517269/relativization\\_that\\_you\\_did.pdf?sequence=4](https://dash.harvard.edu/bitstream/handle/1/26517269/relativization_that_you_did.pdf?sequence=4) [June 12<sup>th</sup> 2017]