ON 'RESTRICTED DEGREES'

Contrasts like the one between the full and reduced versions of [1] are common cross-linguistically, the deviance of the reduced version (the one without the definite article), being straightforwardly attributable to the fact that a physical object has a **unique** (maximal) weight, so that definiteness is preferred to indefiniteness in view of its stronger presupposition (of uniqueness; see Heim 1991 on the principle 'Maximize presupposition').

[1] [*(The) nine kilos that your hand-luggage weighs __] won't prevent you from
   boarding the plane.'

Unexpectedly, however, in the Romanian counterpart of [1], the reduced version is also perfectly felicitous, as shown in [2] (comparable data are found in Albanian; illustrations to be provided at the talk).

[2] [(Cele) nouă kilograme cât cântăreşte __ bagaju-l   tău de mână] nu te
    (*the*) *nine kilos   how-much weighs luggage-the your of hand not you*
    vor împiedica să   te urci in avion.
    will.PL prevent Subj Refl climb in plane

Importantly, the reduced version of [2] does not have indefinite force, i.e., it is not a partitive with the import of 'nine of the kilos that …', and the two versions of [2] seem to have essentially the same truth conditions, with the subtle difference that in out-of-the-blue contexts, the reduced version, unlike the full one, does not imply that the particular weight attributed to the luggage is part of the contextual assumptions of the speaker and addressee; rather, the natural interpretation is that the speaker guesses/assesses the weight of the luggage to be nine kilos, e.g., on the basis of its appearance.

Also important is the fact that the reduced version of [2], just like the full version, makes a statement about 9 kgs. **as the weight of a specific object,** and not about 9 kgs. in the abstract. What this means is that the bracketed structure in the reduced version of [2] cannot be explained away as an appositive construction analogous to, e.g., *nine kilos, which is what your hand-luggage weighs,* because it cannot, unlike the latter, felicitously serve as the argument of a predication like *is (also) the weight of my dog*.

These similarities notwithstanding, the two versions of [2] differ in the range of expressions that can serve as their CP-external head, the reduced version having a more restricted range of options available. For example, if 'nine' is replaced by 'few' in [2], the reduced version becomes totally unacceptable (just like its English counterpart), as illustrated in [3].

[3] [Puţine-*(le) kilograme} cât cântăreşte   bagajul   tău de mână] …
    few-(the)   kilos   how-much weighs luggage-the your of hand*
   '[*(The) few kilos that your hand-lugage weighs] …'

To capture the properties just noted, it will be proposed that the bracketed expression in the reduced version of [2] denotes a **restricted degree**, an extension of the notion **'restricted individual'**, which was used by Landman (1989) to characterize the italicized nominal in [4].

[4] *John as a judge* has been on strike for a full month, but as a hangman, he has never
   stopped working [context: John is both the judge and the hangman of some city).

Landman analyzes *John as a judge* as an intensional generalized quantifier, the set of properties that John has as a judge, represented as $j \uparrow J(UDGE)$, and I propose to analyze the relevant expression in [2] as the set of properties that the degree denoted by *nine kilos* has in the special circumstance where it is the weight of 'your' hand-luggage.

Compositional analyses will be outlined for both constructions in [2], and it will be shown how these analyses capture their shared and distinguishing properties. Specifically, the relative CP is translated in both versions of [2] as [5], i.e., as a singleton predicate of degrees whose member is the unique weight of your hand luggage (abbreviated as YHL).

[5] [[CP]] = $\lambda\delta.$ WEIGH(YHL, δ)   [δ a variable of the type of degrees].

The CPs in the two constructions contrast, however, with respect to the kind of modifier they form. Thus, [5] acquires modifier status in the full and reduced versions of data like [2] by virtue of the distinct operations shown in [6] and [7] respectively.

[6] CP → λPλδ.P(δ) ∧ CP(δ)

[7] CP → λδ.δ ↑ (λδ'.δ' = σ(CP))

Correspondingly, NP is also interpreted differently in the two constructions, in particular, as a set of degrees and as a degree respectively, as shown in [8] and [9] ('9kg' in [9] is the proper name of a degree).

[8] [[NP]] = λδ.δ = 9kg

[9] [[NP]] = 9kg

The application of [6] to [8] results in the intersection of NP and CP, which necessarily yields a singleton, because the intersection of any set with a singleton is itself a singleton; hence, the necessary definite article (in languages that have such an article, of course; Romanian does). The application of [7] to [9] maps a degree to the set of properties of that degree, where this set includes the property of being identical to the unique member of CP. The two bracketed expressions in [2] end up translated as in [10]-[11].

[10] σ[λδ.δ = 9k ∧ WEIGH(YHL, δ)] (full version of [2])

[11] 9kg ↑ (λδ.δ = σ(λδ". WEIGH(YHL, δ"))) (reduced version of [2])

These translations account for the similarity in truth conditions between the two versions of [2], since they denote, respectively, a unique degree that has the value '9kg' and constitutes the weight of YHL, and the set of properties of such a degree.

The proposed translations can also shed light on the differences between the two constructions. The fact that the reduced version does not, unlike the full one, assume contextual knowledge of the value of the weight will be shown to be traceable to the fact that in [10], both the denotation of NP and that of CP are in the scope of a definiteness operator, while in [11], only the denotation of CP is. Thus, both constructions assume that YHL has a unique value, but only the one in the full version also assumes that that value is the one described by NP.

The contrast in [3] can also be provided with an account based on the proposed translations. It will be proposed that the full version of [3] involves abstraction not over **degrees** i.e., points on a linear scale), but over **measure units** (which can be put together to define degrees), and that a comparable option is excluded in the restricted version. Degrees and measure units will be shown to be sortally different by exhibiting their different behavior under equation, as in [12].

[12] The weight of your luggage is {nine, *few} kilos.

[12] shows that *nine kilos,* but not *few kilos*, can be felicitously equated with *the weight of your luggage*, which incontrovertibly denotes a degree.

The lesser flexibility available for the mapping operation in [7] relative to the one in [6], and the special interpretation assigned to NP in [9], will be blamed on the fact that the construction illustrated by the reduced version of [2] seems to have peripheral, *sui generis,* status (its 'unexpected' presence in the languages in which it has been identified is, as far as one can tell, without a synchronic explanation at the moment). Its peripheral status notwithstanding, the construction at issue is theoretically interesting in being analyzable by means of an extension of an independently needed notion, i.e., 'restricted entity.'

References

Heim, I. 1991. Artikel und Definitheit. In *Semantics: An international handbook of contemporary research*, ed. A. von Stechow & D.Wunderlich. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 487 – 535.

Landman, F. 1989. Groups II, *Linguistics and Philosophy,* 12, 723 – 744.