Previous analyses of the Bi Comparative Construction (BCC) in Mandarin have put the emphasis on the syntactic category of the bi phrase. Chao (1968) maintain that bi is a verb and thus states that CC is a serial verb construction. Fu (1978), based on the theory of Transformational Grammar, proposes that the underlying structure of CCs consists of three clauses in which the two compared propositions are in sequence, and then followed the abstract verb bijiao, which is replaced by the comparative marker bi by transformation. Besides, Hong (1991) treats the comparative marker bi as a conjunction, which together with the two compared items makes a coordinate complex.

(1) Wo [Deg clause bi Zhangsan ai ni] geng ai ni
   ‘I love you more than Zhangsan does.’

However, it is ignored that in a BCC sentences like (1), it is the two proportions rather than any contrasting items in the propositions that are compared. This paper is based on the minimalist program trying to treat BCC as a coordinate structure (CS) with the degree word geng ‘more’ to be the coordinator of the two compared propositions. And the comparative marker bi is a complementizer taking the compared proposition to be the external conjunct. (i.e., the first conjunct in Zhang 2004)

(2) [TOP wo [CP1 [IP t [DegP [CP2 bi zhangsan love you] geng [vP1 t, love you] ]]]]

The bi-phrase is a degree clause that provides the comparative context-setter (Beck, Oda and Sugisaki (in press)) is a CP in the LF. After the comparative ellipsis, which is an obligatory operation, the comparative marker can take the contrasting element in different categories. Therefore we have the sentence like (3) (Li and Thompson 1981).

(3) wo [Deg clause bi wo zuotian shufu] geng shufu.
   ‘I feel more comfortable than I do yesterday.’

With the projection of the comparative degree geng, it s-selects its complement, the main proposition, to be a gradable one. Providing the comparative datum, the degree clause is also gradable and is put in the specifier position that makes the projection of the degree geng work. There is a co-occurrence restriction relationship among the three core elements of BCC.

Nevertheless, with different comparative degree head like yiyang ‘the same,’ there may be different s-selection of the degree clause such as xiang-clause ‘like’. According to Zhang’s (2004) terminology, vP2 is the internal conjunct, while vP1 is the external one. Therefore, it is the internal conjunct vP2 that is the main proposition rather than vP1. The ellipsis occurs with the Antecedent Contained Deletion, in which the reduplicated parts in vP1 are deleted.

According to Bhatt and Pancheva (2004), despite non-adjacency, there are co-occurrence restrictions and semantic constituency relationships between the degree head and the degree clause. Although geng is sometimes covert in its PF, we cannot conclude by this reason that it is not the core element in the BCC. In the Equality Comparatives (EC) and Inferiority Comparatives (IC), there is a selectional restriction between the degree head and the degree clause. In EC, the degree head yiyang ‘the same’ is required to co-occur with the degree clause headed by xiang ‘as/ like.’ In IC, the degree head name ‘so’ is essential to appear with the degree clause headed by meiyou ‘not.’ Similarly, the degree expression geng selects the bi-clause. Moreover, the replacement of the degree head geng to be hai/ haiyao with the same meaning does not violate this rule.
The Pronoun binding and Reflexive binding provides evidences to this studies. Since semantically it is universal that comparatives involve two propositions, It may be workable to apply this proposal to comparative structures of different degree crosslinguistically.
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