English Language and Linguistics 7.2: 195–210. © Cambridge University Press 2003
DOI: 10.1017/S0000000000000000 Printed in the United Kingdom

On *such*[1]

MARIANGELA SPINILLO
University College London
(Received 13 March 2002; revised 1 November 2002)

The word *such* represents a challenge to most grammatical treatments when it comes to assigning it to a particular word class. In this article I consider the syntactic as well as the semantic properties of *such*. I argue that its conventional dual treatment as a determiner and as a pronoun (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad & Finegan, 1999; Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985) is unwarranted. I also discuss some more recent treatments (Altenberg, 1994; de Mönnink, 1996; Siegel, 1994) and argue that these too cannot fully account for the facts. Based on syntactic evidence drawn from the British component of the International Corpus of English (ICE-GB),[2] I will argue that the analysis I refer to as the 'uniform adjective analysis' of *such* (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002) best accounts for the facts.

1 Introduction

In this article I look at the word *such* in constructions like (1) and (2) below.

(1) *Such* an attack would take a terrible toll. (w2e-004 042)[3]
(2) *Such* is their awareness of the foaming discontent in the ranks. (w2c-003 060)

Such is usually classed as a determiner in (1), that is, when occurring with a noun, but as a pronoun in (2) when no noun is present. I will refer to *such* in these constructions as 'prenominal' and 'pronominal' *such*, respectively.[4] Both prenominal and pronominal *such* exhibit properties which seem to defy any attempt at classification. Grammarians have long noted the heterogeneous character of *such*, but seem only to consider certain properties when classifying it, listing other properties as exceptions, and, consequently, give only a partial picture. For example, Quirk et al. (1985) class prenominal *such* as a predeterminer due to its occurring before the indefinite article (see (3) below), although they note that it can also occur after several other determiners (see (5)–(11) below). Also, Altenberg (1994), when classing *such* as an adverb, because in a particular construction it is comparable to the adverbs *quite*, *rather*, and *so* (see (17) below),

[1] I wish to thank the two anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Bas Aarts, David Denison, and Lachlan Mackenzie for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.
[2] ICE-GB is a one-million-word corpus based at the Survey of English Usage, University College London. For details, visit the website (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/english-usage/ice-gb). For a full description of the corpus, see Nelson et al. (2002).
[3] The s-texts are spoken, while the w-texts are written.
[4] Note that by 'prenominal' I mean occurring *with* a noun, but not necessarily *before* it, and 'pronominal' does not mean used *instead of* a noun, but used *without* a noun, i.e. used by itself.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

seems to overlook the fact that *such* differs from these adverbs, and adverbs in general, in every other aspect.

In what follows I look at the properties of *such* and examine its current word-class status. I will show that the conventional analysis of prenominal *such* as a determiner and of pronominal *such* as a pronoun is not satisfactory. I will also show that, although an improvement on the conventional treatment, the more recent 'binary' approach to the analysis of *such* cannot fully account for the facts either. I will then argue that the facts are best explained by the view that *such* is an adjective, both when it occurs prenominally and when it occurs pronominally.

2 The conventional determiner treatment

In this section I consider the determiner analysis of prenominal *such.* I will show that such a treatment fails to account for either its syntactic or semantic properties.

2.1 The syntax of prenominal such

Prenominal *such* is conventionally classed as a determiner because it occurs before a noun.

(3) *such* an event (w2f-019 11b)
(4) *such* thoughts (w2f-014 018)

The treatment of *such* as a determiner, however, is problematic in several ways for several current grammatical treatments. First, this element is taken to be a predeterminer because it occurs before the indefinite article, as in (3). However, *such* can also co-occur with *all*, and in so doing becomes an exception to the tenet that predeterminers are mutually exclusive (Huddleston, 1984; Quirk et al., 1985).

(5) all *such* things (s2a-069 008)

Second, *such* can occur after several so-called central determiners, e.g. *no, any*, and *some*:

(6) no *such* plans (s1b-057 097)
(7) any *such* pretence (s1b-048 008)
(8) some *such* concept (Aarts & Aarts, 1982: 108)

and even after postdeterminers such as *many, few*, and the numerals.

(9) many *such* parents (w2c-007 080)
(10) one *such* example (w2a-035 030)
(11) the first *such* unit (w2b-037 024)

These facts on their own make *such* a rather peculiar determiner, as it would be the only determiner that can be both a pre- and a postdeterminer. Note further that as a predeterminer *such* only combines with the indefinite article, whereas as a postdeterminer it allows a wider range of combinations with other determiners.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Despite (5)–(11) above, prenominal *such* is nevertheless mostly treated as a predeterminer (Huddleston, 1984; Quirk et al., 1972, 1985), and (5)–(11) are described as exceptions to the rules that predeterminers are mutually exclusive and are always the first in a sequence of determiners. Such an account is far from satisfactory.

More recent treatments, however, attempt to account for (5)–(11) in different ways. Altenberg (1994: 231–2) suggests that since prenominal *such* follows rather than precedes quantifying determiners, it could be analysed as a restrictive adjective. However, Altenberg points out that the fact that *such* can precede *other*, which he analyses as a determiner, weakens its analysis as an adjective.

(12) no *such* other organization (Altenberg, 1994: 232)

Like Altenberg (1994), Biber et al. (1999) recognize that prenominal *such* is an unusual determiner. They try to account for its peculiarities by placing it in a category they call 'semi-determiner'. They suggest semi-determiners are like adjectives, but do not make it clear what properties semi-determiners share with adjectives, unlike Altenberg (1994), who suggests (and rejects) the adjective analysis of *such* on syntactic grounds. Instead, they highlight the semantic differences between the two, i.e. that semi-determiners differ from prototypical adjectives in that they lack descriptive meaning and specify rather than qualify the noun (Biber et al., 1999: 280–2). Although a step ahead of traditional treatments, in that it recognizes that *such* has properties which differentiate it from other determiners, Biber et al.'s treatment of *such* is not very different from the conventional account, given that their semi-determiners apparently form a subclass of determiners.

2.2 The semantics of prenominal such

Another problem with the classification of prenominal *such* as a determiner has to do with its semantics. Consider (1) above, repeated here as (13).

(13) *Such* an attack would take a terrible toll. (w2e-004 042)

It has been argued that *such* in (13) is similar to the demonstratives *this/these* and *that/those* in that it points to something in the linguistic or discourse context, and linguists often refer to it as 'identifying' *such*. However, unlike the demonstratives, which express full identity, identifying *such* expresses partial identity. In other words, whereas the demonstratives point out an object, *such* does not point out the object itself, but something similar to it, i.e. of the same kind or class (Altenberg, 1994: 229–30; Berry, 1997: 147). Thus, whereas in (14) we are talking about the same books as someone else, in (15) we mean books of the same kind.

(14) We don't use *those* books anymore.
(15) We don't use *such* books anymore.

This 'comparative reference', to use Halliday and Hasan's term (1976: 76–87), is supported by the fact that *such* in these phrases is equivalent to the expressions *like*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this/that or *of this/that kind*. This is illustrated in (16) below, which is a paraphrase of (13).[5]

(16) An attack *like this*/*of this kind* would take a terrible toll.

We will see below (section 3.2) that this partial identity or comparative reference of *such* is due to its property-identifying, as opposed to referent-identifying, function. *Such* establishes partial identity because by identifying properties, it does not identify a specific entity but its kind, and hence its comparative reference. By identifying properties, *such* refers to a class whose members are comparable to the entity in question by means of sharing the same properties.

Note also that, although identifying *such*, by helping establish the reference of the noun phrase,[6] may be comparable to the demonstratives, this does not make it a determiner.[7] The ability to specify noun phrases is not exclusively a property of determiners. Adjectives such as *same, similar, equal*, and *identical*, for instance, as Altenberg (1994: 229) observes, also help to specify the reference of a noun phrase. Like *such*, they do so by establishing comparative reference, which is absent in the demonstratives.[8,9]

Now consider (17) below.

(17) It makes *such* a difference having you. (w1b-007 027)

Unlike in (13), *such* in (17) does not express class identity. This can be shown by the fact that (17) cannot be paraphrased as (18),

(18) ! It makes a difference like that having you.

[5] Bolinger (1972: 61) says that there is a difference in register between the use of *such* and *like this*/*that, such* being more formal.

[6] The analysis presented here takes noun phrases to be NPs, i.e. headed by the noun, rather than DPs, where the determiner is the head. The NP vs. DP dispute is beyond the scope of this article, but two facts can be said to justify the position assumed here. First, it is the noun that defines the selectional properties of the overall phrase. Second, an NP-analysis can explain determinerless or bare noun phrases (e.g. *books*, *money*, *John*) without having to resort to the postulation of an empty category, namely a zero (Ø) determiner.

[7] In fact, it has been argued (Hudson, 2000; Spinillo, 2000) that the so-called demonstrative determiners are pronouns.

[8] Mackenzie argues that 'comparison is not the essential purpose of *such*, but rather a possible effect of its use' (Mackenzie, 1997: 93). He offers (i) as an example of a construction where there is no comparison involved.

(i) ⟨a long description of the house⟩ I don't wonder that my uncle got a little jumpy if he lived all alone in *such* a house as this (Conan Doyle 21, in Mackenzie, 1997: 93).

As we will see, comparison, although an important property of *such*, is not the only aspect which distinguishes it from the demonstratives *this* and *that*, and determiners in general. Thus the lack of comparison in (i) does not undermine the contrast made here.

[9] It could be argued that identifying *such*, alongside *same, similar, equal*, and *identical*, belongs to neither the determiner nor the adjective classes, but is rather intermediate between the two. However, with the exception of their determiner-like specifying property, *same, similar, equal*, and *identical* are otherwise adjectives, e.g. they can be used attributively and predicatively, and are gradable. It will be seen below that *such* too exhibits several adjective properties.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but rather as in (19).[10]

(19) It makes quite a difference having you.

Such in (17) is an intensifier. As Altenberg (1994: 233) points out, *such* in these constructions does not allude to a class but expresses the degree of a quality. This becomes more apparent when an adjective is present.

(20) It makes *such* a big difference having you.

When occurring in constructions like (20) above, *such* has been compared to the degree adverbs *quite* and *rather* (cf. Allerton, 1987; Altenberg, 1994; Mackenzie, 1997; de Mönnink, 2000; Quirk et al., 1985), which are said to intensify a following adjective or gradable noun, and their meaning is close to that of *very*.

(21) It makes a very big difference having you.

The parallelism between *such* and degree adverbs is further supported by the former's correspondence with the degree adverb *so*.

(22) *such* a splendid car (w2f-015 146)
(23) *so* splendid a car

Thus, although it occurs in what is taken to be a typical determiner position, the role of *such* in (17) is other than that usually ascribed to determiners: it does not contribute to the reference of the noun phrase, nor does it express quantity. Although most treatments recognize this peculiarity of *such*, they nevertheless analyse it as a predeterminer in both (13) and (17), alongside words like *all* and *both*, mainly on the grounds that it can occur before the indefinite article (Allerton, 1987; Bolinger, 1972; Huddleston, 1984; Quirk et al., 1985; Sinclair, 1990). Quirk et al. (1985: 451), for instance, recognize the intensifying function of *such*, but whereas they class *quite* and *rather* as adverbs, they class *such* as a predeterminer. Sinclair (1990: 60), on the other hand, makes no distinction and classifies *such, quite*, and *rather* as predeterminers.

3 Further analyses of prenominal *such*

As Altenberg (1994: 226) observes, 'the analysis of *such* is obviously complicated by conflicting semantic and syntactic criteria and its word-class status is far from clear cut'. Having discussed the conventional determiner treatment of prenominal *such*, I turn now to some alternative analyses.

[10] The two constructions in (17) and (19) are not true paraphrases of each other, if indeed there is such a thing in language. The meaning of *such* differs from that of *quite* in that *such* is more emphatic. The two constructions, nevertheless, can be said to have similar readings.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.1 The binary analysis

Of the peculiarities of prenominal *such*, the difference in meaning when occurring in constructions such as (13) and (17) has been the most discussed. As we have seen, it has been suggested that two uses of the determiner *such* should be distinguished: an identifying or demonstrative use, as in (13), and an intensifying use, as in (17) (Allerton, 1987; Biber et al., 1999; Bolinger, 1972; Mackenzie, 1997).[11] This difference has long been noticed, but some more recent treatments take it further and regard it as compelling enough evidence to justify a split, that is to say, that identifying *such* and intensifying *such* are two separate words. This is the analysis proposed in Altenberg (1994) and de Mönnink (1996), who assign identifying *such* and intensifying *such* to different word classes.

Let us first review the differences between intensifying and identifying *such* on which both Altenberg (1994) and de Mönnink (1996) build their cases. Intensifying *such* is an intensifier, and as such it is dependent on the occurrence of a gradable element in the noun phrase, i.e. an adjective or a gradable noun. It corresponds to degree adverbs such as *quite, rather*, and *so*. Identifying *such*, on the other hand, establishes comparative reference. It helps to restrict the reference of the noun phrase by identifying it and comparing it to a class of referent in the linguistic or situational context. It occurs with any kind of noun, i.e. gradable or nongradable, and it is equivalent to the expressions *like this*/*that* or *of this/that kind.*

Intensifying and identifying *such* also differ syntactically. Intensifying *such* can only combine with the indefinite article and then invariably precedes it. Identifying *such*, on the other hand, can occur with several other determiners besides the indefinite article, and it follows rather than precedes them.

In the light of the above observations, Altenberg (1994) and de Mönnink (1996) argue that identifying and intensifying *such* belong to two distinct word classes. Altenberg's treatment differs from de Mönnink's in that, while both analyse intensifying *such* as a degree adverb, Altenberg regards identifying *such* as a determiner, whereas for de Mönnink it is an adjective. In what follows I examine the motivation for these analyses in more detail.

3.1.1 Intensifying such

Let us first look at the reasons for treating intensifying *such* as an adverb. Like degree adverbs, intensifying *such* is an intensifier. Moreover, intensifying *such* is closely related to the degree adverb *so*, in that constructions with intensifying *such* can often be paraphrased by constructions containing the degree adverb *so*, and vice versa.

(24)(a) *such* a terrible collection of letters (s1a-010 059)
(b) *so* terrible a collection of letters

[11] Some refer to these two uses as the 'phoric' and the 'exclamatory' uses of *such* (Allerton, 1987; Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Biber et al. (1999) use the term 'classifying' rather than 'identifying', whereas Carlson (1980) prefers 'extent' to 'intensifying'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(25)(a) *so* ancient an event (s2b-028 016)
(b) *such* an ancient event

Note, however, that although the adverb treatment of intensifying *such* may explain its similarities to the adverbs *quite, rather*, and *so*, there is a fundamental difference between intensifying *such* on the one hand and degree adverbs on the other. Contrary to *quite, rather*, and *so*, and adverbs in general, intensifying *such* cannot modify verbs or other adverbs.

(26)(a) I *quite*/*rather* like it.
(b) *I *such* like it.

(27)(a) She paints *quite*/*rather*/*so* well.
(b) *She paints *such* well.

Intensifying *such* does not modify adjectives either, as first suggested (cf. Allerton, 1987; Altenberg, 1994; Mackenzie, 1997; de Mönnink, 2000; Quirk et al., 1985). This can be shown by the ungrammaticality of (30b).

(28)(a) *quite*/*rather* a splendid car
(b) The car is *quite*/*rather* splendid.

(29)(a) *so* splendid a car
(b) The car is *so* splendid.

(30)(a) (=22) *such* a splendid car
(b) *The car is *such* splendid.

Unlike adverbs, intensifying *such* modifies noun phrases, as shown by the brackets in (31).

(31) *such* $_{NP}$[a splendid car]

Also, although the fact that *such* can occur outside the noun phrase, as shown in (31) above, may be regarded as a further reason for treating it as an adverb (Mackenzie, 1997: 88), this is not compelling evidence, since intensified adjectives, or rather, the phrases they form, can also be external, as shown in (32).

(32) so low a scale (s2b-025 065)

3.1.2 Identifying such

Let us now consider identifying *such*. The motivation for the determiner analysis has already been discussed, and I look now into the reasons for regarding it as an adjective.

De Mönnink (1996: 149; 2000: 77) argues that identifying *such* resembles other adjectives in that it can be postponed when an *as*- or *that*-clause follows.

(33)(a) as *beautiful* a house as yours
(b) a house as *beautiful* as yours

(34)(a) so *beautiful* a house that everybody was jealous
(b) a house so *beautiful* that everybody was jealous

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(35)(a) *such* a house as yours
(b) a house *such* as yours[12]

(36)(a) *such* a house that everybody was jealous
(b) a house *such* that everybody was jealous

She argues that the (a) constructions are instances of 'discontinuous modification', i.e. constructions where the adjective and its postmodifier clause are not adjacent to each other. The postponement of the adjective in the (b) constructions shows that the adjective together with the clause is a postmodifying adjective phrase made up of a head and a postmodifier clause (see also Mackenzie, 1997: 87).

De Mönnink also claims that the analysis of identifying *such* as an adjective can better explain (4) above, repeated here as (37).

(37) *such* thoughts (w2f-014 018)

She argues that an adjective analysis of *such* here would avoid the ambiguity created by the determiner treatment, where *such* would be analysed as both a predeterminer occurring before the zero article, or as a postdeterminer occurring after it, as shown in (38) and (39), respectively.

(38) $such_{predet}$ Ø thoughts
(39) Ø $such_{postdet}$ thoughts

Further evidence for the adjective analysis of identifying *such* is offered by Siegel (1994: 482), who argues that 'syntactically, *such* behaves much like a typical adjective like *tall* or *red*, appearing prenominally or, more rarely, predicatively':

(40)(a) *Such* people never admit to being guilty.
(b) The guilty person never admitted to being *such*.

(41)(a) *Such* vacations rarely turn out to be perfect.
(b) . . . But perfect vacations rarely turn out to be *such*. (Siegel, 1994: 482)

She argues further that the adjective treatment can explain the occurrence of *such* after quantifiers, as in (5)–(11) above. She also adds that the fact that *such* can appear either before or after adjectives, as in (42) and (43), is evidence that it is itself an adjective (Siegel, 1994: 482).[13]

[12] There is a further kind of occurrence of the word *such* with the word *as*, which should be distinguished from the one treated here.

(i) I wish I would feel relaxed about certain aspects of my life, *such as* work and exams. (s1a-059 019)

In (i) the meaning is not 'similar to' but 'for example', and the string *such as* here is usually regarded as a complex unit (see Carlson, 1980; Mackenzie, 1997). The analysis of this construction is beyond the scope of this article. For discussion see Quirk et al. (1985: 1307).

[13] Sinclair (1990: 357, 392–3,) talks about *such* 'behaving like' or 'being used as' an adjective in constructions like (i) and (ii).

(i) any *such* pretence
(ii) Her surprise was *such* that she couldn't speak.

But I take it that by saying that it 'behaves like' or is 'used as', he is not actually classing *such* as an adjective.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(42) two *such* new problems
(43) two new *such* friends (Siegel, 1994: 482)

Data such as (43) above also constitute evidence of adjective status to Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 529, 540), who argue that the syntactic distribution of identifying *such* is that of adjective phrases. Like adjective phrases, identifying *such*, or rather its phrase, can occur as an external as well as an internal adjunct modifier in noun phrase structure, the former being illustrated by (13) above, and the latter by (43) above and (44)–(46) below (from Carlson, 1980: 247; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 435; and Siegel, 1994: 485, respectively), where identifying *such* follows rather than precedes the adjective.

(44) future *such* events
(45) a further *such* error
(46) more destructive *such* children

All the above facts constitute strong evidence for treating identifying *such* as an adjective. In section 4 I will provide further arguments in support of the view that an adjective analysis is the one which best explains the facts.

3.2 The pro-adjective analysis

While analysing identifying *such* as an adjective, Siegel (1994) claims that semantically it is like a pronoun. She argues that, like pronouns, identifying *such* is a pro-form in that it takes its meaning from an element within or outside its containing sentence. She also argues that *such* obeys binding conditions in the same way that pronouns do. In other words, it follows Principle B of the Binding Theory and it must be free in its governing category (1994: 481–2).

(47) Conscientious students know that everyone resents *them*.
(48) Conscientious students know that everyone resents *such* students.
(Siegel, 1994: 481–2)

Siegel argues that *such* in (48), like *them* in (47), can be interpreted as referring to an element within the sentence, or alternatively, it can be identified with an earlier element in the discourse. However, unlike the pronoun *them*, which, if bound structurally, refers to the referent of the noun phrase 'conscientious students', *such*, if bound structurally, does not refer to the conscientious students in question, but rather to students like them. This can be shown structurally by the fact that *such* does not substitute for the whole noun phrase 'conscientious students', but solely for the adjective phrase 'conscientious'.

(49) $_{NP}$[Conscientious students]$_i$ know that everyone resents $_{NP}$[*them*]$_i$
(50) $_{NP}$[$_{AP}$[Conscientious]$_i$ students] know that everyone resents $_{NP}$[[*such*]$_i$ students]

Identifying *such* is thus a pro-form in that it substitutes for other items. Also, in the manner of pro-forms, it is deictic, taking its meaning from another element in the immediate context. Unlike pronouns, however, *such* does not refer to entities, but to qualities.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

As a way of accounting for the mixed properties of identifying *such*, that is the combination of adjective-like syntax and pro-form-like semantics, Siegel analyses it as a 'pro-adjective'. By using this term Siegel spells out the complex nature of identifying *such*. The term is, however, somewhat misleading. To call identifying *such* a 'pro-adjective' suggests that it can only be associated with adjective phrases. However, as Siegel herself notices, identifying *such* can also be associated with noun phrases.

(51) They say he's $_{NP}$[a liar]$_i$, but I've never known him to be [*such*]$_i$

What makes it possible for *such* to be bound by the noun phrase 'a liar' in (51) is that the phrase here is not entity-referring, but property-referring. In other words, it is not being used to refer to a particular liar in the universe of discourse, but rather to the properties attributed to liars in general. Identifying *such*, as Keizer observes (personal communication), is not a marker of coreference of entities, but rather of codenotation. What identifying *such* shares with the element is a denotation rather than a referent. Thus, as regards the syntactic nature of the element it can be structurally bound to, identifying *such* can be said to be a 'pro-noun', as much as a 'pro-adjective'.[14]

4 The uniform analysis

It has been shown above that there are grounds for treating identifying *such* as an adjective. In this section I will show that the adjective analysis of prenominal *such*, whether it is identifying or intensifying, is the one that best accounts for the facts. This uniform treatment is found in Huddleston & Pullum (2002), and in this section I reinforce their analysis by providing further evidence for a uniform adjective treatment of *such.*

Let me briefly go over the evidence for analysing identifying *such* as an adjective. Identifying *such* shares several properties with members of the adjective class. Firstly, in the manner of adjectives, it can occur both attributively and predicatively (see (40) and (41)). Secondly, it is like other adjectives in that it can be postponed when an *as*- or *that*-clause follows (see (35) and (36)). Thirdly, like adjectives, identifying *such* can be an internal (see (44)–(46)) or external modifier in noun phrase structure (see (13)).

A potential counterargument against an adjective analysis of identifying *such* is that it fails the main syntactic criteria for adjectivehood. Unlike most adjectives, identifying *such* lacks descriptive content. In addition, it does not share with adjectives the ability to appear with degree adverbs, and does not have comparative or superlative forms.

[14] Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1462–3) make use of what they call 'pro-X formulation' when talking about pro-forms. They say, however, that this only applies when the pro-form and what it replaces belong to the same category X, as in (i) and (ii), where both *the car* and *it*, and both *in Paris* and *there*, are noun phrases or prepositional phrases, respectively.

(i) *The car* is being serviced at the moment but *it* should be ready soon.
(ii) I met her last time I was *in Paris* but she doesn't live *there* now.

Carlson (1980) seems to avoid this terminological problem by calling *such* a 'pro-kind'. Note, however, that his term does not offer any indication as to the form-class of *such*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(52) *very/extremely *such* books
(53) **sucher*/the *suchest* books

Note, however, that none of these facts should rule out an adjective treatment of identifying *such*, because there are other words, like *utter*, for instance, which also fail these criteria but are nevertheless regarded as adjectives.

(54) *very *utter* nonsense
(55) **utterer*/the *utterest* nonsense

Moreover, I will show below that there is a semantic explanation for the facts in (52) and (53). Note further that, although it could be argued that the predicative use of identifying *such* is somewhat marked, it is nevertheless possible, whereas this is not at all possible for *utter*.

(56) *The nonsense is *utter*.

Finally, whereas one could argue that the occurrence of *such* in constructions like those in (44)–(46) is somewhat limited, in that *such* occurs in this pattern only with a handful of adjectives, note that *such* occurs freely after adjectives in their superlative forms, as shown in (57) below.[15]

(57) the biggest/the smallest/ the longest/ the most risky *such* operation

Thus, although not a typical adjective, as stated in Siegel (1994: 482), identifying *such* shares more properties with the members of the adjective class than it does with the members of the determiner, the adverb or the pronoun class, and is therefore best analysed as an adjective. In spite of the fact that it does not exhibit all the properties usually associated with the adjective class, identifying *such* should not be excluded from it, but should rather be seen as one of its many peripheral members.[16]

[15] I thank Evelien Keizer (personal communication) for pointing this out to me. She argues that this may be a partitive construction. Note, however, that when partitive *of* is present, the noun needs to be in its plural form, which shows that (ii) and (57) are not alternative versions of each other.

(i) *the biggest of *such* operation
(ii) the biggest of *such* operations

The question whether (57) is or is not a partitive construction does not affect the claim that *such* is an adjective and I will, therefore, not pursue it further here.

[16] I take the view that grammatical categories are structured around prototypes. However, like Aarts (2000), I assume a midway position between the Aristotelian categorical approach, i.e. the all-or-none view (Newmeyer, 2000), and the Rosch–Lakoff (Lakoff, 1987; Langacker, 1987; Rosch, 1978; Ross, 1972) approach, i.e. categorial indeterminacy. Whereas I take the boundaries between categories to be discrete, there are degrees of category membership, that is, some elements are better representatives of the category than others. *Such* is an instance of what Aarts calls 'subsective gradience' or, more specifically, what he refers to as 'convergence'. Subsective gradience occurs within classes and allows for degrees of class membership. 'It allows for a particular element *x* from category *a* to be more or less *a*-like than some other element *y* from the same category, and recognizes a core and periphery within the form classes of language' (Aarts, 2000: 5). Thus *big*, for instance, is a more typical or central member of the adjective class than *such*, because it fulfills all the criteria for adjectivehood. As for convergence, this is the instance of subsective gradience where an element displays a semantic property (weak convergence) and/or a syntactic property (strong convergence) typically

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let us now consider intensifying *such* and the justification for an adjective treatment. Contrary to Altenberg (1994) and de Mönnink (1996), Huddleston & Pullum (2002) do not make a categorical distinction between identifying and intensifying *such* and treat both as adjectives. The advantage of this uniform analysis is twofold: it highlights the similarities between the two uses of *such*, while at the same time it brings out the similarities between *such* and other adjectives.

Huddleston & Pullum (2002) claim that the distribution of identifying *such* is evidence of its adjective status. They do not make entirely clear, however, what facts make them treat intensifying *such* as an adjective. They simply state that in constructions like (58) and (59) below '*such* is an adjective functioning as modifier in NP structure' and that 'it may be concerned with either degree [(58)] or kind [(59)]' (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002: 1546).

(58) His first film was a major film, but this one has not been *such* a success.
(59) Cricket, football and *such* games are played with the aim of instilling team spirit in the children.

I would like to argue that the justification for regarding intensifying *such* as an adjective stems from its similarities to identifying *such*. The identifying–intensifying distinction between the two uses of *such* is not as pronounced as some treatments make it out to be. As Bolinger (1972: 60) points out, intensifying *such* also has identifying properties, and the difference between the two uses of the word is that intensifying *such* identifies a degree, whereas identifying *such* identifies a class. Identifying *such*, in turn, also has intensifying properties, as de Mönnink (1996: 152) and Carlson (1980: 224) observe. This explains why *such* does not share with other adjectives the ability to take modification by intensifying adverbs: because it already has an inherently intensifying quality, further adverbial intensification leads to infelicitous results. This also explains the parallel distribution of *such*, whether it is identifying or intensifying, and other adjectives in constructions like the ones below.

(60) *so massive* an instrument
(61) *too great* a tendency
(62) *such* a plan (w2e-007 064)
(63) *such* a shame (s2a-009 181)

Only adjective phrases headed by intensified adjectives can occur outside the noun phrase, and *such*, being inherently intensifying, enables its phrase to occur outside noun phrases without requiring further modification. Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 550–1), although they recognize this similarity in distribution between *such* and adjectives, and in fact offer it as evidence of the adjective status of *such,* do not attribute it to its inherently intensifying quality.

associated with another class, and is therefore said to converge onto it. Thus *such* is also less of an adjective than *big* because one pronoun-like property and one adverbial property have, to use Aarts's words, 'rubbed' onto it, namely the ability to be used as a pro-form and the intensifying meaning. In several other respects, however, *such* is an adjective. Thus, while firmly within the adjective class, *such* can be said to converge on the pronoun and adverb classes.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus the lack of modification of *such* does not raise a problem for the adjective treatment. Moreover, *such* would not be the only adjective not to take modification. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 404), there is a whole category of adjectives, namely 'intensifying adjectives', which do not occur with degree adverbs or have comparative forms (e.g. *absolute*, *sheer*, *total*).

The above facts are in harmony with the view that prenominal *such* is at the same time identifying and intensifying, and hence they reinforce the uniform analysis. The distinction between identifying and intensifying *such* is not determined by *such* per se, but by whether the noun phrase is seen as gradable or not. This explains why in (64), where it is possible to be a snob to a lesser or greater extent, the intensifying reading is favoured over the identifying reading, whereas in (65) an identifying reading is more natural, given that a thing either is, or is not, a telescope.

(64) *such* a snob (s1a-007 182)
(65) *such* a telescope (w2a-040 015)

It also explains why in some cases ambiguity arises, as in (66) below from Bolinger (1972), which can be interpreted as 'extremes like these' or as 'extremes so great'.

(66) Who can be patient in *such* extremes? (Bolinger, 1972: 60)

One further matter worthy of note is that, as with other adjectives, but unlike determiners, the constraints between *such* and the noun are semantic rather than syntactic. That is, whereas there are no syntactic restrictions on which type of noun *such* can occur with (i.e. singular count, plural count or noncount noun), whether *such* is going to be interpreted as identifying or intensifying depends on whether the noun phrase is seen as gradable or not.

To conclude the present discussion of *such*, consider (67)–(70).

(67) =(2) *Such* is their awareness of the foaming discontent in the ranks. (w2c-003 060)
(68) *Such* is the case with cycles in the British Dimantian. (w2a-023 080)
(69) They say he's very interested in music, but I've never known him to be *such*.[17]
(70) . . . But perfect vacations rarely turn out to be *such*. (Siegel, 1994: 482)

When it occurs without a following noun, as in (67)–(70) above, *such* is usually regarded as a pronoun (cf. Biber et al., 1999; Quirk et al., 1985; Altenberg, 1994). In what follows I will show that this categorial split between prenominal and pronominal *such* is not justified, and that the analysis in Huddleston & Pullum (2002) according to which prenominal and pronominal *such* are one-and-the-same word, or more precisely, one-and-the-same adjective, is the one which best accounts for the facts.[18]

Again it is not obvious what motivated Huddleston & Pullum's (2002) adjective treatment of pronominal *such*. I want to argue here that part of the explanation for analysing pronominal *such* as an adjective rather than as a pronoun follows from the

[17] I thank an anonymous referee for this example.
[18] As with the determiner *such*, Altenberg (1994) distinguishes between an identifying use of the pronoun and an intensifying use. To my knowledge, his is the only account to draw the distinction.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

identifying properties of *such*. Although pronominal *such* can be said to be pronoun-like, in that it is deictic and takes its meaning from another element in the immediate context, like prenominal *such* it is property-referring rather than entity-referring, as Mackenzie (1997: 92) points out. In (67) and (68) for instance, *such* alludes to the properties of the entities in question, namely 'their awareness of the foaming discontent in the ranks' and 'the case with cycles in the British Dimantian', respectively. Thus, unlike pronouns and like adjectives, pronominal *such* is predicative in that it has to do with the properties being predicated of entities, rather than with the entities themselves. The property-referring nature of *such* is even more apparent in (69) and (70), where the properties that *such* refers to can be found in the sentence domain: *such* = 'very interested in music' in (69), and *such* = 'perfect' in (70). Thus, as Postal (1969: 232) remarks, pronouns are markers of coreference whereas *such* is a marker of identity of sense.

Further evidence for the analysis of pronominal *such* as an adjective is that, like adjectives in predicative position, it can take a *that*-clause as a dependent.

(71) His aloneness was *such* that it was a numbing coldness. (w2f-020 102)
(72) His aloneness was *(*so*) *great* that it was a numbing coldness.

Remember that only intensified adjectives can occur in this construction. However, like prenominal *such*, pronominal *such* does not require a degree modifier because of its inherent intensifying quality.

An apparent hindrance to the analysis of pronominal *such* as an adjective is its position in the sentence. Adjectives do not normally occur in precopular position. Note, however, that, although unusual, adjectives can occur at the beginning of a sentence.

(73) *Green* were his eyes.

Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 1546) claim that (73) is an instance of 'inverted predicative order', and so are (67) and (68) above. In these constructions, the subject and its predicative complement have swapped places. They argue, however, that when the predicative complement is *such* the inverted order is the only possible option, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (75) and (76).

(74) His eyes were *green*.
(75) *Their awareness of the foaming discontent in the ranks is *such*.
(76) *The case with cycles in the British Dimantian is *such*.

Pronominal *such*, then, appears to differ from other adjectives in that its unmarked position seems to be the precopular position. An explanation for this can be found in Mackenzie (1997: 91), who argues that the position of *such* follows from its focality. He claims that *such* is a 'communicatively salient word' because it establishes an implicit contrast, and one of the ways of indicating focus is to place the information that is communicatively salient in initial position. This not only explains the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

position of *such* in sentences like (67) and (68), but also its typical initial position in the noun phrase.

5 Conclusion

In this article I reviewed several treatments of prenominal and pronominal *such*, and showed that most of them fail to account for all their properties. I showed that the conventional analysis of prenominal *such* as a determiner and of pronominal *such* as a pronoun is not warranted. I also showed that the binary analysis which makes a categorical distinction between identifying and intensifying *such*, although somewhat of an improvement on the conventional treatment, also falls short of providing a description which fully accounts for the facts. I then argued that the uniform analysis, that is the analysis according to which *such* is an adjective, both when it occurs with a noun (prenominal *such*) and when it stands on its own (pronominal *such*), is the one which best accounts for the facts. I particularly argued that *such* is at the same time identifying and intensifying. Whether it is the identifying or the intensifying quality that takes precedence is determined by the nature of the nominal it enters into construction with.

Thus, although it lacks some of the criteria for adjectivehood, as well as presenting properties not usually attributed to the adjective class, *such* exhibits several structural properties which secure its membership in the adjective class. Like words such as *utter*, *afraid*, and *asleep*, to name just a few, *such* is best analysed as a peripheral adjective.

Author's address:
Mariangela Spinillo
Department of English
University College London
Gower Street
London WCIE 6BT
UK
m.spinillo@ucl.ac.uk

References

Aarts, B. (forthcoming). Modelling linguistic gradience. *Studies in Language* **28.1**.
Aarts, F. & J. Aarts (1982). *English syntactic structures.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Allerton, D. (1987). English intensifiers and their idiosyncrasies. In Steele, R. & T. Threadgold (eds.), *Language topics: essays in honour of Michael Halliday.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **2**: 15–31.
Altenberg, B. (1994). On the functions of *such* in spoken and written English. In Oostdijk, N. & P. de Haan (eds.), *Corpus-based research into language*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 223–39.
Berry, R. (1997). *Collins Cobuild English guides 10. Determiners and quantifiers.* London: HarperCollins.
Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad & E. Finegan (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* London: Longman.
Bolinger, D. (1972). *Degree words.* The Hague: Mouton.
Carlson, G. (1980). *Reference to kinds in English.* New York: Garland.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Denison, D. (2001). Gradience and linguistic change. In Brinton, L. (ed.), *Historical linguistics 1999: selected papers from the 14th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Vancouver, 9–13 August 1999.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 119–44.
Halliday, M. A. K. & R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Huddleston, R. (1984). *Introduction to the grammar of English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Huddleston, R. & G. K. Pullum (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Hudson, R. (2000). Grammar without functional categories. In Borsley, R. (ed.), *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 32. London: Academic Press. 7–35.
Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: theoretical prerequisites*, vol. 1. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Mackenzie, J. L. (1997). Grammar, discourse and knowledge: the use of *such*. In Aarts, J., I. de Mönnink & H. Wekker (eds.), *Studies in English language and teaching.* Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi. 85–105.
de Mönnink, I. (1996). A first approach to the mobility of noun phrase constituents. In Percy, C., C. Meyer & I. Lancashire (eds.), *Synchronic corpus linguistics. Papers from the 16th International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora.* Amsterdam: Rodopi. 143–57.
de Mönnink, I. (2000). *On the move: the mobility of constituents in the English noun phrase: a multi-method approach.* Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
Nelson, G., S. Wallis & B. Aarts (2002). *Exploring natural language: working with the British component of the International Corpus of English.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Newmeyer, F. (2000). The discrete nature of syntactic categories: against a prototype-based account. In Borsley, R. (ed.) *Syntax and semantics*, vol. 32. London: Academic Press. 21–50.
Postal, P. (1969). Anaphoric islands. *Papers from the 5th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Chicago: CLS. 205–39.
Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik. (1972). *A grammar of contemporary English.* London: Longman.
Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* London: Longman.
Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In Rosch, E. & B. Lloyd (eds.), *Cognition and categorization.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 27–48.
Ross, J. (1972). The category squish: Endstation Hauptwort. In Peranteau, P., Levi & Phares (eds.), *Papers from the 8th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Chicago: CLS. 316–28.
Siegel, M. (1994). *Such*: binding and the pro-adjective. *Linguistics and Philosophy* **17**: 481–97.
Sinclair, J. (ed.) (1990). *Collins Cobuild English grammar.* London: HarperCollins.
Spinillo, M. (2000). Determiners: a class to be got rid of? *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* **2**: 173–89.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674302001004 Published online by Cambridge University Press