

Degree adverbs as displaced predicates

Norbert Corver

This paper deals with the internal syntax of adjective phrases containing degree adverbs. Taking the idea of cross-categorical symmetry as a guiding principle, I argue that placement of degree adverbs within the adjective phrase involves the phenomenon of predicate movement, a phenomenon which has been identified for the nominal and clausal domain in recent years. As in full clauses and noun phrases, leftward movement of the (degree) predicate_{*} can be of two types: the A-movement type and the $\bar{A}$ -movement type.

1. Introduction

Studies on adverbial modification mostly take the clausal domain (i.e. the extended verbal projection) as their empirical domain of research. As a matter of fact, this bias towards the clausal/verbal domain is already clear from traditional terminology: the term 'ad-verb' already suggests that these modifying elements are typically analyzed as modifiers of the verb. Of course, it is well-known nowadays that adverbs modify not only verbs, but also predicates belonging to other syntactic categories, for example adjectives. Thus, besides modifying a verb (e.g. *John rather heavily depends on his parents*), an element like *heavily* can also modify an adjective, as in *John is rather heavily dependent on his parents*.

In this article, I will investigate certain properties of adverbial modification within the adjectival system. More specifically, I will examine the syntactic behavior of degree adverbials, i.e. such items as *extremely* and *incredibly* in (1):

- (1) a. extremely tall
 b. incredibly stupid

Traditionally, these modifying elements are analyzed as being base-generated in some left-branch specifier or adjunct position within the (extended) adjectival projection (cf. Bresnan 1973, Bowers 1975, Corver 1997a,b). In this article, I will argue that the pre-adjectival position is in fact a derived position and that the

degree modifier undergoes a process of leftward predicate movement. The phenomenon of predicate movement has been identified within the clausal (see especially Moro 1991, 1997) and the nominal domain (see e.g. Kayne 1994). Predicate movement within the clausal domain is exemplified in (2), where (2a) represents the straight (i.e. non-inverted) order and (2b) the inverted order. The examples in (3) illustrate the application of predicate movement within the nominal domain.

- (2) a. I consider [_{SU} Peter] to be [_{PreD} the best candidate]
 b. I consider [_{PreD} the best candidate] to be [_{SU} Peter]

- (3) a. that [_{PreD} idiot] of a [_{SU} doctor]
 b. cet [_{PreD} idiot] de [_{SU} Jean] (French)

Although the application of predicate displacement within the adjectival system is not so transparent in a language like English, it is quite so in a language like Rumanian. Therefore, in this article, I will focus initially on such Rumanian adjectival constructions as (4a) and claim that it features displacement of a degree element. More specifically, I will propose that the modifying phrase *extrem* starts out as a predicate taking the adjective *înnalt*, the modifiee, as its subject. Taking the theoretical position that the predication relationship is structurally represented in terms of a Small Clause (SC), one is led to an analysis in which there is a SC (i.e. XP) projected internal to the adjective phrase. This means that underlyingly we have a structure like (4b). The surface string is then derived by leftward movement of the predicate to a position to the left of the (adjectival) subject of the SC.

- (4) a. extrem de înnalt
 extreme of tall
 'extremely tall'
 b. [_{XP} înnalt [_{X'} extrem]] (*de* omitted)

After having examined predicate displacement of degree adverbs in the Rumanian adjectival system, I will discuss the existence of such a displacement operation within the Italian adjective phrase. In the next section, I will first, however, present some of the major characteristics of predicate displacement, as found in the clausal and nominal system.

2. Predicate displacement within clausal and nominal constructions

Within the clausal domain, predicate displacement can be of two types (cf. among others Bennis, Corver & Den Dikken 1998).

(5) types of predicate displacement

- Predicate Inversion (PM-A, i.e. predicate movement to an A-position)
 - a. *copular inversion* The best candidate is John
 - b. *locative inversion* Down the hill rolled the baby carriage
- Predicate Fronting (PM- $\bar{A}$, i.e. predicate movement to an $\bar{A}$ -position)
 - c. *wh-movement* How good a candidate is John?
 - d. *topicalization* Down the hill, the baby carriage rolled

The $\bar{A}$ -type of predicate fronting in (5c,d) is quite straightforward: the predicate is moved to a left peripheral $\bar{A}$ -position, say [Spec,CPI], and ends up in a position to the left of the subject (*John*, *the baby carriage*). Following especially Moro (1988, 1997), and also Hoekstra and Mulder (1990), I assume that the inverted predicate in (5a,b) targets the same position as the raised subject in (6), the straight order counterpart of (5a): viz. [Spec,IP].

- (6) John is the best candidate

Thus, starting from an underlying structure like (7a), the straight order pattern in (6) is derived by movement of the XP-internal subject to [Spec,IP] (cf. (7b)), whereas the inverted pattern involves movement of the predicate to [Spec,IP] (cf. (7c)).

- (7) a. [_{IP} ... be [_{XP} John X [_{PreD} the best candidate]]]
 b. [_{IP} John_i ... be [_{XP} t_i X [_{PreD} the best candidate]]]
 c. [_{IP} the best candidate_j ... be [_{XP} John X [_{PreD} t_j]]]

A consequence of the A-movement analysis of Predicate Inversion is that potential problems of locality are expected to arise in the derivation of Predicate Inversion-constructions, given that the displaced predicate skips an intervening A-position, viz. the SC-subject position. This crossing would incur a violation of Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990) unless the position that is skipped by the A-moving predicate and the (first) landing position of the predicate can

be rendered 'equidistant' from the extraction site, in the sense of Chomsky (1993). Two positions are equidistant if they are members of the same minimal domain. In the minimalist locality theory, this situation is obtained by having the SC-head undergo domain-extending head movement to a higher head, i.e. a head in whose specifier position the displaced predicate lands (or makes an intermediate stop). I will identify this head as 'F' in the structure in (8) (cf. Den Dikken 1995 for further discussion). What is important is that F (and its projections) is present in the tree for purely structural reasons, having to do with the minimalist theory of locality.

- (8) $[_{FP} LP_j [_F F+X_i [_{XP} Spec [_X [_x t_i] t_j]]]]$

Movement of X to F creates the requisite minimal domain that contains both [Spec,XP] and the first available landing site for the raised predicate LP: [Spec,FP].

As first observed in Moro (1991), there are syntactic contexts in which the application of Predicate Inversion leads to the presence of a copular element at the surface. Compare, for example, (9a) with (9b).

- (9) a. I consider John (*to be*) the best candidate
b. I consider the best candidate **(to be)* John

In the former, straight order pattern the infinitival copula *be* is only optionally present; in the inverted pattern, however, *to be* is obligatorily present. In Den Dikken (1995), the presence of the verbal copula is taken to be a surface reflex of the presence of F in the structure in (8). That is, *to be* is the overt realization of F.

From the perspective of cross-categorical symmetry,¹ one should raise the question whether the phenomenon of predicate displacement is also attested in other, i.e. non-clausal domains. In recent studies on the internal syntax of nominal phrases, such DP-internal predicate displacement operations have been argued to exist. Furthermore, both Predicate Inversion patterns (PM-A) and Predicate Fronting patterns (PM-Ā) have been identified within the nominal domain. The most evident case, presumably, is the nominal construction type exemplified in (10), which I will refer to as the *N of N*-construction (cf. Kayne 1994, Den Dikken 1995):²

- (10) that idiot of a doctor

In this example, the referent denoted by *doctor* is ascribed the

property of being like an idiot. That is, the predicate nominal (*doctor*) precedes the subject over which this property is predicated. Den Dikken (1995) proposes that this construction features Predicate Inversion: the nominal *idiot* originates as the predicate in a DP-internal SC (i.e. XP) and undergoes A-movement to [Spec,FP], crossing the SC-subject *doctor*. As shown in (11), this movement across an A-position requires that the SC-head X raises to a higher functional head position, viz. F. This way, the predicate nominal and the nominal subject are rendered equidistant from the extraction site. In analogy with the appearance of *be* in clausal Predicate Inversion patterns (cf. (9b)), Den Dikken (1995) makes the interesting proposal that the meaningless preposition *of* is the surface reflex of the presence of F in the *N of N* structure. He refers to it as the nominal copula.

- (11) $[_{DP} \text{that } [_{FP} \text{idiot}_j [_F [F+X_i (=of+a)] [_{XP} \text{doctor}[_{X'} t_j]]]]]$

Of course, this analysis extends quite easily to equivalents in other languages. In the following examples drawn from a variety of Romance languages, the italicized element is the inverted nominal predicate and the meaningless element *de/di* is regarded as the nominal copula.

- (12) a. cet *idiot* de Jean (French; cf. Milner 1978)
that idiot of Jean
b. il tuo *cretino* di fratello (Italian; cf. Napoli 1989)
the your cretin of brother
'your cretin of a brother'
c. esta *maravilla* de niño (Spanish; cf. Rivero 1980)
this marvel of child
d. *idiotă* așat de Maria (Rumanian)
idiot-the that of Mary

The question arises whether instances of Predicate Fronting are also attested in the nominal domain. Without going into details, for reasons of space, I will simply refer to the proposal by Bennis, Corver & Den Dikken (1998) to analyze the Dutch *wat voor*-construction (cf. (13a)) and the *wat*-exclamative construction (cf. (13b)) as constructions that feature Predicate Fronting, namely of the element *wat* ('what').³ I should like to confine myself here to giving the derived structures of the two construction types.

- (13) a. $[_{DP} \text{ wat}_i [_D \text{ voor } [_{XP} \text{ jongens } [_X \text{ } \emptyset] t_i]]]$
 what for boys
 'what kind of boys'
 b. $[_{DP} \text{ wat}_j [_D \text{ een}_i [_{XP} \text{ jongens } [_X \text{ } [_X t_i] t_j]]]]]$
 what a boys
 'How many boys!'

Observe that in these structural representations FP is absent. The reason is obvious: No domain extending head movement of the SC-head (X) to a higher functional node F is required, since the interrogative/exclamative predicate does not undergo A-movement, but rather (direct) $\bar{A}$ -movement to [Spec,DP].

Let me close off this section by pointing out the following extraction asymmetry (drawn from Dutch):

- (14) a. **Etters*; zijn het $[_{DP} [_D \text{ } \emptyset] [_{FP} t'_i [_F \text{ F+X}_j (=van) [_{XP} \text{ jongens } [_X t'_j t_i]]]]]$
 Jerks are it of boys
 'They are jerks of boys'
 b. *Wat*_i zijn het $[_{DP} t'_i [_D \text{ voor } [_{XP} \text{ jongens } [_X \text{ } \emptyset] t_i]]]$?
 What are it for boys
 'What kind of boys are they?'

This contrast shows that predicates that have undergone DP-internal Predicate Fronting to [Spec,DP] can (sometimes) be removed out of DP (cf. (14b)).⁴ A-moved predicates that have been shifted to [Spec,FP] cannot be subextracted (cf. (14a)).

3. Predicate inversion within the adjectival system. Evidence from degree modification in Rumanian

Consider the following examples from Rumanian (drawn from Grosu 1974 and Mallinson 1986):⁵

- (15) a. Ion e [*extrem* de înalt]
 Ion be:3SG extreme of tall-M.SG
 'Ion is extremely tall'
 b. Maria e [*enorm* de fericită]
 Maria be:3SG enormous of happy:F.SG
 'Maria is enormously happy'
 c. Aleargă [*enorm* de repede] dar înoată cam încet
 run:3SG enormous of quick but swim:3SG rather slowly
 'He runs enormously quickly but swims rather slowly'

- d. Fata e [[foarte harnică] și [*nemaipomenit* de frumoasă]]
 girl-det be:3SG very industrious:F.SG and unprecedented of beautiful:F.SG
 'The girl is very industrious and unprecedentedly beautiful'
 e. un rol [*deosebit* de important in aceasta acțiune] [...]
 a:M. role particular of important:M.SG in this:F.SG action
 'a particularly important role in this action [...]'

The adjectival constructions in these examples feature a degree/intensifying element which modifies the gradable adjective to its right. The degree element and the gradable adjective are separated from each other by the intervening element *de*. This linking element is obligatorily present in these examples: *extrem*(de) înalt*. A further characteristic of these constructions concerns the form of the (adjectival) degree element. As illustrated in (16), it never displays agreement with the subject. It is only the gradable adjective that agrees in gender and number with the subject of the clause (see e.g. (15b)).

- (16) a. *Fată e [*enormă* de fericită]
 Girl-det be:3SG enormous:F.SG of happy:F.SG
 'The girl is enormously happy'
 b. *Fetele sînt [*enorme* de fericite]
 Girl-det:PL be:3PL enormous:FPL of happy:FPL
 'The girls are enormously happy'

Superficially, at least, the adjectival pattern *A de A* is reminiscent of the nominal *N of/de N* construction. As we will see below, there are clear syntactic parallels between the two construction types. I will therefore propose that a sequence like *extrem de înalt* in (15a) derives from an underlying SC-structure like (17a). In this structure, *extrem* occupies the predicate position of the SC (i.e. XP) and *înalt* occupies the subject position of XP. Each adjective has a thematic grid associated with it. The adjective *înalt* has two arguments in its grid: a thematic argument (i.e. 1) and a degree argument *G* which encodes the lexical property of gradability (cf. Zwarts 1992, Corver 1997a); *înalt* is interpreted as 'x is tall to degree d'. The degree adjective *extrem* is a one-place predicate which is licensed by predicating over the degree argument (*G*) of *înalt*: 'd is extrem'. This predication relationship is formally expressed by coindexation of the thematic argument of *extrem* and the degree argument of *înalt*; see (17b).⁶

- (17) a. $[_{XP} \text{inalt}_{<1,G>} [_{F'} X \text{extrem}_{<1>}]]$
 b. $[_{XP} \text{inalt}_{<1,Gi>} [_{X'} X \text{extrem}_{<1i>}]]$

The surface string *extrem de inalt* is derived by applying Predicate Inversion to *extrem*. Recall this is an A-type movement operation. Movement of the modifying adjectival predicate (i.e. AP) across the A-position occupied by the subject-AP *inalt* does not incur a violation of Locality (i.e. Relativized Minimality) if the SC-head X raises to the functional head position F_i into whose Spec the raised adjectival predicate will land. In (18), *inalt* and *extrem* are equidistant from the extraction site (t_j).

- (18) $[_{FP} \text{extrem}_j [_{F'} F+X_i (=de) [_{XP} \text{inalt} [_{X'} t_i [_{AP} t_j]]]]]$

Following Den Dikken's suggestion for the *N of N*-construction, I will analyze the meaningless element *de* as the surface realization of F . Thus, *de* is a copular element that shows up in $[+N]$ -domains featuring Predicate Inversion.

If the *A de A* construction is assigned a syntactic structure parallel to that of the *N of N* construction, one expects the two constructions to exhibit parallel syntactic behavior. As a matter of fact, there are certain shared properties that corroborate a parallel treatment of the two construction types.

A first property they share is the impossibility of subextracting the inverted (nominal/adjectival) predicate. Consider, first, subextraction from the *N of N* construction:

- (19) a. *Fools of policemen*, they certainly are —!
 b. **Fools*, they certainly are [— of policemen]!

As shown by the extraction facts in (20), observed in Grosu (1974), subextraction of the modifying AP *extrem* is blocked as well.

- (20) a. *Extrem de deştept* te mai crezi tu!
 Extreme of clever yourself still believe you
 'You fancy yourself extremely clever!'
 b. **Extrem* te mai crezi tu [— de deştept]!

The impossibility of fronting the degree element cannot be due to semantic or pragmatic reasons. The lexical item *tare*, for example, has exactly the same meaning as *extrem* but can be reordered to a left peripheral position (cf. (21b)). Of course, fronting of the entire adjective phrase, as in (21a), is also permitted.⁷

- (21) a. *Tare deştept* te mai crezi tu!
 extremely clever yourself still believe you
 'You fancy yourself real clever!'
 b. *Tare* te mai crezi tu [— deştept]!

As Grosu also notes, the contrast between (20b) and (21b) arguably relates to the categorial nature of the lexical items involved. *Extrem* is plausibly analyzed as an adjective (AP), while *tare* seems to be more of a true adverb (ADVP). The question, of course, arises what syntactic property this asymmetry between (20b) and (21b) relates to. At this point, I will leave it unanswered. I will come back to it briefly in section 5.

A second property which the *N of N* construction and the *A de A* construction have in common is the fact that removal of the sequence of *N/de A* is not allowed.

- (22) **Of policemen* they certainly are *fools* (*N of N*)
 (23) **De deştept* te mai crezi tu [extrem —]! (*A de A*)
 Of clever yourself still believe you extremely
 'You fancy yourself extremely clever!'

The ill-formedness of these examples can be explained in terms of non-constituency: the copulas *of* and *de* (i.e. F') do not form a constituent with *policemen* and *deştept*, respectively, that occupy the specifier position of XP in a tree like (8). An alternative analysis, in which the constituent F' is fronted, is ruled out as well: The Proper Binding Constraint (Fiengo 1977) blocks extraction of F' , since the trace of the inverted adjectival predicate (t_j in (24)) will not be properly bound when F' is fronted to [Spec,CP]. Notice furthermore that it is generally assumed that $\bar{X}$ -constituents cannot be fronted to [Spec,CP] (cf. Chomsky 1986).

- (24) $[_{CP} [_{F'} X_i + F (=de) [_{XP} \text{deştept} [_{X'} t_j]]]_k [_{IP} \dots [_{FP} \text{extrem}_j [_{F'} t_k]]]]$

4. *Intermezzo on the nature of the landing site*

Thus far, I have argued that the *A de A* construction in Rumanian should be treated on a par with the *N of N* construction. More specifically, I have defended an analysis in which there is a Small Clause (XP) internal to the adjective phrase, whose specifier position is filled

by the gradable adjective and whose complement-position is occupied by the (modifying) degree-adjective. The surface order is derived by applying Predicate Inversion to the degree-adjective. This inversion operation was considered to be movement to an A-position.

Traditionally (cf. Chomsky 1981), an A-position is a position to which a theta role can potentially be assigned. Under this definition, however, A-movement is strictly speaking a misnomer for adjectival predicate inversion in Rumanian, since [Spec,FP] is never occupied by any argument bearing a theta role (like agent, theme, etcetera). Given this, one might argue that [Spec,FP] should be analyzed as an $\bar{A}$ -position, which is traditionally defined as a position which never receives a thematic role. [Spec,CP] and adjunct-positions are considered to be typical cases of $\bar{A}$ -positions. This alternative analysis, however, does not seem adequate either. Why, for example, is it impossible to move the inverted predicate out of the adjective phrase? Furthermore, there is cross-linguistic evidence, that the relationship between a degree modifier and a gradable adjective is much tighter in a (grammatical) sense than that between other types of modifiers and the gradable adjective. Let me give some illustrative examples.

First of all, in Rumanian it is only the degree adjectives that are linked to the modified adjective by means of the element *de*. Domain adverbs like *fizic*, for example, are never linked to the modified phrase by means of *de*.

- (25) Ion e [fizic (*de)] [extrem de bine dezvoltat]
'Ion is physically extremely well-developed'

In Dutch, the closeness of the relationship between the degree adjective and the modified gradable adjective manifests itself morpho-syntactically. As exemplified in (26), certain adjectival degree modifiers can (optionally) carry the inflectional morpheme *-e*, which is obligatory for the attributive (gradable) adjectival head modifying the noun (cf. Corver 1997b).⁸ This phenomenon of optional agreement between a modifier and an attributive adjectival head is only found with modifying degree adjectives. When the modifier does not express degree but rather modality (27a) or temporality (27b), it is impossible for the modifier to share the inflectional morpheme *-e* with the gradable adjective.

- (26) a. een vreselijk(e) dure fiets
a terrible(INFL) expensive bike
'a terribly expensive bike'

- b. een belachelijk(e) dure fiets
a ridiculous(INFL) expensive bike
'a ridiculously expensive bike'
- (27) a. een vermoedelijk(*e) dure fiets
a presumable(INFL) expensive bike
'a presumably expensive bike'
- b. een tijdelijk(*e) goedkope fiets
a temporary(INFL) cheap bike
'a temporarily cheap bike'

A third illustration of the special relationship between a modifying degree adjective and the modified adjectival head comes from Finnish. In this language, (certain) degree elements modifying the adjectival head bear genitive case (cf. Sulkala & Karjalainen 1992; Vainikka 1993). This is illustrated in (28). Importantly, this distribution of genitive case is not attested with other kinds of elements modifying the adjective; see e.g. *rahallisesti* in (28a), which carries adverbial marking (*-sti*).

- (28) a. Juha on [rahallisesti hyvin riipuvainen vanhemmistaan]
John is financially very:GEN dependent on his parents
- b. Hän on noin vanha
He is that:GEN tall
'He is that tall'
- c. Valtavan kylmä
enormous:GEN cold
'enormously cold'

Another phenomenon which suggests that degree adjectives stand in a different relation with the modified adjectival head than other types of modifiers do, comes from scrambling within the adjectival domain. Although the PP-complement to *riipuvainen* in (28a) displays a certain degree of freedom in its placement, there is one clear restriction: the degree modifier can never be separated from the modified adjectival head by the leftward scrambled PP-complement (cf. (29a)). As shown in (29b), the modifier *rahallisesti* can be separated from the rest of the adjective phrase by the leftward moved PP-complement.

- (29) a. *Juha on [rahallisesti hyvin vanhemmistaan riipuvainen]
b. Juha on [rahallisesti vanhemmistaan hyvin riipuvainen]

In view of the above crosslinguistic facts, it seems fair to conclude that the modification relationship between a degree element and the modified adjective is different from the relationship between other types of modifiers and the adjective. The fact that the modifying degree element carries genitive case in Finnish and the fact that it can be involved in an agreement relationship, as in Dutch, is reminiscent of A-positions.⁹ Of course, although the above-mentioned empirical facts are suggestive for an A-type status of the landing site of the inverted adjectival degree-predicate, further research is definitely needed for a proper characterization of the landing site. I will further simply assume that the other types of modifying elements within the adjective phrase are best analyzed in terms of A-positions (possibly, adjoined ones).¹⁰

Under an inversion analysis, the Dutch and Finnish adjectival patterns are assigned the structural representations in (30a) and (30b) for the examples (26a) and (28c), respectively.¹¹

- (30) a. $[_{FP} \text{vreseli}[_{ke}[_{F'} F+X_i [_{XP} \text{dure} [_{X'} t_i t_j]]]]]$
 b. $[_{FP} \text{valtavan}_j [_{F'} F+X_i [_{XP} \text{kylmä} [_{X'} t_i t_j]]]]]$

Let me, finally, point out the following examples from Finnish that are quite suggestive for the parallism between the *N* of *N* construction and the AP-internal degree modification structure. In both examples *helvetin*, carrying genitive case, qualifies the item that follows. (31a) is interpreted as 'a theory which is like hell', i.e. a hell of a theory. (31b) is interpreted as 'cold like hell', i.e. hellish cold. A uniform treatment of the nominal construction (31a) and the adjectival construction (31b) is obviously the null-hypothesis. If the Finnish genitival *N* of *N*-variant features predicate inversion (of *helvetin*), the same inversion process should apply within the adjectival construction (31b).¹²

- (31) a. se *helvetin* teoria
 that hell:GEN theory
 'that hell of a theory'
 b. *helvetin* kylmä
 hell:GEN cold
 'hellish cold; cold like hell' (Vainikka 1993)

5. Predicate fronting and subextraction

Thus far, I have argued on the basis of Rumanian that Predicate Inversion is attested within the adjectival system. The question ari-

ses whether Predicate Fronting, i.e. predicate displacement of the $\bar{A}$ -type, is also found within this syntactic domain. Rumanian again provides the relevant examples.

- (32) a. *Cît de frumoasă e Maria!* (Grosu 1974)
 How-much of beautiful is Maria
 'How beautiful Maria is!'
 b. *Cît de vechi e acest vin?*
 How-much of old is this wine
 'How old is this wine?'
 (33) a. *Cît e Maria [t_i de frumoasă]!*
 b. *Cît e [t_i de vechi] acest vin?*
 (Murrell & Ștefănescu-Dragănești 1980⁵)

In (32), the entire adjective phrase has been fronted to [Spec,CP]. In (33), left branch extraction of the interrogative element *cît* from within the adjective phrase has taken place.¹³ Of course, the pattern *cît de A* is highly reminiscent of the *A de A* pattern, which I discussed in section 3. In fact, the former pattern only differs from the latter pattern in terms of the properties 'interrogativity' and 'exclamation', and not in its categorial features. That is, there are reasons for treating *cît* as an adjectival (i.e. [+N,+V]) element. Like other (attributive) adjectives, it displays, for example, agreement with a modified noun:¹⁴

- (34) a. *cîtă cafea?*
 how-much:F.SG coffee:F.SG
 'how much coffee?'
 b. *cîte cărți?*
 how-many:F.PL book:F.PL
 'how many books?'

In view of its adjectival nature, it is not unlikely that the (interrogative) degree adjective undergoes Predicate Inversion and ends up in [Spec,FP]. The nominal copula *de* shows up as a result of X-raising to F.

- (35) $[_{FP} \text{cît}_j [_{F'} F+X_i (=de) [_{XP} [_{AP} \text{frumoasă}] [_{X'} t_i [_{AP} t_j]]]]]$

The interrogative adjectival *cît* differs, however, from adjectival elements like *extrem* in being able to escape from the adjectival phrase. One might want to relate this to such features as 'interrogativity'

(i.e. [+WH]) and 'exclamation' (i.e. [+EXCL]). Suppose that these features are associated with the functional head Deg which heads a DegP-projection, whose specifier position has $\bar{A}$ -properties and can function as an escape hatch for extraction, similarly to [Spec,CP]. Movement of *cit* to the specifier of DegP will then determine the interrogative or exclamative interpretation of *cit*. The resulting structure is given in (36):

- (36) $[_{\text{DegP}} \text{cit}_i [_{\text{Deg}}' \text{Deg}_{[\text{I}, \text{WH}/(+\text{EXCL})]} [_{\text{FP}} \text{t}'_j [_{\text{F}} \text{F} + \text{X}_i (=de) [_{\text{XP}} [_{\text{AP}} \text{frumoasă}] [_{\text{X}} \text{t}_i [_{\text{AP}} \text{t}_j]]]]]]]$

This stepwise derivation of the pattern *cit de A* is similar to the analysis of certain *wat voor*-patterns in Dutch as proposed in Bennis, Corver & Den Dikken (1998). They argue that the derivation of such patterns as *wat voor een jongen(s)* (what for a boy(s); 'what kind of boy(s)'), i.e. patterns featuring what they call the spurious indefinite article *een*,¹⁵ involves ($\bar{A}$ -) raising of the predicate *wat* to [Spec,DP] via prior Predicate Inversion to [Spec,FP]. This is depicted in (37):

- (37) $[_{\text{DP}} \text{wat}_j [_{\text{D}}' [_{\text{D}} \text{voor}] [_{\text{FP}} \text{t}'_j [_{\text{F}} \text{F} + \text{een}_1 [_{\text{XP}} [_{\text{NP}} \text{jongen(s)}] [_{\text{X}} \text{t}_i [_{\text{Pred}} \text{t}_j]]]]]]]$

The authors propose, furthermore, that other *wat voor*-patterns, viz. those lacking the spurious indefinite article (as in *wat voor jongen(s)*; what for boy(s); 'what kind of boy(s)'), involve direct $\bar{A}$ -movement (i.e. Predicate Fronting) of the small clause predicate *wat* to the operator position [Spec,DP]. This derivation is given in (38):

- (38) $[_{\text{DP}} \text{wat}_j [_{\text{D}}' [_{\text{D}} \text{voor}] [_{\text{XP}} [_{\text{NP}} \text{jongen(s)}] [_{\text{X}} \emptyset [_{\text{Pred}} \text{t}_j]]]]]$

This $\bar{A}$ -raising of the Small Clause predicate might be at the basis of such structures as in (21b), in which a degree adverb (*tare*) is removed out of the AP. The fact that *de* is absent in these structures (cf. *tare* (**de*) *deștept*) suggests that Predicate Inversion (i.e. $\bar{A}$ -movement) does not apply in adjectival structures in which the adjective is modified by an adverb. Given that $\bar{A}$ -positions typically function as escape hatches for extraction, it does not seem implausible to analyze such adjectival constructions as *tare deștept* in terms of Predicate Fronting internal to the adjective phrase. Schematically:

- (39) $[_{\text{DegP}} \text{tare}_j [_{\text{D}}' \text{Deg} [_{\text{XP}} [_{\text{AP}} \text{deștept} [_{\text{X}} \text{X} [_{\text{Pred}} \text{t}_j]]]]]]]$

Summarizing, I have identified two types of predicate displacement within the Rumanian adjectival system: Predicate Inversion and Predicate Fronting. The occurrence of these operations internal to the adjectival system strengthens the view of cross-categorical parallelism. The examples from Rumanian feature displacement of an 'adjectival' predicate (with the exception of (39)). As shown in (40), this syntactic category can also be the inverted predicate in clausal (Den Dikken 1995; Emonds 1976; Hoekstra & Mulder 1990) and nominal contexts (cf. Aarts 1994:20; Den Dikken 1995:23):

- (40) *Most embarrassing*_i would have been losing the Cup Final to a second division team *t*_i

- (41) a. un *drôle* de type (French)
a funny of chap
'a funny chap'
b. la *tonita* de Juana (Spanish)
the silly of Juana
'that silly Juana'

6. Predicate displacement in simili-constructions

In this section I will consider some more examples from Rumanian illustrating the phenomenon of predicate displacement within the adjectival system. Take the following examples, in which the degree of thickness is expressed by a simili expression: *ca peria*. The meaning of the adjectival expression can be stated as follows: 'x is thick to degree d, where d is like a brush'.

- (42) a. Pădurea e [deasă *ca peria*] (Mallinson 1986)
wood-det be:3SG thick:F.SG as brush-det
'The woods are as thick as a brush'
b. Pădurea e [*ca peria* de deasă]
wood-det be:3SG as brush-det of thick:F.SG
'The woods are as thick as a brush'

In the non-inverted pattern (42a), the metaphorical standard of comparison *ca peria* follows the gradable adjective. (42b), on the other hand, exemplifies the Predicate Inversion pattern featuring the nominal copula *de*.

The question arises how to analyze adjectival constructions like these. Let us first consider the simili-phrase introduced by *ca*.¹⁶ Two

potential analyses of this phrase come to mind. One could, first of all, propose that *ca* should be interpreted as an equative/comparative marker (cf. Mallinson 1986: 175) quite parallel to the comparative marker *than* in English, which is often analyzed as a conjunction or preposition-like element that heads the comparative phrase. The second, alternative analysis would interpret *ca* as a pro-predicate element (meaning 'so/as') that has been moved to the specifier position of the comparative/equative head. The two analyses are schematically represented in (43) and (44); the simuli-phrase (KP) occupies its base (i.e. post-adjectival) position.¹⁷

(43) $\text{deasă}_{<1,G>} [\text{KP } \text{Pred}_q [\text{K } \text{ca} [\text{XP } \text{peria} [\text{X}^0 \text{X}^0 \text{t}_q]]]]$

(44) $\text{deasă}_{<1,G>} [\text{KP } \text{ca}_q [\text{K } \text{K} [\text{XP } \text{peria} [\text{X}^0 \text{X}^0 \text{t}_q]]]]$

In (43), *ca* heads a functional projection KP and takes a Small Clause (XP) as its complement, of which *peria* is the subject. The predicate (*Pred*) of the Small Clause is raised to the specifier position of *ca*. In the structure in (44), *ca* itself is the raised predicate and the head of KP is phonetically empty.¹⁸

I will adopt the second analysis here; also in other structural contexts, *ca* appears as a predicative element with the meaning of 'so' (data from Murrell & Ștefănescu-Drăgănești 19805).¹⁹

(45) a. ca să vorbiți
so to speak

'so as to speak; in order to speak'

b. ca de obicei
so of habit/custom

'as usual'

Notice that the structural configuration in (44) is quite parallel to the structure of relative and comparative clauses, in the sense that some 'pronominal' (or maybe better, pro-adverbial) element has been moved to the specifier position of some conjunction(-like) head. A relative clause is generally interpreted as a one-place predicate that restricts the reference of the DP of which it is a part. Movement of the relative pronoun to [Spec,CP] creates a free position (the trace) that makes the clause into a one-place predicate. I will assume that the modification relation between the gradable adjective and the simuli-phrase is established in the same way: movement of the predicate *ca* to [Spec,KP] creates an open position within the (small) clau-

se and turns KP into a one-place predicate. This one-place predicate predicates over the degree argument *G* that is part of the thematic grid of the gradable adjective (the modifiee).

The derivation of the construction in (42b) is given in (46):²⁰

(46) a. $[\text{XP } \text{deasă} [\text{X}^0 [\text{KP } \text{Spec} [\text{K } \text{K} [\text{XP } \text{peria} [\text{X}^0 \text{X}^0 \text{ca}]]]]]]$

b. $[\text{XP } \text{deasă} [\text{X}^0 [\text{KP } \text{ca}_q [\text{K } \text{K} [\text{XP } \text{peria} [\text{X}^0 \text{X}^0 \text{t}_q]]]]]]$

c. $[\text{FP } [\text{KP } \text{ca}_q [\text{K } \text{K} [\text{XP } \text{peria} [\text{X}^0 \text{t}_q]]]]] [\text{F}^0 \text{F} + \text{X}_i (=de) [\text{XP } \text{deasă} [\text{X}^0 \text{t}_i \text{t}_j]]]]$

In (46a), the pro-predicate *ca* ('so/as') is in its base position, i.e. the predicate position of the small clause. In (46b), *ca* has been moved to [Spec,KP]. In (46c), finally, the complex KP-projection has been shifted leftward across the adjectival 'subject' *deasă*. As a consequence of the raising of the complex predicate, the nominal copula *de* appears.

Notice also the following extraction facts (capitals indicate focus accent):

(47) a. $\text{Ca } \text{peria } \text{de } \text{deasă } \text{e } \text{pădurea}$
as brush-det of thick.F.SG be:3SG wood-det
'As thick as a brush the woods are!'

b. $\text{CA } \text{PERIA } \text{e } [\text{— } \text{de } \text{deasă}]$
As brush-det be:3SG — of thick

'As thick as a brush it (i.e. the woods) is!'

In (47a), the entire adjectival expression is fronted. In (47b), the KP-projection is moved out of the adjectival phrase. This subextraction suggests that the simuli-phrase, which – in view of the appearance of the nominal copula *de* – has undergone Predicate Inversion, is subsequently moved to the $\bar{A}$ -position [Spec,DegP]. From [Spec,DegP], the phrase can leave the adjectival phrase. Observe that this derivation is parallel to the one in (36), where the wh-element *cît* is the displaced predicate.

(48) $[\text{DegP } [\text{KP } \text{ca } \text{peria}]_j [\text{Deg}^0 \text{Deg} [\text{FP } \text{t}'_j [\text{F}^0 \text{F} + \text{X}_i (=de) [\text{XP } [\text{AP } \text{deasă}] [\text{X}^0 \text{t}_i \text{t}_j]]]]]]]$

7. Predicate displacement in the Italian adjectival system

Thus far, I have argued on the basis of Rumanian that AP-internal degree-modifiers originate in a post-adjectival position and that

their surface position is the result of leftward predicate displacement within the adjectival system. Two types of predicate displacement were distinguished: (i) predicate inversion (an A-movement type operation) and (ii) predicate fronting (an $\bar{A}$ -movement type operation). After this discussion of Rumanian, the question arises whether the displacement of degree-predicates in adjectival constructions is also attested in other languages. A broad cross-linguistic perspective on AP-internal predicate displacement is beyond the scope of this paper. In what follows, however, I will explore the possibility of extending this predicate displacement analysis to Italian adjectival constructions.

Consider, first, the adjectival expression in (49a), the Italian equivalent of the Rumanian expression *extrem de înalt* (see (14a)). Under a Predicate Inversion analysis, the underlying order of the adjective phrase is the one in (49b); (49c) represents the derived order.

- (49) a. Gianni è [estremamente alto]
 Gianni is extremely tall
 b. [_{XP} alto [_{X'} X estremamente]]
 c. [_{FP} estremamente]_i [_F F+X_i [_{XP} alto [_{X'} t_i t_j]]]

The construction in (49a) differs from the Rumanian equivalent in two respects: First of all, the Italian expression does not feature the prepositional element (**estremamente di alto*). Secondly, the Italian degree modifier contains the adverbial marker *-mente*. As for the absence of the prepositional copula, I restrict myself to the observation that although predicate inversion often triggers the appearance of a linking element, it does not seem to be a necessary property. Consider, for example, the following examples, which arguably involve Predicate Inversion of the adjectival predicate (*pauvre/povero*) and the pronominal subject (*moi/me*).

- (50) a. *pauvre* *(de) moi!
 poor *(of) me
 'poor me!' (French)
 b. *povero* *(di) me!
 povero *(di) me
 'poor me!' (Italian)

What about *mente*? One possible treatment would be to say that *mente* is a derivational suffix which attaches to an adjectival stem

and creates a new category, say Adverb. There is an argument, however, which goes against such an analysis and which suggests that *mente* is a word-level category rather than a suffix.²¹ In Italian, you can have open vowels (open *e* and open *o*) only if the vowel is stressed: e.g. *pOvero* (stressed vowel in capital). If you build a derived word out of *povero*, the stress shifts and the *o* becomes closed: e.g. *povertA*, with accent on *a* and *poverIno*, with accent on the vowel *i*. However, if you build from the adjective *povero* the corresponding adverb with *mente*, the vowel remains open: *pOveramente*. This shows that *povero* retains its own word stress. Thus, *mente* does not seem to be a derivational suffix heading a category Adverb. It rather behaves like a word-level category. In view of its historical relation to the independent feminine noun *mente* ('mind'), it may be characterized as a noun. Observe also that *mente* has retained its grammatical features: it is a nominal element that agrees in gender (feminine) and number (singular) with the adjective. From a synchronic point of view, it seems more appropriate to regard it as a grammatical or semi-lexical noun (cf. Emonds 1985; Corver & Van Riemsdijk (forthcoming)): that is, a noun which is semantically less specific or contentful than lexical nouns (e.g. *car*, *bike*, etcetera). For the moment, I will restrict myself to the observation that the grammatical noun *mente* is comparable to such nominal elements as *body* and *thing* in *some-body* and *some-thing*. I will come back later to this semi-lexical status of *mente*.

If *mente* is a noun (i.e. a word-level category), the question arises how it combines with the adjective (e.g. *estrema*). One way to go would be to say that the string *estrema+mente* is a compound structure (cf. Zagana 1990 for such an analysis for Spanish *mente*-adverbs). Thus:

- (51) [_A *estrema*] + [_N *mente*] → Adv°

The word stress pattern of *poveramente* is compatible with a compound analysis. In compounds, an open vowel retains its open character. Thus, within the compound *bEnaccetto* ('well accepted'), you have an open *e*, whereas in a derived word you must have a closed *e*: e.g. *benIno*, with stress on *i*.

Having determined that *mente* is a word-like unit (i.e. not a suffix), let us next address the issue of the semantic relationship between the adjective (e.g. *estrema*) and the grammatical noun *mente*. With Zagana (1990), I will assume that the nominal element *mente* is the external argument (i.e. the subject) of the adjectival pre-

dicate *estrema*. Thus, *mente* satisfies the external argument of the underlying adjective. As a consequence of this thematic relationship between *mente* and *estrema*, the external argument of *estrema* is no longer available for defining a predication relationship between the degree adverb and (the degree argument *G* of) the gradable adjective. Recall at this point, that for the Rumanian string *extrem de înalt*, I assumed that the external argument of the adjective *extrem* predicates over the degree argument *G*, associated with the gradable adjective; see (16a), repeated here as (52a). If, in Italian, the external thematic role of *estrema* is discharged to the nominal element *mente* (see (52b)), the question arises how the modification relationship between *estrema-mente* and the gradable adjective (*alto*) is defined. That is, what predicates over the degree argument *G*?

- (52) a. $\text{inalt}_{<1,G>} \text{extrem}_{<1>}$
 b. $\text{alto}_{<1,G>} [\text{estrema}_{<1>} \text{mente}]$

My answer to this question will be the following: There is an additional head which heads a phrase predicating over the degree argument *G*. This head is the zero equivalent of the word *come* ('like'), as it is used in such sentences as (53):

- (53) a. È [bianco come la neve]
 (It) is white as snow
 'It is white as snow'
 b. È [intelligente come mio fratello]
 (He/she) is intelligent as my brother
 'He/she is as intelligent as my brother'

In (53a), the degree of 'whiteness' is expressed by the simile-expression *come la neve*. The meaning of the adjectival expression can be stated as follows: 'x is white to degree d, where d is like snow'. Observe that (53a) is the Italian equivalent of the Rumanian construction (42a). In the equative construction in (53b), the degree of intelligence is expressed by the equative phrase *come mio fratello*. The meaning of the adjective phrase is roughly the following: 'x is intelligent to degree d, where d is the same as my brother's intelligence'.

As also shown by the following examples, *come* typically heads a projection that predicates over another element within the clause. In the examples in (54), the subject of the predication relationship is an argument denoting an individual: the clitic *lo* in (54a) and the null subject (*pro*) in (54b).

- (54) a. $\text{Lo}_i \text{considero} [t_i \text{come un nemico}]$
 Him (I) consider like an enemy
 b. $\text{Per me è} [\text{come un figlio}]$
 For me (he) is like a son

In (53), the projection headed by *come* does not stand in a predication relationship to an argument denoting an individual, but to an argument denoting a degree, viz. the degree argument *G* that is part of the thematic grid of gradable adjectives.²²

Let us return now to the modification relation between *estrema-mente* and the gradable adjective *alto* (cf. (52b)). I assume that there is an additional empty head (K°) which is the zero equivalent of *come*. Under an analysis in which *estrema-mente* forms a compound, we would have a structure like (55). The external role of *estrema* is discharged word-internally to the nominal element *mente*.

- (55) $[_{KP} \text{Spec } [_K K^\circ (= \text{come})] [\text{estrema}_{<1>} \text{-mente}]]]$

Under the assumption that, parallel to Rumanian, the degree modifier originates in a post-adjectival position, we end up with an underlying structure like (56). The surface order is derived by applying Predicate Inversion to KP; see (57).

- (56) $[\text{alto}_{<1,G>} [_{KP} \text{Spec } [_K K^\circ] [\text{estrema-mente}]]]$

- (57) $[_{FP} [_{KP} \text{Spec } [_K K^\circ] [\text{estrema-mente}]]]_j [_F F+X_1 [_{XP} \text{alto}_{<1,G>} [_X t_i t_j]]]$

Notice that in (57), a *come*-like phrase (KP) has undergone leftward displacement. Notice that such a predicate displacement was also attested in Rumanian, viz. the example (42b), which is repeated here as (58).

- (58) $\text{Pădurea e} [ca \text{ peria de deasă}]$
 wood-det be:3SG as brush-det of thick:F.SG
 'The woods are like a brush as thick'.

Recall that I argued that in (58), a predicative element (*ca*) was moved to the specifier position of the functional projection KP. Due to the doubly filled XP-filter, the functional head *K* is phonetically empty when there is an overt operator (*ca*) in [Spec,KP]. Notice that such a movement process has not applied in the structural representation of *estremamente alto* in (57); i.e. no predicative element has been moved

to [Spec,KP]. Notice also that the non-overtness of K remains unclear, or at least it cannot be reduced to a doubly filled XP-effect, since no (overt) element has been moved to [Spec,KP]. In other words, why don't we find such sequences as **[[come estremamente] alto]*?

There is, however, an alternative to the analysis in (57). Rather than analyzing *estremamente* as a compound (see (51)), which is derived by morphological rules, I propose that this string syntactically derives from an underlying structure like (59a). In this structure, the noun phrase *mente* is the subject of the predicate *estrema*. The surface order is derived by moving *estrema* to [Spec,KP], yielding *estrema mente* (see (59b)).²³ Suppose that fronting of the adjectival predicate to [Spec,KP] turns KP into an open predicate. This one-place predicate predicates over the degree argument *G* that is part of the thematic grid of the gradable adjective (the modifiee, e.g. *alto*).

- (59) a. $[_{KP} \text{Spec } [_K K^\circ (= come)] [_{XP} [_{NP} mente] [_X' X [_{AP} \text{estrema}]]]]]$
 b. $[_{KP} \text{estrema}] [_K K^\circ (= come)] [_{XP} [_{NP} mente] [_X' X t_i]]]$

The derived pattern is quite parallel to the Rumanian pattern *ca peria* in (58). The only differences are the following: (i) *ca* is a pro-predicate, whereas *estrema* is not; (ii) *peria* is a lexical noun, whereas *mente* is what I called earlier a semi-lexical or grammatical noun (see Emonds 1985:162). An important property which is shared by *estrema mente* and *ca peria* is the fact that *K°* cannot be overtly realized; this, I assume, is due to the doubly filled XP-filter.

Let me briefly elaborate on the analysis of *mente* as a semi-lexical or grammatical noun. Emonds (1985:162) informally characterizes these semi-lexical categories as '[...] the most frequently used and least semantically specific members of each lexical category'. They are hybrid categories, in the sense that they display both lexical (e.g. as regards their form) and functional (e.g. closed class-property) properties. Emonds states that the closed class of grammatical nouns in English includes such terms as *one, self, people, thing, place, time, and way*. He further argues that one property of grammatical as opposed to lexical heads is that certain types of transformations only apply to the former. As a consequence, grammatical heads differ in their distribution from lexical heads.

Emonds illustrates this different distribution of grammatical nouns by means of what he calls 'compound pronouns'. These are such items as: *some-one, every-thing, any-body*, etcetera. He argues that these composite pronouns are derived by moving syntactically the grammatical noun (*one, thing, body*) to the quantifying element

(*some, every, any*). One distributional phenomenon quite clearly shows that the grammatical noun has raised to a higher position, viz. the fact that the composite pronoun must precede simple adjectives; see the examples in (60), drawn from Emonds (1985). Observe that lexical nouns do not display such behavior.

- (60) a. Somebody clever is invited. *Clever somebody is invited.
 b. *Housemates clever can be fun. Clever housemates can be fun.
 c. Some clever fellows are invited. *Clever some fellows are invited.

Another asymmetry, observed in Emonds (1985:204), between lexical nouns and grammatical nouns is the fact that the latter do not have plural forms. Compare:

- (61) a. Somebody clever was invited. *Somebodies clever were invited.
 b. Some clever fellow was invited. Some clever fellows were invited.

Given the above-mentioned characteristics of grammatical nouns, it does not seem entirely implausible to characterize *mente* as a grammatical noun. First of all, it has a distribution which differs from that of ordinary nouns, i.e. it combines as a bare NP with adjectival predicates which undergo leftward predicate displacement, yielding the surface pattern *AP+mente*. Secondly, just like the grammatical noun *body* in (61a), it never appears with plural morphology: **estreme-menti* (extreme:F.PL + *mente*:F.PL).

Although the status of *mente* as a grammatical noun deserves further examination, I will restrict myself to the above-mentioned remarks and turn to a (central) assumption I have made thus far, but for which I haven't provided potential empirical support. This assumption is the idea that a string like *estrema-mente* involves a projection KP, which is headed by the covert equivalent of *come*. Support for the presence of such a KP-projection would come from the overt appearance of *come* in certain adjectival environments.

I would like to argue that *come* surfaces in such exclamative constructions as in (62):

- (62) Come è brutto!
 How (he/she/it) is ugly
 'How ugly he/she/it is!'

In this exclamative construction *come* exclaims at the degree to which someone or something is ugly. The lexical item *come* which appears in this exclamation sentence is often analyzed as a different lexical item (viz. an exclamative degree adverb) than the item *come* showing up in simili-expressions. I would like to argue, however, that it is one and the same lexical item.²⁴ So, *come* in (62) has the meaning 'like/as'. A question which then, of course, arises is: How do we get the exclamative reading?

Before answering this question, let us first consider the internal syntax of the adjective phrase in (62). The hypothesis that 'exclamative' *come* in (62) and *come* as it appears in equative/simili-phrases is one and the same lexical item leads to a structural analysis as in (63a) for exclamative *come*. Furthermore, if the *come*-phrase originates in a post-adjectival position, we get an underlying structure like (63b):

- (63) a. $[_{KP} e [_K \text{ come YP}]]$
 b. $[\text{brutto}_{<1,G>} [_{KP} \text{ Spec } [_K \text{ come YP}]]]$

(63b) reads as: 'x is ugly to degree d, where d is like YP'. Recall that in (59) *come* takes a Small Clause as its complement. If we extend this analysis to exclamative *come*, we get the following full-fledged representation (where PRED stands for predicate):²⁵

- (64) $[\text{brutto}_{<1,G>} [_{KP} \text{ Spec } [_K K^o (= \text{come})] [_{XP} [_{\text{SUBJ}} e] [_X X [\text{PRED}]]]]]$

As is clear from the string in (62), the only position that lexicalizes is K^o ; the subject position of the Small Clause and the predicate remain empty. I tentatively assume that the empty predicate is the zero-equivalent of *che* ('what'), the wh-element which shows up in such exclamative phrases as (65).

- (65) [Che brutto] sei!
 What ugly (you) are
 'How ugly you are!'

So, (62) and (65) have the intermediate representation (66) and (67), respectively:

- (66) $[\text{brutto}_{<1,G>} [_{KP} WH_i [_K \text{ come } [_{XP} [_{\text{SUBJ}} e] [_X X [t_i]]]]]]]$

- (67) $[\text{brutto}_{<1,G>} [_{KP} che_i [_K K^o [_{XP} [_{\text{SUBJ}} e] [_X X [t_i]]]]]]]$

After movement of the wh-predicate to [Spec,KP], the entire KP undergoes leftward predicate displacement to [Spec,DegP] (cf. (68)), possibly via [Spec,FP]. Via [Spec,DegP], the *come*-phrase can leave the adjectival projection, yielding such patterns as (62).²⁶

- (68) $[_{\text{DegP}} [_{KP} WH_i (= che) [_K \text{ come } t_i]]] [_{\text{Deg}^o} \text{ Deg}_{[+EXCL]} [_{XP} [_{\text{AP}} \text{ brutto}]]] [_X [_{\text{AP}} t_i]]]$

As indicated in (68), I assume that the KP headed by *come* receives its exclamative meaning by standing in the specifier position of a functional Degree head (Deg^o) which is specified for the feature [+EXCL]. In other words, the exclamative meaning of *come* (or better, the *come*-phrase) is configurationally defined. Thus, the exclamative interpretation of *come* in (62) is not a lexical property of this lexical item itself, but rather the result of occupying the specifier position of the functional head Deg, which can be specified for the illocutionary property 'exclamation'.²⁷

As is shown in (66) and (67), *che* and *come* cannot co-occur within KP. This can be interpreted as a doubly filled XP-effect. This effect is also attested in other contexts featuring *come*. Consider, for example, the following pair of adjectival constructions in which the *come*-phrase has an equative meaning.

- (69) a. è [intelligente] $[_{KP} WH_i [_K [_K \text{ come}]]]$
 is intelligent like my brother
 'He is as intelligent as my brother'
 b. è [intelligente] $[_{KP} \text{ quanto}_i [_K K^o [_{\text{mio}} \text{ fratello } t_i]]]$
 is intelligent how much my brother
 'He is as intelligent as my brother'
 c. *è [intelligente] $[_{KP} \text{ quanto}_i [_K [_K \text{ come}]]]$ [mio fratello t_i]]]

Let me summarize the main conclusions of this section. I have argued that *estrema+mente* is syntactically derived from the following underlying configuration: $[_{KP} \text{ Spec } [_K K^o (= \text{come})] [_{XP} \text{ mente } [_X X^o \text{ estrema}]]]$. *Mente*, the subject of the small clause, is a grammatical noun. The surface order is derived by moving the adjectival predicate *estrema* to [Spec,KP]. Given the doubly filled KP-effect, K^o cannot surface as *come* when the specifier position is occupied by an overt phrase. *Come*, however, surfaces in contexts where the element in [Spec,KP] is covert, e.g. in exclamative contexts. As regards the modification relationship between the KP *estrema+mente* and the gradable adjective (e.g. *alto*), I have proposed that movement of *estre-*

ma to [Spec,KP] turns KP into an open predicate (i.e. a phrase containing an open/free position). This one-place predicate predicates over the degree argument *G* that is part of the thematic grid of the gradable adjective (the modifiee, e.g. *alto*). The surface order *estrema+mente alto* is derived by moving the predicative KP *estrema+mente* to the left of *alto*. This operation is similar to the KP-inversion that (optionally) applies to Rumanian simli-phrases (e.g. *ca peria*).

I will close off this section with a few remarks about extraction of degree modifiers from within the Italian adjective phrase. Recall that in my discussion of predicate displacement phenomena in the Rumanian adjective phrase, I made a distinction between two types of predicate displacement processes: (i) Predicate Inversion (A-movement type) and Predicate Fronting (Ā-movement type). The former moves an inverted predicate to an A-type position, whereas the latter places it into an Ā-position (which can also function as an escape hatch for subextraction from within the adjectival domain). Consider now the following extraction facts:

- (70) **ESTREMAMENTE* è *alto* Gianni!
extremely is tall Gianni
'Extremely tall, Gianni is!'
- (71) a. *Come* è *brutto*!
Like/as he/she/it is ugly
'How ugly he/she/it is!'
- b. *COME MIO FRATELLO* è intelligente!
Like my brother he/she is intelligent
'He/she is as intelligent as my brother'
- c. *QUANTO MIO FRATELLO* è intelligente!
How-much my brother he/she is intelligent
'He/she is as intelligent as my brother'

The impossibility of extracting the modifier *estremamente* from within the adjective phrase is reminiscent of the Rumanian example (20b), where it was shown that the modifier *extrem* could not be removed from the adjective phrase *extrem de destept*. I argued there that subextraction was only possible if the displaced predicate could reach the [Spec,DegP]-position, i.e. an Ā-position which functions as an escape hatch for extraction. Wh-predicates (cf. *cît* in (36)) and predicative KPs containing a "covert" Ā-moved element in [Spec, KP] (cf. *ca peria* in (48)) are moved to [Spec,DegP] and can leave the adjective phrase from there. The fact that such predicative phrases

as *cît* and *ca peria* can reach [Spec,DegP] is arguably related to the fact that this position within the adjective phrase is associated with interrogative and exclamative force. More specifically, I will assume that it is the functional head position Deg^o which – quite parallel to Comp in the CP-domain – defines the type of illocution (e.g. interrogativity, exclamation) of the adjective phrase. I will assume that the type of illocution is formally marked by a feature (e.g. [+WH]) for interrogativity and [+EXCL] for exclamation) on Deg^o. Suppose that movement of the wh-form to the specifier position of Deg^o will then determine the interrogative or exclamative interpretation of the fronted predicate.

Consider now the exclamative construction in (71a). I have argued that *come* heads a KP containing a wh-element that has been moved to [Spec,KP]. Suppose now that the silent wh-predicate in [Spec,KP] drags along the other material dominated by KP and moves it to [Spec,DegP], the locus of wh-degree predicates within the adjective phrase. The representation resulting from this KP-movement operation has already been given in (68). Having reached [Spec,DegP], the exclamative KP can leave the adjective phrase and move on to [Spec,CP]. Notice that this subextraction of exclamative *come* in Italian is parallel to the Rumanian subextraction of the simli-phrases *ca peria* that I discussed in section 6 (example (48)).

Consider next the examples (71b,c). Not unexpectedly, these examples show that equative KPs headed by overt or covert *come* can be removed from within the adjective phrase (if KP carries focus). In (71c), the wh-predicate *quanto* has been moved to [Spec,KP]. The overt wh-element in [Spec,KP] drags along the rest of the adjective phrase to [Spec,DegP], from where the entire KP moves on to [Spec,CP]. In (71b), there is a covert Ā-moved predicate in [Spec,KP], due to the fact that K^o is now lexically realized as *come*. Just as in (71b), the Ā-moved element in [Spec,KP] pied pipes the rest of the KP to [Spec,DegP]. From there, the KP *come mio fratello* can be moved to [Spec,CP].

8. In situ degree adverbs

A central claim in this paper is that degree modifiers within the adjective phrase originate in a post-adjectival position. I tried to substantiate this claim by showing that there is a clear parallelism between the so-called *N of/de N* construction and the Rumanian *A de A*-construction. Adopting an analysis for the *N of/de N* construction in which the first nominal element (N1) is a displaced predicate (cf.

Kayne 1994; Den Dikken 1995), I extended this predicate displacement analysis to the *A de A*-construction. As a next step, I explored the idea of extending this predicate displacement analysis of degree modifiers to Italian.

A quick glance at the adjectival constructions discussed in this article shows that in most cases the degree modifier precedes the modified adjective. Thus, besides the inverted patterns in (72a) and (73a), we do not find such non-inverted (i.e. straight order) patterns as in (72b) and (73b):

(72) a. Ion e [*extrem de înalt*]

b. *Ion e [*înalt extrem*]

(73) a. Gianni è [*estremamente alto*]

b. *Gianni è [*alto estremamente*]

Under a predicate displacement analysis of degree modifiers, this implies that in certain cases predicate displacement obligatorily applies. At this point, I don't have any deep explanation for the obligatoriness of the predicate inversions in (72a) and (73a), although, as will soon be shown, heaviness/focalization effects are sometimes involved in the placement of the degree adverb.²⁸ Thus, as pointed out in Giorgi & Longobardi (1991:106), degree modifiers sometimes occur in post-adjectival position in Italian:

(74) a. Mario è intelligente *più di te*

Mario is intelligent more than you

b. Gianni è intelligente *tanto quanto Maria*

Gianni is intelligent so-much how-much Maria

'Gianni is as intelligent as Maria'

In these examples, the degree modifiers have a complex structure. As shown in (75), 'simple' degree modifiers preferably occur in pre-adjectival position:

(75) a. Mario è tanto intelligente/*intelligente tanto

Mario is so much intelligent/intelligent so much

b. Mario è molto intelligente/*intelligente molto

Mario is much intelligent/intelligent much

If one adopts a predicate displacement analysis for AP-internal degree adverbs, there is one phenomenon which suggests that in certain syntactic contexts the degree modifier remains in situ. The argu-

ment is based on the following interesting observation made in Moro (1991): Predicate Inversion in copular sentences blocks A-bar extraction of the postcopular subject. This opacity effect is illustrated in (76b), where *the cause of the riot* is the inverted, A-moved constituent and *which picture* the underlying small clause subject (example taken from Moro 1997). Observe that *which picture* can be extracted in (76a); in this example the wh-phrase is extracted from a clause with straight (i.e. non-inverted) order.

(76) a. *Which picture*_i do you think [_{IP} t_i was [_{SC} t_i [_{DP} the cause of the riot]]]?]

b. *Which picture*_i do you think [_{IP} [_{DP} the cause of the riot]_j was [_{SC} t_i t_j]]?

The ban on extraction of the subject of the inverted predicate also holds for nominal predicate inversion contexts, i.e. *N of N*-type of constructions. As observed in den Dikken (1998), the subject of this type of construction (*which* in (77)) cannot be $\bar{A}$ -moved (see also Corver 1998) across the inverted predicate (*hell*):

(77) *a problem *which*_i this is [a hell of (a) t_i]

If such sequences as *estremamente alto* involve predicate inversion of the degree modifier, then we expect subextraction of the adjectival 'subject' *alto* (or some element substituting for it) to be impossible. In what follows, I will test this prediction by investigating the possibility of pro-predicate cliticization. As is well-known, the clitic *lo* can substitute for a predicative phrase in a copular sentence:

(78) a. Gianni è *intelligente*. Anche Carlo *lo* è

Gianni is intelligent. Also Carlo it is

b. Gianni è *estremamente intelligente*. Anche Carlo *lo* è

Gianni is extremely intelligent. Also Carlo it is

Observe now that cliticization is less acceptable when the degree modifier is not part of the substitution (cf. (79a)). Under the predicate inversion analysis defended above, *estremamente* (a KP-projection), has been inverted. This means that in (79a), the clitic *lo* is $\bar{A}$ -moved across an inverted predicate. The resulting representation is given in (79b). As we have seen above, such a movement operation is typically blocked.

- (79) a. ??Gianni *lo* è estremamente
 b. Gianni *lo_k* è [_{FP} [_{KP} estremamente]_j] [_F *F+X_j*] [_{XP} *t_k* [_{X'} *t_j*]]]

Some more examples are given in (80) (example (80a) drawn from Zamparelli 1993):

- (80) a. ??Pesante, il pacco *lo* era estremamente
 Heavy, the pack it was extremely
 b. ??Nuda, Maria *lo* era tutta
 Nude, Maria it was entirely
 c. ??Gianni *lo* è poco
 Gianni it is little (e.g. little intelligent)

Interestingly, cliticization yields a much better result when the modifier is complex ((81a) taken from Zamparelli 1993):

- (81) a. Coraggioso, Don Abbondio *lo* era assai poco
 Brave, Don Abbondio it was very little
 b. Gianni *lo* è anche troppo
 Gianni it is also too-much
 c. Gianni *lo* è non poco
 Gianni it is not little

One might want to relate the contrast between the examples in (80) and those in (81) to the position of the degree modifier. In (80), the degree modifier has undergone Predicate Inversion and as a consequence of that, *lo*-cliticization is blocked. Suppose now that in (81) the complex modifier simply occupies its base position. That is, within the adjective phrase we have a straight (i.e. non-inverted) order: AP + degree modifier. In this non-Predicate Inversion context (see (82)), *lo*-cliticization (i.e. $\bar{A}$ -movement) is not blocked.

- (82) Gianni *lo_i* era [_{XP} *t_i* [_X *X* non poco]]

9. Conclusion

In line with the search for cross-categorical parallelism, I have tried to show that there are good reasons for assuming that the phenomenon of predicate displacement, which has been argued to apply within the clausal and nominal domain, is also operative within the adjectival domain. More specifically, I have tried to show on the basis of such languages as Rumanian and Italian that predicate displace-

ment is found in adjectival environments involving a degree modification relationship between a gradable adjective and a degree modifier.²⁹ The degree modifier acts as the predicate which undergoes leftward movement across the gradable adjectival subject over which it predicates. Moreover, as in full clauses, the leftward movement of predicates can be either $\bar{A}$ -movement (Predicate Inversion) or $\bar{A}$ -movement (Predicate Fronting). In the literature, these two types of predicate displacement have been argued to exist within the nominal and clausal domain as well. Thus also from the perspective of types of predicate movement, there is parallelism between the clausal, nominal and adjectival domain.

Address of the Author:

Grammar Models Group/Center for Language Studies (CLS), Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, NL-5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands,
 e-mail: N.F.M.corver@kub.nl

Notes

* I would like to thank Anna Cardinaletti, Denis Delfitto, Marcel den Dikken, Josep Quer and Riet Vos for discussion of (certain parts of) this paper. I have also benefited from opportunities to present this material at Groningen University, the University of Leiden, ZAS/Berlin and the university of Venice. My special thanks go to Alex Grosu for helpful discussion of the Rumanian data. Thanks also to Anders Holmberg for discussion of the Finnish data. All errors are mine.

¹ See especially Chomsky (1970), where Chomsky points out on the basis of such examples as in (i) that the strict subcategorization requirements of the verb, and the grammatical relations (subject, object) within the clause are mirrored in the nominal domain. It is further shown that cross-categorical parallelism also holds for displacement phenomena; sentential passivization is mirrored in the noun phrase (see (ii)). For other studies which are guided by the search for cross-categorical symmetry, see e.g. Jackendoff (1977), Abney (1987), Szabolcsi (1992).

- (i) a. They destroyed the city
 b. Their destruction of the city
 (ii) a. The city was destroyed by the Romans
 b. The city's destruction by the Romans

² See also Corver (1998) for an analysis of pseudopartitive constructions (e.g. *a bottle of wine*) in terms of predicate displacement.

³ See, among others, Corver (1991) and Bennis (1995) for a discussion of the internal syntax of the *wat voor*-construction. Observe, in connection with the predicate nominal interpretation of *wat* in (13), that *wat* also appears as an interrogative predicate nominal in clausal contexts:

- (i) [_{Pred} Wat] zijn [_{SU} deze jongens]?
 'What are these boys?'

⁴ Movement into [Spec,DP] is a necessary condition for subextraction, but not a sufficient one. See Corver (1990) for discussion of the syntax of left branch extraction.

⁵ The construction type *XP de A* is also found in Spanish (cf. Rivero 1978). E.g.: *igual / así / como de inteligente* (as/this/how of intelligent; 'as/this/how intelligent').

⁶ In the representations in (17), the subject (i.e. argument 1 of the thematic grid) is not structurally represented. This is done for reasons of simplicity. Under the assumption that the subject forms a Small Clause with the adjectival predicate *înalt*, the structure looks as follows:

(i) [_{NP} [_{NP} SUBJ [_{inalt<1,5>}]] [_X X extrem<1>]]

The small clause XP2 forms the subject of *extrem*. In this article, I will abstract away from the placement of the subject and stick to the representation in (17) for reasons of simplicity.

⁷ Subextraction is also permitted with the adverbial modifier *prea*:

(i) *Prea, mergi [t_i înceț]* (Murrell & Ștefănescu-Drăgănești 1980⁵:144)

Too go:2SG slowly

'You're so slow'

⁸ The ending *-e* is absent before indefinite singular neuter nouns. Compare *een oud huis* ('an old house') with *het oude huis* (the old-inf house).

⁹ See, for example, the morphological behavior of left branch possessors in nominal possessive constructions. These possessors, which are standardly analyzed as nominals that occupy an A-position, typically carry genitive case (as in Finnish) or display agreement with the nominal designating the possessum (as in Turkish).

¹⁰ In view of the fact the degree modification relationship involves the 'lexical' degree property *G* associated with the gradable adjective, a characterization of the position occupied by the inverted predicate in terms of the notion of (narrow) L-relatedness (Chomsky 1995) seems worthwhile to explore. One might, for example, propose that the inverted predicate checks off the *G*-feature associated with the gradable AP. Other types of modification relationships internal to the adjectival phrase do not involve this lexical property, and as such may be characterized in terms of non-L-relatedness (or, possibly, broad L-relatedness). A complete elaboration of this idea is beyond the scope of this article.

¹¹ In view of the fact that Predicate Inversion typically triggers the appearance of a copular element (e.g. copular *de*), one might reinterpret the structures in (30) as follows:

(i) a. [_{NP} vreselij_k [_F F+X (=e) [_{XP} dure [_X X t_i]]]] (Dutch)
b. [_{NP} valtava [_F F+X (=n) [_{XP} kylmä [_X X t_i]]]] (Finnish)

In (ib), the genitival suffix is interpreted as a copular element. The bound morpheme *-e* in (ia) could also be analyzed as a copular element that appears as the result of Predicate Inversion. Note that under such an analysis, the *-e* phonologically attached to *vreselij_k* is a different element (viz. a copular bound morpheme) than the homophonous *-e* that appears as an agreement suffix (i.e. a truly inflectional element) on the modifying adjective *duur* ('expensive'). In other words, the *-e* on *vreselij_k* should not be interpreted as the result of agreement-spreading under such an analysis. See also Den Dikken (1998) for a discussion of realization forms of the nominal copula. He proposes that the Saxon genitive *'s*, as in *John's car*, is in fact a nominal copula which appears in possessive noun phrases as a result of Predicate Inversion of the possessor (*John*).

¹² Example (31b) is quite similar to the Rumanian example (ib), which is the Predicate Inversion variant of (ia). Importantly, *al dracului* bears genitive case.

(i) a. Casa e [mare al dracului] (Mallinson 1986)
house-DET be:3SG big:SG POSSESSIVE ARTICLE-M.SG devil:DET-GEN
'The house is devilishly big'

b. Casa e [al dracului de mare]

¹³ That a movement dependency is involved here is shown by its sensitivity to island constraints, e.g. the Coordinate Structure Constraint (cf. (ia)). Subextraction of *cît* is only permitted if it applies in an Across-the-Board fashion, as in (ib).

(i) a. *Cît_i e Maria [[t_i de frumoasă] si [extrem de harnică]]!

b. Cît_i e Maria [t_i de frumoasă] si Donca [t_i de harnică]]!

How-much is Maria — of beautiful and Donca — of industrious

'How beautiful Maria is and how industrious Donca is'

¹⁴ Example (i) shows that *cît* also appears as a predicate in copular constructions.

(i) Cît e ceasul, vă rog?

How-much is time-the, please

'What is the time, please?'

¹⁵ The indefinite article *een* in (37) is called 'spurious', for it does not seem to belong to the plural noun that follows (*jongens*): *een* is compatible with singular nouns only.

¹⁶ *Ca* is also found in equative constructions like (i) and is increasingly used in comparative constructions (cf. (ii)).

(i) a. Viața mea nu e tot [atît de bună ca a ta]

life-det my:F.SG neg be:3SG still so much of good:F.SG as pos:F.SG your:F.SG

'My life isn't as good as yours'

b. E [la fel de înalt ca mine]

be:3SG the same as tall:M.SG as me

'He is as tall as me'

(ii) Ion e mai mic ca mine

Ion be:3SG more small:M.SG than me

'Ion is smaller than me'

¹⁷ 'KP' does not stand for Kase phrase. It refers to 'Konjunction', which is intended to stand for the notion of conjunction in a quite general way. 'K' is used rather than 'C' to prevent confusion with the notion C(omplementizer) P(hrase).

¹⁸ In the Rumanian examples, K° is phonetically empty. This can plausibly be interpreted as a doubly filled XP-effect. In a language like Dutch, the displaced pro-predicate and K° can both be lexicalized in certain structural environments. Consider, for example, the following example, where the simuli-phrase KP acts as an appositive (small) clause.

(i) a. Marie is [behendig, zo als een hinde]

'Mary is [behendig, so as a hind (i.e. like a hind)']

b. behendig<1,5> [_{KP} zo_i [_{K°} als [_{XP} een hinde [_{X°} t_i]]]]

¹⁹ Observe that the string *ca de obicei* (so of custom/habit; 'usually') contains the element *de*. This string arguably involves Predicate Inversion of *ca* across the (nominal) subject *obicei*, triggering the appearance of the nominal copula *de*:

(i) [_{NP} ca_i [_F [F+X_i (=de)] [_{XP} obicei [_{X°} t_i]]]]

²⁰ Besides permitting leftward displacement of a simuli-phrase like *ca peria* in (46), Rumanian displays such constructions as (i), where we have the wh-predicate *cît* ('how-much'), rather than *ca*, in the [Spec,KP]-position.

(i) Are o casă [cît un palat de mare] (Mallinson 1986:175)

have:3SG a:F house how much a:M palace of big:SG

'He has a house as big as a palace'

The derivation of this construction is depicted in (ii). In (iia), the wh-predicate *cît*

'how much' is in its base position, i.e. the predicate position of the Small Clause. In (iib), the wh-predicate has been moved to [Spec,KP]. In (iic), where the nominal copula *de* appears, the complex KP-projection has been shifted leftward across the adjectival 'subject' *mare*.

- (ii) a. $[_{XP} \text{ mare } [_X' [_{XP} \text{ Spec } [_K K [_{XP} \text{ un palat } [_X X^0 \text{ cit}]]]]]]]$
 b. $[_{XP} \text{ mare } [_X' [_{XP} \text{ cit}_q [_K K [_{XP} \text{ un palat } [_X X^0 \text{ t}_q]]]]]]]$

c. $[_{FP} [_{KP} \text{ cit}_q [_K K [_{XP} \text{ un palat } [_X X^0 \text{ t}_q]]]]]_j [_F F+X_i (=de) [_{XP} \text{ mare } [_X t_i \text{ t}_j]]]]]$

21 I'd like to thank Anna Cardinaletti for pointing out this argument to me.

22 *Come*-phrases also appear as adverbial modifiers in VP-contexts: e.g. *Studia come un matto* (He studies like a madman; 'He studies very hard').

23 Such a syntactic derivation of *estrema+mente* is compatible with the distribution of the open vowel, as discussed above.

24 The German word *wie* also shows up in exclamative constructions (i) and similar/equative-expressions (ii):

- (i) [Wie stark] ist Karl!
 'How strong Karl is!
 (ii) so stark [wie ein Bär]
 'as strong as a bear'

25 Consider in this context also the French interrogative expression *comment* ('how'). Although a full analysis of this phrase is beyond the scope of this paper, the approach adopted here suggests an analysis as depicted in (i):

- (i) $[_{KP} WH_j [_K \text{ comme } [_{XP} \text{ ment } [_X X \text{ t}_j]]]]]$

In French, we also find constructions like (ii), which is quite similar to the Finnish example (31b) in the main text and the Rumanian example (ib) of footnote 12. In this example, a predicate nominal *diable* acts as the inverted predicate within KP. The structure is arguably the one in (iib):

- (ii) a. Ce gâteau est [diablément bon]
 This pastry is devil-ly good
 'This pastry is very good'
 b. $[_{KP} \text{ diable}_j [_K K [_{XP} \text{ ment } [_X X \text{ t}_j]]]]]$

26 *Che*, which occupies the specifier position of the displaced KP, cannot be moved out of the adjectival phrase: **Che sei brutto!* (What he/she/it is ugly; 'How ugly he/she/it is!'). This may be due to the fact that it is too deeply embedded within the adjective phrase, i.e. *che* itself does not occupy the specifier position of DegP, which functions as an escape hatch for extraction; *che* rather occupies the specifier position of KP, which in turn occupies [Spec,DegP]. Interestingly, the Rumanian *ce*-exclamative (cf. (i)) displays the same extraction behavior (data from Grosu 1974):

- (i) a. Ce frumoasă e Maria!
 What beautiful is Maria
 'How beautiful Maria is!
 b. *Ce e frumoasă Maria!

These facts plausibly receive the same analysis as the one I have proposed for the Italian *che*-exclamative.

27 See Postma (1994), Bennis (1995), Corver & Den Dikken (1998) for a discussion of the configurational definition of illocutionary properties.

28 The pro-predicate *così* ('so'), which can express the degree of some property, can also occur in postadjectival position when it is used deictically:

- (i) Il pesce era [grande così]!
 The fish was big so
 'The fish was so big!' (a gesture indicates the size of the fish)

In non-deictic contexts, *così* typically precedes the modified adjective:

- (ii) Il treno era così pieno che molti dovettero stare in piedi

The train was so full that many had-to stand on feet

'The train was so full that many people had to stand'

29 In this article I haven't discussed the English constructions in (1) (*extremely tall* and *incredibly stupid*). In future work, I will argue that these adjectival constructions feature predicate inversion as well and that the adverbial marking *-ly* should be interpreted as the copular element.

Bibliographical References

- AARTS, BAS (1994), "The syntax of binominal noun phrases in English", *Dutch working papers in English language and linguistics* 30, Leiden, revised ms. (August 1995), University College London.
- ABNEY, STEVEN (1987), *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect*, Doctoral Dissertation, MIT.
- BENNIS, HANS (1995), "The meaning of structure: the *wat voor* construction revisited", in MARCEL DEN DIKKEN & KEES HENGVELD (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1995:25-36.
- BENNIS, HANS, NORBERT CORVER & MARCEL DEN DIKKEN (1998), "Predication in nominal phrases", *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1:85-117.
- BOWERS, JOHN (1975), "Adjectives and adverbs in English", *Foundations of Language* 13:529-562.
- BRACCO, CLAUDIO (1980), "On the island character of Italian *Quanto* comparatives", *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 1:19-46.
- BRESNAN, JOAN (1973), "Syntax of the comparative clause construction in English", *Linguistic Inquiry* 4.3:275-343.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (1970), "Remarks on nominalization", in RODERICK A. JACOBS & PETER S. ROSENBAUM (eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar*, Waltham, Mass.: Ginn and Co., 184-221.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (1981), *Lectures on government and binding: The Pisa Lectures*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (1986), *Barriers*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (1993), "A minimalist program for linguistic theory", in KENNETH HALE & SAMUEL JAY KEYSER (eds.), *The view from building 20: Essays in Linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1993:1-52.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM (1995), *The Minimalist Program*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- CORVER, NORBERT (1990), *The syntax of left branch extractions*, Doctoral Dissertation, Tilburg University.
- CORVER, NORBERT (1991), "The internal syntax and movement behavior of the Dutch 'wat voor'-construction", *Linguistische Berichte* 133:190-228.
- CORVER, NORBERT (1997a), "Much-support as a last resort", *Linguistic Inquiry* 28.1:119-164.
- CORVER, NORBERT (1997b), "The internal syntax of the Dutch extended adjectival projection", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15:289-368.

- CORVER, NORBERT (1998), "Predicate movement in pseudopartitive constructions", in ARTEMIS ALEXIADOU & CHRIS WILDER (eds.), *Possessors, predicates and movement in the determiner phrase*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1998:215-257.
- CORVER, NORBERT & HENK VAN RIEMSDIJK (eds.), (forthcoming), *Semi-lexical Categories. On the function of content words and the content of function words*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- DIKKEN, MARCEL DEN (1995), "Copulas", paper presented at GLOW 18, Tromsø; ms., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
- DIKKEN, MARCEL DEN (1998), "Predicate inversion in DP", in ARTEMIS ALEXIADOU & CHRIS WILDER (eds.), *Possessors, predicates and movement in the determiner phrase*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1998:177-214.
- EMONDS, JOSEPH (1976), *A transformational approach to English syntax*, New York, Academic Press.
- EDMONDS, JOSEPH (1985), *A unified theory of syntactic categories*, Dordrecht, Foris.
- FIENGO, ROBERT (1977), "On trace theory", *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:35-61.
- GIORGI, ALESSANDRA & GIUSEPPE LONGOBARDI (1991), *The syntax of noun phrases: Configuration, parameters, and empty categories*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- GROSU, ALEX (1974), "On the nature of the left branch condition", *Linguistic Inquiry* 5:308-319.
- HOEKSTRA, TEUN & RENÉ MULDER (1990), "Unergatives as copular verbs: Locational and existential predication", *The Linguistic Review* 7:1-79.
- JACKENDOFF, RAY (1977), *X' syntax: A study of phrase structure*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- KAYNE, RICHARD (1994), *The antisymmetry of syntax*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- MALLINSON, GRAHAM (1986), *Rumanian*, London, Croom Helm.
- MILNER, JEAN-CLAUDE (1978), *De la syntaxe à l'interprétation. Quantités, insultes, exclamations*, Paris, Editions du Seuil.
- MORO, ANDREA (1988), "Per una teoria unificata della frasi copulari", *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 13:81-110.
- MORO, ANDREA (1991), "The raising of predicates: copula, expletives and existence", in LISA L.S. CHENG & HAMIDA DEMIRDASH (eds.), *MIT Working papers in Linguistics 15: more papers on Wh-movement*, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT 1991:183-218.
- MORO, ANDREA (1997), *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- MURRELL, MARTIN & VIRGILIU ȘTEFĂNESCU-DRĂGĂNEȘTI (1980⁵), *Romanian. A complete course for beginners*, Kent, Hodder and Stoughton.
- NAPOLI, DONNA-JO (1989), *Predication theory. A case study for indexing theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- POSTMA, GERTJAN (1994), "The indefinite reading of WH", in REINEKE BOK-BENNEMA & CRIT CREMERS (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1994:187-198.
- RIVERO, MARÍA-LUISA (1980), "Theoretical implications of the syntax of left-branch modifiers in Spanish", *Linguistic Analysis* 6.4:407-461.
- RIZZI, LUIGI (1990), *Relativized Minimality*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- SCHWARZE, CHRISTOPH (1988), *Grammatik der italienischer Sprache*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- SULKALA, HELENA & MERJA KARJALAINEN (1992), *Finnish*, London, Routledge.
- SZABOLCSI, ANNA (1992), "Subordination: Articles and Complementizers", in ISTVAN KENESEI & CSABA PLÉH (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian 4: The structure of Hungarian*, Jate, Szeged, 1992:123-137.
- VAINIKKA, ANNE (1993), "The three structural cases in Finnish", in Anders Holmberg and Urpo Nikanne, eds., *Case and other functional categories in Finnish syntax*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 1993:129-159.
- ZAGONA, KAREN (1990), "Mente adverbs, compound interpretation and the projection principle", *Probus* 2:1-30.
- ZAMPARELLI, ROBERTO (1993), "Pre-nominal modifiers, degree phrases and the structure of AP", WPL, University of Venice.
- ZWARTS, JOOST (1992), *X-syntax - X-semantics. On the interpretation of functional and lexical heads*, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Utrecht.