Not as hard a problem to solve as you might have thought
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A number of 'wrap-around modifiers', including too, enough, so, more, less, -er, and as have in common the basic distributional property that their complement can (usually must) follow their head, as exemplified in (1).

(1) a. too old an issue to worry about
   b. more windows than I wanted to wash
   c. So many more girls than boys that the dance was postponed

Also, as exemplified in (1c), more than one of these items, with its complement, can occur in a phrase.

However, these elements fail to share many distributional properties. For example, the complements of too, so, and enough cannot precede complements of a modified adjective, while comparative complements can. Compare (2) and (3)

(2)   a. too afraid of the water to swim
       b. so afraid of the water I was shivering
       c. *too afraid to swim of the water
       d. *so afraid I was shivering of the water

(3)   a. more afraid than Kim of the water
       b. less at home than Kim in the water

Similarly, comparative complements licensed in VP can either precede or follow complements of the modified adjective, but complements of too, enough, and so cannot. Compare (4) and (5).

(4) a. more willing to help than Kim
     b. more willing than Kim to help

(5) a. so willing to help that everyone was surprised
     b. *so willing that everyone was surprised to help

An analysis in Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG) attempts to sort out, explain, and model these and other details of differing distributions of different classes of wrap-around modifiers.