

AS RELATIVES?

In the discussion of the functional adjective *same* little if any attention has been given to the fact that it can appear not only with an *as*-clause, as in (1a), but also with a relative clause, as in (1b). A total lack of a dependent clause, as in (1c), is grammatical only on the discourse-anaphoric reading.

- (1) a. Tonks is the same person **as** Nymphadora.
 b. Harry admired the (very) same robes **that** Ron hated.
 c. Hermione likes the same music.

A striking difference between comparative *as*-clauses and comparative *that*-clauses is that the former but not the latter require either gapping or VP-ellipsis, as shown in (2).

- (2) a. Lucius like the same flowers **as**/***that** his father. gapping
 b. Lucius like the same flowers **as**/**that** his father does. VP-ellipsis
 c. Lucius like the same flowers ***as**/**that** his father likes/bought. no VPE or deaccenting

Given that the dependent clause in (1b) looks like a relative clause, a natural question arises whether it is a relative clause and if the answer is positive, how it can be a dependent of the adjective *same*.

I propose that both the availability of the two options and their distribution can be explained once we consider in detail the semantics of the *as*-comparative clause, both for *same* and for equatives. The first similarity point (beyond the use of the same complementizer *as*) is the maximality presupposition that it introduces (3).

- (3) a. The Catholic Bible has the same books as the Protestant Bible, and then six more.
 b. *The Protestant Bible has the same books as the Catholic Bible, but the Catholic Bible has six more.

Whereas (3a), where the set of books introduced by the DP *the same books* is bigger than the set of books introduced by the comparative clause, is grammatical and felicitous, this is not true for the reverse situation in (3b), where set of books introduced by the comparative clause cannot be a non-maximal set of books that the Catholic Bible has.

The non-maximality of the DP containing *same* is compatible with the previously observed (Barker 2007) fact that despite the presence of the definite article such a DP does not have the existence presupposition associated with it: as (4) shows, *the same book* is not presupposed to exist. Furthermore, (5a) demonstrates that *same*, like the indefinites in (5b) and unlike the definites in (5c), doesn't have a maximality presupposition either.

- (4) a. Hermione and Ron read the same book.
 b. Hermione and Ron didn't read the same book.
 c. Did Hermione and Ron read the same book?
 d. Hermione and Ron might have read the same book.
- (5) a. Ginny and Harry took the same two courses. In fact, they took the same three courses.
 b. Ginny and Harry took two courses. In fact, they took three courses.
 c. Ginny and Harry took the two courses that Snape taught. *In fact, they took the three courses that Snape taught.

In other words, the comparative though not the matrix clause contains a maximality operator. The presence of this operator (probably explained by the fact that the null operator involved is essentially a *wh*-operator and it is well-known that questions involve maximality) rules out the simplest analysis of *as*-clauses, where they involve simple movement of a null operator, as in (6b): the *as*-clause is predicted to denote all the things that the Protestant Bible has, and

the whole sentence in (6a) is incorrectly predicted to be true if the Catholic Bible contains the books identical to the maximal set of things that the Protestant Bible contains.

- (6) a. The Catholic Bible has the same books as the Protestant Bible.
 b. *[[as the Protestant Bible Δ]] = $\lambda X . X = \max \{ \lambda Y . \text{the Protestant Bible has } Y \}$

The repair strategy is clear: the comparative clause must also make reference to books, so as to denote the maximal set of books that the Protestant Bible contains, as in (7).

- (7) [[as the Protestant Bible Δ]] = $\lambda X . X = \max \{ \lambda Y . \text{the P. Bible has } Y \text{ and books } (Y) \}$

This can be achieved if the null operator forms part of the DP *OP books*. The NP restrictor can then raise together with the operator to the clause periphery or remain in situ, as in (8).

- (8) a. $\text{MAX}_P [\text{CP} [\text{OP books}] \lambda X \text{ that the Protestant Bible has } X]$
 b. $\text{MAX}_P [\text{CP} \text{OP } \lambda X \text{ as the Protestant Bible has the books } X]$

I propose that the two truth-conditionally equivalent options are both possible: (8a), with full DP-movement, corresponds to a normal relative clause with the relative complementizer *that*, whereas the complementizer *as* in (8b) arises as a result of agreement with a non-DP element moves to [Spec, CP]. Crucially for the compositionality of the latter case, the DP in-situ is interpreted as a definite DP by the rule of Trace Conversion (Fox 1999, 2002); in the former case a simplex trace will do as well.

With these assumptions in place we can now explain the different behavior of *as*- and *that*-clauses with respect to ellipsis. Following Lasnik 1999, I hypothesize that a PF-violation can be salvaged if the offending structure is not pronounced. As is easy to see, the structure in (8b) (though not in (8a)) violates the Left Branch Condition: the null operator is extracted out of the left branch of a DP. To repair this violation (at least) the VP needs to be deleted, which is exactly the analysis proposed by Kennedy and Merchant 2000 in order to explain the obligatory ellipsis of the VP (or a larger constituent) in the comparative clause in attributive comparatives, as in (9).

- (9) a. Pico wrote a more interesting novel than Brio *wrote/*read/did/ \emptyset a ___ play.
 b. Erik bought a more expensive car than Polly *bought/*sold/did/ \emptyset a ___ motorbike.

It comes as no surprise that equatives have exactly the same maximality presupposition in the comparative clause, as shown by the pattern in (10).

- (10) Fred is as tall as George...
 a. and even taller.
 b. *and even less tall.

If both *as* and *that*-relatives denote definite descriptions of some sort (rather than properties, as has been commonly assumed for relative clauses), the question arises how the latter can be interpreted inside DPs. I will also discuss some recent theories of the semantics of *same* and comparatives, which bring into focus the question of whether *as*-clauses, *than*-clauses and relative clauses are DP-internal or merged at the clausal level.

References

- Barker, Chris. 2007. Parasitic scope. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30, 407-444.
 Fox, Danny. 1999. Reconstruction, binding theory, and the interpretation of chains. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 157-196.
 Fox, Danny. 2002. Antecedent-contained deletion and the copy theory of movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 63-96.
 Kennedy, Christopher, and Jason Merchant. 2000. Attributive comparative deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19, 89-146.
 Lasnik, Howard. 1999. On feature strength: Three minimalist approaches to overt movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30, 197-217.