

These two types of comparatives, those containing a free relative and those lacking it, have also been recognized in other romance languages (Donati 1997, Saez del Alamo 1999, Brucart 2003)—e.g., Donati contrasts standard comparatives in Italian, (2b), with restrictive relative comparatives, (12).

- (12) *Maria ha mangiato più biscotti di quelli che ha mangiato t_i Giulia.*
 Maria has eaten more cookies than those that has eaten Giulia

5. To capture the correlation between the degree expression and the degree clause it has been claimed that the comparative clause is selected by a degree word, forming with it a DegP that specifies a gradable predicate, (13a), (Bresnan 1973, Heim 2000, Bhatt & Pancheva 2004), or is the complement or modifier of Deg (e.g. Abney 1987, Kennedy 1997), (13b):

- (13) a. [_{AP} [_{DegP} Deg CP] A] b. [_{DegP} Deg AP CP] / . [_{DegP} [_{Deg'} Deg AP] CP]

In (13a), the degree clause precedes the Adjective. So, in classical analyses Extraposition operates placing the CP in a post-gradable predicate position. Starting with (13a), Bhatt & Pancheva 2004 adopt a different view: they claim that the obligatory Extraposition is not due to word order requirements, but to trace interpretation (Fox 2002). Besides, they claim that QR applies covertly, moving the degree head to a scope position and right adjoining it to a maximal projection, XP, containing the AP. Then, the degree clause is late merged to the raised Deg, (14), and at PF the copy of the moved degree head is spelled out:

- (14) [_{XP} [_{XP} [_{AP} [_{DegP} Deg]_i A]] [_{DegP-i} [_{Deg'} Deg CP]]]]

Although departing from those authors in not assuming the *wh* nature of the CP, we could try to accommodate this analysis to Portuguese, hypothesizing that the CP is a completive clause selected as a complement by Deg (cf. (13a)) and headed by *do que*, viewed as a complementizer instancing Force (we discard the possibility of analysing *do que* in current Portuguese as split C projections (Rizzi 1997), *de+o que*, because no overt expression may follow *de* nor precede *o que* in comparatives).

Yet, this analysis must be rejected. Late Merge does not apply to complements, but to Adjuncts (Lebaux 1988, Chomsky 2004). Besides, this hypothesis is inconsistent with the behaviour of clauses headed by other occurrences of the form *que* as a complementizer: while the latter exclude infinitival clauses, (15b), and gapping phenomena, (16b), *do que* sentences accept them, (15a) and (16a).

- (15) a. *Eles apreciam mais tu descansares do que nós ganharmos o concurso.*
 They appreciate more you (to) rest.Infinitive.2sg than we (to) win.Infinitive.2sg the contest
 b. *Eles apreciam que tu {descanses/*descansares}.*
 They appreciate that you {rest/(to) rest.Infinitive.2sg}
 (16) a. *Ela come mais bolos do que eu [-] chocolates.* b. **Eu como chocolates e acho que ela[-]bolos*
 She eats more cakes than I [-] chocolates. I eat chocolates and I think that she [-] cakes

6. Thus the categorial nature of *do que* remains to be determined. Considering the dependency relation it establishes with the degree word, we hypothesize that it integrates a specific kind of correlative coordination, (17), (18). This explains (15a)-(16a): coordinators accept (in)finiteness and gapping.

- (17) a. *Tu és {mais/menos/*tão}alto do que gordo* b. *Tu és tão alto como/*do que gordo.*
 You are more/less/*as tall than fat You are as tall/*than fat
 (18) a. *Not only John {but also/*and} Mary* b. *Both John {and/*but also} Mary smiled.*

In correlative coordination, when the initial correlative word is an adverbial, it may modify either the first conjunct or the whole coordinate structure (Kayne 1994:143, Johannessen 2005). In (18b), *both* adjoins to the whole coordinate structure: [_{ConjP} both [_{ConjP} John and Mary]] (Johannessen 2005).

Also, there are correlative coordinations, where the first correlative adverb, a quantifier-like element, occupies different positions in Syntax and SEM (Larson 1985, Hendrix 2002, Johannessen 2005): in (19), *either* is internal to the first conjunct in Syntax, but it c-commands it at SEM.

- (19) a. [[Mary *either* is driving to the airport] [or she is taking a cab]]. (Larson 1985)
 b. [either [Mary ~~either~~ is driving to the airport or she is driving a cab]] (SEM)

Extending this analysis to canonical comparatives in Portuguese, (20a) would be analysed in Syntax as in (20b) and at SEM as in (20c). Notice that Co(nj) is a categorially underspecified head that assumes the categorial nature of its conjuncts by Agree.

- (20)a. *Mais alunos saíram do que professores entraram.* (more students left than teachers came in).
 b. [_{CoP=CP/TP} [_{CP/TP} [_{DegP/QP} mais [alunos]] [_{T'} saíram]]] [[_{Co=C/T} do que] [_{CP/TP} professores entraram]]]
 c. [_{CoP=CP/TP} mais] [_{CoP=CP/TP} [_{CP/TP} [_{DegP/QP} mais [alunos]] [_{T'} saíram]]] [_{Co=C/T} do que] [_{CP/TP} professores entraram]]]

Due its quantifier nature, the degree word is subject to QR at SEM: it *Internally merges* in adjunction to CoP, and takes scope over the whole comparative structure. We assume that Pair Merge compositionally creates a predication relation (Chomsky 2004). In (20c) this relation holds between the degree expression and the whole CoP structure it adjoins to. As a consequence, a dependency relation arises between the degree word and the comparative connector that heads this structure.