

Deletion, Operators and Comparative Clause Formation Cross-linguistically

Julia Bacskai-Atkari
University of Potsdam (SFB-632)

julia.bacskai-atkari@uni-potsdam.de

SynSem Colloquium
Potsdam
7 January 2014

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 \pm 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

cf. Chomsky (1977), Kennedy and Merchant (2000)

The left periphery

on multiple CPs, cf. Rizzi (1997, 1999, 2004)

(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 overttness 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

contrastive 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 overttness requirement

Standard English: zero operator

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

English

- *what* (cf. Chomsky 1977) – takes no lexical AP

(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. Bacskai-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

- *amilyen* 'how'

- (13) a. Mari magasabb volt, mint **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 **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.'

- *amennyire* 'how much'

- (14) a. Mari magasabb volt, mint **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 **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

irrespective of whether the AP is contrastive or not

→ information structure plays no role in these configurations

no violation of the overttness 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. Bacskai-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

(17)



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

cf. É. Kiss (2002), Bródy (1990, 1995)

→ infelicitous for a non-contrastive AP

→ preferred position for a contrastive AP

Czech *jak*

jak + non-contrastive AP:

- (20) a. ?? Marie je vyšší, než **jak vysoký** je Karel.
Mary is taller than how tall is Charles
'Mary is taller than Charles.'
- b. ? Marie je vyšší, než **jak** je **vysoký** Karel.
Mary is taller than how is tall Charles
'Mary is taller than Charles.'
- c. #Marie je vyšší, než **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. Bacskai-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. Bacskai-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

Estonian zero operator

- (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

← overttness 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

- (25) a. *Marie je vyšší, než je **vysoký** Karel.
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.'

Czech

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

possible reason: no zero operator in Czech?
(~Hungarian, cf. Bacskai-Atkari 2013a, 2013b)

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 **szersokie**.
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
(overttness 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

cf. Kennedy and Merchant (2000)

- 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

Bacskai-Atkari (2013a), based on Kennedy and Merchant (2000):

(30)



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 (← overttness requirement):

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

Overttness requirement

QP not licensed in the [Spec,FP] position in the lower copy
(cf. Kennedy and Merchant 2000)

reason: overttness 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) *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

Kennedy and Merchant (2000: 104, ex. 30):

- (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

Kennedy and Merchant (2000: 104, ex. 29):

(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

Czech

Kennedy and Merchant (2000: 105, ex. 32b):

- (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]
overttness 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 (\leftrightarrow 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


operator overt?

A short guide

operator overt?

YES

NO



A short guide


operator overt?

YES


NO




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide



A short guide



A short guide



A short guide


operator overt?

YES


NO




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide




A short guide



A short guide



A short guide



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!



References

- Bacskai-Atkari, Julia (2012) Reducing Attributive Comparative Deletion. *The Even Yearbook* 10. 1–25.
- Bacskai-Atkari, Julia (2013a) *The Syntax of Comparative Constructions: Operators, Ellipsis Phenomena and Functional Left Peripheries*. PhD dissertation submitted to the University of Potsdam.
- Bacskai-Atkari, Julia (2013b) *Comparative Deletion in Germanic*. Talk delivered to: Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop 28 (CGSW 28), Leipzig, Universität Leipzig, 4–5 October 2013.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David (2002) A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and ‘Covert’ Movement. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20.2: 197–267.
- Bošković, Željko (2005) On the Locality of Left Branch Extraction and the Structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59.1. 1–45.
- Bošković, Željko and Jairo Nunes (2007) The Copy Theory of Movement: A View from PF. In: Norbert Corver and Jairo Nunes (eds.) *The Copy Theory of Movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 13–74.

References

- Bresnan, Joan (1973) The Syntax of the Comparative Clause Construction in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4. 275–343.
- Bródy, Michael (1990) Some Remarks on the Focus Field in Hungarian. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2: 201–225.
- Bródy, Michael (1995) Focus and Checking Theory. In: István Kenesei (ed.) *Approaches to Hungarian 5: Levels and Structures*. Szeged: JATE. 31–43.
- Chomsky, Noam (1977) On WH-movement. In: Peter W. Culicover et al. (eds.) *Formal Syntax*. New York: Academic Press. 71–132.
- Chomsky, Noam (2005) *On Phases*. Ms. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- É. Kiss, Katalin (2002) *The Syntax of Hungarian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grebenyova, Lydia (2004) Sluicing and Left-Branch Extraction out of Islands. In: Vineeta Chand et al. (eds.) *WCCFL 23: The Proceedings of the 23rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press. 164–172.

References

- Kayne, Richard (1983) Connectedness. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 223–250.
- Kennedy, Christopher (2002) Comparative Deletion and Optimality in Syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20. 553–621.
- Kennedy, Christopher and Jason Merchant (2000) Attributive Comparative Deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 18. 89–146.
- Lechner, Winfried (2004) *Ellipsis in Comparatives*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In: Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 281–337.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1999) *On the Position “Int(errogative)” in the Left Periphery of the Clause*. Retrieved 31 March 2008, from: www.ciscl.unisi.it/doc/doc_pub/int.doc
- Rizzi, Luigi (2004) Locality in the Left Periphery. In: Adriana Belletti (ed.) *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 223–251.

References

- Ross, John Robert (1986) *Infinite Syntax*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing.
- Rudin, Catherine (1988) On Multiple Questions and Multiple WH Fronting. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 6. 445–501.
- Šimík, Radek (2010) Interpretation of Multiple Interrogatives: An Information Structure Sensitive Account. In: Wayles Browne et al. (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 18*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 486–501.
- Šimík, Radek and Marta Wierzba (2012) *Givenness and Scrambling in Czech: Experimental Evidence for a Stress-based Approach*. Ms., University of Potsdam / SFB-632.