ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTIC THEORY 2006

Volume 303

Danièle Torck and W. Leo Wetzels (eds.)

Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2006
Selected papers from 'Going Romance', Amsterdam, 7–9 December 2006

ROMANCE LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTIC THEORY 2006

SELECTED PAPERS FROM 'GOING ROMANCE', AMSTERDAM, 7–9 DECEMBER 2006

Edited by

DANIÈLE TORCK
VU University Amsterdam

W. LEO WETZELS
VU University Amsterdam & Paris III, Sorbonne Nouvelle/LPP, CNRS

FOREWORD

The annual conference series Going Romance is an international initiative of the universities in the Netherlands that engage in linguistic research on Romance languages. Since its inception in the eighties of the past century, the conference has developed into a major European discussion forum where ideas about language and linguistics and about Romance languages are put in an interactive perspective, giving space to both universality and Romance-internal variation.

Since just before the new millennium, the organization publishes a proceedings-like volume, entitled Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory. An invitation to address a key-note lecture includes the possibility to publish the corresponding paper in the volume. For publications by selected speakers a separate review procedure has been agreed upon.

The current volume, Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2006, contains a selection of the papers that have been presented at the twentieth Going Romance conference, which was held at the VU University Amsterdam on December 7–8, 2006.

We wish to thank all those who contributed to the success of this edition of Going Romance. First of all, our thanks go to the invited speakers, selected speakers, presidents of sessions, participants and discussants, for creating that lively atmosphere during the couple of days that we were together.

Our thanks also go to the colleagues that helped in selecting the abstracts, assisted with technical help, and – last but not least – reviewed the papers that were submitted. We feel that the quality of the current volume is largely dependent on their positively critical attitude.

Finally, our thanks go to the institutions that supported us financially: the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), the Faculty of Humanities of the VU University, the Algemeen Steunfonds VU, the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam (UvA), the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics, and the Faculty of Humanities of the Radboud University Nijmegen.

We also thank Jeroen van de Weijer for his work in editing and preparing the final manuscript and Matt Coler for his organisational help.

Amsterdam, April 2009
Danièle Torck
Leo Wetzels

CONTENTS

UNPRONOUNCED MUCH AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF DEGREE EXPRESSIONS IN SPANISH*

ANTONIA ANDROUTSOPOULOU
and MANUEL ESPAÑOL-ECHEVARRIA
Université Laval

This paper focuses on the distribution of degree adjectival modifiers in Spanish. We distinguish two series of morphologically related degree expressions in Spanish: *–to* vs. *–to*less forms, i.e. *tanto* 'so much' vs. *tan* 'so'. In the framework of Corver's (1997) Split-DegP Hypothesis, it will be shown that the distribution of these two series of degree expressions corresponds to that of Q-heads (*–to* forms) and Deg-heads (*–to*less forms). We argue that Q-heads, as opposed to Deg-heads, are nominals, more concretely adjectives, and that they license an unpronounced MUCH head (cf. Kayne 2002). MUCH will be shown to play a crucial role in the account of the distribution of Q-heads and Deg-heads in Spanish. We also consider the relationship between MUCH in Spanish and overt *much* in English *much*-support contexts, as well as the somewhat different conditions determining the licensing of these two elements. Finally, we argue that the postulation of an unpronounced MUCH accounts for the particular syntactic properties of *very* in English.

1. *Deg-heads and Q heads in Spanish*

Corver (1997) proposes to incorporate into Abney's (1987) DegP analysis for degree expressions a categorial distinction between elements like *more*, *less* and *enough* (Q-heads) and elements like *so, too* and *as* (Deg-heads), see also Bresnan (1973).[1] One main piece of evidence for this distinction comes from contexts in which the adjectival phrase does not follow the degree expression, but rather the latter is followed by an adjectival pro-form or by the trace of a displaced AP, as shown in the English *so*-pronominalization and Dutch Split-topicalization contexts in (1) and (2) respectively:

[1] The syntactic status of degree expressions like *enough, much,* etc. as heads is controversial; see Doetjes (1997, 2001) and Neeleman et al. (2004) for an analysis of Q-heads as adjuncts.

(1)   a.   John is *good at mathematics*. He seems [**enough** *so* to enter
              our graduate program].
       b. * The weather was *hot* in Cairo – [**so** *so*, that we stayed indoors all
              day].   Corver (1997:126-127)

(2)   a.   *Bang voor honden*$_i$ is Jan [**minder** t_i dan   Karel].
              afraid of   dogs   is Jan less   than Karel
              'Jan is less afraid of dogs than Charles.'
       b. * *Bang voor honden*$_i$ is   Jan   [**te** t_i].
              afraid of   dogs   is   Jan   too
              'John is too afraid of dogs.'   Corver (1997:127)

Deg-heads, such as English *so* and Dutch *te* 'too', cannot modify an AP pro-form,
cf. (1b), or the trace of a displaced AP, cf. (2b), whereas Q-heads such as English
enough or Dutch *minder* 'less' are perfect in the same contexts.
        Romance languages also present a similar split between Deg-heads and Q-
heads. In Spanish, certain degree expressions are disallowed in adjectival C(litic)
L(eft) D(islocated) C(ontexts), whereas others are fully acceptable, as shown in
(3)-(4), where the clitic *lo* 'it' doubles the topicalized adjective:[2]

(3)   a.   Este   libro   es   tan/muy   interesante.
              this   book   is   so/very   interesting
              'This book is so/very interesting.'
       b. * Interesante, este   libro lo es tan/muy [$_{AP}$ t].
              interesting this   book it-is so/very
              'This book is so/very interesting.'

(4)   a.   Este   libro es   demasiado/bastante   interesante.
              this   book is   too/enough   interesting
              'This book is interesting enough/too interesting.'
       b.   Interesante, este   libro lo es demasiado/bastante [$_{AP}$ t].
              interesting this   book it-is   too/enough
              'This book is interesting enough/too interesting.'

The Deg-heads *tan* 'so' and *muy* 'very' cannot occur when the adjective has been
clitic left dislocated, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (3b). On the other hand,
Q-heads such as *demasiado* 'too' and *bastante* 'enough' can modify a left
dislocated adjective, cf. (4b). In addition, Spanish Q-heads share with their
counterparts in English or French the property of occurring as modifiers of a
variety of phrasal constituents, as shown in (5):

(5)   a.   Juan es   bastante   alto.   AP quantification
              Juan is   enough   tall
              'Juan is tall enough.'

---

[2] For discussion of a similar pattern in French see Doetjes (2001).

b.   Juan no   tiene bastante   dinero.   NP quantification
Juan not   has enough   money
'Juan doesn't have enough money.'

c.   Juan juega bastante   al   ajedrez.   VP quantification
Juan plays enough   to-the   chess
'Juan plays chess quite often/?well.'

d.   Juan respondió bastante   rápidamente.   AdvP quantification
Juan answered enough   quickly
'Juan answered quickly enough.'

e.   Juan tiene bastantes   pocos   libros.   QP modification
Juan has   enough-PL few-PL   books
'Juan has few enough books.'

f.   Este libro es   bastante más interesante   Comparative modif.
this book is   enough more interesting
'This book is far more interesting.'

Deg-heads, on the other hand, are mostly restricted to AP, AdvP and QP modification, as shown in the paradigm in (6):[3]

(6) a.   Juan no   es   tan/muy   alto.   AP quantification
Juan not   is   so/very   tall
'Juan is not too/very tall.'

b.   Juan no   vino tan/muy   rápidamente.   AdvP quantification
Juan not   came so/very   quickly
'Juan didn't come so/very quickly.'

c.   Juan no   tiene tan/muy   pocos libros   QP modification
Juan not   has so/very   few   books
'Juan doesn't have so/very few books.'

d. * Juan no tiene tan/muy dinero.   NP quantification
Juan not has so/very money
'Juan doesn't have a lot of money.'

e. * Juan no   juega tan/muy al   ajedrez.   VP quantification
Juan not   plays so/very to-the chess
'Juan doesn't play chess so often/well.'

f. * Este libro no   es   tan/muy más interesante. Comparative mod.
Este book not is   so/very more interesting
'This book is not much more interesting.'

In sum, the paradigm in (3)-(6) shows that Spanish *tan* 'so' and *muy* 'very' behave as Deg-heads, whereas *bastante* 'enough' and *demasiado* 'too much/many' pattern with Q-heads.

---

[3] See however section 5 for further discussion.

2.   *Two series of degree expressions in Spanish*

A subset of degree expressions in Spanish show two different forms, cf. (7)-(8):

(7) a. tan 'so'   (8) a. tanto 'so much/many'
     b. cuán 'how'[4]   b. cuánto 'how much/many'
     c. muy 'very'   c. mucho 'very much/many'

The distribution of the forms in (7) and (8) follows that of Deg-heads and Q-heads respectively, as shown by the contrasts in (9) and (10):

(9) a.   Importante, este tema   no lo es   tanto/*tan [$_{AP}$ t].
           important, this subject not it-is   so much/so
           'This subject is not so important.'
     b. * Este tema no es   (tanto)   importante (tanto).
            this subject not is   (so much) important   (so much)
           'This subject is not so important.'

(10) a.   Importante, este tema   no lo es   mucho/*muy [$_{AP}$ t].
           important, this subject not it-is   much/very
           'This subject is not very important.'
     b. * Este tema   no   es   (mucho) importante   (mucho).
            This subject   not   is   (much) important   (much)

The examples under (a) illustrate the contrast between *–to* and *-to*less forms: the latter cannot modify a displaced AP, cf. section 2, whereas the former can. The (b) examples show that the *–to* forms cannot be analyzed as adverbial modifiers of the copula *es* 'is' in the contexts under consideration, since the *–to* forms cannot occur in the postverbal field when the adjective follows the copula.

---

[4] In most dialects, *cuán* 'how' has become obsolete. In some of them, for instance certain varieties of Mexican Spanish, the analytical form *qué tan* lit. 'what so' is used instead, as in (i):

(i)   ¿Qué tan   altos son tus   hijos?
        what so   tall   are your children
       'How tall are your children?'

In others, *cómo* 'how' is used instead of the Deg-head *cuán* 'how', as in the example in (ii):

(ii)   ¿Cómo   son   de   altos tus   hijos?
        how are   of   tall   your children
       'How tall are your children?'

However, *cómo* 'how' in (ii) shows properties quite different from those of Deg-heads. Firstly, the preposition *de* 'of' must obligatorily appear in front of the AP, and secondly, the modified AP may not be fronted together with the wh-element, as opposed to what is the case with *cuán* 'how' and *qué tan* 'what so'. The discussion of degree elements like *cómo* 'how' or *igual* 'as' in *igual de alto que* 'as tall as' falls beyond the scope of this paper, see Rivero (1980) and Corver (2001) for relevant discussion.

3.   *So-pronominalization and Much-support*

Corver (1997) accounts for many of the empirical differences between Deg-heads and Q-heads by claiming that they occupy different positions in the extended projection of APs. The tree in (11) shows the possible positions occupied by degree expressions (Deg-heads, Q-heads and adverbs) in the adjectival/adverbial domain:

(11) $[_{DegP} [_{Deg} \{so, too, as, how\}] [_{QP} \{extremely, very, much^5\}$
     $[_Q \{more, less, enough, much\}] [_{A(dv)P}]]]$.

According to (11), Deg-heads are heads of DegP, a projection above QP, the projection occupied by Q-heads and adverbs. The ungrammaticality of the *so*-pronominalization cases, such as the one in (12), cf. (1b):

(12) * The weather was *hot* in Cairo – [**so** *so*, that we stayed indoors all day].

is explained on the basis of the assumption that the Deg-head, **so** in (12), must θ-bind the degree argument of the adjectival pro-form *so* it quantifies on. According to Corver (1997), θ-binding must be local, and therefore the adjectival head must raise up to Q_0 in a structure like (11), otherwise Q_0 would qualify as closest governor with respect to A_0. Under the assumption that the pro-form *so* is not an X_0 category, it is barred from raising to Q_0 in accordance with Chomsky's (1995:223) Uniformity Condition on Chains, as shown in (13):

(13) * $[_{DegP} [_{Deg0} so_i] [_{QP} [_{Q0} [_{AP} so_{<di> j}]]$ $t_j]]$.

                                    *

Consequently, the degree argument of the adjectival pro-form is not θ-bound by the Deg-head and (12) is ungrammatical. The locality requirement on θ-binding of the adjectival degree argument can be met by the introduction of a dummy element, i.e. *much*, in the derivation, cf. (14a), an operation that Corver (1997) labels *much*-insertion:

(14) a.   The weather was *hot* in Cairo – [so **much** *so* that we
              stayed indoors all day].
      b. $[_{DegP} [_{Deg} so_i] [_{QP} [_Q much_{<di>}] [_{AP} so_{<di>}]]]$.

Much is introduced under Q_0 and copies the degree argument of *so*, allowing at the same time for a proper θ-binding configuration, cf. (14b). *Much*-insertion is thought of as a last resort operation, and as such, it does not apply in contexts like the one in (15a), in which the adjective can raise to Q_0:

---

[5] According to Corver (1997), this is a contentful homophone of the dummy *much* heading QP.

(15) a.   so (* much) intelligent
      b. * $[_{DegP}[_{Deg}$ so$_i$] $[_{QP}[_Q$ much$_{<di>}$] $[_{AP}$ intelligent$_{<di>}$]]].

Corver (1997) argues that *much*-insertion in (15b) is a more costly operation than A_0-to-Q_0 raising.

   Although Corver's (1997) account of the ungrammaticality of cases like (12) can be readily extended to explain the ungrammaticality of cases like (9a) with *tan* 'so', and (10a) with *muy* 'very' in Spanish, this language lacks the operation of *much*-insertion and uses a different strategy: the licensing of *–to* forms.

4.   *Two accounts of the distribution of Deg-heads and Q-heads*

Degree modification of an AP-trace by a Deg-head is disallowed in Spanish, as shown in (9a), repeated under (16) for convenience:

(16) * Importante, este tema   no   lo es tan [$_{AP}$ t].
       important, this subject   not   it-is so
       'This subject is not so important.'

The ungrammaticality of (16) can be accounted for, following Corver's (1997) analysis in the preceding section, by claiming that the Deg-head *tan* 'so' cannot θ-bind the degree argument of the preposed adjective. However, the grammaticality of (17), involving the *–to* counterpart of *tan* 'so', i.e. *tanto* 'so much', cf. (9a):

(17)   Importante, este tema   no   lo es tanto   [$_{AP}$ t].
       important, this subject   not   it-is so much
       'This subject is not so important.'

cannot be straightforwardly explained on the basis of Corver's *much*-insertion operation, since Spanish does not have a lexical counterpart of English *much* to insert. A possible account of the grammaticality of (17) under Corver's general approach could be based on the Q-head nature of Spanish *tanto* 'so much/many', cf. section 3. If *tanto* 'so much/many' is a Q-head, then it does not require A_0-to-Q_0 raising in the configuration in (13), since a Q-head under QP can locally bind the degree argument of AP. Consequently, *-to* forms are acceptable in CLLD contexts, cf. (17), in the same way other Q-heads like *bastante* 'enough' or *demasiado* 'too' are, cf. (4b). However, such an approach runs into problems when we consider direct degree AP modification, as in (18):

(18) Este tema   es   tan/*tanto/bastante   importante.
      this subject   is   so/so much/enough   important
      'This subject is too important/important enough.'

A run of the mill Q-head like *bastante* 'enough' can directly modify an AP, but not *tanto* 'so much', or any other *–to* form. In such a context *tan* 'so', or *–to*less counterparts in general, must occur.

Under Corver's (1997) analysis, cf. section 4, dummy *much* is excluded from direct degree AP modification on the basis of *much*-insertion being a more costly operation than A_0-to-Q_0 raising. However, *-to* forms do not seem to involve any sort of *much*-insertion operation, and therefore, Corver's economy based account cannot be extended to explain the ungrammaticality of direct degree AP modification by *–to* elements, cf. (18).

Doetjes (2001) deals with the distributional properties of Deg-heads and Q-heads in a different way.[6] Under her approach, degree quantifiers, i.e. Corver's Q-heads, are not heads, but rather adjuncts, whereas Deg-heads are real heads. From this basic distinction, it follows that Deg-heads impose strict selectional restrictions, whereas degree quantifiers are compatible with more categories. This approach directly derives the fact observed in section 2, cf. (5)-(6), that Q-heads in Spanish can modify a wider range of phrasal categories than Deg-heads, namely APs, NPs, VPs, AdvPs, QPs, and comparatives. Under this same approach, the fact that *–to* degree quantifiers (i.e. *tanto* 'so much' or *mucho* 'very much'), which have Deg-head counterparts (i.e. *tan* 'so' and *muy* 'very' respectively), cannot modify an AP, in contrast to other Q-heads (for instance, *bastante* 'enough') which do not have a *–to*less counterpart:

(19) a.   Juan   es   *mucho/muy   inteligente.
           Juan   is   very much/very   intelligent
           'Juan is very intelligent.'
     b.   Juan   es   bastante   inteligente
           Juan   is   enough   intelligent
           'Juan is intelligent enough.'

is explained assuming that the Deg-head form *muy* 'very' blocks the occurrence of its Q-head counterpart *mucho* 'very much' in (19). Deg-heads, unlike Q-heads, select only for APs.[7] Consequently, they will block the occurrence of Q-heads in a context in which both would be in principle possible. Q-heads are just elsewhere forms occurring in contexts where Deg-heads are not possible due to selectional restrictions, i.e. as degree modifiers of non-AP categories. Other degree quantifiers, like *bastante*, do not have a Deg-head counterpart and consequently they are not blocked in the context in (19b).

This account can be extended to CLLD contexts such as the one in (16)-(17), repeated here under (20)-(21):

---

[6] See also Doetjes (1997) and Neeleman et al. (2004).
[7] Obviously, for this account to work, it should be shown that Spanish adverbs and quantifiers are adjectival in nature, i.e. [+N, +V], see section 2.

(20) * Importante, este tema   no   lo es tan [AP? t].
        important, this subject   not   it-is so
        'This subject is not so important.'

(21) Importante, este tema   no   lo es tanto   [AP? t].
        important, this subject   not   it-is so much
        'This subject is not so important.'

under the additional assumption that the post-copular empty category in (20)-(21)
does not correspond to an AP, cf. Doetjes (2001) and Neeleman et al. (2004). If
so, the selectional restrictions of the Deg-head *tan* 'so', would be violated, cf.
(20), and the occurrence of its *–to* counterpart, i.e. *tanto* 'very much', would be
triggered, cf. (21). For such an account to go through, Spanish Deg-heads must be
assumed to be able to quantify on gradable adjectives only. This assumption,
however, cannot be maintained, because evidence to the contrary is available in
Spanish. Consider, for instance, the case of gradable predicative nouns such as
amigo 'friend' in (22):

(22) a.   Juan y   Julia no   son   tan/*tanto amigos
            Juan and Julia not   are   so/so much friends
      b.   ¿Cuán/*cuánto   amigos   son Juan y   Julia?
            how/how much   friends   are Juan and   Julia
      c.   Juan y   Julia son   muy/*mucho   amigos.
            Juan and Julia are   very/ very much friends

In spite of the fact that an uncontroversial noun like *amigo* 'friend' follows the
degree word, *–to*less forms, i.e. Deg-heads, are the only possibility, while *-to*
elements are banned. Moreover, as illustrated in (23), Q-heads like *bastante*
'enough' and *demasiado* 'too' are also fine as degree modifiers of a noun.

(23) Juan y   Julia son bastante/demasiado   amigos.
      Juan and Julia are enough/too much   friends

Therefore, we conclude that the distribution of Deg-heads and Q-heads cannot be
accounted for just on the basis of the categorial selectional properties of Deg-
heads plus an Elsewhere Condition for the distribution of the Q-heads.[8] As shown
in (22), Deg-heads are possible as degree quantifiers on nouns as well as degree
modifiers of adjectives.
        In certain cases of NP-modification, the complementary distribution be-
tween *-to* and *–to*less forms may even break down, as shown in the examples
in (24):

---

[8] Note that the fact that a Deg-head can co-occur with a noun does not pose any problem for
Corver's (1997) account. Provided that the noun *amigo* 'friend' in (22) has a degree argument, this
argument can in principle be bound by a Deg-head. Under this approach, the ungrammaticality of
–to Q-heads in these cases is, however, unexpected, see also (18) for discussion.

(24) a. Josefa   es   muy mujer.
      Josefa   is   very woman
      (qualitative reading)
   b. Josefa   es   mucha   mujer   para ti.
      Josefa   is   much   woman   for you
      (quantitave reading)

In the context in (24) both a *–to* form, cf. *muy* 'very', and a *–to*less form, cf. *mucha* 'much', are possible. However, the two degree modifications do not share the same meaning. In (24a) *muy* 'very' denotes the degree of feminity of Josefa, and *muy mujer* 'very woman' is interpreted as a near synonym of *muy femenina* 'very feminine'. On the other hand, *mucho* 'much/a lot' quantifies on the NP *mujer* 'woman' as if it was a mass noun, quantitative reading. These examples show again that the distribution of Deg-heads and Q-heads is to a certain extent independent of the category they modify. In addition, the observed interpretative difference indicates that Deg-heads operate directly on a degree variable of the nominal, whereas Q-heads involve a quantity predicate, cf. Kennedy & McNally (2005) and Doetjes (to appear).

5. *Unpronounced MUCH and the distribution of degree expressions in Spanish*

Our account of the distribution of the Deg-heads and their Q-head counterparts, i.e. *-to* elements, in (7)-(8) relies on Corver's (1997) analysis of *much*-support. We would like to claim that *–to* elements, and Q-heads in general, license an unpronounced MUCH head.[9] In particular, we claim that CLLD contexts such as the one in (17) involve the configuration in (25):

(25) Importante, este tema   no lo   es [$_{QP}$ tanto$_i$ [$_Q$ MUCH$_{<di>}$] [$_{AP}$ t$_{<di>}$]].
    important   this subject not it   is   so much
    'This subject is not so important.'

Unpronounced MUCH copies the degree argument of the adjective, so that it can be θ-bound by the degree quantifier *tanto* 'so much'. This is essentially the role played by overt *much* in Corver's (1997) analysis of the analogous English *so*-pronominalization contexts in (14a). This proposal straightforwardly derives the distribution of *–to* Q-heads and *–to*less Deg-heads, cf. (7)-(8): whenever a degree argument of a gradable adjective/noun cannot be locally bound by a Deg-head, in

---

[9] The idea of an unpronounced MUCH as complement of a quantifier like *enough* goes back at least to Jackendoff (1977). Spanish, as opposed to English, does not have overt *much*. This may be due to the fact that English *much* occurs as a result of a last resort operation, cf. Corver (1997), whereas unpronounced MUCH does not. The absence of overt *much* may be indirectly explained by the fact that all Deg-heads in Spanish have a Q-head counterpart. In fact, it could be argued that all Spanish Deg-heads derive historically from Q-heads. This is the case for *mucho/muy*, and a possibility for *cuanto/cuán* and *tanto/tan*, cf. Corominas (1980) and the references therein.

the sense of locality discussed in section 4, unpronounced MUCH must occur. In (18) and (22) –*to* Q-heads are excluded, since a Deg-head, i.e. *tan* 'so', *muy* 'very' or *cuán* 'how', can locally bind the degree argument of the adjective without unpronounced MUCH. In all cases in which there is no Deg-head available or A_0-to-Q_0 raising is not possible, cf. (25) or (10a), a degree quantifier licenses MUCH.

Now the question arises of why overt *much*-insertion can rescue a derivation in which a Deg-head binds the degree argument of an AP pro-form in English, whereas, in Spanish, unpronounced MUCH cannot. That is, we are looking for the reason of the contrast in (26):

(26) a.   The wheather was *hot* in Cairo – [so **much** *so* that we
                  stayed indoors all day].   cf. (14a)
       b. * Importante, este tema   no   lo es tan **MUCH** [$_{AP}$ t].
             important, this subject   not it-is so
             'This subject is not so important.'   cf. (24)

In (26a), *much*-insertion copies the degree argument of the *so* pro-form, and allows local binding of this argument by the Deg-head. Following the same line of reasoning, unpronounced MUCH would have the same impact on (26b), but the output is still ungrammatical. We would like to claim that the licensing conditions on overt *much* and unpronounced MUCH are somehow different. In fact, unpronounced MUCH is more limited in its distribution than overt *much*. The condition in (27) derives the desired results:

(27) Unpronounced MUCH is licensed by a +N element.[10]

Tan 'so' is clearly a non nominal category from a morphosyntactic point of view in Spanish: it lacks number or gender features characteristic of adjectives and nouns in this language. Thus, according to (27), *tan* 'so' or any Deg-head in Spanish, cf. (7), cannot license unpronounced MUCH, and consequently Deg-heads are excluded from CLLD contexts such as the one in (26b). On the other hand, Q-heads, including –*to* elements are nominals, more specifically adjectives, and as such, they have number and gender features, as shown in (28):

(28) *demasiado-a-os-as*   'too   much/many-(masc-sing)-(fem-sing)-(masc-pl)-
        (fem-pl)',
        bastante-s 'enough-(masc/fem-sing)-(masc/fem)-pl)',
        tanto-a-os-as 'so much/many-(masc-sing)-(fem-sing)-(masc-pl)-(fem-pl)',
        mucho-a-os-as 'much/many-(masc-sing)-(fem-sing)-(masc-pl)-(fem-pl)',
        etc.

These nominals, as opposed to Deg-heads, are able to license unpronounced MUCH, and therefore they can appear in CLLD contexts in Spanish. In sum, the distributional properties of Deg-heads and Q-heads are determined by the licensing

---

[10] This condition has been suggested in Kayne (2002).

of a MUCH head in Spanish. Unpronounced MUCH in Spanish has the same semantics as its English overt *much* counterpart, although they differ in the licensing conditions: licensing of MUCH, as opposed to *much*, seems to be determined by (27).

The suggested link between Q-heads and MUCH/*much* is also compatible with the particular behaviour of degree expressions in comparatives, illustrated in (5f) and (6f) repeated under (29) for convenience:

(29) Este libro es   mucho/*muy   más interesante.
    this book is   much/very   more interesting

Q-heads are required in comparative contexts, whereas D-heads are excluded, cf. (29). Extending Bresnan's (1973) analysis of English comparative forms *more/ less* to Spanish, we assume that *más/menos* 'more/less' are derived from *mucho/poco* plus a comparative morpheme. We would like to claim that the obligatory occurrence of Q-heads in these contexts has its source in the particular semantics of comparatives.[11] *Mucho* in (29) acts as a differential, cf. von Stechow (1984), measuring the difference between two points of a scale of interest. *Muy*, as well as other Deg-heads, cannot function as differentials, due to the fact that they cannot operate on parts of a scale, but rather just on points of a scale.[12]

Finally, the existence of an unpronounced MUCH also accounts for the similar distribution of Q-heads and *–mente* '-ly' adverbs in the contexts under consideration, as shown in the CLLD contexts in (30)-(31):

(30) a.   Esta novela   es   increíblemente   interesante.
          this novel   is   unbelievably   interesting

     b.   Interesante,   esta novela   lo es increíblemente.
          interesting   this novel   it-is unbelievably
          'This novel is unbelievably interesting.'

(31) a.   Esta novela   es   bien interesante.
          this novel   is   well interesting

---

[11] Comparative meaning also plays a similar role in degree modification of adverbs. In the general case, degree modification of adverbs must involve Deg-heads, as shown in (i):

i.   muy bien/desafortunadamente
      'very well/unfortunately'

However, when the adverb has a comparative meaning, Q-heads are required, as shown in (ii):

ii.   mucho antes/después
      'well before/after'

[12] It has been claimed, cf. Creswell (1976) for instance, that in cases like *The book is interesting* the adjective is interpreted as something like 'more interesting than X' where the degree X is supplied by context, but see Klein (1980) and Zwarts (1992) for criticism of such an analysis. The facts above are problematic for this treatment of bare adjectives as hidden comparatives, which is incompatible with the view taken in this paper.

    b. * Interesante,   esta novela   lo es bien.
        interesting   this novel   it-is well
        'This novel is very interesting'

As it was observed in the case of Q-heads, cf. section 2, -*mente* adverbs can also modify a CLLD adjective, cf. (30b). In this sense –*mente* adverbs like *increíblemente* 'unbelievably' in (30) contrast with other adverbs (without –*mente*) like *bien* 'well', which are unacceptable in the same CLLD contexts, cf. (31b). We can account for this contrast under the assumption that –*mente* adverbs, but not –*mente*less adverbs, are +N items, as it has been proposed in Déchaine & Tremblay (1996) and Baker (2003) among others. As +N elements, they can license an unpronounced MUCH, as opposed to –*mente*less adverbs which directly bind the degree variable in the adjectival predicate. As a consequence, only –*mente* adverbs can appear in CLLD contexts.[13]

    The analysis of Spanish degree expressions in adjectival contexts developed in this section is crucially based on the claim that Q-heads and adverbs, as opposed to Deg-heads, can license an unpronounced MUCH. The syntax of unpronounced heads such as MUCH, MANY, NUMBER or AMOUNT has been studied in great detail by Richard Kayne, cf. Kayne (2002, 2005, 2007), in particular with respect to the syntactic and semantic properties of determiners and quantifiers. From a conceptual point of view, the present analysis follows from the principle in (32), formulated in Kayne (2007:835)

(32) UG excludes the possibility of a single adjective such as *many* or *few* could simultaneously express what is expressed by the adjective *large* or *small* and what is expressed by the noun *number*.

In our case, we enrich the syntactic environment of Q-heads and adverbs with a counterpart of *number* in (32) which we call MUCH.

6.   *Unpronounced* MUCH *and degree adverbials in English*

Although an analysis of adjectival degree modification in English falls beyond the scope of this paper, we would like to consider the import of the proposals made in the preceding sections to an account of the syntactic properties of the degree modifier *very*. *Very* shares many properties with degree –*ly* adverbials like *terribly* or *extremely*. For instance, *very* or *extremely*, as opposed to degree heads, do not trigger degree fronting, cf. Hendrick (1990), Corver (2001), Kayne (2002), Matushansky (2002), as shown in (32):

---

[13] An anonymous reviewer points out that the distribution of –*mente* adverbs is not equivalent to that of Q-heads, in spite the fact that both can license unpronounced MUCH. In particular, Q-heads can occur as NP quantifiers, whereas –*mente* adverbs cannot. We would like to claim that this difference is due to the inability of –*mente* adverbs to be associated with scales other than degree scales. In other words, what make Q-heads capable to appear in NP contexts is that the can modify a variety of unpronounced nouns other than MUCH; namely, AMOUNT, NUMBER, MANY, etc., cf. Kayne (2007). We leave the explanation of why adverbs should be limited to degree scales for further research.

(32) a.   so/too interesting a movie
    b. *   very/extremely interesting a movie

In addition, *very* and degree adverbials seem to occupy the same syntactic position in the extended projection of adjectival phrases, i.e. following Deg-heads and preceding the AP, cf. (11), as shown in (33):

(33) This movie is so very/extremely interesting that …

Nonetheless, *very* contrasts with *–ly* adverbials with respect to *much*-support in *so*-pronominalization contexts, as shown in (34):

(34) a.   John was nervous, as a matter of fact extremely (??? much) so.
                                     cf. Corver (1997: 155)
    b.   John was nervous, as a matter of fact very *(much) so.

-*ly* adverbials are incompatible with *much*-support, cf. (34a), whereas *very* requires *much*-support, cf. (34b). Under the approach sketched out in section 6, the distinction between *very* and *–ly* adverbials can be stated as follows: *very,* as opposed to *–ly* adverbials,[14] is a –N lexical element[15]. Therefore, *very* cannot license MUCH in *so*-pronominalization contexts, as shown in (35):

(35) very $[_{QP} [_{Q}$ *MUCH/much] $[_{AP}$ so]].
    -N

Therefore, *much*-insertion will be required in (35) as a last resort operation, despite the fact that *very* is not a Deg-head in English.

7.   *Conclusion*

In this paper we have provided an account of the distribution of Deg-heads and Q-heads in Spanish as a function of the licensing of unpronounced MUCH. We have argued that MUCH must be licensed by a +N modifier, or alternatively through agreement with a +N modifier. Moreover, we have integrated the licensing of MUCH into Corver's (1997) Split-DegP Hypothesis and determined the licensing conditions on MUCH and overt *much*. Thus, a typology of syntactic operations enabling local θ-binding of a degree argument by a degree expression emerges. This typology includes A_0-to-Q_0 raising in the case of Deg-heads, licensing of MUCH in the case of degree quantifiers and adverbials, and *much*-insertion in *so*-pronominalization contexts. Under the assumption that locality in θ-binding is in

---

[14] See Déchaine & Tremblay (1996), Baker (2003) among others for the claim that *–ly* adverbials, as well as Spanish *–mente* adverbials, are categorially nominals.
[15] See also Kayne (2005), p. 153, on French *très* 'very'.

fact an interface condition, all the above cases come out as related strategies to meet readability at the C-I interface.[16]

References

Abney, Steven. 1987. *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Baker, Mark. 2003. *Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bresnan Joan. 1973. "Syntax of the comparative clause construction in English". *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 275-343.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. The Minimalist Program. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Corominas, Joan. 1980. *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. Madrid: Gredos.

Corver, Norbert. 1997. "*Much*-support as last resort". *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 119-164.

Corver, Norbert. 2001. "Predicative displacement within the adjectival system. Evidence from degree modification in Rumanian". *Adverbial Modification*, ed. by Reineke Bok-Bennema, Bob de Jonge, Brigitte Kampers-Mahne & Arie Molendijk, 139-156. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.

Creswell, Maxwell. 1976. "The semantics of degree". *Montague Grammar*, ed. by Barbara Partee, 261-292. New York: Academic Press.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Mireille Tremblay. 1996. "Adverbial PPs and prepositional adverbs in French and English". *CLA Annual Conference Proceedings 1996*. Calgary: University of Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics.

Doetjes, Jenny. 1997. *Quantifiers and selection. On the distribution of quantifying expressions in French, Dutch and English*. Doctoral dissertation, HIL/ Leiden University.

Doetjes, Jenny. 2001. "Beaucoup est ailleurs". *Adverbial Modification*, ed. by Reineke Bok-Bennema, Bob de Jonge, Brigitte Kampers-Mahne & Arie Molendijk, 125-138. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.

Doetjes, Jenny. To appear. "Adjectives and degree modification". *Adjectives and Adverbs: Syntax, Semantics and* Discourse, ed. by Louise McNally & Chris Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hendrick, Randall. 1990. "Operator Binding in NP". *Proceedings of the Ninth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. by A. Halperin, 249-264. Standford: CSLI.

Higginbotham, James. 1985. "On Semantics". *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:547-594.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X'-Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

---

[16] The interpretation of *-ly* adverbials like *extremely* in *extremely dangerous* seems to involve θ-identification of the external argument of the adjectival modifier with the degree argument of the adjective, rather than θ-binding. However, as argued in Higginbotham (1985), θ-identification must also be local. Therefore, the syntax of degree adverbials should involve similar strategies in order to meet locality at the C-I interface.

Kayne, Richard. 2002. "On Some Prepositions That Look DP-internal: English *of* and French *de*". *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 1:71-115 (Reprinted in Kayne 2005).

Kayne, Richard. 2005. *Movement and Silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kayne, Richard. 2007. "*Several, few* and *many*". *Lingua* 117:832-858.

Kennedy, Christopher & Louise McNally. 2005. "Scale structure and the semantic typology of gradable predicates". *Language* 81.2:345-381.

Klein, Ewan. 1980. "A Semantics for Positive and Comparative Adjectives". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4:1-45.

Matushansky, Ora. 2002. *Movement of Degree/Degree of Movement.* Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Neeleman, Ad, Hans van de Koot & Jenny Doetjes. 2004. "Degree expressions". *The Linguistic Review* 1-2004:1-66.

Rivero, María Luisa. 1980. "Theoretical implications of the syntax of left-branch modifiers in Spanish". *Linguistic Analysis* 6:407-461.

von Stechow, Arnim. 1984. "Comparing Theories of Comparison". *Journal of Semantics* 3:1-77.

Zwarts, Joost. 1992. *X'-syntax – X'-semantics: On the interpretation of functional and lexical heads*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Utrecht.

THE STATUS OF THE (SUPPOSED) EXPLETIVE IN BRAZILIAN PORTUGUESE EXISTENTIAL CLAUSES[*]

JUANITO AVELAR

Universidade Estadual de Campinas

This paper characterizes the occurrence of the pronoun *você* 'you' in Brazilian Portuguese existential clauses as an instance of an indeterminate pronoun, arguing against the idea that it corresponds to an expletive. I present some evidence that *você* is not directly merged in [Spec,TP], but in a thematic position within a locative predicate that is part of the existential coda.

1. *Introduction*

In Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth, BP), existential clauses with *ter* 'to have, to exist' can bring the pronoun *você* 'you' in subject position, as exemplified in (1) to follow.[1] Although there is no systematic study on this matter in the literature on BP, *você* is commonly described as an expletive (Duarte 1999, Callou & Avelar 2001) when placed in contexts like these. The main substance of this idea derives from the fact that the occurrence of *você* would make the sentence unacceptable if it were not an expletive, given that existential clauses are impersonal, and as such cannot present an external argument.[2]

(1) a. *(Você) tem   muitos castelos na   Europa*
         you   exist many   castles in-the   Europe
         'There are many castles in Europe.'

---

[1] In European Portuguese, the canonical existential verb is *haver*, which is treated along this paper.
[2] The data to be presented in this paper are in accord with judgments of speakers living in the metropolitan zone of Rio de Janeiro, in the South-Eastern Region of Brazil. However, evaluations of peoples from other Brazilian regions have shown that the use of *você* in existential contexts is generalized in the dialects in which this pronoun is largely used.

b. *(Você)   tinha   poucos computadores na   década de sessenta*
   you   existed few   computers   in-the   decade of sixty
   'There were few computers in the sixties.'

Adopting the Minimalist Program framework (Chomsky 2000, 2001), I will argue against the idea that *você* is an expletive when it is realized in *ter* existential sentences. My proposal is that the relevant version of *você* corresponds to an indeterminate pronoun, identical to the case presented in the non-existential context in (2) below.[3,4]

(2)   <u>*Você*</u> *pode encontrar roupas bem baratinhas no   centro*
       you   can find   clothes very cheap   in-the   center
       'One can find very cheap clothes downtown.'

To deal with the question of how this pronoun is licensed as the subject of impersonal clauses, I will explore the hypothesis that *você* is initially inserted into a locative phrase (LocP) that is part of the existential coda, and then moves to [Spec,TP] in order to satisfy grammatical requirements. These procedures are represented in (3), in which *você* is inserted and thematically interpreted in [Spec,LocP].

(3)   [$_{TP}$ você$_i$ [$_{T'}$ tem ... [$_{XP}$ [$_{DP}$ muitos castelos] [$_{X'}$ [$_{LocP}$ t$_i$ na Europa]]]]]

The main reason to assume a link between the pronoun and the locative phrase is the fact that the supposed expletive is licensed only if the existential clause presents a locative anchorage, as seen in (4) and (5) to follow. Note that the (a) instances, which do not accept *você*, do not present a locative phrase.

(4)   a. *As   crianças   acreditam que (*você) tem   fantasma*
          the children   believe   that you   exist ghost
          'Children believe that ghosts exist.'
       b. *As   crianças   acreditam que (você) tem   fantasma   dentro*
          the children   believe   that you   exist ghost   within
          de   casa   velha
          of   house   old
          'Children believe that there are ghosts in ancient houses.'

---

[3] See Cavalcante (1999) for a diachronic study on indeterminate pronouns in BP.
[4] Although the existential meaning is not altered by *você*, I think the pronoun triggers pragmatic effects. For example, if *você* is realized as in (1a), the sentence can express the content in (i).
(i) *Tem muitos castelos na   Europa   que   você pode ver   se você estiver lá*
    exist many castles in-the Europe   that you   can see   if you   is   there
    'There are many castles in Europe, and people can see them if they is there'

(5)   a. *(*você) tem   E.T.*
          you   exist E.T.
          'E.T.'s exist'
      b. *(você)   tem   E.T. em   diversos filmes   americanos*
          you   exist E.T. in   many   movies   Americans
          'There are E.T.s in many American movies'

If this view is correct, the presence of *você* does not conflict with the impersonal
character of the existential sentence, given that, as expected, there is no thematic
relation between the existential verb and the pronoun, but between the pronoun
and the predicative category heading the locative phrase.[5]

---

[5] The reviewer of this paper affirms that the reasons for considering the sentences in (1) as
existential are not clear. (S)he also enquires about the difference between those sentences and the
ones with TER + indeterminate SE, commonly described as possessive, as exemplified below.
(i) ... *nas   baixas latitudes tem-se   o clima   equatorial ...*
         in-the low   latitude have-SE the climate equatorial
         'The equatorial climate appears in low latitude zones.'
The example above, given by the reviewer, was taken from the Corpus NILC/São Carlos
(http://www.nilc.icmc.usp.br/), which stores data of written language. However, sentences with
TER + indeterminate SE are realized only in a very polite register, and cannot be considered as
part of the nuclear grammar of BP speakers. Moreover, recent variationist analyses have shown
that the frequency of *se* as an indeterminate pronoun is decreasing. In this sense, I think that we
cannot establish formal comparisons between VOCÊ+TER and TER+SE in BP, given that only the
former can be considered a truly grammatical expression in this language.
    The reviewer also present cases with TER + indeterminate SE in European Portuguese (EP),
where the indeterminate SE is largely used, in contrast with BP. At a first glance, the TER
sentences with *você* in (1) could correspond to the EP sentences with TER + indeterminate SE.
This fact would pose a problem for my analysis: given that EP does not accept *ter* as an existential
verb, we would be forced into characterizing the cases with VOCÊ+TER as instances of
possessive, and not existential sentences.
    However TER + indeterminate SE in EP is not used in the same contexts as VOCÊ+TER in
BP. The contexts exemplified in (ii)-(iii) below, for example, reject the indeterminate SE in EP,
but licenses VOCÊ in BP. The unacceptability of these cases in EP is probably due to the fact that
it is pragmatically strange that planets or the bigger river of the world have an indeterminate
owner; in other words, this sentences cannot be interpreted as possessive because of pragmatic
restrictions that prohibit the insertion of an indeterminate possessor indicate by SE. In contrast, the
use of *você* in these contexts is acceptable in BP because Brazilian speakers do not interpret these
sentences as possessive, but as existential constructions. In this sense, there is no possessive
relation between the indeterminate content of *você* and the complement of *ter*. I think this contrast
is sufficient to assume that the BP instances presented in (1) are existential, and not possessive.
(ii) a. **Tem-se   oito   planetas no   sistema   solar*   (EP)
            have-SE eight planets   in-the system   solar
            Lit.: 'One has eight planets in Solar System.'
      b. *Você tem   oito   planetas no   sistema solar*   (BP)
          you   exist eight planets   in-the system solar
          'There are eight planets in Solar System.'
(iii) a. **Tem-se   o maior rio   do   mundo   no   Brasil*   (EP)
            have-SE the bigger river of-the world   in-the Brazil
            Lit.: 'One has the bigger river of the world in Brazil.'
      b. *Você tem   o   maior rio   do   mundo   no   Brasil*   (BP)
          you   have   the   bigger river of-the world   in-the Brazil
          Lit.: 'There is the bigger river of world in Brazil.'

The paper is divided in the following way. In section 2, I concentrate on facts that cannot be appropriately explained if *você* is characterized as an expletive; in section 3, I present theoretical presuppositions on the structure of existential clauses in BP; section 4 highlights pieces of evidence for the structural link between *você* and a locative phrase; in section 5, the present analysis is associated with Kayne's (2006) view on categories commonly characterized as expletives; the paper is concluded in section 6.

2.   *Arguments against* você *as an expletive*

The fact that the supposed expletive can bind null subjects in coordinated sentences is one of the points that cannot be clearly explained within the view that *você* is an expletive. For example, in (6) to follow, the verb *recorrer* 'to resort' in the coordinated sentence requires an agentive subject with a generic interpretation. In this sentence, the agentive subject is an empty category *ec* bound by the pronoun in the subject position of the preceding existential clause. The sentence is unacceptable if *você* is not realized in the existential, presumably because there will be no element to bind the null subject. Considering this fact, it is strange that an expletive can bind an element in need of a thematic role.

(6)   *(Você$_i$) tinha   poucos computadores na   década de sessenta
       you   existed few   computers   in-the   decade of sixty
       e   por isso ec$_i$ recorria   a formas mais   rudimentares
       and   by   this   resorted   to ways   more   rudimentary
       para armazenar dados
       to   store   data
       'There were few computers in the sixties, and because of this people
         resorted to more rudimentary ways of storing data.'

The idea that *você* has emerged as an expletive because of morphological innovations in the BP inflectional paradigm is another problematic point. As BP has lost typical properties of null subject languages due to the impoverishment of its inflectional paradigm, Duarte (1999) and Callou & Avelar (2001) argue for the existence of a possible link between the emergence of an existential expletive and the loss of a rigidly pro-drop condition.[6] However, there are pro-drop languages that present expletives in existential clauses. In Italian, for example, the item *ci* is realized in existential sentences, as exemplified in (7) below. If *ci* functions as *there* in English existential sentences, occurring as expletives in the terms proposed in Burzio (1986),[7] then there can be no relation between being or not being a pro-drop grammar and rejecting or not rejecting expletives. In other

---

[6] For BP innovations in inflectional paradigms, see Duarte (1995), Galves (1996), Figueiredo Silva (1996), Ferreira (2000), Kato (2000), Kato, Duarte & Barbosa (2005), Rodrigues (2002).
[7] Kayne (2006) proposes that categories like *ci* and *there* are not real expletives (see section 5).

words, if the non-pro-drop status were a precondition for expletives, Italian would not present this type of category.

(7) *C'e un libro sul tavolo*
   there-is a book on-the table
   'There is a book on the table.'

Another fact without a clear explanation is the impossibility of inserting *você* in sentences with *haver* 'to exist', which is concurrent with *ter* in BP existential clauses. Given that *haver* is also impersonal, it would be expected that sentences with this verb could license an expletive. Contrary to expectations, sentences like (8) to follow show that *você* is not licensed in *haver* existential clauses.

(8) *(*Você) há muitos castelos na Europa*
   you exist many castles in-the Europe
   'There are many castles in Europe.'

As we can see, there are facts that cannot be satisfactorily explained within the view that *você* is an expletive. Taking these into account, I will propose that there is no difference between the version of *você* in the possessive *ter* sentence in (9) and the version in the existential *ter* sentence in (10). In (9), the sentence shows an indeterminate possessor expressed by *você*. The same *ter* sentence is realized in (10), but in a context that receives an existential interpretation; in this context, *você* cannot be interpreted as a possessor, but its indeterminate interpretation is maintained. In the next sections, I will argue for the idea that the crucial difference between the sentences in (9) and (10) has to do with the locus in which *você* is inserted: particularly in the existential version, the pronoun is initially merged in a point without relation with the thematic interpretation of possessor provided by *ter*. I will identify this point as a locus within the domain of a locative phrase that is part of the existential coda.

(9) <u>*Se você tem castelos na Europa,*</u> *então é porque você é rico*
   if you has castles in-the Europe, then is because you is rich
   'If one has castles in Europe, then it is because this one is rich.'

(10) <u>*Se você tem castelos na Europa,*</u> *é porque os europeus*
   If you exist castles in-the Europe, is because the Europeans
   se interessam por preservar sua história
   self interests by preserving their history
   'If there are castles in Europe, it is because the Europeans are interested in preserving their history'