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Introduction

Comparative Deletion in (Standard) English: absence of a lexical AP/NP from the subclause - cf. Bresnan (1973)

• predicative structures:

(1)  a. *Mary is taller than Liz is tall.
    b. The desk is longer than the office is wide.

• attributive structures:

(2)  a. *Mary bought a smarter dog than Liz did a dog/a smart dog.
    b. Mary bought a smarter dog than Liz did a (*smart) cat.
Information structure seems to be decisive

contrastive AP/NP remains overt – (1b) and (2b)

question:

is the (Standard) English pattern universal or is it related to parametric settings?
Cross-linguistic variation

- languages that allow both (1a) and (1b)
- languages that prohibit both (1a) and (1b)
- languages that allow (2) but not (1)

→ Comparative Deletion is subject to parametric variation

→ Comparative Deletion cannot be conditioned in a ± fashion
Proposal

comparative clause formation is dependent on several factors

- overtness of the comparative operator
- extractability of the operator from the quantified degree expression
- properties of movement chains – realisation of lower copies
- information structure
The Standard English pattern

comparative subclause: operator movement of the quantified expression

The left periphery


(3)
Copies

two copies: higher copy in a [Spec,CP] position, lower copy in the base position

operator: zero (x) in Standard English

(4) a. Mary is taller than [x-tall] Charles is [x-tall].
   b. The desk is longer than [x-wide] the office is [x-wide].
The overtness requirement

a lexical AP (or NP) is licensed in an operator position such as [Spec,CP] if the operator itself is overt

→ higher copies of the QPs in (4) deleted
Lower copies

realised only if contrastive (Bacskai-Atkari 2012, 2013a, 2013b)

• possible if the higher copy cannot be pronounced
  (cf. Bošković and Nunes 2007)
• otherwise regularly deleted
  (Bobaljik 2002; Chomsky 2005; Bošković and Nunes 2007)

→ final string:

(5) a. Mary is taller than [x-tall] Charles is [x-tall].
  b. The desk is longer than [x-wide] the office is [x-wide].
Extractability

movement of the entire QP (including the AP): operator cannot be extracted

similarly: how in interrogatives

(6) a. How tall is Mary?
   b. *How is Mary tall?

deletion in [Spec,CP] ← operator not overt and not extractable – AP cannot be stranded
Nominal comparatives

similarly: quantified degree expression cannot be moved out of a DP

• interrogatives:

(7)  a. **How many dogs** did Mary buy?
    b. *How many** did Mary buy **dogs**?

• comparatives:

(8)  a. Mary bought more dogs than [x-many dogs] Liz bought [x-many dogs].

    b. Mary bought more dogs than [x-many cats] Liz bought [x-many cats].
Contrastiveness

ccontrastive lower copy remains

it can be GIVEN (Kennedy 2002, quoting Chomsky 1977):

(9) A: This desk is higher than that one is wide.  
    B: What is more, this desk is higher than that one is HIGH.
Role of information structure

only contrastive lower copies remain

deletion itself is not tied to information structural properties
Standard English pattern

contingent upon three factors:

- the operator is zero
- the operator is not extractable
- the overt realisation of contrastive lower copies is licensed
The overtness requirement

Standard English: zero operator

but: overt operators in other languages and certain dialects of English
English


(10) % Mary is taller than [what] Liz is [what].

- *how*

(11) a. % Mary is taller than [how tall] Charles is [how tall].
    b. % The desk is longer than [how wide] the office is [how wide].
Dutch

- *hoe* ‘how’ (cf. Bacskaï-Atkari 2013a, 2013b)

(12) a. % Maria is groter dan *hoe groot* Jan is.
   Mary is taller than *how tall* John is
   ‘Mary is taller than John.’

   b. % De tafel is langer dan *hoe breed* het kantoor is.
      the table is longer than *how wide* the. *NEUT* office is
      ‘The table is longer than the office is wide.’

(online) study with 70 speakers (September/August 2013):
acceptability marked from 5 (best) to 1 (worst)
*hoe + AP: (12a) fully acceptable for 16%, (12b) for 27%
average rating for (12a): 2.84
average rating for (12b): 3.41
Hungarian

• \textit{amilyen} ‘how’

(13) a. Mari magasabb volt, mint \textit{amilyen magas} Zsuzsa volt.
    Mary taller was.3SG than how tall Susan was.3SG
    ‘Mary was taller than Susan.’

    b. Az asztal hosszabb volt, mint \textit{amilyen széles} az iroda volt.
    the table longer was.3SG than how wide the office was.3SG
    ‘The table was longer than the office was wide.’

• \textit{amennyire} ‘how much’

(14) a. Mari magasabb volt, mint \textit{amennyire magas} Zsuzsa volt.
    Mary taller was.3SG than how.much tall Susan was.3SG
    ‘Mary was taller than Susan.’

    b. Az asztal hosszabb volt, mint \textit{amennyire széles} az iroda volt.
    the table longer was.3SG than how.much wide the office was.3SG
    ‘The table was longer than the office was wide.’
Czech

- *jak* ‘how’

(15) a. ?? Marie je vyšší, než *jak vysoký* je Karel.
   Mary is taller than *how tall* is Charles
   ‘Mary is taller than Charles.’

b. ?? Ten stůl je delší, než *jak široká* je ta kancelář.
   that desk is longer than *how wide* is that office
   ‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’
Information structure

overt operator + AP allowed in a [Spec,CP] position if the operator is overt

irrespectively of whether the AP is contrastive or not

→ information structure plays no role in these configurations

no violation of the overtness requirement – no deletion required
Extractable and non-extractable operators

Standard English: zero operator not extractable – AP cannot be stranded

same holds for how in comparatives (and in interrogatives):

(16) a. *Mary is taller than how Charles is tall.
   b. *The desk is longer than how the office is wide.

possibility of overt operator without a lexical AP/NP: not excluded by overtness requirement
cf. the proform what in English

Dutch hoe ‘how’, Hungarian amilyen ‘how’ not extractable
cf. Bacskaia-Atkari 2013a, 2013b)
Operator positions

two different operator positions in the extended projection of the AP

two functional layers – DegP and QP (cf. Lechner 2004)

operator: a Deg head or a QP modifier
Structure
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Extractability

Deg heads not extractable
(Hungarian amilyen, English how)

QP modifiers extractable if the entire QP is in a predicative position

e.g. Hungarian amennyire ‘how much’, Czech jak ‘how’
Hungarian *amennyire*

*amennyire* + non-contrastive AP:

(18) Mari magasabb,
Mary taller

a. mint *amennyire magas* Péter volt.
than how.much tall Peter was

b. #mint *amennyire* Péter *magas* volt.
than how.much Peter tall was
‘Mary is taller than Peter was.’

c. mint *amennyire* Péter volt *magas*.
than how.much Peter was tall

‘Mary is taller than Peter was.’
Hungarian *amennyire*

*amennyire* + contrastive AP:

(19) A macska kövérebb,
the cat fatter

a. ? mint *amennyire széles* a macskaajtó volt.
    than how.much wide the cat flap was
b. mint *amennyire* a macskaajtó *széles* volt.
    than how.much the cat flap wide was
c. ? mint *amennyire* a macskaajtó volt *széles*.
    than how.much the cat flap was wide

‘The cat is fatter than the cat flap was wide.’
Hungarian *amennyire*

preverbal position in Hungarian: canonical focus position


→ infelicitous for a non-contrastive AP
→ preferred position for a contrastive AP
Czech \textit{jak}

\textit{jak} + non-contrastive AP:

(20) a. ?? Marie je vyšší, než \textit{jak vysoký} je Karel.
Mary is taller than how tall is Charles
‘Mary is taller than Charles.’

b. ? Marie je vyšší, než \textit{jak je vysoký} Karel.
Mary is taller than how is tall Charles
‘Mary is taller than Charles.’

c. #Marie je vyšší, než \textit{jak je Karel vysoký}.
Mary is taller than how is Charles tall
‘Mary is taller than Charles.’
Czech *jak*

*jak* + contrastive AP:

(21) a. ?? Ten stůl je delší, než *jak* široká je ta kancelář.
   that desk is longer than how wide is that office
   ‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’

b. #Ten stůl je delší, než *jak* je široká ta kancelář.
   that desk is longer than wide is wide that office
   ‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’

c. Ten stůl je delší, než *jak* je ta kancelář široká.
   that desk is longer than wide is that office wide
   ‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’
Czech *jak*

(20c) and (21b) infelicitous

- clause-final position: sentential stress position (Šimík and Wierzba 2012)
- main contrast expressed by *Karel* in (20) ↔ in (21): by the AP *široká* ‘wide’

AP may move together with the operator to [Spec,CP] but this is not the preferred position
not sensitive to information structural properties
Information structure

→ role of information structure: determines the preferred position of the AP

condition: the operator is separable
Operators

operators can be overt/covert, extractable/non-extractable

- overt, non-extractable: e.g. English *how*
- overt, extractable: e.g. Czech *jak*
- covert, non-extractable: e.g. English *zero*
- covert, extractable: ???

stranded AP should be acceptable irrespectively of whether it is contrastive or not
German zero operator

cf. Bacskaia-Atkari (2013a, 2013b)

(22)  a. ?Maria ist größer als Michael groß ist.
      Mary is taller than Michael tall is
      ‘Mary is taller than Michael.’

b. Der Tisch ist länger als das Büro breit ist.
      the.MASC table is longer than the.NEUT office wide is
      ‘The table is longer than the office is wide.’
Dutch zero operator

cf. Bacskaï-Atkari (2013a, 2013b)

(23) a. Maria is groter dan Jan groot is.
     Mary is taller than John tall is
     ‘Mary is taller than John.’

     b. De tafel is langer dan het kantoor breed is
     the table is longer than the. NEUT office wide is
     ‘The table is longer than the office is wide.’
Dutch zero operator

online study (70 speakers)

(23a) fully acceptable for 10%, average rating: 2.80

(23b) fully acceptable for 81%, average rating: 4.71
(24) a. ‘Jaan on pikem kui Mari on pikk.’
John is taller than Mary is tall
‘John is taller than Mary is.’

b. ‘Vastuvõtulaud on pikem kui kontor on lai.’
desk is longer than office is wide
‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’
Visibility and extractability

deletion in [Spec,CP]: if the AP moves together with the zero operator

← overtness requirement

optional for extractable operators

→ visibility and extractability of the operator are truly two independent factors
Predicative comparatives in Czech and Polish

- **Czech**: AP in the base position + zero operator ruled out

   Mary is taller than is tall Charles
   ‘Mary is taller than Charles.’

b. *Ten stůl je delší, než je ta kancelář široká.
   that desk is longer than is that office wide
   ‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’
ungrammaticality of (25)

zero operator → higher copy has to be deleted (overtness requirement)

but: lower copy cannot remain even if it is contrastive, see (25b)
↔ English


overt operator jak ‘how’ available
Predicative comparatives in Czech and Polish

- Polish: AP in the base position + zero operator unacceptable for most speakers

(26) a. *Maria jest wyższa niż Karol jest wysoki.
   Mary is taller than Charles is tall
   ‘Mary is taller than Charles.’

   b. */?? Stół jest dłuższy niż biuro jest szerokie.
   desk is longer than office is wide
   ‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’
Polish

ungrammaticality of (26)

zero operator → higher copy has to be deleted
(overtness requirement)

but: lower copy cannot remain even if it is contrastive, see (26b)
↔ English

possible reason: no zero operator in Polish at all? (~Czech?)
But...

there is no overt operator either
only candidate would be jak ‘how’

(27) a. *Maria jest wyższa niż jak wysoki jest Karol.
Mary is taller than how tall is Charles
‘Mary is taller than Charles.’

b. *Stół jest dłuższy niż jak szerokie jest biuro.
desk is longer than how wide is office
‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’
So...

→ different reason – operator must be zero

  comparative operator required by semantics in clausal comparatives

if there is an extractable zero operator, then both sentences in (27) should be fine

  ~ zero in German, Dutch, Estonian

→ the zero operator is not extractable (~English)

→ question: why a contrastive lower copy cannot be realised in Polish (and Czech?)
Attributive comparatives

attributive comparatives in English:

(28) a. Mary bought a bigger dog than Peter did.

b. Mary bought a bigger dog than Peter did a cat.
The syntax of attributive modification in English


- QP modifier cannot be extracted from within the nominal expression
- QP modifier moves to a left peripheral position within the nominal expression

interrogatives:

(29) **How big a dog** did Mary buy?
Structure
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Comparatives

same inversion in comparatives like (28):

(31) Mary bought a bigger dog than [x-big a cat] Peter did buy [x-big a cat].

entire nominal expression (FP) moves up ← QP cannot be extracted

DP-island constraint
(Kayne 1983; Ross 1986; Grebenyova 2004; Bošković 2005)

higher copy of the FP deleted (← overtness requirement):

(32) Mary bought a bigger dog than [x-big a cat] Peter did buy [x-big a cat].
Overtness requirement


reason: overtness requirement – operator position (Bacskai-Atkari 2013a)

QP cannot be eliminated on its own (no separate mechanism)

→ VP-ellipsis applies (Kennedy and Merchant 2000; see also Bacskai-Atkari 2013a)

(33) Mary bought a bigger dog than [x-big-a cat] Peter did buy [x-big-a cat].
Verb deletion

lexical verb cannot be overt:

\[(34) \quad *\text{Mary bought a bigger dog than Peter bought a cat.}\]

condition for the grammaticality of structures like (34):
QP can move out on its own
→ can be used as a test for the extractability of the QP (even if the QP is not visible)
Attributive comparatives in Czech and Polish

QP extractable from the nominal expression visible in interrogatives
Czech


(35) a. Jak velké auto Václav koupil?
    how big car Václav bought
    ‘How big a car did Václav buy?’

b. Jak velké Václav koupil auto?
    how big Václav bought car
    ‘How big a car did Václav buy?’
Polish


(36) a. Jak długą sztukę napisał Paweł?
    how long     play     wrote     Paweł
    ‘How long a play did Paweł write?’

b. Jak długą napisał Paweł sztukę?
   how long     wrote     Paweł     play
   ‘How long a play did Paweł write?’
Comparatives

lexical verb + remnant NP licensed
(37) Václav koupil větší auto než Tomáš ztratil loď.
Václav bought bigger car than Tomáš lost boat.
‘Václav bought a bigger car than the boat that Tomáš lost.’
Polish

Kennedy and Merchant (2000: 104, ex. 31a):

(38) Jan napisał dłuższy list, niż Paweł napisał sztukę.
Jan wrote longer letter than Paweł wrote play
‘Jan wrote a longer letter than Paweł did a play.’
So...

higher copy of the QP: deleted in [Spec,CP] overtness requirement

remnant NP not affected – not a lower copy itself

→ there is a zero comparative operator both in Czech and in Polish
Predicative comparatives in Czech and Polish – a second attempt

zero operator + AP
→ unacceptability of lower copies of non-contrastive APs
(~English):

(39) a. *Marie je vyšší, než je vysoký Karel.
   Mary is taller than is tall Charles
   ‘Mary is taller than Charles.’

   b. *Maria jest wyższa niż Karol jest wysoki.
   Mary is taller than Charles is tall
   ‘Mary is taller than Charles.’
But...

contrastiveness does not license contrastive lower copies either (↔ English):

(40) a. *Ten stůl je delší, než je ta kancelář široká. 
that desk is longer than is that office wide 
‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’

b. */?? Stół jest dłuższy niż biuro jest szerokie. 
desk is longer than office is wide 
‘The desk is longer than the office is wide.’
Movement chains

→ difference in the overt realisation of copies of a movement chain

no multiple *wh*-fronting in English:

↔ Czech, Polish: multiple *wh*-fronting (cf. Rudin 1988)
Czech

(41) a. *Kdo koho* viděl?
   who whom saw
   ‘Who saw whom?’

   b. *Kdo* viděl *koho*?
   who saw whom
   ‘Who saw whom?’

note: (41b) marked ungrammatical by Rudin (1988)
but cf. Šimík (2010) on multiple wh
Polish

Rudin (1988: 497, ex. 104):

(42) a. **Kto kiedy wyjechał?**
   who when left
   ‘Who left when?’

b.  *Kto wyjechał **kiedy**?
   who left when
   ‘Who left when?’
Proposal

languages with non-extractable zero comparative operator

↔ German, Dutch, Estonian: extractable zero operator availability of (39)

Estonian: allows multiple wh-fronting (preferred option)

→ proposal: (40) unacceptable because the realisation of lower copies is generally not preferred in the given languages (↔ English)
Predicative comparatives – a short guide

in case you seem to have forgotten which language(s) you speak...
A short guide
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A short guide

operator overt?

YES

NO
A short guide

operator overt?

YES

NO
A short guide

operator overt?

| NO |
---|---|

operator extractable?

| YES | NO |
---|---|
A short guide

operator overt?

operator extractable?

YES

NO

NO
A short guide

operator overt?

NO

operator extractable?

YES

German(∅)

Dutch (∅)

Estonian(∅)
A short guide

operator overt?

operator extractable?

YES

NO

NO
A short guide

operator overt?

NO

operator extractable?

YES

NO
A short guide

operator overt?
  NO
operator extractable?
  NO
lower copies available?
  NO
YES
  NO
A short guide

operator overt?
  NO
operat or extractable?
  NO
lower copies available?
  NO
  YES

  NO
A short guide

operator overt?
  NO
  operator extractable?
   NO
   lower copies available?
    YES
    English (Ø)
A short guide

operator overt?

NO

operator extractable?

NO

lower copies available?

YES

NO
A short guide

operator overt?
  NO
operator extractable?
  NO
lower copies available?
  YES
  NO
A short guide

operator overt?
  NO
operator extractable?
  NO
lower copies available?
  NO
Czech (Ø)  Polish (Ø)
Conclusion

Standard English pattern far from being universal

Comparative Deletion: result of various factors

- overtness of the comparative operator
- extractability of the operator from the quantified degree expression
- properties of movement chains – realisation of lower copies
- information structure
Thank you!

Danke!

😊
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