

# Pragmatic Implications of the *Izyoo-ni* Comparative

Kimiko Nakanishi

## 1. Introduction

It is well known that languages are equipped with ways of making comparisons, and that there is a variation in how comparisons are made both within and across languages. For example, in English, we can compare the smartness of two individuals by using either (1a) or (1b).

- (1) a. Al is smarter than Bill.  
 b. Compared to Bill, Al is smart.

Kennedy (2007a) points out that the two constructions in (1) differ in how to establish ordering relations of the two individuals; (1a) uses specialized morphology (namely, *-er*) that expresses the ordering of the two, while (1b) uses the *compared* to phrase that manipulates the context to establish the ordering. Kennedy calls the former EXPLICIT COMPARISON, and the latter IMPLICIT COMPARISON, and explores the possibility of classifying languages based on whether the language at issue has these modes of comparison.

Japanese differs from English in that it has no overt comparative morphology on gradable adjectives, but like English, it has various ways of expressing comparisons, as shown in (2).

- (2) a. Al-wa Bill-yori kasikoi.  
 Al-Top Bill-than smart<sup>1</sup>  
 'Al is smarter than Bill.'  
 b. Bill-ni kurabe-tara Al-wa kasikoi.  
 Bill-Dat compare-Cond Al-Top smart  
 'Compared to Bill, Al is smart.'

Kennedy (2007a) claims that the *yori*-comparative in (2a) involves explicit comparison, demonstrating that (2a) shares various properties in common with (1a), but not with (1b) (see also Beck et al. 2004). Extending Kennedy's claim, Sawada (2009) shows that (2b) is a case of implicit comparison analogous to (1b) (see section 3.1 below). It follows then that both modes of comparison exist in languages like Japanese that lack overt comparative morphology on adjectives.

Japanese has yet another construction of comparison, namely, the *izyoo-ni* comparative in (3) (Hayashishita 2007, 2017, Kubota 2012).

- (3) Bill-izyoo-ni Al-wa kasikoi.  
 Bill-more-Dat Al-Top smart  
 '(lit.) More than Bill, Al is smart.' / 'Al is smarter than Bill.'

An obvious question to follow in this context is whether the *izyoo-ni* comparative is explicit or

implicit comparison, given that Japanese has both modes of comparison. In this article, I demonstrate that the *izyoo-ni* comparative is another case of implicit comparison, and further argues that there is a variation among implicit comparison. More specifically, it is shown that implicit comparison may differ in the kind of pragmatic implications that they introduce, which leads them to show different semantic properties even though they fundamentally have the same semantics.

The structure of the article is as follows. Section 2 introduces Kennedy's (2007a) diagnostics that are used to tease apart explicit and implicit comparison. Section 3 summarizes Sawada's (2009) analysis of the *kurabe-tara* comparative in (2b) as implicit comparison. In section 4, I apply the diagnostics to the *izyoo-ni* comparative in (3). Section 5 examines pragmatic implications of the *izyoo-ni* comparative that differ from the *kurabe-tara* comparative, and argues that the *izyoo-ni* comparative is another example of implicit comparison. Section 6 concludes the article by discussing a potential variation in implicit comparison.

## 2. The Semantics of Explicit and Implicit Comparison

### 2.1. Definitions of Explicit and Implicit Comparison

It is well known that the interpretation of the positive (unmarked) form of gradable adjectives is context dependent. For instance, the sentence *Al is smart* may be judged true when he is with his juniors, but false if surrounded by top scientists. This variability is often explained by introducing a standard of comparison into the meaning of gradable adjectives. Roughly speaking, *Al is smart* is judged to be true if Al 'stands out' in the context of utterance relative to smartness (cf. Kennedy 2007b). It follows then that comparisons can be made by modifying the context so that the standard makes the positive form true of the subject *x* but false of some compared object *y*.

With this semantics of gradable adjectives, Kennedy (2007a) argues that there are two modes of comparison, which are defined as follows (see also Sapir 1944):

(4) Explicit Comparison

Establish an ordering between objects *x* and *y* with respect to gradable property *g* using a morphosyntactic form whose conventional meaning has the consequence that the degree to which *x* is *g* exceeds the degree to which *y* is *g*.

(5) Implicit Comparison

Establish an ordering between objects *x* and *y* with respect to gradable property *g* using the positive form by manipulating the context in such a way that the positive form is true of *x* and false of *y*. (Kennedy 2007a: 156)

In explicit comparison, special comparative morphology (e.g., English *-er* in (1a)) is required to establish ordering. As an example of implicit comparison, Kennedy uses the English construction with a positive form gradable adjective modified by *compared to*, as in *x is A compared to y* (e.g., (1b)). The semantics of *compared to y* in this construction is to manipulate the context where *A* is evaluated so that only *x* and *y* are included. Suppose that the domain of the adjective must be

partitioned into non-trivial sets, namely, non-empty positive and negative extensions (Klein 1980). Under this condition, if *x is A* is true, then *y is A* is false. Recall that in *x is A compared to y*, only *x* and *y* are included and that *x is A* is true. It follows then that in this construction, *y* is not *A*, which in turn means that *x > y* relative to *A*. In this way, in implicit comparison, it is possible to express the ordering of two objects even in the absence of overt comparative morphology.

## 2.2. Diagnostics for Explicit and Implicit Comparison

Kennedy (2007a) provides various diagnostics to distinguish between explicit and implicit comparison, which are all based on the fundamental difference between the two, as defined in (4) and (5). That is, the semantic property of the positive form, namely, its context-dependent nature, is relevant to implicit comparison, but not to explicit comparison.

### 2.2.1. Crisp judgments

As stated above, the positive form requires its argument to ‘stand out’ with respect to the measurement expressed by the adjective. For example, in *x is long*, *x*’s length must stand out in the relevant context. Similarly, in *x is long compared to y*, *x*’s length must stand out in the context where only *x* and *y* are included. This means that *x* should be longer than *y* in some substantial extent. This property of implicit comparison manifests in contexts that require what Kennedy calls CRISP JUDGEMENTS. Explicit comparison simply requires there to be an asymmetric ordering of two degrees, and thus there needs not be any substantial difference between the two. In contrast, in implicit comparison, the positive form cannot be felicitously used to distinguish between two objects that are very similar in some gradable property; one degree needs to stand out.

The following examples show the difference between explicit and implicit comparison. Both modes of comparison are acceptable in the context (6) that does not require crisp judgments, but in (7), where crisp judgments are required, only explicit comparison is felicitous.

- (6) CONTEXT: A 600 word essay and a 200 word essay
- a. This essay is longer than that one.
  - b. Compared to that essay, this one is long.

(Kennedy 2007a: 159)

- (7) CONTEXT: A 600 word essay and a 597 word essay
- a. This essay is longer than that one.
  - b. #Compared to that essay, this one is long.

(*ibid.*: 159)

### 2.2.2. Absolute gradable adjectives

It has been claimed that not all gradable adjectives make use of context dependent standards (Paradis 2001, Rotstein and Winter 2004, Kennedy and McNally 2005, Kennedy 2007b). More specifically, adjectives can be classified into two kinds, relative and absolute, depending on whether their standard of comparison is context sensitive. Absolute adjectives come with lexically specified standards. For examples, adjectives like *bent*, *open*, and *wet* have positive

forms where the standard of comparison is a minimum value on the relevant scale (e.g., in *x is bent*, *x* has a non-zero degree of bent). In implicit comparison, but not in explicit comparison, the adjective is in the positive form. It follows that when an absolute adjective is used in implicit comparison, as in (8b), the standard of comparison is based on the lexical meaning of the adjective. Put differently, there is no context dependency involved in this case; the *compared to* phrase has no semantic effect of manipulating the context, which explains why (8b) is odd. In contrast, there is no context dependency with explicit comparison, and thus (8a) is felicitous.

- (8) a. B is more bent than A.  
 b. ??Compared to A, B is bent. (*ibid.*: 160)

### 2.2.3. Differential measurements

Kennedy (2007a) assumes that in sentences like *Kim is 2m tall*, the measure phrase *2m* directly combines with the positive form gradable adjective *tall*, and expresses that the maximum degree *d* to which Kim is *d*-tall is (at least) 2m. In this way, the interpretation of a positive form is not context dependent when a measure phrase is present. This explains why the implicit comparison in (9a) is odd. In contrast, in explicit comparison, the context dependency of the positive form is irrelevant, and thus (9b) is felicitous. Here the measure phrase denotes the difference between two degrees on a scale, namely, Kim's height and Lee's height.

- (9) a. ??Compared to Lee, Kim is 10cm tall.  
 b. Kim is 10cm taller than Lee. (*ibid.*: 160)

## 3. The Semantics and Pragmatics of the *Kurabe-tara* Comparative

### 3.1. The *Kurabe-tara* Comparative as Implicit Comparison

Let us now turn to comparatives in Japanese. As briefly stated in the introduction, Kennedy (2007a) demonstrates that the *yori* comparative in (2a) is explicit comparison by applying the diagnostics presented in the previous section. Crucially, he concludes that the lack of comparative morphology does not necessarily exclude the possibility of being explicit comparison. Sawada (2009) corroborates his conclusion by examining the semantic and pragmatics of a variety of Japanese comparative constructions.<sup>2</sup> Among them I focus on the *kurabe-tara* comparative.

First, the *kurabe-tara* comparative does not tolerate contexts that require crisp judgments, as in (10). Second, *kurabe-tara* is incompatible with absolute adjective like *magat-teiru* 'bent', as in (11). Finally, it cannot be used with differential measure phrases, as in (12). These tests uniformly show that the *kurabe-tara* comparative is implicit comparison.

- (10) (Context: There are two papers. One is 100 pages long and the other is 98 pages long.)  
 ??Ano peepaa-ni kurabe-tara kono peepaa-wa nagai.  
 that paper-Dat compare-Cond this paper-Top long  
 'Compared to that paper, this paper is long.'

(Sawada 2009: 1085)

(11)??Ano sao-ni kurabe-tara kono sao-wa magat-teiru.

that rod-Dat compare-Cond this rod-Top bent-Stativ

'Compared to that rod, this rod is bent.'

*(ibid.*: 1087)

(12)??Ziro-ni kurabe-tara Taro-wa san-senti se-ga takai.

Ziro-Dat compare-Cond Taro-Top three-cm height-Nom tall

'Taro is 3cm tall compared to Ziro.'

*(ibid.*: 1086)

### 3.2. Additional Diagnostics for Explicit and Implicit Comparison

To these three tests taken from Kennedy (2007a), Sawada (2009) adds two more, namely, differences in discourse structures and compatibility with the noun *hoo* 'direction'.

#### 3.2.1. Discourse structures

Sawada shows that implicit, but not explicit, comparison is natural for a reply to a *yes-no* question. For instance, in (13A), what is questioned is whether this car is expensive, which reflects the meaning of the positive form gradable adjective. The *compared to* comparative in (13B") is an appropriate answer to this question as it also reflects the meaning of the positive form adjective; (13B") asserts that this car is indeed expensive. In Japanese, the fact that the *kurabe-tara* comparative is natural in (14) shows that it involves implicit comparison.

(13) A: Is this car expensive?

B': ??This car is more expensive than that car.

B": Yes, compared to that car, this car is expensive.

*(ibid.*: 1085)

(14) A: Taro-wa se-ga takai-desu-ka?

Taro-Top height-Nom tall-Cop-Q

'Is Taro tall?'

B: Hanako-ni kurabe-tara Taro-wa se-ga takai-desu.

Hanako-Dat compare-Cond Taro-Top height-Nom tall-Cop

'Compared to Hanako, Taro is tall.'

*(ibid.*: 1088)

#### 3.2.2. The noun *hoo* 'direction'

Sawada provides another test that is only applicable to Japanese, using the noun *hoo* 'direction'. When *hoo* is attached to the positive form gradable adjective, as in (15), the sentence is judged to be true as long as the contextually determined standard is 'more or less' satisfied. Put differently, Sawada claims that *hoo* has a function of hedge when attached to a gradable adjective. It is predicted then that implicit, but not explicit, comparison is compatible with *hoo* because only the former is based on a contextually determined standard. The fact that the *kurabe-tara* comparative is felicitous in (16) shows that it involves implicit comparison.

(15) Kotosi-wa atatakai-hoo-da.

this year-Top warm-direction-Cop

'It is kind of warm this year.'

(*ibid.*: 1086)

(16) Kyonen-ni kurabe-tara kotosi-wa atatakai-hoo-da.

last year-Dat compare-Cond this year-Top warm-direction-Cop

'Compared to last year, this year is kind of warm.'

(*ibid.*: 1086)

### 3.3. Pragmatic Implications of the *Kurabe-tara* Comparative

Sawada further argues that the two modes of comparison differ in pragmatic implications. In particular, implicit comparison (e.g., *Compared to Bill, Al is smart*) has the implications in (17), but explicit comparison (e.g., *Al is smarter than Bill*) does not. Sawada calls (17a) THE IMPLICATION FROM THE STANDARD and (17b) THE IMPLICATION FROM THE MAIN CLAUSE. The *kurabe-tara* comparative in (2b), being implicit comparison, also introduces the implications in (17).<sup>3</sup>

(17) a. from the standard: Bill is not smart

b. from the main clause: Al is not definitely smart

(possibly borderline)

We may take this pragmatic difference as an additional property to distinguish the two modes of comparison: implicit, but not explicit, comparison introduces the implications from the standard and from the main clause.

## 4. The Semantics of the *Izyoo-ni* Comparative

Let us now turn to another comparative construction in Japanese, namely, the *izyoo-ni* comparative in (3). By applying the diagnostics presented above, I evaluate whether this comparative is explicit or implicit comparison.

### 4.1. The *Izyoo-ni* Comparative as Implicit Comparison

As emphasized in Kennedy (2007a), the crux of crisp judgment facts is that the positive form cannot be felicitously used to distinguish between two objects that are very similar in some gradable property. (18) shows that the *izyoo-ni* comparative is infelicitous in the context that requires crisp judgments. It suggests that the adjective in (18) is in the positive form, that is, the *izyoo-ni* comparative involves implicit comparison. Note that the sentence is felicitous when there is a substantial difference between the number of words in this essay and that of that essay (e.g., the context in (6)).

(18) CONTEXT: A 600 word essay and a 597 word essay

??Ano essei-izyoo-ni kono-essei-wa nagai.

that essay-more-Dat this-essay-Top long

'(lit.) More than that essay, this essay is long.'

Second, the *izyoo-ni* comparative is incompatible with a differential measurement, as in (19),

which suggests that the interpretation of the adjective in this construction is context-dependent.

- (19)??Lee-izyoo-ni Kim-wa 10-senti se-ga takai.  
 Lee-more-Dat Kim-Top 10-cm height-Nom tall  
 ‘(lit.) More than Lee, Kim is 10cm tall.’

Third, as shown in (20), the *izyoo-ni* comparative can serve as a reply to a *yes-no* question, which also shows that it involves implicit comparison.<sup>4</sup>

- (20) A: Taro-wa se-ga takai-desu-ka?  
 Taro-Top height-Nom tall-Cop-Q  
 ‘Is Taro tall?’  
 B: Hanako-izyoo-ni Taro-wa se-ga takai-desu.  
 Hanako-more-Dat Taro-Top height-Nom tall-Cop  
 ‘(lit.) More than Hanako, Taro is tall.’

#### 4.2. Potential Problems

The diagnostics presented so far suggest that the *izyoo-ni* comparative is an example of implicit comparison. However, the diagnostics shown below point toward the opposite conclusion.

First, unlike implicit comparison with *kurabe-tara* in (11), the *izyoo-ni* comparative is felicitous with absolute adjectives such as *magat-teiru* ‘bent’.

- (21) Ano sao-izyoo-ni kono sao-wa magat-teiru.  
 that rod-more-Dat this rod-Top bent-Stative  
 ‘(lit.) More than that rod, this rod is bent.’

(Hayashishita 2007: 89, slightly modified)

Another problematic case is found with the noun *hoo* ‘direction’, which is fine in the *kurabe-tara* comparative, as shown in (16) above. In contrast, *hoo* cannot be used in the *izyoo-ni* comparative, as in (22).

- (22)??Kyonen-izyoo-ni kotosi-wa atatakai-hoo-da.  
 last year-more-Dat this year-Top warm-direction-Cop  
 ‘(lit.) More than last year, this year is kind of warm.’

## 5. The Pragmatics of the *Izyoo-ni* Comparative

### 5.1. Pragmatic Implications

We have seen so far that in determining whether the *izyoo-ni* comparative involves explicit or implicit comparison, the semantic diagnostics give us mixed results. In search of an answer, let us now turn to pragmatic implications of the *izyoo-ni* comparative. I argue below that the *izyoo-ni* comparative introduces implications that differ from the ones introduced by the *kurabe-tara* comparative. I further demonstrate that this pragmatic difference accounts for why the *izyoo-ni* comparative does not behave on a par with the *kurabe-tara* comparative with respect to the

diagnostics given in section 4.2.

It has been argued in the literature that the *izyoo-ni* comparative in (23) has the two implications in (24) (Hayashishita 2007, 2017, Kubota 2012).<sup>5</sup>

- (23) Bill-izyoo-ni Al-wa kasikoi.  
 Bill-more-Dat Al-Top smart  
 '(lit.) More than Bill, Al is smart.' (= (3))
- (24) a. from the standard: Bill is smart  
 b. from the main clause: Al is smart [to be revised]

In section 3.3, we have seen Sawada's (2007) claim that only implicit comparison introduces pragmatic implications. It follows then that the *izyoo-ni* comparative involves implicit comparison as it has the implications in (24). However, the implications of *izyoo-ni* in (24) are substantially different from the implications of *kurabe-tara* in (26).

- (25) Bill-ni kurabe-tara Al-wa kasikoi.  
 Bill-Dat compare-Cond Al-Top smart  
 'Compared to Bill, Al is smart.' (= (2b))
- (26) a. from the standard: Bill is not smart  
 b. from the main clause: Al is not definitely smart  
 (possibly borderline) (= (17))

Recall here that in implicit comparison, the context is manipulated so that only two objects are included when evaluating the positive form gradable adjective. For example, in (25), *kurabe-tara* (or English *compared to*) is used to restrict the context so that only Bill and Al are relevant in order to evaluate whether *Al is smart* is true. I argue that the same semantics holds for the *izyoo-ni* comparative; in (23), *izyoo-ni* restricts the context to include only Bill and Al, and the positive form adjective is evaluated in this manipulated context. Thus, the *izyoo-ni* comparative as well as the *kurabe-tara* comparative involves implicit comparison. This is why the *izyoo-ni* comparative shows properties of implicit comparison when some diagnostics are applied (namely, crisp judgements, differential measurements, and discourse structures, as shown in section 4.1). I further argue that as long as the definition of implicit comparison is met, nothing prevents the two comparatives from introducing different pragmatic implications, hence the different implications in (24) and (26).

A further scrutiny is required for the implications of the *izyoo-ni* comparative. In the literature, it is shown that (23) has the implications in (24). My claim is that the implication in (24b) is stronger than that. For example, by asserting (23), the speaker implicates not just that Al is smart, but that he is definitely smart, or put differently, his smartness is way above average, as in (27).

- (27) a. from the standard: Bill is smart  
 b. from the main clause: Al is definitely smart

In a way, the implication in (27b) is the opposite of (26b). As stated above, in implicit comparison, *y-ni kurabe-tara* 'compared to y' and *y-izyoo-ni* 'more than y' restrict the context to include only y and the subject of the main clause (e.g., x in *y-izyoo-ni x-wa A* 'more than y, x is A'). In (25),



*kurabe-tara* brings in *y* as a “negative” contextual standard; it is “negative” because of the implication in (26a) that Bill is not smart. Then the sentence ends up meaning that Al is better than the negative standard. In this case, it is not clear whether Al is smart or not; all we know is that he is better than Bill, who is not smart, hence the borderline implication in (26b). In contrast, *izyoo-ni* brings in *y* as a “positive” standard, which is based on the implication in (27a) that Bill is smart. We then obtain the interpretation that Al is better than the positive standard. In this case, we know for sure that Bill is smart, hence the implication in (27b).

## 5.2. Diagnostics of Implicit Comparison Revisited

Having established the claim that the *izyoo-ni* comparative is implicit comparison, I now address the question of why it has properties that differ from the *kurabe-tara* comparative, as shown in section 4.2. I claim that the answer to this question lies in the difference in pragmatic implications of the two comparatives, presented in section 5.1.

### 5.2.1. Absolute gradable adjectives

We have seen in section 2.2.2 that some adjectives, namely, absolute adjectives, come with lexically specified standards. With the absolute adjectives considered so far (e.g., *bent*), the standard of comparison is a minimum value on the relevant scale. It has been argued that there are absolute adjectives whose standard of comparison is a maximum value (e.g., *straight*, *closed*, and *dry*); for instance, in *x is straight*, *x* must have a maximal degree of straightness (Rotstein and Winter 2004, Kennedy and McNally 2005, Kennedy 2007b).

As discussed in section 2.2.2, one of Kennedy’s (2007a) diagnostics of implicit comparison is the incompatibility with absolute adjectives. This is because absolute adjectives provide lexically specified standards, and thus the interpretation of the positive form adjective cannot be context dependent. However, this test is inconclusive in that it makes use of minimum-standard, but not maximum-standard, absolute adjectives. The prediction is that the same incompatibility is observed with maximum-standard adjectives as they also provide lexically specified standards. To the contrary, this prediction is not borne out; the *kurabe-tara* comparative, which cannot take a minimum-standard adjective (see (11)), is fine with a maximum-standard one, as shown in (28).

- (28) Ano sao-ni kurabe-tara kono sao-wa massugu-da.  
 that rod-Dat compare-Cond this rod-Top straight-Cop  
 ‘Compared to that rod, this rod is straight.’

Recall now that the *izyoo-ni* comparative is compatible with minimum-standard absolute adjectives (see (21)), but as pointed out by Hayashishita (2007), the opposite holds with maximum-standard ones; the *izyoo-ni* comparative is infelicitous with the maximum-standard adjective *massugu-da* ‘straight’, as in (29).

- (29)??Ano sao-izyoo-ni kono sao-wa massugu-da.  
 that rod-more-Dat this rod-Top straight-Cop  
 ‘(lit.) More than that rod, this rod is straight.’



by Sawada (2009), I claimed that the *izyoo-ni* comparative involves implicit comparison. Furthermore, I argued that it introduces pragmatic implications that are different from the ones introduced by another implicit comparison examined by Sawada, namely, the *kurabe-tara* comparative.

As a way of concluding the article, I discuss a potential variation in implicit comparison. Kennedy initially proposes the contrast between explicit and implicit comparison as a potential parameter of language variation. All languages have positive form gradable adjectives, which in turn suggests that implicit comparison can be found in any language. One of the crucial questions that Kennedy addresses is whether there is any language that has only implicit comparison. Japanese is a candidate since it lacks specialized comparative morphology on adjectives. However, as mentioned in the introduction, Kennedy applies the diagnostics presented in section 2 to the *yori* comparative in (2a) and claims that it involves explicit comparison. Thus, he concludes that the existence of the two modes of comparison cannot distinguish between English and Japanese; they both have explicit and implicit comparison.

Although the existence of explicit and implicit comparison may not be useful in distinguishing the two languages, there are other important facts lurking in the two modes of comparison. As mentioned above, the original motivation for the contrast between the two modes comes from the fact that languages vary in whether they possess specialized comparative morphology on gradable adjectives. Japanese is a language without such morphology, and for this reason, we may expect it to have more ways of manipulating the context for comparison than languages with comparative morphology. The finding in this article may be taken as a piece of supporting evidence for this view: there are at least two cases of implicit comparison in Japanese that can be classified into different types based on their pragmatic implications. In particular, while the *kurabe-tara* comparative introduces “negative” implications both from the standard and from the main clause (see (26)), the *izyoo-ni* comparative does the opposite; they introduce “positive” implications (see (24)). This suggests the existence of implicit comparison with one “positive” and one “negative” implication. As Kennedy points out, there is no cross-linguistic variation in the existence of implicit comparison as all languages have implicit comparison. However, a typological variation may be found in a kind of implicit comparison that languages possess. A working hypothesis is that languages without specialized comparative morphology have a richer variety. A further investigation is required to assess the validity of this hypothesis.

#### Note

- 1 Abbreviations used in this article are as follows: Cond=conditional, Cop=copula, Dat=dative, Nom=nominative, Pres=present, Q=question, Top=topic.
- 2 Besides the comparative with *yori* or with *kurabe-tara*, exemplified in (2), Sawada (2009) examines the following comparatives:
 

(i) Bill-ni	{kurabe-te / kurabe-ru-to}	Al-wa	kasikoi.
Bill-Dat	{compare-TE / compare-Pres-Cond}	Al-Top	smart

‘Al is smarter than Bill.’ / ‘Compared to Bill, Al is smart.’

Sawada claims that, while the *yori* comparative and the *kurabe-te* comparative involve explicit comparison, the *kurabe-tara* comparative and the *kurabe-ru-to* comparative involve implicit comparison. Note that Sawada reports no substantial semantic or pragmatic difference between the two cases of implicit comparison.

- 3 Sawada carefully examines whether the implications in (17) are entailments, presuppositions, conversational implicatures, or conventional implicatures, which I do not have space to discuss. In this article, I stay agnostics to the status of (17a) and (17b), and simply address them as pragmatic implications.
- 4 A reviewer pointed out that (20B) sounds a little abrupt as a reply to (20A). This is different from the *kurabe-tara* comparative in (14B), which does not seem to cause such an abruptness. The reviewer suggested that this may be due to syntactic differences between the two comparatives; while *kurabe-tara* ‘(lit.) if compared to’ is syntactically clausal, *izyoo-ni* ‘(lit.) more than’ is not (at least on the surface). In general, it is easier to introduce a new entity into discourse by using a new clause. Thanks to the reviewer for this insight.
- 5 Just like with the *kurabe-tara* comparative, it is important to examine the nature of the implications in (24) (see footnote 3). According to Kubota (2012) and Hayashishita (2017), (24a) is a presupposition, while (24b) is an entailment. Again, due to the lack of space, I simply treat them as pragmatic implications.
- 6 There is yet another difference between the *kurabe-tara* and the *izyoo-ni* comparative, which was brought to my attention by an anonymous reviewer. While the two constructions are compatible with “positive” adjectives such as *kasikoi* ‘smart’ (see (2b) and (3)), the former is not compatible with “negative” ones.

- (i) Bill-ni kurabe-tara Al-wa {kasikoi / ??oroka-da}.  
Bill-Dat compare-Cond Al-Top {smart / stupid}  
‘Compared to Bill, Al is {smart / stupid}.’
- (ii) Bill-izyoo-ni Al-wa {kasikoi / oroka-da}.  
Bill-more-Dat Al-Top {smart / stupid}  
‘(lit.) More than Bill, Al is {smart / stupid}.’

The reviewer suggested that there may be an inconsistency between “negative” adjectives and negative implications of the *kurabe-tara* comparative. However, it is not the case that any “negative” adjectives are infelicitous; adjectives such as *bikui* ‘short’ and *osoi* ‘slow’ are perfectly acceptable in this construction. Thus, the generalization here is that the *kurabe-tara* comparative is incompatible with evaluative “negative” adjectives (*oroka-da* ‘stupid’, *burei-da* ‘impolite’ etc.). A further investigation is required to answer why this is the case.

#### References

- Beck, S., T. Oda, and K. Sugisaki. 2004. Parametric variation in the semantics of comparison: Japanese vs. English. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 13, 289–344.
- Hayashishita, J.-R. 2007. *Izyoo(ni)*- and *gurai*-comparatives: Comparisons of deviation in Japanese, *Gengo Kenkyu* 132, 77–109.
- Hayashishita, J.-R. 2017. Reconfirming *izyoo(ni)*- and *gurai*-comparatives as comparisons of deviation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 26, 163–187.

- Kennedy, C. 2007a. Modes of comparison. *Papers from the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Volume 1: The Main Session*, 139–163.
- Kennedy, C. 2007b. Vagueness and grammar: The semantics of relative and absolute gradable adjectives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30, 1–45.
- Klein, E. 1980. A semantics for positive and comparative adjectives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4, 1–45.
- Kubota, Y. 2012. The presuppositional nature of *izyoo(ni)* and *gurai* comparatives: A note on Hayashishita (2007). *Gengo Kenkyu* 141, 33–46.
- Paradis, C. 2001. Adjectives and boundedness. *Cognitive Linguistics* 12, 47–65.
- Rotstein, C., and Y. Winter. 2004. Total adjectives vs. partial adjectives: Scale structure and higher-order modifiers. *Natural Language Semantics* 12, 259–288.
- Sapir, E. 1944. Grading: A study in semantics. *Philosophy of Science* 11, 93–116.
- Sawada, O. 2009. Pragmatic aspects of implicit comparison: An economy-based approach. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 1079–1103.