

---

## Variation and homogeneity in Polish comparative clauses

Mokrosz, Ewelina (John Paul II Catholic University in Lublin)

The aim of this paper is to show how varied and at the same time homogenous Polish comparative clauses are. We will use an analysis of comparative clauses of identity (henceforth CCI) as a springboard for an analysis of other comparative clauses. As shown in (1), in comparative constructions containing a CCI, the comparee is preceded by an optionally spelled-out *samsame* that shows adjective-like inflections. The comparative clause is introduced by *co* that.

(1) Jan    zaśpiewał    te same piosenki co Piotr.

John sang            the    same songs        as Peter

Comparative clauses of identity will be contrasted with comparatives of equality and comparatives of degree. The discussion will address the following issues: (i) the syntactic category of the item introducing the comparative clause as well as the subordinate vs coordinate relation between the main clause and the comparative clause. Since comparative clauses in CCI, comparatives of equality as well as Polish restrictive relative clauses are introduced by what appears to be the same lexical item, namely *co*, we will examine whether those comparative clauses may receive one of the analyses assigned to Polish relative clauses.

As for the analysis of CCI, we will show that *co* in CCI has the status of a complementizer. In order to determine the extent to which comparative clauses in CCI resemble relative clauses, we will use the diagnostic tests presented by Szczegielniak (2005) who argues for two different analyses of relative clauses in Polish. The *co*-relative clauses require a head raising analysis, while *który*-relative clauses an operator movement. The diagnostic tests such as a degree/amount reading, the ability to break up idiom chunks, narrow/wide reading and restrictions on binding show that the comparative clause shares only some features with relative clauses introduced by *co*. A head movement analysis in CCI introduced by *co* remains unwarranted. Yet, sensitivity to islands as well as an optional resumptive pronoun in the case of an object functioning as a comparee are indicative of an operator movement. In contrast to Matushansky's (2011) analysis of comparatives introduced by *as*, we will argue that the operator in Polish comparative clauses cannot receive an interpretation of a maximality operator.

We will also address some points of variation in comparative clauses. The first variation can be observed with regard to the element introducing a comparative clause. We will examine what determines the choice of a given introductory element. Also, we will try to account for the fact that fronting of comparative clauses appears to be much more acceptable in the case of comparatives of degree than in comparatives of equality and CCI. Moreover, comparative clauses of identity are the only ones among comparative clauses that lack subcomparative constructions (\**Jan zaśpiewał te same psalmy co Piotr hymny* John sang the same psalms as Peter hymns).

### References

- Matushansky, Ora. 2011. *As* relatives. In Yehuda N. Falk (ed.) *Proceedings of IATL 26*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Szczegielniak, Adam. 2005. *Relativization That You Did*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics vol. 24.