

Exclamative relatives in vocative noun phrases

Norbert Corver

Abstract: This article examines the grammatical properties of the Dutch construction *Kluns dat/die je bent!* Specifically, it addresses the question of how exclamation is formally encoded in this construction. In line with Bennis (1998), it is proposed that exclamative force follows from an interaction between lexical properties of function words, on the one hand, and configurational structure (syntax), on the other hand. It is proposed that the *dat/die*-clause is a relative clause which is part of a larger vocative noun phrase containing a silent or overt 2nd person pronoun (the addressee). It is shown that the relative clause, and not the antecedent, is the locus of exclamation. The small word *daar/d'r*, which optionally appears in the relative clause, is analyzed as a surface manifestation (spell-out) of the LOCATION-feature (the distal property) that is associated with the relative (= distal) pronoun and the second person pronoun.

Keywords: exclamation, relative clause, vocative, LOCATION-feature, micro-variation.

1. Introduction

People mentally evaluate the world (e.g., individuals, objects, events) in which they live. These evaluations can be positive or negative, and they become manifest to the outer world through different means of externalization (e.g., facially, gesturally or bodily). An important channel for expressing one's evaluation of "stimuli" in the surrounding world is language (Corver, to appear), and these evaluations often manifest themselves as exclamations in language use (performance). The question arises what knowledge of language (competence) is at the basis of these evaluative exclamatives. That is, we need to find the internalized atoms (features/primitives) and computations (rules) that are involved in the generation of these exclamative expressions.

In Bennis (1998), the question is addressed of how exclamation is linguistically encoded in the formal build of Dutch. Specifically, is it lexically encoded by means of a function word that is lexically specified as being exclamative, or does exclamative force follow from the syntactic structure in which a lexical item is embedded? Bennis's answer to these questions is that you need both: exclamative meaning follows from the interaction between lexical material (a functional category) and syntactic structure (see also Postma 1994). One illustration of this comes from the clausal exclamative construction in (1a).

- (1) a. [CP *Een boeken* [C' dat_{Excl} [Jan ~~een boeken~~ gelezen heeft]]]!

a books that Jan read has

'How many books Jan read!'

- b. *Leuk dat hij *een boeken* gelezen heeft!

nice that he a books read has

(1a) shows that a well-formed exclamative sentence is obtained when the DP *een boeken*, featuring so-called spurious *een* (Bennis *et al.* 1998), occupies the Spec-position of the complementizer *dat*, which marks exclamative force in the root clause. As shown by (1b), an exclamative reading is impossible if the *een*-DP occupies its base position in the clause. In short, syntactic placement matters for the expression of exclamation.

Adopting the idea that exclamative force results from the interaction between functional material and configurational placement, I will examine in this article the grammatical behavior and properties of the (evaluative) exclamative construction in (2), which, due to space limitations (see Bennis's note 8), is not discussed in Bennis (1998).

- (2) Kluns dat je bent!

klutz that you are

'You are such a klutz!'

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the lexical nature of *dat*. In section 3, it will be argued that the *dat*-clause is a relative clause that takes an evaluative noun phrase as its antecedent. The entire noun phrase behaves like a vocative expression. In section 4, it will be shown how exclamation is formally encoded in the relative clause.

2. What's *dat*?

From a superficial perspective, the exclamative pattern in (2) looks quite similar to the one in (3), which is another illustration of exclamative pattern (1a):

- (3) Een klunzen dat ik ontmoet heb!

a klutzes that I met have

Both in (2) and in (3), there is a nominal expression (*kluns*, *een klunzen*) which is followed by what looks like the subordinator *dat*, which introduces the rest of the embedded clause. On closer inspection of (2) and (3), it turns out, however, that underneath of this superficial symmetry, there is hidden a remarkable syntactic asymmetry (see also Paardekooper 1963). Firstly, in example (2), *dat* can be "replaced" by *die*. This replacement is impossible with (3):

- (4) a. Kluns *die* je bent!

- b. *Een klunzen *die* ik ontmoet heb!

Secondly, pattern (2), and also (3) for that matter, does not permit the presence of *een* 'a' before the singular noun *kluns*, while pattern (3) requires its presence:

- (5) a. (*Een) kluns dat/die je bent!

- b. *(Een) kluns dat ik ontmoet heb! Je zult het niet geloven!

a klutz that I met have! you will it not believe

These asymmetries suggest that (2) and (3) have a different underlying syntax. Especially the fact that we find *die* right after the noun in (4a) hints at a relative clause analysis of the embedded clause that follows the noun *kluns*. Schematically, where I take the relative pronoun *die* to be moved to Spec,CP:

- (6) [kluns_[-neuter] [CP die_[-neuter] [TP je ~~die~~ bent]]]]

When the relative clause is introduced by *die*, the relative pronoun clearly agrees with the antecedent noun of the relative construction. But how should we interpret the element *dat* in (2)?

2. What's *dat*?

The use of *dat* in (2) is quite surprising. The antecedent noun *kluns* has [-neuter] gender and consequently requires the presence of the relative pronoun *die* at the beginning of the relative clause, analogously to *de kluns die/*dat ik ontmoet heb* ('the klutz who I met'). Furthermore, plural antecedent-nouns always require the presence of the relative pronoun *die*, as in *de kluzen die/*dat ik ontmoet heb* ('the klutzes who I met'). The question therefore arises how to analyze *dat*.

One line of analysis would be to say that *dat* is a subordinating conjunction (Complementizer), as in (7a). Under such an analysis, the relative operator (REL) in Spec,CP remains phonologically unrealized. Normally, Dutch, as opposed to English, does not allow a relative clause to be introduced by a subordinator.¹ Alternatively, one might propose that *dat* is a neuter relative pronoun, as in (7b). Such an analysis, however, seems to violate the requirement that the antecedent noun and the relative pronoun agree in gender (and number).

- (7) a. [kluns_[-neuter, +sg] [CP REL_i [_C dat] [TP je t_i bent]]]]
b. [kluns_[-neuter, +sg] [CP dat_{[+neuter, +sg]/i} [_{C'} C_o [TP je t_i bent]]]]]

¹ See, though, patterns like *de dagen dat/waarop hij ziek was* (the days that/on-which he ill was). See also Verdenius (1941).

As Paardekooper (1963) points out, an analysis according to which *dat* is a neuter relative pronoun is not entirely implausible. Its appearance in (7b) possibly follows from the fact that the relative pronoun has the function of predicate nominal within a copular construction. As shown by the Dutch examples in (8), the pro-form *dat*, functioning here as a demonstrative pronoun, can fulfill the role of predicate nominal. Note that it is possible for neuter demonstrative *dat* to substitute for a predicate nominal headed by a common (i.e., non-neuter) singular noun (*kluns*) or a plural noun (*klunzen*).

- (8) a. A: *Ik ben een kluns.* B: *Dat ben je zeker!*
I am a klutz that you are for.sure

b. A: *Jullie zijn klunzen.* B: *Dat zijn we zeker!*
you are klutzes that are we for.sure

In view of (8), the appearance of a neuter relative pronoun *dat* in (7b) is not entirely unexpected. What remains surprising, though, is that a neuter relative pronoun takes a [-neuter] noun or a plural noun as its antecedent. As Paardekooper notes, this would be the only instance of a relative construction in which antecedent and relative pronoun do not (have to) match as regards their phi-features. One might try to relate this special use of the relative pronoun *dat* to the nature of its antecedent noun (De Rooij 1967). The noun *kluns* has a negative-affective meaning. As is well-known, the demonstrative pronoun *dat* is sometimes used with a pejorative meaning, as in *dat mens* (that_{neut} human being; 'that woman') and *Dat gaat allemaal maar naar bed met elkaar!* (that goes all PRT with each other to bed; 'Those folks are having sex all the time'). Possibly, this negative-affective use of *dat* also holds for the neuter relative pronoun *dat*. In that case, the agreement relationship between the antecedent noun *kluns* and the relative pronoun *dat* could be characterized as being expressive-semantic; i.e., both the antecedent noun and the relative pronoun *dat* express a negative value.

The question arises which analysis to adopt for the pattern in (2): the *dat = complementizer* analysis (7a) or the *dat = relative pronoun* (7b) analysis? For Standard Dutch, it turns out to be quite difficult to decide which analysis is the correct one. It should be

noted, though, that the expressive-semantic motivation (neuter = pejorative) for the relative pronoun analysis faces a problem: *dat* is also found in combination with [-neuter] antecedent nouns with a positive-evaluative meaning:

- (9) Lieve jongen/doorzetter/klasbak/lieverd/beauty dat je bent!

sweet boy/go-getter/topper/sweetheart/beauty that you are

Certain Dutch varieties turn out to be helpful in making a choice between the two analyses in (7). In Maastricht Dutch, for example, the complementizer 'that' is formally distinct from relative pronouns, viz., *tot* 'that' (= complementizer) *versus* the relative pronominal forms: *dee* masc.sg, *die* fem.sg., *wat* neut.sg., *die* plural (Shepherd 1946).² The use of *tot* is illustrated in (10a), and the use of masculine singular relative pronoun *dee* in (10b):

- (10) a. Heer zaog *tot* 't al laat waor.

he saw that it already late was

- b. de maan *dee* (*wat*) us de weeg vroog.

the man who (what) us the road asked

'the man who asked us the way'

Notice now that Maastricht Dutch uses *tot* in constructions like (2).³

- (11) a. Koejong *tot-ste* bis!

² I would like to thank Marc Haesen for discussion of the Maastricht Dutch data.

³ My informant rejects the pattern featuring a relative pronoun, as in **Koejong dee (wat)-ste bis!* and *Koejonges die ger zeet!*.

- rascal that-2P.SG are.2P.SG
- b. Koejonges *tot* ger zeet!
- rascals that you.2P.PL are.2P.PL

From the data in (9) and (11), I conclude that (7a) is the correct representation of (2). Thus, *dat* is a complementizer.

3. Relatives, *pro*, and vocatives

So far I have argued that the exclamative constructions in (2) and (4a) contain a relative clause. Their intonation pattern suggests that the relative clause is restrictive rather than appositive. The relative clause forms an intonation unit with its antecedent. Having an intonation break right after the antecedent noun yields an unacceptable (#) expression: *kluns* <#break> *die/dat je bent!* The non-appositive nature of the relative clause is corroborated by the fact that adverbs like *overigens* and *trouwens*, which signal a side remark on the side of the speaker, cannot occur in the relative clause:

- (12) Kluns die/dat je <*overigens/*trouwens> bent!

klutz who/that you by-the-way are

A restrictive relative clause serves to restrict the referent set of the antecedent. In a sentence like *De zoon die in Boston woont heet Bob, de andere Piet* ('The son who lives in Boston is called Bob, the other one Piet.'), it is quite clear that the relative clause narrows down the reference set of the antecedent noun. But in what way does the relative copular clause (*dat/die je bent*) restrict the reference set of *kluns*? In a way, this relative clause duplicates the information that is already provided by the antecedent noun: the antecedent noun *kluns* represents a (negative) evaluation of the addressee by the speaker, and this negative evaluation is repeated in the relative clause: *die (= kluns) je bent*. In view of the double expression of the same information, we might characterize this exclamative

construction as instantiating the phenomenon of reduplication. As is well-known, one of the meaning effects resulting from reduplication is that of intensification. The relative clause acts as an intensifier in the sense that it scales up or emphasizes the quality of clumsiness assigned to the addressee. In a way, the relative clause has the same intensifying meaning contribution as other reduplicative patterns have, as in *Stomme, stomme kluns!* (stupid stupid klutz) and *Ach jij kluns, kluns, kluns!* (oh you klutz klutz klutz).

I will now discuss the nature and form of the antecedent noun (phrase). The antecedent noun can be bare if it is a degree noun, like *kluns*, i.e., a noun with an intrinsic intensifying meaning (Bolinger 1972). A non-degree noun like *jongen* 'boy', as in (13b), cannot function as antecedent noun. Adding a (gradable) evaluative AP like *domme* 'stupid', as in (13b), turns the ill-formed pattern in (13a) into a well-formed pattern:

- (13) a. Kluns/*jongen die je bent!
b. Domme kluns/jongen die je bent!

Some further illustrations of larger evaluative noun phrases that are permitted as antecedent of the relative clause are given in (14):

- (14) *Idioot van een kerel / Lieve jongen van papa / Pietje precies* die je bent!
idiot of a bloke sweet boy of daddy Piet-DIM precise who you are

Importantly, determiner-like material can't be added at the beginning of the antecedent noun phrase. Thus, replacement of the italicized antecedents in (14) by the following noun phrases yields an ill-formed pattern: *die idioot van een kerel, papa z'n lieve jongen, wat een Pietje precies.*

How do we account for the absence of determiner-like material in the antecedent noun phrase? I propose that its absence is caused by the syntactic presence of another lexical item,

namely, a silent second person pronoun (*pro_{2P}*), as in [*pro_{2P.SG} kluns die/dat je bent*].⁴ Interpretively, the presence of *pro_{2P}* is motivated by the fact that those exclamative constructions are typically directed towards the addressee ('you'). A second argument in support of *pro_{2P}* comes from the fact that it is syntactically active in binding.

- (15) [pro_i stomme criticus van *jezelf_i*] dat je bent! Je gaat je eigen boek toch niet afkraken!
stupid critic of yourself that you are you go your own book PRT not criticize

A third argument in support of *pro*'s hidden presence comes from the fact that the pronoun can actually appear at the surface. Note that the pronoun must be strong: *jij* is permitted, *je* is not:

- (16) *Jij/*je kluns dat/die je bent!*

Under an analysis according to which a silent (*pro*) or overt (*jij*) pronoun is present at the left periphery of the antecedent noun phrase, the obligatory absence of determiner-like elements can be accounted for if *pro/jij* occupies the same syntactic position as those determiners.⁵ Specifically, under the standard assumption that determiners occupy the D-head of D(eterminer) P(hrase), I come to the conclusion that *pro* occupies the D-head of DP.

The proposal that *pro_{2P.SG}/jij* occupies D is compatible with Déchaine and Wiltschko's (2002) proposal that pronouns are phrases with an internal structure, and that different types of pronouns can be distinguished (pro-DP, pro-ΦP and pro-NP).⁶ They argue that English *one*, as in *a small one*, is a pro-NP. They further make a distinction between 1st and 2nd person pronouns (*I, we, you_{SG/PL}*), on the one hand, and 3rd person pronouns (*she, they, him, et cetera*), on the other hand. The former are pro-DPs, the latter are pro-ΦPs. One empirical

⁴ It should be noted that a 1st person (i.e., speaker) silent pronoun is also possible, as in *kluns die ik ben!* (klutz that I am; 'I am such a klutz!'). I propose that there is a silent 1st person pronoun present in this self-directed expression.

⁵ Note that *jij* can't combine either with an overt determiner: *Jij (*die) idioot van een kerel dat je bent!*

⁶ ΦP stands for the constellation of number and gender features.

argument in support of this distinction is based on the contrast: *OK* *we/you linguists*; **they linguists*. Dutch displays the same contrast: *OK* *wij/jullie taalkundigen*; **zij taalkundigen*. Given this contrast, Déchaine and Wiltschko conclude that pro-DPs make an overt (i.e., lexicalized) NP sub-constituent available, while pro-ΦP does not.

With Déchaine and Wiltschko, I assume that 2nd person pronouns (*jij/jullie/pro_{2P.SG/PL}*) head DP. This yields the following structure for *pro/jij kluns die/dat je bent!*⁷

- (17) [DP [D *jij/pro_{2P.SG}*] [_Φ [NP *kluns* [CP *dat/die je bent*]]]]]

Let me finish this section with a remark about the use of the noun phrase in (17). Consider the examples in (18):

- (18) a. *(Jij) eikel dat je bent!* Waarom zeg *jij* zulke nare dingen?
you jerk that you are why say you such nasty things
- b. **Waarom zeg [jij/pro_{2P.SG} *eikel dat je bent*] zulke nare dingen?*
why say you jerk that you are such nasty things

These examples show that the noun phrase in (17) is typically used as a vocative noun phrase (18a) and cannot function as an argument (i.e., theta-role bearing unit) within the clause; see Corver (2008).⁸

4. Exclamation and micro-variation

⁷ The lower subpart *kluns dat/die je bent*, which expresses the evaluation (property) assigned to the addressee, grammatically behaves like an indefinite noun phrase. This is shown by the fact that attributive APs display indefinite agreement morphology: *(jij) stom(*-e) varken dat je bent!* (you stupid(*-e) pig_[NEUTER.SG] that you are). Compare: *een stom varken* (a stupid pig) versus: *het stomme varken* (the stupid-e pig).

⁸ Importantly, *jij eikel dat je bent* in (18b) must be pronounced as a single intonation unit. With a comma intonation (*jij <break> eikel dat je bent <break>*) the sentence is fine, but in that case we have a (clause-internal) vocative expression.

This section addresses the question of how exclamation is encoded in the vocative noun phrase in (17). Let me start with the observation that the first person ethical dative pronoun *me* 'me' can be found in the relative clause:

- (19) Kluns dat/die je (me) bent!

As is well-known, the ethical dative pronoun *me* is typically found in exclamative clauses, as in *Een boeken dat Jan (me) gekocht heeft!* (a books that Jan me bought has, 'How many books Jan bought!). The appearance of *me* suggests that exclamation in (19) is associated with the relative clause, and not with the antecedent noun phrase. Recall that the latter cannot take an exclamative form (*(*Wat een) Pietje precies dat je bent!)*). Exclamation within the relative clause regards the degree to which "you (the addressee) are X" holds, where X stands for the (evaluative) property designated by the antecedent.

I will now discuss how exclamation is formally encoded within the relative clause. With Bennis (1998) I assume that this encoding follows from the interaction between functional material —specifically, the relative C-head and the relative pronoun—and syntactic structure. Let me start the discussion with the relative pronoun (*die_{f-}neuter*/*dat_{f+neuter}*). Following Rooryck (2003) and Boef (2013), I take the relative pronoun *die* and the distal demonstrative pronoun *die* to be one and the same linguistic element. Thus, there is a single pronoun *die* which can fulfill different grammatical roles ('multifunctionality') depending on its position in the syntactic structure. The same holds, by the way, for demonstrative *dat* and relative *dat*. According to Rooryck (p. 11) and Boef (p. 186), the distal pronouns *die* and *dat*, as opposed to the proximal demonstrative pronouns *deze* 'this/these' and *dit* 'this', are underspecified for the feature 'location'. Thus, *die* carries the (underspecified) feature [LOCATION:], while *deze* carries the (specified) feature [LOCATION: proximal]. The "relative-pronominal" use of *die* is configurationally defined: movement of the pronoun to the Spec-position of CP turns the proposition (i.e., CP) into a predicate, which acts as a modifier of the antecedent noun phrase through the anaphoric connection between the "relative pronoun" and the antecedent.

Having argued that the relative-pronominal use of *die/dat* is configurationally defined, let us next consider the question of how the relative clause turns into an *exclamative* modifier.

I propose that the functional category C that heads the relative CP is the locus of exclamative force: C_{EXCL} . This exclamative relative C surfaces lexically (Standard Dutch *dat*, Maastricht Dutch *tot*) in the *dat*-variant in (20a) and remains silent, at least in Standard Dutch, when the relative pronoun (*die* in (20b)) occupies the Spec-position of C_{EXCL} (arguably, a doubly filled-CP effect). Importantly, it is the movement of the (underspecified) pronoun to the specifier of C_{EXCL} that turns the relative clause into an exclamative modifier.⁹

- (20) a. [jij/pro kluns [CP DIE_[LOCATION:] [C dat_{EXCL} [TP je T(ense) [VP DIE_[LOCATION:] bent]]]]]
- b. [jij/pro kluns [CP die_[LOCATION:] [C C_{EXCL} [TP je T(ense) [VP die_[LOCATION:] bent]]]]]

Possibly, silent DIE is permitted in (20a) because of the presence of the second person (*jij/pro*) in the antecedent noun phrase. Under the assumption that a second person pronoun contains a distal feature, as argued for in Bennis (2006) and Barbiers (2007), the lexical nature of the silent pronoun —specifically the presence of the LOCATION-feature— is locally recoverable.

So far, I have argued that the distal (i.e., location) property of *die* is underspecified. This underspecification for location accounts for the fact that *die* can be used in a neutral/non-deictic contexts (Boef 2013:187). This non-deictic use is also what we find in relative clauses. Interestingly, the exclamative relative CPs discussed in this article sometimes exhibit signs of the LOCATION-feature at the sound surface of the clause. Consider the following variants of the relative CP:

- (21) Kluns dat/die je *d'r/daar* bent!

In this variant of the relative CP we find the adverb *d'r/daar* 'there', which we know from sentences like *Jan heeft d'r/daar gewoond* ('Jan has lived there.'), where it, clearly, has a locative meaning. The adverb in (21), however, does not seem to contribute "locative meaning" to the sentence. For one thing, replacing *daar* by the emphatically deictic form *daarzo* (there+so, 'over there') yields an ill-formed pattern: **Kluns dat/die daarzo bent!* It

⁹ I abstract away here from the exact analysis of the copular clause. DIE represents the silent "relative" pronoun.

is, therefore, tempting to analyze *d'r/daar* in (21) as an expletive (i.e., meaningless) element.¹⁰ Specifically, I take *daar* and *d'r* to be phonological spell-outs of the underspecified LOCATION-feature that is part of the copy ("trace") of the displaced pronoun. This is depicted in (22). At an informal level, one might say that exclamation manifests itself phonologically with extra noise (emphasis through sound) within the relative clause.

- (22) a. [.... [CP DIE_[LOCATION:] [C' dat_{EXCL} [TP je T(ense) [VP DIE_[LOCATION: d'r/daar] bent]]]]]
- b. [.... [CP die_[LOCATION:] [C' C_{EXCL} [TP je T(ense) [VP die_[LOCATION: d'r/daar] bent]]]]]

Importantly, this overt manifestation of the LOCATION-feature is only possible if the copy carrying this feature is within the scope (c-command) domain of a relative C-head specified for exclamative force. Thus, a "normal" (i.e., non-exclamative) relative-C-head does not permit realization of the LOCATION-feature:

- (23) Jan is niet meer [de schaker [die hij (*d'r) was]].

Jan is no longer the chess-player who he there was

In (22), the LOCATION-feature of the pronoun is spelled out *in situ*, i.e., in the syntactic position occupied by the copy. As exemplified in (24), there are also Dutch dialects that can have the adverb *daar* at the beginning of the exclamative relative clause. As noted in De Rooij (1966), who only discusses relative clause patterns attested in the Netherlands, the pattern in (24) is mainly attested in dialects spoken in the Dutch province of Limburg and sporadically found in the eastern part of the province of North-Brabant. In addition, it has been attested in a few other dialects spoken in the provinces of Zeeland, South-Holland and Groningen. Older

¹⁰ This expletive *daar* also occurs in other types of exclamative constructions. For example, *Dat is me daar even goed nieuws, zeg!* (that is me there PRT good news, say; 'Wow, that's really good news!').

variants of Frisian displayed this use of *daar*, but it is no longer found in present-day Frisian.¹¹

- (24) Toewe lummel *door* ge bent! (Kempenland Dutch, De Bont 1958)
you yokel there you are
'You are such a yokel!'

One approach towards the distribution of *daar* in (24) would be to say that, in those dialects, the LOCATION-feature of the displaced pronoun in Spec,CP gets realized phonologically. Again, such spell-out is possible only if the pronoun carrying the feature is in the right syntactic configuration. In this case, being in the Spec-position of C_{EXCL} constitutes the right structural context for such spell-out. The relevant structure is given in (25):

- (25) [.... [CP DIE[LOCATION:*door*] [C' C_{EXCL} [TP ge T(ense) [VP DIE[LOCATION:*bent*]]]]]

Although this analysis of left peripheral *daar* is quite straightforward, the question, of course, arises why this left peripheral spell-out is typically found in dialects spoken in Limburg and the eastern part of Northern-Brabant. If spell-out of the LOCATION-feature is simply a matter of structurally low spell-out (22) or structurally high spell-out (24), the question could arise why the high spell-out pattern isn't more widespread across Dutch dialects. In view of this question, one might try to explore an alternative analysis that tries to correlate high spell-out of *daar* in dialect D with another C-related grammatical property of dialect D, such as subject doubling (Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2002) or complementizer agreement (Van Koppen 2015). Analyses of these phenomena show that there is a morphosyntactic dependency between the C-position and the pronominal subject. In neutral terms, a grammatical feature complex of the subject-pronoun —e.g., a *second* person

¹¹ De Rooij (1966) gives the following examples from an older stage of Frisian: *Rakkert, dérste biste!* (rascal there+2P.SG are.2P.SG; 'You are such a rascal!'). In present-day Frisian (Popkema 2006), we find patterns such as: *Aap dy'tst / datst bist!* (monkey who-2P.SG are.2P.SG / monkey that-2P.SG are.2P.SG 'You are such a monkey!').

subject pronoun— gets associated with C and surfaces morphologically on C, e.g., as an enclitic element (subject doubling) or an agreement-suffix (C-agreement). This can be abstractly (i.e., word order being irrelevant) represented as: [[2P(ERSON); SG/PL] + C]. Now, if second person pronouns carry a distal feature (i.e., the underspecified feature [LOCATION:]) besides the features PERSON and NUMBER, then the appearance of *daar* in the relative-clausal left periphery of certain dialects can also be interpreted as a surface manifestation of the 2nd person property on C. Thus, [[2P(ERSON); SG/PL; LOCATION (= ***daar***)] + C_{EXCL}].¹² Under such an analysis, (24) can be represented as follows (DIE is the displaced silent pronoun):

- (26) [.... [CP DIE[LOCATION:] [C' [2P.SG.LOCATION (= ***door***) [C_{EXCL}]] [TP ge T(ense) [VP
DIE[LOCATION:] bent]]]]]

Under this analysis, left peripheral *daar* is not a spell-out of the LOCATION-feature of the "relative" pronoun, as in (25), but rather a spell-out of the LOCATION-feature of the second person feature complex on C. Again, this LOCATION-feature only spells out as *daar* if it is in the right structural configuration, *in casu* head-adjunction of the 2nd person feature complex to C_{EXCL}. In other words, it does not appear in "neutral" relative clauses.¹³

If the second analysis of the phenomenon in (24) is on the right track, the question arises whether the spell-out of *daar* on C is a morphological reflex of subject doubling or C-agreement. Given the geographical distribution of the phenomenon in (24) — Limburg, Northern Brabant — and the fact that it used to exist in older stages of Frisian — a C-agreement language for 2nd person — an analysis which takes *daar* in C to be a formal manifestation of the C-agreement phenomenon does not seem implausible.¹⁴ Under such an analysis, the appearance of *daar* in C is a reflex of the LOCATION-feature (i.e., the distal property) associated with the second person feature on C.

¹² Alternatively, one might analyze *daar* as a spell-out form of the entire C-complex. That is, [2P.SG.LOCATION [C_{EXCL}]] = ***daar***.

¹³ Admittedly, the analysis in (26), which relates the appearance of *daar* to 2nd person, could possibly extend to the patterns in (22). In that case, *daar/d'r* is not a spell-out of the LOCATION-feature of the pronominal copy, but rather a spell-out of the LOCATION-feature associated with the 2nd person pronoun. I'll leave a systematic comparison of the two analyses to future research.

¹⁴ It should also be noted that the phenomenon of subject doubling does not exist in the Limburg varieties spoken in the Netherlands. This is based on a search for "2nd person pronoun subject doubling" in *DynaSAND*, which is short for the Dynamic Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects (see www.meertens.knaw.nl/sand).

5. Conclusion

In this article, I proposed that the Dutch construction *Kluns die/dat je bent!* is a vocative noun phrase that contains an exclamative relative clause. The exclamation expressed by the relative clause results from an interaction between properties of functional items (C_{EXCL} , pronouns), and syntactic structure (placement "in the scope" of C_{EXCL}). It was further shown that the "small words" *daar* and *d'r* are surface manifestations of the LOCATION-feature, which is part of the feature constellation of "relative" (= distal) pronouns and 2nd person pronouns. This LOCATION-feature becomes phonologically manifest in the scope of C_{EXCL} .

References

- Barbiers, Sjef (2007). On the periphery of imperative and declarative clauses in Dutch and German. In W. van der Wurff (red.), *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 95-112.
- Bennis, Hans (1998). Exclamatives. In: R. Kager & R. van Bezooijen (red.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 27-40.
- Bennis, Hans (2006). Agreement, pro and imperatives. In: P. Ackema, P. Brandt, M. Schoorlemmer & F. Weerman (red.), *Arguments and Agreement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 101-127.
- Bennis, Hans, Norbert Corver and Marcel den Dikken (1998). Predication in nominal phrases. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1, 85-117.
- Boef, Eefje (2013). *Doubling in relative clauses. Aspects of morphosyntactic microvariation in Dutch*. Utrecht: LOT-publication 317.
- Bolinger, Dwight (1972). *Degree words*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bont, A.P. de (1958). *Dialekt van Kempenland. Meer in het bijzonder d'Oerse taol. Deel 1. Klank- en vormleer en enige syntactische bijzonderheden*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V.

Corver, Norbert (2008). Uniformity and diversity in the syntax of evaluative vocatives. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11, 43-93.

Corver, Norbert (to appear). Emotion in the build of Dutch: Deviation, augmentation, and duplication. *Journal of Dutch Linguistics and Literature/Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*.

Craenenbroeck, Jeroen van & Marjo van Koppen (2002). Pronominal doubling and the structure of the left periphery in southern Dutch. In: S. Barbiers et al. (red.), *Syntactic Microvariation*, www.meertens.knaw.nl/books/synmic.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Martina Wiltschko (2002). Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 409-442.

Koppen, Marjo van (te verschijnen). Complementizer agreement In: M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (red.), *Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Paardekooper, Piet C. (1963). Stommeling dat je bent!. *Nieuwe Taalgids* 56, 160 - 164.

Popkema, Jan (2006). *Grammatica Fries*. Utrecht: Uitgeverij het Spectrum B.V.

Postma, Gertjan (1994). The indefinite reading of WH, In: R. Bok-Bennema & C. Cremers (red.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1994*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 187-198.

Rooij, Jaap de (1967). Lummel dat je bent. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 83, 108-121.

Rooryck, Johan (2003). The morphosyntactic structure of articles and pronouns in Dutch. In: J. Koster & H. van Riemsdijk (red.), *Germania et alia. A Linguistic webschrift for Hans den Besten*. <http://odur.let.rug.nl/koster/DenBesten.htm>.

Shepherd, P. (1946). *Van taol naar taal*. Maastricht.

Verdenius, A.A. (1941). Een onveranderlijk relatief *dat*. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 35, 108-116.

About the author

Norbert Corver, Utrecht university, N.F.M.Corver@uu.nl