Comparatives can be ‘clausal’ (CC) (than she is) or ‘phrasal’ (PC) (than her). We offer evidence from three acceptability-rating studies in Polish that than has an elided small clause complement in PCs.

1. Analyses of PCs. The reduction analysis (RA) holds that PCs and CCs differ only in the size of ellipsis in the than-clause and in the mechanism of case-marking the remnant DP ([2], [15], [16], [17], [7]), see (1). As in CCs, a wh-operator moves to Spec, CP of the than-clause, creating a degree predicate, which more takes as an argument. Under the direct analysis (DA) than has a DP complement ([8], [14]). The DA needs two mores as in PCs more combines with an individual, while in CCs it has a degree predicate argument ([9],[14],[11]). The SCA posits that than has a small clause complement, whose subject it ECMs (e.g., [19], (2)). There is wh-movement in the than clause, as in CCs, but no C to attract the wh-operator. The movement is just for the creation of a degree predicate, as in [10]. In the absence of a wh-probe, the wh-operator moves to the edge of the predicate, here a vP. The small clause predicate is obligatorily elided. The SCA captures the syntactic behavior of the than PP as well as the DA does, while preserving the lexical semantic parsimony of the RA, as it relies on the same more.

2. Distinguishing between the Theories: The SCA predicts that when the more-NP originates in Spec, vP, PCs will be degraded. Consider (3) as a PC (in actuality, the English sentence must be a CC, given that neither (3a) nor (3b) is acceptable). Movement of the subject out of Spec, vP targeting vP, as in (3a), is precluded in Bare Phrase Structure (BPS [3]) as too local. Movement of X is defined as the ordered set <{X, A}, {X, B}> where B and A are X’s sisters before and after movement. The chain needed for (3a) is <{wh-NP, vP}, {wh-NP, vP}> i.e., it is non-distinguishable from a trivial, non-movement chain. The wh-movement needed for (3a) cannot even be stated non-vacuously, so (3a) is categorically precluded. The alternative in (3b) involves sub-extraction of the degree wh-word from the subject. But subjects are islands ([11], [3], [4], [5], [6]). Thus, such PCs should show the gradient acceptability associated with subject-island violations. [12] offers experimental evidence that extraction from Spec, vP subjects is not categorically precluded (rated on average 3.6 on a 1-7 scale) and that it substantially varies among speakers, with means ranging 2-5.5. SCA further predicts that degree dependencies involving unaccusative subjects should be permitted in PCs, since these subjects do not originate in Spec, vP.

Neither the RA nor the DA makes these predictions, which stem from locality and island constraints on wh-movement. The DA posits no wh-movement in PCs. Under the RA, wh-movement is to Spec, CP, i.e., not too local, so the whole subject wh-phrase can move, avoiding a sub-extraction violation.

3. Testing the Predictions: Three Off-line Acceptability-Judgment Experiments in Polish. Because the predictions of the SCA involve gradient unacceptability, quantitative data are needed to test them. Polish distinguishes CCs and PCs by the type of than (niż and od ‘from’, respectively), and it allows the niż–clause to be elided up to a single remnant, in parallel to PCs (e.g., [13]). Experiment 1 compared CCs and PCs with more-NP objects (4a,b) and subjects (4c,d) in transitive predicates. Experiment 2 added 2 more adverbial conditions (4e,f). Sentences were judged on a 7-point rating scale. The SCA predicts an interaction, with (4d) degraded relative to the other conditions. 4 out of 39 subjects in Exp.1, and 4 out of 30 subjects in Exp.2 show an unexpected pattern of (4c) judged worse than (4d) by >1 point. For the remaining subjects, in both experiments, repeated measures ANOVAs yield significant main effects of type of than (niż vs. od) and position of more (subject vs. object (vs. adverb), and, most importantly, significant interactions (5). This suggests that (4d)’s lowest mean is not just a cumulative effect of the two main factors, but an additional effect, which we attribute to the island violation. Underscoring this point, the main effects remain significant when the subject conditions are not included in an ANOVA but there is no interaction (Exp. 2: F(1,25)=0.77, p=0.39); i.e., the lower mean of (4f) relative to (4a,b,e) is entirely cumulative. The results support the SCA over its alternatives. Experiment 3 compared CCs and PCs with unaccusative (6a,b) and unergative (6c,d) subjects. Again, the SCA predicts an interaction, with (6d) having the lowest ratings. A repeated measures ANOVA on 51 subjects revealed a significant effect of than (niż vs. od) and, importantly, a than × verb type (unaccusative vs. unergative) interaction (see (7)).

4. Consequences. The results allow for economy in the functional lexicon: only one more is needed. The generalization that vP-deletion does not repair island violations ([18]) receives support. Finally, the results illuminate the role of (anti-)locality in wh-movement and provide support for a BPS-model of syntax.
(1) He visited more cities than \[\text{CP wh}_2 \text{ she}_3 \{\text{CP x visited d many cities}\}\] (RA)
(2) He visited more cities than \[\text{Predp she}_3 \{\text{wh}_2 \rightarrow \text{x visited d many cities}\}\] (SCA)
(3) More tourists visited London than Paris
a. * … than \[\text{Predp Paris}_1 \{\text{wh}_2 \rightarrow \text{many tourists}_2 \{\text{x visited x}_2\}\}\] (SCA)
    b. ??* … than \[\text{Predp Paris}_1 \{\text{wh}_2 \rightarrow \text{d many tourists}_2 \text{ visit x}_2\}\] (SCA)
(4) a. Zespół Impresja zatańczył więcej latynskich tańców niż zespół Tęcza
    b. Zespół Impresja zatańczył więcej latynskich tańców od zespołu Tęcza.
    c. Więcej par zatańczyło tango niż poloneza.
    d. Więcej par zatańczyło tango od poloneza.
    e. Wszystkie pary zatańczyły tango lepiej niż poloneza.
    f. Wszystkie pary zatańczyły tango lepiej od poloneza.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>object niz (4a)</th>
<th>object od (4b)</th>
<th>subject niz (4c)</th>
<th>subject od (4d)</th>
<th>adverb niz (4e)</th>
<th>adverb od (4f)</th>
<th>than \times\ position of more interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.1</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>F(1,54) = 6.26, p = 0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.2</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>F(2,25) = 3.99, p = 0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(6) a. W tym sezonie wyrosło więcej dorodnych truskawek niż w ubiegłym sezonie
    b. W tym sezonie wyrosło więcej dorodnych truskawek od ubiegłego sezonu
    c. W tym sezonie spało pod namiotami więcej turystów niż w zeszłym sezonie
    d. W tym sezonie spało pod namiotami więcej turystów od zeszłego sezonu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>unacc. subj niz (6a)</th>
<th>unacc. subj od (6b)</th>
<th>unerg. subj niz (6c)</th>
<th>unerg. subj od (6d)</th>
<th>than \times\ verb type interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp.3</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>F(1,05) = 5.65, p = 0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>