

On Classifiers and Affect in the Nominal Domain: Organizing “Disorganization”

Norbert Corver

This chapter presents six case studies on the encoding of affective-expressive information in the Dutch nominal domain. Each affective phenomenon that is discussed, displays a formal property that, from a surface perspective, could be qualified as “disorganizing”. It is proposed that disorganization is only apparent, and that the affective-expressive nominal expression has an organized structure that falls within the variation space as defined by UG. It is the *different* formal organization, compared to the organization of nominal expressions with descriptive contents, which yields “the feel of disorganization”. The availability of different grammatical routes provided by UG allows the language user to use her language for distinct communicative functions, including the expression of one’s affective feelings. It is proposed that the Classifier Projection plays an important role in the manifestation of those routes.

affect; classifier; listeme; proper name; kinship term; mass noun; deferential noun; diminutive

1. Introduction

Linguistic utterances are organized expressions.¹ They have an inner structure that obeys certain organizational rules. The Dutch examples in (1) illustrate the existence of such rules: (1a) shows that proper names are typically bare and cannot be introduced by the indefinite article *een* ‘a’. (1b) shows that possessive pronouns that are used attributively, are morphologically bare, as opposed to, for example, possessive pronouns that are used substantively: *de har-e* (the her-*e*, ‘hers’).

- (1) a. Kijk, [_{NP} (*een) Jan] staat voor de deur!
look a Jan stands before the door
'Look, Jan is standing at the door.'
b. Haar moeder is ziek.
her mother is ill
'Her mother is ill.'

With the above rules in mind, consider now the following two examples:

- (2) a. Kijk, [_{NP} die etter van een Jan] staat voor de deur!
look that puss of a Jan stands before the door
'Look, that horrible Jan is standing at the door.'
b. Hare Majesteit is ziek.
her-*e* Majesty is ill
'Her Majesty is ill.'

¹ Different versions of this chapter have been presented at the Linguistics Seminar, Freie Universität Berlin (2018); the CRISP seminar, KU Leuven, Brussels Campus (2018); the Language, Communication and Emotion Symposium, Utrecht university (2019); the workshop on Functional Categories and Expressive Meaning, Universitat Autònoma Barcelona (2019). I would like to thank the audiences for questions and discussions. I also thank the participants of my Comparative Syntax class at the university of Connecticut during the Spring term of the academic year 2018-19.

The nominal expression in (2a), which contains the evaluative epithet noun *etter* (litt.: puss, ‘jerk’) is surprising in showing an indefinite article (*een*) before the proper name (*Jan*). The possessive pronoun *haar* in (2b), which is part of a deferential noun phrase, also displays surprising behavior: it has the bound morpheme *-e* attached to it.

From a surface-based comparative perspective, the appearance of *een* in (2a) and the bound morpheme *-e* in (2b) could be characterized as “unexpected”, “deviant” or “anomalous”: a functional element appears in a linguistic environment where it normally —compare with (1a,b)— does not surface. Given this deviant external behavior, one might characterize *een* and *-e* in (2) as disorganizing elements.

It should be noted that the disorganizing elements *een* and *-e* in (2) are contained in nominal expressions with an affective/expressive flavor; that is, these expressions encode information about the speaker's evaluation of, and feelings about, some individual.² In (2a), for example, the epithet noun *etter* expresses the speaker's negative evaluation of the individual *Jan*. In (2b), deference is expressed by means of the positive-evaluative meaning associated with the noun *majesteit*.

The descriptive aim of this chapter is to present a range of affective/expressive phenomena in the Dutch nominal domain. A common feature of these phenomena will be the presence of what looks like a disorganizing element at the surface. This chapter's analytical aim will be to show that these surface disorganizations result from a regular, that is organized, underlying (nominal) syntax. Importantly, the linguistic encoding of expressive-affective information falls within the same structural format as that of descriptive information, which means that it falls within the syntactic design as defined by U(niversal)G(rammar).³ Specifically, it makes use of the same types of lexical atoms (content words, function words) and the same types of computational rules (e.g., movement, feature assignment) that are used for the representation of descriptive information.⁴ As will be shown in the course of this chapter, however, the way in which these atoms and rules are used, departs from the way in which they are normally or conventionally used, that is, for representing descriptive information. In other words, the encoding of affective/expressive information involves the alternative use of available linguistic means. One might also say: linguistic expressions encoding affective information have their own grammar, that is, their own way of organizing information on the basis of linguistic atoms that are also used for the formation of descriptive linguistic expressions. Disorganization, then, is not an absolute property of the affective linguistic expression itself. It is rather a relative property related to the alternative (i.e., secondary) use of lexical and grammatical means. The affective linguistic expression generated by this alternative linguistic route appears to be disorganized since it is *differently* organized, and also in a *less conventional* (and consequently, less expected and predictable) way from the perspective of language use. In short, different formal options made available by UG allow the language user

² Also in theories about the structure and meaning of music (Meyer 1956, Huron 2007), it has been argued that emotions can be induced by disorganizing the organized structure of music. The “violated” and therefore unexpected pattern excites the listener since she has to struggle to uncover its order. Levitin (2006: 169) states it as follows: “Music communicates to us emotionally through systematic violations of expectations. These violations can occur in any domain—the domain of pitch, timbre, contour, rhythm, tempo, and so on—but occur they must.”

³ See Potts (2007) for discussion of the distinction between ‘descriptive/propositional meaning’ and ‘expressive meaning’.

⁴ See also Corver (2016).

to use her language for distinct communicative functions, among which the expressive-affective function (see also Jakobson 1960).⁵

The general idea that the use of expressive language involves the use of “anomalous” forms can already be found in stylistic studies from the early-twentieth century.⁶ For example, in his *Le langage et la vie* (1913:96-97), Charles Bally makes the following statement:⁷

“A propos de langage usuel, on pourrait se demander si l'expressivité ne trouve pas son compte dans une condition du système, qui, en elle même, lui est étrangère: l'irrégularité. L'expressivité, par instinct, recherche l'inédit, l'imprévu ... La diversité, ressort essentiel de l'expressif, suppose presque naturellement l'anomalie.”

Consider also the following statement by the Dutch philosopher-linguist Pos (1935:329), who hints at the secondary nature of the expression of affect in language:

“Je crois que pour comprendre la sphère affective en matière de linguistique, il faut se fonder sur la langue prise comme instrument de la raison. Sur cette base, le sens affectif apparaîtra comme une complication du langage rationnel.”⁸

Pos characterizes this “complication de la raison” in terms of the inverse use of functional material (“les particules”):

“Mais la fonction logique des particules n'est pas la seule qui leur appartienne. Elles ont un autre emploi qui suit un sens inverse: l'usage émotif et affectif”; (Pos 1935: 328).⁹

In what follows, I will present some case studies on nominal expressions that exemplify “the organization of disorganization”, or in Pos’s terms “le sens affectif comme une complication du langage rationnel”. An important ingredient of my analysis of these affective nominal expressions regards the nature of the substantive vocabulary of a language, that is, the nature of open class words such as English *bike*, *red*, and *eat*. Following Borer’s (2005) exo-skeletal model, I assume that these substantive atoms, so-called listemes, are no more than sound-meaning pairs (i.e., a phonological index and a conceptual meaning).¹⁰ They are units of the

⁵ The approach sketched here is reminiscent of what Roeper (1999) calls ‘Theoretical Bilingualism’, that is, the idea that, within every language, there is a set of mini-grammars with opposite formal properties that are used for different social or communicative domains. In a way, every language has “pockets of bilingualism”, which provide the language user with a nuanced array of communicative functions/styles. See also Yang’s (2002) Variational Model.

⁶ See also Joos (1923: 317-318) and Overdiep (1937) for Dutch.

⁷ Translation of Bally’s text: “As regards everyday language, one might ask whether there isn’t some kind of benefit to expressiveness in a requirement of the system, which, in itself, is foreign to it: irregularity. Expressiveness, by instinct, seeks the unprecedented, the unforeseen ... Diversity, an essential feature of the expressiveness, almost naturally presupposes anomaly.

⁸ Translation of Pos’s French text: “I believe that to understand the affective sphere of linguistics, one must rely on language taken as the instrument of reason. On this basis, the emotional sense will appear as a complication of rational language.”

⁹ Translation of Pos’s French text: “But the logical function of particles is not the only one they have. They have another use that follows the opposite direction: the emotional and affective use.”

¹⁰ The term ‘exo-skeletal’ stands for “the view that it is the properties of the ‘outside’, larger structure which ultimately determine the overall ‘shape’ of what is within, rather than the other way around. More specifically, I (NC: Hagit Borer) will suggest that syntactic properties typically assumed to emerge from properties of listemes, are, by and large, properties of structures and not properties of the listemes themselves.” (Borer 2005:15). The opposite is labeled ‘endo-skeletal’ and takes “the listeme as a skeleton around which the syntax is constructed.” (Borer 2005: 5). In other words, the latter approach takes the properties of larger units to be projections of properties of some central lexical entry. Borer’s exo-skeletal model shows relationships both with other generative-

conceptual system and do not carry any formal-grammatical properties, such as categorial value or specification as count or mass noun, which need to be projected onto syntax. When the listeme becomes part of a (functional) syntactic structure as a result of the application of syntactic rules (the linguistic computational system), the grammar assigns an interpretation to the structure. The extent to which the conceptual meaning associated with the listeme matches the structural meaning imposed by the functional system, determines the felicitousness of the use of the entire linguistic expression. The better the match between the conceptual meaning and the structural meaning, the more felicitous the linguistic expression is. For example, the listeme *spider* is normally used as a count noun, as in *There is a spider on the wall*. That *spider* is conventionally used this way is information that is associated with the encyclopedic entry of the listeme *spider*. Besides this normal use of *spider* as a count noun, we can also use it as a mass noun, as in *There is a lot of spider on the wall* (e.g., after having hit it flat against the wall), or a proper name, as in *Spider is my favorite pet*. With Borer (2005), I assume that this default use of a listeme can be overridden (coerced) by the grammar, more specifically by the functional system of the noun phrase in which the listeme is embedded. As will become clear in the course of this chapter, the functional projection ‘CIP’ (Classifier Phrase) plays an important role in coercing the encyclopedic meaning of listemes, and also in the encoding of affect in human language.

The chapter is organized as follows: section 2 gives some background information on classifiers, and presents the structural organization of the noun phrase, based on Borer (2005). Sections 3–8 present six case studies of affective-expressive phenomena in the Dutch nominal domain. Section 9 concludes the chapter.

2. Classifiers and the inner organization of nominal expressions

This section provides some background for the hypothesis that classifying elements in the nominal domain play an important role in the expression of the speaker's positive or negative evaluation (so-called ‘valence’) of the entity denoted by the head of the extended nominal projection.¹¹ In what follows, I will first give some background information about so-called classifiers and subsequently discuss Borer's (2005) proposal regarding the inner organization of nominal expressions, including the placement and function of the functional projection CIP (Classifier Phrase).

Classifiers are free or bound morphemes that categorize (= classify) the nouns with which they combine (Lyons 1997, Croft 1994, Aikhenvald 2003). They assign those nouns to a particular semantic or grammatical class. A well-known example are numeral classifiers in languages such as Mandarin Chinese, which enable the noun following the classifier to be associated with a cardinal numeral. In other words, the numeral classifier assigns the selected noun to the class of countable elements (i.e., units). In (3), for example, the classifier *ben*

linguistic studies adopting UG-determined structural templates (e.g., Harley 1995, Kratzer 1996, Marantz 1997) and with studies adopting the model of Construction Grammar, which takes a language-specific approach towards constructions (e.g., Goldberg 1995, Croft 2001).

¹¹ As is clear from the following statement by the neuroscientist and emotion researcher Antonio Damasio (2018:101), our feelings play an important role in classifying the world around us in terms of good/pleasant things and bad/unpleasant things: "Once feeling would have been removed [NC: from the mind], you would have become unable to classify [NC: sensory] images as beautiful or ugly, pleasurable or painful, tasteful or vulgar, spiritual or earthy".

proposes that the listeme (*in casu: shu*) has the mass reading as a default reading. The listeme gets its count reading by merging with the classifier head $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$, where $\langle e \rangle$ is an *open value* which needs to be assigned range, and DIV marks its categorial membership, that is, the type of element that can assign range to $\langle e \rangle$. In (3), $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$ is assigned range by the free morpheme *ben* ‘volume’. It portions out (i.e., divides) the mass into smaller units that can interact with the ‘count’ system. This count system is encoded by the Quantity Phrase #P, which is responsible for the assignment of quantity (e.g., number) to units (= divisions) of stuff. In (3), for example, the number ‘three’ (*san*) is assigned to the open value $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$. When the extended nominal projection has a mass reading, as, for example, in Mandarin Chinese *shenme qian* (what money, ‘much money’), the extended nominal projection lacks the layer CIP_{DIV} , which means that the quantifying head $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$ directly merges with LP. As indicated in (6), the highest functional layer is DP, which is headed by the open value $\langle e \rangle_{\text{d}}$. This open value needs to be assigned a referential index to objects, where the object is a discourse antecedent or situationally provided.

In view of the above discussion, the nominal expression *san ben shu* ‘three books’ in (3), which has a count reading, and the nominal expression *shenme qian* (what money, ‘much money’), which has a mass reading, can be represented as (7a) and (7b), respectively (Borer 2005: 96-97):

- (7) a. $[\text{DP Spec } [\text{D}' \langle e \rangle_{\text{d}} [\text{\#P } \text{san } [\text{\#} \langle e \rangle_{\#} [\text{CIP } \text{ben}_{\text{DIV}} [\text{LP } \text{shu}]]]]]]]$
 b. $[\text{DP Spec } [\text{D}' \langle e \rangle_{\text{d}} [\text{\#P } \text{shenme } [\text{\#} \# [\text{LP } \text{qian}]]]]]$

In line with Chomsky's (2001: 2) Uniformity Principle,¹⁴ Borer (2005: 93) proposes that a language like English, traditionally considered to be a non-classifier language, actually has a CIP-layer in its extended nominal projection. The English classifier head fulfills the same function as the Mandarin Chinese one: it portions out (i.e., divides) the listeme (i.e., the lexical "noun"), which, also in English and even universally, has the mass reading as the default reading. This portioning-out function, however, is not accomplished by a Mandarin-Chinese type of classifier, but instead by the plural inflection, as well as by the indefinite article (*a*). The latter is a free morpheme that assigns the value 'singularity' to $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$, the former is the Spell-out of an abstract head feature 'plurality' ($\langle \text{plur} \rangle$) that assigns range to $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$. This abstract $\langle \text{plur} \rangle$ -feature necessitates head movement of the listeme to Cl, yielding the surface form *books*. With Borer (2005: 111-14), I assume that the article *a* fulfills a double function: besides being a divider (of mass), it also functions as a counter (of a unit). In other words, *a* assigns range also to the open value $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$. This counting function is clear from the fact that *a book* stands for ‘one book’. Again following Borer, I take this double function to result from head movement of *a* from the head-position of CIP to the head position of #P.

The above discussion brings us to the structural representations in (8a-c) for the nominal expressions *three books*, *a book* and *much money*, respectively:

- (8) a. $[\text{DP } \langle e \rangle_{\text{d}} [\text{\#P } \text{three } [\text{\#} \langle e \rangle_{\#} [\text{CIP } [\text{Cl}' \text{book} + \langle \text{pl} \rangle (= -s) \rangle [\text{LP } \text{b\text{oo}k}]]]]]]$
 b. $[\text{DP } \mathbf{a} \langle e \rangle_{\text{d}} [\text{\#P } [\text{\#} \mathbf{a} \langle e \rangle_{\#} [\text{CIP } [\text{Cl}' \mathbf{a} [\text{LP } \text{book}]]]]]]$
 c. $[\text{DP } \langle e \rangle_{\text{d}} [\text{\#P } \text{much } [\text{\#} \langle e \rangle_{\#} [\text{LP } \text{money}]]]]]$

Let me conclude this brief discussion of Borer's approach to the inner organization of nominal expressions with a remark about the definite article *the*. According to Borer (2005:161- 68), *the* is a discourse anaphor which assigns range to $\langle e \rangle_{\text{d}}$ indirectly, namely

¹⁴ Chomsky's Uniformity Principle: "In the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, assume languages to be uniform, with variety restricted to easily detectable properties of utterances."

through the properties it has inherited from its antecedent. For example, when *the* has a singular antecedent (say, *a book*), it inherits the dividing property and the count property from its antecedent, which corresponds, roughly, to the properties of *one* (Borer 2005: 167). This, in turn, leads Borer to propose that (singular) *the* starts out in the head position of CIP and head-moves to # and D, assigning range to $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$ and $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$, as depicted in (9):

(9) [DP the $\langle e \rangle_d$ [#P *the* $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$ [CIP *the* $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$ [LP book]]]]

When *the* has a plural count antecedent (say, *books*), the situation looks slightly different: $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$ is assigned range through the instantiation of the head-feature $\langle \text{pl(ural)} \rangle$ on a moved L-head (*book*) and the plural spell-out. As a consequence, ‘plural’ *the* starts out in #, and has the properties that correspond to quantifiers such as *all* and *several*, which also assign range to $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$. Schematically:

(10) [DP the $\langle e \rangle_d$ [#P *the* $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$ [CIP **book**+ $\langle \text{pl} (= -s) \rangle$ [LP *book*]]]]

Following Borer (2005), I take the structural representation in (6) to be universal, which means that it constitutes also the inner organization of Dutch nominal expressions. In Sections 3-8, I will try to show that this syntactic design underlies both “neutral/descriptive” nominal expressions and “affective/expressive” nominal expressions. In other words the distinction between “descriptive expression of thought” and “affective expression of thought”, exemplified here by the study of nominal expressions, boils down to different choices that are made within the formal possibilities that are made available by UG. The descriptive (“organized”) nominal expressions and their expressive (“apparently disorganized”) counterparts that will be studied comparatively, are given in (11a-e) and (11a’-e’), respectively. The superficially (dis)organized parts are italicized.

- | | |
|---|---|
| (11) a. dat stuk <i>kaas</i>
that piece cheese | a.’ dat stuk <i>verdriet</i>
that piece misfortune |
| b. <i>de</i> _[-neuter] mens
the human-being | b.’ <i>het</i> _[+neuter] mens
the human-being |
| c. <i>oom</i> Gerrit
uncle Gerrit | c.’ Gerrit- <i>oom</i>
Gerrit-uncle |
| d. Jan
Jan | d.’ die etter van <i>een</i> Jan
that jerk of a Jan |
| e. <i>haar</i> moeder
her mother | e.’ <i>Hare</i> Majesteit
her- <i>e</i> majesty |

In section 3, I start my comparative study with the pair in (11a, a’).

3. Evaluative direct partitives: On abstract mass nouns and hidden ones

Consider the Dutch direct partitive construction in (12):

- (12) Jan heeft [dat *stuk* kaas] opgegeten.
 Jan has that piece cheese eaten
 'Jan ate that piece of cheese.'

A characteristic feature of this binominal construction is the fact that the "noun" *stuk* (N1) and the mass "noun" *kaas* (N2), which are in a partitive relation, are juxtaposed.¹⁵ There is no linking preposition (e.g., *van* 'of') that intervenes between the two nouns (Vos 1999, Van Riemsdijk 1998).¹⁶ The part noun *stuk* in (12) functions as a unit classifier. It normally combines with a mass "noun" denoting a substance such as *kaas* 'cheese', *cake* 'cake', or *hout* 'wood'. In other words, there are selectional requirements imposed by the part noun (N1) onto the mass Noun (N2). In (12), *stuk* turns the concrete mass noun *kaas* into a unit that can be counted (Doetjes 1997).¹⁷ Being a countable unit, *stuk* can be pluralized and combine with a cardinal numeral, as in (*die*) *twee stukken kaas* ((those) two pieces cheese, 'those two pieces of cheese').

Given the classifier-like status of *stuk*, I assign the following structure, based on (6), to the direct partitive *die twee stukken kaas*:

- (13) [_{DP} die [_{D'} <e>_D [_{#P} twee [_# <e>_# [_{CIP} [_{CIP} stukken] [_{CI'} <e>_{DIV} [_{LP} kaas]]]]]]]]]]
 those two pieces cheese
 'those two pieces of cheese'

According to this analysis, the listeme ("noun") *kaas* receives the default mass interpretation. It is selected by the functional head <e>_{DIV}, which is silent, and whose open value <e> is assigned a range indirectly, namely by means of specifier-head agreement with the plural form *stukken*, which I take to occupy [Spec,CIP].¹⁸ I assume that the feature 'plurality' of *stukken* is shared with the silent classifier-head. As indicated in (13), I take the element *stukken* to be a phrasal constituent, more specifically a CIP, whose functional head (i.e., <e>_{DIV}) is assigned range by a head feature <plur>, which attracts the listeme *stuk* and is realized as the plural morpheme *-en*; whence: *stuk+en*. The constituent *stukken kaas*, representing units of stuff, is selected by the quantifying head <e>_#, whose open value is assigned range by the cardinal *twee* in its Spec-position.

Having provided an analysis of the inner structure of Dutch direct partitives, consider next example (14a), which has the representation in (14b):

- (14) a. [Dat *stuk* ongeluk/verdriet/ellende/vreten] zeurt altijd.
 that piece misfortune/sorrow/misery/grub nags always
 'That good-for-nothing/piece of work is always nagging.'

- b. [_{DP} dat [_{D'} <e>_D [_# <e>_# [_{CIP} [_{CIP} stuk] [_{CI'} <e>_{DIV} [_{LP} ongeluk]]]]]]]]]]

¹⁵ Certain direct partitive constructions can have a plural noun as N2: *een pak melk/koekjes* (a carton milk/a packet biscuits, 'a carton of milk/a packet of biscuits').

¹⁶ Compare, for example, English *a piece of cheese/fish*.

¹⁷ Compare it with the Mandarin Chinese example in (3).

¹⁸ See Borer (2005: 41) for the claim that specifier-head relations can give rise to indirect range assignment. Her example is the indirect assignment of definiteness to <e>_d under Spec-head agreement with a possessor, as for example in (i), where the definiteness of *the dog's* determines the definiteness of the entire noun phrase:

(i) [_{DP} [_{DP} the dog's]³ <e>_d ... [_{NP} ear]] (Borer (2005: 41, ex. (21))

See Borer (2005: 99-100) for the idea that English measure phrases such as *box* and *cup* are phrasal elements occupying the specifier position of a functional projection.

(14a) shows that direct partitive constructions featuring *stuk* can also be used for evaluating persons. Interestingly, when used that way, *stuk* displays surprising selectional behavior: the selected listeme denotes an *abstract* mass (e.g., *ongeluk*) instead of the normal *concrete* mass (e.g., *kaas*). So the abstract mass interpretation associated with the listeme *ongeluk* is coerced into a concrete interpretation by virtue of the presence of *stuk*. Importantly, when *stuk* is absent in (14a), as in *dat ongeluk* (that misfortune), it is impossible to get a reading in which the noun phrase refers to a person, possibly because the abstractness of the listeme “survives” and is incompatible with the concreteness that is typically associated with an individual person. I assume that the expressive-affective flavor of *dat stuk ongeluk* in comparison with *dat stuk kaas* relates to the less optimal match between the conceptual meaning of the listeme *ongeluk* (i.e., being associated with abstractness) and the selectional properties of the unit “noun” *stuk*, whose conventional combinatorics require the presence of a concrete listeme. It is this less optimal match within an organized structure that gives the “feel of disorganization”. The negative-evaluative meaning associated with the individual denoted by the nominal expressions in (14a) comes from the abstract listeme: *ongeluk*, for example, stands for something negative and is a property associated with the individual denoted by *dat stuk ongeluk*.¹⁹ I assume that the “human interpretation” of *dat stuk ongeluk* is determined by the discourse-anaphoric relationship that the determiner *dat* has with its (human) antecedent (say, a noun phrase denoting the individual ‘Jan’).

As was pointed out earlier, the unit “noun” *stuk* acts like a divider: it turns the listeme with a (default) mass interpretation into a countable unit. The countability of the nominal expressions in (14) is exemplified in (15), where the plural form *stukken* shows that the unit ‘*stuk verdriet/ongeluk*’ can be counted.²⁰

- (15) a. Kunnen [die stukken verdriet] dat niet eerder bedenken?
 can those pieces sorrow that not earlier think.about
 ‘Wouldn't it be possible for those bloody guys to think about this a little earlier?’
- b. Baby's zijn [om aandacht krijgende stukken ongeluk].
 babies are for attention screaming pieces misfortune
 ‘Babies are horrible creatures that scream all the time in order to get your attention.’

Besides the anomalous behavior exemplified in (14a), the part noun *stuk* displays another type of surprising behavior. Before showing this, consider, first, example (16):

- (16) Kun je [dat stuk (vlees)] even doorgeven?
 can you that piece meat just pass.over
 ‘Could you pass over that piece (of meat)?’

As shown by this example, the listeme *vlees* —the mass “noun”— can be absent. Given the fact that the classifier-like element *stuk* typically combines with a listeme denoting mass, I assume that *dat stuk* is actually a hidden direct partitive construction in which the (mass) listeme is silent. Thus, we have the following structure, where *VLEES* is a silent listeme:

- (17) [DP dat_{+neuter} [D' <e>_d [# <e>_# [CIP [CIP stuk_[+neuter]] [CI' <e>_{DIV} [LP VLEES_[-neuter]]]]]]]]

¹⁹ The nominalized infinitive *vreten* ‘grub/devour’ is the negative-expressive equivalent of *eten* ‘eat’.

²⁰ Example (15b) comes from the the novel *Somberman* (2016) by the Dutch novelist Remco Campert.

I take the contents of silent *VLEES* to be recoverable on the basis of an available discourse antecedent or situational object.

Consider now the following example:

- (18) [Dat stuk (#vlees)] woont bij ons om de hoek.
that piece meat lives with us around the corner
'That beauty / hunk lives around the corner.'

The nominal expression *dat stuk* in (18) denotes a person and typically has a positive-evaluative meaning based on physical qualities of the person.²¹ In view of this, it does not seem implausible to associate these physical properties with a silent listeme that represents a bodily mass, say *VLEES* 'meat/flesh', or maybe *LICHAAM* 'body'.²² In other words, *dat stuk* in (18) is a hidden direct-partitive construction that stands for 'a piece of flesh/body.'

As indicated, adding the overt noun *vlees* yields an odd expression. One prefers to leave the physical component that is (positively) evaluated implicit, possibly because of politeness or decency; that is, it not appropriate to qualify persons as being pieces of flesh. In this case, then, it is not a *meaning* characteristic of the listeme that is overridden (coerced), but it is rather a *sound* characteristic of the listeme that is overridden: instead of being (able to be) pronounced, as in (16), the listeme 'vlees' must remain unpronounced (i.e., lack a phonological index). Only then can *dat stuk* get a reading in which it refers to a person rather than a non-human being. It is this "phonological coercion" that gives the "feel of disorganization".

Let me finish this section by pointing out that this evaluative use of a hidden direct partitive construction is more common in Dutch. For example, besides "normal" direct partitives such as *deze brok chocolade* (this piece chocolate, 'this piece of chocolate') and *een stoot azijn* (a punch vinegar, 'a large amount of vinegar'), we also find hidden direct partitives such as *die brok* and *die stoot* in (19), which are used to refer to a person, and which also have the structure in (17).

- (19) Marie wilde graag met [die brok/stoot] uit eten gaan.
Marie wanted much with that piece/punch for dinner go
'Marie would like to have dinner with that hunk.'

Summarizing, I have tried to show that Dutch direct partitive constructions can have an evaluative-expressive meaning, where the entire nominal expression denotes a person. It was shown that two anomalous (i.e., disorganizing) properties index the expressive-evaluative nature of this construction: firstly, selection of an abstract mass noun instead of a concrete mass noun; secondly, selection of a silent mass noun instead of an overt one. Importantly, the syntactic structure (organization) that underlies these affective direct partitives is not different from that of normal direct partitives.

²¹ Note that 'body' also appears in [+human] indefinite pronominals such as English *somebody* and *anybody*, where *body* clearly has a semantically bleached meaning and does not literally refer to a person's body.

²² See also English Slang expressions such as *piece of meat* and *piece of ass*, which are used to refer to a woman as a sexual object; see Dalzell and Victor (2006).

4. On [+neuter] *mens* and diminutive *-je*

This section examines the grammatical behavior of the Dutch noun *mens*, which is non-neuter when it carries the meaning 'human being'. This is clear from the use of the non-neuter definite article *de* in (20); the neuter definite article has the form *het* in Dutch.

- (20) Honden houden van *de*_{-neuter} *mens*.
 dogs like of the human being
 'Dogs are fond of people.'

Interestingly, as shown in (21), *mens* sometimes combines with a neuter determiner; for example, the neuter definite article *het* or the neuter demonstrative pronoun *dat*. Importantly, the pattern *het/dat mens* has an evaluative flavor. It can have a negative-pejorative meaning, as in (21a), but also a more pitiful one, especially in combination with evaluative adjectives such as *arm* 'poor' and *lief* 'sweet/dear'. Furthermore, the noun phrase typically refers to a woman.

- (21) a. Ik haat *het*_{+neuter} *mens* / *dat*_{+neuter} *mens*!
 I hate the human-being /that human-being
 'I hate that woman!'
 b. Je moet *het*_{+neuter} *arme mens* / *dat*_{+neuter} *arme mens* niet zo plagen!
 you should the poor human-being / that poor human-being not so-much tease
 'You should not tease that poor woman so much!'

Taking a mere surface perspective, one might (incorrectly) characterize the sequence *het/dat mens* as an instance of misagreement; that is, the noun *mens*, which normally combines with a non-neuter determiner, now combines with a neuter determiner. Of course, an easy solution to the different agreement patterns in (20) and (21) would be to say that there are two lexical items *mens* in the lexicon: (i) *mens*_[-neuter] with the interpretation 'human being/person', and (ii) *mens*_[+neuter], with the interpretation 'female person'. An alternative approach, one more in line with Borer's (2005) exoskeletal model, would be to say that there is only one listeme *mens* in the Dutch Encyclopedia.^{23 24} Suppose now that this listeme has common gender as a default gender, which means that it combines with the definite article *de* 'the', as in *de mens*.²⁵ Evidence in support of the idea that common gender is the default comes from the much larger frequency of *de+N* combinations in comparison with *het+N* combinations, and from the fact that nonce nouns typically combine with *de*, and not with neuter *het*, as in *de blisp* and *de glork*.²⁶ If *mens* has common gender by default, the neuter pattern *het mens* possibly results from the functional structure in which the listeme *mens* is embedded. I propose that *de mens* in (20) and *het mens* in (21) have the structures in (22a) and (22b), respectively:

- (22) a. [DP *de*_{<e>d} [# *de*_{<e>#} [CIP [CI *de*]_{<e>DIV} [LP *mens*]]]]
 b. [DP *het* _{<e>d} [# *het* _{<e>#} [CIP *het* [CI' <neut>CI⁰ [LP *mens*]]]]]]

²³ The *encyclopedia* is the general reservoir of listemes, "a list of arbitrary pairings of sound and meaning, where by sound we mean a phonological index, and by meaning we refer to the appropriate package of conceptual properties associated with such an index." (Borer 2005: 30).

²⁴ It goes without saying that the idea that neuter gender is a configurationally defined property associated with the CIP-projection, needs further investigation. Due to space limitations, I leave this for future research.

²⁵ Compare in this respect Borer's claim that 'mass' is the default value of "nouns" and that 'count' is a property imposed by the functional structure.

²⁶ In Van Berkum (1996), it is noted that, as far as simplex nouns are concerned, about 80 per cent of them are *de*-nouns.

The definite article *de* in (22a) starts out in Cl^o, assigning range to <e>_{DIV}, and subsequently assigns range to <e>_# and <e>_d via successive head-movements. As depicted in (22b), I take ‘neuter’ to be a head-feature associated with <e>_{DIV}. This feature gets associated with the listeme *mens* as a result of head movement, as shown in (23a). It is the amalgam *mens*+<neut> which enters into an agreement relationship (concord) with the neuter definite article.²⁷ In other words, it is the neuter feature on the Cl-head that triggers the apparently deviant appearance of the neuter article *het*. As shown in (23a), I take this article to occupy the specifier position of CIP. In addition, I assume that it enters into a Spec-head agreement relationship with the neuter-feature on Cl, and assigns range to <e>_# and <e>_d by successive movements to the specifier positions of these functional elements, as in (23b).

- (23) a. [_{DP} <e>_d [_{#P} <e>_# [_{CIP} *het* [_{Cl} **mens**+<neut> [_{LP} **mens**]]]]]
 b. [_{DP} *het* [_D <e>_d [_{#P} **het** [_# <e>_# [_{CIP} **het** [_{Cl} **mens**+<neut> [_{LP} **mens**]]]]]]]]]

Although this derivational approach towards *dat/het mens* in (21) seems as stipulative as the lexicalist approach, which lexically distinguishes a [-neuter] *mens* and a [+neuter] *mens*, it gains plausibility when one realizes that gender-switches as a result of bound morphology are quite common. A pertinent example is the diminutive morpheme *-je*, which is associated with the gender feature [+neuter]. Combining a [-neuter] noun (e.g., *fiets*, ‘bike’) with the diminutive morpheme *-je*, yields a [+neuter] amalgam *N+je*. This is exemplified in (24):

- (24) a. *de*_[-neuter] *fiets*_[-neuter] ‘the bike’
 b. *het*_[+neuter] *fietsje*_[+neuter] ‘the little bike’

Extending Wiltschko’s (2005) analysis of the German diminutive *-chen* to Dutch, I take the Dutch diminutive affix *-je* to function as a classifier.²⁸ This classifier status receives support from the observation that, just like Mandarin Chinese numeral classifiers, the diminutive *-je* turns mass nouns into count phrases. That is, when *-je* is absent, these nouns preferably do not combine with a cardinal numeral like *een* ([e:n], ‘one’), as shown in (25a). When *-je* is present, however, as in (25a), a cardinal numeral like *een* is permitted (see also Borer 2005: 92, De Belder 2011):

²⁷ Occupying the specifier position, *het* is a phrasal element. I tentatively assume that it is identical to the neuter personal pronoun *het* ‘it’. It should be noted that the definite article *de* does not have a pronominal use. This contrast possibly hints at a structural difference between the two “definite articles”. There is also dialectal evidence in support of their different status. For example, in certain Northern varieties of Dutch, *de* can be dropped when it is part of a definite/specific noun phrase. This article-drop phenomenon is only attested with the common definite article *de* and not with the neuter article *het*. This is exemplified in (i) for Hogelandster Dutch (Ter Laan 1953); see also Overdiep (1937:294):

- (i) a. *Jong het bok verkòft.*
 boy has goat sold
 ‘The boy sold the goat.’
 b. **(’t) peerd löpt in *(’t) land.*
 the_{neut} horse walks in the meadow
 ‘The horse walks around in the meadow.’

²⁸ For the observation that Dutch diminutive suffixes turn mass nouns into count nouns, see als Borer (2005, chapter 4, footnote 6). Borer attributes the observation to Henk van Riemsdijk. For the idea that diminutives are classifiers, see also Ott (2011), and Wittenberg and Trotzke (to appear).

- (25) a. ?* een ijs
 one ice
 b. een ijs-je
 one ice-DIM
 'one ice-cream'

Getting back to the agreement patterns in (24a,b), I propose that, in the pattern without *-je*, it is the noun (*fiets*) that enters into a concord relationship with the definite article, as in (26a). In the pattern with *-je*, on the contrary, there is an affixal classifier-head (*-je*) specified for [+neuter], which determines the concord relationship with the determiner.²⁹ As shown in (26b), head movement and adjunction of [-neuter] *fiets* to [+neuter] *-je* creates the complex head $[[fiets]-je]$, which has [+neuter] *-je* as its head.

- (26) a. [DP $de_{\langle e \rangle d}$ [#P $de_{\langle e \rangle \#}$ [CIP $de_{\langle e \rangle DIV}$ [LP *fiets*]]]]
 b. [DP *het* [D' $\langle e \rangle d$ [#P het [#' $\langle e \rangle \#$ [CIP het [C' **fiets**+<neut = -je> [LP **fiets**]]]]]]]]

Interestingly, as exemplified in (27), the diminutive *-je* can be added also to the noun *mens*; compare with (21b).

- (27) Je moet *het*+neuter *arme mensje* / *dat*+neuter *arme mensje* niet zo plagen!
 you should the poor human-being-DIM / that poor human-being-DIM not so-much tease
 'You should not tease that poor woman so much!'

The fact that the diminutive can be used in (27) possibly relates to the pitiful evaluation of the referent of *mens(je)*. The smallness-meaning associated with *-je* does not only stand for physical smallness (say, the descriptive meaning), as with *fietsje* in (24b), but also for smallness in a more psychological-metaphorical sense (the more expressive meaning): 'vulnerable/pitiful'. The latter notion of smallness is associated with a more positive evaluation by the speaker; it expresses support or compassion from the speaker's side. The derivation of *dat mensje* is given in (28):

- (28) a. [DP *dat* [ClasP $-je_{[+neuter]}$ [NP *mens*[-neuter]]]]
 b. [DP *dat* [ClasP [$mens$ + $-je_{[+neuter]}$] [NP **mens**]]]]

Even though *-je* can be easily attached to *mens* in (21b), as was shown in (27), the same attachment yields a less acceptable pattern with *mens* in (21a), as shown in (29):

- (29) Ik haat *het*+neuter *mens*(#-je) / *dat*+neuter *mens*(#-je)!
 I hate the human-being /that human-being
 'I hate that woman!'

The impossibility of *-je* in (29) is expected if *-je* has a more positive-evaluative meaning. Adding *-je* would be incompatible with the negative-evaluative meaning intended by the speaker. As indicated in (30), I assume that, in *het/dat mens*, there is a classifier-head present, more specifically a zero-affix that attracts the noun and forms a complex head: $[[mens]+CL_{[+neuter]}]$. In view of the highly negative interpretation of *mens* in (29), one might propose that this (silent) classifier is the opposite of diminutive *-je*. Suppose it is an

²⁹ According to the analyses in (26a,b), the non-existence of *de N+je* follows from the fact that *de* and diminutive *-je* are in complementary distribution: they compete for the same syntactic position: the classifier-head.

augmentative (zero-affixal) classifier, that is, a morpheme which expresses greater intensity. Thus, the complex head in (28b) may be more precisely represented as in (30):

(30) [DP dat [ClasP [mens+CL_[augmentative; +neuter]] [LP mens]]]

The idea that the augmentative zero-affix is the classifier-counterpart of the overt diminutive affix gets some support from the minimal pairs in (31):

(31) a. die_[-neuter] jongen_[-neuter]
 that boy
 b. dat_[+neuter] jong-etje_[+neuter] b.' dat jochie
 that boy-DIM that boy-DIM
 'that little boy' 'that little boy'
 c. dat_[+neuter] jong_[+neuter] c.' dat joch
 that boy that boy
 'that boy' (pejorative) 'that boy' (pejorative)³⁰

The noun *jongen* in (31a) is the base form. Adding a diminutive morpheme gives the form *jongetje* in (31b), which plausibly relates to *jong* in (31c). I assume that in the latter example, we have an augmentative zero-affix, which is specified as [+neuter]. The forms (31b') and (31c') display the same pattern: *jochie* features the more colloquial diminutive *-ie*, while *joch* has a more augmentative meaning, which I take to be associated with a zero-augmentative suffix.

(32) [DP dat [ClasP [jong/joch+CL_[augmentative; +neuter]] [LP jong/joch]]]

There is one final question that has not been addressed so far: why does *mensje* typically refer to a female person? I tentatively propose that *mens* —historically a combination of *man/men* ‘person in general’ plus adjectival *-s* (Van der Sijs 2010)— has masculine reference as a default. This is also clear from the use of a possessive pronoun that takes *de mens* as its antecedent: we typically find the masculine possessive pronoun *zijn*, as in *De mens bepaalt zelf zijn lot* (the person determines self his destiny, ‘Man determines his own destiny’). If the listeme *mens* has masculine-personal reference by default, then it does not seem implausible to think that feminine-personal reference of *het mens* is the deviant form, obtained by moving the listeme to Cl. Notice also that *het mens* can function as the antecedent for the feminine possessive pronoun *haar*, but not for *zijn*: *Het (arme) mens betreurde haar/*zijn lot* (the (poor) person regretted her/his destiny; ‘The (poor) woman regretted her destiny’).³¹

³⁰ When *jong/joch* is accompanied by a positive attributive adjective such as *leuk* ‘nice’, a positive reading of the entire noun phrase is possible, as in: *Ik vind Jan een leuk jong/joch* (I find Jan a nice lad). Obviously, a negative attributive adjective yields a negative reading, as in *een vervelend jong/joch* (an annoying lad).

³¹ That “nouns” denoting male persons can form the basis of “nouns” denoting female persons is also familiar from the realm of personal names. For example, the boys’ names *Jos*, *Jan* and *Frans* can be used as girls’ names when the diminutive *-je* is added: *Josje*, *Jantje*, *Fransje*. Of course, these proper names carrying a diminutive can refer also to a male person, for example, a little boy called *Jos*, or a male adult whose name is used in an affective-expressive way. Importantly, the diminutive attached to the proper name is what De Belder *et al* (2014) call a ‘low’ diminutive; in their analysis, a diminutive with non-compositional meaning, which attaches to the Root, and is located in a projection (LexP) embedded in the categorial projection nP. As De Belder *et al* (2014) point out, these diminutives do not lead to changes in gender, as in (26). That *-je* in *Josje* is a low diminutive is suggested by the fact that, when *Josje* combines with a determiner, it is a common determiner (e.g. *die* ‘that’) and not a neuter determiner (*dat*, ‘that’). For example: *Die Josje van jullie is aardig* (that_{common} Jos-DIM of you is kind, ‘(your daughter) Josje is kind’).

5. On the expressive use of definite articles with proper names

In Standard Dutch, proper names (for persons) typically do not combine with a definite article, as is shown in (33):

- (33) (*De) Jacob slaapt nog.
 the Jacob sleeps still

In the spirit of Longobardi (1994), Borer (2005:78;176) proposes that a listeme like *Jacob* (covertly) head-moves to D via intermediate successive mergers with $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$ and $\langle e \rangle_{\#}$. In D, *Jacob* supports a definiteness-feature $\langle \text{def} \rangle$. It is this syntactic configuration that turns the listeme *Jacob* into a proper name. According to Borer, the definiteness-feature is a discourse-anaphor, just like the definite article *de* ‘the’, which means that it inherits its (referential) index from the discourse, and assigns range to $\langle e \rangle_{\text{a}}$. By virtue of having merged with $\langle \text{def} \rangle$, *Jacob* becomes a restricting modifier of the index of $\langle \text{def} \rangle$; it functions as a restriction on the possible antecedents of the $\langle \text{def} \rangle$ feature. Thus, *Jacob* stands roughly for ‘the antecedent with *Jacob* properties’.

- (34) [DP **Jacob** $\langle \text{def} \rangle$ [#P **Jacob** $\#$ [CIP **Jacob** $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$ [LP **Jacob**]]]]

As shown in (35), certain Dutch dialects permit nominal expressions consisting of a definite article and a “proper name”. An illustration from Oerle Dutch is given in (35); data drawn from De Bont (1958: 376-77). The prime examples illustrate the “bare” (i.e., determiner-less) equivalents in Standard Dutch:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| (35) a. den Tei | a.’ The(odorus) |
| the Theo | |
| ‘Theodorus/Theo’ (first name) | |
| b. de Cie ^j | b.’ Lucia |
| the Lucy | |
| ‘Lucy’ (first name) | |
| c. de Geer | c.’ Vergeer |
| the Geer | |
| ‘Vergeer’ (last name) | |
| d. de Smolder | d.’ Smolders |
| the Smolder | |
| ‘Smolders’ (last name) | |

Besides being characterized by the presence of a definite article, the proper names in (35a-d) display also the property of having a reduced form in comparison to the full-fledged proper names in the primed examples. In the dialectological literature, it has further been claimed that the forms in (35a-d) have an augmentative function, where ‘augmentative’ covers a use “that ranges from familiar to pejorative” (Van Langendonck and Van de Velde 2009). In other words, the forms in (35a-d) have an affective-evaluative meaning involving social proximity (familiar) or distance (pejorative).

One might characterize the patterns in (35a-d) as being anomalous and surprising given the fact that proper names are often considered to be inherently definite. For that reason, it has been proposed in Longobardi (1994) that articles such as *den* in (35) are expletive articles, that is, meaningless articles that simply assign phonological content to D, and that are

replaced in LF by the proper name as a result of (covert) N-to-D movement. According to this approach, the proper names in (35a-d) have essentially the same derivation as those in (35a'-d'), namely covert movement of a lexically defined proper name (N) to D.³²

Basing myself on Borer (2005: 70-85), I take a different approach to the augmentative patterns in (35a-d). Assuming names such as *Vergeer* (35c') and *Geer* (35c) to be listemes, they lack the lexical specification of being definite. Their definiteness is a syntactically derived property, where definiteness can be obtained in two ways: firstly, by head-moving the listeme (e.g. *Vergeer*) to the definiteness feature <def>, which assigns range to <e>_d; secondly, by using the strategy that is familiar from common name expressions such as *de fiets* 'the bike', namely, the use of an independent functional morpheme, namely the definite article *de*, in order to assign range to <e>_d, as in *de Geer*. Importantly, according to Borer (2005: 81), nominal expressions such as *de fiets* and *de Geer* are the same types of nominal expressions, namely definite descriptions: the "nouns" are interpreted as common names, which is to say, as predicates, and the open value <e>_d is assigned range by a "normal" definite article. This implies that *de* in *de Geer* is not an expletive article, but a fully regular definite article with a "normal" discourse-anaphoric function (Compare with (26a)).

(36) [DP de<e>_d [#P de<e>_# [CIP de<e>_{DIV} [LP Geer]]]]

What makes the common name expression in (36) special is that it refers to a set with precisely one (i.e., unique) member. Thus, *de Geer* stands for the set 'Geer' having as its sole member the individual Vergeer. In this respect, a nominal expression like *de Geer* is comparable to nominal expressions such as *de Paus* 'the Pope' or *de zon* 'the sun', which, according to common knowledge about the world, are unique entities.³³ The uniqueness of the pope only differs from the uniqueness of *Vergeer* as regards the size of the social context in which they are known: the pope's uniqueness holds at a worldwide level, whereas *de Geer*'s uniqueness/significance holds at the level of a village or even a small group of friends.³⁴

Interestingly, also Standard Dutch makes use of the strategy to "name" a single individual, object or entity by means of a definite description denoting a set with a unique member. First of all, we find it in discourse fragments such as (37), where the use of *de* in combination with *Chomsky* defines a set with a unique member (i.e., the individual 'Chomsky'), and consequently marks the individual's significance: "the one and only".

³² As Longobardi (1994) points out, Italian has patterns in which the proper name has undergone overt movement to D, namely patterns in which the proper name precedes an adjectival possessive pronoun, as in: *Gianni mio* (Gianny my, 'my Gianni'). The sequence *mio Gianni* is ill-formed. This order is possible only when the noun phrase is introduced by an overt determiner, as in: *il mio Gianni*.

³³ As Borer (2005: 85) points out, the common noun strategy involving a definite article is the normal strategy for forming personal names in a language like Greek. For example: *O Kosti efuge* ('Kostis is gone.').

³⁴ In Mexican Spanish, expressive children's names sometimes occur with a plural ending, often in combination with a definite article and a diminutive suffix, as, for example, in (i) drawn from Svennung (1958: 405):

(i) Qué lindos son los Manuellitos!
 what sweet.PL are the.PL Manuel-DIM-PL
 'How sweet Manuel is!'

In line with Borer (2005), I take *los Manuellitos* to be a common name defining a set with a unique member. In view of its semantically singular but inflectionally plural status, it does not seem implausible to interpret this personal name as a *plurale tantum*, a phenomenon familiar from common nouns such as *spectacles* and *pants* (See Borer 2005:105). I leave the exact analysis of *plurale tantum* names to future research.

- (37) A: Ik heb gisteren Chomsky ontmoet.
 I have yesterday Chomsky met
 B: Dé Chomsky?!
 [thee] Chomsky

A second illustration comes from name-like expressions designating geographical locations. Interestingly, there is a subtle subdivision, which is not purely grammatical but involves semantic properties of the listeme that denotes a geographical location. As shown in (38a), names of continents, countries, regions, and cities do not combine with a definite article. Names of mountains, rivers, and nature reserves, however, do.³⁵

- (38) a. Ik heb Europa/Italië/Lombardije/Milaan bezocht.
 I have Europe/Italy/Lombardy/Milan visited
 b. Ik heb de Kilimanjaro/de Amazone/de Veluwe gezien.
 I have the Kilimanjaro/the Amazon/the Veluwe seen

As noted in Van Langendonck and Van de Velde (2009), the contrast between (38a) and (38b) has a semantic classificatory basis, more specifically an anthropocentric cline: names of geographical locations in which human involvement has been present are typically determiner-less, those in which the human involvement is absent or reduced to a minimum, typically display the definite article. The examples in (38) clearly show the co-existence of two “naming strategies” in a single language.

So far, we have argued that certain nominal expressions that look like proper names are actually definite descriptions denoting a set with a unique member. The examples given so far feature a definite article, but also other determiners such as demonstratives can be found in this context. Consider, for example, the following minimal pairs:

- (39) a. Ha Jan! Hoe gaat het met je!
 Hey Jan how goes it with you
 ‘Hey Jan! How’s life?!’
 b. Ha die Jan! Hoe gaat het met je!

- (40) a. Ik vind Jan een aardige kerel.
 I find Jan a nice guy
 ‘I think Jan is a nice guy.’
 b. Ik vind die Jan (van jullie) een aardige kerel.
 I find that Jan of yours a nice guy

In the a-examples, *Jan* is a true proper name, and is derived by movement of *Jan* to D, as in (34). In the b-examples, the (distal) demonstrative *die* precedes *Jan*. In line with the preceding discussion, I take these nominal expressions to be definite descriptions denoting a set with a

³⁵ We find the same pattern in English:

- (i) a. I visited (*the) Paris / I visited (*the) Kansas
 b. I visited the Ozarks / the Bluegrass
 c. I saw the Mississippi / the Potomac

unique referent. Importantly, in the b-examples, *Jan* is a common name, as is also suggested by the fact that a possessor *van*-phrase can follow the proper name, as in (40b).

6. Evaluative kinship terms and other socio-relational nouns

Section 3 discussed binominal constructions of the direct partitive type. This section examines another type of nominal expression featuring juxtaposition of two nominal elements, namely those in which a kinship term (N1), or another kind of socio-relational (henceforth: SR) noun, is followed by a proper name (N2). Some illustrations of this type of nominal expression are given in (41):

- (41) vader Jacob (father Jacob), broer Jan (brother Jan), zus Nellie (sister Nellie), oom Gerrit (uncle Gerrit), tante Toos (aunt Toos), neef Piet (nephew Piet), baas Piet (boss Piet), boer Kees (farmer Kees)

An interesting property of these nominal constructions is the fact that N1 cannot be preceded by a definite article *de*, as is shown in (42a). Notice that *de* must appear before *vader* when the latter is the head of a possessive construction.

- (42) a. (*De) vader Jacob slaapt nog.
the father Jacob sleeps still
'Father Jacob is still sleeping.'
b. De vader van Jacob slaapt nog.
the father of Jacob sleeps still
'The father of Jacob's is still sleeping.'

Furthermore it should be noted that the binominal construction *vader Jacob* differs from a binominal (direct partitive) pattern such as *de fles wijn* (the bottle wine, 'the bottle of wine'), where the definite article *de* clearly *can* precede N1. In short, the nature of the binominal construction *vader Jacob* is different from that of *de fles wijn*. The impossible occurrence of *de* in (42a) is, of course, reminiscent of the behavior of proper names in Standard Dutch. As was exemplified by (33), the proper name *Jacob* cannot be preceded by *de* either: (**de Jacob*). From this one might conclude that *vader Jacob*, and also the other binominal patterns in (41), are complex proper-name-like expressions. For the second noun (N2) in the patterns in (41), the proper-name-like status seems obvious, for the first noun (N1) maybe less so. Nouns such as *vader* 'father' normally behave like common names, as in (42b). Now if the binominal pattern *vader Jacob* is a nominal expression consisting of two proper names, it is similar to complex proper names such as *Jacob Smit*, which consists of a first name and a last name.

The intuition that *vader* and also other kinship terms can function as proper names is confirmed by the fact that they can also be used on their own:³⁶

- (43) a. Vader/Zus slaapt nog.
father/sister sleeps still
'Father/Sis is still sleeping.'
b. Heb jij de laatste dagen Tante nog gezien?
have you the last days auntie yet seen

³⁶ *Zus* (sister/siss) and *broer* (brother) are often used as proper names for the youngest sister or brother.

'Have you seen Auntie recently?'

So far, we have seen that kinship terms such as *vader* are ambiguous: they can have a common-name interpretation (42b) or a proper-name interpretation (43a). Instead of accounting for this ambiguity by means of dual listing of *vader* in the lexicon (encyclopedia) – say, *vader*_[common] and *Vader*_[proper] – I assume, following Borer (2005: 73-74), that there is only a single listeme *vader* in the lexicon, and that its interpretation as common name or proper name is determined by the functional structure in which it is embedded. The generalization that emerges is the following: when the listeme *vader* occurs with a determiner (e.g., *de*, as in (42b)), it must be interpreted as a common name, when it occurs without a determiner, as in (43), it must be interpreted as a proper name. In the former case, the determiner *de* assigns range to <e>_d, in the latter case, range is assigned to <e>_d by a definiteness-feature <def> that is associated with D and that gets bound by the listeme *vader* as a result of covert head-movement. In other words, the proper-name interpretation emerges when the noun is in D as a result of head-movement.

Returning now to complex expressions such as *vader Jacob* and *oom Gerrit* in (41), I propose that these have the following structure:

(44) [DP D<def> [#P <e># [CIP [DP vader/oom] [CI' <e>DIV [LP Jacob/Gerrit]]]]]

According to this structure, *Jacob/Gerrit* (N2) is the head of the extended nominal projection, and *vader/oom* (N1) occupies the specifier position of CIP. In a way, *vader/oom* specifies the “broad” class to which *Jacob/Gerrit* belongs. I assume that each of the two proper names — *Jacob/Gerrit* in the “matrix-DP” and *vader/oom* in the embedded DP— undergo covert head-movement to D.

The preceding discussion, which dealt with binominal expressions featuring a non-evaluative kinship/SR noun, was a prelude to my discussion of the patterns in (45), which also feature nouns that correspond to kinship terms and SR nouns (Verdenius 1940).

(45) *Gerrit-oom* (*Gerrit-uncle*), *Jan-maat* (*Jan-buddy/pal*), *Pieter-baas* (*Pieter-boss*),
Door-zus (*Door-sister*)

These expressions, which are common in older varieties of Dutch, present-day Dutch dialects, but also colloquial Dutch, have a positive-evaluative meaning in the sense that they express intimacy, respect, or friendship.³⁷ Another illustration of this evaluative pattern involves the noun *man* ‘man’, as in (46a).³⁸ As noted by Verdenius (1939: 173), *-man* is found even after girl's names (46b) and ‘mother’ (46c) in certain dialectal varieties of Dutch.

(46) a. *Janne-man*
Jan-e-man
‘dear little Jan/Johnny-boy’

³⁷ For English, see nominal expressions such as *Johnny Boy*, and *Freddy Boy* in (i):

(i) Mr. Bush now refers to Representative Fred Upton, a Michigan Republican, as *Freddy Boy*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2001/01/25/us/freddy-boy-big-george-and-the-gang-are-discovering-the-bush-charm.html>

³⁸ The proper name *Jan* is followed by *-e* (i.e., the sound ‘schwa’). Possibly, this *-e* is a meaningless linking sound, but it might also be an augmentative suffix as in *reuz-e-sterk* (giant-*e*-strong, ‘very strong’) and *reet-e-duur* (ass-*e*-expensive, ‘extremely expensive’). Interestingly, *-e* can also appear attached to the noun *oom* ‘uncle’, as in *ome Jan* (uncle-*e* Jan, ‘uncle Jan’).

- b. Grait-man (Groningen Dutch) / Klieneman (Veluwe Dutch)
Margareth-man / Caroline-man
‘dear Margareth/Caroline’
- c. mouder-man (Groningen Dutch; Ter Laan 1958)
mother man
‘dear mother / mommy’

The question arises as to how to analyze the patterns in (45)-(46), which, clearly have a different word order than those in (41). Specifically, the kinship/SR noun follows the proper name. Before giving a more precise structural analysis of these patterns, let me point out two important characteristics of the kinship/SR nouns in (45)-(46). Firstly, they tend to have a semantically bleached meaning. For example, *man* in (46) does not have the descriptive meaning 'male person', but the more general meaning 'person'. Also, *baas* in (45) does not literally mean 'boss' but has the more general meaning '(male) person'.³⁹ Secondly, the kinship/SR terms are phonologically weak: the nominal patterns in (45) typically have stress on the first element, as in *JAN-maat* and *PIETER-baas*. On the basis of these characteristics, I propose that the kinship/SR term that follows the proper name is an affixal classifier that instantiates the functional head $\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}$. It categorizes the proper name to which it is attached, in terms of social proximity and intimacy. The base structure is given in (47a). I propose that the inverted word order, as in *Gerrit-oom* in (45), is derived by head movement and left-adjunction of the listeme *Gerrit* to the affixal classifier *-oom*. The derived structure is given in (47b). Since the nominal expressions in (45) behave like proper names, in the sense that they do not combine with a determiner (e.g., **de Gerrit-oom*), I propose that the complex head *Gerrit-oom* covertly raises to D in order to support the definiteness feature associated with D.

- (47) a. $[_{\text{DP}} \text{Spec} [_{\text{D}} \text{D}_{\langle \text{def} \rangle} [_{\text{CIP}} [_{\text{CI}} [_{\text{CI}} \text{-oom}]_{\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}} [_{\text{LP}} \text{Gerrit}]]]]]$
- b. $[_{\text{DP}} \text{Spec} [_{\text{D}} \text{D}_{\langle \text{def} \rangle} [_{\text{CIP}} [_{\text{CI}} [_{\text{CI}} \text{Gerrit}]_{\text{CI} \text{-oom}]_{\langle e \rangle_{\text{DIV}}} [_{\text{LP}} \text{Gerrit}]]]]]$

Notice that the base structure of *oom Gerrit* in (44) and the base structure of *Gerrit-oom* in (47a) are quite comparable, the only difference being the morphological status of *oom*—free morpheme *versus* bound morpheme—and the (related) syntactic placement—[Spec,CIP] *versus* CI^o— of the SR term. Minimal pairs such as *oom Gerrit* and *Gerrit-oom* nicely illustrate how the grammar enables the alternative use of available means, *in casu* the use of kinship/SR terms, and makes it possible to form linguistic expressions with a more descriptive or a more expressive function.

I would like to finish this discussion on the expressive use of kinship/SR terms with the examples in (48), where the kinship/SR term is used as a vocative expression:

- (48) a. <Context: A talks to B, but there is no kinship/(real) social relationship between A and B>
Loop eens door, [*broer / zus / vriend / maat / man*]!
walk PRT on brother/sister / friend / pall / man
‘Come on, man! Walk a little faster!’

³⁹ See English expressions such as *sis*, *bro* and *mate/matie*, which can be used as terms of endearment in certain social contexts:

- (i) a. Hey, sis, what's up?
- b. Sing a song, bro!

- b. <Context: A addresses (female) B, but B is not A's aunt>
 Pas maar op, *tante!*
 watch PRT PRT aunt
 'You'd better watch out, girl!
- c. <Context: Friend A asks friend B to do something. Friend B answers:..>
 Nee, *vader*, dat doe ik mooi niet!
 no father that do I for.sure not
 'No, my dearest, I won't do it!'

What is interesting about these examples, is that the kinship/SR term is used without there being any true kinship relationship between the speaker and the addressee. For example, the use of *broer* 'brother' in (48a) does not imply that the speaker and the addressee are literally each other's brothers, and the use of *vriend* 'friend' in (48a) does not imply that they are really friends of each other. In other words, the kinship terms are used in a more figurative way, that is, *as if* the addressee is the speaker's brother/friend. Interestingly, in this use, the hierarchical nature of the social relationship is still present: for example, the use of *broer* in (48a) suggests equality of speaker and hearer, while the use of *vader* is meant to suggest a parent-child-like relationship between the two interactants.

As exemplified in (49b) and (50b), these expressive kinship/SR terms block plural formation. As shown by (49a) and (50a), plural formation *is* permitted, however, when the nouns have a descriptive-referential meaning instead of an evaluative-expressive meaning:

- (49) a. Wees niet bang, *mannen!*
 be not afraid men
 'Dear men, don't be afraid!'
 b. Schei toch uit, **mannen/okman!*⁴⁰
 stop PRT PRT men / man
 'Come on, stop it, man!'
- (50) a. Jullie moeten meer tijd aan je kinderen besteden, *vaders!*
 you should more time with your children spend fathers
 'You should spend more time with your children, dear fathers!'
 b. <Context: Friends A&B ask friend C to do something. Friend C answers:..>
 Nee, *?*vaders/okvader*, dat doe ik mooi niet!
 no fathers/father that do I for.sure not
 'No, my dearest friend, I won't do it!'

I propose that, in the a-examples, the kinship/SR terms *mannen* and *vaders* are listemes that behave like common names. They are formed by moving the listeme *man/vader* to <e>_{DIV}, where it picks up its plural inflection. The kinship terms in the b-examples, on the contrary, behave like proper names, which typically do not permit plural formation: *Schei toch uit Jan(*-en)!* (compare with (49b)). Given their status as proper names, the kinship/SR terms in

⁴⁰ The [+singular] vocative noun *man* can be used even when the addressee is a woman. We see the same with the vocative expression *joh*, a reduced variant of *jongen*:

- (i) Schei toch uit, *joh!*
 stop PRT PRT boy
 'Stop it, man!' (addressee can be a man or a woman)

(48) receive the same analysis as *Jacob* in (34), that is, the listeme undergoes covert head-movement to D, where it supports the <def>-feature associated with D.

(51) [DP **vader**<def> [#P **vader**# [CIP **vader**<e>DIV [LP **vader**]]]]] (= *vader* in (48c))

In summary, this section tried to show that kinship/SR terms, which “normally” behave like common names, can be used expressively by two alternative strategies: (i) its use as an affixal classifier, (ii) its use as a proper name.

7. The *N van een N* construction

In section 5 we saw that what appears to be a proper name can combine with a definite article, as in dialectal *de Geer*. It was proposed that *de Geer* is not a proper-name-like expression but rather a common-name-like expression, whose set consists of a unique member. Importantly, names such as *Geer* and *Vergeer* are not lexically defined as belonging to the class of proper names. Rather, they are listemes whose status as proper names or common names is configurationally defined.

Another nominal expression which exemplifies the co-occurrence of an article—in this case, an indefinite article—and what appears to be a proper name is the *N van N*-construction in (52); see Paardekooper (1956), Everaert (1992), Bennis, Corver and Den Dikken (1998), Foolen (2004), Den Dikken (2006) for Dutch, and Kayne (1994) for English.

(52) Ik heb [die schat van een Jan] gisteren ontmoet.
 I have that darling of a Jan yesterday met
 ‘I met that darling Jan yesterday.’

Before giving a formal analysis of this construction, I will briefly discuss a number of characteristic features of this construction. Its first characteristic feature is that the first noun (N1) gives an evaluative categorization (i.e., valence) of the second noun (N2). This evaluation can be negative, as in (53a) or positive, as in (53b).

- (53) a. een {nul / ezel / doos} van een vent
 a zero /donkey/ box of a guy
 'a nobody' / 'an idiot of a man'
- b. een {kanjer / beer / kei} van een vent
 a whopper /bear/stone of a guy
 'a great/huge guy'

Importantly, it is the speaker of the utterance who evaluates. In (54), for example, the subject noun phrase *Jan* likes *Kees*. The speaker of the utterance, however, does not. He assigns negative valence to the referent *Kees* by qualifying the latter as (*die*) *etter* (litt.: (that) puss, 'that jerk').

(54) Jan vond [die etter van een Kees] erg aardig.
 Jan considered that jerk of a Kees very kind
 'Jan considered that bloody Kees a very nice person.'

The qualifying nature of N1 is also clear from *N van een N*-patterns in which N1 and N2 have the same lexicalization, as in (55):

- (55) [Die *ezel* van een *ezel*] weigert te lopen!
 that donkey of a donkey refuses to walk
 'That stupid donkey refuses to walk!'

The first instance of *ezel* 'donkey' (N1) has a (metaphorical)-evaluative meaning and not a "referential" meaning. It assigns negative valence to the referent of the second instance of *ezel* (N2). The donkey (N2) is qualified as being stupid or stubborn.

The *N van N*-construction superficially (i.e., linearly) looks quite similar to possessive *van* 'of' constructions. The two constructions, however, display very different syntactic behavior, which hints at different underlying syntactic structures for the two types of nominal expressions. A first contrast is exemplified in (56) and (57); see also Bennis *et al* (1998):

- (56) a. Ik heb [*de ezel van Jan*] herkend.
 I have the donkey of Jan recognized
 'I recognized Jan's donkey.'
 b. Ik heb [*de ezel --*] herkend [_{PP} *van Jan*]
- (57) a. Ik heb [*die ezel van een Jan*] herkend.
 I have that donkey of a Jan recognized
 'I recognized that idiot Jan.'
 b. *Ik heb [*die ezel --*] herkend *van een Jan*

(56a,b) shows that the string *van* + N2 can be extraposed (i.e., moved to a postverbal position) if N2 designates the donkey's possessor. As illustrated by (57a,b), extraposition of *van* N2 is impossible when N2 designates an individual who is assigned a (negative) value by the speaker of the utterance.

Also at the sound level, the *N van N*-construction and the possessive construction display different behavior. In the latter construction, phonological stress typically falls on N2 (when the entire NP represents new information). This is exemplified in (58). In the *N van N*-construction, on the contrary, stress falls also on N1. This is shown in (59).

- (58) A: Wat heb je zien lopen in de wei?
 what have you seen walk in the meadow
 'What did you see walking in the meadow?'
 B: [*de ezel van JAN*]!
 the donkey of Jan
 'that donkey of Jan's'
- (59) A: Wie heb je zien lopen in de straat?
 who have you seen walk in the street
 'Who did you see walking in the street?'
 B: [*die EZEL van een JAN*]!
 that donkey of a Jan
 'that idiot Jan'

So far it has been shown (i) that the *N van N*-construction has an evaluative component (N1) which expresses the speaker's judgment about the referent of N2, and (ii) that it displays

different syntactic and phonological behavior from possessive noun phrases that feature the string *van* + *N*. I will now turn to another characteristic property of the *N van N*-construction, one which may be characterized as “surprising” from a surface perspective. This property concerns the appearance of the singular indefinite article *een* before a proper name that functions as N2.

This property was already exemplified by (52) at the beginning of this section. In that particular example, *een* precedes the name *Jan*. If one assumes that *Jan* is lexically specified as a proper name with the intrinsic property of being definite, then *een* in (52) must be a semantically empty (i.e., expletive) article.⁴¹ An alternative approach, one which I will take in this chapter, would be to say that *Jan* is not lexically specified as being a proper name, but that its name-like status is configurationally defined. *Jan* functions as a proper name when it head-moves to D in order to merge with the definiteness feature <def>. If the listeme *Jan* does not raise to D, it behaves like a common name, just like *jongen* ‘boy’ in the *N van N* construction *die schat van een jongen* (that darling of a boy, ‘that darling boy’). In line with Borer’s (2005: 111) analysis of the English indefinite article *a*, I assume that Dutch *een* ‘a’ functions as a classifier of sorts: it portions out mass, that is, it assigns range to the open value <e>_{DIV}. I furthermore follow Borer’s (2005: 111) suggestion that English *a*, and by extension Dutch *een*, fulfills a double function: it has a dividing function —assignment of range to <e>_{DIV}— but also a counting function —assignment of range to <e>_#. In simplex nominal expressions such as *een jongen* ‘a boy’, as in *Ik heb gisteren een jongen ontmoet* (I have yesterday a boy met, ‘I met a boy yesterday’), *een* starts out as a Cl-head and raises upwards via the #-head to D, as in (60):

(60) [DP **een**<e>_d [#P **een**<e>_# [CIP **een**<e>_{DIV} [LP boek]]]]

In (60), *een* fulfills its double function by successive merger in <e>_{DIV}, <e>_# and <e>_D. What I would like to propose now is that, in an *N van N*-construction like (52), this double function is obtained by a process in the reverse direction. Specifically, *een* starts out in #, where it fulfills the counter function, and moves downward to <e>_{DIV}.⁴² I assume that this operation is of the affix-hopping type, which I take to be a post-syntactic (PF-Lowering) operation in the sense of Embick and Noyer (2001): affixal *een* hops downward across *etter*, which occupies [Spec,CIP], and attaches to the dividing classifier head <e>_{DIV}. I assume that the dummy element *van* spells out the classifier-head and, this way, provides a host for the affixal *een* that has moved downward.⁴³ The listeme *boek* remains *in situ* because dummy *van* instantiates the

⁴¹ See, for example, Bennis *et al* (1998), who call this semantically empty article ‘spurious *een*’. The element *een* is ‘spurious’ in the sense that it does not belong to the noun that follows *een*, nor to the noun that precedes it.

⁴² That *een* does not necessarily start out as a classifier head (a divider) but can also have its origin in # possibly receives support from exclamative nominal expressions such as *Wat een water!* (what a water, ‘how much water!’) and *Wat een boeken!* (what a books, ‘how many books’), where *een* precedes a mass noun and a plural noun, respectively, and exclamation applies to the quantity (amount/number) of water/books. If nominal expressions with a mass interpretation have the structure (8c) —that is, there is no CIP present— the conclusion must be drawn that *een* occupies the #-head, as in (i):

(i) [DP <e>_d [#P wat [#P **een**<e>_# [LP water]]]]

In more archaic Dutch, the quantifier *al* ‘all’ instead of *een* can be found between *wat* and the noun, as in *Wat al banaliteit!* (what all banality, ‘such banality!’) and *Wat al fouten in dat opstel!* (what all mistakes in that essay, ‘The number of mistakes in that essay!’); see Joos (1923).

⁴³ At a more speculative level, the lowered #-affix *een* possibly assigns quantificational force to its sister-projection CIP. This may correlate with the high degree reading of evaluative nominals such as *etter* and *pracht*, which occupy the specifier position of CIP. The phonological stress associated with these evaluative nominals, as exemplified by (59), may be interpreted as a surface manifestation of this quantificational force.

Cl-head. The base representation and the derived one are given in (61a) and (61b), respectively:⁴⁴

- (61) a. [DP die<e>d [#P [# een<e># [CIP etter [CI' <e>DIV [LP Jan]]]]]]]
 b. [DP die<e>d [#P [# een<e># [CIP etter [CI' [van<e>DIV+een<e>#] [LP Jan]]]]]]]

So what we see here is that the grammar has different strategies for assigning the article *een* a double function, the first strategy being upward head-movement, and the second one being downward head-movement (affix hopping). Upward movement is the more usual strategy, while downward movement is the more unusual (i.e., anomalous) one. I assume that the determiner *die* in (61) assigns a value to <e>_d and this way determines the unique reference of the entire definite description *die etter van een Jan*.

As noted in Bennis *et al* (1998), the “special” use of *een* in the *N van N*-construction is found not only with “proper names” but also with “mass nouns” and plural nouns. There are speakers of Dutch, who permit *een* before *spinazie* ‘spinach’ and *jongens* ‘boys’.

- (62) a. Koop toch [die pracht van een spinazie]!
 buy PRT that beauty of a spinach
 ‘Come on! Buy this beautiful piece of spinach!’
 b. Jan heeft [die etters van een jongens] ontmoet.
 Jan has those jerks of a boys met

In line with Borer (2005), I assume that *spinazie* is a listeme, which means that it is not lexically specified as being a mass noun. Its status as mass noun is configurationally defined, namely by being the complement of the #-head (see (7b)). I propose that, being embedded in a CIP-layer, *spinazie* behaves like a count noun. Its derivation is depicted in (63), and similar to the derivation of *die etter van een jongen*.

- (63) [DP die<e>d [#P [# een<e># [CIP pracht [CI' [van<e>DIV+een<e>#] [LP spinazie]]]]]]]

Let us, finally, turn to example (62b), where *jongens*, and also *etters*, is a plural noun. The co-occurrence of *een*, which normally marks singularity, and the plural form *jongens* is rather surprising. Suppose now that *een*, being an affixal element rather than a free functional morpheme, has lost its singularity meaning, and that it acts like an unspecified counter; that is, it is unspecified for number (see also Bennis *et al* 1998).⁴⁵ Being unspecified for number, there is no number conflict between *een* and the plural form *jongens*. The only question that remains regards the plural inflection (-s) on the listeme (*jongen*). Normally, *jongen* picks up the plural feature by moving to the Cl-head. In the *N van N*-construction, however, this Cl-head is occupied by the amalgam *van+een*_{affix}. I therefore propose that PF-lowering applies in a successive fashion: affixal *een* lowers onto the classifier-head, and the plural-feature <plur>, associated with the classifier-head, lowers onto the listeme, where it spells out as *jongen+s*. Schematically:

- (64) [DP die<e>d [#P een<e># [CIP etters [CI' <plur>Cl^o [van<e>DIV+een<e>#] [LP jongen<plur = -s>]]]]]]]

⁴⁴ The non-extraposability of the sequence *van een Jan* (see (57)) follows from this structural representation if one assumes that only maximal projections (XP) and heads (X^o) are visible for movement operations (see Chomsky 1995).

⁴⁵ This unspecified status of *een* also holds for affixal *een* in (61b) and (63).

In summary, it was argued in this section that the anomalous behavior of the indefinite article *een* in the *N van N*-construction relates to its semantically bleached, and affixal status. As opposed to the free morpheme *een*, which starts as a classifier head and head-moves to #, this way functioning as a divider and a counter, the affixal element *een* starts out in # and lowers onto Cl, where it possibly functions as some sort of marker of emphasis on the degree noun that occupies the specifier position of CIP.

8. Deferential noun phrases

Section 3 discussed nominal expressions such as *dat stuk verdriet* (that piece misfortune, ‘that good-for-nothing’), which are used to refer to an individual in a negative-evaluative way. It is the abstract “noun” (listeme) *verdriet* which provides the negative contents, and it is the unit noun *stuk*, in combination with the anaphoric properties of the definite determiner *die*, which allows for the reference to an individual (i.e., countable) person. The phenomenon that a listeme with an abstract evaluative meaning is used to qualify a person, is more widespread. Consider, for example, the nominal expressions in (65), which refer to a person of high esteem and status.⁴⁶

- (65) a. *Uwe Excellentie*, bent u van plan af te treden?
 your-*e* excellency are you of plan PRT to resign
 ‘Your Excellency, are you considering the possibility of resigning?’
 b. *Wenst Hare Majesteit een koekje bij de thee?*
 wishes her-*e* majesty a biscuit with the tea
 ‘Does Her Majesty wish to have a biscuit with her tea?’

As shown by (65), these honorific/deferential noun phrases can be used as forms of address (65a), but also function as arguments within a clause (65b). As regards their inner syntax, three main ingredients can be identified: a possessive pronoun (e.g., *Haar*, *Uw*), a bound morpheme *-e* (pronounced as ‘schwa’) that is attached to the pronoun, and an abstract noun that designates an eminent quality of the person addressed or referred to.

The presence of a possessive pronoun suggests that we are dealing with a possessive noun phrase in (65). It turns out, however, that these nominal expressions behave very differently from normal possessive noun phrases. First of all, as shown in (66), attributively used possessive pronouns in regular possessive noun phrases cannot be augmented with *-e*. Given the characteristic absence of *-e* on possessive pronouns that are used attributively, one might characterize the appearance of *-e* in (65) as a disorganizing property.

- (66) a. *Komt uw(*-e) moeder ook naar het feest?*
 comes your(-*e*) mother also to the party
 ‘Will your mother also come to the party?’
 b. *Wil haar(*-e) vriend een koekje bij de thee?*
 wants her(-*e*) friend a biscuit with the tea
 ‘Would her friend like to have a biscuit together with his tea?’

Secondly, as shown in (67a), the deferential nouns cannot have a plural form. Possessed nouns in regular possessive noun phrases, however, *can* have a plural form, as exemplified by (67b).

⁴⁶ Some further illustrations of this type of construction: *Zijne Heiligheid* (his-*e* holiness, ‘His Holiness/the pope’), *Zijne Koninklijke Hoogheid* (his-*e* royal highness, ‘His royal Highness’). For elaborate discussion of the linguistic behavior of this type of construction in English, see Collins and Postal (2012).

- (67) a. *Wensen *Hare Majesteiten* een koekje bij de thee?
 Wish her-*e* majesties a biscuit with the tea
 b. Willen *haar vrienden* een koekje bij de thee?
 want her friends a biscuit with the tea

This match in number value (i.e., PRON_{SG} N_{SG}) hints at a concord relationship between the possessive pronoun and the deferential noun.

Thirdly, the anaphoric behavior of the possessive pronoun in the deferential noun phrase is very different from that of the possessive pronoun in the possessive construction. While the latter can enter into an anaphoric or binding relationship with a c-commanding antecedent, as in (68a), the former cannot (see (68b)).

- (68) a. Jan_i/Iedereen_i herkende [zijn_i koning].
 Jan/everyone recognized his king
 b. *Jan_i/iedereen_i herkende [Zijne_i Koninklijke Hoogheid].
 Jan/everyone recognized his-*e* royal highness

From the above discussion it is clear that, in spite of their superficial similarity, regular possessive noun phrases and deferential noun phrases have a different underlying grammar. For possessive noun phrases it has been argued that the possessor occupies the specifier position of a functional projection that formally encodes the possessive relationship. This projection is represented as PosP in (69):

- (69) [DP <e>_d [PosP haar [Pos' <e>_{POS} [#P <e>_# [CIP <e>_{DIV} [LP moeder]]]]]]]

Following insights from Longobardi (1996), I take the position that these possessive constructions featuring a prenominal possessor —sometimes referred to as Saxon genitive constructions— are hidden Construct State noun phrases. Construct State noun phrases, which are familiar from Semitic languages, have the characteristic property that the possessum noun, which immediately precedes the possessor, cannot be accompanied by a definite article (Ritter 1988, Siloni 1996, Borer 1999). For example, Hebrew allows the Construct State pattern *beyt ha-mora* (house the-teacher, ‘the teacher’s house’), but not the pattern *ha-beyt ha-mora*. Notice now that, also in Dutch, it is impossible to add a definite article at the beginning of the nominal expression: **de haar moeder* (the her mother). Another characteristic feature of the Construct State pattern is the fact that the (in)definiteness value of the entire noun phrase is determined by the (in)definiteness of the possessor in [Spec,PosP]. Evidence for this comes from existential constructions. As shown in (70a,b), a possessive noun phrase containing an indefinite possessor can occur as a (low) subject of an existential construction, a possessive noun phrase containing a definite possessor cannot:

- (70) a. Er stond [iemand_{S[-def]} fiets] voor het huis.
 there stood someone’s bike in.front.of the house
 b. *Er stond [Marie’s_{S[+def]} / haar_[+def] fiets] voor het huis.
 there stood Marie’s / her bike in.front.of the house

I assume that the possessor in [Spec,PosP] —*haar* in (69)— assigns its definiteness value to <e>_{POS} under Spec-head agreement, and that the possessum-listeme —the “common name” *moeder* in (69)— raises to the classifier-head in overt syntax, assigning range to <e>_{DIV}, and

head-moves covertly to D via Pos. In Pos, *moeder* picks up the definiteness property assigned under Spec-head agreement, and moves on to D, where it assigns range to $\langle e \rangle_d$.

Turning next to the deferential noun phrases in (65), I propose that these differ in a subtle way from “normal” possessive constructions. Specifically, the definiteness-property does not get associated with D via an upward operation, namely by pickybacking on a covertly raised possessum noun. Instead of that, I assume that the deferential noun phrases in (65) are proper-name-like expressions, which implies that D is specified for the head feature $\langle \text{def} \rangle$. I propose that this $\langle \text{def} \rangle$ -feature is assigned to its complement, PosP, and gets associated with the Pos-head, where it spells out phonologically as *-e*, whence forms such as *uw-e* and *h(a)ar-e* in (65).⁴⁷ Under Spec-head agreement, the “lowered” $\langle \text{def} \rangle$ -feature on Pos gets associated with the properties of the possessive pronoun, yielding, for example, the interpretation “the *female* x” for the pattern *Hare* in (65b). As for the lower part of the deferential noun phrase, I propose that positive-evaluative “nouns” such as *Majesteit* are mass nouns, which means that they are listemes directly embedded in #P (see (7b)). The fact that *Majesteit* cannot be pluralized (see (67a)) suggests its mass-like status. In sum, the overall structure of *Hare Majesteit* looks like (71), and its interpretation can be informally paraphrased as ‘the female (antecedent) x with the property *majesty*’.⁴⁸

(71) [DP D $\langle \text{def} \rangle$ [PosP Haar [Pos $\langle \text{def} \rangle = -e \rangle$ [#P # [LP Majesteit]]]]]

Summarizing, I have argued that deferential noun phrases such as *Hare Majesteit* are proper-name-like expressions, in the sense that D is specified for the definiteness feature. As opposed to normal proper names, whose derivation is characterized by upward movement of the listeme in order to support the definiteness-feature, these deferential noun phrases display downward movement of the definiteness-feature onto Pos, where it receives a value under Spec-head agreement with the possessive pronoun in [Spec,PosP]. The lowered definiteness property surfaces as *-e*, which yields “the feel of disorganization”.

9. Conclusion

This chapter presented six case studies on the encoding of affective-expressive information in the Dutch nominal domain. Each affective phenomenon displayed a formal property that, from a surface perspective, could be qualified as “disorganizing”. It was shown that this qualification is incorrect from a formal perspective, that is, the affective nominal pattern is built in line with the organizational rules provided by UG. Importantly, the formal choices that are made within the range of options as defined by UG are different for nominal expressions with an affective-expressive flavor compared to those with a more descriptive meaning. In other words, UG organizes “disorganization” by providing different ways in which a language can manifest itself, where “the descriptive way” is often considered to be the primary way, and the “affective-expressive” one the secondary way. Importantly, from a formal perspective their inner organizations are equally good and legitimate. They both fall within the variation space as defined by UG, which is to be attributed to the formal properties of grammatical formatives (Borer 1984, Chomsky 1995). The affective linguistic expression that is generated by this alternative grammatical route appears to be disorganized since it is

⁴⁷ The element *-e* shows up also on possessive pronouns that are used substantively, as in *de hare* (the her-*e*, ‘hers’). In Corver and Van Koppen (2018), it is proposed that *-e* is not an adjectival inflection but rather a marker of definiteness. In their analysis, it is a copy of the displaced definite pro-form *de*.

⁴⁸ Of course, “normal” possessive noun phrases can also have a mass noun as possessum, as in *Haar bloed was overal in de kamer* (her blood was everywhere in the room).

differently organized, and possibly also in a *less conventional* and therefore less predictable way from the perspective of language use (E-language, in the sense of Chomsky 1986); that is, the use of certain linguistic forms may be more common than the use of other forms. It is the availability of different grammatical routes provided by UG, which allows the language user to use her language for distinct communicative functions, one of these functions being the expression of one's feelings about, and evaluations of, the world around us.

This chapter took a single-language perspective on the linguistic encoding of affective-expressive information. The focus was on Dutch, with some attention for phenomena in dialectal varieties of Dutch. Taking the encoding of affective-expressive information to be a universal property of human language, and taking UG to provide universal fragments of syntactico-semantic structures—see, for example, the nominal configuration in (6) with its organized functional layers—one would expect to find cross-linguistic similarities in the formal-linguistic expression of affect. Furthermore, under this UG-based approach, one would expect these modes of formal expression of affective information to be limited and non-arbitrary rather than unlimited and arbitrary.⁴⁹ I leave a systematic, cross-linguistic study of the encoding of affect in the nominal domain for future research, and confine myself to giving a few examples of cross-linguistic similarities in the formal encoding of affective-expressive information. Firstly, in section 8 it was shown that Dutch has deferential noun phrases of the type *Hare Majesteit* 'Her Majesty', where *hare* is a possessive pronoun (carrying *-e*) but does not have the meaning of a true possessor. This "special" use of a possessive pronoun is found also in evaluative vocative expressions in certain languages, as, for example, in Norwegian *din tosk!* (your idiot, 'you idiot!') and Brazilian Portuguese *seu idiota!* (your_{masc.sg.} idiot, 'you idiot!'); see Corver (2008). Secondly, in certain dialectal varieties of Dutch, expressive pronominals can carry a diminutive suffix, as, for example, in Lommel Dutch *humkes* (him-DIM-s, 'him'); see Janssen (1991). The diminutive suffix does not designate smallness in the literal sense (i.e., a small male person), but rather in a more figurative (i.e., depreciative) sense. Interestingly, this phenomenon of marking a pronoun with an expressive diminutive suffix is attested also in (genetically unrelated) languages such as Tongan and Samoan. As noted in Besnier (1990: 422), these languages have a diminutive form of the first-person singular pronoun, historically derived from a plural form, that can be used to elicit empathy and mark self-deprecation (Ochs 1986). Thirdly, as noted in Stankiewicz (1960), the reverse use of gender (e.g., feminine gender instead of masculine gender) contributes emotional intensity in Russian (e.g., using the form *dura* (fool-FEM) while referring to a man). Specifically, it intensifies the negative value expressed by the evaluative noun. The expression of affect by means of a "deviant" grammatical gender is also found in certain dialectal varieties of Dutch. In Tegelen Dutch, for example, the masculine pronoun *'m* ('him') is used instead of the feminine form *eur* or *ze* ('her') when the pronoun has a direct object function; see Houx, Jacobs and Lückers (1968: 44). The masculine form is typically used to refer to a female person who is closely related to the speaker (e.g., someone from the speaker's family or someone the speaker knows very well). When the female person is unknown to the speaker or when the speaker uses more formal polite speech, the speaker uses the feminine pronominal form *eur* or *ze* ('her') in its use as a direct object. As a final example of a formal strategy that languages use to encode affective information, I mention the phenomenon of duplication of functional categories (e.g., articles) in the nominal domain. As noted in Plank (2003), Bavarian German allows nominal expressions in which the definite article occurs more than once, as in *die ganz die großn Brezn* (the very the big pretzels, 'the really very big pretzels'). This duplicative use of the definite article marks intensity. This duplicative use of an article is also found in certain dialectal varieties of Dutch. In Schouwen-

⁴⁹ Under a Construction Grammar approach towards the encoding of affect, one would expect the encodings of affect to be language specific, and, for that reason, presumably more arbitrary and less restrictive in nature.

Duiveland Dutch, for example, the indefinite article *en* ‘a’ is repeated in exclamative noun phrases, as in: *Wat en slächt-en spul is tat noe!* (what a bad-a stuff is that now, ‘It is such bad stuff!’).

These four illustrations of cross-linguistic parallels in the formal encoding of affect in the nominal domain suggest that languages make use of similar formal strategies for the representation of affective-expressive information. This parallelism is expected if the functional architecture associated with language-particular grammars is uniform (see (6)). It is this cross-linguistically uniform functional architecture that demarcates the variation space in which affective information can be expressed. Language variation —both *intra*-linguistic (e.g., the grammar of descriptive information in language L_A versus the grammar of affective-expressive information in L_A) and *inter*-linguistic (e.g., the grammar of descriptive information in language L_A versus the grammar of descriptive information in L_B) is attributed to the mode in which open values associated with grammatical formatives are assigned range (see section 2). A future research agenda might consist in a more systematic cross-linguistic investigation of the ways in which languages organize the grammar of descriptive information (say, within the nominal domain) and the grammar of affective-expressive information (say, within the nominal domain). This way, we will get a deeper understanding of the language-particular instantiations of the organization of “disorganization”.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2003) *Classifiers: A Typology of Noun Classification Devices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2006). ‘Noun classes and classifiers: semantics’, in E.K. Brown and Anne Anderson (eds), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 463-471.

Bally, Charles (1913). *Le langage et la vie* (troisième édition 1977). Genève: Droz.

Bennis, Hans, Norbert Corver & Marcel den Dikken (1998). ‘Predication in nominal phrases’. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1: 85-117.

Berkum, Jos van (1996). ‘The psycholinguistics of grammatical gender’. Ph.D. dissertation, Max Planck-Institut für Psycholinguistik & University of Nijmegen.

Besnier, Niko (1990). ‘Language and affect’. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 491-551.

Bont, A.P. de (1958). *Dialekt van Kempenland*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V.

Borer, Hagit (1984). *Parametric Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Borer, Hagit (1999). ‘Deconstructing the construct’, in K. Johnson and I. Roberts (eds), *Beyond Principles and Parameters*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 43-90.

Borer, Hagit (2005). *In Name Only. Structuring sense, volume I*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Cheng, Lisa L.-S., and Rint Sybesma (1999). 'Bare and not-so-bare nouns and the structure of NP'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 509-42.
- Cheng Lisa L.-S. and Rint Sybesma (2012), 'Classifiers and DP', *Linguistic Inquiry* 43: 634-50.
- Chomsky, Noam (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Collins, Chris and Paul Postal (2012). *Imposters. A study of pronominal agreement*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Corver, Norbert (2008). 'Uniformity and diversity in the syntax of evaluative vocatives'. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11: 43-93.
- Corver, Norbert (2016). 'Emotion in the build of Dutch: Deviation, augmentation and duplication'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 132: 232-75.
- Corver, Norbert and Marjo van Koppen (2018). 'Pronominalization and possessive expressions', in M. Coniglio, A. Murphy, E. Schlachter and T. Veenstra (eds), *Atypical Demonstratives. Syntax, semantics and pragmatics*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 57-93.
- Croft, William (1994). 'Semantic universals in classifier systems'. *Word* 45: 145-71.
- Croft, William (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dalzell, Tom and Terry Victor (eds), *The New Partridge Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*, Volume II: J-Z. New York/London: Routledge.
- Damasio, Antonio (2018). *The Strange Order of Things. Life, feeling, and the making of cultures*. New York: Pantheon books.
- De Belder, Marijke (2011). *Roots and Affixes: Eliminating lexical categories from syntax*. Utrecht: LOT.
- De Belder, Marijke, Noam Faust, and Nicola Lampitelli (2014). 'On a low and a high diminutive: Evidence from Italian and Hebrew', in A. Alexiadou, H. Borer, and F. Schäfer (eds), *The Syntax of Roots and the Roots of Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 149-63.
- Déchaine, Rose-Marie and Martina Wiltschko (2002). 'Decomposing pronouns'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 409-42.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (2006). *Relators and Linkers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Doetjes, Jenny (1997). *Quantifiers and Selection. On the distribution of quantifying expressions in French, Dutch and English*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

- Embick, David and Rolf Noyer (2001). 'Movement operations after syntax'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 555-91.
- Everaert, Martin (1992). 'Nogmaals: Een schat van een kind', in H. Bennis and J. W. de Vries (eds), *De binnenbouw van het Nederlands. Een bundel artikelen voor Piet Paardekooper*, Dordrecht: ICG-Publications, 45–54.
- Foolen, Ad (2004). 'Expressive binominal NPs in Germanic and Romance languages', in G. Radden and K.-U. Panther (eds), *Studies in linguistic motivation*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 75-100.
- Gebhardt, Lewis (2011). 'Classifiers are functional'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42: 125–30.
- Goldberg, Adele (1995). *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harley, Heidi (1995). 'Subject, Events and Licensing'. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Houx, J.H., A.M. Jacobs and P.P. Lücker (1968). *Tegels dialect. Uiteenzetting over de klankleer, spraakkunst en woordenschat van het dialect van Tegelen*. Maastricht: Boosten en Stols.
- Huron, David (2007). *Sweet Anticipation. Music and the psychology of expectation*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Jakobson, Roman (1960). 'Closing statements: Linguistics and poetics', in T.A. Sebeok (ed.). *Style in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 350-77.
- Huang, Chu-Ren, and Kathleen Ahrens (2003). 'Individuals, kinds and events: Classifier coercion of nouns'. *Language Sciences* 25: 353–73.
- Joos, Kan. Am. (1923). 'Het gevoel in de spraakkunst'. *Verslagen en mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde* 1923, 251–318.
- Kayne, Richard (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1996). 'Severing the external argument from the verb', in J. Rooryck and L. Zaring (eds), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109-37.
- Levitin, Daniel (2006). *This is your Brain on Music. Understanding a human obsession*. London: Atlantic books.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (1994). 'Reference and proper names: a theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 609-65.
- Lyons John. (1977). *Semantics. Vol. 2*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marantz, Alec (1997). 'No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon', in A. Dimitriadis and L. Siegel (eds), *Proceedings of the 21st*

- Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium. University of Pennsylvania working papers in linguistics* 4, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 201-24.
- Matthews, Stephen and Yip, Virginia (1994). *Cantonese: A comprehensive grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Meyer, Leonard (1956). *Emotion and Meaning in Music*. Chicago: Chicago university press.
- Ochs, Elinor (1986). 'From feeling to grammar: a Samoan case study', in B. Schieffelin and E. Ochs (eds), *Language Socialization across Cultures*, 251-72.
- Ott, Dennis (2011). Diminutive-formation in German: Spelling out the classifier analysis. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 14: 1-46.
- Overdiep, G.S. (1937). *Stilistische Grammatica*. Zwolle: W.E.J. Tjeenk Willink.
- Paardekooper, P. C. (1956). 'Een schat van een kind'. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 49: 93-99.
- Plank, Frans (2003). 'Double articulation', in F. Plank (ed.), *Noun Phrase Structure in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 337-95.
- Pos, Hendrik J. (1935). 'Remarques sur les particules, leurs fonctions logiques et affectives', in B. Migliorini & V. Pisani (eds), *Actes du III^{ème} Congrès International des Linguistes* (Rome, 19-26 septembre 1933). Florence: Felice le Monnier, 138-41.
- Potts, Christopher (2007). 'The expressive dimension'. *Theoretical Linguistics* 33: 165-97.
- Ritter, Elizabeth (1988). 'A head movement approach to construct-state noun phrases'. *Linguistics* 26: 909-29.
- Roeper, Tom (1999). 'Universal bilingualism'. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 2: 169-86.
- Sijs, Nicoline van der (editor) (2010). *Etymologiebank*, <http://etymologiebank.nl/>
- Siloni, Tali (1996). 'Hebrew noun phrases: generalized noun raising', in A. Belletti and L. Rizzi (eds), *Parameters and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 239-67.
- Stankiewicz, Edward (1960). 'Problems of emotive language', in T.A. Sebeok, A.S. Hayes and M.C. Bateson (eds.), *Aspects of Semiotics*. Janua Linguarum Series Maior 15, Den Haag: Mouton, 239-64.
- Svennung, J. (1958). *Anredeformen: Vergleichende Forschungen zur indirekten Anrede in der dritten Person und zum Nominativ für den Vokativ*. (Acta Soc. Litt. Hum. Reg. Upsal. 42). Uppsala & Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Van Langendonck, Willy and Mark van de Velde (2009). 'The functions of (in)definiteness markers with proper names', in W. Ahrens, S. Embleton, and A. Lapierre (eds). *Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Onomastic Sciences*. Toronto: York university, 1005-011.

Van Riemsdijk, Henk (1998). 'Categorial feature magnetism: The endocentricity and distribution of projections'. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2: 1-48.

Verdenius, A. A. (1940). 'Composita bestaande uit eigennaam+ waarderingsselement'. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 34: 168-74.

Vos, Riet (1999). *A Grammar of Partitive Constructions*, doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University.

Wiltschko, Martina (2005). 'Why should diminutives count?', in H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huijbregts, U. Kleinhenz, J. Koster (eds), *Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 669-78.

Wittenberg, Eva and Andreas Trotzke (to appear). A Psycholinguistic Investigation into Diminutive Strategies in the East Franconian Noun Phrase: Little schnitzels stay big, but little crooks become nicer. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*.

Yang, Charles (2002). *Knowledge and Learning in Natural Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.