For an overt movement analysis of comparison at a distance in French*

Jérémy Pasquereau (UMass - Amherst)

1 Introduction

There is a class of split-DP constructions in French involving certain nominal quantifiers and their restrictors (*aka* deP). In (1), the quantifier *trop* 'too much' appears next to its restrictor *de vin* (Canonical Quantification), and in (2), it appears before the verb (Quantification At a Distance). QAD has been the topic of much work starting with Kayne 1975 (*see* Burnett 2009 for an overview).

(1) Éva a bu *trop de vin*.
Eva has drunk too.much DE wine
Éva drank too much wine.

(2) Éva a *trop* bu *de vin*.
Eva has too.much drunk DE wine
Éva drank too much wine.

The *de* particle obligatorily marking the restrictor needs to be licensed by a quantifier, lest the construction be ungrammatical (3) and (4).

(3)* Éva a bu *de vin*.
Eva has drunk DE wine

(4)* *De gens* ont bu du vin.
DE people have drunk some wine

The dependency between deP and the quantifier can be analyzed in two different ways. Under a movement analysis, the quantifier is base-generated next to deP and can move overtly to a preverbal position, whereas under a base-generation analysis, the quantifier is base-generated in the position where it appears, and a dependency is established between it and deP. The consensus concerning QAD split-DP constructions is that the quantifier is actually a base-generated adverb modifying the VP to its right. However, the literature has not looked at cases where the quantifier in question is a comparative quantifier, henceforth Comparison At a Distance, as in (6). I argue that CAD involves movement.

(5) Éva a bu *plus d' eau* que de *vin*.
Eva has drunk more DE water than DE wine
Éva drank more water than wine.

(6) Éva a *plus* bu *d' eau* que *de vin*.
Eva has more drunk DE water than DE wine
Éva drank more water than wine.

The structure of the paper is the following. Section 2 takes on two generalizations that have been used as arguments for the base-generation analysis of QAD. I show that the first generalization does not extend to CAD and that the second one does not constitute an argument. There is therefore no reason to favor a base-generation story for CAD, but there are reasons to favor a movement story. Section 3 shows that in some cases, a CAD quantifier can be interpreted below the position where it appears. This is a fact that can be straight-forwardly explained under the movement analysis. In section 4, I show that locality restrictions that apply to CAD can be derived from movement, and more specifically if we assume that CAD involves A-movement. Indeed CAD is subject to restrictions that are typical of A-movement, namely a sensitivity to the difference between finite and non-finite clause boundaries and intervention. Finally I compare the locality restrictions that hold of CAD to those that hold of *tout* 'everything' and conclude that they are co-extensive. This makes a movement analysis of CAD all the more plausible since *tout* has been argued to move (Kayne 1975).

2 No support for base-generation analysis

The consensus on the base-generation analysis seems to have been motivated by two generalizations. The generalization in (7) goes back to Obenauer 1983 and was taken to be evidence that a quantifier in

. *Thanks to Rajesh Bhatt and Vincent Homer for their invaluable feedback on this project. Thanks also to Seth Cable. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation, under Award No. BCS-1322770.

QAD/CAD not only has scope over the VP, but actually modifies it (Doetjes 1997; Burnett 2009)[1]. I show that analyzing CAD as adverbial modification makes wrong predictions. Rather, CAD is a construction in which a quantifier can take scope over a VP without modifying it.

(7) ***Multiplicity of Events (MoE) Requirement*** (Obenauer 1983)
QAD is grammatical only if the context involves multiple events.

MoE has been motivated by examples like (8). The PP *en soulevant le couvercle* 'as he lifted the lid' is used to fix a single event reading. The CQ sentence (8a) is felicitous, but the QAD sentence (8b) is reported not to be because it is not compatible with there being just one event of finding gold coins.

(8) a. En soulevant le couvercle, il a trouvé beaucoup de pièces d' or.
in lifting the lid, he has found many DE coins of gold
As he lifted the lid, he found many gold coins.

b.*En soulevant le couvercle, il a beaucoup trouvé de pièces d'or.

MoE can be understood in two ways when extended to CAD: (MoE extension 1) CAD is grammatical only if the context involves multiple events or (MoE extension 2) CAD is grammatical only if, in that position, the quantifier quantifies over events as well as individuals (Burnett 2009 offers such a treatement of QAD). Either way, I show that extending MoE to CAD makes wrong predictions. Under MoE extension 1, the CAD sentence in (9) should not be felicitous in the single-event context (9a) since there is only one event of sending macarons: Marcel mailed out one box once containing macarons for both Aymeric and Éva. But this sentence can be use felicitously in this context.

(9) Au total, Marcel a plus envoyé de macarons à Aymeric qu' à Éva.
In total Marcel has more sent DE macarons to Aymeric than to Éva
In total, Marcel sent more macarons to Aymeric than to Éva.

a. Single-event context: Yesterday, Marcel had one box containing 10 macarons for Aymeric and 5 for Éva delivered to their house.

b. Multiple-event context: Every year, Marcel sends 10 macarons to Aymeric and 3 to Éva. This year is Aymeric's 5th and Éva's 10th birthday.

The hypothesis that CAD is subject to MoE extension 2 predicts that the CAD comparative in (9) can be true only if the following two conditions are met: (condition i) the number of events of sending macarons to Aymeric is greater than the number of events of sending macarons to Éva, and (condition ii) the number of macarons sent to Aymeric is greater than the number of macarons sent to Éva. In the multiple-event context (9b), there is exactly 5 events of sending 10 macarons to Aymeric each time, and exactly 10 events of sending 3 macarons to Éva each time. In this context, only condition (ii) is met, therefore MoE extension 2 predicts that the CAD sentence in (9) is false but in this context too, the CAD construction is true. I therefore conclude that CAD constructions do not have a(n extension of) multiplicity of events requirement. Therefore one cannot appeal to an MoE-like meaning difference to support an adverbial account of CAD[2].

The second observation is the one posited by Kayne (1975) in (10). The quantifier *beaucoup* 'many' illustrates this correlation: in (11), it may be used as a VP adverb and 'at a distance'. The quantifier *plein* 'many', however, cannot be used as a VP adverb, and it cannot quantify at a distance (12).

1. Burnett 2009 gives an adverbial analysis to QAD in Québec French in which the adverb does not modify the VP, but facts do not motivate this adverbial story for CAD in European French.

2. Even if CAD constructions had a MoE requirement, this fact would not be proof that quantifiers in preverbal positions are base-generated. Movement gives rise to scope effects that change the truth-conditions of a sentence.

(10) **Kayne's generalization**
A degree quantifier can quantify at a distance iff it can be used as a preverbal adverb.

(11) a. J' ai acheté beaucoup de pommes.
I have bought many DE apples
I bought many apples.

b. J' ai beaucoup acheté de pommes.

c. J' ai beaucoup dormi.
I have many slept
I've slept a lot.

(12) a. J' ai acheté plein de pommes.
I have bought many DE apples
I bought many apples.

b.* J' ai plein acheté de pommes.

c.* J' ai plein dormi.
I have many slept
Int. I've slept a lot.

Kayne (1975) points out that if we explain QAD by movement of the operator, then the unacceptability in (12b) is unexpected, thereby suggesting a causal link between the ability to be used as an adverb and the possibility of QAD. But there is another correlation that holds of the set of QAD operators (13).

(13) **QAD nominal quantifiers generalization**[3]
A degree quantifier can only quantify at a distance if it can be used pronominally.

Adding *beaucoup* 'many/much' in CQ (14a) or QAD (14b) satisfies the selectional requirements of *faire* 'do'. Adding *plein* 'much' does not (15).

(14) a. J' ai fait beaucoup pour les pauvres.
I have done much for the poor
I did a lot for the poor.

b. J'ai beaucoup fait pour les pauvres.

(15) a.* J' ai fait plein pour les pauvres.
I have done much for the poor

b.* J'ai plein fait pour les pauvres.

Doetjes (1997) has argued that both the adverbial use and the pronominal uses of the quantifiers follow if one assumes (i) that the quantifier is an adverb (modulo optional participle movement) and (ii) that it can bind a silent restrictor in object position. But such an analysis is not compatible with the fact that all QAD / CAD operators can saturate the subject as well as the object position of a transitive verb, e.g. *plus* 'more' (16), *moins* 'less' (17), or be used in a PP (18) (*pace* Doetjes 1997[4]).

(16) J' ai fait plus pour les pauvres que toi.
I have done more for the poor than you
I did more for the poor than you did.

(17) Moins sont venus que ça.
fewer have come than that
Fewer came than this.

(18) Je vais vous confier une façon de voir qui risque de déplaire à beaucoup.
I go you confide a way of see that risks to displease to many
I'll tell you about a way of seeing things that may displease many (people).
(adapted from Romains, Lettre ouverte contre une vaste conspiration, p. 142)

3. A similar generalization is mentioned in Doetjes 1997.

4. Doetjes (1997) argues that QAD operators are really not used pronominally in such constructions as evidenced by the fact that they cannot be used in all of the syntactic positions in which DPs can be used. In (ib), using bare *beaucoup* 'much' as the object of *s'intéresser à* 'be interested in' is not possible.

(i) a. Marie s' intéresse à tout.
Marie REFL interests to everything
Marie is interested in everything.

b.* Marie s' intéresse à beaucoup.
Marie REFL interests to much
Int. Marie is interested in a lot.

However, (ib) only shows us that QAD operators are not just like any other DPs. I don't know why (ib) is bad, further constraints might apply to the distribution and interpretation of pronominal quantifiers. As Doetjes notes, the interpretation of quantifiers used pronominally seems to be very much context dependent. Grevisse and Goosse (2007) give many examples of QAD/CAD quantifiers used pronominally in various positions.

In conclusion, two correlations hold of QAD/CAD quantifiers: the possibility to be used as a VP adverb is therefore not the only feature that is predictive of QAD/CAD. Previous analyses privileged Kayne's generalization, but there is no reason why this should be so. In fact, assuming that QAD/CAD quantifiers are always adverbs (Doetjes 1997) runs into difficulties when dealing with their pronominal uses. What we observe is that certain quantifiers can appear to have no restrictor, and this may be the reason why they do not need to sit next to deP when it is there[5].
There are no arguments in favor of analyzing CAD as a base-generated structure but there are arguments in favor of analyzing it as a derived structure. The first argument, to which I turn now, is a direct prediction of the movement analysis: the moved element can be interpreted below its landing position.

3 Reconstruction facts

Example (19) contains the modal *devoir* 'must' and the downward monotonic degree quantifier *moins* 'less' (otherwise the readings would be equivalent (Heim 2001)).

(19) Vos enfants vont moins devoir envoyer de lettres que ça.
your children go less must send DE lettres than this
Your children are required to send fewer letters than that (=50).

It has the surface scope reading (*moins >> devoir*): 'the minimal requirement reading'. That such a reading is available is shown by the felicitous use of (19) in context (22). The (simplified) LF for this reading is in (20). It says that the minimal number of letters that the children are required to send is less than 50. It says nothing about an upper end, leaving open that more letters can be sent.

(20) The minimal requirement reading (*moins >> devoir*):
$[\![(19)]\!]$ =
$\text{Max}\{d \mid \forall w' \in \text{Acc}(w)$ Your children are going to send d-MANY letters in $w'\} < 50$

What is interesting is that (19) has the lower scope reading (*devoir >> moins*) which can be paraphrased as the maximal number of letters that the children are allowed to send is less than 50[6].

(21) The maximal requirement reading (*devoir >> moins*):
$[\![(19)]\!]$ =
$\forall w' \in \text{Acc}(w)$. $\text{Max}\{d \mid$ Your children are going to send d-MANY letters in $w'\} < 50$

That such a reading is available is shown by (22). A falsity judgment task needs to be used to show that the maximal requirement reading is there. This is because the maximal requirement reading entails the minimal requirement reading: if the highest possible number is 50 then it is also true that the lowest possible number is less than 50.

(22) Context: Parents are gathered together in their children's classroom for a meeting with their teachers. The children are all going to apply for an internship over the summer. One teacher tells the parents that one year, a child sent out 50 application letters. Of course, children are free to send as many or even more letters but it's also definitely not necessary for them to send as many.

A. Les enfants vont moins devoir envoyer de lettres que ça(= 50 letters).
the children go less must send DE lettres than this

5. An account of the structure of quantified dePs capturing both correlations is proposed in Pasquereau 2016a.
6. This is a short version of the argument for reconstruction. For the complete version, see Pasquereau 2016b.

B. Mais c' est faux voyons ! Au contraire ... s' ils le veulent, ils peuvent en envoyer
but this is false see ! at.the contrary if they it want they can them send
à toutes les entreprises du pays.
to all the companies of.the country
But that's not true, come on! If they want, they can send letters to every single company in the country!

The scenario in (22) sets up the minimal requirement reading while making the maximal requirement reading false. The scenario tells us that two parents are talking about a parent / teacher meeting that happened earlier. Speaker A utters the test sentence in (22). Speaker B reacts to A's utterance by denying the stronger maximality reading. Informants were asked to judge whether the dialogue between A and B was coherent. The dialogue in (22) is coherent, we can conclude that the sentence in A has the maximality reading (*devoir >> moins*).
For the scope argument with intensional verbs to hold it is crucial that the scope-bearing element should not be able to raise covertly, otherwise covert movement of this scope-bearing element could give it scope over *moins* where it appears. Modals in French have been argued not to be able to move covertly by Hacquard (2006, p. 44). A challenge is that Homer (2011, p. 217) claims that *devoir* 'must' is a PPI, which can escape out of the scope of a DE operator by moving covertly out of its scope. Here is how the challenge might be answered. If the scope relation *devoir >> moins* obtained because *moins* created a DE environment in its scope that *devoir* wanted to escape, then we would expect negative polarity items to be licensed under *moins*. The examples in (23) show that NPIs are not licensed in the scope of *moins* so there is reason to think that *moins* does not create a DE environmnent in its scope. Therefore, according to Homer's theory, *devoir* is not antilicensed and does not need to escape.

(23) a.* Jean va moins faire quoi que ce soit que son frère.
Jean goes less do anything than his brother

b.* Jean va moins dormir de la semaine que son frère.
Jean goes less sleep in a week than his brother

4 Locality restrictions

If CAD is obtained via movement, we expect to see locality restrictions and this is what we find. I use *plus* 'more' throughout and only mention the other quantifiers when they pattern differently.

4.1 Where can deP be?

A CAD operator can license a deP if the deP meets all of the following 3 conditions: (i) deP is not in a PP, (ii) deP is postverbal, and (iii) deP an argument. As we have seen CAD is possible with an object argument (24), but only with DP ones: (25) shows that *plus* 'more' cannot license deP across a PP boundary even if it is an argument of the verb.

(24) CAD into object: ✓

a. J' ai vu *plus de gens* que ça.
I have met more DE people than that
I have met more people than that.

b. J'ai *plus* vu *de gens* que ça.

(25) CAD into (argument) PP: *

a. J' ai téléphoné à plus de gens que ça.
I have called to more DE people than that
I've called more people than that.

b.* J'ai plus téléphoné à de gens que ça.

The CAD dependency can also hold from the subject of a verb as long as it is postverbal, which happens

under very specific conditions: with unaccusative verbs, in so-called locality inversion constructions, and via clefting of the object (26).

(26) Clefting of the object, CAD into postverbal subject: ✓

a. [O **V** *plus* de-S]
Ce sont ces projets qu' ont soutenus *plus d' hommes* que de femmes.
this are those projects that have supported more DE men than DE women
Those are the projects that more men than women have supported.

b. [O *plus* **V** de-S]
Ce sont des projets qu'ont *plus* soutenus *d'hommes* que de femmes.

A generalization recurring in the literature is that QAD is restricted to the (surface) object. This generalization is motivated it seems by examples like (27) in Kayne 1975, p. 29 and from Burnett 2009, p. 20 where CAD is not good with the (derived) subject. Notice though that the subject is preverbal.

(27)* De carottes ont été trop mangées cette année.
DE carrots have been too eaten this year.
Intended: Too many carrots have been eaten this year.

Finally, only postverbal DPs arguments allow CAD.

(28) CAD into adjunct: *

a. J'ai dormi plus de temps que ça.
I've slept more DE time than this
I slept longer than this.

b.* J'ai plus dormi de temps que ça.

(29) CAD into object: ✓

a. J'ai passé plus de temps que ça.
I've spent more DE time than that
I've spent more time than that.

b. J'ai plus passé de temps que ça.

Under the movement analysis we do not need to explain why the selection of a deP by the quantifier in a CAD sentence appears to be non-local[7]: the comparative quantifier is merged into the structure as the sister of deP and moves from there. Furthermore, if indeed the quantifier itself undergoes movement, then the generalization that CAD can only occur with postverbal arguments follows from the fact that the landing position of the movement is lower than the surface position of subjects.
If CAD involves overt Q-movement, we might expect this movement to be an instance of a known type of movement. I show below that CAD seems to have the profile of A-movement.

4.2 How distant can Q and deP be?

In what follows, I show that the CAD dependency cannot hold across tensed clause boundaries, although it can hold across certain infinitival boundaries. I also show that it is sensitive to extraction islands and intervention. All of this is suggestive of A movement.
The quantifier *plus* 'more' cannot be in a different tensed clause from the clause where the deP it quantifies over is (*cf.* 30a, 30b to 30c). This restriction holds even if the embedded verb is in the subjunctive.

(30) CAD into indicative clause: *

7. Kayne (1975) points out that movement is not necessary to explain the distribution of dePs since they are possible in argument position under negation and it is not possible for *pas* to appear next to deP. But there are arguments that the *de* found under negation and the *de* licensed by quantifiers are not the same morphemes (*see* Milner 1978).

a. J' ai pensé [$_{CP}$ que tu avais vendu *plus* d' encre que de craie aujourd'hui].
I' ve thought that you had sold more DE ink than DE chalk today
Today I thought you had sold more ink than chalk.

b. J' ai pensé [$_{CP}$ que tu avais *plus* vendu d'encre que de craie aujourd'hui].

c.* J' ai *plus* pensé [$_{CP}$ que tu avais vendu d'encre que de craie aujourd'hui].

(31) CAD into subjunctive clause: *

a. Carla a exigé [$_{CP}$ que Nicolas prenne *plus* de cours de syntaxe que ça].
Carla has demanded that Nicolas take.SUBJ more DE classes of syntax than this
Carla demanded that Nicolas take more syntax classes than this.

b.* Carla a *plus* exigé [$_{CP}$ que Nicolas prenne de cours de syntaxe que ça].

CAD is possible across a non-finite boundary in causative constructions (32b).

(32) CAD into infinitival under *faire* causativizer[8]: ✓

a. Je vais faire tailler *plus* d' arbres à mon jardinier que de rosiers.
I go make prune more DE trees to my gardener than DE rose_bushes
I'm going to make my gardener prune more trees than rose bushes.

b. Je vais *plus* faire tailler d'arbres à mon jardinier que de rosiers.

This could be thought to be a consequence of a possible special status of causative constructions, but CAD is possible into infinitivals in raising constructions, with *paraître* 'appear' and *devoir* 'must' for instance (33).

(33) CAD into infinitival under *paraître* 'appear' and *devoir* 'must': ✓

a. Jean a pourtant paru/ dû arroser *plus* de fleurs que d' arbustes.
Jean has yet seemed/ must water more DE flowers than DE shrubs
Yet, Jean seemed to have/ must have watered more flowers than shrubs.

b. Jean a pourtant *plus* paru/ dû arroser de fleurs que d'arbustes.

Licensing into infinitivals is not restricted to raising constructions. Although judgments are much less clear with control verbs, at least some of them allow CAD, e.g. *essayer* 'try' (34).

(34) CAD into infinitival under *essayer* 'try': ✓

a. Il a essayé de lire *plus* de livres que de magazines.
he has tried to read more DE books than DE magazines
He tried reading more books than magazines.

b. Il a *plus* essayé de lire de livres que de magazines.

But it is less clear whether other subject control verbs like *décider* 'decide' are acceptable with CAD (35). If the contrast in acceptability extends to other pairs of restructuring/non-restructuring verbs like *essayer* 'try'/*décider* 'decide' (*see* Wurmbrand 1998), then this contrast constitutes an even stronger argument for a movement analysis against a base-generation analysis.

8. The order in which the standard clause precedes the goal *à mon jardinier* is also possible, maybe preferred.

(35) CAD into infinitival under *décider* 'decide': ✓

a. Il a décidé de lire *plus* de livres que de magazines.
he has decided to read more DE books than DE magazines
He decided to read more books than magazines.

b??Il a *plus* décidé de lire de livres que de magazines.

To recapitulate, CAD is not possible across finite clause boundaries but it is across at least some non-finite clause boundaries depending on the embedding verb that heads them. This is a difference exhibited by A movement. We will now see that CAD across extraction island boundaries is not possible as predicted by the movement account. Any sentence in which the *plus*-deP dependency spans a tensed clause boundary will be unacceptable. So I only look at non-finite embedded clauses in the extraction islands which can embed a non-tensed clause: adjunct (*cf.* 28 and 29), complex NP (36), wh-island (37), conjunction (38).

(36) CAD into complex NP: *

a. J' ai vu un homme à qui vendre plus de choux que de fraises.
I have seen a man to whom sell more DE cabbage than DE strawberries
I saw a man to whom I can l sell more cabbage than strawberries.

b.*J'ai plus vu un homme à qui vendre de choux que de fraises.

(37) CAD into wh-island: *

a. Christian s'est demandé [à qui donner *plus* de gâteau].
Christian has wondered to whom give more DE cake
Christian wondered who to give more cake to.

b. Christian s'est demandé [à qui *plus* donner de gâteau].

c.*Christian s'est *plus* demandé [à qui donner de gâteau].

(38) CAD into one conjunct: *, CAD into both conjuncts: ✓

a. J' ai donné [*plus* de temps et *plus* d' argent] à Marie qu' à Pauline.
I have given more DE time and more DE money to Marie than to Pauline
I've given more time and more money to Marie than to Pauline.

b.*J'ai *plus* donné [de temps et *plus* d' argent] à Marie qu' à Pauline.

c. J'ai *plus* donné [de temps et d' argent] à Marie qu' à Pauline.

If CAD does involve movement, specifically A-movement (as evidenced by the fact that CAD is not possible across tensed clauses but is across some non-finite clauses), we might expect there to be intervention effects (Malhotra 2011) and this is indeed what we find.

4.3 Intervention

It seems that a CAD cannot span a DP (39) or a PP (40). In (39), *Paul* is the object of the control verb *supplier* 'beg'. In (40), *Paul* is the indirect object of the control verb *conseiller* 'advise'.

(39) CAD across DP *Paul*: *

a. Marie a supplié **Paul** d' acheter *plus* de magazines que de journaux.
Marie has begged Paul to buy more DE magazines than DE newspapers
Marie begged Paul to buy more magazines than newspapers.

b.*Marie a *plus* supplié **Paul** d'acheter de magazines que de journaux.

(40) CAD across PP *à Paul* 'to Paul': *

a. Marie a conseillé **à Paul** d' acheter *plus* de magazines que de journaux.
Marie has advised to Paul to buy more DE magazines than DE newspapers
Marie advised Paul to buy more magazines than newspapers.

b.* Marie a *plus* conseillé **à Paul** d'acheter de magazines que de journaux.

However, the CAD quantifier - deP dependency can hold once the intervening DP or PP has gotten out of the way. In (41a, 41b), the intervener has cliticized and in (42), it has been wh-extracted.

(41) CAD after cliticization of DP/PP: ✓

a. Marie **l'** a *plus* supplié d' acheter de magazines que de journaux.
Marie him has more begged to buy DE magazines than DE newspapers
Marie begged him to buy more magazines than newspapers.

b. Marie **lui** a *plus* conseillé d' acheter de magazines que de journaux.
Marie him.DAT has more advised to buy DE magazines than DE newspapers
Marie advised Paul to buy more magazines than newspapers.

(42) CAD after wh-movement of intervening XP: ✓

a. **Qui** est- ce que Marie a plus supplié d'acheter de magazines que de journaux ?
who is it that Marie has more begged to.buy DE magazines than DE newspaper
Who did Marie beg to buy more magazines than newspaper?

b. **À qui** Marie a-t elle plus conseillé d'acheter de magazines que de journaux ?
to whom Marie has she more advised to.buy DE magazines than DE newspaper
To whom did Marie advise to buy more magazines than newspaper?

This contrast is also observed with the ECM verb *laisser* 'let' in (43). The dependency cannot hold across the raised DP *mes enfants* 'my children' in (43b), and as (43c) and (43d) show, the sentences are grammatical once the DP has gotten out of the way.

(43) CAD into infinitival under ECM *laisser* 'let': $\checkmark^{cl}$ / $*^{DP}$

a. Je vais laisser **mes enfants** lire *plus* de bandes dessinées que de romans.
I go let my children read more DE comic books than DE novels
I'm going to let my children read more comic strips than books.

b.* Je vais *plus* laisser **mes enfants** lire de bandes dessinées que de romans.

c. Je vais *plus* **les** laisser lire de bandes dessinées que de romans.
I go more them let read DE comic books than DE novels
I'm going to let my children read more comic strips than books.

d. **Qui** est- ce que tu vas *plus* laisser lire de bandes dessinées que de romans.
who is it that you go more let read DE comic books than DE novels
Who are you going to let read more comic books than novels?

Those facts are unexpected under the base-generation account, especially in the face of the acceptability of the examples in (44) where CAD across the unembedded PP *à Marie* 'to Marie' does not cause unacceptability. Arguably though, the object DP *(plus) de livres sur Napoleon* in (44) has been extraposed. If the CAD dependency is derived before the extraposition, we then have an explanation for the acceptability of this example.

(44) CAD into DP over PP in ditransitive construction: ✓

a. J' ai prêté **à Marie** plus de livres sur Napoléon que de livres sur Louis XIV.
I have lent to Marie more DE books about Napoleon than DE books about Louis XIV
I've lent Marie more books about Napoleon than books about Louis XIV.

b. J'ai plus prêté **à Marie** de livres sur Napoléon que de livres sur Louis XIV.

The cases where a DP intervenes in cross-clausal CAD may be likened to a kind of DP intervention that has been discussed in raising constructions: defective intervention, even though it is unclear how the proposed analyses in Anagnostopoulou 2003 and Hartman 2011 for instance could be extended to intervention in CAD. Moreover, it is not only DPs which intervene, adverbials do too: in (45), my informants consistently found a. and c. to be much better than examples b, in which the adverbial *à chaque fois* 'each time' or *demain* 'tomorrow' appears between *plus* and deP.

(45) CAD across adverbial *hier/à chaque fois*: *

a. Il m' a paru **hier/ à chaque fois** avoir emprunté plus d' argent que toi.
it to.me has seemed yesterday/ each time have borrowed more DE money than you
Yesterday/Each time, it seemed to me that I borrowed more money than you did.

b.* Il m'a plus semblé **hier/ à chaque fois** avoir emprunté d'argent que toi.

c. **Hier/ À chaque fois**, il m'a plus semblé avoir emprunté d'argent que toi.

This pattern of locality, especially the facts related to intervention, point toward a syntactic explanation. Movement is made more plausible by the fact that there is another word which (i) has been argued to move, (ii) may also be used pronominally, and (iii) exhibits the same locality restrictions as CAD.

5 Comparison with *tout* 'everything'

In this section I show that *tout* 'everything', which has been argued to move (Kayne 1975), exhibits the same locality restrictions as *plus* 'more', thus suggesting that *plus* should be analyzed similarly. The quantifier *tout* 'everything' used as an object can appear in positions that are not positions where objects can ordinarily appear, namely the position to the left of a non-finite verb (*cf.* 46 and 47).

(46) a. J' ai bu du vin.
I have drunk some wine.

b.* J'ai du vin bu.

(47) a. J' ai bu tout.
I have drunk all

b. J'ai tout bu.

If *tout* appears in an embedded finite clause, it cannot appear in the matrix clause, like CAD Qs.

(48) In indicative clause: *

a. J' ai pensé [que tu avais vendu *tout*].
I have thought that you had sold all
Today I thought you had sold everything.

b. J'ai pensé [que tu avais *tout* vendu].

c.* J'ai *tout* pensé [que tu avais vendu].

(49) In subjunctive clause: *

a. J' ai exigé [qu' il ait pris *tout*].
I have demanded that he have.SUBJ taken all
I demanded that he took everything.

b.* J'ai *tout* exigé [qu'il ait pris].

Movement of *tout* is possible across a non-finite boundary in causative constructions (32b).

(50) Infinitival under *faire* causativizer: ✓

a. Je vais faire tailler *tout*.
I go make prune all
I'm going to have everything pruned.

b. Je vais *tout* faire tailler.

(51) Infinitival under *paraître* 'appear': ✓

a. Jean a paru/ dû arroser *tout*.
Jean has seemed/ must water all
Jean seemed to/must have watered everything.

b. Jean a *tout* paru/ dû arroser.

(52) Infinitival under *essayer* 'try': ✓

a. Il a essayé de lire *tout*.
he has tried to read all
He tried to read everything.

b. Il a *tout* essayé de lire.

(53) Infinitival under *décider* 'decide': ??

a. Il a décidé de lire *tout*.
he has decided to read all
He decided to read everything.

b?? Il a *tout* décidé de lire.

Just like *plus* 'more', *tout* 'all' cannot move out of extraction islands.

(54) Movement out of adjunct: *

a. Il s' est blessé en rangeant tout.
he REFL is wounded in tidying all
He got injured misbehaving.

b.* Il s'est tout blessé en rangeant.

(55) Movement out of complex NP: *

a. J' ai vu un homme à qui tout vendre.
I have seen a man to whom all sell
I saw a man to whom I can l sell everything.

b.* J'ai tout vu un homme à qui vendre.

(56) Movement out of wh-island: *

a. Christian s' est demandé où tout acheter.
Christian REFL is asked where all buy
Christian wondered where to buy everything.

b.* Christian s'est tout demandé où acheter.

(57) Out of one conjunct: *, out of both conjuncts: ✓

a. J' ai dû tout dire et tout faire.
I have must all say and all do
I had to give everything and do everything.

b.* J'ai tout dû dire et *tout* faire.

c. J' ai tout dû dire et faire.

The quantifier *tout* is sensitive to DP intervention too as the sentences in (b) show, and cliticization improves the acceptability of the sentence (c.). It is also sensitive to adverb intervention (59).

(58) Movement over DP: *, over clitic: ✓

a. Je vais laisser mes enfants tout lire.
I go let my children all read
I'm going to let my children read everything.

b.* Je vais *tout* laisser mes enfants lire.

c. Je vais tout les laisser lire.
I go all them let read
I'm going to let them read everything.

(59) Movement over adverb: *

a. Je vais essayer demain de tout finir.
I go try tomorrow to all finish
Tomorrow, I'll try to finish up.

b.* Je vais tout essayer demain de finir.

c. Demain, je vais tout essayer de finir.

Interestingly, another hint that *tout* and CAD should be given a similar analysis is that both fall within the purview of the pronominal generalization (13). This could suggest that the possibility for quantifiers to be used pronominally is indeed predictive of whether they can undergo movement although I cannot develop this idea further here.

6 Conclusion

I have endeavored to show that the CAD dependency is derived via movement. Firstly, there are no arguments favoring a base-generation account. Secondly, reconstruction facts with locality restrictions make a strong case for analyzing CAD in terms of overt movement. I have hinted that CAD looks like A-movement because unlike Ā-movement, it cannot cross finite-clause boundaries but, like A-movement, it is finite-clause bound and sensitive to intervention. Another observation is that no known Ā-movement targets the positions that CAD targets: *combien* wh-moves in (60) and cannot be preverbal[9].

(60) a. Il a lu combien de livres ?
he has read how_many DE books
How many books has he read?

b.* Il a combien lu de livres ?

c. Combien il a lu de livres ?

(61) a. Il a lu plus de livres que ça.
he has read more DE books than that
He read more books than this.

b. Il a plus lu de livres que ça.

c.* Plus il a lu de livres que ça.

I have argued that there are reasons to think that CAD and *tout*-movement involve the same operation but whether the latter is A-movement is not known either. Moreover an analysis in terms of A-movement brings up a number of issues and I must leave this discussion for later. In particular, I think a more precise characterization of this movement partly hinges on how the structure of French quantified dePs is analyzed (Pasquereau 2016a).

References

Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). *The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Burnett, H. S. (2009). Formal Approaches to Semantic Microvariation: Adverbial Quantifiers in European and Quebec French. Ms. UCLA, Los Angeles, CA.

Doetjes, J. (1997). *Quantifiers and Selection*. Ph. D. thesis, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden.

Grevisse, M. and A. Goosse (2007). *Le Bon Usage* (14 ed.). Éditions De Boeck Université.

Hacquard, V. (2006). *Aspects of Modality*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Hartman, J. (2011). Intervention in Tough Constructions. In S. Lima, K. Mullin, and B. Smith (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 39th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 39)*, Amherst, MA, pp. 387–398. GLSA.

Heim, I. (2001). Degree operators and scope. In *Proceedings of SALT 10*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.

Homer, V. (2011). *Polarity and Modality*. Ph. D. thesis, University of California.

Kayne, R. S. (1975). *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Current Studies in Linguistics. MIT Press.

Malhotra, S. (2011). *Movement and intervention effects: evidence from Hindi/Urdu*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Maryland.

Milner, J.-C. (1978). *De la syntaxe à l'interprétation.* Editions du Seuil.

Obenauer, H.-G. (1983). Une quantification canonique: la quantification à distance. *Langue francaise 58*, 66–88.

Partee, B. H. (2004). *Compositionality in Formal Semantics*, Chapter Many Quantifiers, pp. 241–258. Blackwell Publishing.

Pasquereau, J. (2015). Overt movement of comparative quantifiers in European French.

Pasquereau, J. (2016a). On the structure and interpretation of French quantified de-NP's. In Progress.

Pasquereau, J. (2016b). Two scope ambiguities in support of overt quantifier movement in European French. In *Proceedings of NELS 46*.

Wurmbrand, S. (1998). *Infinitives*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.

9. This is admittedly not an observation in favor of A-movement, simply one against Ā-movement.