Silent Nouns and the Spurious Indefinite Article in Dutch

Henk van Riemsdijk
Tilburg University, Models of Grammar Group

1.   Introductory remarks[1]

This article discusses the distribution of the so-called spurious indefinite article in Dutch. In a recent presentation, Thomas Leu (2004) has suggested that the occurrence of the spurious article in *wat-voor*-questions could be linked to the presence of a silent noun. My purpose in the present article is to take up this idea and to examine its viability in two other constructions: exclamatives and the N-*of-an*-N construction. The discussion supports Leu's analysis and will shed more light on the phenomenon of silent nouns (cf. Kayne, 2003a, 2003b) and of silent (semi-)lexical heads (cf. Van Riemsdijk, 2002) in general.

2.   Spurious indefinite articles

Dutch has several constructions in which the article *een* shows up in contexts where it is not expected. One such construction is the *wat voor* question, used to ask question about the type or sort of some substance. Here are some examples.

(1)   a.   Wat voor (een) musea   heb je bezocht?
            what for   a   museums have you visited
            'What kind of museums did you visit?'

       b.   Wat heeft Piet voor (een) wijnen uitgezocht?
            what has Pete for   a   wines selected
            'What kind of wines did Pete select?'

The curious thing about *een* in these examples is that it is the indefinite singular form of the article while the nouns following it are plural nouns. That is the property that has led to the name 'spurious indefinite article' (SIA). The *wat voor* construction can also be used with mass nouns. And though mass nouns normally do not tolerate any indefinite article, the SIA does show up.

---

[1]   This article is dedicated to Lars Hellan in recognition of his qualities as a broadband grammarian and theoretician, and of his merits as one of the great 'machers' in linguistics. With the present modest essay on NP/DPs I particularly want to honor him for his important contributions to our understanding of noun phrase structure (cf. Hellan, 1980, 1985). The silent nouns I discuss in this paper may have a duration of a few milliseconds, or perhaps not even that, hardly enough to make much of an impression on Lars, who is known for protracted silences in the middle of his lectures. If the minuscule silent nouns can carry so much meaning, we can only marvel at the spiritual riches of Lars' prolonged pauses.

(2)   a.   Wat hebben jullie   voor (een) zout gekocht?
                   what have   you$_{PL}$ for   a   salt bought
                   'What kind of salt did you buy?'

        b.   Wat voor (een) bocht   wordt hier verkocht?
                   what for   a   hooch is   here sold
                   'What kind of hooch is sold here?'

The SIA occurs in other constructions as well. Specifically, we find SIAs in the N-*of-an*-N construction and in exclamatives. In the N-*of-an*-N construction, in addition to the above two types of nouns (indefinite plurals and singular mass nouns) we also find proper names that are also normally incompatible with the indefinite article.

(3)   a.   een pracht van een gladiolen
                   a splendor of a gladioli
                   'splendid gladioli'

        b.   die   smeerboel van een olijfolie
                   that muck   of a   olive-oil
                   'that filthy olive oil'

        c.   dat juweel van een Fuji
                   that jewel of a   Fuji
                   'that brilliant Mount Fuji'

In these cases, the use of the SIA is even obligatory. And that is also true for the third construction in which we find the SIA: exclamatives. Dutch exclamatives in which the exclamation targets a noun phrase come in different guises. Sometimes there is an overt exclamative operator *wat* sometimes there is not. When *wat* is present, it is either part of the noun phrase, or it is in initial position, separated from the noun phrase in question. When *wat* is absent, the noun phrase can be fronted or *in situ*. When fronted it is followed by the complementizer *dat* ('that') and the verb is final, while when *in situ* the verb is in second position.

(4)   a.   Wat heeft die auto een deuken!
                   what has that car a dents
                   'What dents that car has!'

        b.   Wat een deuken heeft die auto!

        c.   Een deuken dat die auto heeft!

        d.   Die auto heeft een deuken!

3.   Silent nouns

We see that the SIA is a fairly pervasive phenomenon in Dutch syntax. But where does this oddity come from? In a recent presentation, Thomas Leu (2004) has suggested a new analysis for the *wat voor* construction in a variety of continental

3

Germanic languages, in particular German, Dutch and Swiss German. He notes, first, that the question that is asked by means of this construction is always about the sort or type or kind of the noun. And in fact, English translations always have an overt occurrence of such a KIND-noun, as shown in the translations of (1) and (2). In Dutch, overt KIND-nouns are also sometimes present.[2]

(5)   a.   Wat voor een slag meisjes gaan naar die kroeg?
                what for a type girls go to that bar
                'What kind of girls go to that bar?'

        b.   Wat voor een soort bloemen doen het hier goed?
                what for a sort flowers do it here well
                'What kind of flowers thrive here?'

Observe that even when the KIND-noun is overt, as in (5), the indefinite article is optional. In (5) it is present, but alongside (5) Dutch also has (6).

(6)   a.   Wat voor slag meisjes gaan naar die kroeg?
        b.   Wat voor soort bloemen doen het hier goed?

On the basis of such observations, and taking into account the SIA-phenomenon, Leu (2004) proposes, following suggestions in Kayne (2003a), that there is, alongside the overt KIND-nouns, a silent noun KIND that is regularly present in the *wat voor* construction. That is, the examples in (1) and (2) really have the structure in (7).[3]

(7)   a.   Wat voor (een) SOORT musea heb je bezocht?
        b.   Wat heeft Piet voor (een) SOORT wijnen uitgezocht?
        c.   Wat hebben jullie voor (een) SOORT zout gekocht?
        d.   Wat voor (een) SOORT bocht wordt hier verkocht?

Leu limits himself to the kind-interpretation of *wat voor* questions. However, depending on the choice of noun, a second interpretation is available as well. Consider again the examples in (1) and (2). These questions can actually be answered in two different ways, shown here as A and B respectively.

---

[2] In Swedish, which also has the *wat voor* construction, the use of the overt KIND-noun (*slags* or *sorts*) appears to be obligatory, cf. Leu (2004). There are other differences, however. First, the noun is *slag* or *sort*, and the *s*-form used in the *vad för* construction as well as in cases like *tre slags mjölk* ('three kinds of milk') is (at least historically) a genitive, the so-called qualitative genitive. Second, *slags* and *sorts* do not behave like (semi-)lexical nouns in that the article preceding them agrees in gender with the second noun rather than with the first one: *ett slag* ('a$_{NEUTER}$ kind') but *en slags handske* ('a$_{UTER}$ kind glove'), where *handske* is a uter noun. Thanks to Lars-Olof Delsing for providing this information.

[3] As discussed in detail in Van Riemsdijk (2002, 2003, to appear), the silent noun should not be taken to arise through PF-deletion. Rather, it is a lexical item that has its own properties (collocations, licensing conditions, etc.) but is somewhat special in that it lacks a phonetic matrix. When I use the term 'overt counterpart', this should be taken to mean 'noun with similar (but not identical) properties and with a phonetic matrix'.

(8)   a.   Wat voor (een)$_A$/*een$_B$ musea   heb je bezocht?
             what for   (a)   museums have you visited
             'What kind of museums did you visit?'

      A. Musea voor moderne kunst ('museums of modern art')
      B. Het Rijksmuseum en het Van Gogh museum ('the Rijksmuseum and the Van
          Gogh museum')

      b.   Wat heeft Piet voor (een)$_A$/*een$_B$ wijnen uitgezocht?
             what has Pete for (a)   wines selected
             'What kinds of wines did Pete select?'

      A. Rode en witte Bordeauxwijnen ('red and white Bordeaux wines')
      B. De Cos d'Estournel van 1947 en de Château d'Yquem van 1970

      c.   Wat hebben jullie voor (een)$_A$/*een$_B$ zout gekocht?
             what have   you$_{PL}$ for (a)   salt bought?
             'What kind of salt did you buy?'

      A. Zeezout ('sea salt')
      B. Fleur de sel, dat jodiumvrije merk en een pakje grof zout om te malen ('fleur
          de sel, that iodine free brand, and a pack of coarse salt for grinding')

      d.   Wat voor (een)$_A$/*een$_B$ bocht wordt hier verkocht?
             what for   (a)   hooch is   here sold
             'What kind of hooch is sold here?'

      A. Een mengeling van eenvoudige landwijn en goedkope rode port ('a mixture
          of simple country wine and cheap red port')
      B. Château Gueule de Bois en Château Migraine ('Château Hangover and
          Château Migraine')

That is, these questions can either ask for a TYPE or for a LIST. Put differently, they ask for an intensional or an extensional characterization (cf. Pafel, 1996). Instead of LIST, we might also think of the hypothetical silent noun in the B-interpretations as TOKEN(S).[4] However, as the notation "(een)$_A$/*een$_B$" is meant to indicate, The TOKEN(S) interpretation is only possible when the SIA is absent. On the assumption that TOKENS is truly a plural, this is exactly what we expect since the indefinite

---

[4]   It might be interesting to reexamine the Split Topicalization construction of German and certain Dutch dialects in this light (cf. Van Hoof, 1997, Van Riemsdijk, 1989). In general, the topicalized part represents the TYPE, while the remnant specifies the TOKEN(S), as in (i).
(i)   Einen Zweitwagen können wir uns   keinen leisten
           a   second-car can   we REFL none   afford
           'A second car we cannot afford'
One of the curious phenomena here is the fact that both parts of the noun phrase have an article. The article on the topicalized part might be considered spurious. And assuming that there is a silent noun TOKEN(S) in the remnant noun phrase might account for the presence of two articles. What remains problematic under such an account is why the construction should exhibit movement properties, as discussed in detail in (Van Riemsdijk, 1989). I will not pursue this line of thinking here.

plural article is null.[5] In a context where a singular is perfectly plausible, for example when the second noun is a singular and is interpretable both as a mass noun or as a count noun, TOKEN would be expected to trigger the SIA, and it does.

(9)   Wat heeft Piet voor een wijn$_{SG}$ uitgezocht?
    A.   Rode Bordeaux
    B.   De Cos d'Estournel van 1947

Both interpretations are available with the indefinite article present.

4.   Exclamatives

With this much by way of background,[6] let us now exmine Dutch exclamatives in more detail.[7] Consider again the examples in (4), repeated here as (10).

(10)   a.   Wat heeft die auto een deuken!
                    what has that car a dents
                    'What dents that car has!'

        e.   Wat een deuken heeft die auto!

        f.   Een deuken dat die auto heeft!

        g.   Die auto heeft een deuken!

Regardless of which variant is chosen, we find a consistent ambiguity in the interpretation of these exclamations.[8] The exclamation is not about the fact that this car has dents as such, but it is either about the number of dents or about the type of the dents. In the former case, we exclaim about the relatively large number of dents in the second about some relatively excessive property of the dents, for example their large

---

[5]   The idea that silent heads could have a morphology is not obvious. Certainly, we would not expect a silent verb to be inflected for person or tense, at least not in languages with fusional morphology. But in Van Riemsdijk (to appear) I present an argument to the effect that the participle of the silent motion verb GAA in Swiss German can be silent. I am assuming here without further discussion that the same applies to the plural form of SOORT or TOKEN.

[6]   A further construction that could profitably be examined in the light of the presence of silent nouns is what Borer (2004) calls 'grocerese' or 'restaurantese'. Consider the following examples.
(ii)   twee melk$_{SG}$ -   drie pils$_{SG}$ -   vier erwtensoep$_{SG}$
            two milk   -   three beer   -   four pea-soup
In each case, the numeral is a plural, but the noun is in the singular. And in each case a standard measure or container noun (cf. Van Riemsdijk, 1998b, Vos, 1999) is implied:
(iii)   twee pakken (packs) melk - drie glazen (glasses) pils - vier borden (plates) erwtensoep
The missing noun, if there is one, could either be assumed a silent variant of these concrete container nouns, or, alternatively, it could be a more generic type of noun such as UNIT(S) or, indeed, TOKEN(S). There is a serious complication with the argument, however, in that the container noun, when overt, can also occur in the singular in many of these cases:
(iv)   twee pak/pakken melk   - drie glas/glazen pils - vier *bord/$^{\sqrt{}}$borden erwtensoep
[7]   See Corver (1990), Bennis (1998).
[8]   See Milner (1978:253): "toute phrase qu'on désigne [exclamative] implique *l'expression d'un haut degré*, soit dans l'ordre de la qualité […], soit dans l'ordre de la quantité".

size or perhaps the (high) degree of deformation or destruction. Which end of the spectrum is chosen appears to depend, at least in part, on intrinsic properties of the object in question. For example, examples like (11) can plausibly be interpreted as exclamations about how small the drawing or person in question is.

(11) a.   Wat een miniaturen worden hier tentoongesteld!
             what a   miniatures are   here exposed
             'Such miniatures are on display here!'

      b.   Daar staat me toch een lilliputter!
             there stands me PRT a lilliputian
             'Such a lilliputian, that person standing there!'

But when intrinsic properties do not provide a guideline, the interpretation seems ot be determined by the default end of the scale in question: big on the size-scale. For the number scale, the default interpretation (large number) appears to be dominant throughout. (12) means that there are amazingly many, not amazingly few, oligarchs in Russia.

(12)   Wat zijn er   in Rusland een oligarchen!
             what are there in Russian an   oligarchs
             'So many oligarchs there are in Russia!'

Zanuttini and Portner (2003) use the term 'widening' for these scalar extensions.[9] One might think that the scale inversion we find in examples like (11) is not compatible with this notion, but probably a good way of thinking about this is to say that even in these examples we are talking about a high degree of smallness. A high degree of 'few-ness' is not a concept that makes much sense, which may well be why (12) is interpreted the way it is.

What Milner (1978) calls quantity and quality seems to correspond quite closely to what I have been calling TYPE and TOKEN above. We may thus assume that these two silent nouns are licensed, in Dutch, by the question operator *wat voor* and by the exclamative operator *wat* or *WAT*.

5.   The N-*of-an*-N construction

Returning now to the N-*of-an*-N construction and its Dutch counterpart the N-*van-een*-N construction, we may ask if the silent nouns TYPE and TOKEN could be involved here as well. The occurrence of the SIA (cf. (3a)) would seem to suggest that it does. But how is this construction to be analyzed in the first place? I will largely follow Matushansky (2002)[10] in assuming that the N1-of-an-N2 construction is

---

[9]   See also Michaelis and Lambrecht (1996) and Obenauer (1994) for relevant discussion.
[10]   Matushansky (2002) argues against the predicate inversion analysis advanced by Bennis, Corver and Den Dikken (1998), Den Dikken (1998) and others in which the first one of the two nouns (N1 in N1 – N2) originates as the predicate of a small clause. To cite just two arguments that

largely base generated, that N2 is the semantic head and that N1 is a modifier. It is, of course, a modifier of a specific kind. Matushansky calls this an emotive modifier in the sense that it is used to express the mood or feeling of the speaker rather than a judgment. In addition, as is also suggested by the above discussion, the modifier is scalar. The idea then is that the modifier undergoes DP-internal operator movement, like APs sometimes do, as in (13).[11]

(13)   More capable a sorceress Miranda has never met

The DP-internal inversion is thus assumed to apply to adjectival and nominal modifiers alike. I deviate from Matushansky in postulating a silent semi-lexical noun (TYPE or TOKEN(S)). The nominal modifier can then be taken to modify the silent noun rather than the lexical noun directly. The notion of a semi-lexical noun occurring in an (extended) nominal projection between the lexical head noun and the functional shells has been argued for in Van Riemsdijk (1998b) and Vos (1999).

The appearance of the preposition *van* ('of') in the N-of-an-N construction remains somewhat mysterious, despite the suggestion in footnote 11 that *of*-insertion is an automatic consequence of DP-internal operator movement. This strikes me as somewhat *ad hoc*, but more importantly it does not really explain why it should be the preposition *of* that shows up. I would like to explore another way of looking at this issue which, while also stipulative in certain ways, may give us more of a handle on this question. There is something inherently unsatisfactory about the notion of a (left adjoined) nominal modifier in the DP because nominal modifiers do not seem to occur in that position in any obvious overt constructions.

As Matushansky (2002) notes, the N1-modifier in the N-of-an-N construction can apparently be phrasal in that it can take an adjective, for example, as in (14), which seems to argue against the analysis of N1 as a semi-lexical head in the extended projection of N2.

(14)   A big fat bastard of a spider

Note, however, that semi-lexical heads have a (limited) potential of being modified as well, as in the following direct partitive examples in Dutch.

Matushansky gives, note first, that extraction out of (the complement of) N2 is possible, which is quite normal if N2 is the head of a DP, but unexpected if N2 is the subject of a predication:
(v)   a.   Which linguist is this a beauty of a book about
*Which linguist is a/the book about a beauty
Furthermore, N1 is iterable, which predicates are not.
(vi)   That asshole of an idiot of a musketeer
[11]   As Matushansky notes, Abney (1987:325) observes that *of*-insertion optionally occurs in certain English dialects even with inverted adjectives, as in (vii).
(vii)   a.   too big (of) a house
                 b.   how beautiful (of) a man

(15) a.   een klein glas bier   b.   een koel glas bier   c.   #een Duits glas bier
          a   little glass beer   a   cool glass beer   a   German glass beer
          'a little glass of beer'   'a cool glass of beer'   'a German glass of beer'

In (15a), the adjective clearly modifies the glass since the beer cannot be small. In (15b) the adjective primarily seems to modify the lexical noun *bier*, but in actual fact it might be said to extend its scope over both juxtaposed nouns, that is, it is the glass of beer that is cool. This is confirmed by the c-example because it is inappropriate if the adjective German is taken to modify the beer alone, though that would be a perfectly plausible interpretation. Instead, the only felicitous reading is the one in which the glass of beer is German, which might be appropriate if the Germans tend to drink beer from very big glasses, as they tend to do. Hence (15c) could be used to characterize a big glass of beer.

These observations would seem to suggest that the modifier is only seemingly phrasal in nature. The article could be thought to provide a more convincing indication that indeed the modifier is phrasal in that it agrees with N1. However, in the partitive construction, the same facts obtain. And I consider the arguments to the effect that in the partitive construction we have a non-phrasal combination of a semi-lexical head with a lexical head given in Van Riemsdijk (1998b) and Vos (1999) to be decisive.[12] Here the article also generally agrees in gender and number with N1 and only in exceptional cases with N2, depending on the specific choice of N1.

(16) a.   het paar sokken   cf.   het paar
          the pair socks   the pair ('2')

     b.   de paar sokken die hij nog heeft   cf.   *de paar ('few')   de sokken
          the pair socks that he still has   the few   the socks

The pattern in (16b) is only found when N1 is grammaticalized entirely into a quantifier meaning 'a few, some', with loss of its original lexical meaning ('pair').

Consequently, neither the adjectival modification of N1 nor the fact that N1 has 'its own' article can be considered decisive. Nevertheless, I believe that Matushansky (2002) is correct in claiming that the Det+(AP)+N1 sequence consitutes a constituent. The reason is that her arguments against the predicate inversion analysis are cogent (cf. footnote 10.) and hence DP-internal fronting must apply, and it applies (minimally) to precisely this sequence of elements which, *ipso facto*, must constitute a constituent.

At this point, we return to the exclusion of nominal adjuncts (and complements). Prenominal adjuncts can be verbal (participles), adjectival and, occasionally prepositional. The reason many instances of such adjuncts cannot be realized is that,

---

[12]   I consider the fact that Det (Adj) N1 (Adj) N2 all agree in case in an overtly case marking language like German particularly conclusive.
(viii)   mit einem$_{DAT}$ grossen$_{DAT}$ Glas$_{DAT}$ Französischem$_{DAT}$ Wein$_{DAT}$
        with a   big   glass (of) French   wine

in addition, their heads must be adjacent to N.[13] This will exclude most PP-adjuncts, of course, but it permits intransitive P as a left-hand modifier of N, as in

(17) a. the upstairs bathroom   b. an inside job   c. a down payment   d. an away game

The stress pattern suggests that these are not compounds. Traditional grammar generally calls these adjectives, but, as Jackendoff (1973) and many others have argued, these are really intransitive adpositions.

Observe further that nominal predicates are often accompanied by the default preposition *of*.

(18)   a.   his opinion is of no importance   b.   a proposal of considerable interest

Furthermore, we know that *of* is the default preposition when it comes to saving constructions from external constraints such as the case filter, hence the name *of*-insertion.

Suppose, then, that prenominal nominal adjuncts must be prepositional in order to be saved from the magnetism principle that excludes nominal dependents in nominal projections. We would then have a structure that violates the head final filter.

(19)   * [$_{DP}$ D° [$_{PP}$ [of]$_{P°}$ DP] N°]

Suppose furthermore that the DP is fronted inside the PP. This would create a configuration that is in conformity with both principles. And after the DP-internal fronting triggered by the emotive operator, we derive (20).

(20)   [$_{DP}$ [$_{PP}$ [$_{DP}$ D° N1°]$_i$ [of]$_{P°}$ [e$_i$]]$_j$ D° [e$_j$] N2°]

In order for this to work, we must assume that the inversion inside the PP, which has become obsolete[14] in Germanic languages, applies exceptionally here. This is admittedly stipulative, but at least the analysis provides a plausible source for the presence of *of* (or *van*).[15]

---

[13]   This has been called the Head Final Filter in Williams (1982), but the observation goes back at least to Emonds' (1976:19) Surface Recursion Restriction, taken up again in Emonds (1985:131) as the Generalized Left Branch Restriction. In essence, these principles stipulate that an adjunct that precedes the head in a head-initial phrase must be head-final, cf. also Van Riemsdijk (1998a).

[14]   In German and Dutch, directional PPs can be postpositional as are various other instances of lexical P. Furthermore, R-words invert in the manner indicated. In Old English, personal pronouns could invert inside PPs. Vestigial inversion in PP is also found in Latin (*tecum* 'with me'), Italian (*teco* idem) and Spanish (*contigo* idem).

[15]   There is one serious flaw in this analysis. While in Dutch direct partitive constructions of the type we have been looking at are constructed by means of two juxtaposed nouns, many languages employ a default preposition to separate the two nouns, as in English (*a glass of wine*) or French (*un verre de vin*). If, as I have argued, these consist of a semi-lexical nominal head followed by a lexical nominal head in a single extended projection, then the appearance of the default preposition cannot be ascribed to a scenario like the one suggested in the text.

6.   NUM and DEG

Let us get back to the interpretation of the three constructions with SIAs. We have seen that the *wat-voor* construction can be a question about the kind (TYPE) or the (number of) TOKEN(S) of N. Similarly, Exclamatives exclaim about the TYPE or the (number of) TOKEN(S) of N. What about the N-of-an-N construction? The examples in (3) are all about kinds. But examples in which the modification by N1 targets the number of tokens rather than their kind are also possible.

(21)   a.   hordes van (*een) demonstranten
              hordes of   a   demonstrators
              'hordes of demonstrators'

        b.   karavanen van (*een) strandgangers
              caravans of   a   beach-goers
              'caravans of beach goers'

        c.   drommen van (*een) atleten
              masses   of   an   athletes
              'masses of athletes'

Note that the SIA is not grammatical in these cases. Recall first that this is expected under the assumption that the silent noun is the plural noun TOKENS. Note second that these are quite similar to the corresponding partitives.

(22)   hordes demonstranten   –   karavanen strandgangers   –   drommen atleten

The difference, in addition to the presence vs. absence of the preposition *van*, is that the expressions in (22) can be used for relatively neutral statements about the large numbers in question, at least to the extent that the N1s in (21/22) are inherently unemotive. The expressions in (21), however, are clearly used to convey a fair degree of emotivity.

We may conclude, then, that all three constructions can be said to involve the silent nouns TYPE and TOKEN(S). There is one piece still missing, however. When an exclamation is about the TYPE of some N, it is really about some pragmatically or contextually inferred scalar property, size in the default case. Similarly, when we exclaim about the TOKENS of some N, we exclaim about the relatively large number of tokens in question. In the N-of-an-N construction it is the modifier that contributes to the correct interpretation, in the exclamative construction, it is presumably the exclamative operator that forces an interpretation the involves a 'widening' of the scale. The *wat-voor* construction, on the other hand seems to be neutral.

But what about the number component in the TOKENS case? Following Kayne (2003b) we may assume that a second silent noun is involved here: NUMBER (of) TOKENS. This would be a partitive nexus in which, as we have seen, N1 and N2 are not separated by the preposition *van* in Dutch. There is one complication, however, in that NUMBER and its Dutch counterpart *aantal*, are singular nouns. Therefore, if a silent noun NUMBER were present here, would we not expect the SIA to show up

(which it does not)? The answer must be that NUMBER, unlike its overt counterpart *aantal*, is a pure quantifier, not a semi-lexical noun.[16] Hence, the presence of silent NUMBER will not affect the agreement between the indefinite article and TOKEN(S). Following Borer (2004) I will use '#' to represent the silent number quantifier.

It might be tempting to make the TYPE and TOKEN(S) cases fully similar by assuming that in the TYPE case there is a purely functional element expressing degree (DEG) that modifies TYPE. I do not see much evidence one way or another, but will adopt this idea for reasons of symmetry. One might, in fact, go one step further and claim that DEG and # are really one and the same element whose interpretation is determined by the (silent) noun it quantifies over, TYPE or TOKEN(S). I will refrain from taking this last step, however, since it would require a more elaborate semantic analysis.

7.   **Summary**

I have extended and expanded Leu's (2004) proposal to link the spurious indefinite article in Dutch to the presence of a silent noun. The resulting structures for the three constructions in question can now be given as in (23-25).[17]

(23)   ***wat voor***

    a.   [$_{DP}$ *wat voor*   [[$_{D°}$ (*een*)]   [DEG [[$_n$ TYPE]   N°   ]]]]

    b.   [$_{DP}$ *wat voor*   [[$_{D°}$ (*een*)/Ø]   [[$_n$ TOKEN(S)]   N°   ]]]

(24)   **exclamatives**

    a.   !!! …….. [$_{DP}$ [[$_{D°}$ (*een*)]   [DEG [[$_n$ TYPE]   N°   ]]]]

    b.   !!! …….. [$_{DP}$ [[$_{D°}$ Ø]   [# [[$_n$ TOKENS]   N°   ]]]]

---

[16]   *Aantal* always comes with a singular article, even though the nouns it quantifies over are plural. On the other hand, subject-verb agreement wavers: both singular and plural agreement are possible.
(ix)   Er   is/zijn een aantal   bezoekers aangekomen
    there is/are a   number visitors   arrived
    'A number of visitors has (have) arrived'
Most quantifiers are incompatible with determiners, but *veel* ('much/many') and *weinig* ('little/few') do cooccur with an article that agrees in gender and number with the (semi-)lexical head noun.
[17]   I will use the lower case 'n' to label semi-lexical nouns. The exclamative operator is rendered as '!!!' and the emotive operator of the N-of-an-N construction as '♥'. Also, I will refrain from advancing any concrete analysis for the position of *wat voor* inside the DP.

(25)   **N-*van-een*-N**

    a.   ♥...[$_{DP}$ [$_{Spec,DP}$ [$_{PPj}$ [$_{DP}$ D N1] [$_{P°}$ *van*] [e$_i$]] [$_{D°}$(*een*)] [[$_{PP}$ e$_j$] [DEG [[$_n$TYPE] N2]]]]]

    b.   ♥...[$_{DP}$ [$_{Spec,DP}$ [$_{PPj}$ [$_{DP}$ D N1] [$_{P°}$ *van*] [e$_i$]] [$_{D°}$ Ø] [[$_{PP}$ e$_j$] [# [[$_n$TOKENS] N2]]]]]

13

8.　　　　References

Abney, Steven. 1987. The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect, Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT: Ph.D. dissertation.
Bennis, Hans. 1998. Exclamatives! In *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1998*, eds. Renée van Bezooijen and René Kager, 27-40. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Bennis, Hans, Corver, Norbert, and Dikken, Marcel den. 1998. Predication in nominal phrases. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 1:85-117.
Borer, Hagit. 2004. *Structuring Sense*.vol. 1 - In Name Only. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Corver, Norbert. 1990. The Syntax of Left Branch Extractions, Models of Grammar Group, Tilburg University: Ph.D. dissertation.
Dikken, Marcel den. 1998. Predicate inversion in DP. In *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*, eds. Artemis Alexiadou and Chris Wilder, 137-178. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Emonds, Joseph E. 1976. *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax: Root, Structure-Preserving, and Local Transformations*. New York: Academic Press.
Emonds, Joseph E. 1985. *A Unified Theory of Syntactic Categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Hellan, Lars. 1980. Toward an integrated theory of noun phrases, University of Trondheim: Ph.D. dissertation.
Hellan, Lars. 1985. The headedness of NPs in Norwegian. In *Features and Projections*, eds. Pieter Muysken and Henk C. van Riemsdijk, 89-122. Dordrecht: Foris.
Hoof, Hanneke van. 1997. Left Dislocation and Split Topicalization in Brabant Dutch. In *Materials on Left Dislocation*, eds. Elena Anagnostopoulou, Henk C. van Riemsdijk and Frans Zwarts, 275-306. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Jackendoff, Ray. 1973. The base rules for prepositional phrases. In *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, eds. Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 345-356. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
Kayne, Richard S. 2003a. Silent years, silent hours. Ms., *NYU*. New York.
Kayne, Richard S. 2003b. On the syntax of quantity in English. Ms., *NYU*. New York.
Leu, Thomas. 2004. *What for* properties are odd? (Abstract). Paper presented at *Comparative Germanic Syntax Workshop (CGSW) 19*, City University of New York (CUNY) Graduate Center.
Matushansky, Ora. 2002. A beauty of a construction. In *WCCFL 21: Proceedings of the 21st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, eds. Line Mikkelsen and Christopher Potts, 264-277. Cambridge, MA: Cascadilla.
Michaelis, Laura A., and Lambrecht, Knud. 1996. The exclamative sentence type in English. In *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*, ed. Adele E. Goldberg, 375-389. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
Milner, Jean-Claude. 1978. *De la syntaxe à l'interprétation : quantités, insultes, exclamations*. Paris: Seuil.
Obenauer, Hans-Georg. 1994. Aspects de la syntaxe A-barre: effets d'intervention et mouvement des quantifieurs, Linguistique, Université de Paris 8: Doctorat d'état.

Pafel, Jürgen. 1996. Die syntaktische und semantische Struktur von 'was für'-Phrasen. *Linguistische Berichte* 161:37-67.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 1989. Movement and regeneration. In *Dialect variation and the theory of grammar*, ed. Paola Benincà, 105-136. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 1998a. Head movement and adjacency. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16:633-678.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 1998b. Categorial feature magnetism: The endocentricity and distribution of projections. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2:1-48.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 2002. The unbearable lightness of GOing. The projection parameter as a pure parameter governing the distribution of elliptic motion verbs in Germanic. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 5:143-196.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. 2003. Some thoughts on specified ellipsis. In *Grammar in Focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack 18 November 2003*, eds. Lars Olof Delsing, Cecilia Falk, Gunlög Josefsson and Halldor Armann Sigurdsson, 257-263. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages,.

Riemsdijk, Henk C. van. to appear. The Morphology of Nothingness: Some Properties of Elliptic Verbs. In *LP2002. Proceedings of the LP2002 conference at Meikai University*, ed. Bohumil Palek. Prague,: Charles University Press.

Vos, Riet. 1999. A grammar of partitive constructions, Tilburg University: Ph.D.

Williams, Edwin. 1982. Another argument that passive is transformational. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:160-163.

Zanuttini, Raffaella, and Portner, Paul. 2003. Exclamative clauses: at the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 79:39-81.