1. "Gradability" in the nominal and in the adjectival domain cannot be reduced to the same syntactic and semantic primitives.

2. The restrictions on the distribution of expressions in the small clause complement of the verb *seem* follow from factors having to do with epistemicity and evidentiality, not gradability (whether at the lexical or syntactic level).

3. The so-called "degree *such*" is not a degree operator but an expression that picks out salient sub-kinds identifiable by natural consequences.

4. Size adjectives are always interpreted as modifying size, even when they apply to abstract objects, such as (instances of) properties, as in *enormous generosity*, or to individuals defined in terms of such objects, as in *big idiot*.

5. All things being equal, an account which makes use of general mechanisms that are independently needed and motivated is preferable to one which relies on particular mechanisms that are specifically formulated for the cases at hand.

6. Linguistic phenomena that seem to affect different syntactic categories are best examined by a combination of a cross-categorial perspective with careful intra-categorial investigation.

7. Different grammatical mechanisms applying to different syntactic categories may nevertheless give rise to similar interpretations.

8. In the course of the syntactic derivation nouns may acquire the type of semantic structure that adjectives are lexically endowed with (cf. *more idiots* vs. *a more idiot* vs. *more intelligent*).

9. "Evaluation" is a multifaceted notion.

10. Nominal gradability is more of an illusion than a grammatical reality.

11. Big eaters can be small.