

(Appeared in “Triggers”, editors: Anna Breitbarth & Henk van Riemsdijk, published by Mouton de Gruyter)

Some Notes on Emphatic Forms and Displacement in Dutch*

Norbert Corver

1. Introduction

The starting point of this paper are the following pairs from (variants of) Dutch:¹

| | | | | | |
|---|----|--|----|----|---|
| 1 | a. | 'n kist tōrref a box peat 'a box with peat' | 1' | a. | 'n kiste tōrref (dialect of Katwijk) a box-e peat 'a box with peat' |
| | b. | 'n hóóp wáeter a heap water 'a lot of water' | | b. | 'n hóópe wáeter a heap-e water 'a lot of water' |
| 2 | | verdomd aardig damned nice | 2' | | verdomd-e aardig (colloquial Dutch) damned-e nice |
| 3 | a. | ik (I) | 3' | a. | ikke (I-e) |
| | b. | dat (that) | | b. | datte (that-e) |
| | c. | dit (this) | | c. | ditte (this-e) |
| | d. | wat? (what?) | | d. | watte? (what-e?) |

The linguistic expressions in (1)-(3) differ from those in (1')-(3') in the presence of the element *-e*, i.e. the sound ‘schwa’. In the former expressions we have a bare category, whereas the latter have a schwa attached to them. In (1'), the schwa combines with the quantity denoting noun of a pseudopartitive construction. In (2'), schwa is attached to a degree adverb contained within an adjectival phrase. In (3'), finally, the schwa is added to different types of pronouns: the first person singular personal pronoun *ik*, the singular demonstrative pronouns *dat* and *dit*, and the neuter interrogative form *wat*.

In traditional reference grammars of Dutch (cf. Overdiep 1937), the schwa-patterns in (1')-(3') are often referred to as ‘heavy’ forms and they are said to be associated with emphatic or affective force. More specifically, this emphatic force is associated with *-e*, which is traditionally called an emphatic suffix. The question arises whether these linguistic expressions have other grammatical properties in common besides the surface appearance of *-e* and the meaning-related property of emphasis/affect. In this article, I will argue that in all of the above constructions a predicative relationship is involved between two elements (a subject and a predicate). I will further propose that the predicate undergoes a leftward predicate displacement process. The element to which *-e* is (right-)attached is the displaced category which has been moved leftward across the subject over which it predicates. If movement is involved in the derivation of these expressions, a number of questions arise, such as: What triggers displacement of the predicative category? What is the nature of the grammatical marker *-e* and what operations of the computational system apply to it? And in what way is predicate reordering involved in the derivation of pronominal expressions like *ikke*, *ditte*, *datte* and *watte*? At the surface, these pronominal expressions seem to be simplex expressions; that is, they do not seem to consist of two subparts (i.e. a subject-like and a

predicate-like part). After having given an analysis of the linguistic expressions in (1')-(3'), I will explore the internal syntax of a number of other grammatical constructions which also feature the grammatical marker *-e* and which arguably should also be treated in terms of predicate displacement.

2. Predication and predicate movement in nominal phrases

Before turning to a detailed discussion of the linguistic expressions in (1')-(3'), let me first give some background information about the phenomenon of predicate displacement in the nominal domain, since this process will figure prominently in this article. In recent generative studies, a number of nominal construction types have been (re)analyzed in terms of predicate displacement, most notably the so-called *N of/van N*-construction (cf. (4a,b)). Kayne (1994:106) proposes an analysis according to which a noun like *idiot* (English: *idiot*) originates as a clause-internal predicate and is preposed across the subject *dokter* (English: *doctor*) in Spec,IP to the specifier position of a clause headed by a prepositional determiner *van* (English: *of*). The derived representation is given in (5).

- 4 a. die idiot van 'n dokter (Dutch)
 b. that idiot of a doctor

5 die [_{DP}PP [_{NP} *idiot*_{t_i}] [_{van} [_{IP} 'n dokter I^o [_e]_j...]

An alternative implementation of the DP-internal predicate displacement analysis is given by Den Dikken (1995, 1998). He proposes that in constructions like (4a,b) the displaced predicate originates in a DP-internal Small Clause configuration, i.e. XP. This XP is asymmetrically constituted such that the argument of the predicate, located in the complement position of the Small Clause head X, occupies the specifier position of XP, which — following Bowers (1993) — may also be referred to as Pr(edicate)P(hrase).^{2,3} Predicate displacement involves movement of the predicate (i.e. the complement of the small clause head) to a higher functional head FP. Schematically:

6 [_{DP} die [_{FP} idiot_{t_i}] [_{F'} F (= van)+X_i (= een) [_{XP} dokter [_{X'} t_i t_j]]]]]

According to Den Dikken, predicate movement as found in (6) is taken to be an A-movement operation. What characterizes this movement operation is that the inverted nominal predicate skips an intermediate A-position, viz. that of the small clause subject (i.e. Spec,XP). Hence, the movement of the nominal predicate appears to be a non-local A-movement. As Den Dikken points out, however, the predicate movement is local if one adopts Chomsky's (1993) locality theory in terms of equidistance. Under this theoretical proposal, the moved predicate can cross the subject as long as the two nominals are technically equally far away from the predicate's extraction site (i.e. t_j). Under Chomsky's assumptions, this situation is obtained by the application of a domain-extending head movement operation that creates a minimal domain that contains both the raised predicate and the small clause subject. Den Dikken argues that in the case of DP-internal predicate inversion, the requisite domain extending head-movement operation consists of raising of the functional head (X) of the small clause to a higher functional head (labeled here as 'F'). As indicated in (6), I will take X to be the indefinite article *een*. As noted in Bennis et al. (1998), *een* is spurious in this nominal environment in the sense that it does not seem to 'belong to' the noun that follows it, nor in fact to the noun that precedes it. Normally, the indefinite article is compatible with singular

NPs only (see (7a,b)). Furthermore, it does not cooccur with proper names and mass nouns (see (7c,d)).

- 7
- a. Ik heb een boek gelezen
I have a book read
 - b. *Ik heb een boeken gelezen
I have a books read
 - c. *Ik heb een Westertoren gezien
I have a Westertoren seen
 - d. *Ik heb een spinazie gegeten
I have a spinach eaten

As illustrated in (8), the second noun of the *N van een N* construction may be plural (8a); *een* also precedes proper names ((8b)) and mass nouns ((8c)). That *een* does not belong either to the preceding noun (i.e. the displaced predicate) is shown by the existence of examples like (8d), in which the first noun (and also the second one) is plural (data drawn from Bennis et al 1998).⁴

- 8
- a. ?die ramp van een getalscongruentiefeiten
that disaster of a number agreement facts
 - b. die pracht van een Westertoren
that beauty of a Westertoren
 - c. een pracht van een spinazie
a beauty of a spinach
 - d. die schatten van een kinderen
those darlings of a children

Consider, finally, the prepositional element *van* in (6). With Den Dikken (1995), I will assume that *van* in the *N van een N* construction is a nominal copula, which surfaces at PF in the functional head position F. In fact, this nominal copula is considered to be the (nominal) equivalent of the verbal copula (*to be*). As shown in (9a), the infinitival copula can be freely omitted in copular sentences with a straight subject-predicate order. It cannot be left out, however, in the Predicate Inversion counterpart of (9a) given in (9b) (see Moro 1991, Heycock 1991 for discussion):

- 9
- a. I consider John (*to be*) the best candidate
 - b. I consider the best candidate (**to be*) John

In Bennis et al. (1998), it is argued that next to predicate displacement of the A-type (henceforth: Predicate Inversion), there is predicate displacement of the A-bar type (so-called: Predicate Fronting) in the nominal domain. They give the following examples of the latter type:

- 10
- a. wat een boek(en)!
what a book(s)
'what books!'
 - b. wat voor een boek(en)?
what for a book(s)'
'what kind of books?'

It is assumed that in both the exclamative construction (10a) and the interrogative construction (10b), there is a predication relationship between the noun *boek(en)* — the subject — and the predicate *wat*. The surface pattern in (10a) is derived by fronting of the predicate *wat* across the Small Clause subject *boek(en)* to a left edge (i.e. A-bar) position within the extended nominal projection (i.e. Spec,DP). It is proposed that the exclamative interpretation of *wat* is the result of its being moved into the Spec of a functional projection whose head (D) is specified for the illocutionary feature [+EXCL]. Thus, this [+EXCL] operator head, just like the C-head in clausal constructions, triggers overt raising of the *wh*-form *wat* to its specifier. By raising to Spec,DP, *wat* ends up in a position to the left of its subject, as required in the light of the word-order facts. The derived structure then looks as follows:

11 [DP *wat*_j [D' [D_[+EXCL]] [X *een*]_i] [XP *boek(en)* [X' t_i t_j]]]]

As indicated in (11), Bennis et al. assume that movement of *wat* to [Spec,DP] requires the [+EXCL] operator head (i.e. D) to be lexical in exclamative DPs. They interpret this head movement to D as being parallel to the Verb Second effect in (main) clauses. The way to provide D with content is to raise *een*, the X-head internal to the Small Clause, to D. Notice that *een* is the spurious indefinite article: it does not belong to the noun that follows it, as is clear from the fact that a plural noun (*boeken*) can follow it. Nor does it belong to the *wh*-form *wat* (i.e. the fronted predicate).

Let us next consider the derivation of the interrogative noun phrase in (10b). Following Bennis et al., I will assume that *voor* is the lexicalization of the [+WH] operator D-head present in the structure.⁵ It is this prepositional D-head which defines interrogative force on the nominal expression. With *voor* filling the D-head, the spurious indefinite article is not required to lexicalize D. However, it can still be made use of for the process of Predicate Inversion. Head raising of *een* to F allows the predicate *wat* to first undergo predicate inversion to [Spec,FP] before it subsequently undergoes the process of predicate fronting to [Spec,DP]. Schematically, then, the derived structure of the *wat voor 'n N*-expression looks as follows:⁶

12 [DP *wat*_j [D' *voor* [FP t'_j [F' [F [X *een*]_i] [XP *boeken* [X' t_i t_j]]]]]]

Summarizing, two types of predicate displacement operations can be distinguished within the (Dutch) nominal domain: (i) Predicate Inversion and (ii) Predicate Fronting.⁷ Whenever Predicate Inversion takes place, the functional head F is necessarily included in the syntactic structure for purely structural reasons, having to do with the minimalist theory of locality (equidistance). The presence of nominal copula *van* can be taken to be a reflex of structurally driven functional head movement of X to F. Predicate fronting moves the predicate to the left edge of the extended projection (i.e. DP). It is driven by the need to associate the predicate with illocutionary properties such as exclamation and interrogation. It should further be emphasized that the motivation for the insertion of spurious *een* in the exclamative construction is different from the motivation of *een* in the *N van een N* construction. In the exclamative noun phrase, spurious *een* is inserted and moved in order to lexicalize the head of the exclamative operator projection (DP). In the *N van een N* construction *een* is inserted and moved in order to allow A-movement to take place without violating strict locality.

Having provided the reader with some background of the phenomenon of DP-internal predicate displacement, I will now turn to a discussion of the emphatic expressions in (1')-(3')

featuring the grammatical marker *-e*. I will start my discussion with the pseudopartitive pattern in (1').

3. Emphatic *-e* in pseudopartitive contexts

In Corver (1998), it is argued that the derivation of pseudopartitive constructions like those in (13) involve an underlying subject-predicate relationship and feature predicate movement. Of course, from a superficial point of view, the parallelism between the *N of N*-construction and the pseudopartitive construction is already quite telling: both constructions feature a meaningless preposition-like element *of*, which links two nouns.

- 13 a. John drank [a bottle *of* wine]
 b. John bought [a bunch *of* flowers]

Adopting a predicate displacement analysis (along the lines of Den Dikken 1995 and Bennis et al 1998) of the linguistic expression *a bottle of wine*, we start with an underlying representation like (14a) and end up with a derived structure like (14b):

- 14 a. $[_{XP} \text{ wine } [_{X'} [_{X} \emptyset] \text{ bottle}]]$
 b. $[_{DP} a [_{FP} \text{ bottle}_j; [_{F'} F (= \text{of})+X_i (= \emptyset) [_{XP} \text{ wine } [_{X'} t_i t_j]]]]]$

In (14a), *wine* — the quantified element — is the subject of the predication relationship, and *bottle* — the quantity-designating nominal — acts as the predicate. Empirical support for the predicative status of the quantity-designating noun comes from constructions like (15), in which the quantitative noun is the pro-element *so*. This coordinate pattern yields an approximative reading.^{8,9}

- 15 a. a [bottle or so] of wine
 b. a [liter or so] of water

What is important is that *so* generally functions as a pro-predicate, as is also clear from the examples in (16):

- 16 a. Mary is *very busy* and she expects to be *so* for the next four hours at least
 b. Mary became *a doctor* and remained *so* for the rest of her life

The occurrence of *so* as a right conjunct in expressions like *bottle or so* is completely in line with an analysis of the quantity-designating nominal as a predicate. That is, the requirement that two conjoined elements be of the same semantic type (e.g. argument & argument; predicate & predicate) is satisfied under a predicate displacement analysis: both the quantitative noun and *so* are treated as predicates. The conjunction of the two predicates undergoes Predicate Inversion in structures like (15).

Further evidence for the parallelism between the *N of N*-construction and the pseudo-partitive construction comes from the dialect of Katwijk, as described in Overdiep (1940: 139). Consider the following constructions:

- 17 a. D'r waere [*'n vrácht van ðn vaertuige*]
 There were a load of a vessels

- ‘There were a lot of vessels!’
- b. D’r lagge dan [ðn mácht van ðn tonne] op tie dam
 There lay then a power of a barrels on that dam
 ‘There lay a lot of barrels on that dam.’

The bracketed expressions in (17) are quite similar to the *N van een N* constructions in (4a) and (8). They feature the element *van*, which we analyze as the nominal copula which shows up in the head of FP as a result of the application of Predicate Inversion. Furthermore, the spurious indefinite article *ðn* is present in (17). Note that this article cannot possibly belong to the following noun (*vaertuige, tonne*), given the plural status of this noun. All this leads to the following derived structure of the linguistic expressions in (17):

18 [DP ’n [FP *vracht*_j [F’ F (= *van*)+X_i (= *ðn*) [XP *vaertuige* [X’ t_i t_j]]]]]

The quantity-designating predicate nominal (*vrácht/ mácht*) has undergone predicate inversion to [Spec,FP], after the small clause head *ðn* (X) has raised to the higher functional head F (this for reasons of equidistance).

Besides the pseudopartitive pattern featuring the elements *ðn* and *van*, the dialect of Katwijk, as described in Overdiep (1940), also has a pattern in which the two nouns are simply juxtaposed (cf. (19)). This juxtaposition pattern for pseudopartitive constructions is also the one found in standard Dutch (cf. (20)).

- 19 a. Toe krége we [’n hóóp wáeter] en toe riep de skípper...
 Then got we a heap water and then shouted the sailor...
 b. [’n Kist törrðf] is chaauw óp
 a packing-case peat is quickly gone
- 20 a. een hoop water
 a heap water
 b. een kist turf
 a packing-case peat

In Corver (1998), I argue that these juxtaposed pseudopartitive patterns involve head-movement (i.e. N-raising) of the quantity-designating predicate to the F+X-complex, which results from the domain extending X-to-F raising operation (see also Corver 2003). From the absence of the nominal copula *van* in these juxtaposed patterns, one might conclude that the raised predicate-nominal head has been substituted for F. Since the F-position is lexically filled in syntax by the raised nominal head, the appearance (i.e. phonological spell out) of the copula *van* at PF, is blocked. The derived structure looks as follows.^{10,11}

21 [DP ’n [FP [*hóóp*_j+X_i] [XP *wáeter* [X’ t_i t_j]]]]]

Notice that, as opposed to the pseudopartitive variant in (17), there is no spurious *ðn* present in (21). In the spirit of Bennis et al. (1998), I will assume that X can be radically featureless (i.e. \emptyset), meaning that it does not possess any morphosyntactic or phonological features. It is a mediating syntactic head which establishes a predication relationship between a predicate and a subject (i.e. external argument).¹²

What is interesting is that besides the pattern in (19a,b) the dialect of Katwijk also allows the following pattern:¹³

- 22 a. Toe krège we-n-om 'n uur of drie toch ['n hóope wáeter], man!
Then got we -n- around an hour or three but a heap water, man
'Oh man, around three o'clock, our boat made so much water!'
- b. We hadde-n-[ðn kiste tórref] staen
We had -n- a packing-case peat stand

The expressions *'n hóope wáeter* and *ðn kiste tórref* minimally differ from those in (19), namely in the appearance of the element *-e*, which is pronounced as 'schwa'. Importantly, Overdiep (1936, 1937, 1940) remarks that the presence of *-e* has an interpretative effect: it has an intensifying meaning and signifies strong affect or strong emphasis on the part of the speaker. Thus, while in the neutral-declarative sentences in (19) this intensifying element *-e* is absent (i.e. the amount is neutrally described), it must be present in constructions where the amount is presented as being amazingly or surprisingly great. Thus, *hóope* in (22a) designates a surprisingly great amount of water.¹⁴

Some additional examples of this intensifying pseudopartitive pattern are given in (23) (Examples are drawn from Overdiep 1936, 1937, 1940):

- 23 a. Toe vinge we daer in 'n week [ðn skuite haering]!
Then captured we there in a week a barge herring
'We then caught such an enormous amount of herring in a week!'
- b. De boere, die reen altijd nae Lâaje toe mit [ðn vrachte visch]!
The farmers, they drove always to Leiden PRT with a load fish
'Those farmers always drove to Leiden with such an enormous amount of fish!'
- c. Hael effe-n-[ðn nemmere waeter]
Get just-n- a bucket water
'Get me a large bucket with water!'
- d. Die vent die ving ['n berge haering]
That man that caught a mountain herring
'That man caught an enormous amount of herring!'
- e. We zette-n-[ðn potte brokken] op ('t vuur)
We put-n- a pot lumps on (the fire)
'We put a really large pot full of lumps on the fire!'

The question, of course, arises how to analyze these emphatic pseudopartitive constructions. Let us first consider the status of the element *-e*. Overdiep refers to it as an inflectional ending. Importantly, it should be distinguished from the inflectional ending *-e* that appears on attributive APs that enter into an agreement relationship with a noun, as in *'n ròdij-e ochend* (a red morning; 'a morning with the rising sun') and *'n skoon-e gront* (a clean soil). This inflectional ending *-e* does not appear on attributive APs modifying singular neuter nouns that are preceded by an (overt or covert) indefinite article, as in *blâeuw waeter* (blue water; i.e. transparent water) and *'n skoon overhemd* (a clean shirt-blouse). Given the absence of *-e* on APs that modify singular neuter nouns, it can be concluded that the element *-e* on *nemmer* in (23c), which is followed by the neuter noun *waeter*, is not the same type of inflectional element that appears on attributive adjectives.¹⁵

When we look at what can intervene between two nominal elements in contexts of DP-internal predicate displacement, we come to two possible candidates for the analysis of *-e*. First, it could be analyzed as an instance of the nominal copula; i.e. it would be a bound-morphemic equivalent of *van* and as such occupy the F-position. Secondly, it could be treated as an instance of the Small Clause head X. Under this second interpretation, it would be treated on a par with the spurious indefinite article *een*. The former analysis is excluded if one adopts the above-mentioned proposal that the raised predicate nominal (i.e. N) substitutes for F, so that PF-spell-out of this position by means of a nominal copula is blocked. This brings us to the second option: *-e* as an instance of the Small Clause head X, i.e. the head position which is also the locus of the spurious indefinite article. This analysis would give us the following representation of the string *'n hóope wáeter* in (22a):

- 24 [XP waeter [X' -e [hóop]]]
 25 [DP 'n [F' [F hóop]_j+X_i (= -e) [XP waeter [X' t_i t_j]]]]

In this structure, the Small Clause head X (= *-e*) raises to F for reasons of domain extension: after X has raised to F, the predicative head *hóop* can move across t_i into the [F+X]-complex, where it substitutes for F. I will assume here that the Small Clause head *-e* carries emphatic meaning.¹⁶ Suppose further that the quantity designating predicate receives an emphatic/affective reading (i.e. “a surprisingly great heap” in (25)) when it gets attached to *-e*. In a way, the emphatic reading of the displaced predicate is structurally determined.

4. Emphatic *-e* in adjectival contexts

As noted in Verdenius (1939b), adverbs of degree that precede a predicative adjective may optionally get attached the grammatical marker *-e* in Dutch.¹⁷ In present-day colloquial Dutch, the occurrence of this grammatical marker is rather limited. In the dialect of Groningen (a Low Saxon dialect), this phenomenon seems to be more common. In (West) Frisian, the emphatic marker *-e* obligatorily occurs on intensifying degree adverbs that modify a predicative adjective (cf. also Hoekstra 1997).

- 26 a. Die auto is [verdomd-e duur] (colloquial Dutch)
 That car is damned expensive
 b. Dat meisje is [verrekt-e aardig]
 That girl is damned nice
- 27 a. 't Was [gloepend-e mooi] (dialect of Groningen, Ter Laan 1953)
 it was very-E beautiful
 b. 't Was [donderz-e kòld]
 it was deuced-E cold
 c. 't Was [bitterliek-e kòld]
 it was bitter-E cold
- 28 a. dat skilderij is [wakker-e moai] ((West) Frisian, Hoekema 1996)
 that painting is very-E beautiful
 b. hy wie [stjerrend-e benaud]
 He was dead-E scared
 c. hy rôp [ôfgrysliek-e lû]
 he shouted terrible-E loud

Verdenius (1939b: 363) notes that only those degree adverbs can carry *-e* which have a strongly affective or emphatic force. More neutral degree adverbs (e.g. *matig* 'moderately') generally do not permit attachment of *-e*.

The question arises how to analyze these adjectival expressions featuring the grammatical marker *-e*. Could *-e*, for example, be interpreted as a grammatical marker that attaches to a displaced predicate, just like in the pseudopartitive constructions of the previous section? Even though the standard analysis of the sequence 'degree adverb + adjective' is one in which the two constituents are simply combined via (external) merge, there are phenomena in certain languages which hint at the application of predicate displacement in adjectival constructions featuring a degree adverb. A very suggestive case is provided by Romanian (cf. Corver 2000, 2001).

Romanian has constructions like those in (29) (examples drawn from Mallinson (1986)):

- 29 a. Ion e [extrem de înalt]
 Ion is extrem of tall-ms
 'Ion is extremely tall'
- b. Maria e [enorm de fericită]
 'Maria is enormously happy'
- c. Aleargă [enorm de repede] dar înoată cam încet
 run-3s enormous of quickly but swim-3 rather slowly
 He runs enormously quickly but swims rather slowly'
- d. un rol [deosebit de important in aceasta action] [...]
 a-m role particular of important-ms in this-fs action
 'a particularly important role in this action [...]

What makes these examples very interesting is the fact that the degree adverb (e.g. *extrem*) and the gradable adjective (e.g. *înalt*) are separated from each other by an intervening preposition-like element *de*.¹⁸ As noted in Corver (2000, 2001), the *N of N* construction and the *A de A* construction display similar syntactic behavior. As shown in (30) and (31), the first lexical element cannot be moved away from the sequence *of N/de A*. Furthermore, the latter sequence cannot be fronted to the beginning of the clause (cf. (32)).

- 30 a. *Fools of policemen*, they certainly are -- !
 b. **Fools*, they certainly are [-- of policemen]!
- 31 a. *Extrem de deștept* te mai crezi tu! (Grosu 1974)
 Extremely of clever yourself still believe you
 'You fancy yourself extremely clever!'
 b. **Extrem* te mai crezi tu [-- de *deștept*]!
- 32 a. **Of policemen* they certainly are *fools*
 b. **De deștept* te mai crezi tu [extrem --]!
 Of clever yourself still believe you extremely
 'You fancy yourself extremely clever!'

Whatever the exact analysis of these facts, they are suggestive of a parallel treatment of the two construction types. If one adopts a predicate displacement analysis for the *N of N* construction,

one should also do so for the Romanian *A de A* construction. Such an analysis leads to the following derivation of a linguistic expression like *extrem de înalt* in (29a): In the ‘underlying’ structure, there is a predicative relationship between the gradable adjective *înalt* — the ‘subject’ of the predication — and the degree adverb *extrem* — the predicate of the relationship. Under the assumption that this predication relationship is configurationally defined in terms of a Small Clause configuration, we end up with an underlying structure like in (33). I will assume that predication involves association (say: coindexation) of the external argument (i.e. 1) of *extrem* with the *G(rade)*-argument of the gradable adjective *înalt*. This association leads to the interpretation: ‘tall to degree D, where D is extreme’.

33 [XP *înalt*_{<1,G>} [X' X *extrem*_{<1>}]]

Application of the Predicate Inversion process leads to the derived representation in (34). The linking element *de* can now be interpreted as the nominal copula, which shows up as a surface reflex of the application of A-type predicate displacement.

34 [FP *extrem*_j [F F (= *de*)+X_i [XP *înalt* [X' t_i [AP t_j]]]]]

As shown by (35) it is impossible to remove the degree adverb out of the adjectival projection. Pied piping is required.

- 35 a. **Extrem te mau crezi tu* [-- *de deștept*]!
 Extreme yourself still believe you – of clever
 ‘You fancy yourself extremely clever!’
 b. [*Extrem de deștept*] *te mau crezi tu*!

When the degree word can be shifted further to the left edge of the adjectival projection (i.e. an A-bar position) — for example, when the degree words carries an interrogative feature — it can leave the extended adjectival projection:

- 36 a. *Cît de frumoasă e Maria!* (Grosu 1974)
 How-much of beautiful is Maria
 ‘How beautiful Maria is!’
 b. *Cît_i e Maria* [t_i *de frumoasă*]!

I will assume that the string *cît de frumoasă* has the derived representation in (37). The *wh*-word *cît* has first undergone Predicate Inversion, triggering the presence of the nominal copula *de*. The *wh*-word is subsequently moved to Spec, DegP via Predicate Fronting.

37 [DegP *cît*_j [Deg' Deg_[+WH] [FP t'_j [F' F (=de)+X_i [XP [AP *frumoasă*] [X' t_i [AP t_j]]]]]]]

Grosu (1974) also observes that there are patterns which lack the intervening linking element *de*. The absence of the nominal copula and the possibility of subextracting the degree adverb, as shown in (38), suggest that the degree adverb – adjective order results from the application of direct Predicate Fronting of the adverb from its base position to the A-bar position Spec, DegP (cf. (39)).

- 38 a. *Tare deștept te mai crezi tu!* (Grosu 1974)
 extremely clever yourself still believe you
 ‘You fancy yourself real clever!’

42 [DegP wakker_j [Deg' [Deg -e_i] [XP moai [X' t_i [AP t_j]]]]]

As indicated in (42), the grammatical element *-e* (i.e. X) raises to Deg (the operator head position of the extended adjectival projection). I will assume that quite along the lines of the exclamative *wat*-construction (cf. section 2), the X head has to raise to Deg in order to lexicalize the operator head position, into whose Spec the emphatic phrase has landed.

Let me close off this section with the expression *donderz-e kòld* in (28b). This example from the dialect of Groningen is interesting for the following reason: it exemplifies the application of Predicate Inversion plus subsequent Predicate Fronting to the left edge of the extended adjectival projection.²¹ Close investigation of the internal make-up of the degree designating expression *donderze* leads to the identification of two bound-morphemic elements: *-s* (orthographically realized as *-z* here) and *-e*. The former we analyzed as the nominal copula, the latter as the emphatic grammatical marker (i.e. the Small Clause head X). This then leads to the following derived structure of *donderz-e kòld*.

43 [DegP donder_j [Deg' [-s+-e_j]_k [FP t'_j [F' t_k [XP [AP kòld] [X' t_i [AP t_j]]]]]]]

5. Emphatic *-e* in pronominal contexts

In this section, I will consider the internal syntax of the pronominal forms in (44), which are all emphatic forms of the pronominal elements in (43).²²

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|--------------|-----|----|---------------------------|---------|
| 44 | a. | ik (I) | 44' | a. | ikke (I+ <i>e</i>) | (Dutch) |
| | b. | dat (that) | | b. | datte (that- <i>e</i>) | |
| | c. | dit (this) | | c. | ditte (this- <i>e</i>) | |
| | d. | wat? (what?) | | d. | watte? (what- <i>e</i> ?) | |

The emphatic forms in (44') carry the grammatical marker *-e*. In this respect, they are similar to the emphatic categories that we have analyzed thus far. The question then arises, of course, whether these pronominal forms have the same internal syntax as the emphatic expressions that were previously discussed. More in particular, the question arises, whether these pronominal forms feature a predicative relationship underlyingly, and whether predicate displacement might be involved. At first sight, such an analysis seems highly unlikely given the fact that these emphatic forms appear to exist of a single lexical item; since predication involves a relationship between two elements, there seems to be no such relationship involved in these emphatic pronominal expressions.²³

A very interesting observation, however, has been made by Sassen (1953: 118) in his book on the dialect of Ruinen (a dialect of Low Saxon). Sassen makes the observation that in this dialect the emphatic form *ikke* never co-occurs with a finite verb. Sassen's generalization, which extends to standard Dutch, may alternatively be formulated as follows: the emphatic pronominal *ikke* cannot function as a (subject) argument of a verb. In a sense, it displays the behavior of a (nominal) root expression. This restricted distributional behavior of *ikke* is illustrated in (45) with some examples from Dutch. Notice that the pronominal form *ik*, its near-surface-equivalent, can function as an argument within the clause.

45 A: Wie is er ziek?

- B: Ik / Ikke.
- 46 a. Jan dacht dat ik/?*ikke ziek was
John thought that I/*I-e ill were
- b. Die jongen ken ik/?*ikke niet
That boy know I/*I-e not

This restricted distribution is also found with the other emphatic pronominal forms.

- 47 a. Dat/*Datte heeft mij aangevallen
That has me attacked
- b. Jan heeft dat/*datte uitgespuugd
Jan has that/*that-e out-spitted
- 48 a. Dit/*Ditte zat in mijn tas
This/*This-e was in my bag
- b. Ik heb dit/*ditte vandaag gevonden
I have this/*this-e today found
- 49 a. Wat/*Watte zit er in die tas?
What/*What-e is there in that bag
- b. Wat/*Watte heb je gekocht?
What/*What-e have you bought
- c. Ik vraag me af [wat/*watte hij gekocht heeft]
I wonder REFL PRT wat/*what-e he bought has
- d. Jan heeft WAT/*WATTE gekocht?
John has WHAT/WHAT-E bought

In all these examples, the emphatic pronominals cannot occur as arguments of the verb. Notice now that the emphatic forms are permitted when they occur in isolation, for example as answers to questions ((50)-(52)) or as a reaction to incomprehensible speech (cf. (53)).

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 50 | A: Wat heeft Jan uitgespuugd? | B: Datte |
| | A: What has John out-spitted | B: That-e |
| 51 | A: Wat zat er in Maries tas? | B: Ditte |
| | A: What was there in Mary's bag? | B: This-e |
| 52 | A: Jan heeft iets leuks gekocht? | B: O ja? Watte? |
| | A: Jan has something nice bought? | B: Oh yes? What-e? |
| 53 | A: xxxxx (murmured speech) | B: Watte? |

One might interpret this restricted distributional behavior of the emphatic pronominals as evidence that they do not constitute regular nominal phrases (say, DPs). If they were DPs, why wouldn't they be able to occur in positions where other (pronominal) DPs are permitted. One way to go would be to say that the emphatic forms in (44') are ellipted constituents, more in particular ellipted small clausal constituents. This would imply that one element of the subject-predicate relationship of the Small Clause configuration is missing. I would like to propose that the missing element is the subject. More specifically, I propose that the empty subject (let's assume a 'pro') represents information that is pragmatically presupposed (i.e. familiar on the basis of information previously provided in the discourse). In (45), for example, there is the presupposed (i.e. background) information that 'there is a person X who is ill', when person B answers person A's question. And in (50), to use another illustration,

there is the presupposed information ‘there is a thing X which John has spitted out’, when B gives his answer ‘Datte’. The emphatic pronominal provides the new, focused information. In (45), it identifies the person X who is ill; and in (50), it identifies the thing X which John has spitted out. Given this interpretation of the emphatic pronominals, we arrive at the following underlying structure:

54 [XP pro (i.e. presupposed information) [X' [X -e] ik/dat/dit/wat]]

In line with our interpretation of the grammatical marker *-e* thus far, I will assume it to be the head of a Small Clause structure. The surface structure will be derived by fronting of the pronoun to an A-bar position to the left of the small clause subject pro. For the sake of explicitness, I have termed the projection containing this A-bar position CP. The marker *-e* raises to the functional head C, in order to lexicalize this functional head (a phenomenon which is reminiscent of the Verb Second effect in contexts of operator movement within a clause). The derived structure then looks as follows:²⁴

55 [CP ik/dat/dit/wat_i [Z' -e_j [XP pro [X' t_j t_i]]]]

At this point it is interesting to also mention the following patterns, in which the emphatic pronoun *ikke* combines with the negative adverb *niet* or the positive adverb *wel* (cf. Sassen 1953).

56 A: Houd jij van voetbal?
Like you of soccer
B: Ikke niet / Ikke wel
I-e not ('I don't') / I-e certainly ('I do')

Under the assumption that the adverbs *niet/wel* occupy the Spec-position of some functional head within the (small) clausal projection, we end up with the following representation:

57 [CP ik_i [C' -e_j [YP niet/wel [Y' t_j [XP pro [X' t_j t_i]]]]]]

The Small Clause head *-e* raises to the functional head Y and moves on to C. The pronominal *ik* undergoes A-bar movement to the left edge of the small clause structure.

Consider also the following structural context, noted by Sassen (1953), in which the emphatic form *ikke* may appear:

58 Wij, mijn vrouw en ikke, gaan vandaag naar de stad
We, my wife and I-e, go today to the city

At first sight, the appositional phrase *mijn vrouw en ikke* — a coordinate structure — seems problematic for my analysis, that is, if one assumes an analysis in which *mijn vrouw* is coordinated with *ikke*: *[[mijn vrouw] en [ikke]]*. If my analysis according to which *ikke* is a small clause-like structure is correct, then the coordinate pattern (a noun phrase together with a small clause structure) is rather strange, so it seems. Notice, however, that an alternative analysis is available, which makes perfect sense under the proposal given above. This analysis is the following:

59 wij, [CP [mijn vrouw en ik]_i [Z' -e_j [XP pro [X' t_j t_i]]],

In this structure, the coordinated structure is *mijn vrouw en ik*. It is this coordinate phrase which is preposed to the left edge of the Small Clause. The emphatic marker *-e* raises to C, the operator head, yielding the surface sequence: *mijn vrouw en ik-e*. The empty subject pro (i.e. the presupposed information) arguably corresponds to the referent of *wij*.²⁵

Let us, finally, turn back to the Sassen's generalization that, for example, the pronominal form *ikke* does not co-occur with a finite verb.²⁶ The reason for this distributional restriction may relate to the fact that small clauses typically do not occur as subject arguments of verbs. To give an example, even though it is possible to have a small clausal phrase as a left dislocated expression (i.e. external to the clause) (cf. (60)), it is impossible to have it as an argumental expression in the subject position of the clause:

- 60 a. [Jan een boek lezen], dat lijkt me onwaarschijnlijk.
 John a book read, that seems me unlikely
 b. *[Jan een boek lezen] lijkt me onwaarschijnlijk
 John a book read seems me unlikely

6. Other environments featuring *-e*

Thus far we have come across three types of linguistic expressions which, at first sight, do not seem to have much in common besides the appearance of the grammatical marker *-e* and the fact that they share the property of having an emphatic/affective meaning. I have argued that these expressions also share a syntactic property: they all feature the phenomenon of predicate displacement (and the phenomenon of head movement of X to a higher functional head). The question, of course, arises whether there are more grammatical constructions that display this set of properties. Even though an elaborate discussions of various constructions is beyond the scope of this article, I would like to point out a few expressions which, at a more abstract level, can be considered to be instances of the same type of syntactic construct.

A first construction I would like to mention here is the Dutch vocative-like expression in (61):

- 61 arm-e ik!
 poor-e I
 'poor me!'

This expression has the remarkable property that what appears to be an attributive adjective precedes a pronominal element. Normally, however, attributive adjectives do not modify pronouns. Notice also that when the expression functions as an argument within a clause, it becomes less acceptable:

- 62 ??Jan dacht dat [arme ik] ziek was
 John thought that poor-e I ill was

Given this special behavior of this expression, one might wonder whether *arme* in *arme ik!* is a truly attributive adjectival inflection (i.e. an inflection as we find it in: *een arme jongen*; a poor-e boy). Also when we look at equivalent expressions in other languages, it becomes

clear that *arme ik!* has a ‘special’ syntax. Consider, for example, the following expressions from French, Portuguese and Spanish:

- 63 a. pauvre de moi! (French)
 poor of me
 ‘poor me!’
 b. pauvres de nous!
 poor-pl of us
 ‘poor us!’
- 64 a. pobre de mim! (Portuguese)
 poor of me
 b. pobres de nós!
 poor of us
- 65 pobrecitos de nosotros (Spanish; cf. Jespersen 1977)
 poor-pl of us

Of course, what is interesting about these examples is the presence of the linking element *de*. Crucially, the sequence *de+pronoun* is not a PP-complement of the preceding adjective. Rather, there is a predicative relationship between the pronoun and the adjective: an example like *pauvre de moi!* has the interpretation that the property ‘poor’ is predicated over ‘me’ (i.e. the speaker). As the predicate precedes the subject, an analysis seems likely in which the predicate is fronted via predicate displacement to a position preceding the subject. The appearance of the nominal copula *de* suggests that predicate displacement is of the A-movement type here (i.e. movement to Spec,FP). Schematically:²⁷

- 66 [FP pauvre_j [F F (= de)+X_i [XP moi [X' t_i [AP t_j]]]]]

As shown in (65) for French, it is also possible to leave out the linking element *de*:

- 67 a. Pauvre moi!
 Poor me
 b. Pauvre lui!
 Poor him

If *de* shows up in contexts of Predicate Inversion (i.e. A-type predicate displacement), one might want to analyze the pattern in (67) as an instance of Predicate Fronting (i.e. A-bar-type predicate displacement); compare the contrast between *extrem de deștept* and *tare deștept* in Romanian adjectival expressions (cf section 4). If Predicate Fronting is involved in (67), the derived structure looks as follows:

- 68 [CP pauvre_j [C' C [XP [DP moi] [X' X [AP t_j]]]]]]]

Suppose now that in Dutch, as opposed to French, there is the ‘Verb Second-like’ requirement that the operator head position must be lexically filled when some phrase has been moved into the A-bar position (see my discussion of the *wat*-exclamative discussion in section 2). The grammatical marker *-e*, which I assume to be the Small Clause head, raises to C in order to satisfy this lexicalization requirement. The resulting derived structure of the string *arme ik!* is then the following:

- 69 [CP arm_j [C' -e_j [XP [DP ik] [X' t_j [AP t_j]]]]]]]

The analysis given above of vocative expressions like *arme ik, pauvre (de) moi! et cetera* can arguably be extended to phrases in which the noun following the (strictly speaking predicative) adjective is a non-pronominal element (e.g. a proper name).

- 70 arm-e Jan!
poor-e John

Normally, proper names cannot be preceded by an attributive adjective either:

- 71 a. Ik heb Jan gezien
I have John seen
b. ??Ik heb arm-e Jan gezien
I have poor-e John seen

The well-formedness of the expression in (70) suggests that it is derived along the same lines as *arme ik!*. That is:

- 72 [CP arm_j [C' -e_j [XP [DP Jan] [X' t_j [AP t_j]]]]]]

And in French, which does not require the lexicalization of C when the A-bar position is occupied by some operator-like (e.g. focalized) phrase:

- 73 [CP pauvre_j [C' C [XP [DP Jean] [X' t_j [AP t_j]]]]]]] (i.e. *Pauvre Jean!*)

An analysis of strings like *arme Jan/pauvre Jean* along the lines depicted in (72)/(73) paves the way for the analysis of 'phrases of addressing'. Dutch phrases like *Beste Jan* (Dear-e John), *Lieve Marie* (Dear-e Mary), i.e. phrases that you use to address people in letters or speeches, plausibly receive an analysis like (74):

- 74 [CP best_{t_j} [C' -e_j [XP [DP Jan] [X' t_j [AP t_j]]]]]]]]

And in a language like French:²⁸

- 75 [CP cher_j [C' C [XP [DP Jean] [X' t_j [AP t_j]]]]]]]]] (i.e. *Cher Jean*)

Consider, finally, the vocative expressions from Dutch in (76):

- 76 a. Hemeltje lief!
Heaven-DIM dear
'Good heavens!'
b. Lieve hemel!
Dear-e heaven
'Good heavens!'

What makes these examples interesting is that, even though they are fixed expressions — you cannot say, for example, *Lief Hemeltje!* — they show the characteristics that would be expected under our analysis: in the vocative expression (76a) we have the basic small clause pattern with the straight word order (i.e. subject-predicate: 'heaven (is) dear/good'). In (76b),

we have the pattern featuring predicate displacement. The structural representations of the two expressions is given in (77):

- 77 a. [XP hemeltje [X' X lief]]
 b. [CP lief_i [C' -e_j [XP [NP hemel] [X' t_j [AP t_j]]]]]]

7. Concluding remarks

In this article, I have examined a variety of construction types (from Dutch, (West) Frisian, the dialect of Katwijk, the dialect of Ruinen) that feature the grammatical marker *-e*, an element which has often been said to carry emphatic/affective force in the traditional literature. I have argued that the element (i.e. a quantity designating noun, a degree adverb and a restricted set of pronouns) to which this so-called marker of emphasis is attached constitutes a displaced predicate. I have furthermore proposed that *-e* should be treated as the mediating Small Clause head, which takes the predicate as its complement and the 'subject' as its specifier. This mediating head can raise to higher (functional) head positions. With Bennis et al. (1998), I argued that head raising of X is either motivated by purely structural reasons of locality (i.e. equidistance) or by reasons of lexicalization of the operator head position of a phrase whose Spec contains a fronted constituent. I have argued that *-e* is a small clause head whose movement enables structural domain extensions (for reasons of locality; i.e. X-to-F movement) or lexicalization of operator-heads. As such, it fulfills the same function as the spurious indefinite article *een* that appears in a variety of nominal environments: *N van een N*, pseudopartitive constructions (cf. section 3), *wat voor een N*-constructions and *wat-*exclamative phrases. In view of the fact that the emphatic marker *-e* is superficially similar to the adjectival inflection *-e*, one might wonder whether the former could be an instance of a spurious *-e*, i.e. an inflectional element that does not seem to belong to what follows and what precedes (cf. the discussion in footnote 15). One might want to say that just like the spurious indefinite article *een*, the spurious inflection *-e* is featurally un(der)specified and that this accounts for its unexpected distribution: e.g. combination with a following pronoun (*arm-e ik*) and a proper name (*arm-e Jan*) or attachment to a preceding noun and combination with a following indefinite neuter noun (cf. *∂n nemmere waeter*). Although a full investigation of the existence of a spurious inflection *-e* is beyond the scope of this paper, I would like to point out that if *een* and *-e* are instances of the mediating Small Clause head (X) and if both elements can have a 'spurious nature', one might expect to find the two elements in the same types of structural environments. Now consider the following pairs:

- 78 a. Hij heeft [een mirakel van een bibliotheek]
 He has a miracle of a library
 b. Hij heeft [een mirakel-*e* bibliotheek] (Overdiep 1937:166)
 He has a miracle-*e* library
 'He has a miracle of a library'
- 79 a. wat *een* grote vis! (standard Dutch)
 What a big fish
 b. Wát-∂ gróote viss! (dialect of Katwijk; Overdiep 1940:91)
 What-∂ big-*e* fish!
 'How big a fish!'
- 80 a. wat voor *een* jongens (standard Dutch)

- what for a boys
 ‘what kind of boys’
- b. Wa^əffər-□ jð^angəs (the dialect of West-Voorne; Van Weel 1904)
 Wat-for-e boys
 ‘what kind of boys’
- 81 a. Ik haar zoo’n ontzettend-*en* dorst (dialect of Groningen; Ter Laan 1953)
 I have such a great-a thirst
 ‘I am so extremely thirsty’
- b. I heb zo’n ontzettend-e dorst (standard Dutch)
 I have such a great-e thirst

In the a-examples, we find instances of the spurious indefinite article. Notice, in particular, pattern (81a) from the dialect of Groningen. As noted in Ter Laan (1953: 37-38), the adjective can be followed by the indefinite article *en* when the adjective carries an emphatic meaning.²⁹ As shown by the b-examples, the inflectional element *-e* can occur in those structural environments where we also find the spurious indefinite article. This distributional parallelism may further strengthen the idea that both the indefinite article *een* and the (adjectival) inflectional element *-e* have spurious counterparts in syntax.³⁰ Being instances of the Small Clause head X, both elements arguably undergo movement for the same reasons: either to enable domain extension in contexts of Predicate Inversion or to enable lexicalization of an operator head in contexts of Predicate Fronting.

Notes

*I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for helpful and insightful comments. I am also grateful to Joost Zwarts for discussion of certain parts of this paper.

1. In Dutch orthography, there are two ways of spelling the singular indefinite article: *een* and *'n*. In the examples from the dialect of Katwijk, we will also encounter the form *ən* for the indefinite article. This is a phonetically based spelling given in Overdiep’s (1936) study on this dialect. In this article, the spelling used for the examples from the Katwijk dialect are those given in Overdiep’s study.

2. For the idea that predication (in the clausal system) is mediated through a functional head, see among others Hornstein and Lightfoot (1987), Moro (1988).

3. Along the lines of Stowell’s (1981) original insight, I will assume that the predicative category belongs to the set of lexical categories (but see section 5) and that, semantically, the predication relationship consists of saturating or completing a structure that is inherently unsaturated or incomplete (i.e. the “Fregean view”). In the small clause configurational structure adopted in this paper (i.e. XP), it is the complement to the small clause head (i.e. X), which functions as the unsaturated predicate. The argument in [Spec,XP] saturates the structure. Following Chierchia (1984), I will assume that the lexical phrase (e.g. NP) in the complement position of X denotes a simple property and that the small clause head X defines a predication relationship which informally reads as: “the property associated with the complement of X *holds of* the subject”. See Bowers 1993 and Adger and Ramchand 2003 for further discussion.

4. As pointed out in Bennis et al. (1998), there is some variation among speakers of Dutch with respect to their judgments of some of the examples in (8). This may be related to the speaker variation found in the *N van een N* constructions with differences in gender between the two noun phrases (cf. Everaert 1992 for relevant discussion). The judgments given in (8) are those given in Bennis et al. (1998).

5. The idea that *voor* is a [+WH] operator head (i.e. a prepositional element with an interrogative force) is plausible in light of the fact that many southern varieties of Dutch and substandard Dutch in fact use *voor* as the infinitival complementizer in constructions that feature operator movement to Spec,CP, as the example of an infinitival relative in (i) shows (cf. Bennis et al. for discussion).

- (i) een boek [OP voor in te kijken]
 a book for into to look
 'a book to look into'

6. Bennis et al. (1998) discuss another pattern of the *wat voor*-construction, viz. one in which there is direct movement of the predicate (*wat*) to Spec,DP. In those constructions, the small clause head is said to be empty as regards its semantic and morphosyntactic feature specification.

7. In section 3, I will discuss a third type of predicate movement, viz. predicate displacement of the head-movement type (N-raising).

8. Interestingly, the approximative pattern in (15) is also found with numerals: [*twenty or so* minutes]. See Corver (2001) for a discussion of this pattern and for further arguments in support of the predicative status of numerals.

9. Not all pseudopartitives allow the pattern in (15): e.g. ^{??}*a bunch or so of flowers*. The intuition seems to be that *so* only appears with measures, while *bunch* is a collective. Another issue raised by the pattern in (15) is the fact that besides a pattern like *two liters or so of water*, English also permits: *two liters of water, or so*. For those cases, one might explore an analysis according to which not the entire quantity designating phrase has undergone DP-internal predicate displacement, but only the left conjunct of the coordinated phrase (leaving behind the sequence *or so*). Schematically:

- (i) [FP [two liters]_i [F' of [XP water [ConjP t_i [Conj' [Conj or] so]]]]]

See Corver (1998) for a discussion of this split pattern in Dutch and Modern Hebrew.

10. The structure in (21) predicts that N1 (*hóóp*) cannot be phrasal. As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, this may lead one to expect that it cannot be modified by an attributive adjective, as in a phrase of the type 'a large heap of water'. Unfortunately, I haven't been able to find such examples in the studies by Overdiep. But it should also be noted that attributive modifiers arguably occupy a position external to the N (of) N sequence. As is clear from the *one-pronominalization* test, an adjective like *small* in *a small bottle of beer* does not form a constituent with *bottle*. That is the representation is not: [a [[small bottle] of beer]]. If this were the right representation, one would incorrectly predict that the string *bottle of beer* could not be substituted for by the pro-form *so*:

(i) John drank [a small *bottle of beer*] and Mary [a large *one*]

11. One might alternatively want to argue that the quantity designating noun (*hoop*) first undergoes head movement to X and that the complex head [N+X] subsequently raises to F. This sequence of head movement steps is compatible with the Head Movement Constraint. The analysis presented in the main text can be made compatible with the Head Movement Constraint if it is assumed that after X-to-F raising, the empty X in XP is invisible for head raising of the nominal head of the predicate.

12. Bennis et al. assume this featureless small clause head to be present in *wat voor*-constructions that lack the spurious indefinite article, like in: *wat voor boeken*.

13. In Standard Dutch, the effects of the emphatic suffix *-e* in the Katwijk dialect seem to be ‘mimiced’ by stress. Compare the neutral stress pattern *een berg HAring* (a mountain herring; ‘a lot of herring’) with the pattern featuring emphasis on the quantity designating element: *een BERG HAring* (a mountain herring; ‘a surprisingly large amount of herring’).

14. This emphatic marker in pseudopartitive constructions was also found in 17th century Dutch. E.g. *ien hoop-e stof* (a heap-e dust; ‘a lot of dust’); cf. Weijnen (1952).

15. However, one might hypothesize that it is somehow related or close to this attributive-adjectival inflection *-e*, maybe in a way the regular indefinite article and the spurious indefinite article are related to each other. And on analogy with the notion of ‘spurious indefinite article’ one might want to talk about a ‘spurious inflection’, i.e. an inflection which does not seem to ‘belong’ to the elements in its near surroundings. Just like the spurious indefinite article does not seem to belong to the following noun (nor to the preceding noun, for that matter), the ‘emphatic’ inflection *-e* does not seem to belong to the following noun either (cf. (23c), where *-e* precedes a singular neuter noun). Nor does it seem to ‘belong to’ the preceding noun: the regular adjectival inflection *-e*, for example, normally does not combine with nouns in Dutch. I will briefly return to the relationship between the adjectival *-e* and the emphatic *-e* in section 7.

16. Alternatively, one might want to argue that the grammatical marker *-e* does not carry the emphatic meaning as a lexical property, but that the property of emphasis (or maybe Focus) is associated with the functional head position to which it is moved. Arguably, the spurious indefinite article *een* in *wat*-exclamative noun phrases (cf. (10)) also receives its exclamative meaning by occupying the operator head position D (i.e. the D-position that is specified for the exclamative force feature [+EXCL]).

17. The phenomenon that the emphatic marker *-e* appears on a degree adverb that modifies a predicative adjective should not be confused with the *-e* that proleptically appears on degree adverbs modifying attributive adjectival phrases (cf. also Corver 1997). For example:

- (i) een [erg-e dur-e] fiets
a very-e expensive-e bike
‘a very expensive bike’

For one thing: the adverb *erg* in (i) cannot carry a *-e* in predicative adjectival environments:

- (ii) Deze fiets is [erg(*-e) duur] (Compare: verdomd(-e) duur)
 This bike is very(-e) expensive damned(-e) expensive

For discussion of the phenomenon of proleptic agreement, see Corver (forthcoming).

18. As illustrated in (i), the modifying degree element never displays agreement with the subject (and the modified adjective). It is only the gradable adjective that agrees in gender and number with the subject of the clause (cf. (29b)):

- (i) Fată e [enormă de fericită]
 Girl-det is enormous-F.Sg of happy-F.Sg
 ‘The girls is enormously happy’

19. Elements such as *bliksems* (lightning-s), *duivels* (devil-s), *hels* (hell-s) also occur as attributive adjectives in nominal contexts:

- (i) a. die helse pijnen
 those hel-s-e pains
 b. die duivel-s-e kerel
 that devil-s-e man
 c. die bliksem-s-e jongens
 those lightning-s-e boys

Traditionally, the element *-s* is interpreted here as a derivational suffix that turns a noun into an adjective. The *-e* (schwa) that follows the sequence *N+s* is the inflection that shows up on attributive adjectives in Dutch. In the spirit of the DP-internal predicate displacement analysis as defended here, I would like to propose that in those constructions *-s* is a nominal copula as well. Drawing a parallel with the Dutch *N van N*-construction (cf. (iiia)), this would lead us to a derived structure like (iiib):

- (iii) a. [DP die [FP *duivel*_j [F' F (= van)+X_i (= 'n) [XP jongen [X' t_i t_j]]]]]
 that devil of a boy
 b. [DP die [FP *duivel*_i [F' F (= -s) +X_j (= -e) [XP jongen [X' t_j t_i]]]]]

As indicated in structure (iiib), I tentatively assume here that the Dutch inflectional element *-e*, which appears on attributively used adjectives, is the surface reflex of the raised small clause head X. In its base position, X stands in a Spec-head relation with the subject of the small clause (i.e. the [-neuter], [+singular] nominal phrase *jongen* in (iiib)). Let's assume that the grammatical features on the subject noun phrase value the small clause head, and that X surfaces as the attributive inflectional morpheme *-e*.

20. Interestingly, Den Dikken (1998) takes the ‘possessive marker’ *-s* (like in *Jans auto*; Jan-s car) to be an instance of the nominal copula. Presumably, the *-s* in the ‘N_{possessor} -s N_{possessee}’ construction and the *-s* in the ‘degree word -s A’ are tokens that are of the same type, viz. the nominal copula.

21. See also Frisian: *bliksem-s-e goed* (lightning-s-e well; ‘very well’) and *duvel-s-e kâld* (devil-s-e cold; ‘very cold’)

The impossibility to attach *-e* to the noun *vrouw* may be related to certain categorical restrictions on the phrasal host to which *-e* morpho-phonologically attaches; i.e. it needs a pronominal element as its host.

26. In Zwart (2000), it is noted that Sassen's generalization does not extend to all dialects of Dutch. There are Dutch dialects which seem to permit the co-occurrence of *ikke* and a finite verb. He gives the following example from Southern-East-Flemish:

- (i) \bar{i} ke zal dat doen
 I-e will that do
 'I will do that'

There are two possible lines one could explore here: First of all, one might want to analyze this pattern as a hidden left dislocation construction, 'hidden' in the sense that a demonstrative element (in Spec,CP) is missing. Under such a left dislocation analysis, *ikke* would not be the true subject-argument of the verb. Secondly, one might try to set up a cleft-like analysis, roughly along the following lines: 'it is *ik* (who) will do that'. The copular part 'it is *ik*' would underlyingly be represented as: [pro *-e ik*]. *Ik* will then be fronted to the left edge of the small clause, yielding [CP *ik*_j[C' *e*_i [XP pro t_i t_j]]] (+ (who) will do that). Needless to say, that for a complete answer these constructions need further investigation.

27. Possibly, *pauvre* moves on to the left edge (i.e. A-bar position) of the small clausal configuration.

28. Not unexpectedly, we also find *cher toi* (dear you) in French. This phrase receives the following structure under the approach adopted here:

- (i) [CP *cher*_j [C' C [XP [DP *toi*] [X' t_j [AP t_j]]]]]]]

29. Also in Frisian we find patterns in which an attributive adjective has the ending *-en* attached to it. As noted in Hoekema (1996:12), those adjectives always have an emphatic meaning. Arguably this *-en* is a weakened form of the indefinite article *in*.

- (i) Ha se ús gjin ôfgryslík-en fertriet besoarge?
 Has she us no terrible-en pain delivered
 'Hasn't she caused great trouble?'

See als Van der Meer (1987) and Verdenius (1939) for discussion.

30. In Lilley (2001), interesting examples from Northern Swedish dialects are given of what he calls dummy indefinite articles (i.e. spurious indefinite articles in our terminology).

- (i) a. Vi fått [fint e var]
 We have got fine a weather
 'We got fine weather.'
 b. Dänna var he [stor a husa]
 Over-there were there big a houses
 'There were big houses over there.'
 c. [en stor en ful en kar]

a big an ugly a man
'a big ugly man'

In (ia) and (ib), the spurious indefinite article is followed by an uncountable noun and a plural noun, respectively. The example in (ic) shows that this spurious indefinite article also shows up in recursive environments. It is interesting to see that the spurious indefinite article functions as a mediating head in structural contexts where a noun is modified by an attributive adjective. If spurious articles typically show up in contexts of predicate displacement (see e.g. the *wat voor*-construction, the *wat*-exclamative construction, the *N van N*-construction), then these facts from Northern Swedish may be suggestive for the application of predicate displacement in contexts of DP-internal modification by (prenominal) attributive adjectives.

References

- Adger, D. and G. Ramchand (2003) Predication and equation, *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 325-359.
- Bennis, H., Corver, N and den Dikken, M. (1998) 'Predication in nominal phrases'. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1, 85-117.
- Bowers, J. (1993) The syntax of predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591-656.
- Chierchia, G. (1984) Topics in the syntax and semantics of infinitives and gerunds. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Chomsky, N. (1993) 'A Minimalist program for linguistics theory'. In K. Hale and S.-J. Keyser, eds., *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1-52.
- Chomsky, N. (2001) Derivation by phase. In: M. Kenstowicz, ed., *Ken Hale: a life in language*, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Corver, N. (1997) 'The internal syntax of the Dutch extended adjectival projection' *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15, 289-368.
- Corver, N. (1998) 'Predicate movement in pseudopartitive constructions'. In A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder, eds., *Possessors, predicates and movement in the Determiner Phrase*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 215-257.
- Corver, N. (2000) 'Degree adverbs as displaced predicates'. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 12.1., 155-191.
- Corver, N. (2001) 'On predicate numerals'. In T. van der Wouden and Hans Broekhuis, eds., *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2001*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 65-76.
- Corver (2001) 'Predicate displacement within the adjectival system. Evidence from degree modification in Rumanian' In: R. Bok-Bennema, B. de Jonge, B. Kampers-Manhe and A. Molendijk, eds., *Adverbial modification*, Rodopi, Amsterdam.

- Corver, N. (2003) 'On three types of movement within the Dutch nominal domain'. In. M. Coene and Y. d'Hulst, eds., *From NP to DP. Volume I: The syntax and semantics of noun phrases*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 297-328.
- Corver, N. (forthcoming) 'Proleptic agreement as a good design property'. In J. Costa et al., eds., *Proceedings of the Lisboa Workshop on Agreement*.
- Dikken, M. den (1995) *Copulas*. Paper presented at GLOW 18, Tromsø, Unpublished manuscript, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam/HIL.
- Dikken, M. den (1998) 'Predicate Inversion in DP'. In A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder, eds., *Possessors, predicates and movement in the Determiner Phrase*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 177-214.
- Grosu, A. (1974) 'On the nature of the Left Branch Condition, *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 308-319.
- Haeseryn, W., K. Romijn, G. Geerts, J. de Rooij en M.C. van den Toorn (1997) *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*, Band 1, Tweede, geheel herziene druk, Martinus Nijhoff Uitgevers, Groningen.
- Heycock, C. (1991) *Layers of predication: The non-lexical syntax of clauses*. Doctoral Dissertation, Upenn. (published 1994, New York: Garland).
- Hoekema, T. (1996) *Beknopte Friese vormleer*. Afûk, Leeuwarden/Ljouwert.
- Hoeksema, J. (2000) 'Ikke as default-nominatief' *TABU* 30, 27-46.
- Hoekstra, J. (1997) Absolutely intensifying adjectives and the emphatic ending *-e* in North Frisian (Fering-Öömrang), West-Frisian and other West-Germanic languages. *Us Wurk* 46, 90-117.
- Hornstein, N. and D. Lightfoot (1987) Predication and PRO. *Language* 63:23-52.
- Jespersen, O. (1977; first published in 1924) *The philosophy of grammar*. George Allen & Unwin, London.
- Kayne, R. (1994) *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Laan, K. ter (1953) *Proeve van een Groninger spraakkunst*. Van der Veen, Winschoten.
- Lilley, J. (2001) The syntax of Germanic post-adjectival articles. Talk at the 16th Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax (CGSW 16), McGill University, Montréal, Canada.
- Mallinson (1986) *Rumanian* Croom Helm, London.
- Moro, A. (1988) Per una teoria unificata delle frasi copulari. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 13 : 81-110.

- Moro, A. (1991) 'The raising of predicates: Copula, expletives and existence'. In L. Cheng and H. Demirdache, eds., *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 15: More papers on Wh-movement*. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, 193-218.
- Overdiep, G.S. (1936) 'Zinsvormen en woordvormen' *Onze Taaltuin* IV, 362-375.
- Overdiep, G.S. (1937) *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch*, W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink, Zwolle.
- Overdiep, G.S. (1940) *De volkstaal van Katwijk aan Zee*, Standaard-Boekhandel, Antwerpen.
- Royen, G. (1953) *Buigngsverschijnselen in het Nederlands*. Amsterdam.
- Sassen, A. (1953) *Het Drents van Ruinen*. Van Gorcum/Hak & Prakke, Assen.
- Stowell, T. (1981) *Origins of phrase structure*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- Van der Meer, G. (1987) It is in dregen baas (de 'būgings' –(e)n bij eigenskipswurden), *Us Wurk* 36, 97-111.
- Verdenius, A. (1939a) Over de vormen van het adnominale adjectief en het lidwoord van bepaaldheid in de 17^{de} eeuwse Amsetrdamse volkstaal. *Nieuwe Taalgids* 33, 97-108.
- Verdenius, A. (1939b) Adverbia van graad op –e. *Nieuwe Taalgids* 33, 361-368.
- Weel, M. van (1904) *Het dialect van West-Voorne*. E.J. Brill, Leiden.
- Weijnen, A. (1952) *Zeventiende-eeuwse Taal*. Thieme & Cie, Zutphen.
- Zwart, J.-W. (2000) 'Ikke en de default-naamval: een reactie op Hoeksema', *TABU* 30, 175-182.