Syntactic paradigms, markedness and similative markers in comparative and relative clauses

Julia Bacskai-Atkari

University of Konstanz

julia.bacskai-atkari@uni-konstanz.de

1 Introduction

manner deictic elements:

(1)   **So** möchte   ich mal tanzen   können.
      so want.1SG I   once dance.INF can.INF
      'I would like to be able to dance that way at some point.'

manner deictic elements can grammaticalise as complementisers (cf. König 2015) – two major forms:

- basic form (*so*)

- reinforced version, e.g. *as*, *als*, going back to *all* + *so* 'just as' (see Kortmann 1997 and López-Couso & Méndez-Naya 2014 for English, Jäger 2010 for German)

observation:

- the individual syntactic constructions involving a SO-complementiser partly constitute grammaticalisation paths (with two major directions)

- but: analogical changes affect the constructions beyond a single path

proposal:

- syntactic paradigms exist – members ordered according to markedness

- gaps in the paradigm appear to be systematic: they occur in the more marked (potential) slots

→ paradigm effects arise both for filled and non-filled slots

2 Grammaticalisation

manner deictic element can appear on its own:

(2)   a.   It is **so**.

        b.   Es ist **so**.
            it   is   so
            'It is so.'

no manner deixis proper with the reinforced forms (linguistic antecedent necessary):

(3)   a.   *It is **as**.

        b.   *Es ist **als**.
            it   is   as
            'It is so.'

appearance also in similative clauses – examples from Middle English:

(4)   a.   Se sæ heo onhefð . . . **swa swa** weall
            'The sea rises like a wall.' (*Vespesian Homilies* 90; Nevanlinna 1993)

        b.   beoð ofdred of euch mon **alswa as** þe þeof is
            'Be wary of every man just like the thief is.'
            (*Ancrene Wisse* 91; Nevanlinna 1993)

Old High German:

(5)   **só** thu giloubtus   **só** si   thir
     so you believed.3SG so be.SBJV you.DAT
     'Let it pass onto you as you believed.' (*Tatian* 84, 6; Jäger 2018)

grammaticalisation can proceed into two directions: relative and comparative clauses

- similatives → equative relatives → relatives

- similatives → degree equatives → (degree) comparatives

equative relatives:

(6)   a.   Al **such so** sette ben callid contemplatif soules and ravischid in loue of god.
            'All who plant are called contemplative souls and are delighted in the love of God.' (*The Tree and Twelve Fruits of the Holy Ghost* 60.14)

        b.   Now therefore let us make a covenant with our God to put away all the wives, and **such as** are born of them, according to the counsel of my lord, and of those that tremble at the commandment of our God; and let it be done according to the law. (*King James Bible*)

relative clauses:

(7) a. and yrfan hi **swa** hi wyrðe witan
     'And let those inherit whom they know worthy.' (*Charters* 578; Ericson 1931)

    b. He … was a chap **as** got a living anyhow.
        (Anderwald 2008)

example from Old Saxon – equative relative clause:

(8) **sulike** gesidoe   **so** he im   selbo gecos
     such   companions so he him self   chose
     'such companions that he chose for himself'
     (*Heliand* 1280; Brandner & Bräuning 2013)

example from German – relative clause:

(9) hier das   Geld   **so** ich neulich nicht habe mitschicken   können
     here the.M money so I   recently not   have with.send.INF can
     'Here the money that I recently could not send.'
     (Schiller to Goethe 127; Brandner & Bräuning 2013, quoting Paul 1920)

equative relatives involving a matrix equative-like head seem to be an intermediate step
  to relative clauses

other direction: similatives to equatives to comparatives – following a markedness hier-
  archy (Jäger 2018)

degree equatives:

(10) a. seoþ swa swyde þ hit þriwa wylle **swa** swyðe **swa** wæter flæsc
         'Cook it until it turns round as fast as water flash.'
         (*Peri Didaxeon* 104; Nevanlinna 1993)

     b. Mary is **as** tall **as** Susan is.

comparatives:

(11) Also this erbe haviþ **mo** vertues **as** endyue haþe.
      'This herb also has more virtue than endive has.'
      (J. Lelamour, ca. 1400; Jäger 2018)

equatives in German:

(12) a. wart   aber ie   **sô** werder man geborn [. . .] **sô** von Norwege Gâwân
         was.3SG but ever so noble.M man born   as from Norway Gawain
         'But was there ever born a man as noble as Gawain from Norway?'
         (*Parzival* 651, 8ff; Eggs 2006)

     b. dochn was   dâ   nieman **alsô** vrô **alsô** mîn her Gawein
         but   was.3SG there noone so   glad as   my lord Gawain
         'but noone was as glad there as my Lord Gawain' (*Iwein* 2618f; Eggs 2006)

comparatives in German:

(13)   Maria ist größer **als** Peter.
        Mary is   taller as Peter
        'Mary is taller than Peter.'

both directions of changes represent grammaticalisation – original manner deictic and
    similative meaning bleached

3   Paradigm effects

grammaticalisation processes appear to be unidirectional – e.g. complementiser taken
    over from equatives to comparatives but not vice versa (see Jäger 2018)

pattern:

(14)   comparatives ← degree equatives ← similatives → relative clauses

likewise: no changes affecting all these constructions as a single chain:

(15)   *comparatives → degree equatives → similatives → relative clauses

possible expectations: two chains unrelated, and grammaticalisation has no reverse effect

but: the syntactic similarities among all these constructions still hold (cf. Haspelmath &
    Buchholz 1998, Brandner & Bräuning 2013, Bacskai-Atkari 2018b)

→ the constructions constitute a syntactic paradigm

members of this paradigm are subject to diachronic changes in the complementiser along
    two major lines:

- morphological distinction among the individual members (comparable to phonolog-
  ical distinctions in inflectional paradigms)

- analogical changes affecting the morphological properties of the complementiser
  (comparable to analogical changes in pronominal systems, e.g. the change from
  h-pronouns to *th*-pronouns in 3Pl in Middle English)

morphological distinctions in Standard English:

construction	marker
relative	*that*
similative	*like*
equative	*as*
comparative	*than*

historically and dialectally: distinctions may differ

4

morphological distinctions in syntactic paradigms similar to phonological distinctions in morphological paradigms

German: changes from *d*-series to *w*-series also induce differentiations (see Jäger 2018)

e.g. Early New High German had initially *als* both in similatives and in equatives – later similatives predominantly contained *wie* 'how'

but: these changes not only cyclic but also analogical – in South German, the change from *als* to *wie* in comparison constructions (including later comparatives proper) is accompanied by the change from relative *so* to *wo* (Brandner & Bräuning 2013) – *wo* not a similative element otherwise (and changes affecting relatives cannot be a push chain here either)

→ analogical change from the *d*-series to the *w*-series affects the whole paradigm

paradigmatic change differs from simple analogical extension – e.g. hypothetical comparatives also take over the new similative complementisers (e.g. the combination *wie wenn* 'how if' in German) but this is additive, as the older patterns (e.g. *als wenn* 'as if', *als ob* 'as if') remain (see Jäger 2010; 2018, Bacskai-Atkari 2018a on the changes)

syntactic paradigms relating to functional elements are not only results of changes but they also contribute to the way changes happen

4 Markedness and gaps

Minimalist Morphology: the members of inflectional paradigms are ordered according to markedness (see Wunderlich & Fabri 1995, Wunderlich 1996; 1997; 2004)

feature values: only positive values in the paradigm – the more positive values, the more marked the given element is

e.g. past tense more marked than present tense: [+Pst]

systematic gaps in inflectional paradigms occur in the more marked slots – e.g. future tense more marked than present tense: in languages like English, there is no morphological future tense

similative-based paradigm: the unmarked pattern is the similative – source construction for others: grammaticalisation from the unmarked value to the marked values

- similative → equative → comparative (termed the "comparative cycle" by Jäger 2010; 2018)

- similative → relative (contrary to Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998)

similative constructions: no matrix (lexical) head needed:

(16)   a.   Es ist **wie** es ist.
             it is how it is
             'It is as it is.

        b.   Mary is **like** you.

        c.   It feels **like** I haven't done enough.

all other constructions contain a matrix lexical head:

- an NP in headed relative clauses

- a gradable predicate (AP or NP) in degree equatives and comparatives

(17)   a.   This is the **book** that I was talking about.
        b.   This book is as **boring** as the other one.
        c.   This book is more **boring** than the other one.

relative clauses: nominal head necessary (↔ equative relatives: a similative head is sufficient) – property [+rel] for shorthand

degree equatives and comparatives: degree property [+deg] – more marked (Jäger 2018)

degree interpretation: both a gradable predicate and a degree head present (Bacskai-Atkari 2019)

(18)   a.   Mary is **as tall** as Susan is.
        b.   Mary is **taller** than Susan is.

comparatives more marked than equatives – inequality/difference more marked than equality/similarity (Jäger 2018; see also Bacskai-Atkari 2016)

→ property [+ineq] in comparatives

differentiations in the paradigm – two kinds:

- systematic: starting from the unmarked member (similatives) – potentially leading to reanalysis processes (e.g *wie*), but not necessarily (e.g. *like*)

- system-external: innovations in the marked cases – not leading to reanalysis, e.g. non-similative-based complementisers such as English *that* or *than*

predictions based on markedness:

- gaps arise in the most marked slots, i.e. relative and comparative clauses

- languages that lack more unmarked members also lack the more marked members, but not the other way round

gaps in Germanic:

- relative pronouns (demonstrative-based or interrogative-based)

- historically: phrasal comparatives marked by case (dative/genitive, see Jäger 2018) – also in other European languages (often following the CONTRASTIVE or SEQUENCE schema, Stolz 2013)

typological predictions also borne out

Estonian has phrasal equatives and phrasal comparatives (also: similative-based clausal equatives and comparatives with *kui*):

(19)   a.   Minu õde   on minu pikk**one**.
            my   sister is me   tall.EQUAT
            'My sister is as tall as me.' (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998)

        b.   kevad on sügis**est**   ilusam
            spring is fall.COMPR more.beautiful
            'The spring is more beautiful than the fall.' (Stassen 2013)

typologically: (19a) less common than (19b)

relative clauses: similative base common in European languages (but not exclusive)

Nenets: similative clauses possible, but relative clauses independent (possessive-based):

(20)   a.   Ne   nāmi   sit   piruvna ŋobtarcja sjadota.
            woman sibling.1SG you.GEN as   same   beautiful
            'My sister is as beautiful as you.' (Haspelmath & Buchholz 1998)

        b.   [xans-əm] neːpək-eːm
             write-MC book-1SG
            'the book I wrote' (Ackerman & Nikolaeva 2013)

→ gaps in the complementiser paradigm appear in the more marked slots

5 Conclusion

modelling a similative-based syntactic paradigm (in Germanic)

- syntactic similarities point to the relatedness of the constructions

- analogical changes and differentiations beyond mere relatedness – paradigmatic effects

- markedness similar to marked members of inflectional paradigms

predictions made by assuming a syntactic paradigm borne out both for a single system and typologically

References

Ackerman, Farrell & Irina Nikolaeva. 2013. *Descriptive typology and linguistic theory: A study in the morphosyntax of relative clauses.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Anderwald, Lieselotte. 2008. The varieties of English spoken in the Southeast of England: Morphology and syntax. In Clive Kortmann, Bernd & Upton (ed.), *Varieties of English: The British Isles*, 440–462. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bacskai-Atkari, Julia. 2016. Towards a cross-linguistic typology of marking polarity in embedded degree clauses. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 63(4). 389–409.

Bacskai-Atkari, Julia. 2018a. Complementizers and negative polarity in German hypothetical comparatives. In Christine Dimroth & Stefan Sudhoff (eds.), *The grammatical realization of polarity: Theoretical and experimental approaches*, 89–108. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bacskai-Atkari, Julia. 2018b. *Deletion phenomena in comparative constructions: English comparatives in a cross-linguistic perspective.* Berlin: Language Science Press. doi:10.5281/zenodo.2545509.

Bacskai-Atkari, Julia. 2019. Towards a Fanselownian analysis of degree expressions. In Jessica M. M. Brown, Andreas Schmidt & Marta Wierzba (eds.), *Of trees and birds: A Festschrift for Gisbert Fanselow*, 95–106. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.

Brandner, Ellen & Iris Bräuning. 2013. The particle *wo* in Alemannic: Only a complementizer? *Linguistische Berichte* 234. 131–169.

Eggs, Frederike. 2006. *Die Grammatik von* als *und* wie. Tübingen: Narr.

Ericson, Eston Everett. 1931. The use of Old English 'swa' as a pseudo-pronoun. *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 30(1). 6–20.

Haspelmath, Martin & Oda Buchholz. 1998. Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe. In Johan van der Auwera & Dónall Ó Baoill (eds.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*, 277–334. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jäger, Agnes. 2010. Der Komparativzyklus und die Position der Vergleichspartikeln. *Linguistische Berichte* 224. 467–493.

Jäger, Agnes. 2018. *Vergleichskonstruktionen im Deutschen: Diachroner Wandel und synchrone Variation.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

König, Ekkehard. 2015. Manner deixis as source of grammatical markers in Indo-European languages. In Carlotta Viti (ed.), *Perspectives on historical syntax*, 33–60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kortmann, Bernd. 1997. *Adverbial subordination: A typology and history of adverbial subordinators based on European languages.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

López-Couso, María José & Belén Méndez-Naya. 2014. On comparative complementizers in English: Evidence from historical corpora. In Nila Méndez-Naya Vazques (ed.), *Creation and use of historical English corpora in Spain*, 311–333. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Nevanlinna, Saara. 1993. The structure of Middle English similes of equality. In Matti Rissanen et al. (eds.), *Early English in the computer age: Explorations through the Helsinki Corpus*, 139–170. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

Paul, Hermann. 1920. *Deutsche Grammatik, Band 3: Syntax.* Halle: Niemeyer.

Stassen, Leon. 2013. Comparative constructions. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*, Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Available at http://wals.info/chapter/121 (last accessed: 2 February 2016).

Stolz, Thomas. 2013. *Competing comparative constructions in Europe.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Wunderlich, Dieter. 1996. Minimalist Morphology: The role of paradigms. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 1995*, 93–114. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Wunderlich, Dieter. 1997. Cause and the structure of verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 27–68.

Wunderlich, Dieter. 2004. Is there any need for the concept of directional syncretism? In Gereon Müller, Lutz Gunkel & Gisela Zifonun (eds.), *Explorations in nominal inflection*, 373–395. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wunderlich, Dieter & Ray Fabri. 1995. Minimalist Morphology: An approach to inflection. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 14(2). 236–294. doi:10.1515/zfsw.1995.14.2.236.