ON SILENT SEMI-LEXICAL *PERSON*

NORBERT CORVER*

ABSTRACT: It is a well-known fact that the bound morpheme *-s* occurs on the possessor in Dutch possessive noun phrases such as *Jans auto* ('Jan's car'), *tantes fiets* ('aunt's bike'), etc. In recent years, various generative-linguistic studies have tried to give a proper characterization of the bound morpheme *-s*, which historically relates to a genitival suffix. For example, it has been interpreted as a functional category belonging to the category D, Agr, or Pos(sessor). One of the most remarkable occurrences of *-s* is the one on proper names and family names that function as arguments in the clause, a phenomenon attested in various dialects of Dutch. Van Haeringen's (1947) seminal article on this phenomenon gives the following example: *Laten we vaders daar nou maar buiten houden* (lit. 'Let we father's there but outside keep', 'Let's keep father out'). In this article, I will try to give a proper characterization of this bound morpheme that has a definite article-like behavior and elaborate on the syntax of proper names.

KEYWORDS: silent noun, semi-lexical noun, person, subject-object asymmetry, Dutch dialects

1. INTRODUCTION

As has been observed by various Dutch traditional grammarians, the grammatical marker *-s*, which is most familiar from its occurrence in possessive noun phrases such as *Piets auto* (Piet-s car, 'Piet's car') and *vaders hoed* (father-s hat, 'father's hat'), also shows up, in a great variety of Dutch dialects, in what appear to be non-possessive contexts (cf. Van Haeringen, 1947; Overdiep, 1940). An example of this quite remarkable phenomenon is given in (1), which represents Alblasserwaard Dutch (cf. Van Haeringen, 1947):

(1) We kwamen Anna's tegen
We met Anna-s PRT
'We met Anna.'

The question, obviously, arises as to how to interpret here the occurrence of *-s* on the proper name, which seems to function as an argument within the

* Utrecht Institute of Linguistics-OTS, Utrecht University.
Parts of this article were presented at the workshop on The syntax and semantics of grammatical features (Stuttgart university, 2007), the TIN-meeting (Utrecht University, 2007), the 9th conference of the English department at Bucharest University (2007), and the 17th generative grammar colloquium at Girona University (2007). I thank the audiences in all of these settings for valuable comments and discussion. I would, finally, also like to thank the anonymous reviewer and the special editors of this volume for their comments.

main clause. The approach taken by traditional grammarians is to analyze *-s* as a case morpheme. In this paper I will propose an alternative analysis according to which a linguistic expression like *Anna's* in (1) is, in fact, a hidden possessive construction, with *-s* as a possessive marker occupying a functional head position. More specifically, *Anna* is a possessor which enters into a possessive relationship with a silent (i.e. unpronounced) nominal possessum. Thus: [*Anna* + *-s* + POSSESSUM]. If this is the correct analysis, this would provide another instance of a nominal construction featuring an element which is syntactically and interpretively active, but yet not pronounced (cf. Kayne, 2003). I will further argue that this silent possessum can be characterized as a grammatical, i.e. semi-lexical, noun in the sense of Emonds (1985). More particularly, this silent semi-lexical noun will be identified as PERSON.

2. *-S*: AN ENCLITIC ARTICLE OR A CASE MORPHEME?

Before discussing two potential analyses of the linguistic expression *Anna's* in (1), let me give a few additional examples in order to show that this phenomenon is broadly attested in Dutch dialects and that the *-s* appears on proper names (and kinship nouns) fulfilling a variety of argumental functions.

(2) Dialect of Alblasserwaard; Van Haeringen (1947)

a. We kwamen *Anna**'s*** tegen
We met Anna-s PRT
'We met Anna'

b. We zullen het *moeder**s*** maar niet vertellen
We shall it mother-s but not tell
'We won't tell it to mother'

c. Dat is de hoed van *Arie**s***
That is the hat of Arie-s
'That's Arie's hat'

(3) Dialect of Katwijk; Overdiep (1940: 108)

a. Hè-je *Jantjie**s*** iet ezien?
Have-you Jan-DIM-s not seen
'Haven't you seen Johnny?'

b. Ik hep et *Jantjie**s*** ezâat
I have it Jan-DIM-s told
'I told it to Johnny'

c. Isset mit *Jantjie**s*** choed?
Is-it with Jan-DIM-s good
'Is everything okay with Johnny?'

(4) Dialect of Gilze[1]

a. Ik kwam *Jann**e*** tegen
I met Jan-e PRT
'I met Jan'

b. Ik gaaf *Teun**e*** un kado
I gave Teun-e a present
'I gave Teun a present'

c. Des de stoel van *Jann**e***
That-s the chair of Jan-e
'That's Jan's chair'

In the (a) examples, the proper name functions as a direct object, as an indirect object in (b), and as the complement of P in (c).[2]

Now that we have a rough picture of the distribution of *-s*, let us address the question as to what analysis could be assigned to this grammatical marker. A first hypothesis that comes to mind is that an expression like *Anna's* consists of a proper name and an enclitic definite article that attaches to the nominal stem. In the spirit of Longobardi's (1994) treatment of proper names as Determiner Phrases (DP) involving N-to-D movement in overt or covert syntax, one might want to argue that *Anna's* is derived by overtly moving the proper noun to an expletive article *-s*, which, being a bound morpheme, needs a nominal host to which it can attach. This derivation is represented in (5), and is reminiscent of the N-to-F/D raising analysis of enclitic articles in languages such as Romanian (6a) and Norwegian (6b):

(5) $[_{DP}$ -s $[_{NP}$ Anna]] → $[_{DP}$ $[_{N}$ Anna$]_j$-s $[_{NP}$ [t $]_j$]]

(6) a. copil-ul (Romanian)
child-the
'the child'

b. stol-en (Norwegian)
chair-the
'the chair'

[1] These examples feature the bound morpheme *-e* rather than *-s* on the proper name. As shown by the example in (i), *-e* (also *-en*) appears on proper names in possessive noun phrases. This *-e* is referred to as a weak genitival form in traditional Dutch grammars, cf.:

(i) Dat is *Janne* pet (Alblasserwaard Dutch, cf. Van Haeringen, 1947)
that is Jan-e hat
'That's Jan's hat'

[2] In (2a), *Anna's* appears to be the direct object of *(tegen)kwamen*; see also (4a). Since this is an unaccusative verb, *Anna's* arguably should be analyzed as the subject of a small clause which is the complement of *komen*, as in (i), where for the sake of simplicity we use the embedded word order:

(i) . . . dat we $[_{SC}$ Anna's tegen] kwamen

Potential support for an N-to-D analysis of *Anna's* comes from the observation that the grammatical marker *-s* (and *-e*, as in the example below) is in complementary distribution with the expletive definite article *de* ('the'), which can appear with proper names in certain dialects. The fact that the *de* and *-s* cannot co-occur might be due to the fact that they compete for the same structural position, i.e. D.

(7) bɛ Flipp*e* (dialect of Oerle; De Bont, 1958: 299)
with Flip-e
'at Philip's place'

(8) a. bɛ *de* Flip
with the Flip
'at Philip's place'
b. *bɛ *de* Flipp*e*

There is also an argument, however, which seems to go against a treatment of *-s* (or *-e*) as an enclitic definite article, namely the fact that the nominal expression *Proper Name + 's* does not occur in subject position. Cf. (9):

(9) a. Is *vaaier(*s)* zie^{j}k? (dialect of Oerle)
Is father(-s) ill
'Is father ill?'
b. *Jann(*e)* is nie thuis (dialect of Gilze)
Jan(-e) is not at-home
'Jan isn't at home'
c. Hier wunt *Krijn(*e)* (dialect of Katwijk)
Here lives Krijn(-e)
'Krijn lives here'

Under an analysis in which *-s* is an enclitic definite article, it is not directly clear why the appearance of *-s* is excluded on subject proper names.

This brings me to an alternative analysis of *-s*, the one proposed by Dutch traditional grammarians, which states that *-s* is a case morpheme, representing non-nominative (i.e. accusative/oblique) case. Cf. (10):

(10) a. Ik hoorde [*Harrie**s*** huilen] (dialect of Asten)
I heard Harrie-s cry
'I heard Harry cry'
b. Ik vind [*Harrie**s*** aardig]
I find Harrie-s nice
'I consider Harrie a nice guy'

These examples represent ECM (exceptional case marking) environments: *Harries* occupies the subject position of an infinitival clause or a small clause. Un-

der a case analysis of *-s*, the appearance of *-s* on the subjects in (10) directly follows: the verbs *hoorde* and *vind* are able to 'assign' accusative case to the subject argument *Harrie*.[3]

Notice also that the marker *-s* (or *-e*) does not occur on vocative nominal expressions (examples drawn from the dialect of Katwijk).

(11) a. *Piet(*-e)*, lech iet te vloouke! (Overdiep, 1940: 134)
Piet(*-e), lay not to curse
'Piet, don't curse!'

b. Bin óm en brok sââl, *Klaes(*-e)*! (Overdiep, 1940: 195)
Put around a piece canvas, Klaas(-e)
'Klaas, put a piece of canvas around it.'

If *-s/-e* represents a non-nominative (i.e. accusative/oblique) case form, then the absence of this morpheme on these vocative nominals is expected. As shown by (12), where we have a pronominal element for the addressee, Dutch vocatives typically carry a 'nominative' case form:

(12) Kom eens hier, jij / *jou!
Come PRT here, you.NOM / you.ACL-OBL
'You, come here!'

Thus, the facts in (10) and (11) are suggestive for a case analysis of the pattern *Proper Name + -s*, i.e. *-s* is a case form that appears on the proper name when it appears in a structural position to which accusative/oblique case can be assigned (e.g. by V or P).

Although, at first sight, such a case analysis appears to be on the right track, it is faced with one serious question: the marker *-s/-e* never appears on the proper noun when it takes a PP-complement. This is illustrated by the Katwijk Dutch example in (13); examples drawn from Overdiep (1940: 110):[4]

(13) a. Ik ben [$_{PP}$ bij [*Piet(*-e)* fan Nelles]] eweest
I have with Piet(-e) of Nelle-s been
'I visited Piet, who is Nel's son'

b. Wij hebbe teuges den aevent gistere [$_{DP}$ *Piet(*-e)* van
We have against the evening yesterday Piet(-e) of
Klemme-n] epraejt
Klem-e spoken
'Towards evening, we spoke with Piet, who is Clemens's son.'

[3] I abstract away here from the exact technical analysis of case licensing; e.g. in terms of case assignment, checking, or Agree.

[4] In many Dutch dialects, the pattern 'Proper name + [$_{PP}$ P + proper name]' is a very common way of expressing family relationships: e.g. *Kees van Klaas* 'Kees, who is Klaas's son.'

If *-s* is a case marker, it is not so obvious why the pattern in (13), featuring the marker *-e*, is excluded. Under an analysis in which *Piet* enters the syntactic derivation with the case suffix *-e* attached to it, it is entirely unclear why such a case marked noun would block the appearance of a PP-complement. Languages that display morphological case marking on nouns do not block such marking when a noun combines with a following PP-complement; see the German example in (14):

(14) Ik habe [den Kinder-*n* [$_{PP}$ von Karl]] süβigkeiten gegeben
I have the children-DAT of Karl sweets given

Also for a case analysis in which *-s* would instantiate a functional Case head (say, K; cf. Bittner & Hale, 1996), the facts in (13) are problematic. If *-s/-e* were in K and the form *Piet-e* were derived in terms of N-to-K-movement (see (15)), it would be unclear why such head movement is blocked by the presence of a PP-complement.[5]

(15) a. [$_{KP}$ -e [$_{NP}$ Piet [$_{PP}$ fan Nelles]]]
b. [$_{KP}$ Piet$_j$-e [$_{NP}$ t$_j$ [$_{PP}$ fan Nelles]]]

Besides the "PP-complement" problem posed by (13), there is another problem, which concerns the absence of *-s/-e* on proper names that behave like predicate nominals. Consider the examples in (16a,b), which are taken from the Katwijk Dutch dialect and the Asten Dutch dialect, respectively:

(16) a. [*Jáepje Skúit(*-e)*] nòmde ze die (Overdiep, 1940: 226)
Jaap-DIM Skuit(-e) called they that
'They called him Japie Skuit'
b. We noemen hem *Harrie(*-s)*
We call him Harrie(-s)
'We call him Harrie'

The predicative function of the proper name in (16) is strongly suggested by the fact that when we 'pronominalize' the proper name, we get the adverb-like pro-form *zo*, which typically functions as a pro-predicate in Dutch:

(17) We noemen hem zo
we call him so
'We call him so'

Clearly, *Jáepje Skúit* and *Harrie* in (16a,b) should be interpreted as predicate nominals that predicate over the external arguments *die* and *hem*, respectively. As is especially clear from the pronominal form *hem* 'him', these external ar-

[5] In (15), I have abstracted away from the potential presence of a DP-layer in between KP and NP.

guments carry accusative (i.e. non-nominative) case, and arguably should be analyzed as subjects of the small clause selected by *nòmde/noemen*.[6] Schematically:

(18) We noemen [$_{SC}$ hem Harrie]

It seems very unlikely that, in this small clause configuration, *Harrie* represents a nominative case form. If it carries any case form, it should be an accusative one, given the widespread case agreement attested with subject-predicate relations. In short, the 'bareness' of the proper name in (16) also seems to go against a case analysis of the *Proper Name* + *-s* construction.

3. *-S* AS A POSSESSIVE MARKER

If *-s* (or *-e*) is neither an enclitic definite article nor an accusative /oblique case marker, what can it be? What I would like to propose is that *-s* on *Anna's* in (1) is precisely the same element as the one we find on the possessive noun phrase in (19).

(19) We kwamen [Anna's moeder] tegen
We came Anna-s mother PRT
'We met Anna's mother'

Thus, the linguistic expression *Anna's* in (1) is a hidden possessive noun phrase, in which the possessed noun is silent, i.e. unpronounced. The internal structure which I will assume for *Anna's* is the one in (20):[7]

(20) [$_{DP}$ D [$_{PosP}$ Anna$_j$ [$_{Pos'}$ -s [$_{NP}$ POSSESSUM t$_j$]]]]

If *Anna's* in (1) is the same element and occupies the same (DP-internal) structural position as *Anna's* in (19), one would expect parallelism in their syntactic behavior. This, in fact, seems to hold true. A first sign of parallelism is the fact that the marker *-s* (or *-e*) typically attaches to the last proper noun in the case of a complex proper name (i.e. first name + family name). In (21a), this is illustrated for a regular possessive noun phrase, in (21b) for a possessive noun phrase featuring a silent possessed noun.

[6] See, for example, the following German example; H. van Riemsdijk p.c.: *Sie nannten Napoleon* [*den kleinen General*] ('They called Napoleon the-ACC small-ACC general'). The presence of accusative case on the predicate nominal in Dutch is also suggested by an example like the following, where the accusative pronominal form *haar* must appear in predicate position: *We noemen* [*hem*] [*haar/*zij*] *om iedereen in verwarring te brengen* ('We call him her/*she in-order-to everyone in confusion to bring').

[7] See, for example, Longobardi (1996) for a structural layering as in (20). The functional layer (PosP) in between DP and NP is the locus where the prenominal possessor is located.

(21) a. Dat is [*Krijn Haezenoot**e*** huis] (dialect of Katwijk)
that is Krijn Haezenoot-e house
'That is Krijn Haezenoot's house'
b. Ik hep *Krijn Haezenoot**e***-n -ezien
I have Krijn Haezenoot-e seen
'I saw Krijn Haezenoot'

Another parallel property relates to Van Haeringen's (1947) observation that the expression *Proper Name + -s* is typically found with 'bare' proper names, i.e. proper names that are not accompanied by any determiner-like element. Van Haeringen gives the following contrast:

(22) a. Laten we *vader**s*** daar nou maar buiten houden
let we father-s there PRT but outside keep
'Let's not involve father in this'
b. *Laten we *die arme vader**s*** daar nou maar niet mee
Let we that poor father-s there PRT but not with
lastig vallen
be-annoyed
'Let's not bother poor father with this'

A similar contrast is found with 'normal' possessive constructions:[8]

(23) a. [*Vader**s*** *fiets*] is gisteren gestolen
father-s bike is yesterday stolen
'Father's bike was stolen yesterday'
b. ?*[*Die arme vader**s*** *fiets*] is gisteren gestolen
that poor father-s bike is yesterday stolen
'That poor father's bike was stolen yesterday'

A third piece of parallelism concerns the fact that the grammatical morpheme *-s* that we find in expressions like *Anna's* in (1) is also found on the demonstrative pronoun *die* ('that') and the interrogative pronoun *wie* ('whose') (cf. (24)); that is, those elements that also have *-s* attached to them in regular possessives (cf. (25)); examples drawn from Overdiep, 1940: 110,131)

(24) a. *Wie**s*** sag ik taer? (dialect of Katwijk)
who-s saw I there
'Who did I see there?'

[8] Compare (23b) with the following doubling possessive construction, which is much better than (23b):

(i) [*Die arme vader z'n fiets*] is gisteren gestolen
That poor father his bike is yesterday stolen
'That poor father's bike was stolen yesterday'

b. Neen, ***dies*** ken ək iet foor dat werrek gebruiken
no that-s can I not for that work use
'No, I can't use him for that kind of work'

(25) a. ***Wies*** hoed is-tat?
who-s hat is-that
'Whose hat is that?'
b. Neen, ***dies*** hoet is ət iet
no, that-s hat is it not
'No, it isn't that person's hat'

Notice also that the ill-formedness of the pattern *Piet-e fan Nelles* in (13) follows quite straightforwardly: a possessor-noun (i.e. proper name + -s) never takes a PP(-complement) to its right. This restriction can quite nicely be shown on the basis of English, which, permits PP-satellites going with proper names as long as the grammatical marker *'s* follows the entire complex [N+PP]. That is, *[N+PP]'s* is permitted, whereas *[N+'s+PP]* is not:

(26) a. [[the man [PP with the beard]]*'s* bike
b. *[the man*'s* [PP with the beard]] bike

Clearly, *'s* attaches to the entire possessor noun phrase, and not just to the head noun (N). This restriction on the attachmnent of *'s* is also at the basis of the ill-formedness of the sequence *Piet-e fan Nelles*; the bound morpheme *-e* is attached to the head *Piet*, which takes a PP to its right.

Let me say a few more words on the sequence *Piet van Nelles* in (13). When we look closely at the nominal form *Nelles*, we distinguish a sequence of two markers, viz. *-e* and *-s* (see Overdiep, 1940: 110).[9] Thus, *Nelles* has the following composition: *Nel+-e+-s*. If both bound morphemes are grammatical markers of possession, there should be two possessive relationships involved: *Nel* is a possessor, which has *-e* attached to it and combines with an empty possessum; the complex '*Piet van Nell-e* POSSESSUM' also functions as a possessor and is "linked" to the possessum via the grammatical marker *-s*. Schematically:

(27) [[Piet van [[Nel]-*e* POSSESSUM]]-*s* POSSESSUM]

The linear ordering of the grammatical morphemes *-e* and *-s* corroborates the idea that the possessive marker does not combine directly with the proper noun (i.e. *Piet*), but rather with a phrasal projection.

[9] Overdiep (1940: 110) points out that this pattern featuring *-es* (arguably: *-e* + *-s*) at the end is typically found with names of older people.

4. A SUBJECT-OBJECT ASYMMETRY

So far, I have argued that the linguistic expression *Anna's* in (1) is a hidden possessive noun phrase, whose possessum noun is phonetically empty (see (20)). I will now address the question as to why the nominal pattern *Proper Name + -s* is permitted in object position but not in subject position (see (9)). The contrast is also shown by the pair in (28):

(28) a. Is *vaaier(*s)* zie^{j}k? (dialect of Oerle)
Is father(-s) ill
'Is father ill?'
b. Hedde *moeiers* be.w?
Have-you mother-s with-you
'Have you taken mother with you?'

I will make use here of Longobardi's (1994) insight regarding the distribution of bare nouns in Italian and English. He observes that Romance bare nouns are usually excluded from preverbal subject position, but admitted in internal argument position (Longobardi, 1994: 616); see the contrast in (29), where the bare noun is a mass noun:

(29) a. **Acqua* viene giu dalle colline (Italian)
water comes down from-the hills
'Water is coming down from the hills'
b. Ho preso *acqua* dalla sorgente
I.have taken water from-the source
'I took water from the spring'

Assuming that a bare noun like *acqua* is a DP consisting of a phonetically empty determiner and the lexical N(P) *acqua*, Longobardi (1994: 617) proposes that the distribution of the bare noun phrase *acqua* is determined by the requirement that the empty determiner be lexically governed.[10] In (29a), the empty determiner of the DP $[_{DP}\ [_{D}\ e][_{NP}\ acqua]]$ is not governed by any lexical head. The closest head is T, but T is not lexical. In (29b), on the contrary, the verb *preso* (lexically) governs the empty D of the DP *acqua*.

Longobardi (1994: 621) further points out that under an analysis in which arguments are always DPs, proper names like *Gianni* in (30a) and *John* in (30b) have the "underlying" structure in (30c); i.e. an empty D is syntactically present in the structure.

[10] The DP-status of the bare noun *acqua* is based on the idea that a nominal expression is an argument only if it is introduced by a categrory D.

(30) a. *Gianni* mi ha telefonato
Gianni me has called-up
'Gianni has called me up'
b. *John* called me up
c. [$_{DP}$ [$_{D}$ *e*] [$_{NP}$ Gianni/John]]

If (30c) is the structure of the proper names in (30a,b), the question obviously arises as to why the sentences are not ill-formed. Notice that the empty D would not be lexically governed, the closest head being T. Longobardi's solution to this puzzle is the following: the proper name *Gianni/John* raises and substitutes for D, so that there is no empty D present in the representation which is subject to the lexical government requirement. Evidence for N-to-D raising in Italian comes from the ordering of an attributive adjective and a proper name. The proper name precedes the modifying adjective, which arguably is obtained by moving the proper noun to D across the left branch attributive adjective:[11]

(31) a. *E' venuto [vecchio Cameresi] (Longobardi, 1994: 624)
Has come older Cameresi
b. E' venuto [Cameresi vecchio]

Now what about the English example (30b)? Should we also assume overt N-to-D raising for English? In view of the word order *old John* (and the ill-formedness of *John old*), the conclusion is inescapable that movement of the proper noun to D does not take place in overt syntax. Taking the idea seriously that languages that differ superficially as regards their word order can be computationally the same (i.e. the uniformity hypothesis), Longobardi (p. 641) argues that English N-to-D raising only differs from Italian in the timing of the movement. More specifically, N-to-D movement takes place in covert syntax (i.e. after Spell-Out) in English. After N-to-D raising (i.e. substitution) has taken place, the (LF-)representation does not contain any empty D, and consequently the structure is no longer excluded by a head government violation.

Taking Longobardi's approach towards proper names as our background, let's retun to the ill-formed example (28a), where *vaaiers* is in subject position. Remember that *vaaiers* is a hidden possessive noun phrase, whose internal representation before Spell-Out is the one in (32a). Let's further assume, in line with Longobardi's (1996) hypothesis that Saxon genitive constructions in the Germanic languages are hidden Construct States, that the head noun (i.e. the possessum) undergoes N-to-D raising (arguably for reasons of genitive case "assignment"). In a possessive construction in which the possessed noun is

[11] As noted by Longobardi, the order 'adjective + proper name' is attested with nominal expressions featuring an expletive definite article: *E' venuto* [*il vecchio Cameresi*] ('Has come the older Cameresi')

lexical (e.g. *vaders huis*, 'father's house'), this results in an LF-representation in which D is lexically filled. Consequently , the lexical government requirement does not apply. In a hidden possessive like *vaaiers* in (28a), however, the empty D remains empty even after LF N-to-D raising has taken place, this for the very simple reason that the raised (possessum) noun has no phonetic content. Thus, schematically, the LF-representation of *vaaiers* is like (32), where I have added the clausal environment (i.e. TP):

(32) $[_{TP}\ [_{DP}\ [_{N}\ e]_j\ [_{PosP}$ vaaier $[_{Pos'}$ -s $[_{NP}\ t_j\ ]]]]\ [_{T'}\ T\ldots]]$

D, which is substituted for by an empty Noun, remains empty. Since the empty head is lexically ungoverned at LF, the structure is ruled out.[12] When it is lexically governed, as in (33), the structure is well-formed:

(33) $\ldots\ [_{DP}\ [_{N}\ e]_j\ [_{PosP}$ moeier $[_{Pos'}$ -s $[_{NP}\ t_j]]]]$ hed (=V) (cf. (28b))

Recall that an expression like *Anna's*, which we now take to be a hidden possessive noun phrase whose unpronounced possessed noun raises to D in covert syntax, also occurs as an indirect object (2b) and a complement of P (2c). In the former case, V arguably fulfills the role of lexical governor of the empty noun that occupies D after N-to-D raising; in the latter case, P is the lexical governor. The ECM-examples in (10) are also accounted for: the matrix verb lexically governs the raised empty head noun occupying D. The impossibility of 'Proper name + -s' as a vocative expression (cf. (11)) also follows: the vocative phrase, clearly, is not governed by any lexical head.

[12] One might raise the question whether silent PERSON can occur in sentences in which DP is the subject of an unaccusative verb. As is well-known from split *wat voor* noun phases (see (i)), subextraction out of a "DP-subject" of an unaccusative verb is not possible when DP occupies the structural position Spec,TP (cf. Den Besten, 1985); see (ia). Subextraction is only possible if the "subject-DP" occupies a VP-internal object-position (see (ib)). Under an ECP-approach, this contrast is accounted for in terms of proper government: the VP-external subject-DP (and its spec-position) is not properly governed, since T is not a proper governor. The VP-internal subject-DP (and its spec) is properly governed because it is lexically governed by V.

(i) a. *Wat$_i$ zou $[_{SU}\ t_i$ voor schrijver$]\ [_{IO}$ haar] interesseren?
What would for writer her interest
'What kind of writer would interest her?'
b. [Wat$_i$ zou haar $[t_i$ voor schrijver] interesseren?

The prediction we make is that silent PERSON can occur in a subject-DP occupying a VP-internal position, but not in a subject-DP occupying a VP-external one. The relevant pair to look at would be the one in (ii):

(ii) a. Ik denk dat $[_{SU}$ Jantjes PERSON$]\ [_{IO}$ haar] zou interesseren
I think that Johnny-s PERSON her would interest
'I think that Johnny would interest her'
b. Ik denk dat $[_{IO}$ haar$]\ [_{SU}$ Jantjes PERSON] zou interesseren

Unfortunately, I haven't been able to find relevant pairs in the dialectal data sources that are available to me. I will therefore leave this interesting question for future research.

5. A SILENT SEMI-LEXICAL NOUN *PERSON*

A question which, obviously, should be addressed is the following: What is the nature of the phonetically empty noun that raises to D in covert syntax? In this section, I propose that this unpronounced noun is a silent, grammatical (i.e. semi-lexical) noun PERSON. Thus, *Anna's* in (1) is [*Anna's* PERSON]. More precisely, it has the following (overt syntax) representation:[13]

(34) $[_{DP}$ D $[_{PosP}$ Anna$_j$ $[_{Pos'}$ -s $[_{NP}$ PERSON t$_j$ $]]]]$

5.1 Semi-lexical nouns and silent nouns

In Emonds (1985), it is proposed that besides the well-known classes of lexical categories and functional categories an in-between class of categories should be distinguished, viz. the class of grammatical categories (e.g. grammatical nouns, grammatical verbs, etc.). This class of categories is also known under the label "semi-lexical" (cf. Corver & Van Riemsdijk 2001). According to Emonds, the closed class of grammatical nouns includes lexical items such as: *self, one, people, thing, place, reason, time, way*. Emonds (1985: 162) argues that these are words of the lexical category N which can be characterized as being the most frequently used and least semantically explicit members of the category noun. As regards their lexical make-up, Emonds (2000: 9) states the following: "a closed grammatical class X [. . .] is one whose members have no purely semantic features f, but only cognitive syntactic features F."[14] Following Chomsky (1965: 142), he argues that semantic features play no role in any syntactic rule, whereas cognitive syntactic features do (see also Chomsky, 1995: 230). This distinction at the featural level is exemplified in (35a) for the lexical noun *thing* (cf. (36a)) and in (35b) for the semi-lexical noun *thing* (cf. (36b)).

(35) a. *thing* {[+N,-V],[+Common],[-Animate],[+Count],[semantic features]}
b. *thing* {[+N,-V],[+Common],[-Animate],[-Count]}

(36) a. I bought a nice *thing* (*thing* as a lexical noun)
b. I bought some*thing* (*thing* as a semi-lexical noun)

The examples in (37) and (38) show that both types of nouns display a different (morpho)syntactic behavior. More particularly, lexical *thing*, being

[13] See also Kayne (2005) for PERSON as a silent noun.

[14] Thus, purely semantic features f are only present in the lexical make-up of the open class of lexical categories N, V, A and (lexical) P. Chomsky (1995: 230) gives [artifact] as an example of such a feature. Emonds's cognitive syntactic features F are present in the lexical make-up of lexical, functional and grammatical (i.e. semi-lexical) categories. They contribute centrally to meaning (i.e. are interpretable at the CI-interface level; cf. Chomsky (1995)). The set of cognitive syntactic features includes properties such as: ±N, ±V, ±PROXIMATE, ±PLURAL, ±DEFINITE, etc. In Chomsky (1995:230), these are referred to by the term "formal features".

[+count] can be pluralized; see (37a). This is impossible with the [–count] semi-lexical noun *thing*, as shown by (37b) A further distinction regards displacement: a semi-lexical noun *thing* is able to undergo N-to-D raising across an attributive adjective, yielding the surface pattern *some+thing nice* (cf. (38b)) This movement step is impossible with the lexical noun *thing*; see **some things nice*. The only possible order is that in (38a).

(37) a. I bought some *thing**s*** (plural formation)
b. *I bought some*thing**s*** (no plural formation)

(38) a. I bought [some nice *thing(s)*] (no N-to-D)
b. I bought [some+*thing*$_j$ nice t$_j$] (N to D raising across an adjective)

Besides this special transformational behavior of certain semi-lexical nouns, we have identified another property which seems to be characteristic of (certain) semi-lexical nouns, namely their ability to be silent in the sense of Kayne (2003, 2005, 2007). According to Kayne, silent nouns are nouns that are syntactically and interpretively active, but yet not pronounced. In the direct object noun phrase in (39), for example, a silent noun NUMBER is taken to be present.

(39) John ate [a few NUMBER sandwiches]

Presence of a silent noun NUMBER accounts for the occurrence of the singular indefinite article *a*, which obviously does not belong to the plural noun *sandwiches*. Under such an analysis, *few*, which is an adjective in view of the comparative form *fewer*, can be taken to modify the silent noun NUMBER. As Kayne (2003) points out, the occurrence of a silent noun is subject to a licensing requirement that there be some sort of antecedent which makes it possible to recover the (semantic) contents of the silent noun. This antecedent is not "strong" in the sense that there is a lexical item (say, a lexical noun *number*) present that "antecedes" the silent item. Rather, an interpretable formal feature (i.e. a cognitive syntactic feature in Emonds's sense) functions as an antecedent (i.e. identifies the semantic contents) of the silent noun. In (39), for example, the feature [+number], which arguably is part of the lexical make-up of the quantifying adjective *few* functions as a sort of antecedent for silent NUMBER (see Kayne, 2003).

5.2 Evidence for semi-lexical persoon/PERSOON

The question, obviously, arises what evidence there is for the existence of semi-lexical PERSON. As pointed out by Kayne (2003), silent nouns typically have an audible, i.e. pronounced, counterpart. As suggested by the example

in (40), the hypothesized silent grammatical noun PERSON also has a phonetically overt counterpart:

(40) a. Jan gaf mij informatie over [*Anna's persoon*]
'Jan gave me information about Anna's person'
b. Mijn CV geeft informatie omtrent [*mijn persoon*]
'My CV gives information about my person'
c. Er doen allerlei verhalen rond [*zijn persoon*]
there do all-sorts-of stories around his person
'All sorts of stories go around about his person'

In a way, the expression *Anna's persoon* in (40a) is an indirect way of referring to the individual *Anna*.[15] The same holds for *mijn persoon* and *zijn persoon*, which are paraphrasable as *mij* 'me' and *hem* 'him', respectively.[16]

That a phrase like *zijn persoon* functions as an interpretive unit is also clear from the following examples:

(41) a. *Bush* betreurde de kritiek op *zijn persoon*
'Bush regretted the criticism of his person'
b. *Bush* betreurde de kritiek op *hem*
'Bush regretted the criticism of him'

(42) a. [*Zijn*$_j$ moeder] waarschuwde *Jan*$_j$
'His mother warned Jan'
b. *[*Zijn*$_j$ persoon] waarschuwde *Jan*$_j$ (*zijn persoon* = 'he')
'His person warned Jan'
c. **Hij*$_j$ waarschuwde *Jan*$_j$
'He warned Jan'

In (41), *zijn persoon* enters into a relation of coreference with *Bush* and can be paraphrased by the pronoun *hem*. That *zijn persoon* functions as a single unit at the level of coreference is clear from the examples in (42). While it is possible for the possessive pronoun *zijn* to enter into a coreference relationship with the direct object *Jan* in (42a), this turns out to be impossible for *zijn persoon* in (42b). In a way, the ill-formedness is quite similar to the principle C violation in (42c), where the subject pronoun c-commands the proper name.

[15] See Jespersen (1924: 217) for this phenomenon of indirect reference. He mentions the following deferential substitutes as nominal expressions used for indirect reference: *your highness, your Majesty, your excellency, your Holiness, your eminence, your Lordship, your honor*. Observe that these noun phrases consist of a possessive pronoun and a quality denoting noun. In a way, the entire noun phrase indirectly refers to the addressee. The 2nd person possessive pronoun, which is part of the vocative expression, refers to the addressee.

[16] There, arguably, is a parallel here with composite reflexive pronouns of the type *myself, yourself* (as in *I hate myself*) which consist of a possessive pronoun + a semi-lexical noun *self*; see also dialectal *hisself*. See also the Dutch dialectal/colloquial form *z'n eigen* (his + own; 'himself'), as in *Jan slaat z'n eigen* (lit. 'Jan hits his own', 'Jan hits himself').

A further argument in support fo the semi-lexical status of *persoon* in (40) comes from the absence of plural formation (Recall at this point the behavior of semi-lexical *thing* in (37b)). As shown in (43), *persoon* cannot have a plural form in these contexts. In a way, the plurality is provided by the possessive pronoun, as is quite clear in (43a), where *hun* has *steeds meer mensen* as its antecedent:

(43) a. We zijn ons bewust van het feit dat steeds meer mensen op zoek zijn naar een levensinvulling die past bij *hun persoon/*hun personen*
We are ourselves aware of the fact that increasingly more people on search are for a life-fulfillment which suits with their person/*their persons
b. Er doen allerlei verhalen rond *hun persoon/*hun personen*
There go all-sorts-of stories around about their person/their persons

Another piece of evidence for the semi-lexical status of *persoon* is the fact that it cannot be modified by an attributive AP. Of course, modifiability by an attributive AP is a typical property of lexical nouns.

(44) a. [Die afkeer jegens *zijn (*strenge) persoon*] verbaasde Mourinho
That antipathy to his (severe) person astonished Mourinho
b. Op het web is veel informatie te vinden over [*zijn (*vriendelijke) persoon*]
On the web is much information to find about his (friendly) person

Further support for the semi-lexical status of *persoon* comes from coordination. As shown by (45), *persoon* cannot be coordinated with a lexical noun. Nor is it possible to coordinate the entire phrase *zijn persoon* with a noun phrase headed by a lexical (i.e. semantically contentful) noun; see (46).[17]

(45) a. Jan gaf mij informatie over [Anna's *zoon en dochter*]
'Jan gave me information about Anna's son and daughter'
b. *Jan gaf mij informatie over [Anna's *persoon en dochter*]
Jan gave me information about Anna's person and daughter
'Jan gave me information about Anna and Anna's daughter'

[17] Coordination with another N(oun Phrase) turns out to be possible if the second noun refers to an action or state involving the "person": *Er verschenen in de kranten allerlei commentaren op [**zijn persoon en werk**]*, 'There appeared in the journals all-sorts-of commentaries on his person and work'.

(46) a. Jan gaf mij informatie over [*zijn broer en zijn moeder*]
'Jan gave me information about his brother and his mother'
b. *Jan gaf mij informatie over [*zijn persoon en zijn moeder*]
'Jan gave me information about his person and his mother'

Now that we have given evidence for the existence of a pronounced (i.e. non-silent) semi-lexical noun *persoon*, we may return to its silent counterpart PERSOON. Remember from section 5.1 that silent nouns are typically 'licensed' by some sort of weak antecedent. More specifically, a cognitive syntactic feature F associated with some category in the local syntactic environment of the silent noun in a way identifies (the semantic contents of) the silent noun. It is quite obvious which element functions as the licensing antecedent for the silent noun PERSOON in nominal expressions like *Anna's* PERSOON in (1). The proper name *Anna* arguably carries a feature like [+person] or [+human] and as such is able to identify the contents of the silent semi-lexical noun PERSOON.

5.3 Silent semi-lexical PLACE, TIME, WAY

Thus far, I have argued that an expression like *Anna's* in (1) has the following more abstract representation (where I abstract away from LF-raising of PERSOON to D; see section 4): [*Anna's PERSOON*]. The question arises whether this hidden possessive construction – "hidden" in the sense that only the possessor+*'s* part surfaces phonetically – is found more widely in natural language syntax. Remember that according to Emonds (1985), the class of semi-lexical nouns includes lexical items such as: *one, self, place, reason, time, way*. It should be investigated then whether silent counterparts of some of these elements ever show up in hidden possessive environments. In this section, I will simply provide some further examples of this hidden possessive pattern, without entering into any in-depth discussion of each of these constructions.

A first example is given in (47), where arguably the silent semi-lexical noun PLACE functions as the possessum.

(47) I met her at *my uncle's*

This pattern is also found in dialects of Dutch; (48a) is Groningen Dutch (Ter Laan, 1953) and (48b) is Oerle Dutch (De Bont, 1958):

(48) a. Wie hebben vandoag bie *Haartenhof**s*** west?
Who has today with Haartenhof-s been
'Who's been with the Haartenhof family today?'
b. Bè *Nälleke**s*** is te naacht ene klaene gekomme
At Nelleke's is to night a small-one come
'Tonight, at Nalleke's, a baby was born'

The abstract representation of (48b) is given in (49), where the [+LOCATIVE] feature associated with the lexical P *bè* arguably functions as a weak antecedent for the silent noun PLACE, which denotes the location point (i.e. the reference object).

(49) $[_{PP}$ bè$_{[+LOC]}$ $[_{DP}$ D $[_{PosP}$ Nälleke$_j$ $[_{Pos'}$ -s $[_{NP}$ $[_{N}$ PLACE] t$_j$]]]]]

A second illustration of the hidden possessive construction featuring a silent semi-lexical noun is given in (50), where the noun *dinsdag* is followed by *-s*:

(50) Ik kom *dinsdag**s*** altijd later thuis (Dutch)
I come Tuesday-s always later home
'On Tuesday, I always come home later'

As shown in (51), *dinsdag-s* can combine with a lexical noun which also denotes time:

(51) Ik bezoek mijn moeder *dinsdag **s** ochtend* / *dinsdag **s** avond*
'I visit my mother Tuesday-s-morning / Tuesday-s-evening'

From the construction in (51), it is only a little step towards an analysis of (50) that has a silent semi-lexical noun TIME following *dinsdags*. I will tentatively assume that a property like [+TIME] is part of the lexical entry of names of days, and functions as an antecedent for silent TIME.

(52) $[_{DP}$ D $[_{PosP}$ dinsdag$_{[+TIME]}$ $_j$ $[_{Pos'}$ -s $[_{NP}$ $[_{N}$ TIME] t$_j$]]]]

A final illustration of the hidden possessive pattern is given in (53), where the silent noun is plausibly interpreted as WAY; see (54). In this case, the anteceding grammatical feature is somewhat less easy to identify and I will therefore leave a more complete characterization of this construction for future research.

(53) a. Jan zwom [op zijn *hondje**s***]
Jan swam at his dog-s
'Jan swam in a dog-like way'
b. Piet zal [op zijn *Piet**s***] afscheid nemen
Piet will at his Piet-s goodbye take
'Piet will say goodbye to us in his particular way'

(54) $[_{PP}$ op $[_{DP}$ z'n $[_{PosP}$ Piet$_j$ $[_{Pos'}$ -s $[_{NP}$ $[_{N}$ WAY] t$_j$]]]]]

6. CONCLUSION

In this article, I argued that the nominal expression *Anna's* in the dialectal Dutch sentence *We kwamen Anna**'s** tegen* (lit. 'We met Anna's', 'We met

Anna') is a hidden possessive noun phrase consisting of the proper name *Anna* and a silent noun PERSON in the sense of Kayne (2003). It was further shown that PERSON has the characteristics of what Emonds (1985) calls a grammatical (i.e. semi-lexical) noun. In line with Kayne (2003), I argued that the semantic contents of the silent noun PERSON could be recovered from some grammatical feature (the "weak" antecedent) associated with the possessor (i.e. *Anna*). I further tried to show that the distribution of nominal expressions like *Anna's* (see the subject-object asymmetry) follows from a theory of lexical government, quite along the lines of Longobardi (1994).

REFERENCES

Besten, H. den. (1985). The ergative hypothesis and free word order in Dutch and German. In J. Toman (Ed.), *Studies in german grammar* (p. 23-64). Dordrecht: Foris.

Bittner, M., & Hale, K. (1996). The structural determination of case and agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *27*, 1-68.

Bont, A. P. de. (1958). *Dialekt van Kempenland. meer in het bijzonder d'Oerse taol*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. (1995). *The minimalist program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Corver, N., & Riemsdijk, H. V. (2001). *Semi-lexical categories: The function of content words and the content of function words*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Emonds, J. (1985). *Towards a unified theory of syntactic categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Emonds, J. (2000). *Lexicon and grammar: The English syntacticon*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haeringen, C. van. (1947). Naamvallen bij eigennamen van personen en bij verwantschapsnamen. *Nieuwe Taalgids, XL*, 250-259.

Jespersen, O. (1924). *Philosophy of grammar* (1977 ed.). London: George Allen & Unwin.

Kayne, R. (2003). Silent years, silent hours. In L.-O. Delsing, C. Falk, G. Josefsson, & H. A. Sigurðsson (Eds.), *Grammar in focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack* (Vol. 2, p. 209-226). Lund: Wallin and Dalholm.

Kayne, R. (2005). On the syntax of quantity in English. In *Movement and silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kayne, R. (2007). Several, few and many. *Lingua*, *117*(5), 832-858.

Laan, K. ter. (1953). *Proeve van een Groninger spraakkunst*. Veen: Winschoten.

Longobardi, G. (1994). Reference and proper names. *Linguistic Inquiry*, *25*(4), 609.

Longobardi, G. (1996). The syntax of N-raising: a minimalist theory. *UiL OTS Working Papers of Theoretical Linguistics*.

Overdiep, G. S. (1940). *De volkstaal van Katwijk aan Zee*. Antwerpen: Standaard-Boekhandel.

Norbert Corver
Utrecht Institute of Linguistics-OTS
Utrecht University
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands
e-mail: norbert.corver@let.uu.nl