https://doi.org/10.18485/icgl.2024.15.2.ch2

Artemis Alexiadou[1]
Leibniz-Centre General Linguistics (ZAS)
& Humboldt University of Berlin

Foteini (Fenia) Karkaletsou[2]
Technische Universität Kaiserslautern

Despina Oikonomou[3]
University of Crete

DOUBLE COMPARATIVES ARE MORE STRONGER! EVIDENCE FROM GREEK

In this paper we discuss double comparatives (DCs) in Greek (e.g. *pjo psiloteros* 'more taller'). We investigate their distribution in Greek corpora showing that they are common in environments with extra emphasis. We argue that this emphasis is related to an evaluativity inference, which suggests that the compared entities possess the relevant property to a degree at least as high as the contextual standard in the scale. Following Rett (2008) and Moracchini (2018) we provide an analysis of this inference as a conversational implicature derived in the presence of structural alternatives. This raises further questions for the distribution of evaluativity across the different comparative forms.

Keywords: Double Comparatives, Synthetic, Analytic, Evaluativity, Degree

1. INTRODUCTION

Greek has two types of comparatives, synthetic *-ter-* comparatives (e.g. *psil-o-ter-os* 'taller') and analytic *pjo*-comparatives (e.g. *pjo psil-os* 'taller'). In addition, the two forms can be combined, creating a double comparative form, e.g. *pjo psil-o-ter-os* 'more taller'. In this paper we investigate the interpretation of Double Comparatives (DCs) as in (1), arguing that they trigger an evaluative inference,

[1] artemis@leibniz-zas.de
[2] fenia.karkaletsou@sowi.uni-kl.de
[3] despina.oikonomou@uoc.gr

i.e., an inference that the compared entities possess the relevant property to a degree at least as high as the contextual standard in the scale. For example, in (1) we derive an inference that Peter and Nick are both tall.

1	O Nikos ine pjo psiloteros apo ton Petro.
	Nick is more taller than the Peter
	'Nick is more taller than Peter.' ⇝ Evaluative inference: Nick and Peter are tall.

In support of this analysis, we present a corpus study of the environments that DCs appear. The majority of the environments suggest that the relevant property holds to a degree at least as high as the contextual standard. We propose that this inference is derivable as an implicature (following Rett 2008, and Moracchini 2018), given that DCs are structurally more complex than plain synthetic or analytic comparatives (Moracchini 2018).

In Section 2 we present the background on DCs emphasizing their wide distribution cross-linguistically and diachronically. We also discuss multiple comparison showing that it is related to analytic forms, not necessarily to DCs. Section 3 presents the corpus study from Modern Greek, showing that the majority of DC instances are in evaluative contexts. Section 4 presents an analysis of the evaluativity inference, based on the syntax of comparative forms in Greek, building on the idea of structural alternatives (Moracchini 2018). In Section 5 we discuss further questions arising from this account.

2. BACKGROUND ON DOUBLE COMPARATIVES

DCs are more common in languages which have a synthetic and an analytic comparative, combining the two forms (Cuzzolin & Lehmann 2004: 1217; Bobaljik 2012: 72)[4]. In Greek, DCs are attested throughout the different diachronic stages of the language (Markopoulos 2017; Smyth 1920) as illustrated in (2) from Ancient, Medieval and Modern Greek. DCs are also attested in Latin, Italian, Dutch and English as shown in (3).

[4] Notice that it is also possible to find double synthetic comparatives (e.g. *kaliteroteros 'betterer', tallerer*). However, as noted in Wood (2012), it is not clear whether the latter form is grammatical or whether it can be treated as more of a "language game". We did not find synthetic DCs, confirming that they are less common.

2	a. τίς γὰρ γένοιτ' ἂν μᾶλλον ὀλβιώτερος	Ancient Greek
	'for who could become more happier...'	(Arist. Eccl., 1131)
	b. pleon dinatoteros	Medieval Greek
	'more stronger'	(Holton et al. 2019: 820)
	c. pio megaliteros gafatzis	Modern Greek
	'more bigger blanderer'	(Hellenic National Corpus)
3	a. magis fortior = fortior/magis fortis	Late Latin
	'stronger'	(Hofmann & Szantyr 1965:166f.)
	b. più migliore	Italian
	'more better'	(Bobaljik 2012: 73)

Despite the fact that DCs is a robust phenomenon cross-linguistically and diachronically, there is limited work on their syntax and semantics. In addition, traditional grammars often treat DCs as slips/errors (Ferguson 1959, Heylighen & Dewaele 1999). One of the most detailed works investigating the interpretation of DCs from a diachronic perspective is Gónzalez-Diaz (2006) who presents several factors which influence the use of DCs in the diachrony of English, that is in Middle English, Early Modern English and Present Day English. One common environment for DCs is when the quality comparison is set by the context. For example, in (4), the first comparative, *wiser*, denotes a high standard adjectival quality and the DC following, *more wyser*, scales upwards.

4	thaire eldres, and wiser thanne they; (...) but the yonge folkes now a dayes lust not to do there after, but they haue dyspite whanne they be blamed of thayre folye, and whanne they be more wyser thanne suche as be moche more cunnin.	(Gónzalez-Diaz 2006: 632: 25)

Gónzalez-Diaz (2006) also notices that DCs tend to combine with degree adverbials and intensifiers such as *much* and *a lot* in the following examples.

5	much more gladdere	(Gónzalez-Diaz 2006: 633: 28)
6	Who can remember that police dog coming here? Yeah? We'll he's still willing but cos that dog is a lot older and a lot more grumpier. They can take the dog to the schools any more	(BNC, FM7)

González-Diáz (2006: 640) concludes that DCs "are indeed more emphatic structures than their simple synthetic or analytic counterparts". A similar intuition is presented by Holton et. al. (2019: 821) for the diachrony of Greek suggesting that "the two types of comparative, synthetic and analytic, are sometimes combined for added emphasis''. This insight from diachronic studies can be extended to synchrony for certain languages: for instance, several of examples for Present Day Dutch provided in Corver (2005) contain intensifiers.

Aside from the observation that DCs are associated with an emphatic interpretation, an alternative potential function of DCs comes up in different works which discuss DCs in passing (see summarized discussion in Wood 2012). This possibility concerns multiple comparison among more than two entities. For example, the intended interpretation of the sentence in (7) is that *the degree to which John is taller than Bill is greater than the degree to which Francis is taller than Bill*. Wood (2012) reports that according to Nevins (2012: 92) who follows Radford (1977) multiple comparison of this sort is unacceptable irrespective of whether a plain or a double comparative is used. Thus, sentences like (7) are considered unacceptable.

7	a. *John is more taller than Bill than Francis is.
	b. *John is more tall than Bill than Francis is.
	c. *John is taller than Bill than Francis is.

A different intuition is reported by Bhatt and Pancheva (2004, footnote 5) who discuss multiple degree clauses with a single -er-comparative, as in (8) (they do not discuss DCs).

8	a. John is (much) taller than Mary than Bill is.	
	b. John has (much) more CDs than Mary than Bill does.	[B&P, 2004 footnote 5]

Kennedy and McNally (2005), provide DC examples as in (9), with *less*, arguing that they license an extra layer of comparison:

9	an old department store a lot less taller than the city hall building than is the new company headquarters	[K&McN, ex. 3]

Seuren (1972: 561) also suggests that DCs with *more* can in fact license multiple comparison:

10	John is more taller than Bill than Peter.

From this limited discussion, we can conclude that there is no consensus as to whether multiple comparison is licit and whether DCs are associated with multiple comparison constructions. For Greek, we are not aware of any work discussing multiple semantic comparison. In the following we briefly discuss this possibility arguing that indeed DCs seem to be appropriate in this environment but, by no means, necessary.

An example of multiple comparison in Greek is presented in (11) instantiated with the three types of comparatives. Let us consider first the sentence with the simple analytic comparative in (11a). The meaning is that *the degree to which Nick is taller than John is greater than the degree to which George is taller than John*, i.e. Nick is the tallest among the three, George is taller than John, who is the shortest. In terms of naturalness, we find that the two analytic forms (AC and DC) are more natural than the synthetic form which otherwise in typical comparative constructions is entirely natural. Thus, we assign a question mark on the DC, due to the fact that DCs are often considered a bit degraded (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 1997), but two question marks on the synthetic comparative which in this construction based on our judgements and feedback from five more linguists is degraded.

11	a. O Nikos ine pjo psilos apo ton Giani ap' o,ti ine o Giorgos.
	The Nick is more tall than the.ACC John from what is the.NOM George
	'Nick is more tall than John than what George is.'
	b. ??O Nikos ine psiloteros apo ton Giani ap 'oti ine o Giorgos.
	The Nick is taller than the.ACC John from what is the.NOM George
	'The Nick is taller than John than what George is.'

	c. ?O Nikos ine pjo psiloteros apo ton Giani ap' o,ti ine o Giorgos.
	The Nick is more taller than.ACC John from what is the.NOM George
	'Nick is more taller than John than what George is.'

In conclusion, multiple comparison is an environment in which DCs are appropriate but not necessary. What seems important is to have an analytic form, something that we leave for future investigation.

In the following we present our findings in support of the view that DCs are more appropriate in environments in which comparison exceeds the contextual standard. In line with the crosslinguistic and diachronic insights, we propose that DCs involve comparison among degrees which exceed the contextual standard (i.e., they are evaluative, in the sense of Rett 2008). Evaluativity in DCs is triggered by the fact that DCs are structurally more complex than plain *pjo-* and *ter-*comparatives (see Rett 2008; Moracchini 2018).

3. CORPUS STUDY: THE DISTRIBUTION OF DOUBLE COMPARATIVES

We investigated for all types of DCs in the written texts of three corpora: i) Hellenic National Corpus[5], ii) Corpus of Greek Texts (Goutsos 2010)[6] and iii) Corpus of Modern Greek[7]. In total, we found 74 instances of DCs, out of which 67 (90.5%) are formed as *pjo + -ter*, 5 (6.8%) as *perissotero + -ter* and 2 (2.7%) as *ligotero + -ter*. In Table 1 we classify the contexts in which the extracted DCs appear:

Context	Raw number of instances (%)
akoma / akomi pjo 'even'	10 (13.5%)
olo ke 'more and more'	5 (6.8%)
oso…toso 'the more … the more'	2 (2.7%)
oso to dinato 'as much as possible'	1 (1.4%)
poli 'much'	4 (5.4%)

[5] http://hnc.ilsp.gr/
[6] http://sek.edu.gr/login?next=%2F
[7] http://web-corpora.net/GreekCorpus/search/

Superlative	25 (33.8%)
Superlative with *o,ti*	1 (1.4%)
Superlative with *ti pjo*	1 (1.4%)
Context	7 (9.5%)
Unclear	18 (24.3%)

Table 1. Classification of the contexts in which DCs appear in the three corpora. Raw numbers (and percentages) of the extracted instances are presented.

As shown in Table 1, out of 74 DCs, 56 (75.7%) appear in contexts which suggest that the scale of comparison is set at a relatively high threshold. These environments involve intensifiers such as *akoma/akomi pjo* (13.5%), *olo ke* (6.8%), *oso…toso* (2.7%), an evaluative context (9.5%), or a superlative (33.8%).

In many cases, the context suggests that the compared properties already hold to a degree that is equal to or exceeds the contextual standard, as illustrated in (12).

12	Context		
	a. έπειτα όμως στ' απόμερα στην εξοχή	και πιο μακρύτερα	
	later far away in the countryside	and more farer	
	b. είδε τους κύκλους στα μάτια της	πιο βαθύτερους	
	he saw the circles around her eyes	more deeper	(Corpus of Modern Greek)

Akoma/akomi pjo + comparative functions like *even* + comparative in English (Greenberg 2015, 2018). In English, the presence of *even* presupposes that both entities "involve a degree which is at least as high as the standard on that contextually supplied scale." (Greenberg 2018: 59; cf. Bi 2021).

13	*akoma/akomi pjo* 'even'		
	a. Η ανάγκη αυτή γίνεται	ακόμα πιο προφανέστερη μετά	(Hellenic National Corpus)
	This need becomes	even more obvious.comp after	
	b. έγιναν	ακόμα πιο λεπτομερέστερες έρευνες	
	took place	even more detailed.comp investigations	(Hellenic National Corpus)

To our knowledge, *olo ke* + comparative has not been analyzed in Greek. In English, the closest construction is coordinated comparatives (e.g. *better and better*) which also have received limited attention (Jackendoff 2000; Matushansky 2013). *Olo ke* establishes that there are multiple stages of change on a relevant scale. On this basis, it must combine either with a comparative as in (14) or with a predicate encoding gradual change of state as in (15).

14	*olo ke* 'more and more'		
	a. μια μικρή μειοψηφία γίνεται	όλο και πιο πλουσιότερη	(Hellenic National Corpus)
	A small minority becomes	richer and richer	
	b. γίνεται	όλο και πιο πληρέστερη	
	becomes	more and more fuller	(Corpus of Greek Texts)
15	Όλο και μεγαλώνει	η ενεργειακή φτώχεια στην Ευρώπη.	
	grows more and more	the energy poverty in Europe	

The superlative in our examples mostly picks out an entity from a set of entities that already possess the relevant property to a contextual standard, thus creating again an evaluative context, as illustrated in (16).

16	Superlative	
	a. έναν από τους πιο σημαντικότερους θεατράνθρωπους	(Hellenic National Corpus)
	one of the more important.comp theater persons	
	b. το πιο διασημότερο αγροτικό δράμα του ελληνικού κινηματογράφου	(Corpus of Modern Greek)
	the more famous.comp rural drama in the Greek cinema	

In these cases, comparison is always established with an intermediate point of scale and not with the starting point of comparison.

4. EVALUATIVITY IN DOUBLE COMPARATIVES

The distribution of DCs in the corpora supports the hypothesis that DCs give rise to an evaluativity inference. Evaluativity has been observed for various environments which involve comparison. According to Rett (2008), an evaluativity inference is triggered when there is a competition between 'marked', analytic, vs. 'unmarked', synthetic, degree constructions which are semantically equivalent. Moracchini (2018) suggests that markedness can be cashed out in terms of structural complexity once we adopt a decompositional analysis of degree expressions. In what follows, first, we discuss the syntax of comparatives, showing that DCs are more complex and next we present how the evaluativity inference is derived.

4.1. Syntax of comparison

The analytic and the synthetic comparative have been argued to have different syntax both in English and in Greek. For English, it has been proposed that analytic comparatives with *more* involve a quantity phrase headed by a contentless *much* as shown in (17b) (Corver 1997; Solt 2009, 2015). By contrast, *-er* comparatives are analyzed as involving less structure with a Degree phrase, directly adjoining to the adjective (Embick 2007; Bobaljik 2012).

17	a. Sue is $[_{AP}$ [DegP -er] tall]
	b. Sue is $[_{FP}[_{QP}$[DegP -er] much] F_0 $[_{AP}$ tall]]

For Greek, *pjo*-comparatives exhibit different properties from *ter*-comparatives. *Pjo*-comparatives can always substitute *ter*-comparatives but not vice versa (Cheila-Markopoulou 1986; Giannakidou & Stavrou 2009; Merchant

2012; Makri 2018). For example, *pjo*-comparatives can modify non-gradable properties as in (18) (Stavrou 1983; Makri 2018). They can also modify a negated NP, unlike *ter*-comparatives as illustrated in (19).

18	i Ana ine pjo amerikana apo tin Alex.
	the Ana is CMPR American than the Alex
	'Ana is more American than Alex.'
19	O pjo mi katalilos minas.
	the CMPR non appropriate month
	'the more non-appropriate month.'

Also, as discussed in detail in Merchant (2012) synthetic comparatives in certain environments can assign genitive as opposed to analytic comparatives (see also Holton et. al. 1997).[8]

20	O pirgos tha ine psiloteros tu spitju.	[Merchant 2012:(6)]
	the tower will be taller the-GEN house-GEN.	
	'The tower will be taller than the house.'	

Finally, as we saw in Section 2 in (11), multiple comparison is possible with the analytic *pjo/perisotero-comparatives*, but not with the synthetic one.

While the aforementioned properties of *pjo*-comparatives group them with *perisotero*-comparatives, it can be easily shown that the two are different. As discussed in Makri (2018), *pjo* in the absence of a gradable predicate, requires an overt Q-element (e.g. *poli/ligo* 'much/little') to combine with.

21	I Maria diavazi {pjo *(poli/ligo)} / {perisotero/ligotero (*poli/ligo)} apo tin Ana.
	the Maria studies CMPR much/little more / less much/little than the.ACC Ana
	'Maria studies more/less than Ana.'

Based on these properties, we argue that *pjo*-comparatives differ from *ter*-comparatives syntactically. We analyze *pjo* as a degree element which combines

[8] As notice by a reviewer this is not the case across all constructions, for example with *become*-predicates genitive is not always licensed *"tha gini psiloteros {*tu patera tu}/{apo ton patera tu}* 'he will become taller than his father'.

with a phonologically null Q-element with underspecified polarity as shown in (22b).[9] In this way we can account both for the fact that it can combine with non-gradable predicates as in (18) but also for the requirement of an overt Q-element in (21). By contrast, *ter*-comparatives are analyzed similar to English synthetic comparatives as in (22a).

22	a. $[_{AP}\ [_{DegP}$ -ter] *psil*-]
	b. $[_{FP}[_{QP}[_{DegP}$ *pjo*] Ø] $F_0\ [_{AP}$ *psil*-]]
	c. $[_{FP}[_{QP}[_{DegP}$ -*ter*] *poli*] $F_0\ [_{AP}$ *psil*-]]

Based on these assumptions, DCs in Greek are formed by virtue of a *pjo*-comparative embedding a *ter*-comparative, resulting in the construction in (23).

23	Sue is $[_{FP}[_{QP}[_{DegP}$ *pjo*] Ø] $F_0\ [_{AP}\ [_{DegP}$ -ter] tall]]

4.2. Deriving the evaluativity inference as a conversational implicature

For English analytic comparatives with *more*, it has been proposed that when the *more*-comparative is used as in (24b), an evaluative inference is derived because it is structurally more complex than the morphological comparative construction (24a) (Moracchini 2018, 2019). Thus, the speakers assign the less complex alternative (*-er* comparative) in (24a) a non-evaluative interpretation illustrated in (25a) and the more complex alternative (*more* comparative) as in (24b) an evaluative interpretation illustrated in (25b).

24	a. Athos is taller than Porthos is.
	b. Athos is more tall than Porthos is.
25	a. Non-evaluative Interpretation: *The degree d to which Athos is tall exceeds the degree d' to which Porthos is tall.*
	b. Evaluative Interpretation: *The degree d to which Athos is tall exceeds the degree d' to which Porthos is tall and d' exceeds the contextual standard for what counts as tall.*

In Greek, as noticed in Makri (2018), the analytic *pjo*-comparative, along with the synthetic comparative, does not trigger an evaluativity inference (26a).

[9] As a reviewer notices the notion of underspecified polarity needs to be further elaborated.

An evaluativity inference is triggered when the comparative adverbial *perisotero* 'more' is used as in (26b) (Makri, p. 101–102). We argue that, in addition to *perisotero*-comparatives (26b), DCs with *pjo + ter* as in (26c) give rise to an evaluative interpretation.

26	a. O Athos ine {pjo psilos}/{psiloteros} apo ton Portho. The Athos is CMPR tall taller than the Porthos'
	b. O Athos ine perisotero psilos apo ton Portho. The Athos is more tall than the Porthos.
	c. O Athos ine pio psiloteros apo ton Portho. The Athos is CMPR taller than the Porthos

Evaluativity is triggered by the fact that DCs involve a structurally more complex construction. It becomes clear from the syntactic derivation in (23) that DCs are syntactically more complex than both *pjo*-comparatives and *ter*-comparatives. In this sense we expect that they will be evaluative, as suggested by their distribution in the corpus.

An open question remains regarding evaluativity inferences for analytic comparatives. While we agree with Makri (2018) that only *perisotero*-comparatives are evaluative in Greek, it remains a question under the proposed analysis why *pjo*-comparatives do not give rise to an evaluativity inference. The only difference we assumed between the English *more*-comparative and the Greek *perisotero*-comparative is that the Q-element in *pjo*-comparatives is covert with neutral polarity. We believe that the fact that complexity is not expressed phonologically might be a potential direction in understanding complexity patterns. We leave this as an open question for future investigation. Our focus has been DCs for which it is clearly shown that they are syntactically more complex.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

In this paper we discussed DCs which have received scarce attention in Greek linguistics. We showed that it is a phenomenon which appears in the diachrony of different languages. Similar to what is noticed by Gonzales-Diaz (2006) for English DCs, we showed that they mostly appear in emphatic environments. We argued that this insight about more emphasis, can be interpreted semantically as an evaluativity inference which is derivable by the fact that DCs are more complex than *pjo*- and *ter*-comparatives (though see Mondorf (2009) for an alternative analysis on the role of complexity in the interpretation of comparative forms).

Several questions emerge from the present account. First, we think that an experimental investigation of evaluativity inferences for all types of comparatives

can further illuminate us by revealing subtler differences and potential variation among speakers. Especially for DCs, based on our informal investigation among native speakers, while most speakers agree that DCs trigger an evaluative inference, we also observed variation regarding the obligatoriness of the inference and the distinction between evaluativity and linguistic emphasis, which does not necessarily entail an evaluative inference.

Secondly, as pointed out to us by Despina Cheila-Markopoulou, a more in-depth investigation of the distribution of DCs, not only regarding their semantic context but also regarding the type of adjectives that it combines with, is needed. Unfortunately, although we made use of available corpora of Greek language, it is extremely difficult to derive safe conclusions. What we tried is to test all instances of DCs in HNC and compare the raw frequency of synthetic comparatives compared with the raw frequency and percentage of DCs in the total of synthetic comparative forms per adjective, as shown in Appendix 1. What we notice is that there are several adjectives for which a synthetic comparative is not common and yet they participate in double comparative formation. These are *epitaktikos, evmenis, glikos, kodinos, ormitikos, leptomeris, ormitikos, polemikos*. We also notice *anoteros, esoteros, plisiesteros* for which a positive form is not available in Modern Greek and the percentage of a DC is high. In this last case the DC can also be interpreted as a single comparative considering the possibility that the synthetic comparative is listed as such in the lexicon. Further data is necessary to understand whether DC formation prefers certain classes of adjectives or not. At the moment, the restrictions of the corpora available for Greek do not allow us to derive safe conclusions but it remains a question.

Finally, it remains to present an overall analysis of evaluativity inferences in Greek, taking into account all different forms since, as Merchant (2012) observes, Greek has a rich comparative system and it can help us further test different theoretical approaches regarding evaluativity.

References

Bhatt & Pancheva 2004: R. Bhatt & R. Pancheva, Late merger of degree clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry, 35*(1), 1–45.

BNC Consortium 2007: BNC Consortium, *The British National Corpus, XML Edition*. Oxford Text Archive, [Online], [http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12024/2554].

Bobaljik 2012: J. D. Bobaljik, *Universals in comparative morphology: Suppletion, superlatives, and the structure of words*. MIT Press.

Caha, Emonds & Janebová 2017: P. Caha, J. Emonds & M. Janebová, Explaining Bobaljik's root suppletion generalization as an instance of the adjacency

condition (and beyond). In J. Emonds & M. Janebová (eds.), *Language use and linguistic structure: Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2016* (pp. 193–208).

Cheila-Markopoulou 1986: D. Cheila-Markopoulou, *Ta singritika tis Neas Elinikis. Sintaktiki analisi tu singritiku vathmu ton epitheton ke epirimaton. (Comparatives of modern Greek. A syntactic analysis of the comparative degree of adjectives and adverbs)*. [Phd Thesis]. Athens: University of Athens.

Corver 1997: N. Corver, Much-Support as a Last Resort. *Linguistic Inquiry, 28*(1), 119–164.

Corver 2005: N. Corver, Double comparatives and the comparative criterion. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes, 34*, 165–190.

Cuzzolin & Lehmann 2004: P. Cuzzolin & C. Lehmann, Comparison and gradation. *Morphologie. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung, 2*, 1857–1882.

De Clercq & Wyngaerd 2017: K. De Clercq & G.V. Wyngaerd, *ABA revisited: Evidence from Czech and Latin degree morphology. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics, 2*(1), 69.

Embick 2007: D. Embick, Blocking effects and analytic/synthetic alternations. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 25*, 1–37

Giannakidou & Stavrou 2009: A. Giannakidou & M. Stavrou, On metalinguistic comparatives and negation in Greek. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, *57*, 57–74.

González-Díaz 2006: V. González-Díaz, On the Nature and Distribution of English Double Periphrastic Comparison. *The Review of English Studies, 57*, 623 –664.

Goutsos 2010: D. Goutsos, The corpus of Greek texts: a reference corpus for Modern Greek. *Corpora, 5*(1), 29–44.

Greenberg 2018: Y. Greenberg, A revised, gradability-based semantics for even. *Natural Language Semantics*, *26*(1), 51–83.

Heim, Irene. 2006. Little. In *Proceedings of the 16th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference.*, ed. Masayuki Gibson and Jonathan Howell. CLC Publications.

Hofmann & Szantyr 1965: J. B. Hofmann & A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik.* Munich: Beck

Holton, Horrocks, Janssen, Lendari, Manolessou & Toufexis 2019: D. Holton, G. Horrocks, M. Janssen, T. Lendari, I. Manolessou & N. Toufexis, *The Cambridge grammar of medieval and early modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 1997: D. Holton, P. Mackridge & I. Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek: A comprehensive grammar of the modern language*. Psychology Press.

Kennedy & McNally 2005: K. Christopher & L. McNally, Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. *Language*, 345–381.

Makri 2018: M.M. Makri, Aspects of Comparative Constructions: Comparative Syntax, Semantics & L1-acquisition. [Phd Thesis]. Heslington: University of York.

Markopoulos 2017: T. Markopoulos, Analytic comparatives in Ancient Times. In *ICGL13* Proceedings, London.

Matushansky 2013: O. Matushansky, More or better: On the derivation of synthetic comparatives and superlatives in English. *Distributed morphology today: morphemes for Morris Halle*, 59–78.

Merchant 2012: J. Merchant, *The two phrasal comparatives of Greek*. Ms. University of Chicago.

Mondorf 2009: B. Mondorf, More Support for More-Support: The role of processing constraints on the choice between synthetic and analytic comparative forms, vol. 4. John Benjamins Publishing.

Moracchini 2018: S. Moracchini, Evaluativity and structural competition. Proceedings of *SALT 28* (pp. 727–746).

Moracchini, 2019: S. Moracchini, *Morphosyntax and semantics of degree constructions*. [Phd Thesis]. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Rett 2015: J. Rett, Measure phrase equatives and modified numerals. *Journal of Semantics, 32*(3), 425–475.

Rett 2008: J. Rett, Degree modification in natural language. [Phd Thesis]. New Brunswick: State University of New Jersey.

Pieter A. M. Seuren 1972: P. A. M. Seuren, *Foundations of Language 8*(2):237–265.

Smyth 1920: H.W. Smyth, *A Greek grammar for colleges*. American Book Company.

Solt 2010: S. Solt, *Much support and more*. Proceedings of the *Amsterdam Colloquium 2009* (pp. 446–455).

Wood 2012: J. Wood, Double comparatives. *Yale Grammatical Diversity Project: English in North America*, [Online], [http://ygdp.yale.edu/phenomena/double-comparatives] – (Accessed on 2021-01-03). Updated by Tom McCoy (2015) and Katie Martin (2018).

Online Resources

Corpus of Greek Texts: http://sek.edu.gr/login?next=%2F

Corpus of Modern Greek: http://web-corpora.net/GreekCorpus/search/
Hellenic National Corpus: http://hnc.ilsp.gr/
British National Corpus online (BNC): http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/

APPENDIX

Adjective	Raw frequency of synthetic comparative forms	Raw DC frequency	DC percentage
akrivos ‘expensive’	661	1	0,2
anoteros ‘superior’	7	2	28,6
asfalis ‘safe’	482	1	0,2
asthenis ‘weak’	500	1	0,2
dikeos ‘fair’	321	1	0,3
epitaktikos ‘crucial’	27	1	3,7
esoteros ‘innermost’	81	1	1,2
evmenis ‘favorable’	21	1	4,8
evnoikos ‘favorable’	549	1	0,2
evris ‘wide’	11100	2	0,02
fthinos ‘cheap’	1036	1	0,1
glikos ‘sweet’	17	1	5,9
idikos ‘special’	947	1	0,1
ishiros ‘powerful’	1976	1	0,05

kakos 'bad'	8202	7	0,1
kalos 'good'	32568	3	0,01
kodinos 'close, nearby'	208	1	0,5
leptomeris 'detailed'	93	1	1,1
megalos 'big'	46643	5	0,01
mikros 'small'	10655	1	0,01
neos 'young'	5524	2	0,04
oreos 'nice'	629	2	0,32
ormitikos 'vehement'	3	1	33,3
palios 'old'	7431	1	0,01
plisiesteros 'next'	363	2	0,6
plusios 'rich'	870	1	0,1
polemikos 'martial'	1	1	100
profanis 'obvious'	23	1	4,4
safis 'clear'	227	1	0,4
simandikos 'important'	6406	3	0,05
thorivodis 'noisy'	2	1	50

Table A1. List of adjectives appearing in DCs in HNC. The raw frequency of synthetic comparatives is also provided alongside the raw frequency and percentage of DCs in the total of synthetic comparative forms per adjective.

Άρτεμις Αλεξιάδου, Κέντρο Γενικής Γλωσσολογίας Leibniz & Πανεπιστήμιου Βερολίνου Humboldt, Τμήμα Γερμανικών Σπουδών και Γλωσσολογίας

Φωτεινή (Φένια) Καρκαλέτσου, Τεχνικό Πανεπιστήμιο Kaiserslautern

Δέποινα Οικονόμου, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας

ΤΑ ΔΙΠΛΑ ΣΥΓΚΡΙΤΙΚΑ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΠΙΟ ΙΣΧΥΡΟΤΕΡΑ!

Περίληψη

Σε αυτό το άρθρο συζητάμε τα διπλά συγκριτικά στα ελληνικά (π.χ. *πιο βαθύτερος*). Η μελέτη της κατανομής τους στα ελληνικά σώματα κειμένων δείχνει ότι προσθέτουν έμφαση σε σύγκριση με τα απλά συγκριτικά. Υποστηρίζουμε ότι αυτή η έμφαση σχετίζεται με ένα συνομιλιακό υπονόημα, το οποίο υποδηλώνει ότι οι υπο σύγκριση οντότητες διαθέτουν τη σχετική ιδιότητα (π.χ. βάθος) σε βαθμό τουλάχιστον τόσο υψηλό όσο θεωρείται το σύνηθες στην κλίμακα. Για παράδειγμα, στην πρόταση *η Μαρίνα είναι πιο ψηλότερη από την Άννα*, αντιλαμβανόμαστε ότι και οι δύο είναι σχετικά ψηλές. Ακολουθώντας την ανάλυση των Rett (2008) και Moracchini (2018) υποστηρίζουμε ότι αυτό το συνομιλιακό υπονόημα προκύπτει ως αποτέλεσμα της σύγκρισης μεταξύ δομών που διαφέρουν ως προς τη σύνταξη τους. Συντακτικά πιο σύνθετες δομές ερμηνεύονται ως σημασιολογικά πιο σύνθετες σε σχέση με δομές πιο απλές. Βασιζόμενοι στην ανάλυση των Corver (1997) και Solt (2010) αναλύουμε με διαφορετικό τρόπο την σύνταξη των συνθετικών συγκριτικών (π.χ. *βαθύτερος*) από τα αναλυτικά συγκριτικά (π.χ. *πιο βαθύς*), υποστηρίζοντας ότι ο συνδυασμός των δύο στα διπλά συγκριτικά οδηγεί σε πιο σύνθετες δομές. Με αυτό τον τρόπο εξηγούμε γιατί παράγεται το σχετικό υπονόημα σε αυτά τα περιβάλλοντα. Η ανάλυση αυτή εγείρει περαιτέρω ερωτήματα για την παραγωγή των σχετικών υπονοημάτων στο πεδίο των συγκριτικών δομών των Ελληνικών.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: Παραθετικά, Διπλά συγκριτικά, υπονόημα,