

Non-degree equatives and reanalysis

Julia Bacskai-Atkari
University of Potsdam

My talk examines the status of comparative markers in non-degree equative subclauses and their diachronic relation to other elements expressing similarity, with special focus on the grammaticalisation of matrix equative elements into the subordinate clause. I argue that Old Hungarian non-degree equatives had several possibilities for lexicalising the comparative marker, most of which were not available in degree equatives (cf. Kántor 2013, Bacskai-Atkari 2014). They generally correspond to an operator *how*, and in the rare cases of grammaticalising into a complementiser (as with *mint* ‘as’), they represent a standard case of specifier-to-head reanalysis, analogous to comparatives expressing inequality (see Bacskai-Atkari 2014). However, Old Hungarian also represents a case of the matrix equative element reinterpreted as a C head, resulting in a double CP, giving the combinations *oly-mint* ‘so.ADJ-as’ and *úgy-mint* ‘so.ADV-as’. This reanalysis is similar to the one leading to the combination *als wie* in Early New High German equatives (see Jäger 2016), with the important difference that the Hungarian combinations were not analogically extended from non-degree equatives to degree equatives. I argue that this follows from the different syntactic position of Hungarian *mint* and German *wie*.

Observe the following examples from Modern Hungarian, where the availability of the bracketed constituents indicates that there is an underlying finite clause in each case:

- (1) a. Mari **olyan magas** volt, **mint** (amilyen magas) Anna (volt).
Mary so tall was.3SG as how tall Anne was.3SG
‘Mary was as tall as Anne.’
- b. Mari **magas** volt, **mint** (ahogy) Anna (is az volt).
Mary tall was.3SG as how.ADV Anne too that was.3SG
‘Mary was tall, as was Anne.’
- c. Mari **olyan** volt, **mint** (amilyen) Anna (volt).
Mary so was.3SG as how Anne was.3SG
‘Mary was like Anne.’

The example in (1a) shows a degree equative: the matrix equative marker *olyan* ‘so’ takes a gradable adjective and a comparative CP (introduced by *mint* ‘as’) as its two arguments (cf. e.g. von Stechow, Lechner 2004). In order to have a gradable equative, both the gradable adjective and the matrix equative head are necessary. If one of them is absent, as in (1b) and (1c), the result is a non-degree equative (cf. e.g. Jäger 2010), also called similitive construction (cf. e.g. Haspelmath and Buchholz 1998); it is also possible that neither a gradable argument nor a matrix equative marker is present. The interrelatedness of the constructions in question is well known in the literature and is indicated by the fact that the subordinate clause is introduced by the same complementiser. While the complementiser may be shared between degree and non-degree equatives, as with Modern Hungarian *mint* and German *wie*, this is not necessarily the case: English allows *as* but not *like* in (1a), while *as* is not possible in (1c). I argue that degree equatives represent a more grammaticalised construction, whereby the matrix equative element imposes selectional restrictions on the comparative C head and thus allows only for a subset of equative markers; conversely, grammaticalisation may preserve a complementiser that is semantically vacuous and not available in non-degree equatives anymore.

I present the results of a corpus study (using the normalised part of the Old Hungarian Concordance), the core part of which offers a comparison between the translations of Latin *quasi* and *tamquam* (both used in non-degree equatives) in two translations of the gospels: the Munich Codex (1466) and the Jordánszky Codex (1516, 1519). Both show sporadic examples of *mint*, and a clear split regarding four other elements. The Munich C. has 4 examples for *miként* and 21 for *monnal*, while the Jordánszky C. has 8 examples for *miképpen* and 16 for *oly-mint* and 1 for

úgy-mint (there are no one-to-one correspondences between the Latin and the Hungarian variants, or a clear parallelism between the two Hungarian translations regarding the choice of comparative elements). The corpus search yields further results for *monnal* only in the Vienna Codex, which is very closely related to the Munich C., suggesting that it was a dialectally restricted option. Regarding *oly-mint*, further results can be found in the Kazinczy Codex, which is from the same period as the Jordánszky C. but there is no obvious relation between the two; the Kazinczy C. is only in part translation, indicating that *oly-mint* was not restricted to Latin translations. Note also that while the morphological makeup of Latin *tam-quam* ‘so-as’ is essentially the same as that of *oly-mint* ‘so-as’, the vast majority of its occurrences in the Jordánszky C. has *quasi* in the Latin original (which derives from *quam si* ‘as if’ but was no longer transparent, Tarrío 2011). An example for *oly-mint* is given in (2):

- (2) Es legottan mynt ky yewe az vyzból, lataa a’
 and immediately as out came.3SG the water.ELA saw.3SG the
 menyorzagot nythvan lenny, es yftennek zent lelkeet **oly mynth**
 heaven.ACC open.PTCP be.INF and god.DAT sacred spirit.ACC so as
 galamb kepeben le zallany
 dove picture.POSS.INE down descend.INF
 ‘And immediately, coming up from the water, He saw the heavens parting and the Spirit descending upon Him like a dove.’

I argue that *oly* was reanalysed from a matrix equative element into a subclausal C head. Regarding the syntax of equatives, I modify the analysis of Lechner (2004) for comparatives inasmuch as I treat the element *as/so/olyan* as an Equat(ive) head and not a Deg(re)e head, and I assume that the degree interpretation of an Equat head arises if it takes a gradable argument in its specifier but not otherwise. Further, I assume that in degree equatives the Equat head moves to a higher functional projection, QP (cf. Bacskai-Atkari 2014), which derives the Equat + AP order, see (1a). In non-degree equatives, the Equat head has no degree specification and expresses only similarity, see (1c); further, it does not move to QP. While the comparative subclause is regularly extraposed, the lack of a gradable AP makes constellations possible where *oly(an)* and *mint* were actually adjacent. Once the original Equat head is extraposed together with the CP, it can be interpreted as part of the CP, given its functional similarity to the existing complementiser: this merely involves assigning a different label to *oly* (Equat > C) and renders a more transparent structure. The base-generation of a matrix EquatP became superfluous since while a clause-internal Equat head can function as a placeholder for an extraposed clause, an extraposed one cannot; the change in the status of *oly* is phonologically motivated as the complex *oly-mint* involves a reduced (proclitic) form and not the full form (*olyan*). This gave a C + C combination in the subclause, similarly to German *als wie*. However, *oly* was not extended to degree equatives: I will argue that this is because in Old Hungarian the complementiser *mint* was already a high C head in degree equatives (though not in comparatives), dominating another CP projection hosting the comparative operator, and while both CPs are semantically motivated in degree equatives and comparatives, a third CP is not.

References. Bacskai-Atkari, J. (2014) Cyclical change in Hungarian comparatives. *Diachronica* 31.4. ● Haspelmath, M. & O. Buchholz (1998) Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe. In: *EUROTYP 3*. Mouton de Gruyter. ● Jäger, A. (2010) Der Komparativzyklus und die Position der Vergleichspartikel. *Linguistische Berichte* 224. ● Jäger, A. (2016) *Vergleichskonstruktionen im Deutschen: Diachroner Wandel und synchrone Variation*. Habilitationsschrift. Universität zu Köln. ● Kántor, G. (2013) *Hungarian mint as Conj⁰*. Paper presented at: ICSH 11, 29–31 August 2013. ● Tarrío, E. (2011) Comparative clauses. In: *Complex sentences, grammaticalization, typology*. Walter de Gruyter. ● Lechner, W. (2004) *Ellipsis in comparatives*. Mouton de Gruyter. ● von Stechow, A. (1984) Comparing semantic theories of comparison. *Journal of Semantics* 3.