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## Introduction

(1) | POS | CMPR |
---|-----|------|
SYNTHETIC | smart | smart-er |
ANALYTIC | intelligent | more intelligent |
Root Suppletion Generalisation (RSG) (Bobaljik 2012)

Root suppletion is limited to synthetic (i.e., morphological) comparatives.

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>POS</th>
<th>CMPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. SYNTHETIC kak-ós</td>
<td>cheiró-ter-os ‘bad’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ANALYTIC kak-ós</td>
<td>pjo kak-ós</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ANALYTIC kak-ós</td>
<td>*pjo cheir-ós</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Generalisation on Suppletion and PRE-marking (GOSP)

When there is root suppletion in the comparative degree with respect to the positive, the marker of the comparative cannot occur to the left of the adjectival root.

(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POS</th>
<th>CMPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>RIGHT kak-ós cheiró-ter-ós ‘bad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>LEFT kak-ós pjo kak-ós</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>LEFT kak-ós *pjo cheir-ós</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aim

Explain GOSP as a consequence of

- a structural difference between PRE and POST marking
- a comparative functional sequence \(<C2, C1, Q, F0>\)
- a general restriction on admissible functional sequences
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Suppletive triplets in Bobaljik (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SUFF</th>
<th>PRE</th>
<th>CIRCUMF</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BIG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMALL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MUCH, MANY</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>79</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>CMPR</td>
<td>SPRL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg.</td>
<td>mnogo</td>
<td>po-veče</td>
<td>naj-mnogo</td>
<td>‘much/many’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac.</td>
<td>mnogu</td>
<td>po-veke</td>
<td>naj-mnogu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bulgarian/Macedonian**

(5) | POS      | CMPR      | SPRL      |
    |----------|-----------|-----------|
    | Bg.      | mnogo     | po-veče   | naj-mnogo | ‘much/many’ |
    | Mac.     | mnogu     | po-veke   | naj-mnogu |

- problematic for GOSP, but we set this case aside, and we take GOSP to be a valid generalisation for now
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Starke (2018)

POST marking:
- suffixal
- to the right of the lexical root
- displays mirror principle ordering
- results from movement of the root to the left of the POST marker

PRE marking:
- prefixal
- spellout of functional material to the left of the lexical root
- ordering reflects the underlying order of the functional sequence
- involves no movement, but a separately merged complex specifier
(6) POST: unary bottom

K3
  K2
  K1

(7) PRE: binary bottom

K3
  K2
  K1

Starke (2018)
Starke (2018)

(8)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{F2P} \\
\text{F2P} \\
\text{F2} \quad \text{F1} \\
\hline
\text{F1P} \\
\text{F1} \\
\text{F1} \quad \text{F0} \\
\end{array}
\]

*projecting Spec*  

*root*
(9) projecting Spec

F3P

F3

F2

F1P

F1

F0

root
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The adjectival functional sequence

(10) $\quad \text{C2P}$
    \hspace{1cm} \text{C2} \quad \text{C1P}
    \hspace{1cm} \text{C1} \quad \text{QP}
    \hspace{1cm} \text{Q} \quad \text{F0}$
Caha (2017)

(11)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F0</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>bujar</td>
<td>ěj</td>
<td>š</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘merry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>star</td>
<td>š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘old’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>re</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>old</td>
<td></td>
<td>er</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(13)

```
(\text{intelligent})
```

```
(\text{mo})
```
(14)

C2P

C2P

C2

C1

more

QP

Q

F0

intelligent
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Suppletion

(15) \( \text{bett} \) \( \text{good} \) 
\( \text{C1P} \) \( \text{QP} \) 
\( \text{C1} \) \( \text{Q} \) \( \text{F0} \) 
\( \text{C2P} \) \( \text{C2} \) \( \text{er} \)
Suppletion

- Confirmed by the systematic absence of ěj in Czech suppletive comparatives

(16) | POS    | CMPR   | ‘good’   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dobr-ý</td>
<td>lep-š-í</td>
<td>‘good’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>špatn-ý</td>
<td>hor-š-í</td>
<td>‘bad’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mal-ý</td>
<td>men-š-í</td>
<td>‘little, small’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>velk-ý</td>
<td>vět-š-í</td>
<td>‘big’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dlouh-ý</td>
<td>del-š-í</td>
<td>‘long’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(17) | F0 | Q | C1 | C2 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>dobr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>lep</td>
<td>š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Deriving GOSP

GOSP
*[PRE+suppletive comparative root]*
(18)

```
PRE marker
```

```
suppletive root
```
*<X, X>*

There must be no immediately consecutive identical features in the functional sequence.

(De Clercq & Vanden Wyngaerd 2018; Collins 2018)
(19)

PRE marker  nonsuppletive root
Bulgarian

(20) QP
   Q
  F0

   veče

mnogo

(21) C2P
   C2
   C1P
   C1
   Q

   veče

po

QP

Q

F0
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Conclusion

GOSP is derived, assuming

- a comparative fseq $<C_2, C_1, Q, F_0>$
- the structural difference between PRE and POST marking
- a general restriction on admissible functional sequences
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