

Comparative and superlative differentials: Experimental evidence from Czech¹

Mojmír DOČEKAL — Masaryk University

Hana KRAJÍČKOVÁ — Masaryk University

Abstract. This article brings new experimental evidence for the treatment of Czech *ne více než* ‘no more than’ comparative differential modifier as the class B numerals modifier. At a more general level, our experimental data bring support for such theories of modified numerals which distinguish among them based on their semantics (like Kennedy 2015).

Keywords: class A vs. class B modified numerals, Czech, experimental semantics

1. Introduction

Our article discusses an experiment targeting the semantic behaviour of modified numerals. Modified numerals, unlike bare numerals in (1), contain additional linguistic expressions which further specify the range of readings denoted by the whole phrase. The literature on modified numerals (Büring 2008; Geurts and Nouwen 2007; Nouwen 2008; Cummins and Katsos 2010; Kennedy 2015; Alexandropoulou et al. 2016 among others) distinguishes at least two types of modified numerals: (i) comparative modified numerals like in (2a) and (ii) superlative modified numerals as in (2b). The terminology reflects the morphological make-up of the modifiers: in (2a) we find the comparative marker *more* used regularly in the comparative analytic form in English; the same holds analogically for the superlative free morpheme *most* in (2b).

- (1) This chocolate contains 25 grams of sugar.
- (2) a. This chocolate contains more than 25 grams of sugar.
b. This chocolate contains at most 25 grams of sugar.

There are many generally accepted semantic and pragmatic distinctions dividing the comparative and superlative modifiers of numerals (or class A vs. class B modifiers, respectively). One distinction particularly important for the experiment discussed below concerns the scope behaviour of the two kinds of modifiers with respect to existential modals. In the literature (see Geurts and Nouwen 2007; Blok 2019), it was observed that comparative modifiers can scope over or under the existential modals. By way of example, (3) can be true for buses being able to carry less than 55 people, coach bus e.g., the weak reading, where the interpretation follows the linear scope of the modal verb syntactically dominating the modified numeral in the object position, (3a). There is the stronger reading as well, let’s say for city buses, which can carry 44 people or less, the scope of the modified numeral is over the existential modal, (3b).

- (3) This bus can carry fewer than 45 people.
 - a. $\Diamond > \text{fewer than } 45$ true – coach bus: 55 people
 - b. $\text{fewer than } 45 > \Diamond$ true – city bus: 44 people

¹We would like to thank the audience of SuB 26 at the University of Cologne, especially Stephanie Solt, for their insightful comments. We would also like to thank Balázs Surányi and the participants of SinFonJA 13 in Budapest. All errors remain our own.

The superlative modified numerals contrast with the comparative modified ones: (4) seems to disallow the weak reading in (4a) and to be compatible with the more permissive reading in (4b) only. There appears to be a consensus with respect to this scope difference in the literature (see Geurts and Nouwen 2007; Blok 2019 but also Kennedy 2015 for a slightly different view).

- (4) This bus can carry at most 45 people.
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| a. $*\diamond > \text{at most } 45$ | false – coach bus: 55 people |
| b. $\text{at most } 45 > \diamond$ | true – city bus: 44 people |

Another important difference dividing comparative and superlative modifiers concerns their pragmatic implicatures. Namely, comparative modifiers do not, but superlative modifiers do yield the ignorance implicatures. See the contrast between (5a) and (5b), where (5b) seems to be incompatible with the speaker's knowledge of the exact amount of sugar in the chocolate. In some approaches (Kennedy, 2015), this difference is treated as the familiar maximum of quantity implicature where the superlative modified numerals have logically stronger alternatives (the comparative modified numerals and bare numerals).

- (5) a. This chocolate contains more than 25 grams of sugar.
b. This chocolate contains at most 25 grams of sugar.

Our article focuses on a modified numerals construction containing negation and comparative marker exemplified below with (6) from Nouwen (2008). Discussing this kind of example, Nouwen (2008) claims that English *no more than* is a comparative modifier since it allows both scopes with respect to the existential modal and moreover does not yield any ignorance implicature. Because of these two properties (and the morphological mark-up), he classifies English *no more* as a comparative modifier of numerals.

- (6) Cody's paper is allowed to have no more than 20 pages.

To the ears of both authors of this article (and a couple of other native speakers of Czech), Czech *no more* numeral modifier does not allow the narrow scope under the existential modifier and it yields the ignorance implicature even if it has the morphological marker of comparative like the English one. This was the original motivation behind the experiment concerning Czech *no more* which results we report below.

In section 2 we first summarise some important syntactic and semantics properties of Czech *ne víc než* 'no more than'. In section 2.1, we recapitulate the predictions of two kinds of theories with respect to it. Section 3 reports the design and results of our experimental work. Finally, section 4 presents the first preliminary analysis of *ne víc než* couched in the semantic approach to modified numerals.

2. Czech *no more* construction

Before we move to the experiment, we will discuss some properties of Czech *no more* construction. We will identify some differences between Czech and English *no more* but crucially, we will show that the construction in both languages contains the same comparative morphology, as demonstrated in (7) below. In other words, if the essential difference between comparative and superlative modifiers stems from the morphological properties of the modifiers, Czech *no more* should behave like the English one. But let us first look at the differences.

- (7) a. no more than two hours
 b. *ne víc než dvě hodiny*
 no more than two hours
 'no more than two hours'
 c. *Petr je víc unavený než Marie.*
 Petr is more tired than Marie
 'Peter is more tired than Mary.'

The first thing to note is that English *no* can act as a regular determiner as in (8). Unlike that - Czech *ne* is definitely not a determiner but a focus particle as will be shown below; see ungrammaticality of (9) where *ne* in the determiner slot of NP has to be substituted with the adjectival neg-word *žádný* 'any' to make the sentence grammatical.

- (8) a. No man arrived.
 b. Every/the man arrived.

- (9) #*Ne/žádný muž nepřišel.*
 no/any man neg-arrived
 'No man arrived.'

Slavic focus particles (see Jasinskaja 2014 also for older references) share some of the prototypical properties with the English ones. Firstly, in the majority of cases, they have to c-command their associated F-marked expressions. Czech constituent *ne* 'no' behaves like a prototypical focus particle in this respect, see (10).

- (10) a. *Já se choval ne/pouze [seriózně]_F.*
 I SE behaved no/only seriously
 'I behaved not/only seriously.'
 b. **Já se choval [seriózně]_F ne/pouze.*
 I SE behaved seriously no/only
 Intended: 'I behaved not/only seriously.'

Unlike English focus particles, Czech *ne* 'no' has to be adjacent to its focused marked expression; this is a default rule with some exceptions but *ne*'s 'no' behaviour in the exceptional cases (like PPs and complex NPs) copies the pattern of other prototypical focus particles (see also Buring and Hartmann 2001 for German particles).

- (11) a. I behave only [seriously]_F.
 b. I only behave [seriously]_F.
 c. *Já se choval pouze/ne [seriózně]_F.*
 I SE behaved only/no seriously
 'I behaved only/not seriously.'
 d. **Já se pouze/ne choval [seriózně]_F.*
 I SE only/no behaved seriously
 Intended: 'I behaved only/not seriously.'

In sum, Czech constituent negation *ne* 'no' acts and behaves as a focus particle; so for the purposes of our article, we classify it as one, even if a proper linguistic examination of similarities and differences between *ne* 'no' and other focus particles would need more space than we are able to dedicate it to in this paper.

Being a focus particle, *ne* 'no' is related to English superlative modifiers like *at most/at least* which are known to be focus sensitive and different from the comparative modifiers. The following example in (12), from Coppock and Brochhagen (2013), illustrates the focus sensitivity of *at least*. While (12a) implies that the range of appropriate invited guests starts at the level of postdoc, (12b) does not have such an inference but suggest that the lower bound of the appropriate invitations starts with lunch. The difference between (12a) and (12b) is just the focused marked expression (see also Cohen and Krifka 2011).

- (12) a. We should at least invite the [postdoc]_F to lunch.
b. We should at least invite the postdoc [to lunch]_F.

It is apparent that focus sensitivity is a property of many numeral modifiers, Czech *ne* 'no' resembles the English *at most/at least*. But in spite of this, Czech *no more* construction includes the unambiguous marker of the comparative form *víc* 'more' which is regularly used in Czech synthetic comparatives as in (13a). And also, the complementiser *než* 'than' which appears in both synthetic and analytic comparative forms.

- (13) a. Petr je víc zkušený než Karel.
Petr is more experienced than Karel
'Petr is more experienced than Karel.'
b. Petr měří ne víc než dva metry.
Petr measures no more than two meters
'Petr is no more than two meters tall.'

Let us summarise this section, despite the categorical difference between English *no* and Czech *ne*, the Czech *no more* construction witness the clear signs of comparative morphology. And if the decisive factor for comparative/superlative modifies was morphology, we would expect Czech *no more* to behave as its English counterpart. We will comment on this and differing predictions of two types of numeral modifiers theories in the next section.

2.1. Theories and predictions

Theories of modified numerals can be schematically divided into two sorts. The first one distinguishes between comparative and superlative modifiers (or class A vs. class B modifiers) based on their morpho-syntactic properties. It was one of the original insights motivating this kind of approach (see Geurts and Nouwen 2007; Nouwen 2010 a.o.) that even if truth-conditionally *more than three* and *at least four* looks (in the domain of natural numbers) very much the same, natural language distinguishes the two kinds of modifiers in many respects, insecurity inferences being one of them, see (14).

- (14) a. The square has more than three sides.
b. #The square has at least four sides.

The other approach to numeral modifiers advocates for the more semantic based difference between the two kinds of modifiers even if accounting for differences in their semantic and pragmatic behaviour. The recent influential version of the semantic approach is presented by Kennedy (2015), where the difference between the comparative and the superlative modifiers is recast as the difference between the ordering. Namely, for Kennedy (2015), the comparative

modifiers are strictly ordered: *more than three* are generalised quantifiers over degrees with cardinality > 3 , thus strictly ordered. But class B modifiers like *at least four* are generalised quantifiers over degrees with cardinality ≥ 4 , non-strictly ordered. The semantic approach opens up the possibility to treat *no more* as a superlative modifier - if the distinction between class A and class B modifiers is semantic, we can formalise the meaning of *no more* as a class B modifier because of the truth-condition, *no more than three* and *at most three* (again in the domain of the natural numbers) turns out to be the same: ≤ 3 (generalised quantifier over degrees in the formalisation of Kennedy 2015).

On the other hand, in the morphological approach to modified numerals, *sine qua non*, we expect *no more than* to be a comparative (class A) modifier since it contains clear comparative markers. This is exactly the position of Nouwen (2008, 2010) where English *no more than* is described as a class A modifier. We schematically present the predictions of the two kinds of theories in Table 1. If *no more* is a class A modifier, it should be able to scope either wider or narrower than existential modals (the first row in Table 1). But if it is a class B modifier, it should be only acceptable with a wider scope than the existential modal, as we observed for *at most* in (4).

Table 1: Predictions of the two theories

		$\diamond > \text{no more than}$	$\text{no more than} > \diamond$
<i>no more than</i> in	morphology based theories	✓	✓
	semantic based theories	*	✓

Now we can formulate the research questions which were the motivation for the experiments reported below. The first research question simply restates the two diverging theoretical predictions into an empirical question, see (15).

- (15) Q1: Does Czech *no more* behave more like a comparative or a superlative modifier (in the modal environment)?

The second research question concerns the status of Czech *no more* with respect to other differential modifiers like *ten minutes longer than two hours* or vague differentials like *slightly less than two hours*. In our experiments, we tested whether the behaviour of Czech *no more* is the same (in the modal environment) as other differential modifiers (of the same kind), see (16).

- (16) Q2: Does Czech *no more* behave like other differential quantifiers?

The experiments allow us to answer (partially) both questions. And the answers clearly bear upon two issues: (i) they can support empirically one kind of modified numerals theory; (ii) they can add to the evidence distinguishing between differential modifiers. To foreshadow the results reported below: we found that Czech *no more* behaves as a superlative modifier (Q1) and that it behaves unlike the other differential modifiers (Q2). This can be taken as a support evidence for the semantic type of theories of modified numerals and also as an indication that we should differentiate between regular differentials and morphologically comparative but semantically superlative differentials (Q2).

3. Experiment

In this section, we will describe results of Experiment 2 (there was Experiment 1 as well which was a pilot one but we report just the results of Experiment 2 since it included all the conditions from the previous one). The experiment aimed at answering the two research questions formulated in (15) and (16), namely, we queried the nature of the Czech *no more* numeral modifier and its relationship to other differential modifiers of numerals.

3.1. Methodology and predictions

In the experiment, we tested the interpretation of Czech *no more* numeral modifier in the existential modal environment. And we contrasted it with a vague differential numeral modifier *trochu méně* 'slightly less'.

98 participants took part in the experiment, many of them were students at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University. All the participants were native speakers of Czech.

The participants were presented items such as (17), the actual example from the experiment. There were 16 items, each item contained a preceding context and 4 conditions: FEWER, AT-MOST, NO MORE, SLIGHTLY LESS, aggregated as (NUMERALS-MODIFIER) in (17). There was a report of the item's agent in a sentence below after the target sentence in one of the 4 conditions like (17a). Subjects then rated (on Likert's scale 1-5, 1 the worst, 5 the best) how well the agent understood the target sentence in its context. The experiment had 4 main conditions and followed the common Latin-square design: 4 lists were created and each item was presented in one condition in a list. Each subject received one list.

The experiment was a truth-value judgment task where a context described a situation strongly preferring the wide scope of the existential modal over the degree quantifiers. Along with items we also created 16 fillers in the form of the truth-value judgment task. Half of the fillers were designed to be agreeable for native speakers and half should sound odd. Each participant was presented 16 items and 16 fillers. A total number of 32 stimuli was randomised for each participant. The experiment was run online on L-Rex (<https://www.l-rex.de/>).

- (17) Kontext: Aleš si čte následující větu na balení čokolády:
Context: Alex is reading the following sentence on a chocolate bar packaging:
- a. Toto balení může obsahovat (NUMERALS-MODIFIER) 60 gramů cukru.
this packaging can contain NUMERALS-MODIFIER 60 grams of-sugar
'This packaging can contain fewer than/at most/no more than/slightly less than 60 grams of sugar.'

Aleš řekne: 'Takže v téhle čokoládě může občas být i 65 gramů cukru.'

Alex says: 'So, in this chocolate bar there can be sometimes even 65 grams of sugar.'

The previous theoretical literature on modifiers of numerals predicts that: (i) class A modifiers (unlike class B) should be acceptable in a reading where they scope under the existential modals; (ii) there should not be differences between sub-types of class A modifiers with respect to their scope behaviour under or over existential modals. Therefore, if Czech *no more* is

a class B modifier, it should be less acceptable than regular class A modifiers in contexts like (17), where the wide scope of the existential modal is contextually enforced. Moreover, if it is a class B modifier, it should differ from other vague class A differential modifiers despite them bearing a similar morphological make-up.

3.2. Results and discussion

All subjects passed the fillers, so we were able to use all the responses. The experimental data were analyzed in mixed-effects linear models with subject and item intercept+slope random effects via the `LMERTEST` package (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) in R (R Core Team, 2021). In Figure 1, there is a barplot of responses representing the mean acceptability of each condition and their standard errors. The blue bars represent the modifiers of class B and the red bars class A modifiers. As discussed in the previous section, if Czech *no more* is a class B modifier, it should be less acceptable in the contexts where the wide scope of the existential modal is contextually enforced. As evident by the naked eye in Figure 1, the conditions NO MORE and AT MOST (representing the ordinary class B modifier) were accepted very similarly; therefore we classify NO MORE as class B already in this barplot.

Docekal-Krajickova/Docekal-and-Krajickova.png

Figure 1: Barplot of responses

We first constructed a mixed-effects model for the main effects between the conditions. In this model, we set AT MOST as the reference level. The explanatory variables in this model were the four conditions and the dependent variable was the subject's response. Conditions FEWER and SLIGHTLY LESS were robustly more acceptable for subjects ($t = 15.4, p < 0.001$ and $t = 11.5, p < 0.001$ respectively). Only the condition NO MORE was indistinguishable from the reference level AT MOST acceptability-wise ($t = 0.5, p = 0.6$). This was also verified by the Tukey's pairwise differences of conditions (R package `EMMEANS`: Lenth 2021) which yielded the only non-significantly differing pair of conditions: AT MOST and NO MORE ($t = -0.5, p = 0.96$), all other pairs differed significantly with $p = 0.0005$ or below. This finding is in line with semantically based theories and with our treatment of Czech *no more* as a class B modifier. Furthermore, we observed a strong difference between the vague class A differential modifier SLIGHTLY LESS and NO MORE, which proved that we were looking at two types of differential modifiers.

Furthermore, we construed a mixed model incorporating interaction effects. In this model, we decomposed the four conditions in the way reported below. We used two logistic factors: (i) `CLASSA`: to reflect the type of the modifier; (ii) `DIFF` signalling the presence or absence of a differential. SLIGHTLY LESS is therefore `+CLASSA`, since it has comparative morphology and `+DIFF` because it adds a vague differential. NO MORE is `+DIFF` because it contains a differential degree even if null.

1. FEWER: `[+CLASSA,-DIFF]`
2. AT-MOST `[-CLASSA,-DIFF]`

3. NO-MORE [-CLASSA,+DIFF]

4. SLIGHTLY LESS [+CLASSA,+DIFF]

This model revealed a negative main effect of CLASSB (superlative modifiers) ($t = -11.0, p < 0.001$) and a positive effect of the absence of a differential ($t = 3.9, p < 0.001$). Subjects accepted class A modifiers FEWER and SLIGHTLY LESS much more than class B modifiers - which is predicted by the theoretical papers (Geurts and Nouwen, 2007; Blok, 2019). But they also preferred the bare modifiers (AT MOST and FEWER) over the modifiers with differentials (NO MORE and SLIGHTLY LESS) which were unpredicted by the theoretical work on numeral modifiers but can (at least partially) follow from more complex parsing of the +DIFF conditions. Next, we found a negative interaction of CLASSB by DIFFNO ($t = -3.1, p = 0.002$). This means that AT-MOST was less acceptable than FEWER considering that both of them were without differentials. It is not clear to us what is the reason for the last interaction effect, but overall the interaction model confirms the results of the main effects model.

3.3. General discussion

We experimentally tested the acceptability of Czech modified numerals in four conditions. The general prediction of numeral modifiers theories states that only class A modifiers should allow the interpretation in the scope of existential modals. Then, depending on the theory, semantic or morphological, see Table 1, Czech *no more* is either expected to be as acceptable as class A modifiers (morphological theories) or as odd as class B modifiers (semantic theories). The experiment confirmed our expectations: Czech *no more* behaves as a class B modifier in the existential modal sentences. This allows us to answer the research question 1 repeated below as (18). The experimental data bring clear support for the treatment of Czech *no more* as a superlative modifier since the acceptability of NO MORE was indistinguishable from the acceptance of *at most*.

(18) Q1: Does Czech *no more* behave more like a comparative or superlative modifier (in the modal environment)?

We were also able to answer the second research question, again repeated here as (19): the differing acceptability of NO MORE and AT LEAST support the non-unified treatment of differential modifiers. Czech *no more* seems to behave as a superlative differential quantifier but *slightly less* as a comparative differential quantifier.

(19) Q2: Does Czech *no more* behave like other differential quantifiers?

Finally, we would like to discuss a surprising issue which seems to be orthogonal to the research questions formulated and answered above. Looking at Figure 1, we can notice relatively low acceptability of all conditions: even the most default comparative modifier without a differential (condition FEWER) had pretty low acceptability: $\mu = 2.5 (SD : 1.61, SE : 0.04)$. In other words, the baseline which is predicted to be acceptable by all current approaches to modified numerals received a mean acceptability rating just in the middle of the 1 to 5 Likert scale. All other conditions fared even worse. We do not have a clear answer to this overall bad acceptability but we hypothesise that it is possibly a consequence of a priming effect of the most frequent

everyday contexts like (20) (found on Google), which strongly prefer the $max_d > \diamond$ reading, just the opposite scope against the contexts described in our experiment.

- (20) Pro udržení zdraví [...] můžete pít méně než je doporučená hodnota.
 for sustaining health can.2.PL drink less than is recommended value
 Další pití se nedoporučuje.
 further drinking SE neg-recommended
 'To stay healthy [...] you can drink less than the recommended value. Further drinking is not recommended.'

4. Preliminary analysis

In this section, we will develop a preliminary analysis of the results we gathered experimentally. As the answer to the first research question behind our experiment shows, at least in some cases like Czech *no more*, the morphological cues are not the best signs of the class A vs. class B modifier status. And instead of morphology, the semantic theories of the distinction between the numeral modifiers seem to be more usable in the case at hand.

First, we will describe the preliminary meaning ingredients to make the experimental results compatible with the semantic approach like Kennedy's (2015). Let us assume, following Nouwen (2008), that *no more* is a differential degree quantifier in the sense that it specifies zero positive difference between the arguments of the comparative *more*. And again following Nouwen's (2008) suggestion for German/Dutch *nicht mehr/niet meer* we can formalise the meaning of *no more* as the degree quantifier in (21): it takes a degree α and a property P as arguments, returning such properties P , which does not have any degree d' on top of α .

- (21) $\llbracket \text{no more } \alpha \rrbracket = \lambda P. \neg \exists d' [max_d(P(d)) = \alpha + d']$

In the semantic theory of Kennedy (2015) we can observe that exactly this at-issue semantics is equivalent with the superlative meaning of class B modifiers like *at most*. Intuitively: if there is no degree difference between the two arguments of comparative *more*, then its at-issue meaning is the same *at most*, similarly to the algebraic equivalence between the sets of natural numbers $\{x \mid x \leq 5\}$ and $\{x \mid x \not> 5\}$. For the degree quantifier, we can observe the equivalence between (22a) and (22b) where (22b) is exactly the class B semantics of Kennedy (2015).

- (22) a. $\lambda P. \neg \exists d' [max_d(P(d)) = \alpha + d']$
 b. $\approx \lambda P. max_d(P(d)) \leq \alpha$

Based on this, we claim that the Czech *no more* reveals the class B profile of zero differentials which is expected in the semantic approaches like Kennedy (2015).² The results of the experiment then follows easily: class B modifiers like *at most* and *no more* have to scope over the

²We note that similar results can be obtained in another semantic approach like Zhang and Ling (2021) which offers an interval arithmetic compositional approach. There, both *no more than 60* and *at most 60* denote upper bounded closed interval like in (ia), differing from class A in (ib):

- (i) a. no more/at most than 60 ... $(-\infty, 60]$
 b. less than 60 ... $(-\infty, 60)$

Nevertheless, for the purposes of our article we continue with Kennedy's (2015) approach since the reformulation in a different framework would give us the same results.

existential modals, either because they are directly superlative modifiers or because their meaning is equivalent with the superlative modifiers. Therefore we derive only (23), the wide scope of the degree quantifiers over the existential modal, resulting in the stronger truth conditions – the degree quantifier specifies the upper bound of what is possible. The continuation contradicting this upper bound (like in the experiment) is then less acceptable for the subjects. Therefore we derive relatively lower acceptability of AT MOST and NO MORE in the experiment where the following context in items (structurally similar to (17)) exactly provides such contradicting information.

$$(23) \quad \max_d(\Diamond \text{contain}(\text{ChocBar}, d)) \leq 60g$$

For the class A modifiers: either bare *fewer than* or vague differential *slightly less than* numeral modifiers the weak reading corresponding to the surface scope is possible – (24). Therefore FEWER and SLIGHTLY LESS were more acceptable for subjects since the weaker interpretation is not contradicted by the following information containing info about trespassing the cardinality specified with the numeral. The weak scope is theoretically predicted for comparative/class A modifiers. Even if it is still not theoretically agreed upon the exact source of this distinction between class A and class B modifiers in the modal sentences (see Blok 2019 for some possible explanations).

$$(24) \quad \Diamond[\max_d(\text{contain}(\text{ChocBar}, d)) \leq 60g]$$

We can now summarise the most important consequences of our experimental findings. First, it is clear that morphology is not always the right cue in the case of numeral modifiers. Czech *no more* behaves as a superlative/class B modifier despite its clear comparative morphology. Furthermore, our experiment brings support for the theories of numeral modifiers where the distinction between them comes from the semantics. One particular example comes from Kennedy (2015), where the division comes from the nature of the ordering: strict ordering for class A modifiers, non-strict ordering for the class B modifiers. In such a framework, Czech *no more* can be classified as class B modifier since it shares the non-strict ordering between the degrees (cardinalities). The regular differential (SLIGHTLY LESS) remains class A since it is strictly ordered like the prototypical representations of comparative modifiers.

In the end, we would like to add some cross-linguistic speculations. As far as we know, there seems to be three types of languages distinguishable by the behaviour of *no more*: (i) languages where *no more* behaves regularly as class A modifier, showing bounding inferences and both scopes with respect to existential modals – this is English as reported in Nouwen (2008); (ii) languages like Czech - where *no more* behaves like class B modifier: the evidence from the scope behaviour in modal sentences reported here, plus the lack of bounding inferences – see Dočekal (2017); (iii) languages where *no more*, depending on its morpho-syntactic realisation, behaves either as class A or as class B – Hungarian according to Balázs Surányi (p.c.). We would like to extend our experimental research to two other language types to gather clear cut data but it seems that the distinction can be related to the morpho-syntactic status of the constituent negation. If the negation is a focus particle, like in Czech, *no more* seems to behave like a class B modifier. Contrary, if the constituent negation is a categorically negative quantifier (English), then it seems to yield the class A profile. Naturally, these observations need considerable amount of empirical support to be transformed into proper hypotheses. And that is the direction for future work.

References

- Alexandropoulou, S., J. Dotlacil, Y. McNabb, and R. Nouwen (2016). Pragmatic inferences with numeral modifiers: Novel experimental data. In S. D’Antonio, M. Moroney, and C. R. Little (Eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 25*, pp. 533–549.
- Blok, D. (2019). *Scope Oddity: On the semantic and pragmatic interactions of modified numerals, negative indefinites, focus operators, and modals*. Ph. D. thesis, LOT.
- Büring, D. (2008). The least *at least* can do. In C. B. Chang and H. J. Haynie (Eds.), *Proceedings of WCCFL 26*, pp. 114–120.
- Büring, D. and K. Hartmann (2001). V3 or not V3 – An investigation of German focus particles. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19, 229–281.
- Cohen, A. and M. Krifka (2011). Superlative quantifiers as modifiers of meta-speech acts. *The Baltic International Yearbook of Cognition, Logic and Communication* 6, 1–56.
- Coppock, E. and T. Brochhagen (2013). Raising and resolving issues with scalar modifiers. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 6, 1–57.
- Cummins, C. and N. Katsos (2010). Comparative and superlative quantifiers: Pragmatic effects of comparison type. *Journal of Semantics* 27(3), 271–305.
- Dočekal, M. (2017). Upper bounded and un-bounded ‘no more’. *Acta Linguistica Academica. An International Journal of Linguistics* 64(2), 213–231.
- Geurts, B. and R. Nouwen (2007). *At least* et al.: The semantics of scalar modifiers. *Language* 83(3), 533–559.
- Jasinskaja, K. (2014). Information Structure in Slavic. In C. Féry and S. Ishihara (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, pp. 709–732.
- Kennedy, C. (2015). A “de-Fregean” semantics (and neo-Gricean pragmatics) for modified and unmodified numerals. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 8, 1–44.
- Kuznetsova, A., P. B. Brockhoff, and R. H. B. Christensen (2017). lmerTest package: Tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software* 82(13), 1–26.
- Lenth, R. V. (2021). *emmeans: Estimated Marginal Means, aka Least-Squares Means*. R package version 1.7.0.
- Nouwen, R. (2008). Upper-bounded *no more*: The exhaustive interpretation of non-strict comparison. *Natural Language Semantics* 16(4), 271–295.
- Nouwen, R. (2010). Two kinds of modified numerals. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 3, 1–41.
- R Core Team (2021). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Zhang, L. and J. Ling (2021). The semantics of comparatives: A difference-based approach. *Journal of Semantics* 38(2), 249–303.