Inflected intensifiers: The structure dependence of parasitic agreement

1. Parasitism in human language

Research on parasitic gaps has made us familiar with the phenomenon of parasitism in syntax, that is the phenomenon that the presence of symbol α in a syntactic representation is dependent (i.e., parasitic) on the presence of another symbol α in that same representation; see among others Ross 1967/1986, Taraldsen 1981, Chomsky 1982, and Engdahl 1983. Example (1) is an illustration of the parasitic gap phenomenon:

(1) [$_{CP}$ *Which articles* did [$_{TP}$ John [$_{VP}$ file e_{RG}] [without reading e_{PG}]]]]?

The gap (e_{PG}) in the adjunct clause depends on the existence of another gap (the "real" gap: e_{RG}) in the main clause, sharing with it the direct object wh-phrase *which articles*. If the object noun phrase of the main clause is *in situ*, the appearance of e_{PG} in the adjunct clause is impossible: **John filed this book without reading*). In that case, presence of an overt element is required: *...without reading it*. Obviously, presence of the pronoun *it* in the adjunct clause in (1) is also possible.

    Research on parasitic gap constructions led to an important conclusion: the appearance of the parasitic gap is structure-dependent.[1] Specifically, the parasitic gap (e_{PG}) may not be linked to a real gap (e_{RG}) that is in a structurally higher position. In more formal terms: e_{PG} cannot be c-commanded by e_{RG}. This anti-c-command requirement is met in (1): e_{RG}, which is dominated by VP, is in a structurally lower position than e_{PG}, which is part of an adjunct clause higher up in the clausal structure. The anti-c-command requirement is violated, however, in (2), where e_{RG}, the 'trace' of the WH-moved subject noun phrase, c-commands e_{PG} in the adjunct clause.

(2) [$_{CP}$ Who [$_{TP}$ e_{RG} [$_{VP}$ met you] [before you recognized e_{PG}]]]

---

[1] See e.g. Chomsky (1975) for the notion of structure dependence. See also Everaert et al (2015) for various illustrations of the structure dependence of grammatical rules.

The case study on parasitic gaps raises the question whether other instances of syntactic parasitism can be found in natural language syntax. That is, are there other phenomena in which the appearance of symbol α depends on the existence of another symbol α? And to what extent is the appearance of the parasitic symbol subject to a structure dependent requirement? In this article, I present a case study on morphosyntactic parasitism in Dutch. Specifically, an adjectival agreement suffix (-*e*, pronounced schwa) can optionally appear on an adjectival degree word (an intensifier) that modifies an overtly inflected attributive adjective (see Verdenius 1939, Royen 1948, Corver 1997a). An example is given in (3).

(3) een erg(-e)   leuk-e auto
    a   very-(*e*) nice-*e* car

The article is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the phenomenon of parasitic agreement. Section 3 discusses semantic and categorial restrictions on the intensifier that carries the parasitic agreement morpheme. In section 4, multiple parasitism is discussed, that is, the appearance of more than one parasitic agreement morpheme within the adjectival projection. Section 5 discusses a string-based analysis of parasitic agreement, and section 6 discusses a structure-based approach according to which the intensifier and the gradable adjective are represented as separate attributive modifiers within the noun phrase. Section 7 presents the analysis adopted in this article: parasitic agreement as a manifestation of the Spec-head agreement configuration. In section 8 the phenomenon of parasitic agreement is associated with emphasis of information. Section 9 provides a brief overview of parasitic agreement in other varieties of Dutch and other languages. Section 10 concludes the article.

2. Augmented degree words

Consider the inflectional paradigm of Dutch attributive adjectives:

(4) a. de *leuk-e* auto$_{[-neuter]}$ (5) a. het *leuke* huis$_{[+neuter]}$
        the nice-E car   the nice house

b. een *leuk-e* auto_[-neuter]   b. een *leuk* huis_[+neuter]

   a   nice-E car   a   nice house

c. (de) *leuk-e* auto's_[-neuter]   c. (de) *leuke* huizen_[+neuter]

   (the) nice-E cars   (the) nice houses

As (4)-(5) show, attributive adjectives in Dutch normally carry the adjectival inflection –*e* (i.e., /ə/), as in *leuke*. However, when the attributive adjective modifies a noun phrase with the feature constellation [+neuter], [+singular], [−definite], as in (5b), the attributive adjective is morphologically bare (*leuk*), in the sense that there is no overt inflection attached to the adjective. I assume that, in that case, a zero-affix is attached to the adjective: *leuk-ø*.

Consider next the examples in (6), in which the attributive adjectival expression contains an intensifying degree modifier that specifies the degree to which the property denoted by the gradable adjective (*dure*) holds. As indicated, this degree word can optionally carry a schwa. From now on, this augmentative schwa, which is typically found in colloquial speech, is represented as -*E*. This way, it is orthographically easily distinguishable from the adjectival inflection -*e* on the attributive adjective.

(6) een [erg(-E) / afgrijselijk(-E) / ongelofelijk(-E) dur-**e**]   auto

      a   very(-E)/ horrible(-E)   / unbelievable(-**E**) expensive-AGR car

      'a very / horribly / unbelievably expensive car'

The appearance of –*E* on the degree word is dependent (*parasitic*) on the appearance of overt inflectional morphology (i.e., -*e*) on the modified adjective. This is clear from the examples in (7) and (8). Only if –*e* is attached to *leuk* can the degree modifier be augmented with –*E*. If there is no overt inflectional morphology (i.e., -*e*) present on the attributive adjective, -*E* cannot appear on the degree modifier.[2] This is shown by (8a), where we have an attributive adjective within a [-definite, +singular, +neuter] noun phrase. As illustrated by (8b), augmentative -*E* is permitted when the attributive adjectival occurs in a noun phrase specified as [-definite, -singular, +neuter]. In that nominal environment, the attributive adjective carries overt inflection.

---

[2] See, though, section 8.

(7)a.　een [erg(-E) leuk-e]　auto
　　　　a　very-E　nice-AGR　car

　　b.　[erg(-E) leuk-e]　auto's
　　　　very-E　nice-AGR　cars

(8) a.　een [*erg(*-E) leuk*]　huis
　　　　a　very-E　nice　house

　　b.　erg(-E)　leuk-e　　huizen
　　　　very(-E)　nice-AGR　houses

A further illustration of the fact that the appearance of -*E* on the degree word is parasitic on the presence of inflectional –*e* on the (gradable) adjective, comes from NP-ellipsis constructions. As shown by the contrast between (9a) and (9b), -*e* typically appears on an attributive adjectival modifier when the nominal head of the indefinite neuter singular noun phrase has been elided (Kester 1996, Corver and Van Koppen 2011).

(9) a. Jan heeft [een [heel lief]　konijn] en Marie heeft [een [heel *stout*]　konijn]
　　　Jan has　a　very sweet rabbit and Marie has　a　very naughty rabbit

　　b. Jan heeft [een [heel lief]　konijn] en Marie heeft [een [heel　*stoute*] ∅]
　　　Jan has　a　very sweet rabbit　and Mary has　a　very naughty-E
　　　'Jan has a very sweet rabbit and Mary has a very naughty one.'

Notice now that the inflected attributive adjective (*stoute*) in the NP-ellipsis pattern licenses the appearance of –*E* on the degree word (yielding *helE*); see (10b). As shown by (10a), *helE* is impossible when NP-ellipsis has not applied to the nominal expression.

(10) a. *Jan heeft een heel lief　konijn en Marie heeft [een [*helE*　stout]　　konijn]
　　　　Jan has　a　very sweet rabbit and Marie has　a　very-E naughty-E rabbit

　　b. Jan heeft　een heel lief　konijn en Marie heeft [een [hel*E*　*stoute*] ∅]
　　　　Jan has　　a　very sweet rabbit and Marie has　a　　very-E naughty-E

A third observation that suggests that the appearance of augmentative -*E* is parasitic on the presence of (overt) adjectival inflection (i.e., -*e*) on the adjective comes from predicatively used APs. Predicative APs, as opposed to attributive ones, do not display any (overt) inflection on the adjectival head, as is exemplified in (11). Observe that it is impossible to have an augmentative -*E* on the adjectival degree word that modifies the predicative adjective:

(11) Deze   auto   is erg(*-E) leuk.
     this   car   is very(-E) nice
    'This car is really nice.'

3. Semantic and categorial restrictions on parasitic agreement

Besides the morphosyntactic requirement that the modified attributive adjective carry the adjectival inflection –*e,* there are a number of other restrictions on the appearance of augmentative -*E*. From a more interpretative point of view, augmentative -*E* typically occurs on intensifiers that belong to the subtype of amplifiers; that is, degree words that scale upwards from some tacitly assumed standard value or norm (see Broekhuis 2013:104). Besides the intensifiers *erg, afgrijselijk,* and *ongelofelijk* in (6), this subtype also includes modifiers such as *vreselijk* 'extremely', *ontzettend* 'terribly', *ongelofelijk* 'unbelievably', *waanzinnig* 'insanely', *geweldig* 'tremendously', *verschrikkelijk* 'terribly', *belachelijk* 'absurdly', *behoorlijk* 'quite/rather'.[3]

As shown by (12a,b), modifiers of absolute adjectives —i.e., adjectives that are not scalar but rather imply the endpoint of a scale— tend to be less easily combinable with -*E*. The same holds for the approximative modifier *praktisch* in (12c). It should be noted, though, that instances of such patterns can be found on the internet (Google search), whence the judgment [%], which means acceptable for some speakers but not for others.

(12) a.   een compleet/[%]complet-E leg-e   kamer

---

[3] For some speakers -*E* is also accpetable on downtowners (i.e., down-scaling degree words) such as *tamelijk* 'rather' and *redelijk* 'reasonably', as in *een tamelijk-E lompe opmerking* (a quite-E rude-AGR remark) and *een redelijk-E snelle auto* (a reasonable-E fast-AGR car 'a reasonably fast car').

    a   complete/complete-E   empty-AGR room

    'a completely empty room'

b. een volledig/[%]volledig-E   naakt-e   vrouw

    a   complete/complete-AGR naked-AGR woman

    'a completely naked woman'

c. een praktisch/[%]praktisch-E leg-e   kamer

    a   virtual/virtual-E   empty-AGR room

    'a practically empty room'

As indicated by the examples in (13) modal, temporal or evaluative modifiers are never augmented with –E.

(13) een [vermoedelijk(*-E) / tijdelijk(*-E) / [gelukkig(*-E) goedkop-e] fiets

    a   presumable-E   / temporary-E / fortunate-E   cheap-AGR bike

    'a presumably / temporarily / fortunately cheap bike'

Having shown that augmentative -E typically occurs on (amplifying) intensifiers, I now turn to a second restriction on the word that functions as a host for -E. Categorially, the host must be adjectival in nature. Importantly, in line with Bowers' (1975) and Emonds' (1976) claim that English "adverbs" such as *extremely* and *terribly* are actually adjectives, I propose that adverbially used degree modifiers such as *erg*, *afgrijselijk*, and *ongelofelijk* in (6) are actually adjectives. Evidence in support of their adjectival nature comes from their distributional behavior. As illustrated in (14), these intensifying elements occur in syntactic positions that are typically (though not exclusively) occupied by adjectives. For example, they occur as attributive modifiers of nouns, complements of copular verbs, and complements of verbs like *vinden*, which select a predicative complement:

(14) a. een afgrijselijke blunder

     a   horrible   mistake

b. Deze film   is afgrijselijk.

     this   movie is horrible

c. Ik vind die muziek afgrijselijk.

    I   find   that music   horrible

Consider now the degree modifiers *zeer* 'very' and *vrij* 'rather/fairly', which are, respectively, an amplifying intensifier and a downtowning one. As (15) shows, augmentation with –E is impossible.[4]

(15) een zeer/*zer-E dure   auto

    a   very/very-E expensive-AGR car

As shown in (16), the degree modifier *zeer* does not appear in positions where adjectives are typically found.

(16) a. *een zer-e   blunder

      a   horrible mistake

   b. *De pijn was zeer.

      the pain was very

   c. *Ik vond de pijn zeer.

      I   found the pain very

4. Multiple parasitism

E-augmentation can sometimes apply to more than one degree word within the extended adjectival projection. This phenomenon of multiple parasitism is typically found in (inflected) attributive adjectival phrases featuring the complex modifier *heel erg* (very much). An example is given in (17):

(17) een [AxP hel-*E* erg-*E*   dur*e*]   fiets

---

[4] Verdenius (1939) gives the form *eine zere nette miensj* (a very-E decent-AGR person, 'a very decent person') for Limburgian Dutch. The augmented form *zere* suggests that in this variety of Dutch, *zeer* is adjectival.

a   very-E   much-E expensive bike

'a really very expensive bike'

This "spreading" of schwa is not an arbitrary process. As shown in (18), it is impossible to "skip" a potential carrier of augmentative schwa. In a way, a non-augmented degree word counts as an intervener for leftward spreading of augmentative schwa (see also Corver 1997a, Broekhuis 2013).

(18) a.   een [$_{AxP}$ heel   erg   dur*e*]   auto

        a   real   very expensive-AGR car

        'a really very expensive car'

   b. $^?$een [$_{AxP}$ heel erg-E dur*e*] auto

   c.   een [$_{AxP}$ hel-E erg-E dur*e*] auto

   d.   *een [$_{AxP}$ hel-E erg dur*e*] auto

Another pattern in which the phenomenon of multiple parasitism is found is given in (19):

(19) a.   een erg   erg   dure   auto

        a   very very expensive car

        'a really very expensive bike'

   b. $^?$een erg, erg-E dur-e auto

   c.   een erg-E, erg-E dure auto

   d.   *een erg-E, erg dure auto

In these examples, we have an iterative pattern: repetition of the degree modifier amplifies the intensifying meaning.

5. Parasitic agreement: a string-based approach?

From the parasitic agreement phenomena discussed so far one might draw the conclusion that augmentation of the intensifier with –E is a string-based "surface-structure" effect. That is, E-augmentation is a pure PF-phenomenon that results from *linear*-based spreading of the adjectival inflection of the attributive adjective onto the *linearly adjacent* adjectival degree word. More specifically, the affix *-e* of the attributive adjective gets copied onto the adjectival degree word under linear adjacency, a process reminiscent of Embick and Noyer's (2001) post-syntactic (morphological merger) rule of *Local Dislocation*. Schematically, we have the process as depicted in (20), where $\alpha * \beta$ means that the elements α and β are linearly adjacent. Augmentation applies in a right to left direction, where the agreement morpheme *-e* on *dure* gets copied onto the immediately left adjacent instance of *erg*, yielding *ergE*, whose inflection is subsequently copied onto the leftmost instance of *erg*, resulting into the sequence *ergE ergE dure*.

(20) a.　een * erg * dur**e** * auto　　　→

　　　　　een * erg**E** * dur**e** * auto　　　(een ergE dure fiets)

　　 b.　een * erg * erg * dur**e** * auto　→

　　　　　een * erg * erg**E** * dur**e** * auto →

　　　　　een * erg**E** * erg**E** * dur**e** * auto　　(een ergE ergE dure fiets)

　　A first potential problem for this string-based analysis is the fact that degree word augmentation is possible if linguistic material linearly intervenes. Specifically, the parenthetical word *ja* 'yes', expressing the speaker's reinforced affirmation of the high degree, may separate the members of a sequence of iterated degree words like (20b). This is exemplified in (21), where (21a) represents the non-augmented pattern and (21b) the augmented pattern. If degree word augmentation applied only under strict linear adjacency with a preceding lexical item carrying *-e*, then the intervening *ja* should block the "spreading" of schwa, but it doesn't.

(21) a.　een　erg　**ja**　erg　**ja**　erg　goei**e**　grap

　　　　　a　　very　yes　very　yes　very　good　joke

　　　　　'a really, yes, really good joke!'

　　 b.　een erg-*E* **ja** erg-*E* **ja** erg-*E* goei*e* grap

A second potential argument against a linear, purely PF-based analysis of augmentative schwa comes from patterns in which *-E* is present on the adjectival degree word even though there is no overt adjectival inflection *-e* present on the gradable adjective that heads the adjectival projection. The existence of such patterns suggests that augmentative schwa does not simply result from a copying process that applies at the sound surface; that is, *-e* as part of an attributive adjective gets PF-copied onto a linearly adjacent adjectival degree word.

Some relevant facts are given in (22):

(22) a. een erg(-*E*) verlegen(*-e) man[-neuter]

     a   very   shy   man

   b. een erg(-*E*) belezen(*-e) man[-neuter]

     a   very   well-read   man

   c. een erg(-*E*) open(*-e)   samenleving[-neuter]

     a   very   open   society

The adjectives *verlegen*, *belezen*, and *open* end in *–en* in written language but are pronounced as schwa in spoken (Standard) Dutch. Possibly, the absence of attributive adjectival inflection is somehow related to the fact that the adjectival root ends with the sound schwa (see also Broekhuis 2013).

Importantly, the examples in (22) show that, in spite of the presence of the right morphosyntactic feature constellation —i.e., [-neuter], [-definite], [+singular]—, the attributive adjectives do not display the attributive adjectival inflection *-e*. Nevertheless, it is possible to add augmentative *-E* to the adjectival degree word. This suggests that the appearance of *-E* is not simply a matter of (string-based) PF-copying of an overt inflectional marker. Rather, what really matters is the abstract feature constellation associated with the attributive adjective.

For the sake of completeness, observe also the following examples, in which the attributive adjective phrase is contained within a noun phrase having the feature constellation [-definite, +singular, +neuter].

(23) a. een erg(*-*E*) verlegen   kind[-neuter]

a   very   shy   child

b. een erg(*-*E*) belezen   kind[-neuter]

a   very   well-read child

c. een erg(*-*E*) open volk[-neuter]

a   very   open nation (i.e., group of people)

'very open-minded people'

As we saw in (5b), the adjectival head never displays the overt inflection –*e* in those contexts. Example (8a) further showed that augmentative –E never appears on the degree word in those environments. The obligatory absence of augmentative –E in (23) is completely in line with (8a). Importantly, the patterns in (22) and (23) suggest that what matters for E-augmentation is not the Spell-out (i.e., overt phonological realization) of the adjectival inflection, but rather the abstract feature complex that underlies Spell-out.

Let me now turn to a third argument against a string-based "surface" approach to augmentative schwa. The argument comes from participles that are used attributively. Consider the following examples featuring an inflected attributive present participle:

(24) a. een [maandenlang over zijn toekomst erg(*-E)   twijfelend*e*]   leerling

a   months.long   about his future   much(-E) doubting-AGR student

b. een [zich al   jaren daarop erg(*-E)   verheugend*e*]   man

a   REFL already years that.to much(-E) look.forward-AGR man

These examples show that the participles *twijfelend* and *verheugend* can carry an attributive adjectival inflection -*e* and be modified by a degree modifier (*erg*). As indicated, the degree modifier cannot be augmented with –E even though it is linearly adjacent to the inflected present participle. The ill-formedness of the augmented form *erg-E* suggests that E-augmentation is not a surface process based on string-adjacency.

A similar conclusion can be drawn on the basis of the examples in (25), where the degree word modifies a past/passive participle:

(25) a. een [toendertijd door iedereen   erg(*-E) gehat-e]   dictator

11

    a   at.the.time   by   everyone very(-E) hated-AGR dictator

    'a dictator who is hated by everyone'

  b. een [toendertijd door iedereen erg(*-E) gewantrouwd-e] president

    a   at.the.time   by   everyone very-E   distrusted-AGR   president

The examples in (24) and (25) show that E-augmentation of a degree word is not possible when the degree word modifies a (linearly adjacent) present or past/passive participle. At this point, it should be noted, though, that there are patterns in which E-augmentation of the degree word does seem to be possible when it modifies a participle. Consider the following examples:

(26) a. een [erg(-E) opwindend*e*]   gebeurtenis

    a   very(-E) exciting-AGR   event

  b. een [erg(-E) geïnteresseerd*e*] student

    a very-E   interested-AGR   student

So, what underlies the contrast between (24) versus (26a), and (25) versus (26b)?
From a string-based perspective, there is no difference as regards the distance between the inflected present participle and the modifying degree word. So there must be another factor that is at the basis of the contrast. This factor might very well be related to the categorial nature of participle. Specifically, the categorial nature of the participles in (24)-(25) is verbal, while that of the participles in (26) is adjectival (see also Broekhuis 2013 for discussion). The verbal nature of the participles in (24)-(25) is clear from their aspectual properties. The present participles in (24) express durative aspect, as is clear from the presence of the modifiers *maandenlang* and *al jaren*. The participle designates an ongoing event. Note that this durative meaning is absent in (26a): *opwindend* refers to the property (a state of affairs) of being excited. The past/passive participles in (25) express perfective aspect: we are dealing with an event that has been completed. In (26b), on the contrary, the participle *geïnteresseerde* refers to the property of being interested. In other words, it semantically acts like a true adjective.

Note that the adjectival nature of *opwindend* and *geïnteresseerd* in (26) is confirmed by a number of diagnostics for adjectival status (see also Broekhuis 2013). Firstly, synthetic comparative formation can apply to these forms, as in (27).

(27) a.　een　[nog　opwindendere]　　　　gebeurtenis
　　　　　an　 even　exciting-COMPAR-AGR　event
　　　　　'an even more exciting event'
　　 b.　een　[nog　geïnteresseerdere]　　　student
　　　　　an　 even　interested-COMPAR-AGR　student
　　　　　'an even more interested student'

Secondly, as shown in (28), those participles can be prefixed by means of the negative morpheme *on-*, which is typically found on adjectives (e.g., *aardig* 'kind', *onaardig* 'unkind').

(28) a.　een　[onopwindende]　gebeurtenis
　　　　　an　unexciting-AGR　　event
　　　　　'an unexciting event'
　　 b.　een　[ongeïnteresseerde]　student
　　　　　an　uninterested-AGR　　 student
　　　　　'an uninterested student'

Thirdly, the participles in (26) can be modified by the intensifier *heel* 'very' (see (29)), an intensifier that can combine with adjectives but not with verbs.[5]

(29) a.　een　[heel　opwindende]　gebeurtenis
　　　　　an　 very　exciting-AGR　event
　　　　　'an very exciting event'
　　 b.　een　[heel　geïnteresseerde]student
　　　　　a　　very　interested-AGR　student
　　　　　'an very interested student'

---

[5] For example, it is impossible to say: **Dat windt hem heel op* (that excites him much PRT, 'that excites him a lot').

None of these adjectival properties apply to the participles in (24)-(25). In (30), this is exemplified for *twijfelend* in (24):

(30) a. *een nog twijfelendere   student
          an   even doubting-COMPAR-AGR student
          'a student who is even more in doubt'
     b. *een ontwijfelende   student
           an   un-doubting-AGR student
     c. *een heel twijfelende   student
          a   very doubting-AGR student

On the basis of the above-mentioned contrasts it can be concluded that participles can display verbal or adjectival grammatical behavior. When the participle is adjectival, parasitic agreement is attested: that is, the inflection *-e* (= schwa) on the participle can license the appearance of -E (= schwa) on the adjectival degree modifier. When the participle is verbal, however, parasitic agreement is impossible: -E cannot appear on the adjectival degree modifier despite the presence of an inflection on the linearly adjacent participle. As a final illustration of this contrast, consider also the following minimal pair:

(31) a. een [hem erg(*-E) opwindend-e] jurk
          a   him   very(-E) exciting-AGR   dress
          'a dress that excites him a lot'
     b. een [erg(-E) opwindend-e] jurk
          a   very(-E) exciting-AGR   dress
          'a very exciting dress'

In (31a), *opwindend* is a verbal participle, while, in (31b), it is an adjectival participle. Parasitic agreement is possible in (31b), but not in (31a).

Although I have related the absence of parasitic agreement to the verbal nature of participles in (24), (25) and (31a), the question remains why the inflection *-e* on the participle cannot

"spread" onto the degree modifier. Related to that question: if the participle in these examples is verbal, how does that match with a clearly adjectival property, namely the presence of adjectival inflection? In what follows (see section 7), I propose that the adjectival participle and the verbal participle have a different underlying syntactic structure. To make things concrete, the adjectival participle *opwindend* in (31b) is an adjectival word. Specifically, it has the syntactic representation in (32b). The verbal participle *opwindend* in (31a), on the contrary, has a composite syntactic structure, consisting of a verbal part (*hem opwind-*) and an adjectival part (*-end*); see (32b). It will be argued that this difference in phrasal structure is at the basis of the contrast between (24)-(25) on the one hand and (26) on the other hand.

(32) a. [AP [VP hem opwin-] -end]

    b. [A(P) opwindend]

6. Parasitic agreement: inflected intensifiers as attributive adjectives?

In the previous it was shown that the phenomenon of parasitic agreement cannot be analyzed in terms of string-based leftward "spreading" of the overt adjectival inflection *-e*. A structure-based approach seems more plausible. In this section, one implementation of such an approach will be sketched and rejected.

    Starting from the idea that the appearance of *-E* on an AP-internal degree modifier is unusual, this structure-based approach hypothesizes that in a construction like *een erg-E dur-e auto*, the adjectival degree word *erg-E* is not located within the attributive adjectival expression at all but rather behaves like an AP-external attributive AP that somehow has scope over the gradable adjective that follows it. See (33a). Under such an analysis, *afgrijselijke dure* in (33a) has the same structural analysis as *mooie dure* in (33b). Being in an attributive position, the adjectival degree word *afgrijselijk* receives an adjectival inflection (here represented as *-E*), just like the "normal" attributive adjective *dure*.

(33)   a. [DP een [NP afgrijselijk-*E* [NP dur*e*   [NP fiets]]]]
          a   horrible-E   expensive-AGR bike

'a horribly expensive bike'

b. [_DP_ een [_NP_ mooi*e*   [_NP_ dur*e*   [_NP_ fiets]]]]

   a   beautiful-AGR   expensive-AGR bike

   'a beautiful expensive bike'

It can easily be shown that this approach towards augmentative *–E* does not work. First of all, as shown in (34), *-E* can also appear on a degree word that clearly forms a conjunct (and therefore a constituent) together with the modified adjective:

(34)   een [niet alleen [_AP_ afgrijselijk*E* dur*e*]   maar ook [_AP_ afgrijselijk*E* lelijk*e*]] fiets

       a   not   only   horrible-E expensive but   also   horrible-E ugly   bike

       'a horribly expensive and horribly ugly bike'

Secondly, patterns like (35) are possible, in which a PP that is selected by the adjective precedes the augmented degree word.

(35) een daarvan erg-E afhankelijk-e   jongen

     a   that.on   very-E dependent-AGR boy

     'a boy who is very dependent on that'

If the augmented degree word occupied a separate attributive position, as in (33a), the PP-complement would have to be moved from within the second attributive AP to a position preceding the first (supposedly) attributive AP, as is depicted in (36).

(36) [_DP_ een [*daarvan*_i_ [_NP_ erg-**E** [_NP_ [t_i_ afhankelijk**e**] [_NP_ jongen]]]]]

       a   that-on   very-E   dependent-AGR   boy

       'a boy very much dependent on that'

Such a displacement operation, however, is impossible, as shown by the ill-formed example (37b), where the PP-complement *daarvan* has been moved from within the attributive AP headed by *afhankelijke* (see (35a)) to a position preceding the attributive AP *vriendelijke*.

(37) a. [DP een [NP vriendelijk**e** [NP [daarvan afhankelijk**e**] [NP jongen]]]]

    a   friendly-AGR   that-on   dependent-AGR   boy

    'a friendly boy who is very much dependent on that'

   b. *[DP een [*daarvan*_i [NP vriendelijk**e** [NP [t_i afhankelijk**e**] [NP jongen]]]]]

    'a friendly boy who is very much dependent on that'

Given the above-mentioned problems, I conclude that the phenomenon of parasitic agreement cannot be explained in terms of an attributive adjectival analysis of the augmented degree word.

7. Parasitic agreement as a Spec-head relationship

The paradigms in (4) and (5) made clear that three features play a role in determining the appearance of overt adjectival inflection on Dutch attributive adjectives: +/- definite, +/- singular, and +/- neuter. When the noun phrase has the feature specification [-definite, +singular, +neuter], the attributive adjective is morphologically bare, which was interpreted as the presence of a zero-affix on the attributive adjective. In all other cases we find the inflectional affix -*e*. I will take these affixal manifestations to be spell-outs (externalizations) of the feature complex that is associated with the adjective entering into an agreement relationship —concord— with the noun phase. If augmentative (i.e., parasitic) -E is a manifestation of adjectival agreement, then the question arises how this agreement can appear on the adjectival degree modifier.

From the examples in (21) and (22) we may conclude that appearance of parasitic agreement is dependent on the abstract feature constellation of the attributive adjective rather than on the overt manifestation of this feature complex. That is, there are patterns in which -*e* is absent on the attributive adjective but nevertheless (optionally) present on the degree modifier (represented here as -E). This suggests that parasitism regards first and foremost the abstract feature constellations that form the input to Spell-Out.

Besides the feature constellation of the attributive adjective, the structural relationship between the attributive adjective and the degree modifier matters for the appearance of parasitic agreement. Specifically, I propose that parasitic agreement is an instance of Spec-head

agreement. I assume that the adjectival intensifier occupies the Spec-position of the lexical head A, which means that the intensifier is structurally close to the attributive gradable adjective:

(38) a. $[_{AP}$ $[_{AP}$ erg] leuk$_{<1,G>}$-AGR]]^6 (no parasitic agreement)

b. $[_{AP}$ $[_{AP}$ erg-AGR] leuk$_{<1,G>}$-AGR]]   (parasitic agreement)

A reason for placing the degree modifier in a structurally close relationship with the attributive adjective is the fact that the scalar/gradable property of the adjective is a lexical property of the adjective *leuk*, here represented with the subscript G(radable). I assume that this lexical property must be locally satisfied, meaning within the lexical projection AP. Empirical support for the structural proximity of the adjectival intensifier and the gradable adjective comes, first of all, from complex attributive adjective phrases containing multiple modifiers. As shown in (39), the degree word is always closest to the gradable adjective:

(39) a. een [{vermoedelijk / tijdelijk / gelukkig}   [vreselijk   goedkop-**e**]] fiets

a   presumablly / temporarily/ fortunately extremely cheap-AGR   bike

'a presumably / temporarily / fortunately cheap bike'

b. *een [vreselijk {vermoedelijk / tijdelijk / gelukkig} goedkop-e] fiets

Secondly, the PP-complement of a regular adjective like *blij* 'happy' cannot intervene between the gradable adjective and the degree word, neither in predicative APs nor in attributive ones:[7]

(40) a. $[_{AP}$ <Daarmee> erg <*daarmee> blij <daarmee>] was Jan.

that.with   very   happy   was Jan

'Jan was very happy with that.'

---

[6] Subscript 1 represents the external argument of *leuk* and subscript G represents the lexical property of being gradable; see Corver (1997a,b).

[7] As opposed to the predicative AP in (40a), the attributive AP in (40b) does not permit the pattern in which the PP-complement follows the adjective. That is, the (inflected) adjective must be linearly adjacent to the noun. This restriction on the placement of PP within an attributive adjectival phrase has been attributed to a ban on right recursion for (certain) phrases occuring on left branches. For discussion, see among others Emonds (1976), Williams (1981), and Biberauer, Holmberg and Roberts (2008).

b. een [_AP_ <daarmee> erg <*daarmee> blije <*daarmee>] man
   a   that.with   very   happy-AGR   man
   'a man who is very happy with that'

As shown by the following examples, other types of modifiers can reasonably well be separated from the adjective by an intervening PP-complement:

(41) a. een [<daarmee> gelukkig <^?daarmee> erg <*daarmee> blije] man
      a   that.with fortunately   very   happy-AGR man
   b. een [<daarmee> vermoedelijk <^?daarmee> erg <*daarmee> blije] man
      a   that.with presumably   very   happy-AGR man
   c. een [<daarmee> slechts tijdelijk <^?daarmee> erg <*daarmee> blije] man
      a   that.with only temporarily   very   happy-AGR   man

Having shown that there are good reasons for assuming that the adjectival intensifier occupies a syntactic position that is structurally close to the (attributive) adjective, let us next turn to the pattern in (17), repeated here as (42):

(42) a. een [_AxP_ heel erg dur**e**]   auto
      a   real very expensive-AGR car
      'a really very expensive car'
   b. ^?een [_AxP_ heel erg-**E** dur**e**] auto
   c. een [_AxP_ hel-E erg-E dur**e**] auto
   d. *een [_AxP_ hel-E <u>erg</u> dur**e**] auto

Before giving an analysis of the (multiple) parasitic agreement phenomenon in (42c), let me point out that the amplifier *heel* can be followed only by the amplifying degree word *erg*. Other degree words such as *vreselijk* 'extremely', *ontzettend* 'terribly' et cetera cannot occur in combination with *heel*, as is exemplified in (43):

(43) *een [heel vreselijk/ontzettend dure]   auto

      a   very extremely/terribly expensive-AGR car

From the possible cooccurrence of *heel* and *erg* I conclude that they form a syntactic unit that acts as a modifier of the gradable adjective. Schematically:

(44)   een [AP [AP heel erg] dure] fiets

    The question obviously arises why *erg* is the only amplifying degree word that can be modified by *heel*. Possibly, *erg* can function as a pure marker of upward scalarity. That is, it refers to a point on the implied scale that is higher than the standard value, but it does not so much express the size of the interval between the standard value and that higher point. In this respect, *erg* differs from amplifiers such as *vreselijk* 'extremely' and *ontzettend* 'terribly' in (43), which express that the size of the interval between the standard value and the higher degree is "really big". It seems that the amplifier *heel* in (44) marks the (big) size of the interval between the standard value and the higher point on the scale.

    Let us return to the patterns in (42) and see how the (im)possibility of parasitic -E can be accounted for. In (42a), there is no parasitic agreement. The attributive adjective is the only element carrying adjectival inflection (-*e*) as a result of concord with the noun phrase. Specifically, -*e* is an externalization of the feature constellation [-definite, +singular, -neuter].

  Consider next (42b), which for most people is acceptable but a little deviant. In this example, parasitic inflection is overtly realized on the head of the modifying AP:

(45)   een [AP [AP heel erg-E] mooi$_{<1,G>}$-e]] auto

In (42c), the amplifying adjective *heel* carries parasitic -E as a result of the Spec-head agreement relationship with *erg-E*. Thus, *hel-E* carries the attributive adjectival inflection by transitivity; that is, via *erg-E*, which received its parasitic -E under spec-head agreement with the overtly inflected attributive adjective.

    The ill-formedness of (42d) follows straightforwardly: *heel* can never be augmented with -E since it does not enter into a Spec-head relationship with the inflected attributive adjective. Thus, parasitic agreement between the "host" —the carrier of "real" agreement— and the "parasite" —

the carrier of parasitic agreement is only possible when the two stand in a structurally local relationship with each other: the parasite must be the specifier of the host.

Keeping this locality restriction in mind, consider next the examples in (31), repeated here as (46):

(46) a.   een [hem erg(*-E) opwindend-e] jurk

      a   him very(-E) exciting-AGR   dress

    b.   een [erg(-E)   opwindend-e] jurk

      a   very(-E) exciting-AGR   dress

Recall that it was argued that the present participle *opwindend* in (46a) has a different categorial make-up from the one in (46b). Specifically, *opwindend* in (46b) was analyzed as an adjectival element: *[A opwindend]*, *opwindend* in (46a), on the contrary, was claimed to have a composite syntactic structure, consisting of a verbal part (*hem opwind-*) and an adjectival part (the participial ending *-end*); see (32a). As shown in (47b), *erg* is in a Spec-head relationship with the inflected adjective *opwindende*. Consequently, *erg* can display parasitic agreement: *erg-E*. In (47a), however, the degree modifier *erg* is part of the verbal layer and does not stand in a Spec-head relationship with the inflected adjectival part, viz., *-ende*. Since the degree word does not stand in a local Spec-head relation with the inflected participial ending *-ende*, it is not able to display parasitic agreement morphology.

(47) a.   een [AP [VP hem erg opwin-] -end-e] jurk

    b.   een [A(P) erg [A opwindende]] jurk

From the minimal pair in (46) and the structure in (47) it can be concluded that it is hierarchical structure rather than linear order that matters for the licensing of parasitically agreeing degree words.

The relevance of hierarchical structure for the appearance of parasitic agreement is also clear from a number of other adjectives that turn out to be structurally ambiguous. The adjectives I have in mind are the deverbal adjectives in (48). The characterization 'deverbal' comes from two observations: Firstly, some of those adjectives display (past/passive-)participial morphology and

as such are formally similar to verbal forms (e.g., **ge**_stel**d**_, _verknocht_). Secondly, some of those adjectives are derivationally related to a verb. For example, _afhankelijk (van)_ 'dependent (on)' clearly relates to the verb _afhangen (van)_ 'to depend (on)'.

(48) a. een [<daarvan> erg <daarvan>   afhankelijke]   man
     a   that.on   very   dependent-AGR man
     'a man who is very dependent on that'

   b. een [<daarop> erg <daarop>   gestelde] man
     a   that.on   very   keen-AGR man

   c. een [<daaraan> erg <daaraan> verkochte]   man
     a   that.to   very   attached-AGR man

As shown in (48), the PP-complement can appear either at the left periphery of the adjectival projection or in between the degree modifier and the attributive adjective. Especially, the latter syntactic position is remarkable, since, as was shown in (40), the PP-complement cannot occur in between the degree word _erg_ and an attributive adjective, when the latter is a "regular" (i.e., non-deverbal) adjective. This asymmetry between the patterns in (48) and those in (40) suggests that the deverbal adjectives in (48) have, or can have, an underlying structure which differs from that of "regular" adjectives such as _blij_ 'happy' and _trots_ 'proud'. I propose that, analogously to the structural ambiguity of the present participle _opwindend_ in (47), the deverbal adjectives in (48) can have two different structural representations, namely an adjectival one (49a) and a deverbal one (49b):

(49) a. een [$_{AP}$ daarvan [$_A$ afhankelijke]]   man
     a   that.on   dependent-AGR man
   b. een [$_{AP}$ [$_{VP}$ daarvan afhang-] -elijke] man

An elaborate motivation for this structural distinction falls beyond the scope of the present paper. Let me nevertheless give one argument that supports the ambiguous status of _afhankelijk_, namely its possible co-occurrence with two types of modifiers: _heel_ 'very', which typically modifies

(gradable) adjectives, and *voldoende* 'sufficiently', which typically modifies verbs (see also Broekhuis 2013). Let me start with *heel.*

As shown in (50a,b), *heel* only occurs as a modifier of (gradable) adjectives and never modifies verbs that can combine with degree modifiers (e.g., *erg*). The fact that *heel* can modify *afhankelijke*, as in (50c), suggests that *afhankelijke* behaves like a regular adjective in that case. Note in passing that the PP-complement *daarvan* can only occur at the left periphery of the adjectival phrase and not in a position in between the degree word and the adjective. This distributional behavior of the PP-complement is completely in line with that of PP-complements selected by a "regular" adjective like *blij* 'happy'; compare with (40).

(50) a. een [daarmee heel blije]   man
         a   that.with   very happy-AGR man
         'a man who is very happy with that'
     b. Jan verheugde   zich erg/*heel op haar komst.
         Jan looked.forward REFL very   to her   arrival
         'Jan very much looked forward to her arrival.'
     c. een [<daarvan> heel <*daarvan>   afhankelijke] man
         a   that.on   very   dependent-AGR man
         'a man who is very dependent on that'

Consider next the modifier *voldoende* 'sufficiently'. As shown in (51a), combining *voldoende* with a regular adjective like *trots* 'proud' yields a pattern which is quite marked. Combination with a (gradable) verb is completely natural; see (51b). As illustrated in (51c), *voldoende* can easily combine with the adjective *afhankelijk*, which is expected if *afhankelijk* can have a "verbal flavor". Note in passing that, under this verbal behavior of *afhankelijk*, the possible placement of the PP-complement in between the degree word and the adjective is entirely expected. As shown in (51b), the PP-complement can also be placed in between the degree word *voldoende* and the gradable verb.

(51) a. ^{??}Jan is [voldoende trots   op haar]
         Jan   is sufficiently proud of her

23

b. Jan heeft zich \<daarop\> voldoende \<daarop\> verheugd.

Jan has REFL that.on sufficiently looked.forward

'Jan has looked forward to that sufficiently.'

c. Jan is [\<daarvan\> voldoende \<daarvan\> afhankelijk \<daarvan\>]

Jan is that.on sufficiently dependent

'Jan is sufficiently dependent on that.'

If I am right in saying that *heel* acts as a modifier of an *adjectival* projection and *voldoende* as a modifier of a *verbal* projection, then the adjectival structures in (50c) and (51c) can be represented as (52a) and (52b), respectively:[8]

(52) a. een [$_{AP}$ daarvan$_i$ [$_{AP}$ heel [$_{A'}$ afhankelijke t$_i$]]] man

a that.on very dependent-AGR man

b. een [$_{AP}$ [$_{VP}$ \<daarvan\> voldoende \<daarvan\> afhang-] -elijke] man

Having shown that a deverbal adjective like *afhankelijk* has an ambiguous status, let us return to the phenomenon of parasitic agreement. Consider, specifically, the following contrast:

(53) a. een [*erg*(*-E) <u>daarvan</u> afhankelijk**e**] jongen (MOD-E PP A-e)

a very-E <u>that-on</u> dependent-AGR boy

b. een [<u>daarvan</u> *erg*(-E) afhankelijk**e**] jongen (PP MOD-E A-e)

(53a) shows that parasitic agreement is blocked when the PP-complement *daarvan* intervenes between the degree modifier *erg* and the attributive adjective *afhankelijke*. As indicated by (53b), parasitic agreement is possible when the PP-complement is at the left periphery of the adjectival projection and, consequently, does not intervene between the degree word and the attributive adjective. One might interpret this contrast as support for a linear approach towards parasitic agreement (see section 5). That is, the inflected attributive adjective and the adjectival degree word must be linearly adjacent for inflection to spread onto the degree word. As I have argued in

---

[8] As indicated, I assume that the PP-complement has been moved from a postadjectival position to the left periphery of the AP.

section 5, however, there are good reasons for rejecting such a string-based approach to parasitic agreement. A structure-dependent account is preferred. Analogously to my account of the contrast between (46a) and (46b), I propose that the adjectival expressions in (53a) and (53b) have different internal structures. Specifically, (53a) has the structure in (54a), and (53b) the one in (54b).

(54)   a.   een [$_{AP}$ [$_{VP}$ erg(*-E) daarvan afhang-] -elijke] man

           a   very-E that.on depend- ent-AGR man

       b.   een [$_{AP}$ daarvan$_i$ [$_{AP}$ erg(-E)[$_{A'}$ afhankelijke t$_i$]]] man

           a   that.on   very-E   dependent-AGR   man

In (54a), the deverbal adjective *afhankelijk* has a composite structure consisting of a verbal part, the VP *erg(*-E) daarvan afhang-*, and an adjectival part, the adjectival suffix plus the adjectival inflection, *elijk-e*. Since *erg* is contained within the (AP-internal) verbal domain, it does not enter into a Spec-head relationship with the adjectival inflection associated with *-elijke*. Consequently, appearance of –E on the degree word will not be licensed. In (54b), on the contrary, licensing of –E is possible. Here *afhankelijke* is a non-composite adjective (just like *trots* 'proud', for example) which has the degree word erg(-E) in its specifier position. In other words, we have the right structural configuration for parasitic inflection to appear on the adjectival degree word.

8. Parasitic -E as a marker of emphasis

So far I have examined the phenomenon of parasitic agreement from the perspective of syntax. I argued that the adjectival degree word can be augmented with -E (schwa) if it stands in a Spec-head relationship with an attributive adjective carrying a feature constellation that externalizes as *-e* (schwa). The question, obviously, arises why -E should appear, since the -E-less pattern is also well-formed. So what information is it that -E encodes and contributes? I propose that -E is a marker of emphasis. It adds extra force to the amplifying meaning of the adjectival degree word. Emphasis is obtained by duplication of information in syntax —namely, duplication of agreement information via Spec-head agreement— and multiple Spell-out (externalization) at the Syntax-

Sensorimotor interface. An adjectival affix that normally remains silent when the adjectival host fulfills an adverbial function, as in *een erg-∅ mooie auto* (a very beautiful-AGR car), externalizes as -E in order to make the intensified meaning expressed by the adjectival degree word more prominent/salient at the sound surface.

Emphasis of information by externalizing positions that "normally" remain silent is a common strategy in natural language. A well-known case is the emphatic reading of overtly realized subject pronominals in pro-drop languages (see, among others, Rizzi (1982), Biberauer *et al* 2010).

(55) a. pro parla
     'He talks.'

   b. Lui parla
     'HE talks!'

A second illustration is the use of *do*-support for purposes of emphasis. Consider, for example, the following minimal pairs:

(56) a. A: Did John clean his room?   B: Yes, he *did* clean his room.
   b. A: John didn't clean his room, then. B: No, he *did* clean his room.
   c. *Do* drive safely and *do* be careful!

In (56a), *did* emphasizes the positive answer, and in (56b) it emphasizes the correction of the preceding statement. (56c), finally, exemplifies the use of emphatic *do* in imperative sentences. Importantly, in these examples, the dummy verb *do* lexicalizes a syntactic position (T^o) which normally remains silent in declarative clauses (*He cleaned his room*) and imperative clauses (*Drive safely and be careful!*).

Summarizing, I have argued that –E adds emphasis to the adjectival degree word (the intensifier) that modifies the gradable adjective. The emphatic marker –E is, actually, an adjectival inflection that is licensed under Spec-head agreement with the inflected (*-e*) attributive adjective. Thus, syntax (i.e., the structural Spec-head relation) provides the right context for parasitic agreement, and externalization of that structure yields a pattern featuring –E.

I close this section with a brief discussion of a phenomenon that seems unexpected under the

approach towards parasitic agreement taken so far. It turns out that there are patterns in which –E appears on an intensifier, even though there is no gradable adjective present, which carries the inflection –e. Before turning to those patterns, recall that -E does not appear on the degree word when the latter modifies an attributive adjective carrying the feature constellation [-definite, +singular, +neuter], as in (8a), repeated here as (57a). Nor does -E appear when the adjective is used predicatively, as in the copula construction in (11), repeated here as (57b):[9]

(57) a. een [*erg(*-E)* leuk] huis
         a   very(-E) nice house
     b. Deze auto is erg(*-E) leuk.
         this car is very(-E)nice
         'This car is really nice.'

Consider now the adjectival expressions in the following examples:

(58) a. Jan heeft [een [AP verdomd(-E) leuk]   huis!
         Jan has   a   damned-E   nice   house
         'Jan has a really nice house.'
     b. Jan heeft [een [AP verrekt(-E) leuk] huis!
         Jan has   a   damned-E nice   house
         'Jan has a really nice house.'

(59) a. Deze auto is [verdomd(-E) leuk]
         this   car is damned-E   nice
         'This car is really nice!'
     b. Deze auto is [verrekt(-E) leuk]
         this   car is damned-E   nice
         'This car is really nice!'

---

[9] Similar patterns can be found in Frisian. Verdenius (1939), for example, gives the following sentences: (i) *'t is al skandalig(e) let* (it is already scandalous(-E) late, 'It is already very late!' late); (ii) *Hy kaem skandalig(e) let* (he came scandalous(-E) late, 'He arrived terribly late!').

What is remarkable about these examples is that -E appears on an intensifier (*verdomd*, *verrekt*) within an adjectival context that normally does not license the appearance of -E; see (57). The question therefore arises as to what licenses the presence of -E in these examples. And related to that question: what distinguishes intensifiers such as *verdomd* and *verrekt* from intensifiers such as *erg* 'very', *vreselijk* 'extremely', *ontzettend* 'terribly' et cetera?

I propose that the distinct behavior of the intensifiers *verdomd* and *verrekt* has to do with their status as *expressive* modifiers in the sense of Potts (2005, 2007); see also Morzycki (2008). As Potts points out, English expressive modifiers such as *damn* and *fucking*, as in *the damn Republican* or *the fucking car*, do not express truth-conditional, restrictive meaning. In this respect they behave differently from descriptive adjectives such as *rich* and *beautiful*, which clearly contribute restrictive meaning to the noun phrase: *a rich Republican*, *a beautiful car*. As Potts argues, expressive modifiers typically convey the speaker's commentary on and attitude towards what is being said. As such, the expressive modifier has a more appositional or "additional" (i.e., non-restrictive) meaning, one which is directly connected to the utterance situation itself. In a way, then, descriptive modifiers such as *rich* and *beautiful* represent a different dimension of meaning than do expressive modifiers such as *damn* and *fucking*. I refer the reader to Potts (2015, 2017) for further details.[10]

Now what is it that allows expressive modifiers such as *verdomd* and *verrekt* to be augmented with -E in spite of the absence of overt adjectival inflection? One might hypothesize that the answer simply lies in the expressive nature of words such as *verdomd* and *verrekt*. In other words, it is an intrinsic property (say, their expressive semantics) of these lexical items that permits augmentation with -E. Although expressiveness obviously matters for the appearance of -E in (58)-(59), it cannot be the whole story. Under such an analysis, one would expect that these words can be augmented with -E when they occur in an AP-external context. It turns out that –E is

---

[10] The idea that descriptive meaning and expressive meaning represent different layers of interpretation raises the question as to whether this interpretative difference has a counterpart in syntax. That is, are descriptive modifiers integrated differently in syntactic structure than are expressive modifiers? Building on a suggestion by Chris Kennedy, Morzycki (2008), for example, tentatively proposes that phrase structure may contain a specific layer — E(xpressive)P(hrase)—for encoding expressive information. Under such an analysis, *the damn Republican* would look like: *[DP the [EP damn [E' E [NP Republican]]]*. In this article, I won't consider this option and assume that intensifiers such as *verdomd* and *verrekt* occupy the same position as intensifiers such as *erg* and *vreselijk*.

impossible in such contexts. Consider, for example, the following utterances, in which *verrekt* and *verdomd* occur as independent utterances and clearly have an expressive meaning but cannot be augmented with –E.[11]

(60) a. Verrekt(*–E)! Je   hebt gelijk!

damned   you are right

'Gosh! You are right!'

   b. Verdomd(*–E)! Je   hebt gelijk!

damned   you are right

'Gosh! You are right!'

The contrast between (58)-(59), on the one hand, and (60), on the other hand, suggests that some property of the gradable adjective plays a role in licensing the appearance of –E on the expressive intensifier. In view of what we have seen before, it does not seem implausible to claim that this property is the Spec-head agreement relationship between the gradable adjective and the degree word. This would mean that, even if the adjective does not carry any overt inflection (i.e., *-e*), the adjective can still enter into an agreement relationship with the degree modifier in its Spec-position. Under such an analysis, one would be forced to say that morphologically bare adjectives do carry an inflectional morpheme, but that this morpheme is silent; that is, it is a null suffix.

The idea that Spec-head agreement does not have to become manifest by means of overt inflectional morphology but can remain hidden under the (sound) surface as a result of zero-morphology makes it possible to extend the phenomenon of parasitic agreement to the attributive *erg leuk* in (57a) and the predicative AP *erg leuk* in (57b). That is, there can be parasitic agreement between the degree modifier and the gradable adjective but the agreement does not surface audibly/visibly as a result of zero-morphology (represented as $\varnothing$) on both items. Schematically:

---

[11] Verdenius (1939) observes the same for Frisian. Recall from footnote 9 that the intensifier *skandalig* (scandalously, 'terribly') can be augmented with -E when it is contained within an AP. The appearance of -E is blocked, however, when *skandalig* acts as a modifier of a verb. For example: *Hy liicht skandalig(*-E) skandalige*; he lies scandalous(-E), 'He lies terribly!').

(61) a. een [erg-$\varnothing_{[-def,+sg,+neut]}$ leuk-$\varnothing_{[-def,+sg,+neut]}$] huis

　　　a　　very　　　　　　　　nice　　　　　　　house

　　b. Deze auto is [erg-$\varnothing$ leuk-$\varnothing$].

　　　this　car　is　very　　nice

　　　'This car is really nice.'

If we follow this line of analysis, *verdomd leuk* in (58)-(59) would have the structure in (62a), and *verdomde leuk* the one in (62b):

(62) a. [verdomd-$\varnothing$ leuk-$\varnothing$]

　　b. [verdomd-E leuk-$\varnothing$]

Thus, both patterns feature the "abstract" Spec-head agreement relationship between the expressive intensifier and the gradable adjective, but the externalization of the agreement relationship is symmetric (-$\varnothing$ -$\varnothing$) in (6a) but asymmetric (-E -$\varnothing$) in (62b). Possibly, the asymmetric Spell-out of the agreement relationship is a formal manifestation of expressivity on the side of the speaker. In a way, the formally asymmetric manifestation of the Spec-head agreement relationship constitutes a deviant/marked or "imperfect" externalization. As argued in Corver (2013, 2016), such deviations from regular linguistic patterns have a high information/surprise value as a result of their unexpectedness. By means of this unexpected linguistic symbol at the sound surface, the speaker provides a cue/signature of his internal emotional state.[12]

---

[12] Other examples of expressive/affective signatures at the sound surface arguably are the following: First, the appearance of -*e* (schwa) on attributively used monosyllabic adjectives in Afrikaans. Under a neutral reading, these adjectives do not bear any overt inflectional morphology (as opposed to bisyllabic ones), which I take to be an instance of zero-morphology ($\varnothing$); e.g. *'n mooi konyn* ('a beautiful rabbit'). In their expressive/affective use, however, they become augmented with -*e*: *'n mooie konyn* ('a really beautiful rabbit'). A second illustration might be the (optional) augmentation with -*e* (schwa) of Dutch superlative adjectives, as in *Jan reed 't hardste* (Jan drove the/it$_{neuter}$ fastest-*e*, 'Jan drove fastest').

9. Inflected intensifiers from a cross-linguistic perspective

In the previous sections I have illustrated the phenomenon of parasitic agreement by means of examples from Dutch, making use of mostly my own intuitions. Google-searches for patterns of parasitic agreement provided us with many hits:[13] *een erge mooie* (5080 hits), *een vreselijke mooie* (1920 hits), *een hele mooie* (635.000 hits), *een ontzettende mooie* (6.740 hits), *een ongelofelijke mooie N* (8.480 hits), *een hele erge mooie* (873 hits).[14] As shown by the examples in (63), parasitic agreement is attested in many varieties of Dutch, other Germanic languages, and also Romance languages. A systematic cross-linguistic study falls beyond the scope of this article, but I would not be surprised if the phenomenon is attested much more widely across languages.

(63) a. up enen [ser*en* hog*en*]   berech   (Middle Dutch; Stoett 1923)
         at a   very-AGR high-AGR mountain
         'at a very high mountain'

    b. [ongewoonlijk*e* groot*e*]   vygen   (17th century Dutch; Koelmans 1978)
         unususal-AGR   big-AGR figs
         'unusually big figs'

    c. 't is n [hail*e*   best*e*]   kou   (Groningen Dutch; Ter Laan 1953)
         it is a very-AGR bad-AGR cold/weather
         'It's really very cold'

    d. Dä's [beestig*e*   kooi*e*]   grond   (Kempenland Dutch; De Bont 1962)
         that's beastly-AGR bad-AGR soil
         'That's extremely bad land.'

    e. 'n [blakend*e*   gesond*e*]   kind   (Afrikaans)
         a   glowing-AGR healthy-AGR child
         'a really healthy child.'

    f. Wat wenje sokke minsken al yn [freeslik*e* lyts*e* huzen]! (Frisian; Hoekema 1996)

---

[13] Search carried out on January 26th 2017.

[14] See also Royen (1948) for many examples of parasitic agreement drawn from various types of written texts.

31

what live such people PRT in extreme-AGR small-AGR houses

'These people live in such small houses!'

g. eine [ganz*e* gut*e*] Frau (German)

a very-AGR good-AGR woman

h. Maria era [tutt*a* nud*a*] (Italian)

Maria was entire-AGR nude-AGR

'Maria was entirely nude'

i. Elle en était [tout*e* honteus*e*]. (French)

she of.it was entire-AGR ashamed-AGR

'She was very much ashamed of it.'

Also colloquial English possibly displays patterns of parasitic agreement. Consider the following examples (drawn from Jespersen 1969 and Bolinger 1972):

(64) a. a terrible old man (terribly old)

b. a real nice linguist (really nice)

c. in extreme old age (extremely old)

The standard rule in English is to have the adverbial marking -*ly* attached to an 'adverb' that modifies an adjective. Under the assumption that English adjectival inflection corresponds to a zero-suffix, then a pattern like *terrible old* may have the following structure:

(65) [$_{AP}$ terrible-Ø$_{AGR}$ old-Ø$_{AGR}$]

9. Conclusion

The parasitic gap phenomenon has made us familiar with the phenomenon of parasitism in syntax, that is the phenomenon that the presence of symbol α in a syntactic representation is dependent (i.e., parasitic) on the presence of another symbol α in that same representation. Research on parasitic gaps led to an important conclusion: the appearance of the parasitic gap is

structure-dependent. Specifically, the parasitic gap (e_{PG}) may not be linked to a real gap (e_{RG}) that is in a structurally higher position. In this article, I have tried to add another phenomenon to the list of linguistic parasitism, viz. parasitic agreement; that is, the appearance of an inflection whose existence is dependent on the presence of a "real" inflection. Specifically, an intensifying degree word (optionally) carries an inflection which is associated with the gradable adjective. Crucially, it was shown that the appearance of the parasitic inflection depends on hierarchical structure and not on sequential or linear structure. In other words, parasitic agreement, just like the parasitic gap phenomenon, is structure dependent. The structural configuration that was claimed to be at the basis of parasitic agreement is the Spec-head relationship.

In short, rethinking the phenomenon of linguistic parasitism from the perspective of agreement leads to the same conclusion as research on parasitism from the perspective of gaps: Hierarchical structure matters!

References

Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg and Ian Roberts (2008). Disharmonic word-order systems and the Final-over-Final-Constraint (FOFC). In: Bisetto, A. & F.E. Barbieri (eds.), *Proceedings of the XXXIII incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, 86-105. University of Bologna: Department of Modern Languages and Literatures.

Biberauer, Theresa, Anders Holmberg, Ian Roberts, Michelle Sheehan (2010). *Parametric variation: Null subjects in minimalist theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Bolinger, D. (1972) *Degree words*. Mouton, The Hague, Paris.

Bont, A.P. de (1958). *Dialekt van Kempenland. Meer in het bijzonder d'Oerse taol. Deel 1. Klank- en vormleer en enige syntactische bijzonderheden*. Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V., Assen.

Bowers, John (1975). Adjectives and adverbs in English. *Foundations of Language* 13: 529-562.

Broekhuis, Hans (2013). *Syntax of Dutch. Adjective and adjective phrases.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1975). *Reflections on Language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Chomsky, Noam (1982). *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Corver, Norbert (1997a). The internal syntax of the Dutch extended adjectival projection. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15. 289-368.

Corver, Norbert (1997b). *Much*-Support as a last resort. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28.1. 119-164.

Corver, Norbert (2013). Colorful spleeny ideas speak furiously. A passionate question at the interface of language and emotion. Unpublished ms. Utrecht university, UiL-OTS.

Corver, Norbert (2016). Emotion in the build of Dutch. Deviation, augmentation and duplication. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde/Journal of Dutch Language and Literature* 132.14: 232-275.

Corver, Norbert and Marjo van Koppen (2011). NP ellipsis with adjectival remnants: a micro-comparative perspective. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29.2: 371-421.

Emonds, Joseph (1976). *A transformational approach to syntax*. New York: Academic Press.

Embick, David and Rolf Noyer (2001). Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 555-595.

Engdahl, Elisabeth (1983), Parasitic gaps. *Linguistic and Philosophy* 6: 5-34.

Everaert, Martin B.H., Marinus A.C. Huybregts, Noam Chomsky, Robert C. Berwick, and Johan J. Bolhuis (2015). Structures, not strings: Linguistics as part of the cognitive sciences. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19.12: 729-743.

Jespersen, Otto (1969) *Analytic Syntax*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York – London.

Kester, Ellen-Petra (1996). *The nature of adjectival inflection*. PhD dissertation, Utrecht university.

Koelmans, L. (1978) *Inleiding tot het lezen van zeventiende-eeuws Nederlands*, Bohn, Scheltema & Holkema, Utrecht.

Morzycki, Marcin (2008). Nonrestrictive modifiers in non-paremthetical positions. In: McNally, L. & C. Kennedy (eds.), *Adjectives and adverbs. Syntax, semantics and discourse*. 101-122, Oxford: Oxford university press.

Potts, Christopher (2005). *The logic of conventional implicatures. Oxford: oxford university press*.

Potts, Christopher (2007). The expressive dimension. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33.2: 165-197.

Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues in Italian syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris

Ross, John-Robert 1967. *Constraints on variables in Syntax*. MIT, PhD dissertation. [Published as *Infinite syntax!* (1986). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.]

Royen, G. (1948) *Buigngsverschijnselen in het Nederlands.* Deel II. N.V. Noord-Hollandsche uitgevers maatschappij, Amsterdam.

Stoett, F. (1923) *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst*, Martinus Nijhoff, 's-Gravenhage.

Taraldsen, Knud Tarald (1981). The theoretical interpretation of a class of marked extractions. In: A. Belletti, L. Brandi, and L. Rizzi (eds.), *Theory of Markedness in Generative Grammar, Proceedings of the 1979 GLOW Conference*, 475-516. Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa.

Verdenius, A. (1939). Adverbia van graad op –e. *Nieuwe Taalgids 33*, 361-368.

Williams, Edwin (1981). On the notions "lexically related" and "head of a word." *Linguistic Inquiry* 12. 245-274.