

Review

Reviewed Work(s): Three Studies in Locality and Case by Alexander Grosu

Review by: Caterina Donati and M. Rita Manzini

Source: *Journal of Linguistics*, Mar., 1996, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Mar., 1996), pp. 183-187

Published by: Cambridge University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4176355>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Linguistics*

JSTOR

yield an enduring insight, rather than works that take well-plowed ground for which there are a multiplicity of analyses already in existence, and, by employing assumptions that are not well-grounded, reach an analysis that does not yield any deep insight into the phenomena. The present work considers a variety of analyses of pronouns and ellipsis in a variety of approaches, and, all in all, I must say that I was convinced. This book is indispensable for anybody working on anaphora.

REFERENCES

- Baltin, M. (1987). Do antecedent-contained deletions exist? *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 579–595.
 Chomsky, N. (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Hale, K. & Keyser, S. J. (eds.) *The view from Building 20: essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.
 Dalrymple, M., Shieber, S. & Pereira, F. (1991). Ellipsis and higher-order unification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14. 399–452.
 Evans, G. (1977). Pronouns, quantifiers and relative clauses (I). *The Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 7. 467–536.
 Evans, G. (1980). Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11. 337–362.
 Higginbotham, J. (1983). Logical Form, binding, and nominals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14. 395–420.
 Higginbotham, J. (1985). On Semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16. 547–594.
 Hornstein, N. (1994). An argument for Minimalism: the Case of antecedent-contained deletion. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25. 455–480.
 Larson, R. & May, R. (1990). Antecedent-containment or vacuous movement: reply to Baltin. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21. 103–122.
 Lasnik, H. (1976). Remarks on coreference. *Linguistic Analysis* 2. 1–22.
 May, R. (1985). *Logical Form: its structure and derivation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
 McCawley, J. (1968). Concerning the base component of a transformational grammar. *Foundations of Language* 4. 243–269.
 McCawley, J. (1982). Parentheticals and discontinuous constituents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13. 91–106.
 Sag, I. (1976). *Deletion and Logical Form*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
 Williams, E. (1977). Discourse and Logical Form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 101–139.
 Author's address: Department of Linguistics,
 New York University,
 719 Broadway, Rm. #514,
 New York, NY 10003,
 U.S.A.
 E-mail: baltin@is2.nyu.edu

(Received 10 August 1995)

Alexander Grosu, *Three studies in locality and Case*. London: Routledge, 1994. Pp. xii + 256.

Reviewed by CATERINA DONATI and M. RITA MANZINI,
 Università di Firenze and University College London

Grosu's book represents a very valuable contribution to the understanding of the several areas of syntax that it addresses. It should be of interest both to theoretical syntacticians and to scholars working on Romanian and in

general on Western European languages. Because of its clear presentation of a wide range of data, and its systematic review of previous literature, it could also be used as a support in advanced linguistics teaching.

The book comprises three studies, among which the first one, on 'The syntax of free relative constructions', appears to be the most important one, both for its length, and for the intrinsic interest of the topic investigated. Though free relatives were at the centre of the theoretical debate in the late 70's, they were largely ignored within the principles and parameters framework. Grosu's work has the great merit of bringing them up again for discussion, contributing a great wealth of empirical observations and generalizations, as well as several useful theoretical leads. The second study, on 'Romanian Determiners as functional categories', investigates in great detail the internal structure of Romanian nominals, lending further support to the analysis of nominals as involving complex functional structure and in particular a D projection. The third study, on 'Null operators in Romanian', is a rebuttal of Dobrovie-Sorin's (1990) conclusion that null operators are not present in the syntax of Romanian.

Though each of the three studies is essentially self-contained, several recurring topics connect them. The first and third essay are linked by an analysis of the licencing requirements on *pro*, which according to Grosu is to be identified both with the head of free relatives and with the null operator. Furthermore, all three essays are linked by a conception of locality akin to the notion of minimal domain in the minimalist approach of Chomsky. The systematic comparison that Grosu provides between standard Government and Binding conceptions and the innovations introduced by the minimalist framework is a reason for special interest in this work.

In what follows we shall present an overview of each of the three studies, starting with the last one, whose scope is more limited, and ending with the first one, which is the most complex of the three.

In the third study, Grosu argues that Romanian does have null operators, on the basis of a close investigation of the constructions that have been taken to involve null operators in previous literature, namely clefts, which do not exist in Romanian, comparatives, relatives, *tough* and *too/enough* clauses, and on the basis of a systematic comparison of Romanian with other languages such as English, Italian, German and Hungarian.

Though this does not necessarily undermine the validity of his conclusions as a whole, some of Grosu's arguments appear to be less than compelling. Consider in particular his discussion of non-equative comparatives in Romanian, introduced by *decît*, which can in principle be analysed as the preposition *de* followed by the *wh*-operator *cît*. To determine whether a given head is a *wh*-operator or not, Grosu uses the criterion whether it is able to pied-pipe a complement or not. The inability of *decît* to trigger pied-piping leads him to the conclusion that it is a kind of 'complex preposition'. Now, it may be true that empty operators never allow pied-piping, so that the

presence of a null operator in *decît* comparatives automatically explains the impossibility of pied-piping. But it is not true that overt operators always allow it; thus the conclusion that *cît* is an overt operator not triggering pied-piping cannot be excluded.

A comparison with Italian proves instructive. Non-equative comparatives in Italian can be introduced by the preposition *di* 'of' followed by *quanti/e*/etc. 'how many'. Because *quanti/e*/etc. clearly displays agreement morphology, it is quite implausible to treat it as part of a 'complex preposition' in the manner suggested by Grosu for Romanian; yet pied-piping is equally impossible in both languages. The case for empty operators in *decît* comparatives is then clearly more doubtful than Grosu would like it to be.

Another respect in which Grosu's argument raises some doubts is his conclusion that 'null operator relatives do exist, and they invariably exhibit complementizers that are homophonous with *wh*-elements' (212). This conclusion is motivated by a number of arguments, including the lack of Case-markers accompanying the relevant morphemes, and the insensitivity of the relevant constructions to strong islands. Nevertheless, the oddity of an analysis involving systematic homophony between *wh*-operators and simple complementizers requires some further explanation. This leaves the case for empty operators in *tough* and *too/enough* constructions still standing; but it seems fair to conclude that the presence of empty operators is not as obvious as Grosu makes it out to be. This in turn is not without significance for Grosu's theory of *pro*, of which null operators are taken to be an instantiation.

The second study in the book discusses a complex array of facts concerning Romanian nominals, pointing to their relevance to the theory of functional categories and to the DP-hypothesis in particular. After outlining the development of the notion of functional category in the principles and parameters framework, the first section of the study presents a survey of previous literature applying the DP hypothesis to languages such as English, German and Hebrew. Grosu supports the conclusion in the literature that Case assigning properties are associated with the D position, by arguing that in Romanian the only assigner of genitive Case is the morpheme that he represents as *-L*, abstracting away from its various morphological realizations, i.e. precisely the definite article. In particular, Grosu examines all of the possible occurrences of *-L*, as a nominal enclitic, in complex prepositions, with adjectives and with other determiners. He concludes that the Case assigning properties of *-L* are linked to its D position, rather than simply associated with the morpheme itself. Indeed the only instance in which it does not assign genitive Case is when it is associated with another determiner; there, no D analysis is available for it, according to Grosu, and it has a merely 'euphonic' role.

One interesting aspect of this study is that it provides a comparison between GB and minimalist notions, with respect to their ability to account

for variations in the word order of genitive phrases and their licensors in the various languages considered. The conclusion appears to be that the minimalist approach yields a more straightforward account than the GB one (174). On the other hand Grosu notices that there are adjacency effects that hold within DP's in various languages which are not explained in any interesting way by either framework. Though Grosu invokes PF processes of some kind, it seems fair to conclude that the last word has not been said on this complex of topics.

The last study to be considered here, which comes first in Grosu's book, is opened by a careful historical introduction, presenting the various approaches to free relatives that have been attempted in the literature. The major properties of free relatives which drive all of these various accounts, as well as Grosu's own, are on the one hand the obvious apparent lack of a head and on the other hand two distinctive properties of the relative clause itself. These are, first, an apparently universal impossibility of pied-piping, and second, various language specific Case-matching effects. Grosu's analysis, for which he presents a number of arguments, both old and new, holds that free relatives are in fact headed, by an empty category that he identifies with *pro*.

The second section of the study is devoted in particular to an analysis of free relatives in languages such as Turkish, Chinese and Hebrew, which are also characterized, according to Grosu, by the presence of a null operator. Grosu includes in this group, and under this description, the internally-headed relatives of Japanese and other languages. For these latter cases, however, an in-situ analysis along the lines of Kayne (1994) appears at least at first sight to be much simpler. It is also worth noticing in this connection that the raising analysis revived by Kayne (1994) for ordinary headed relatives eliminates null operators from those structures as well. This revival of the raising analysis came too late for Grosu to include it in the range of options he discusses; but the question of a raising analysis for free relatives as well appears to deserve further investigation.

The third section of the study is the central one. In it, Grosu first discusses the main available theories of *pro*, none of which can be naturally extended to account for *pro* as the head of a free relative. He then advances his proposal, which differs from previous ones in that the locality conditions on *pro* are not defined in terms of the GB notion of head-government, but rather in terms of the minimalist notion of minimal domain. In Grosu's analysis, the anti-pied-piping effect universally observed with free relatives is derived as a consequence precisely of the licencing conditions on *pro*. Non-nominal free relatives are also examined in this section. The fourth section then examines the Case-matching and other Case interaction processes that characterize free relatives, exemplified with many languages both modern and ancient (Classical Greek, Latin and Gothic). Grosu argues (108) that such effects are generally amenable to a 'hierarchy of Case-markedness', namely Nom <

Acc < Dat < Gen... < P-Kase. In particular, a more marked Case may identify, or undergo attraction to, a less marked Case, but not vice versa.

Finally, the last section of the study is devoted to irrealis free relatives, which are illustrated with examples from Romance (Spanish and Romanian) and Hebrew, typically involving an embedded subjunctive or infinitive. A first difference that Grosu observes between realis and irrealis free relatives is that the latter have a more restricted distribution, which does not necessarily match that of DP's in general. Furthermore, according to Grosu, Case-matching and anti-pied-piping effects, which characterize realis free relatives, are absent with irrealis free relatives. He then proposes to derive these facts from an analysis of irrealis free relatives as bare CP's.

In our view, however, more robust data would be required to support Grosu's contrasting analyses. To begin with, some of the restrictions on the distribution of irrealis free relatives, such as the inability to appear as the complement of a verb like *know*, are imposed on all irrealis clauses, including headed relatives, for which a bare CP analysis is clearly not an option. Furthermore, a language like Italian, which ought to be very close to Spanish, as quoted by Grosu, casts some doubts on both the Case-matching and the pied-piping generalization. It appears indeed to be true, quite interestingly, that Case-matching effects are less strict in infinitival free relatives but not in subjunctive free relatives, as they should be if the realis/irrealis divide was the relevant one. What is more, pied-piping does not appear to be allowed in Italian, even in infinitival free relatives, any more than it is, say, in English. If this is so, the contrast that Grosu tries to establish between null headed realis free relatives and irrealis free relatives as bare CP's appears indeed to lack factual support.

REFERENCES

- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1990). Clitic doubling, *wh*-movement, and quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21. 351–397.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Authors' addresses:
- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (Donati) | (Manzini) |
| Dipartimento di Linguistica, | Department of Linguistics, |
| Università di Firenze, | University College London, |
| 50121 Firenze, | London WC1E 6BT, |
| Italy. | U.K. |
| E-mail: dotling@cesit1.unifi.it | E-mail: rita@ling.ucl.ac.uk |

(Received 8 August 1995)