

# NP-ellipsis with adjectival remnants: a micro-comparative perspective.

Norbert Corver & Marjo van Koppen

Utrecht institute of Linguistics-OTS, Utrecht University

## Abstract

Two strategies of NP-ellipsis have been identified in the literature: (a) the elision strategy, and (b) the pronominalization strategy. The former has been said to be dependent on the presence of inflectional morphology (i.e., agreement) on the adjectival remnant. The latter strategy is used when the adjectival remnant does not carry any inflectional morphology.

The aim of this article is to show that there are languages, among which Dutch, where morphological agreement appears to be the licensing factor, but where *one*-insertion (i.e., the pronominalization strategy) is the actual strategy. We arrive at this conclusion via an in-depth and systematic micro-comparative investigation of NPE in a number of closely related languages and dialects, more specifically: Afrikaans, Frisian, (standard) Dutch and dialectal variants of Dutch. English will be included in our analysis as well, since it is a core example of the pronominalization (i.e., *one* insertion) strategy. One of the outcomes will be that languages/dialects may have available more than one NPE strategy.

## Keywords

NP-ellipsis, One-insertion, adjectival agreement, semi-lexical nouns, comparative syntax

## 1 Two types of ellipsis strategies

The phenomenon of ellipsis in the nominal domain (henceforth referred to as Noun Phrase Ellipsis or NPE) has received a fair amount of attention in generative syntactic research of the last few decades. From a descriptive perspective two ellipsis strategies have been identified: (a) the elision strategy, and (b) the pronominalization strategy (cf. Ross 1967, Jackendoff 1977). According to the former, ellipsis involves elision of some part of the noun phrase, yielding a noun phrase which is partially phonologically empty. The latter strategy involves replacement of some part of the noun phrase by a lexical (i.e. phonologically overt) pro-form. The two strategies are illustrated in (1), where the French example (1a) represents the elision strategy and the English example (1b) the pronominalization strategy:

- (1) a. Je prends la fleur rouge. Toi, prends [la — jaune]. (Valois & Royle 2008)  
I take the flower red. You, take the yellow.fem.sg.  
'I take the red flower. You take the yellow one.'  
b. John bought [a big car] and Mary bought [a small \*(one)]

This contrast as regards the NPE-strategy has been associated with the presence versus absence of inflectional morphology on the adjectival remnant (Lobeck 1991, 1995; Kester 1996). More specifically, an adjective with morphological inflection (e.g. French *jaune*) is able to license a phonologically empty noun, whereas an adjective on which morphological inflection is absent (e.g. English *small*) is unable to license it.

Another language which seems to provide evidence for this correlation between morphological agreement on the adjective and the use of the elision strategy (i.e. the ability to license a phonologically empty noun) is Dutch. Consider the following examples (see also Broekhuis et al. 2003):<sup>1</sup>

- (2) a. Jan heeft [een witte hond] gekocht en Marie heeft [een zwarte —] gekocht.  
Jan has a white-*e* dog bought and Marie has a black-*e* — bought

---

<sup>1</sup> The symbol % indicates that there is variation in the judgment of the linguistic expression by mother tongue speakers.

- ‘Jan bought a white dog and Marie bought a black one.’
- b. %Jan heeft [een *wit* konijn] gekocht en Marie heeft [een *zwarte* —] gekocht.  
 Jan has a white rabbit bought and Marie has a black-*e* — bought  
 ‘Jan bought a white rabbit and Marie bought a black one.’

In (2a) the attributive *witte* (‘white’), which modifies the non-neuter noun *hond* (‘dog’), carries the adjectival inflection *-e* (i.e. schwa). The adjective *zwarte* also carries this *-e* and is consequently able to license a phonologically empty noun. Consider next (2b). Observe that the attributive adjective *wit*, which modifies the neuter noun *konijn* (‘rabbit’) does not carry the inflectional marker *-e*. Interestingly, for many speakers of Dutch, the marker *-e* must appear when the neuter noun is elided; see the form *zwart-e*. In short, NPE in Dutch seems to require the presence of inflectional morphology on the adjectival remnant.

Given the facts in (2) it seems fair to conclude that Dutch is another language which makes use of the elision strategy, where elision of the noun is dependent on the presence of inflectional morphology on the adjectival remnant. In the spirit of Torrego (1987) and Lobeck (1991, 1995), who argue that the elision strategy involves the licensing of *pro*, Kester (1996) gives the following analytical implementation in order to account for the phenomenon of NPE in Dutch. Adopting Cinque’s (1994) proposal that adjectives occupy the specifier position of a functional projection FP within the extended nominal projection, she argues that the functional head F is able to license *pro*, when it stands in a spec-head agreement relationship with an adjective specified for so-called strong agreement. When the Dutch adjective carries inflectional morphology, viz. *-e*, the functional head F is “strong” enough to license the empty pronoun *pro*. Thus, the elided noun phrase *een zwarte* in (2a) has the following representation:<sup>2</sup>

- (3) [DP een [FP *zwart-e*<sub>[strong]</sub> [F’ F [NP *pro*]]]]

The absence of morphological inflection on the English adjective *small* in (1b) implies that F cannot possibly be a head strong enough to license *pro*. The only mechanism then to realize NPE in English is the pronominalization strategy, i.e. the use of the lexical pro-form *one*, as in *a short one*. Kester (1996:265) proposes an analysis which combines ‘*one* insertion’ and *pro*-licensing. She argues that English *one*, just like the Dutch inflection *-e*, is inserted in F for reasons of formal licensing. F is made visible as a licenser (i.e. governor) for *pro* by insertion of *one*.

- (4) [DP a [FP *small* [F’ [F *one*] [NP *pro*]]]] (*one* as a functional head F)

Other researchers have proposed that *one* actually replaces the NP; see among others Schütze (2001), Barbiers (2005). Schematically:

- (5) [DP a [FP *small* [F’ F [NP *one*]]]]

In summary: two strategies of NPE have been identified in the literature: (a) the elision strategy, and (b) the pronominalization strategy. The former has been said to be dependent on the presence of inflectional morphology (i.e., agreement) on the adjectival remnant. The latter strategy is used when the adjectival remnant does not carry any inflectional morphology. Dutch has been classified as a language that makes use of the elision strategy, where *-e* is the inflectional morpheme that enables the licensing of the phonologically empty (i.e., *pro*). Strong evidence for this came from example (2b), where *-e* had to appear when the noun is elided (i.e., *een zwart-e*) but cannot appear when there is no NPE (i.e., *een wit(\*-e) konijn*).

The aim of this article is to show that there are languages, among which Dutch, where morphological agreement appears to be the licensing factor, but where *one*-insertion (i.e., the pronominalization strategy) is the actual strategy. More specifically for Dutch, we claim that the *-e* on *zwarte* in (2b) is not an adjectival inflection, but rather a pro-form substituting for N(P). In view of its bound morphemic status, we refer to it as a (phonologically) weak pronominal. The fact that this weak pro-form is homophonous with the adjectival inflection *-e* (as in *een witte hond*, a white-*e* dog, ‘a white dog’) makes it hardly

<sup>2</sup> Kester (1996) argues that the semantic content of *pro* is recovered by means of its antecedent.

distinguishable from the latter element. We will show that, by taking a micro-comparative perspective on NPE, we are able to identify apparent adjectival inflections as weak pro-forms. This micro-comparative approach will consist of an in-depth and systematic investigation of NPE in a number of closely related languages and dialects, more specifically: Afrikaans, Frisian, (standard) Dutch and dialectal variants of Dutch. English will be included in our analysis as well, since it is a core example of the pronominalization (i.e., *one* insertion) strategy. One of the outcomes will be that languages/dialects may have available more than one NPE strategy.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the patterns of NP-ellipsis that are found in English, Dutch, Afrikaans and Frisian. Section 3 discusses the nature and behavior of the English pro-form *one*. It will be identified as a grammatical noun, in the sense of Emonds (1985). In section 4, we examine NP-ellipsis patterns in Afrikaans, and in section 5 we give an analysis of NP-ellipsis in Frisian. Although Afrikaans appears to make use of the elision strategy, involving morphological richness of the adjectival remnant, we will show that, on closer inspection, this language makes use of pronominalization (i.e., the *one* insertion strategy). For Frisian it will be shown that it uses both the elision strategy and the pronominalization strategy. It will further be argued in those sections that, in order to determine the true nature of NPE in a language or dialect, it is of great importance to include NPE-patterns involving adjectival remnants consisting of more than one adjective. To our knowledge, such data have largely or entirely been ignored in the literature on NPE so far. Building on our analyses of Afrikaans NPE and Frisian NPE, we try to give insight, in section 6, into the NP-ellipsis strategies in Dutch, by taking a microcomparative (i.e. cross-dialectal) perspective on NP-ellipsis. Section 7, finally, presents some conclusions.

## 2. Diversity in Noun Phrase Ellipsis

In this section we will start our investigation into NP-ellipsis with a brief descriptive presentation of the NPE-patterns that we find in four quite closely related Germanic languages, viz. English, Dutch, Afrikaans and Frisian. Let us first consider English, whose NPE-pattern was already briefly mentioned in the previous section:<sup>3</sup>

- (6) a. John bought [a big car] and Mary bought *a small car*.  
 b. John bought a big car and Mary bought *a small \*(one)*.

As shown in (6b), the lexical pro-form *one* must be present here. Elision of the noun, yielding the surface string *a small* is impossible.

---

<sup>3</sup> In view of the ill-formedness of *a small* in (6b), one might jump to the conclusion that English does not have a silent counterpart of *one*. Kayne (2003), however, points out that even in English nominal constructions can be found in which a silent counterpart is arguably present. He gives the following minimal pair:

- (i) big cars; big ones; \*biggs  
 (ii) other cars; other ones; others

(i) shows that, in the absence of a lexical noun, the grammatical noun *one* must be present. Interestingly, with the modifier *other* it turns out to be possible to leave out the overt pro-form *one*, as is illustrated in (ii). Rather than interpreting *others* as a complex word, Kayne hypothesizes that *others* actually has the representation in (iii). That is, there is a silent pro-form, represented as ONE, which occupies the N-position.

- (iii) other ONE s

According to this representation, the plural morpheme *-s* is not attached to the adjective – which in fact would be quite surprising – but rather to the silent noun, yielding the surface (i.e. pronounced) pattern *others*. In this article, we will not deal with the question as to why the elision strategy (here represented as the presence of a silent noun ONE) is possible in the specific context given in (iii).

Turning next to Dutch, it has been argued that NPE involves elision of the noun. As was pointed out in section 1, the possibility of noun-elision seems to correlate with the presence of inflectional morphology on the attributive adjective. The bound morpheme *-e* on the adjectives *witte* ‘white’ and *zwarte* ‘black’ constitutes the attributive adjectival inflection.

- (7) a. Jan heeft [een witte auto<sub>[-neuter]</sub>] en Marie heeft [een zwarte auto].  
 Jan has a white-*e* car and Marie has a black-*e* car  
 ‘Jan has a black car and Marie has a white one.’  
 b. Jan heeft [een witte auto<sub>[-neuter]</sub>] en Marie heeft [een zwarte].  
 Jan has a white-*e* car and Marie has a black-*e*  
 ‘Jan has a white car and Marie has a black one.’

The involvement of inflectional morphology in the ‘licensing’ of noun-elision is quite strongly suggested by the following pair:

- (8) a. Jan heeft [een wit konijn<sub>[+neuter]</sub>] en Marie heeft [een zwart konijn].  
 Jan has a white rabbit and Marie has a black rabbit  
 b. Jan heeft [een wit konijn<sub>[+neuter]</sub>] en Marie heeft [een zwarte]/%[een zwart].  
 Jan has a white rabbit and Marie has a black-*e*/a black  
 ‘Jan has a white rabbit and Marie has a black one.’

As shown by (8a), the attributive adjective has no overt inflectional morphology when it modifies an overt indefinite neuter singular noun. As illustrated in (8b), however, *-e* must be present in the context of noun ellipsis, although we should add that for many speakers the ‘bare’ adjectival form *zwart* is not completely impossible (see also section 6).

Consider next the following patterns from Afrikaans:

- (9) a. Jan het [’n wit konyn] gekoop en Pieter het [’n swart konyn] gekoop.  
 Jan has a white rabbit bought and Pieter has a black rabbit bought  
 ‘Jan bought a white rabbit and Pieter bought a black one.’  
 b. ....en Pieter het [’n swart *een*] gekoop.  
 ..and Pieter has a black one bought  
 c. ....en Pieter het [’n swart-*e*] gekoop.  
 ..and Pieter has a black-*e* bought  
 ‘..and Pieter bought a black one.’

Afrikaans seems to permit both the ‘English’ strategy, i.e. presence of an overt pro-form *een*, and the ‘Dutch’ strategy, i.e. presence of an elided noun within the structural context of a morphologically inflected adjective. As for the last property, observe that the adjective *swart* remains morphologically bare in (9a,b). It must be present, though, in (9c), where the lexical noun is elided.

Consider, finally, the following Frisian examples:

- (10) a. Ik ha [in grut hûs] en Piet [in lyts hûs].  
 I have a big house and Piet a small house  
 b. Ik ha [in grut hûs] en Piet [in lytsen].  
 I have a big house and Piet a small-en  
 ‘I own a big house and Piet owns a small one.’  
 c. Ik ha [in grut hûs] en Piet [in lytsen ien].  
 I have a big house and Piet a small-en one  
 ‘I own a big house and Piet owns a small one.’

In (10b), the attributive adjective is followed by the bound morpheme *-en*. The latter element is obligatorily present, which makes this pattern quite similar to the Dutch pattern in (8b) and the Afrikaans

pattern in (9c).<sup>4</sup> As shown in (10c), the sequence *A+-en* in Frisian can be optionally followed by the lexical item *ien* ('one'). Presence of the lexical pro-form *ien* is, of course, reminiscent of the presence of English *one* in (6b) and Afrikaans *een* in (9b).

Taking a surface perspective on NPE in the languages at issue, the following descriptive patterns can be identified: (i) a lexical pro-form pattern, as in (11a); (ii) an elision pattern featuring bound morphology ( $\mu$ ) on the adjectival remnant, as in (11b); (iii) a 'contamination' pattern displaying both a lexical pro-form 'one' and bound morphology on the adjective; see (11c).

- (11) a. Art + A + 'one' (English (6b), Afrikaans (9b))  
 b. Art + A+ $\mu$  (Dutch (7b)-(8b), Afrikaans (9c), Frisian (10b))  
 c. Art + A+ $\mu$  + 'one' (Frisian (10c))

It is obviously tempting to put forward the hypothesis that the surface pattern (11b) instantiates, at a more abstract level, the pattern in (12):

- (12) Art + A+ $\mu$  + [<sub>N</sub> *ec*] (*ec* = phonologically empty category)

In line with this analysis, the bound morpheme  $\mu$  might be analyzed as an inflectional suffix whose presence is required for the licensing of the empty (i.e. elided) noun. As will become clear, however, in the course of this paper, the elements *-e* (Afrikaans (9c)) and *-en* (Frisian (10b)) are not inflectional morphemes.<sup>5</sup> Rather, they are instances of the lexical (i.e. overt) pro-form 'one', with the special characteristic that they are phonologically weak/enclitic pro-forms. In other words, they instantiate pattern (11a), where *one* can be more precisely qualified as *one*<sub>[+weak]</sub>. The question, obviously, arises as to whether the standard Dutch NP-ellipsis patterns in (7b) and (8b) can also be reduced to pattern (11a). By taking a micro-comparative perspective on NP-ellipsis in Dutch dialects, we reach the conclusion that, while the *-e* of *zwarte* in (7b) is an inflectional morpheme, the *-e* of *zwarte* in (8b) is not.<sup>6</sup> The latter element will rather be analyzed as a weak, enclitic *pronoun* which fills the N-position and is modified by the morphologically bare adjective *zwart*. In other words, the homophonous *zwarte* in (7b) and *zwarte* in (8b) are similar at the sound surface but different at the level of morphosyntax. More specifically:

- (13) a. [een zwart-e<sub>infl</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> *ec*]] (= (7b); elision strategy)  
 b. [een zwart [<sub>NP</sub> *-e*]] (= (8b); pronoun strategy)

The outcome of our investigation will be that there are two main strategies for NPE: (i) an ellipsis strategy in which N(P) is a silent *pronoun*, and (ii) a pronoun strategy, in which N(P) is a lexical (i.e. non-silent) *pronoun*. Within this latter class, two types can be distinguished: (a) a phonologically strong pro-form (e.g. English *one*, Afrikaans *een*), and (b) a phonologically weak/enclitic pro-form (Afrikaans *-e*, Frisian *-en*, and Dutch *-e*).<sup>7</sup> For Frisian, this approach triggers a new puzzle: If *-en* in (10b) is a pronoun (occupying the N-position), then *ien* in (10c) cannot possibly be a pronoun filling the N-position as well. We will show, however, that *ien* in (12c) is a pronoun occupying the N-position, and that *-en* in (10c) is a different grammatical element than *-en* in (10b). In other words, the syntactician may in fact be fooled, also in this case, as a result of homophony, i.e. the similarity at the sound surface of two different types of grammatical categories.

Now that we have provided the reader with the descriptive patterns of the languages at issue, we will turn in the following sections to a more systematic and in-depth investigation of each of the specific languages,

<sup>4</sup> As we will see in section 5, some Frisian speakers also consider the bare adjectival form quite acceptable (e.g. *in lyts*). We will also see in that section that, besides the pattern *A+en*, Frisian also permits *A+-e*, where *-e* turns out to be an adjectival inflection.

<sup>5</sup> Also in Kester (1996:266 ff.), Afrikaans *-e* in (9c) is not interpreted as an inflectional suffix. She argues that it occupies a functional head position F which takes pro as its complement.

<sup>6</sup> More precisely, it will be argued that *zwarte* in (9b) can be either a realization of the elision strategy or a realization of the pronoun strategy. In the former case, *-e* is an inflection, in the latter case *-e* is a pro-form. See section 6 for details.

<sup>7</sup> In Kranendonk (2008), a similar approach to NP-ellipsis is developed on the basis of a microvariation analysis of Dutch NP-ellipsis phenomena involving numeral remnants.

starting with English. Recall that English NP-ellipsis features the pro-form *one*. An important question that will be addressed regards the precise categorial and syntactic status of this lexical item.

### 3. *One* as a grammatical noun

In this section we argue that the lexical item *one* in *a small one*, as in (6b), should be characterized as a grammatical noun in the sense of Emonds (1985).

#### 3.1. Grammatical nouns

In Emonds (1985), it is proposed that besides the well-known classes of lexical categories and functional categories an in-between class of categories should be distinguished, viz. the class of grammatical categories (e.g. grammatical nouns, grammatical verbs, *et cetera*).<sup>8</sup> According to Emonds, the closed class of grammatical nouns includes lexical items such as: *thing*, *self*, *place*, *body*, *time*, *way*. Emonds (1985:162) argues that these are words of the lexical category N which can be characterized as being the most frequently used and least semantically explicit members of the category noun. As regards their lexical make-up, Emonds (2000:9) states the following: “a closed grammatical class X [...] is one whose members have no purely semantic features f, but only cognitive syntactic features F.”<sup>9</sup> This absence of concept-denoting semantic features makes them descriptively empty or poor and consequently different from lexical nouns such as *car*, *house* and *woman*, which have a denotation. Following Chomsky (1965:142), Emonds argues that semantic features play no role in any syntactic rule, whereas cognitive syntactic features do (see also Chomsky 1995:230). This distinction at the featural level is exemplified in (14a) for the lexical (i.e. concept denoting) noun *thing* and in (14b) for the grammatical (i.e. non-concept denoting) noun *thing* (cf. (15)). As indicated in (14b), a grammatical noun is nothing but a constellation of cognitive, i.e. formal, features.

- (14) a. *thing* {[+N,-V], [+Common], [-Animate], [+Count],  
[semantic features]}
- b. *thing* {[+N,-V], [+Common], [-Animate], [-Count]}
- (15) a. I bought a nice *thing* (*thing* as a lexical noun)
- b. I bought something (*thing* as a grammatical noun)

The examples in (16) and (17) show that both instances of *thing* display a different (morpho)syntactic behavior. More particularly, the lexical noun *thing*, being [+count] can be pluralized; see (16a). This is impossible with the [-count] semi-lexical noun *thing*, as shown by (16b). A further distinction regards displacement: the semi-lexical noun *thing* is able to undergo N-to-D raising across an attributive adjective, yielding the surface pattern *some+thing nice* (cf. (17b)) This movement step is impossible with the lexical noun *thing*; see *\*some things nice*. The only possible order is that in (17a).

- (16) a. I bought some *things*. (plural formation)
- b. \*I bought some*things*. (no plural formation)
- (17) a. I bought [some nice *thing(s)*]. (no N-to-D)
- b. I bought [some+*thing<sub>j</sub>* nice *t<sub>j</sub>*]. (N to D raising across an adjective)

<sup>8</sup> This class of categories is also known under the label ‘semi-lexical’ (cf. Corver and Van Riemsdijk 2001). Another label one might use to characterize these nouns is that of ‘light noun’.

<sup>9</sup> Thus, purely semantic features f are only present in the lexical make-up of the open class of lexical categories N, V, A and (lexical) P. Chomsky (1995:230) gives [artifact] as an example of such a feature. Emonds’s cognitive syntactic features F are present in the lexical make-up of lexical, functional and grammatical (i.e. semi-lexical) categories. They contribute centrally to meaning (i.e. are interpretable at the CI-interface level; cf. Chomsky (1995)). The set of cognitive syntactic features includes properties such as: +/-N, +/-V, +/-PROXIMATE, +/-PLURAL, +/-DEFINITE, *et cetera*. In Chomsky (1995:230), these are referred to by the term ‘formal features’.

Another characteristic property of the grammatical noun *thing* concerns its phonology. Grammatical nouns like *thing* typically do not carry phonological stress. Compare the following examples:

- (18) a. There are some THINGS on the floor. (*THINGS* = lexical noun)  
 b. There is SOMething on the floor. (*thing* = grammatical noun)

### 3.2. The grammatical noun *one*

One of the lexical items that Emonds identifies as a grammatical noun is the lexical pro-form *one* (cf. Emonds 1985: 162); see also Postal 1966, Schütze 2001, Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002 for discussion of the pro-form *one*). It is clear that *one* lacks descriptive content (i.e. does not have semantic features); it does not intrinsically refer to some object or entity, but receives its contents from a nominal antecedent (e.g. *car* in (6b)) or from a situationally available referent (as in: *Wow, that's a fast one!* [while speaker is pointing at a car]).<sup>10</sup>

Even though *one* lacks the semantic characteristics of nouns such as *car*, *picture*, *et cetera*, it is clear that it behaves like any other noun as regards its (morpho)syntactic behavior. First of all, it can inflect for number, as shown in (19b)<sup>11</sup>. Secondly, it can be part of a DP headed by a determiner, as in (20b). Thirdly, it can be preceded by a (sequence of) attributive adjective(s), as is illustrated in (21b). And, finally, it can be followed by prepositional and clausal modifiers; see (22b) and (23b), respectively. See also Schütze (2001).

- (19) a. The new designs are much better than the old designs.  
 b. The new designs are much better than the old *ones*.  
 (20) a. Do you like this picture better than that picture?  
 b. Do you like this *one* better than that *one*?  
 (21) a. Would you like the small red bike or the small blue bike?  
 b. Would you like the small red *one* or the small blue *one*?  
 (22) a. Peter recognized the man from Brazil and Bill the man from Cuba.  
 b. Peter recognized the man from Brazil and Bill the *one* from Cuba.  
 (23) a. For this desert I need bananas that aren't fully ripe yet.  
 b. For this desert I need *ones* that aren't fully ripe yet.

In view of this nominal behavior of the pro-form *one*, the conclusion must be that it is a category of the type [+N,-V], i.e. a noun.

<sup>10</sup> There is another way in which *one* semantically differs from regular nouns, namely it cannot occur with arguments (Lakoff 1970, crediting Baker; see also Jackendoff 1977: 58, Schütze 2001:134, Panagiotidis 2003a,b):

- (i) a. \*Jack met the king of England, and I met the one of France.  
 b. Jack met the king from England, and I met the one from France.  
 (ii) a. \*the treatment of Bill and the one of Sue  
 b. the treatment by the psychologist and the one by the psychiatrist  
 (iii) a. \*the rumor that Bill would be fired and the one that John would keep his  
 job  
 b. the rumor that John heard yesterday and the one that Mary had heard the  
 day before

Traditionally, the ill-formedness of the a-examples in (i)-(iii) was explained by stipulating that *one* substitutes for the constituent N'. Under the assumption that *one* is a grammatical noun, i.e. N<sup>0</sup>, this analysis is no longer available. However, following Schütze (2001) and Panagiotidis (2003a,b), we will assume that the English grammatical noun *one* does not project a complement position in syntax, because it has no thematic grid of its own. Nor is it able to inherit 'argumental' properties from the antecedent noun. Since this property *one* is not crucial to the general idea in this paper we will not discuss this property of pro-forms like *one* in much detail.

<sup>11</sup> In this respect is also differs from the grammatical noun *thing* which cannot be pluralized. It is interesting to note that there are inter- and intralanguage differences between the properties of grammatical nouns. An in depth discussion of these differences is beyond the scope of this paper, however.

Having determined that *one* is a [+N,-V] category without any semantic features (i.e. lacking intrinsic descriptive contents), we should next ask what its formal (i.e. cognitive) syntactic feature make-up looks like. An important characteristic of the pro-form *one* is that it can only substitute for count nouns, and not for mass nouns (cf. Schütze 2001, Barbiers 2005):

- (24) a. Would you like a red bike or a white one?  
b. \*Would you like red wine or white one?

This brings us to the following lexical characterization of the English grammatical noun *one*:

- (25) *one* {[+N,-V], [Count: +], [Number: sg/pl]}

Thus, *one* is a lexical item with a nominal categorial feature specification and a syntactico-semantic (i.e. formal) feature that expresses countability. It can further be used as a singular noun (*one*) or as a plural noun (*ones*).<sup>12</sup>

#### 4. NP-ellipsis in Afrikaans

##### 4.1 Adjectival inflection

In this section we will present an in-depth discussion of the patterns of NP-ellipsis as attested in Afrikaans. Before turning to these patterns, we should first make a few remarks about the inflectional behavior of attributive adjectives in Afrikaans. As opposed to other Germanic languages, the presence versus absence of inflection on attributive adjectives is not determined by grammatical features such as gender, number, or (in)definiteness.<sup>13</sup> This is exemplified in (26) and (27), which show that the form of the attributive AP remains constant no matter what its direct syntactic surrounding is:

- (26) a. 'n/die *mooi* man<sub>sg</sub>  
a/the handsome man  
b. 'n/die *mooi* vrou<sub>sg</sub>  
a/the pretty woman
- (27) a. *mooi* manne<sub>pl</sub>  
handsome guys  
a.' die *mooi* manne<sub>pl</sub>  
those handsome guys  
b. *mooi* vroue<sub>pl</sub>  
pretty women  
b.' die *mooi* vroue<sub>pl</sub>  
those pretty women

A major factor in the inflectional behavior of the attributive adjective in Afrikaans is the syllabic form of the adjective. More specifically, monosyllabic adjectives such as *mooi* (pretty/handsome), *wit* (white), *duur* (expensive) *lang* (long) and *swart* (black) *et cetera*, typically do not carry any inflection (i.e., *-e*) when they are used attributively. On the other hand, polysyllabic ones such as *lewendig* (lively) *lelik* (ugly) and *onverwagt* (unexpected) do carry inflection (see Donaldson 1993).<sup>14</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Schütze (2001:129) proposes a further characteristic property of the grammatical noun *one* and semi-lexical categories, more in general. He argues that semi-lexical categories are last resort defaults which spell out syntactic positions whose presence is forced by purely formal requirements. See Barbiers (2005) for an alternative analysis, according to which *one*-insertion is not a last resort strategy. Rather, *one* is present in the numeration. In this paper, we will follow the line taken by Barbiers.

<sup>13</sup> As a matter of fact, Afrikaans does not morphologically distinguish the property 'gender'. For example, the form of the (in)definite article is constant and not sensitive to any gender distinction, such as neuter versus non-neuter.

<sup>14</sup> There are exceptions to this generalization; more specifically: monosyllabic adjectives ending in /d/, /f/, /x/, and /s/ can also take *-e*; e.g.



- (28) a. Jan het ['n wit konyn] gekoop.  
Jan has a white rabbit bought  
b. Jan het vandag ['n lang vergadering].  
Jan has today a long meeting  
c. Dit is ['n mooi kind].  
This is a beautiful child
- (29) a. 'n lewendig\*(-e) wedstryd  
a lively(-e) match  
b. 'n lelik\*(-e) gesig  
an ugly(-e) face  
c. onverwagt\*(-e) verliese  
unexpected(-e) losses

Thus, in noun phrases featuring a sequence of attributive adjectives, it is possible to have one adjective carrying the inflection *-e* and another one showing up in its 'bare' form:

- (30) a. 'n lang lewendig-e vergadering  
a long lively-e meeting  
'a long, lively meeting'  
b. 'n lelik-e groen romp  
an ugly-e green dress  
'an ugly, green dress'

Turning now to NP-ellipsis in Afrikaans, we observe the following two patterns: one pattern in which the noun is substituted for by a pro-form *een* 'one', and a second pattern in which the adjective is followed by *-e*. The two patterns are illustrated in (31) for NP-ellipsis having a monosyllabic AP as a remnant:

- (31) Jan het ['n wit konyn] gekoop ...  
Jan has a white rabbit bought....
- a. ...en Gert het ['n swart konyn] gekoop.  
..and Gert has a black rabbit bought
- b. ...en Gert het ['n swart *een*] gekoop. (A+*een*)  
..and Gert has a black one bought
- c. ...en Gert het ['n swart\*(-e)] gekoop. (A+*-e*)  
..and Gert has a black(-e) bought
- d. \*.en Gert het ['n swarte *een*] gekoop. (\*A+*-e een*)  
..and Gert has a black-e one bought

(31b) exemplifies the *een*-strategy and (31c) the strategy featuring what, at first sight, looks like an inflection (i.e. *-e*) on the adjective. As shown in (31d), *een* and *-e* cannot cooccur; they are in complementary distribution with each other.

Consider next NP-ellipsis having a polysyllabic AP as its remnant:

- (32) Jan het ['n pragtige konyn] gekoop...

- 
- |     |    |                   |     |                     |
|-----|----|-------------------|-----|---------------------|
| (i) | a. | *'n vreemd gevoel | a.' | 'n vreemde gevoel   |
|     |    | a strange feeling |     | a strange-e feeling |
|     | b. | *styf spiere      | b.' | stywe spiere        |
|     |    | stiff muscles     |     | stiff-e muscles     |
|     | c. | *snaaks dinge     | c.' | snaakse dinge       |
|     |    | funny things      |     | funny-e things      |

- Jan has a beautiful-e rabbit bought...
- a. ... en Gert het ['n lelike konyn] gekoop.  
... and Gert has a ugly-e rabbit bought
- b. ... en Gert het ['n lelike een] gekoop. (A+-e een)  
... and Gert has a ugly-e one bought
- c. ... en Gert het ['n lelike] gekoop. (A+-e)  
... and Gert has a ugly-e bought

Importantly, *lelik*, being a polysyllabic adjective, carries the adjectival inflection *-e* when it is followed by an (overt) noun like *konyn*, as in (32a). This inflected adjectival form *lelike* is also attested before the pro-form *een*, as in (32b). Example (32c), finally, shows that *lelike* is also found when the noun is elided.

In what follows we will examine each of the two patterns more in depth, starting with the pattern featuring *een*, as in (31b) and (32b).

#### 4.2 'n swart een ('a black one'): a pronominalization strategy.

We propose that *een* is the Afrikaans equivalent of English *one*. We further assume that, just like *one*, the pronoun *een* should be interpreted as a grammatical noun replacing N(P). Its status as a grammatical or light noun is suggested by the emptiness of its descriptive content; *een* receives its content from its linguistic (or situational) context.<sup>15</sup>

The nominal (i.e. [+N,-V]) status of *een* is supported by the fact that it can combine with the diminutive morpheme *-etjie*, which typically combines with nouns, as in *mannetjie* (man+etjie, 'little man'), *ringetjie* (ring+etjie, 'little ring'):<sup>16</sup>

- (33) a. Pieter het [die wit hasie] gekoop en Gert het [*die swart enetjie*] gekoop.  
Pieter has the white rabbit bought and Gert has the black one-DIM bought  
'Pieter bought the white rabbit and Gert bought the black one.'
- b. *een+etjie*<sub>DIM</sub>

According to Donaldson (1993:170), plural morphology is found after *een* in non-standard speech, as in *die groot enes* (the big ones). Although our informants reject this pattern, some of them do permit the presence of plural morphology when there is also diminutive morphology present after *een*, as in the following example:<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup> As opposed to English *one*, Afrikaans *een* can combine with an internal argument, although some speakers feel a subtle contrast in well-formedness between (ia) and (ib).<sup>15</sup>

- (i) a. %Ek vind [die koningin van Nederland] meer aangenaam as [*die een van Engeland*]  
I find that queen of (the) Netherlands more kind than the one of England  
b. Ek vind [die koningin uit Nederland] meer aangenaam as [*die een uit Engeland*]  
I find that queen from (the) Netherlands more kind than the one from England

- (ii) [Die gerug dat Bill ontslaan sou word] en [*die een dat Marie haar pos sou behou*], veroorsaak baie oproer.  
The rumor that Bill fired would be and the one that Marie her job would keep caused much commotion

<sup>16</sup> The diminutive morpheme has other allomorphs besides *-etjie*: e.g. *-jie*, *-tjie*, *-kie*, *-pie*, *-ie*. The ending depends on the final sound in the noun. The ending *-etjie* is found after monosyllabic nouns containing a short vowel and ending in *b*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *ng* or *r*. See Donaldson (1993:87). As we will see later, we find the form *ene* besides *een*, especially in spoken language. Possibly, then, *enetjie* may (also) be formed from: *ene* + *tjie*.

<sup>17</sup> Thus, our informants reject:

- (i) \*Pieter het die wit hasies gekoop en Gert het die swart enes gekoop.  
Pieter has the white rabbits bought and Gert has the black ones bought

- (34) a. Pieter het [die wit hasies] gekoop en Gert het [*die swart enetjies*] gekoop. Pieter  
has the white rabbits bought and Gert has the black one-DIM-pl  
bought  
'Pieter bought the (small) white rabbit and Gert bought the (small) black  
ones.'  
b. *een*+etjie<sub>DIM</sub>+ <sub>SPL</sub>

Finally, just like English *one*, Afrikaans *een* can only have a count reading, and not a mass reading:

- (35) a. Wil jy ['n rooi fiets] of ['n wit *een*] hê?  
Would you a red bike or a white one (like to) have?  
'Would you like to have a red bike or a white one?'  
b. \*Wil jy [rooiwyn] of [wit *een*] hê?  
Would you red wine or white one (like to) have?

In view of the above, we conclude that the Afrikaans grammatical noun *een* has the following lexical entry. Observe that it is slightly different from English *one* (see (25)) in the sense that it is lexically specified as being singular.<sup>18</sup>

- (36) *een* {[+N,-V], [Count: +], [Number: sg]}

#### 4.2 Een swarte (a black-e, 'a black one'): *elision or pronominalization?*

Let us now turn to the second strategy used in Afrikaans NP-ellipsis, i.e. the pattern featuring *-e* right after the attributive adjective *swart* in (31c). Obviously, the question should be addressed as to how to interpret this bound morpheme. As a first hypothesis, one might propose that *-e* is an inflection, i.e. the same inflectional morpheme that is attached to polysyllabic adjectives like *lelik* in (32). The idea would be that *-e* shows up after a monosyllabic adjective like *swart* as a sort of default inflectional suffix, which helps to license the empty noun position following the adjectival remnant. Although on the basis of 'simplex' noun phrases featuring an adjectival remnant consisting of a single adjective, this analysis might seem plausible, it is quite obvious that it should be rejected once we consider instances of NP-ellipsis in which the adjectival remnant of ellipsis consists of more than one adjective. Consider, for example, the following sentences:

- (37) Jan het ['n groot wit konyn] gekoop ...  
Jan has a big white rabbit bought...  
'Jan bought a big white rabbit..  
a. ...en Piet het ['n groot swarte --] gekoop.  
...and Piet has a big black-*e* -- bought  
..and Piet bought a big black one.'  
b. \*...en Piet het ['n grote swarte --] gekoop.  
..and Piet has a big-*e* black-*e* -- bought  
c. \*...en Piet het ['n groot swart --] gekoop.  
..and Piet has a big black -- bought  
d. \*...en Piet het ['n grote swart --] gekoop.

<sup>18</sup> The question arises how plural morphology gets in when the diminutive morphology is added to *een* (see (34a)). In the line of Borer (2005), one might propose an analysis which takes the property of countability to be associated with a functional category within the extended nominal projection. Borer refers to this functional category as 'Div(ider)', which is a functional head having a divisional function on mass. One might hypothesize that the diminutive morpheme is a possible realization of Div (i.e. it turns a mass noun into a count noun) and that count-properties such as singular and plural and their morphological realization are associated with Div. An in-depth analysis of the interaction between the diminutive morpheme and plural formation falls beyond the scope of the present article.

..and Piet has a big-*e* black -- bought

The only well-formed pattern is (37a). In the elided noun phrase, it is only the final adjective (i.e. *swart*) in the sequence of (monosyllabic) adjectives that carries the morpheme *-e*. As shown by the ill-formed (37b), it is impossible to have *-e* attached to both of the adjectives that together constitute the adjectival remnant. The pair (37a,b) suggests that *-e* on *swart* should not be interpreted as an adjectival inflection, for, if it were an inflection, the marker *-e* should arguably be present on both adjectives. The ill-formedness of (37c) is due to the absence of *-e* on the adjectival remnant, more specifically, on *swart*. The ungrammatical (37d), finally, shows that the structure cannot be ‘rescued’ if the marker *-e* is present on the first of the two adjectives.

Another observation that suggests that the marker *-e* appearing after the adjective is not an inflectional marker comes from coordination. Consider the following example:

- (38) a. Dit is [’n dom en stout kind].  
This is a stupid and naughty child  
b. Dit is [’n dom en stout *een*].  
This is a stupid and naughty one  
c. Dit is [’n dom en stoute]. [A & A]-*e*  
This is a stupid and naughty-*e*  
‘This is a stupid and naughty one.’

In (38a-c), we find a noun phrase containing a coordinate structure consisting of two attributive APs. In (38a), the lexical noun *kind* ‘child’ is modified, in (38b) the grammatical noun *een* ‘one’ is modified. (38c) exemplifies the pattern featuring the marker *-e*. What is interesting is that in this example *-e* only appears after the second adjective. That is, the monosyllabic adjective *dom* ‘stupid’ is not immediately followed by an instance of *-e*. The appearance of *-e* only on the final (monosyllabic) adjective suggests that *-e* is not an adjectival inflection, since adjectival inflections typically appear attached to each of the two coordinated adjectives.<sup>19</sup> This is illustrated in (39a,b), where we have two coordinated polysyllabic adjectives.

- (39) a. Marie is [’n gelukkige en dankbare vrou].  
Marie is a happy-*e* and grateful-*e* woman  
‘Marie is a happy and grateful woman.’  
b. \*Marie is [’n gelukkig en dankbare vrou].

In (39), we see that both polysyllabic adjectives require the presence of the inflectional marker *-e*. When it is present only on the right adjectival conjunct, as in (39b), the structure is ungrammatical.

Now that we know that the *-e* following the (monosyllabic) adjectival remnant in (31c) is not an adjectival inflection, the question should be raised as to what kind of element *-e* is. Our answer to this question is that *-e* is a phonologically weak equivalent of the pronoun *een*. That is, just like the pro-form *een* in (40a), the enclitic pro-form *e* substitutes for N, as in (40b):<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup> The possibility of (phonologically) attaching *-e* to the right branch member of a coordinate structure is reminiscent of the enclitic behavior of the possessive morpheme *’s* in a structure like (i):

(i) [John and Mary’s] car

In this example, the possessive morpheme *’s* is attached to the coordinate structure *John and Mary*. This placement suggests that *’s* should not be interpreted as a genitival case suffix, given the fact that case suffixes are typically realized on both (nominal) members of a coordinate structure. Given examples like (i), it has been argued that *’s* should be interpreted as an enclitic element which is base-generated in a functional head position, e.g. D (cf. Abney 1987, Corver 1990). In PF, the possessive morpheme cliticizes onto the possessor.

<sup>20</sup> As indicated in (40), we will assume in this article that attributive APs appear in a position adjoined to NP. We should add, though, that nothing hinges on this analysis. That is, an analysis in which attributive APs are located in the Spec-position of some functional head, as in Cinque (1994), is also compatible with the overall analysis of NP-ellipsis as presented in this article.

- (40) Jan het ['n groot wit konyn] gekoop ..  
 Jan has a big white rabbit bought..  
 'Jan bought a big white rabbit..  
 a. ... en Piet het ['n [<sub>NP</sub> groot [<sub>NP</sub> swart [<sub>NP</sub> een]]]] gekoop.  
 ... and Piet has a big black one bought  
 b. ... en Piet het ['n [<sub>NP</sub> groot [<sub>NP</sub> swart [<sub>NP</sub> -e]]]] gekoop.  
 ... and Piet has a big black -e bought  
 ... and Piet bought a big black one.'

Some of the phenomena discussed above support the analysis in (40b). First of all, the complementary distribution of *een* and *-e*, as illustrated in (31d) follows if the *-e* occupies the same syntactic position as the grammatical noun *een*. Secondly, the fact that *-e* only appears right after the final adjective in a sequence of monosyllabic adjectives directly follows if *-e* fills the N-position; see (37). From this perspective, 'n groot swarte in (37a) has the same structural make-up as 'n groot swart een in (40a), the only difference being the filler of the N-slot (see (40b)).

Thus, 'n grot-e swart-e in (37b) is out for the same reason why 'n groot een swart een (a big one black one, 'a big black one') or for that matter 'n groot konyn swart konyn (a big rabbit black rabbit, 'a big black rabbit') is out. That is, neither the grammatical noun (*een*, *e*) nor the lexical noun (*konyn*) can combine with (i.e., select) a complement-noun phrase. As pointed out above, if *-e* were simply some sort of adjectival inflection, it would remain unclear why only a single instance of A+-e can be part of the adjectival remnant of ellipsis.

Also the coordination pattern in (38c), with *-e* following only the second adjectival conjunct, is immediately accounted for if *-e* is an element occupying the N-position. This is illustrated in (41b), which is structurally parallel to (41a), which features the strong pro-form *een*.

- (41) a. Dit is ['n [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> dom en stout] [<sub>NP</sub> een]]].  
 This is a stupid and naughty one  
 b. Dit is ['n [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> dom en stout] [<sub>NP</sub> -e]]]. [A & A]-e  
 This is a stupid and naughty-e

Some additional support for the N-status of *-e* comes from morphology. As the reader may recall, the grammatical noun *een* can be followed by a diminutive morpheme (cf. (33)). Since diminutive morphemes typically attach to nouns, we drew the conclusion that *een* is a noun-like element. What is interesting is that in Afrikaans we also find the diminutive morpheme attached after an A+-e combination like *swart-e*. This is exemplified in (42) and (43):

- (42) a. Jan het ['n wit hasie] gekoop en Gert het ['n swartetjie] gekoop.  
 Jan has a white rabbit and Gert has a black-e-DIM  
 'Jan has a white rabbit and Gert has a black one.'  
 b. ['n [<sub>NP</sub> swart [<sub>NP</sub> -e+tjie]]]  
 (43) a. Dit is 'n dom en stoutetjie.  
 This is a stupid and evil-e-DIM  
 'This is a stupid and naughty one.'  
 b. ['n [<sub>NP</sub> [<sub>AP</sub> dom en stout] [<sub>NP</sub> -e+tjie]]]

Another morphological argument in favor of the N-status of *-e* comes from the distribution of the plural morpheme *-s*. As shown in (44), the plural morpheme *-s* can be attached to the sequence A+-e (see also Kester 1996):

- (44) a. Jan het [die groot wit hasies] gekoop en Gert het die [groot swartes]  
 gekoop.  
 Jan has those big white rabbits bought and Gert has those big black-e-s

bought  
 ‘Jan bought those big white rabbits and Gert bought those big black ones.’

- b. Jan en Kees zijn [dom en stoutes].  
 Jan and Kees are stupid and naughty-e-s  
 ‘Jan and Kees are stupid and naughty ones (e.g. boys).’

Consider, finally, the following example in which we find both a diminutive morpheme and a plural morpheme after the sequence *A+-e*:

- (45) Jan het [die soet wit hasies] gekoop en Gert het [die soet swartetjies] gekoop.  
 Jan has those sweet white rabbits bought and Gert has those sweet black-DIM-PL bought  
 ‘Jan bought those sweet white rabbits and Gert bought those sweet black ones.’

The word *swartetjies* has the following structure: *swart + e + tjie + s*, i.e. *A-e-DIM-PL*. What looks like a single complex word at the surface, actually has a syntactic structure, namely:

- (46)  $[_{NP} \text{ swart } [_{NP} [_{N} -e+tjie+s]]]$

One might raise the question as to why Afrikaans, as opposed to, for example, English has two pro-forms, viz., *een* and *-e*? The co-existence of these two forms might be motivated by the fact that they do not display a completely similar distribution. As we saw above, *een* cannot take plural morphology (*\*die groot enes*, ‘the big ones’) whereas *e* can (*die grotes*, ‘the big ones’). This might be taken as evidence for the fact that the pro-forms *een* and *e* have a slightly different lexical feature specification:<sup>21</sup>

- (47) a. *een* {[+N,-V], [count: +], [number: sg]}  
 b. *e* {[+N,-V], [count: +], [number: sg/pl]}

So far, we have argued that the *e* which appears after a monosyllabic adjectival remnant in Afrikaans NPE is not an adjectival inflection, but rather a pro-form which ‘substitutes’ for N. Recall that polysyllabic adjectives do carry an adjectival inflection when they modify a noun; see (29). The question therefore arises how to interpret *e*, when this element appears after a polysyllabic adjectival remnant in an NPE-environment. We will close off this section about Afrikaans NPE by addressing this question.

Consider the examples in (48):

- (48) a. Jan het [’n pragtige konyn] gekoop en Gert het [’n lelike (een)] gekoop.  
 Jan has a beautiful-*e* rabbit bought and Gert has a ugly-*e* (one) bought  
 ‘Jan bought a beautiful rabbit and Gert bought an ugly one.’  
 b. Jan het [’n pragtige konyn] gekoop en Gert het [’n lelike] gekoop.

(48a) shows that the inflected adjective can be followed by an overt pro-form: *een*. Example (48b) suggests that *lelike* can also constitute an adjectival remnant on its own. A first hypothesis would be to say that, in (48b), there is a phonologically empty (i.e., silent) pro-form occupying the N(P)-position, and that the

<sup>21</sup> As an alternative, one might explore the idea that there is a single lexical pro-form in Afrikaans, which surfaces in different forms (i.e., allomorphs). At this point, it seems relevant to point out that besides *een* we also find *ene*. Thus ‘the/that big one’ may be paraphrased in three ways in Afrikaans: *die groot een*, *die groot ene*, and *die grot-e*. One might hypothesize that *een* and *e* are reduced variants of the form *ene*. More specifically:

- (i) a. *ene*  
 b. *ee~~ne~~*  
 c. *~~ene~~*

Possibly, which surface form appears is just a matter of PF-spell out. The question remains then why *e* can appear with plural morphology, whereas *een/ene* cannot.

morphology on the adjective (*-e*) licenses the presence of the silent NP (see (49)).<sup>22</sup> In other words, the idea would be that with an adjectival remnant consisting of a polysyllabic adjective (carrying agreement morphology), Afrikaans uses the elision strategy. Schematically:

(49) [<sub>NP</sub> *lelike* [<sub>NP</sub> ONE]]]

Such an analysis faces a number of problems, however. A first objection against this analysis is the following: Given the fact that the Afrikaans adjectival inflection *-e* does not express any phi-features (gender, number), it is not really clear what the licensing role of *-e* would be with respect to ONE. Furthermore, if *-e* were an adjectival inflection licensing the presence of ONE, it would remain unclear why the pattern in (50c), where we have an adjectival remnant consisting of two coordinated polysyllabic adjectives, is out. That is, if a single inflected adjective is able to license ONE, why wouldn't two coordinated inflected adjectives not be able to license the silent noun?

- (50) a. Marie is [<sub>NP</sub> *gelukkige en dankbare vrou*].  
 Marie is a happy-*e* and grateful-*e* woman  
 'Marie is a happy and grateful woman.'  
 b. Marie is [<sub>NP</sub> *gelukkige en dankbare een*].  
 Marie is a happy and grateful one  
 c. \* Marie is [<sub>NP</sub> *gelukkige en dankbare*].  
 Marie is a happy-*e* and grateful-*e*  
 'Marie is a happy and grateful one.'

An alternative hypothesis about the NPE-pattern '*n lelike* in (48b) would be to say that, similarly to monosyllabic adjectival remnants such as *swart-e*, polysyllabic adjectival remnants are actually followed by a phonologically weak pro-form *e*. Thus, the syntactic representation looks as in (51a), which is similar to the one corresponding to '*n lelike een* in (51b):

- (51) a. [<sub>NP</sub> *lelike* [<sub>NP</sub> *-e*]]]  
 b. [<sub>NP</sub> *lelike* [<sub>NP</sub> *een*]]]

The idea would be now that when syntactic representation (51a) is mapped onto phonology (i.e., receives a sound representation), only a single *e*-sound survives at the sound surface. That is, a sequence of identical sounds *e* (i.e., schwa) is pronounced as a single schwa as a result of phonological deletion of one of the adjacent identical sounds. One might interpret this as a sort of haplology effect.<sup>23</sup> Let's suppose that the inflectional *-e* is eliminated (under adjacency) and that the pro-form *e* 'survives' at PF (i.e. *lelik-~~e~~ e* = /le:likə/).<sup>24</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Following Kayne (2003), we will represent a silent (i.e. phonologically empty) NP as ONE. Thus, we won't use *pro* in what follows.

<sup>23</sup> Normally, the notion of haplology is used for the elimination of a syllable when two consecutive identical or similar syllables occur. For the purposes of this article, we extend this notion here to the elimination of a sound in a sequence of identical sounds.

<sup>24</sup> A further illustration of the elimination of the sound 'schwa' when it is immediately followed by another sound 'schwa' comes from the Dutch examples in (i) and (iii), where we find instances of the adjectives *stupid* 'stupid' and *morbide* 'morbid', which used to be loanwords from French (17<sup>th</sup> century). Importantly, the *e* that appears at the end of the adjective is not an adjectival inflection, which is shown by the fact that this *e* also appears when the adjective modifies an (indefinite) neuter singular noun (see (ia',b')). Recall that the adjectival inflection *-e* does not show up in these environments. Compare, for example, with: *een stom(\*-e) gezicht* (a stupid(\*-e) look/face) and *een stom(\*-e) grapje* (a stupid(\*-e) joke).

- |      |    |   |     |   |
|------|----|---|-----|---|
| (i)  | a. | een <i>stupid</i> opmerking <sub>[-neuter, +sg]</sub> | a.' | een <i>stupid</i> gezicht <sub>[+neuter, +sg]</sub> |
|      |    | a stupid remark                                       |     | a stupid look/face                                  |
|      | b. | een <i>morbide</i> grap <sub>[-neuter, +sg]</sub>     | b.' | een <i>morbide</i> grapje <sub>[+neuter, +sg]</sub> |
|      |    | a morbid joke   |     | a morbid joke-DIM                                   |
| (ii) | a. | een nog <i>stupider</i> gezicht                       | b.  | een nog <i>morbider</i> grapje                      |
|      |    | an even stupid-er look/face                           |     | an even morbid-er joke                              |

Support for the presence of a pro-form *e* in Afrikaans NPE-contexts featuring a polysyllabic adjectival remnant comes from patterns such as those in (52b) and (53b), where a plural morpheme *-s* and a diminutive morpheme *-tjie*, respectively, follow the adjectival remnant. The presence of these morphemes directly follows from an analysis which takes a phonologically weak pronoun *e* to occupy N.<sup>25</sup>

- (52) a. Ek werk liever met [dankbare mense] as met [ondankbare mense].  
I work preferably with grateful people than with ungrateful people  
b. Ek werk liever met [dankbare mense] as met [ondankbares].  
I work preferably with grateful people than with ungrateful-s  
'I prefer to work with grateful people rather than with ungrateful ones.'
- (53) a. Marie is ['n (on)dankbare enetjie].  
Marie is an (un)grateful one-DIM  
'Marie is an ungrateful one (e.g. child).'  
b. Marie is ['n (on)dankbar-e-tjie].  
Marie is an (un)grateful-e-DIM  
'Marie is an ungrateful one (e.g. child).'

The question arises whether the analysis of ellipsis with polysyllabic adjectives exemplified in (51a) can shed some light on the quite surprising fact in (50c), i.e., the fact that two coordinated polysyllabic adjectives cannot occur as an adjectival remnant? Quite tentatively, we suggest that the ill-formedness results from a conflict between two requirements, namely, first of all, the requirement that haplology (i.e., deletion of a sound in a sequence of identical sounds) only applies when two sounds are linearly adjacent, and secondly the requirement that computational operations applying to a coordinate structure typically operate in an across-the-board fashion.<sup>26</sup> Let us clarify this by considering the representation in (54), where in line with the second hypothesis a weak pronoun *e* occupies N:

'an even more stupid look/face'			'an even more morbid joke'		
<p>The examples (ia,b), in which the attributive adjective modifies an indefinite non-neuter singular noun, display a single schwa-sound at the end of the word, even though adjectival modifiers typically take an adjectival inflection <i>-e</i> in this structural context (Compare: <i>een stom</i>*(-<i>e</i>) <i>opmerking</i>, a stupid*(-<i>e</i>) remark, and <i>een vreemd</i>*(-<i>e</i>) <i>grap</i>, a strange*(-<i>e</i>) joke). That is, the surface forms <i>stupid</i> and <i>morbid</i> arguably look like (iia,b) at a more abstract level but are pronounced with a single schwa-sound at the end of the word as a result of elimination of one of the schwas; let's assume the inflectional one), as is exemplified in (iia',b').</p>					
(iii)	a.	een stupide- <i>e</i> opmerking a stupid- <i>e</i> remark	a.'	een stupide- <del>e</del> opmerking	
	b.	een morbide- <i>e</i> grap a morbid- <i>e</i> joke	b.'	een morbid- <del>e</del> grap	

We propose that in (iia,b) a similar schwa-deletion process takes place. More specifically, the schwa of the comparative bound morpheme *-er* (as in: *domm-er*, *stupid-er*, stupid-er 'more stupid' and *vreemd-er*, strange-er, 'more strange') is deleted when it is immediately preceded by the *e* of *stupide/morbide*. Schematically:

- (iv) a. een nog stupide-*er* gezicht a.' een nog stupide-~~er~~ gezicht  
an even stupid-COMPAR look/face  
'an even more stupid look/face'  
b. een nog morbide-*er* grapje b.' een nog morbide-~~er~~ grapje  
an even morbid-COMPAR joke-DIM  
'an even more morbid joke'

We would like to thank Mieke Trommelen for discussion of the contents of this note.

<sup>25</sup> Not all our informants fully accept the presence of *-s* and *tjie* in (52b) and (53b).

<sup>26</sup> Thus, a consequence of this analysis is that ATB rule application does not only hold of syntactic rules operating on coordinate structures but also to phonological rules. It goes without saying that deeper investigation of this proposal is necessary.



(54) [DP 'n [NP [ConjP gelukkig-*e* [Conj' en dankbar-*e*]] [NP *e*]]]

In this representation, the two coordinated adjectives carry the inflection *-e*. Applying the haplology rule to the adjective *dankbare* 'grateful' would satisfy the adjacency requirement but be in conflict with the ATB-requirement on computational (including phonological) operations on coordinate structures.<sup>27</sup> Notice that, if the deletion did apply in an ATB-way, yielding the ill-formed sequence *\*'n gelukkig en dankbare*, we would have a violation of the adjacency requirement on haplology; the *-e* of *gelukkige* is not adjacent to the pro-form *e*. The two scenarios are depicted in (55):<sup>28</sup>

- (55) a. \* [DP 'n [NP [ConjP gelukkig-*e* [Conj' en dankbar-~~*e*~~]] [NP *e*]]] (ATB-violation)  
 b. \* [DP 'n [NP [ConjP gelukkig-~~*e*~~ [Conj' en dankbar-*e*]] [NP *e*]]] (haplology-violation)

In summary: from our investigation of NP-ellipsis in Afrikaans, the following picture emerges. Afrikaans is a language which uses a pronominalization strategy for NPE. It has two pro-forms which can substitute for N: First of all, the (phonologically independent) grammatical noun *een* (and *ene*), which can be modified by a monosyllabic adjective (31b) or a polysyllabic one (32b). Secondly, it has a 'phonologically weak' grammatical noun *-e*. This enclitic noun is homophonous with the adjectival suffix *-e*, which is found attached to polysyllabic adjectives. This pro-form *e* is present in both NPE-contexts featuring a monosyllabic adjectival remnant (e.g., *in swarte*) and in NPE-contexts featuring a polysyllabic adjective (e.g., *in lelike*). In the latter example, the adjectival inflection *-e* does not surface phonologically as a result of 'haplology'. An important piece of data in our analysis of NPE in Afrikaans came from NPE-patterns featuring an adjectival remnant consisting of more than one adjective, as in *'n groot swarte* (a big black-e, 'a big black one'). The fact that *e* only appears after the final adjective of the adjectival remnant was taken as evidence for the fact that *e* is not an adjectival inflection. A second way we have introduced in this paper to determine whether a certain ending is an adjectival inflection involves coordination of adjectives. The fact that the Afrikaans *-e* does not appear on both adjectives in *'n dom en stout* (a stupid and naughty-e, 'a stupid and naughty one'), also indicates that this *-e* is not an adjectival inflection.

## 5. Frisian

5.1. *in lytse* (a small-e, 'a small one') and *in lytsen* (a small-en, 'a small one')

<sup>27</sup> Thus, haplology is a phonological rule which is active in the mapping of the syntactic structure onto a sound representation.

<sup>28</sup> It should be noted that it is also impossible to have an NPE-pattern featuring an adjectival remnant consisting of two coordinated adjectives, one of which is a monosyllabic (whence, uninflected) adjective and the other a polysyllabic (whence, inflected) one. This is exemplified in (ic). As shown by (ia,b), the coordinate structure is possible when there is present a lexical noun (*vrou*) or a strong pronominal form *een*.

- (i) a. Marie is ['n mooi en dankbare vrou].  
 Marie is a pretty and grateful woman  
 b. Marie is ['n mooi en dankbare een].  
 Marie is a pretty and grateful one  
 c. \*Marie is ['n mooi en dankbare].  
 Marie is a pretty and grateful-e  
 'Marie is a pretty and grateful one.'

The question arises what causes the ill-formedness of (ic). Under the assumption that *mooi* is a morphologically bare adjective, the haplology rule only needs to apply to the right conjunct, as in (ii).

- (ii) \* [DP 'n [NP [ConjP mooi [Conj' en dankbar-~~*e*~~]] [NP *e*]]]

Even though the linear adjacency requirement is satisfied in this structure, the structure is still out. We very tentatively propose that this should be interpreted as a sort of Coordinate Structure Constraint effect (cf. Ross 1967). More specifically, a computational rule (in this case a phonological rule deleting the adjectival inflection *-e*) only applies to a single conjunct. This is forbidden, just like it is forbidden to apply syntactic displacement to a single conjunct.

In this section, we will examine the patterns of noun phrase ellipsis as found in Frisian. Before discussing these patterns, we will first say a few words about the morphosyntactic behavior of attributive adjectives in non-elided nominal contexts. Consider for this the examples in (56) and (57), which show, respectively, adjectival inflection within a definite noun phrase and adjectival inflection within an indefinite noun phrase.

- (56) a. it *lytse* hûs (neuter gender)  
the small house  
b. de *lytse* man / ko (common gender)  
the small-e man / cow  
c. de *lytse* hûsen / manlju / kij (plural)  
the small-e houses / men / cows
- (57) a. in lyts hûs (neuter gender)  
a small house  
b. in *lytse* man / ko (common gender)  
a small-e man  
c. *lytse* hûsen / manlju / kij (plural)  
small-e houses/men/cows

The inflectional pattern that emerges from these examples is the following: the inflectional ending *-e* appears on all attributive adjectives, except for the attributive adjective modifying an indefinite singular noun. In that case, the attributive adjective does not carry any morphological ending (see (57a)).<sup>29</sup>

Let us now turn to the patterns of NP-ellipsis, starting with NP-ellipsis in the definite nominal paradigm.

- (58) a. dat<sub>neuter</sub> *lytse* (neuter gender)  
that small  
'that small one (e.g. house)'  
b. dy<sub>common</sub> *lytse* (common gender)  
that small-e  
'that small one (e.g. man / cow)'  
c. dy *lytse* (plural)  
those small-e  
'those small ones (e.g. houses / men / cows)'

Comparison of the paradigm in (56) with that in (58) shows that the morphological form of the adjectival remnant of ellipsis is the same as the one found on the adjective when the latter modifies an overt noun. More specifically, the adjective is followed by the inflectional ending *-e*.

NP-ellipsis in indefinite noun phrases gives us a more diversified picture. First of all, the strategy in which the adjectival remnant consists of *A+-e* is attested when the elided noun has common (i.e., non-neuter) gender (cf. (59)). As shown by (60a), use of the bare adjectival form yields more versatile judgments: some speakers reject it, others find it quite acceptable but indicate that they prefer the (second) strategy, which will be discussed below, featuring the sequence *-en+ien* right after the adjectival remnant.<sup>30</sup> All speakers agree that the remnant *A+-e* is excluded when the elided noun is a neuter (singular) noun (cf. (60b)).

<sup>29</sup> This inflectional paradigm is similar to the one found for standard Dutch.

<sup>30</sup> Hoekema (1996:10) gives the following Frisian example, in which the adjectival remnant either has the form *lytsen* or the form *lyts*:

- (i) Ik ha leaver in grut hûs as in lyts(en).  
I have preferably a big house than a small(-en)  
'I prefer to have a big house over a small one.'

- (59) Jan hie in witte auto en Geart *in swarte*. non-neuter noun (in A+-e)  
 Jan has a white-e car and Geart a black-e  
 ‘Jan has a white car and Geart a black one.’
- (60) a. \*/?Jan hie in lyts hûs en Geart *in grut* . neuter noun (\*/?in A)  
 Jan has a small house and Geart a big  
 ‘Jan has a small house and Geart a big one.’  
 b. \*Jan hie in lyts hûs en Geart *in grutte* . neuter noun (\*in A+-e)  
 Jan has a small house and Geart a big-e  
 ‘Jan has a small house and Geart a big one.’

Another NP-ellipsis strategy attested in Frisian is illustrated in (61):

- (61) a. Jan hie in wite auto<sub>[common]</sub> en Geart [*in swarten (ien)*].  
 Jan has a white-e car and Geart a black-en (one)  
 ‘Jan has a white car and Geart has a black one.’  
 b. Jan hie in lyts hûs<sub>[neuter]</sub> en Geart [*in grutten (ien)*].  
 Jan has a small house and Geart a big-en (one)  
 ‘Jan has a small house and Geart has a big one.’

In these examples, the remnant of NP-ellipsis consists of the combination ‘A+-en (*ien*)’. Thus, a bound morpheme *-en* immediately follows the adjective and the combination A+-*en* may be optionally followed by the lexical item *ien*. Observe that this ellipsis strategy can be used both with common singular nouns and neuter singular nouns. It should, finally, be noted that the presence of *-en* is obligatory:

- (62) a. \*Jan hie in wite auto en Geart in swart ien.  
 Jan has a white-e car and Geart a black one  
 b. \*Jan hie in lyts hûs en Geart in grut ien.  
 Jan has a small house and Geart a big one

The question, obviously, arises as to how to analyze the elements *ien* and *-en* in the sequence A+-*en (ien)*. It may be tempting to analyze the Frisian bound morpheme *-en* and the free morpheme *ien* as equivalents of Afrikaans *-e* and *een*, respectively. There is one major difference, though: In Frisian, the two elements can co-occur, whereas in Afrikaans this is completely ruled out: ‘*n swart(\*-e) een*, a black(-e) one, ‘a black one’.

In what follows, we will try to defend the following two claims: First, the Frisian bound morpheme *-en* in the pattern *in swart-en* is not an adjectival inflection (contra Barbiers 2005). Rather, it is a phonologically weak pro-NP-form that shows up in contexts of NP-ellipsis. According to this analysis, this instance of *-en* is the Frisian equivalent of Afrikaans *e*, as in ‘*n swarte* (a black-*e*, ‘a black one’). Secondly, the nominal expressions *in swarten* (a black-*en*, ‘a black one’) and *in swarten ien* (a black-*en one*, ‘a black one’) are nominal expressions having completely different syntactic configurations, even though superficially it seems to be a matter of optional presence of *ien*. Importantly, the *en* in *in swarten* is an instance of a pro-form, whereas the *en* that shows up in *in swarten ien* is an instance of the so-called spurious indefinite article, which typically shows up in noun phrases featuring the phenomenon of predicate displacement (cf. Bennis et al 1998).

## 5.2 in lyts-en (a small-*en* ‘a small one’): *-en* as a pro-form

In this section, we will show that Frisian *-en* in the NPE-expression *in lytsen* is not an adjectival inflection, but rather a pro-form substituting for N. Recall from section 4 that we introduced two tests to determine whether a certain ending is an adjectival inflection: (i) stacking of adjectives and (ii) coordination of adjectives. With respect to the first test, we expect that if an ending is an adjectival inflection, it appears on

all adjectives modifying the noun. The coordination test more or less predicts the same: if an ending is an adjectival inflection we expect to appear on all adjectives in the coordination.

First let us consider the first test to determine whether Frisian *-en* is an adjectival inflection or not: NP-ellipsis featuring an adjectival remnant consisting of a sequence of adjectives. The relevant Frisian facts are given in (63):

- (63) a. \*Jan hie [in grut wyt skrift] kocht en Geart hie [in grutten swarten] kocht.  
 Jan has a big white notebook bought and Geart has a big-en black-en bought  
 'Jan bought a big white notebook and Geart bought a big black one.'  
 b. \*Jan hie [in grutte wite auto] kocht en Geart hie [in grutten swarten] kocht.  
 Jan has a big-e white-e car bought and Geart has a big-en black-en bought  
 'Jan bought a big white car and Geart bought a big black one.'

What these examples show is that it is impossible to have more than one *A+-en* combination in the remnant of ellipsis. Recall that in Afrikaans it was impossible to have more than one *A+-e* combination in the remnant of ellipsis, as in 'n *groot/\*grote swarte* (a big(\*-e) black-e, 'a big black one'). In section 4, the impossibility of the sequence *A+-e A+-e* in Afrikaans was accounted for by saying that *-e* actually is a phonologically weak grammatical noun. Thus, Afrikaans 'n *grot-e swart-e* is out for the same reason why 'n *groot een swart een* (a big one black one, 'a big black one') is out. That is, the grammatical noun (*een, e*) cannot combine with (i.e., select) a complement-noun phrase. If *-en* were simply some sort of adjectival inflection, it would remain quite unclear why only a single instance of *A+-en* can be part of the adjectival remnant of ellipsis. Notice at this point that the inflection strategy, which we started our discussion of Frisian NP-ellipsis with (see e.g. (59)), does permit a sequence of inflected adjectives as remnant of ellipsis:<sup>31</sup>

- (64) Jan had [in grutte wite auto] en Geart [in lytse swarte]. (A+-e A+-e)  
 Jan had a big-e white-e car and Geart a small-e black-e  
 'Jan had a big white car and Geart a small black one.'

Further evidence against an analysis of *-en* as an inflectional morpheme comes from the second test introduced in this paper: coordination. Attributive adjectives appearing in a nominal context triggering the appearance of the inflectional ending *-e* should carry this inflection on both coordinated adjectives, i.e. [<sub>A</sub> *A-e* & *A-e*]. Thus, it is impossible to have the adjectival inflection only attached to the second adjectival conjunct, as in: \* [<sub>A</sub> [*A* & *A*]-*e*]. This fact is illustrated in (65) and (66):

- (65) a. Jan hat [in lytse mar djoere auto].  
 Jan has a small-e but expensive-e car  
 'Jan has a small but expensive car.'  
 b. \*Jan hat [in lyts mar djoere auto].

<sup>31</sup> In line with our earlier observation regarding the distribution of adjectival *-e* (see (60b)), it is impossible to have an adjectival remnant consisting of two stacked adjectives *A+-e A+-e* when the elided noun is contained within an indefinite, singular neuter noun phrase.

- (i) \*Jan hie in grut wyt skrift en Geart in lytse swarte  
 Jan has a big white note-book and Geart a small-e black-e  
 'Jan has a big white note-book and Geart has a small black one.'

For some speakers it is quite possible in those cases to have two morphologically bare adjectives as remnant of ellipsis. Others reject this pattern; see (60a).

- (ii) \*/? Jan hie in grut wyt skrift en Geart in lyts swart.  
 Jan has a big white note-book and Geart a small black  
 'Jan has a big white notebook and Geart a small black one.'

- (66) a. Jan hat [in lytse mar djoere].  
 Jan has a small-e but expensive-e  
 'Jan has a small but expensive one.'  
 b. \*Jan hat [in lyts mar djoere]

The ill-formedness of (65b) and (66b) is arguably due to the fact that inflectional suffixes cannot be attached to a coordinate syntactic structure consisting of two nouns.

Interestingly, speakers of Frisian feel a contrast between (66b) and the pattern in (67b), which exists next to (67a).

- (67) a. Jan hat [in lytsen mar djoeren].  
 Jan has a small-en but expensive-en  
 'Jan has a small but expensive one (e.g. car).'  
 b. ?Jan hat [in lyts maar djoeren].  
 Jan has a small but expensive-en  
 'Jan has a small but expensive one (e.g. car).'

In (67b), we have the pattern  $[[AP \& AP]-en]$ . The acceptability of this pattern is expected if *en* is a pro-form replacing N (similarly to the English pattern *a small but expensive one*). The pattern in (67b) arguably involves a coordination of two nominal constituents consisting of an AP + *en*; i.e.,  $[[AP+en] \& [AP+en]]$ .

In view of the above facts we conclude that *-en* is the Frisian equivalent of the English grammatical noun *one*.<sup>32</sup> More specifically, we will assume that it is a phonologically weak instance of the grammatical noun *ien*, which we find in expressions such as:

- (68) a. *Sa'n man* sil men mar ta man har.  
 so a man should one but as husband have  
 'Imagine having a man like this...'  
 b. *sa'nien* sil men mar ta man har. (Hoekema 1996: 28)  
 so a one (= such a one).....

<sup>32</sup> Just like Afrikaans *een* and as opposed to English *one*, Frisian *en* can combine with a complement-PP or complement-clause. Thus, unlike English *one*, (A+)*en* does not display any argument-adjunct asymmetry (Jarich Hoekstra p.c.). We will assume here that *en* is able to inherit the argumental properties of the antecedent noun. For the sake of completeness, we have also indicated that the argument-adjunct asymmetry is absent when we have the NPE-pattern 'in A+-*en ien*'.

- (i) A+*en* (ien) + complement  
 Jitse wiisde him op [in posityf besprek fan syn roman] en Jitske op in [negativen (ien) fan syn samle fersen]  
 Jitse pointed-out him to a positive review of his novel and Jitske to a negative-*en* (one) of his collected poems  
 'Jitse pointed out to him a positive review of his novel and Jitske pointed out a negative review of his collected poems.'  
 (ii) A+*en* (ien) + PP-complement  
 Jitse wiisde him [in posityf besprek yn 'e krante] en Jitske op [in negativen (ien) yn Hjir]  
 Jitse pointed-out him a positive review in the newspaper and Jitske to a negative-*en* one in Hjir  
 'Jitse pointed out to him a positive review in the newspaper and a negative review in Hjir (a literary journal).'  
 (iii) A+ *en* (ien) + CP-complement  
 Jan krige [in mûnlinge meidieling dat syn omke siik wie ] en [in skriftliken (ien) dat syn heit stoarn wie]  
 Jan got an oral announcement that his uncle ill was and a written-*en* (one) that his father died had  
 'Jan got an oral announcement that his uncle was ill and a written announcement that his father had died.'  
 (iv) A+ *en* (ien) + CP-adjunct (i.e. relative clause)  
 Jan krige [in mûnlinge meidieling dêr't er net oars fan waard] en [in skriftliken (ien) dy't er him tige neinaam]  
 Jan got an oral announcement which that he not different from became and a written-*en* one which that he him(self) against took-offence.  
 'Jan got an oral announcement which he did not care about and a written announcement which he took offence at.'

- c. *sa'nen* sil men mar ta man har.  
so one *en* (= such a one).....
- (69) a. *Hoe'n boat* wolst' hawwe?  
How a boat would (you) have  
'What kind of boat would you like to have?'
- b. *Hoe'nien* wolst' hawwe? (Hoekema 1996: 37)  
How a one (= what kind of boat)....
- c. *Hoe'nen* wolst' hawwe?  
How a *en* (= what kind of boat)....

In (68b) and (69b), we find the strong pronoun *ien*, which substitutes for *man* (68a) and *boat* (69a), respectively. In (68c) and (69c), we find the weak (enclitic) counterpart of *ien*, i.e. *en*.

Summarizing, we have analyzed two patterns of Frisian NP-ellipsis: First of all, a pattern in which the adjectival remnant has the same form as the one attested in its non-elided counterpart, i.e. *A+-e* (see (58)-(59)). Importantly, this form is not attested when the elided nominal head is part of a neuter indefinite singular noun phrase (see (60b)). Some speakers allow a bare adjective (cf., *in grut* in (60a)) in the latter structural context, but others reject that form. The second pattern of Frisian NPE consists of a combination of *A+-en*. This NPE-pattern is only found with indefinite noun phrases. We argued that the element *-en* is not an adjectival inflectional suffix, but rather behaves like a phonologically weak grammatical noun.

What does this imply for the typology of pro-forms that show up in contexts of NPE in Frisian? We propose that Frisian has two strategies: (i) an 'elision' strategy involving a silent noun ONE, which is licensed by agreement morphology on the adjective;<sup>33</sup> (ii) a pronominalization strategy involving an overt (weak) pro-form *en*. The lexical entries of the two pro-forms are given in (70), and the syntactic configurations in which they appear in (71).<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> The question arises as to what causes the contrast between speakers rejecting a bare adjectival remnant within an indefinite singular neuter noun phrase and those who more or less accept such forms; see (60a) and example (ii) of note <sup>31</sup>. We tentatively propose that the adjectival remnant of the latter group of speakers carries an adjectival inflection, more specifically a zero-morpheme (cf. (ib)), whereas the former group has an adjectival remnant which is truly morphologically bare, i.e. there is no zero-morpheme attached to the adjective (cf. (ia)). The idea would be that only the (zero-)inflected adjectival form is able to license the silent noun ONE. Schematically, based on example (60c):

- (i) a. \*<sub>[DP in [NP grut [NP ONE]]]</sub>  
b. ?<sub>[DP in [NP grut-Ø [NP ONE]]]</sub> (Ø = zero-morpheme)

The fact that people who do not reject the NPE-pattern *in grut* (a big, 'a big one') find this option nonetheless slightly deviant might be caused by the availability of the alternate form *in grutten*.

<sup>34</sup> With the exception of one speaker, all our Frisian informants accepted the pattern *A+-en* for nominal constructions in which ellipsis has been applied to a plural noun:

- (i) a. Ik ha leaver in tin skrift<sub>sg</sub> as in tsjokken<sub>sg</sub>.  
I have preferably a thin note-book than a thick-*en*  
'I rather have a thin note-book than a thick one.'
- b. Ik ha leaver tinne skriften<sub>pl</sub> as tsjokken<sub>pl</sub>.  
I have preferably thin note-books than thick-*en*  
'I rather have thin note-books than thick ones.'
- c. Ik ha leaver dy tinne skriften<sub>pl</sub> as die tsjokken<sub>pl</sub>.  
I have preferably those thin note-books than those thick-*en*  
'I rather have those thin note-books than those thick ones.'

In (70b), we have represented the possibility of a singular or plural interpretation of *en* by means of a number-feature which can be specified as either 'singular' or 'plural'. An alternative would be to say that *en* is unspecified for number, i.e. its lexical entry would not include a number feature at all. The idea would be then that, being unspecified for number, the pro-form *en* is 'neutral' with respect to the number property of the noun that is 'replaced', i.e. it can be either singular or plural. In what follows, we will adopt the representation in (70b).

- (70) a. ONE { [+N,-V], [+count], [number:sg/pl] }  
 b. *en* { [+N,-V], [+count], [number:sg/pl] }
- (71) a. [in <sub>NP</sub> *swarte* [<sub>NP</sub> ONE]]]  
 b. [in <sub>NP</sub> *swart* [<sub>NP</sub> *en*]]] (but see below)

Importantly, the distribution of the two pro-forms is different. The silent pro-form ONE shows up in definite and indefinite nominal contexts, the overt pro-form *en* only in indefinite nominal contexts.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, ONE only shows up when the adjectival remnant carries overt morphological inflection (i.e. *-e*).<sup>36</sup> When there is NPE featuring the pro-form *en*, the adjectival remnant is morphologically bare at the surface; i.e. *swart* + *en*. Just like in Afrikaans (see section 4), adjectival remnants consisting of more than one adjective are especially interesting for determining the status of the ending appearing on the adjectival remnant of NPE, in this case Frisian *-en*. As was exemplified in (63), it is impossible to have a stacked structure of the following type: *A+en A+en*.<sup>37</sup> (63a) is repeated here as (72a).

- (72) a. \*Jan hat [in grut wyt skrift] kocht en Geart hat [in grutten swarten] kocht.  
 Jan has a big white notebook bought and Geart has a big-en black-en bought  
 ‘Jan bought a big white notebook and Geart bought a big black one.’  
 b. \*/<sup>2(2)</sup>Jan hat [in grut wyt skrift] kocht en Geart hat [in grut swarten] kocht.  
 Jan has a big white notebook bought and Geart has a big black-en bought  
 c. <sup>2(2)</sup>Jan hat [in grut wyt skrift] kocht en Geart hat [in grutte swarten] kocht.  
 Jan has a big white notebook bought and Geart has a big-e black-en bought

As shown in (72b), our informants generally reject the pattern in which we have a bare (i.e. non-inflected) adjective preceding *A+en* (i.e. *A* + *A+en*), even though the nominal antecedent of the pro-form *en* is a neuter indefinite singular noun. Those speakers who find this pattern deviant but nevertheless quite acceptable (i.e., compared to (72a)) typically also accept a morphologically bare adjective as an adjectival remnant (see *in grut* in (60a)). Another quite surprising pattern which some speakers find slightly deviant but still acceptable is the one given in (72c), i.e. *A+-e A+en*. That is, adjective preceding *A+en* carries an adjectival inflection *-e*.

The question arises how to interpret the patterns *A A-en* in (72b) and the pattern *A-e A-en* in (72c). As for the speakers who find the former pattern deviant but acceptable, we will assume that the featural make-up of the pro-form *en* contains an underspecified gender-feature, i.e. gender: [], and that the value of this gender property (e.g. ‘neuter’) is provided by the antecedent noun. When the underspecified gender-feature receives the value ‘neuter’, the modifying adjectives will take the adjectival form which is compatible with a neuter noun, i.e. the morphologically bare form. Thus: [in grut swart [<sub>NP</sub> *en*<sub>[+neuter]</sub>]].

Consider next the pattern (72c), in which the adjectival inflection *-e* appears on *grut*. Clearly, the appearance of this inflection is incompatible with the [indefinite, neuter, singular] feature specification of the antecedent noun *skrift* ‘notebook’. Given the fact that the pro-form *en* can substitute for nouns of different gender types (see (61)), we will assume that it is lexically unspecified for gender (i.e. its lexical entry does not contain a feature ‘gender’); see also Barbiers (2005). We would like to propose that the *-e* that appears on *grutte* in (72c) is a default inflection, which morphologically marks the agreement relationship between the attributive adjective and the pro-form *en*. Since *-en* does not have a gender feature, the default inflection pops up on the adjective. The presence of an agreement relationship is motivated by the fact that *en* has other phi-features, namely it carries a number-feature.

If *grutte* ‘big’ in (72c) agrees with the pro-form *en*, then, arguably, the adjective immediately preceding *en* does so too. We will assume, however, that this inflection never appears at the sound surface as a result of

<sup>35</sup> Thus, Frisian *en* differs from English *one*. The latter element can appear in definite noun phrases, as in *that/the big one* (see Barbiers 2005 for discussion).

<sup>36</sup> And possibly the zero-suffix (i.e.,  $\emptyset$ ) for those speakers of Frisian who permit elision of a neuter singular noun (see (60a) and note 33).

<sup>37</sup> Thus, all our Frisian informants rejected the pattern *A-en A-en*.

‘haplology’.<sup>38</sup> That is, the adjectival inflection *-e* (schwa) and the *e* (schwa) of *en* are linearly adjacent and consequently pronounced as a single schwa at PF (here represented as deletion of the adjectival inflection *-e*). Schematically:

(73) [in [NP grutte [NP swarte~~e~~ [NP *en*<sub><-neuter></sub>]]]] (= in grutte swarten)

### 5.3 in lytsen-ien (a small-en one, ‘a small one’): a different syntactic expression?

Let us now turn to the status of *ien* in *in lyts-en ien*. Superficially, this pattern is very similar to the pattern in *in lyts-en*, the only difference being the presence of the lexical item *ien*. Given this parallelism, it seems like a natural assumption to ‘assign’ the two constructions the same structural analysis. Building on our analysis of *in lyts-en*, according to which *en* is a phonologically weak grammatical noun occupying the N-slot, we can immediately conclude that *ien* does not occupy the N-position, this for the simple reason that only one lexical item can be ‘inserted’ in N. If *ien* is not a grammatical noun in *in lytsen ien*, what else could it be?

One approach would be to say that *ien* is a numeral, as in *ien hûs* ‘one house’ (cf. Barbiers 2005). Given the fact that *ien* occupies the final position in the linear string *in lyts-en ien*, one might propose that *lyts-en* (i.e. [NP *lyts* [NP *en*]]) undergoes displacement from the complement position of NUM to its specifier position. Schematically:

(74) [DP in [NumP [NP *lyts en*]<sub>i</sub> [Num’ *ien* [NP *t<sub>i</sub>*]]]]

A similar displacement operation has been proposed by Barbiers (2005) for Northern Brabantish dialects spoken in the Netherlands.<sup>39</sup> The relevant nominal construction is given in (75):

(75) a. Gè zet unnen arig-en inne. (Brabantish Dutch; Barbiers 2005)  
You are a-MASC strange-MASC.S one(MASC)  
b. [NumP [*unnen arig-en*]<sub>i</sub> [Num’ inne [*t<sub>i</sub>*]]]

As indicated in (75b), the elided NP *unnen arigen* originates as the complement of the Num-head *inne* and moves to the Spec-position of this numeral.<sup>40</sup> From an empirical perspective, one might object that, under such an analysis, the Frisian sequence *ien tinnen ien* (one thin-en one, ‘one thin one’) is incorrectly predicted to be out.<sup>41</sup>

(76) Jan hat [twa grouwe skriften] en [ien tinnen ien].  
Jan has two thick notebooks and one thin-en one

<sup>38</sup> Recall our discussion of Afrikaans; see example (51a).

<sup>39</sup> Barbiers proposes that the displaced constituent that moves from the complement position of Num to its specifier position is a DP. For Frisian nominal constructions of the type *in lytsen (ien)* (a small-en one, ‘a small one’), Barbiers proposes the analysis in (i):

(i) [DP in [NumP [AP *lytsen*]<sub>j</sub> [Num’ *ien* [NP *t<sub>j</sub> N<sub>ø</sub>*]]]]

According to this analysis *en* is a (gender-less) adjectival inflection. The AP *lytsen* is moved from a position within NP to [Spec,NumP]. Potential problems for this analysis are: (i) the impossibility of an adjectival remnant consisting of the sequence *A-en A-en* (see (63)), and (ii) the existence of a word order like (76), i.e. *ien tinnen ien*, in which the numeral ‘one’ is preceded by *tinnen*. This order is not expected under the structure in (i). From a theoretical perspective, one might object that the displacement from the complement position of NUM to the Spec-position of NUM is too local (cf. Grohmann (2003), Pesetsky & Torrego (2001)).

<sup>40</sup> Barbiers (2005) proposes that the displaced elided NP gets associated with contrastive focus in Spec,NumP.

<sup>41</sup> *A+-en* may also be preceded by the negative quantifier *geen* ‘no’:

(i) ik wol gjin readen (ien) (Popkema 2006:166)  
I want no red-en (one)  
‘I don’t want a red one.’



Under the assumption that the numeral *ien* in an expression like *ien tienen ien* occupies the functional head position NUM, we conclude that *ien* in (76) is a noun which occupies an N-position in the syntactic structure.

Thus far, we have tried to develop an analysis based on the assumption that *en* in *in lytsen ien* is a grammatical noun, just as in *in lytsen*. Suppose now that this unified interpretation of *en* in *in lytsen* and *in lytsen ien*, even though superficially quite plausible, is wrong. In other words, suppose they are homophones, i.e. lexical items having the same sound structure but differing in meaning (and categorial status). Suppose, furthermore, that *ien* in *in lytsen ien* is a grammatical noun which is the phonologically strong counterpart of the (weak) grammatical noun *en* in *in lytsen* (see also the examples in (75)-(76)). Adopting such an analysis, we would have the same situation as in Afrikaans, which distinguishes a full grammatical noun *een* (cf. *'n swart een*) and a weak grammatical noun *e* (cf. *'n swart-e*).

Consider the following nominal constructions from Dutch:

- These nominal constructions display an indefinite article which exhibits special grammatical behavior in the sense that it does not seem to belong to any noun within the noun phrase. The regular indefinite article 'n 'a' must be followed by a singular indefinite article (e.g. 'n *boek*(\*-en); a book(\*-s), 'a book(\*s)'). Notice now that the indefinite article in (77) can be followed by a plural noun. Furthermore, it cannot be associated with any of the other (pro)nominal elements within the noun phrase: the wh-phrase *wat* 'what' does not combine with an indefinite article. Nor does the plural noun *etters* 'jerks' in (77c). In short, the indefinite article 'n can rightfully be called spurious in its syntactic behavior.

The question, of course, arises what kind of grammatical ‘role’ this spurious indefinite article fulfils within the noun phrases in (77). Bennis et al. argue that the nominal structures in which this spurious article shows up all involve the phenomenon of predicate displacement, i.e. a DP-internal predicative phrase is moved

<sup>42</sup> Recall from example (63) that it is impossible to have the sequence *A-en A-en*. As shown in (i), this sequence is also ill-formed when it is followed by the pro-form *ien*. This suggests that also in this construction type *-en* is not an adjectival inflection.

- (i) a. \*Jan hie [in grut wyt skrift] kocht en Geart hie [in grutten swarten ien] kocht.  
Jan has a big white notebook bought and Geart has a big-en black-en one bought  
'Jan bought a big white notebook and Geart bought a big black one.'
- b. \*Jan hie [in grutte wite auto] kocht en Geart hie [in grutten swarten ien] kocht.  
Jan has a big-e white-e car bought and Geart has a big-en black-en one bought  
'Jan bought a big white car and Geart bought a big black one.'

across a (small clause) subject to a position in the left periphery of the noun phrase. More specifically, they claim that the spurious indefinite article is a small clause head X, which mediates a DP-internal predication relationship between a subject (in Spec,XP) and a predicate (in the complement position of X). Abstracting away from details, a string like *zulke etters van 'n jongens* in (77c) derives from an underlying representation like (78a). The surface structure is the result of application of DP-internal predicate inversion, along the lines sketched in (78b).<sup>43</sup> In view of the structural environments in which Dutch spurious 'n appears, Bennis et al. (1998) argue that this 'n is unspecified for number. The property of being unspecified for number renders 'n compatible with any NP in its specifier, regardless of the latter's number specification: a clash in number features will never arise within XP (or within a derived Spec-head agreement configuration, for that matter).

- (78) a. [zulke [<sub>XP</sub> jongens [<sub>X'</sub> [<sub>X</sub> 'n] etters]]]  
 b. [zulke [<sub>FP</sub> etters<sub>j</sub> [<sub>F'</sub> [F (= van) +X<sub>i</sub> (= 'n)] [<sub>XP</sub> jongens t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]]]

Besides the nominal constructions in (77), noun phrases of the type in (79) has been identified as a construction type featuring DP-internal predicate displacement (see Den Dikken (2006: 236), Corver (2008:79)).

- (79) a. Wa schön-e wit vlëes! (Kempenland Dutch, De Bont 1958:386)  
 What beautiful-e white meat  
 'Such a beautiful white meat!'  
 b. Hij is [zëu lomp-e vaerke]!  
 He is so clumsy-e pig  
 'He is such a clumsy pig!'

That the adjectival form *schöone* in (79) and *lompe* in (79b) should not be analyzed as an inflected adjective is clear from the fact that, similarly to standard Dutch, attributive adjectives modifying an indefinite noun phrase (like *vlëes* 'meat' and *vaerke* 'pig') do not carry an overt inflectional marker in Kempenland Dutch. This is shown, for example, by the attributive adjective *wit* ('white') in (79a), where there is no *-e* attached to the adjective. The *-e* following the adjectival phrases *wa schön* and *zëu lomp* corresponds to the neuter indefinite article (i.e. *e*, a<sub>neut.sg.</sub>) and is analyzed here as an instance of the spurious indefinite article. Recall that this indefinite article starts out as a DP-internal small clause head (see (80a)) and mediates between the predicate and the subject in Spec,XP. In the line of Bennis et al. (1998), we will assume that the adjectival predicate displacement in (79) involves so-called Predicate Fronting, i.e., A-bar movement of the (adjectival) predicate to [Spec,DP]. Following Bennis et al., we will further assume that the spurious indefinite article raises to D in these predicate fronting environments.<sup>44</sup> The derived structure of (79b) is given in (80b).<sup>45</sup>

- (80) a. [<sub>XP</sub> vaerke [<sub>X'</sub> [<sub>X</sub> e] zëu lomp]]  
 b. [<sub>DP</sub> [zëu lomp]<sub>j</sub> [<sub>D'</sub> [[<sub>X</sub> e]<sub>i</sub> +D] [<sub>XP</sub> vaerke [<sub>X'</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]]]

<sup>43</sup> For further discussion, see Bennis et al (1998).

<sup>44</sup> Bennis et al (1998) assume that the movement of the small clause head X (i.e. 'n) to D is a process which is comparable to the process of V-to-C movement, as found in clausal constructions featuring operator movement to Spec,CP.

<sup>45</sup> The structural analysis in (80) arguably also applies to English nominal constructions of the type *that big a car, so big a car, how big a car, et cetera*. (see Den Dikken 2006:236 and Corver 2008). Bolinger (1972:136) and Abney (1987) point out the existence of forms like *how big of car* in dialects of English (see also Kayne 2005:183). In this pattern, the 'linking' preposition *of* appears in between the inverted adjectival predicate and the small clause subject. Following Bennis et al.'s suggestion that the nominal copula *of* typically shows up in contexts of DP-internal predicate inversion (i.e. predicate displacement of the A-movement type), we will assume that the derivation of a structure like *how big of a car* involves a predicate inversion step (see Den Dikken 2006:236). After predicate inversion, the predicate undergoes predicate fronting (i.e. predicate displacement of the A-bar movement type) to Spec,DP. The two movement steps are depicted in the representation in (i):

- (i) [<sub>DP</sub> how big<sub>j</sub> [<sub>D'</sub> D [<sub>FP</sub> t'<sub>j</sub> [<sub>F'</sub> F (= of) +X<sub>i</sub> (= a) [<sub>XP</sub> car [<sub>X'</sub> t<sub>i</sub> t<sub>j</sub>]]]]]]]

As shown in (80b), the spurious indefinite article *e* ends up in a position right adjacent to the moved AP *zêu lomp* after it has been adjoined to D.

After this brief elaboration on the spurious indefinite article '*n*', let us return to Frisian, and more particularly to our hypothesis above that *-en* in *in lyts-en ien* is an instance of this spurious indefinite article. Quite interestingly, in Frisistics *-en* has been identified as an instance of the indefinite article in nominal constructions of the following type; see Systra & Hof 1925, Tamminga 1963; see also Verdenius 1939).

- (81) a. *in grutten liger* (Sytsra & Hof 1925)  
           a big-en liar  
           'a very big liar.'
- b. *Ha se ús gjin ôfgrysliken fertriet besoarge?* (Hoekema 1996)  
           he will us no enormous-en sadness bring  
           'He won't bring us enormous sadness.'
- c. *Ik hie sa'n alderheisliksten pine yn 'e mûle.* (Hoekema 1996)  
           I have such an incredible-en pain in the mouth  
           'I've got such an incredible pain in my mouth!'

Just like in the phrase *in lytsen ien*, the examples in (81) feature *-en* right after the adjective (e.g. *grut* + *-en* in (81a)). An important characteristic of this nominal construction is the emphatic/focalized meaning of the adjective (cf. Van der Meer 1987, Hoekstra 1997, Popkema 2006:166-167). The adjective expresses a very high degree. As for this last property, a parallel can be drawn with the exclamative noun phrase (77b) and the *N of N*-construction in (77c). In these two nominal constructions, the element preceding the (spurious) indefinite article also has a 'high degree' reading.

What is important for our purposes here is that Systra & Hof (1925) hypothesize that the *-en* immediately following the adjective in (81a) is an indefinite article, which historically relates to *in* 'a' (see also Tamminga 1963, Van der Meer 1987, Verdenius 1939).<sup>46</sup> Interpreting this indefinite article as an instance of the spurious indefinite article, which functions as the small clause head of a DP-internal predication configuration, we may derive the pattern *in grutten liger* as follows:<sup>47</sup>

- (82)  $[_{DP} \text{ in } [_{FP} \text{ grut}_i \text{ } [_{F'} \text{ X}_j (= en) + F \text{ } [_{XP} \text{ liger } [_{X'} \text{ t}_j \text{ t}_i]]]]]$  (where *en* = *in*)

Observe that, as opposed to the adjectival predicate in (87), the AP *grut* in (89) does not move to Spec,DP, but rather to a spec-position lower in the DP. We tentatively assume that this position is an A-bar position of a functional projection within the DP which is associated with focus/emphasis. Thus, FP might more specifically be labeled as Foc(us)P(rojection); see Corver and Van Koppen 2006.

<sup>46</sup> Systra & Hof (1925) hypothesize that from a diachronic perspective a noun phrase like *in grutten liger* 'a very big liar' in (81a) has taken the developmental path sketched in (i):

- (i) (a) *sa grut in liger* → (b) *sa'n grutten liger* → (c) *in grutten liger*  
           so big a liar                      so a big-en liar                      a big-en liar

<sup>47</sup> As shown by the example in (i), it is impossible to have the following structure in Frisian: *in A-en A-en ien*.

- (i) \*Jan hat [in grut wyt skrift] kocht en Geart hat [in grutten swarten ien] kocht  
       Jan has a big white notebook bought and Geart has a big-en black-en one bought

At a descriptive level, the ill-formedness of the pattern *in A-en A-en ien* indicates that (adjectival) predicate displacement cannot apply more than once within the extended nominal projection. Observe in this respect also the ill-formedness of the English nominal constructions *\*that big so expensive a car* (i.e. 'so expensive a car, which is that big'). This ill-formedness of these patterns possibly relates to the fact that contrastive focus is typically associated with a single constituent within the nominal projection.

From (82), it is only a small step towards an analysis of the pattern *in lytsen ien*. As opposed to a lexical noun (e.g. *liger* in (82)), we find the pronoun *ien* as the small clause subject. The predicate *lyts* ‘small’ undergoes DP-internal predicate displacement and the spurious indefinite article raises to a higher functional head F. As a result of this, we get the inverted order ‘adjectival predicate – subject’.<sup>48 49</sup>

- (83) a.  $[_{XP} \text{ ien } [_{X'} [_{X} \text{ en} ] [_{AP} \text{ lyts}]]]$  (*en = in*)  
 b.  $[_{DP} \text{ in } [_{FP} \text{ lyts}_j [_{F'} X(=\text{en})+F [_{XP} \text{ ien } t_j t_i]]]]]$

An important ingredient of our analysis has been the interpretation of *en* as a spurious indefinite article, which at an analytic level has been analyzed as a small clause head X heading a DP-internal small clause XP. The question arises as to whether there is any independent support for the existence of a spurious *en/in*. The following exclamative noun phrases, in which *in* appears before a plural noun, seem to be pertinent (examples drawn from Popkema 2006: 156 & 178):

- (84) a. Wat in minsken!  
 What a people<sub>pl</sub>; ‘how many people!’  
 b. In minsken dat der wiene!  
 A people<sub>pl</sub> that there were; ‘There were so many people!’  
 c. Sa’n minsken dat der wiene!  
 So a people that there were; ‘There were so many people!’

Let us recapitulate: we have shown that Frisian distinguishes a number of NP-ellipsis strategies. First of all, it has the ellipsis strategy, as in *in lyts-e*, where *-e* is an inflectional suffix. The form *in lyts*, as found in NP-ellipsis constructions featuring elision of a  $N_{\text{neut.sg.indef}}$  is accepted by some speakers, but not all. Besides the elision strategy, Frisian also exhibits the pronoun strategy: *in lyts-en*. We analyzed *en* as a phonologically weak counterpart of the pro-form *ien*.<sup>50</sup> Finally, we argued that a third pattern, viz. *in lyts-en ien*, is not derivationally related to *in lyts-en*. Rather *-en* in *in lyts-en ien* was interpreted as a spurious indefinite article *in*, which happens to be homophonous with the weak pro-form *en*. In this construction, *ien*, which occupies the specifier position of a DP-internal small clause XP, represents the pronominalizing element. From the analyses presented in this section, it may be concluded that Frisian exhibits different NPE-strategies.

## 6. NP-ellipsis in Dutch: a micro-comparative perspective

In the introduction of this article, we made the statement that there are languages where morphological agreement (i.e. presence of overt inflection) appears to be the licensing factor in NP-ellipsis, but where *one*-insertion (i.e. pronominalization) is the actual strategy. In sections 4 and 5, we pointed out that Afrikaans (e.g., ‘*n swart-e* ‘a black one’) and Frisian (e.g., *in lyts-en*, ‘a small one’) fall within this class of languages. That is, *-e* in the NPE-pattern in *swarte* and *-en* in the NPE-pattern *in lytsen* are not inflectional morphemes attached to the adjectival remnant, but rather phonologically weak pro-forms that are used to pronominalize N. Against this background, we will investigate in section 6 the NPE-behavior of Dutch noun phrases.<sup>51</sup>

Remember that an important piece of data was the example in (85).

<sup>48</sup> The Frisian nominal construction *in lytsen ien* (a small  $a_{\text{spurious}}$  one, ‘a small one’) is quite similar then to the following English expressions: *that big a one*, *how big a one*, which are the pronominalized counterparts of constructions such as *that big a car* and *how big a car*. Observe that in these constructions the pro-form *one* is preceded by an indefinite article. Following Bennis et al. (1998), we will take this English indefinite article also to be a spurious article which heads a DP-internal small clause XP.

<sup>49</sup> The spurious article must be present, as suggested by ill-formedness of: *\*in lyts ien* (a small one).

<sup>50</sup> Importantly, the strong form *ien* is out: *\*in lyts ien*.

<sup>51</sup> See Corver & Van Koppen (to appear) for a micro-comparative study of NPE-strategies involving a possessive pronoun as the remnant of ellipsis. In this article, it is pointed out that two strategies are used in Dutch dialects: (i) an elision strategy, involving agreement on the adjectival remnant, and (ii) a pro-form strategy, involving a weak pronominal form which fills the N-position.

- (85) %Jan heeft [een *wit* konijn] gekocht en Marie heeft [een *zwarte* —] gekocht.  
 Jan has a white rabbit bought and Marie has a black-e — bought  
 ‘Jan bought a white rabbit and Marie bought a black one.’

This example has always been taken as evidence for the idea that NPE in Dutch requires presence of overt adjectival inflection. Observe that, as opposed to the adjective *wit* in the noun phrase *een wit konijn* ‘a white rabbit’, the adjective *zwart* in the NPE-pattern *een zwarte* ‘a black one’ must be followed by what appears to be an adjectival inflection. By taking a micro-comparative perspective on NP-ellipsis in Dutch, we will show that this *–e* is not an adjectival inflection but should rather be analyzed as a phonologically weak pro-form, quite analogously to Afrikaans *–e* and Frisian *–en*.

### 6.1. NPE in Standard Dutch

In standard Dutch, adjectives agree for number, gender and definiteness. An overview of the inflection on attributive adjectives is provided in examples (93)–(94).

- |      |    |                            |                                |
|------|----|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (86) | a. | een <i>witte</i> hond      | non-neuter singular definite   |
|      |    | a white-e dog              |                                |
|      | b. | de <i>witte</i> hond       | non-neuter singular definite   |
|      |    | the white-e dog            |                                |
|      | c. | (de) <i>witte</i> honden   | non-neuter plural (in)definite |
|      |    | (the) white dogs           |                                |
|      |    |                            |                                |
| (87) | a. | een <b>wit</b> konijn      | neuter singular indefinite     |
|      |    | a white rabbit             |                                |
|      | b. | het <i>witte</i> konijn    | neuter singular definite       |
|      |    | the white rabbit           |                                |
|      | c. | (de) <i>witte</i> konijnen | neuter plural (in)definite     |
|      |    | (the) white rabbits        |                                |

As this overview shows, the attributive adjective in Dutch is always followed by a schwa (i.e. orthographically *–e*; phonetically *ə*), except when the noun phrase is indefinite, neuter and singular.<sup>52</sup>

When we consider the ellipsis-counterparts of the noun phrases of (86)–(87) in (88), we observe that the form of the adjectival remnant is superficially the same as that of the attributive adjective in (86)–(87), more specifically: *A+–e*. There is, however, one exception to this formal identity: the adjectival remnant in the indefinite neuter singular noun phrase (*een wit konijn*) changes its form into *A+–e* (*een witte*, a white, ‘a white one’). The use of the bare adjectival form *wit*, as in *een wit*, is considered to be deviant by certain speakers of Dutch, though not by all.

- (88) a. Jan heeft [een *bruine* hond] gekocht en Marie heeft [een *witte* —] gekocht.  
 Jan has a brown-e dog<sub>common</sub> bought and Marie has a white-e — bought  
 ‘Jan bought a brown dog and Marie bought a white one.’  
 b. Jan heeft [een *wit* konijn] gekocht en Marie heeft [een *zwarte* —] gekocht.  
 Jan has a white rabbit<sub>neuter</sub> bought and Marie has a black-e — bought  
 ‘Jan bought a white rabbit and Marie bought a black one.’

The question arises as to how to interpret the *–e* on the adjectival remnant, especially in the case of *een zwarte* in (95b). As we have already mentioned before, it is generally assumed in the literature that *–e* is an adjectival inflection (i.e. the same inflection that we find on the adjective in its attributive use) and that *–e* is inserted as a default inflection when the elided noun is a N<sub>neuter.sg.indef.</sub> (cf. Muysken & Van Riemsdijk

<sup>52</sup> So Dutch is similar to Frisian in this respect; see (56)–(57).

1986, Kester 1996). In Kester (1996), the following, more specific structural analysis is proposed: Adopting Cinque's (1994) proposal that adjectives occupy the specifier position of a functional projection FP within the extended nominal projection, she argues that the functional head F is able to license *pro*, when it stands in a spec-head agreement relationship with an adjective specified for strong agreement. Since in (96) the adjectival remnant carries inflectional morphology, viz. *-e*, the functional head F is "strong" enough to license *pro*.

(89) [DP een [FP witt-*e*<sub>[strong]</sub> /zwart-*e*<sub>[strong]</sub> [F' F [NP *pro*]]]]

Corver & Van Koppen (2006) present some data that suggest that this Dutch *-e* is not an inflectional affix. They provide a case in which the attributive adjective cannot carry adjectival inflection and another one in which the addition of adjectival inflection results in a meaning difference. In those two cases, however, an *-e* has to appear in ellipsis contexts, making the hypothesis that this *-e* is an inflectional adjective quite unlikely.

First of all, they point out example (90), in which the attributive adjective can appear with or without the *e*-affix, depending on the meaning of the adjective.

- (90) a. Ik heb gisteren [een groot / grote pianist] horen spelen  
I have a big/big-*e* pianist hear play  
'I have heard a great / big pianist yesterday.'  
b. Ik heb gisteren [een echt grote] horen spelen  
I have yesterday a real big-*e* hear play  
'I have heard a truly big/great one yesterday.'

The presence of the *e*-affix on the adjective *groot* 'big/great' affects its meaning: when it is present, the adjective means 'big', whereas it means 'great' when it is absent. In ellipsis contexts, however, the adjective has to carry an *e*-suffix independent of its meaning, as is shown in (90b). This difference between the ellipsis and the non-ellipsis contexts casts doubt on the claim that the *e*-suffix is indeed an adjectival inflection in this case.

A further illustration of the ambivalent character of the *e*-affix is provided in (91):

- (91) a. het doorbakken(\**e*) konijn                      b. het doorbakken\*(-*e*)  
the well-baked(*e*) rabbit                              the well-baked(*e*)  
'the well-baked rabbit'                              'the well-baked one'

As shown by (91a), adjectives that are derived from past participles cannot show inflection. However, when used in ellipsis contexts, these participial adjectives must get the *e*-ending; see (91b). Again this seems to suggest that the *e*-affix is not an adjectival inflection.

In order to be able to give a more precise analysis of the nature of NP-ellipsis in standard Dutch, and more in particular the nature of the marker *-e*, we will examine NP-ellipsis in a number of Dutch dialects and look especially at the formal appearance of the adjectival remnant (see also Peters 1938). The data that will be presented are collected as part of the DIDDD-project (Diversity in Dutch DP Design), which is executed at the University of Utrecht (see Corver et al. 2007).

## 6.2. Asten Dutch: *-e* as an inflection

We start our discussion with Asten Dutch, which is spoken in the province of Northern Brabant/The Netherlands. As shown by the indefinite paradigm in (92) and the definite paradigm in (93), this dialect morphologically distinguishes all three genders, i.e. masculine, feminine and neuter, on the attributive adjective. The masculine inflection corresponds to *-en*, the feminine one to *-e*, and the neuter one lacks any overt morphology.

- (92) a. ne schonen opa (masculine singular indefinite)

- b. a nice-*en* grandfather  
 een leuke oma (feminine singular indefinite)  
 a nice-*e* grandmother
- c. een leuk kind (neuter singular indefinite)  
 a nice child
- (93) a. de schoonen opa (masculine singular definite)  
 the nice-*en* grandfather
- b. de deftige oma (feminine singular definite)  
 the poshy-*e* grandmother
- c. het leuk kind (neuter singular definite)  
 the nice child

Consider now the following examples of NPE with AP as the adjectival remnant:<sup>53</sup>

- (94) a. [Talking about cars...]  
 Hij het pas ne *nijen* gekocht. (masculine singular)  
 He has recently a new-*en* bought  
 'He has recently bought a new one.'
- b. [Talking about cows...]  
 Hij het pas een *bonte* gekocht. (feminine singular)  
 He has recently a multi-colored-*e* bought  
 'He has recently bought a multi-colored one.'
- c. [Talking about rabbits...]  
 Hij het pas een *zwart* gekocht. (neuter singular)  
 He has recently a black bought  
 'He has recently bought a black one.'

What we see is that the adjectival remnant of ellipsis has exactly the same form as in the non-elided noun phrases in (92). This strongly suggests that the markers *-en* and *-e* are really inflections. In (94c), where the neuter noun is elided, the adjectival remnant keeps its bare form.

For this dialect we can apply the same test we have used to determine the status of *-en* and *-e* in respectively Frisian in section 5 and Afrikaans in section 4: the behavior of this element in a sequence of adjectives. Notice that, if the adjectival remnant consists of a sequence of attributive adjectives, the form of each adjective remains the same. For example:

- (95) a. [Talking about cars] (masculine singular)  
 Ik wil zo'n *grote gele*, nie zo'n *grote gruune*.  
 I want such a big-*e* yellow-*e*, not such a big-*e* green-*e*

<sup>53</sup> Another illustration of a Dutch dialect making a three-way gender distinction in the morphological paradigm of attributive adjectives is Winterswijk Dutch, which is spoken in the province of Gelderland/The Netherlands. As shown in (i), this three-way morphological distinction is also found on the adjectival remnant in patterns of NPE (examples drawn from Deunk 1977). In (ia), the adjectival remnant carries the masculine singular suffix *-en*, and in (ib) the feminine singular suffix *-e*. When a neuter singular noun is elided, the adjectival remnant remains morphologically bare, as shown in (ic).

- (i) a. Hónnen hónd, ne broe:*nen* of ne bont*en*? (Winterswijk Dutch)  
 How-a<sub>masc.sg.</sub> dog, a brown-*en* or a spotted-*en*  
 'What kind of dog (would you like to have)? A brown one or a spotted one?'
- b. Hónne katte menste, ne broe:*ne* of ne bont*e*?  
 How-a<sub>fem.sg.</sub> cat mean-you, a brown-*e* or a spotted-*e*  
 'What kind of cat (do you mean)? A brown one or a spotted one?'
- c. Hón kópken, 'n wit of 'n geel?  
 How-a<sub>neut.sg.</sub> cup, a white or a yellow  
 'What kind of cup (would you like to have)? A white one or a yellow one?'

- b. 'I want such as big yellow one, nt such a big green one.'  
 [Talking about candies] (neuter singular)  
 Ik wil zo'n groot geel, nie zo'n klein geel.  
 I want such a big yellow, not such a small yellow  
 'I want such a big yellow one, not such a big green one.'

In (95a), where the masculine noun *auto* 'car' is elided, we find two adjectival remnants, each consisting of a sequence of adjectives: *grote gele* 'big yellow one' and *grote gruune* 'big green one'. On each of the adjectives, we find the inflectional suffix *-e*. In (95b), ellipsis has applied to a neuter noun. Notice that the adjectival remnants (i.e. *groot geel* and *klein geel*) consists of superficially bare adjectives; that is, no overt morphological inflection is added to the adjectival remnant.

On the basis of the NPE-behavior displayed by Asten Dutch, we conclude that this dialect makes use of the agreement strategy; i.e. the rich morphological expression of adjectival agreement makes it possible to license a silent noun. Thus, the NPE-representation looks like (96):

(96) [ne [NP *nijen* [NP ONE]]]

We will assume that in the superficially bare adjectives *zwart* in (95c) and *groot*, *geel* and *klein* in (95b) carry a zero-suffix. This zero-suffix represents neuter gender and is able to license the silent pro-form ONE.

### 6.3 Zierikzee Dutch: *-en* as an weak pronoun

A second type of dialect is Zierikzee Dutch, which is spoken in the province of Zeeland/The Netherlands. Similarly to standard Dutch, this dialect has a two-way gender system; that is, neuter versus common (i.e. non-neuter):

- (97) a. een leuke opa (common gender)  
       a nice-*e* grandfather  
       b. een leuke opoe (common gender)  
       a nice-*e* grandmother  
       c. een leuk kind (neuter gender)  
       a nice child  
 (98) a. de leuke opa (common gender)  
       the nice-*e* grandfather  
       b. de leuke opoe (common gender)  
       the nice-*e* grandmother  
       c. 't leuke kind (neuter gender)  
       the nice-*e* child

This inflectional paradigm looks the same as the standard Dutch attributive adjectival paradigm. That is, we find the inflection *-e* on all adjectives except for the attributive adjective in a neuter singular indefinite noun phrase (i.e. (97c)).

When we consider next the adjectival paradigm in the NPE-contexts, we observe something interesting: the adjectival remnant is always accompanied by the marker *-en*.<sup>54</sup>

- (99) a. [Talking about cars]  
       Hie ei pas een *nieuwen* gekocht.  
       He has recently a new-*en* bought  
       'He has recently bought a new one.'  
       b. [Talking about cows]  
       Hie ei pas een *bonten* gekocht.

<sup>54</sup> This pattern of NPE is typically found in dialects spoken in the province of Zeeland/The Netherlands. Other dialects in the DiDDD-database which display this phenomenon are: Scherpenisse Dutch, Oostkapelle Dutch, and Axel Dutch.



- c. He has recently a multi-colored-*en* bought  
 'He has recently bought a multicolored one'  
 [Talking about rabbits]  
 Hie ei pas een zwarten gekocht.  
 He has recently a black-*en* bought  
 'He has recently bought a black one.'

Notice further that, if the adjectival remnant consists of a sequence of adjectives, it is only the last one which carries the marker *-en*. Thus, a sequence like *zo'n groten gelen* (such a big-en yellow-en) is ill-formed. The attributive adjective that precedes *A+-en* carries the inflection *-e*. This is exemplified in (100):

- (100) a. [Talking about cars] (common gender)  
 Ik wil zo'n grote gelen, nie zo'n grote grunen.  
 I want such a big-*e* yellow-*en*, not such-a big-*e* green-*en*  
 'I want such a big yellow one, not such a big green one.'  
 b. [Talking about sweet candies] (neuter gender)  
 Ik wil zo'n grote gelen, nie zo'n kleine gelen.  
 I want such a big-*e* yellow-*e*, not such a small-*e* yellow-*en*  
 'I want such a big yellow one, not such a small yellow one.'

The NP-ellipsis strategy of Zierikzee Dutch is reminiscent of the one attested in Afrikaans and Frisian. Recall that in Afrikaans only the final adjective in a sequence of (monosyllabic) adjectives constituting the remnant of ellipsis carries the marker *-e* (e.g. *'n groot swart-e*, *\*'n grot-e swart-e*, 'a big black one'). For Frisian, we saw that only the final adjective is able to carry the marker *-en* (*\*in grutten swarten*, 'a big black one', *?(?)in grutt-e swarten*). In view of this similarity, we propose that Zierikzee Dutch uses the pronoun-strategy for noun phrase ellipsis: more specifically, the weak pro-form *-en* is 'inserted' into the N-position. Schematically:

- (101) [een [<sub>NP</sub> nieuw [<sub>NP</sub> en]]]

There is one additional remark, we should make: As shown in (100), the non-final adjectives in the NPE-remnant also carry an inflection affix, namely *-e*: *grote* 'big' and *kleine* 'small'. Especially, the example in (100b) is telling: the adjective carries an inflection *-e*, even though the discourse-antecedent noun (i.e. *zuurke* 'candy') has neuter gender. As shown in (97c), neuter (indefinite) nouns typically combine with a 'bare' (i.e. uninflected) adjective. So, why do we get the sequences *grote gelen* and *kleine gelen* rather than *\*groot gelen* and *\*klein gelen* in (100b)?

Recall that we had a similar situation in Frisian. Reconsider the examples in (72c), repeated here as (102).

- (102) *?(?)Jan hat [in grut wyt skrift] kocht en Geart hat [in grutte swarten] kocht.*  
 Jan has a big white notebook bought and Geart has a big-e black-en bought

To account for these data we argued that the pronoun *-en* for these speakers lacks a gender feature. As a consequence the adjective *grut* agreeing with this gender neutral element appears with the default inflection *-e*.

Our analysis of the data in (100b) is similar to the analysis we gave for the Frisian data in (102). The attributive adjectives *grote* 'big' and *kleine* 'small' modify an NP which is headed by the pro-form *en*. In view of the fact that *en* is able to substitute for both common (99a,b) and neuter (99c) nouns, we propose that *en* in Zierikzee Dutch, just like *en* in the Frisian example (102), is genderless (i.e. its lexical entry does not have a gender feature). We further propose that in those contexts, just like in Frisian, the inflected form *A+-e* is chosen as a default inflection. Schematically:

- (103) [zo'n [<sub>AP</sub> grote [<sub>NP</sub> gele [<sub>NP</sub> en]]]]

Also in this representation, the *e* on *gele* is eliminated at PF as a result of haplology: i.e. [<sub>ZO</sub> 'n [<sub>AP</sub> grote [<sub>NP</sub> gele [<sub>NP</sub> en]]]].

#### 6.4 Standard Dutch and other varieties

In sections 6.2 and 6.3 we saw that two NP-ellipsis strategies are used in Dutch dialects: the elision strategy (Asten Dutch) and the enclitic pro-form strategy (Zierikzee Dutch). The question arises as to what strategy is used in standard Dutch. Consider again the relevant example from standard Dutch, which has mostly been interpreted as evidence that Dutch requires the presence of adjectival inflection in the licensing of NP-ellipsis:

- (104) Jan heeft [een wit konijn] gekocht en Marie heeft [een zwarte/%zwart] gekocht.  
 Jan has a white rabbit bought and Marie has a black-e/black bought  
 'Jan bought a white rabbit and Marie bought a black one.'

On the basis of the available strategies, two potential analyses come to mind for the NPE-pattern *een zwarte* in (104): (i) *-e* is an inflection and the noun is elided (see (105a)); (ii) *-e* is an enclitic pronoun (cf. (105b)), just like Afrikaans *-e* in 'n *swarte* and Frisian *-en* in *in lytsen*.

- (105) a. [een [<sub>NP</sub> zwarte [<sub>NP</sub> ONE]]] (elision strategy)  
 b. [een [<sub>NP</sub> zwart [<sub>NP</sub> e]]] (pronoun strategy)

We believe that there are a number of reasons for choosing the structural analysis in (105b). First of all, none of the dialects that make use of the inflectional strategy (e.g. Asten Dutch) add a (default) inflectional suffix to the adjectival remnant; i.e. the adjectival remnant typically remains morphologically bare (cf. (94c)). To put it differently, the inflection on the adjective is expected to be insensitive to NPE and hence it is expected that the same inflectional paradigm is found in non-ellipsis and ellipsis contexts.<sup>55</sup> Secondly, the fact that some speakers accept the elided pattern *een zwart* next to *een zwarte* also suggests that the former pattern is the true 'ellipsis pattern' and the latter an instance of the pronoun strategy. This co-existence of two strategies has also been found for dialectal variants of Dutch, e.g. in Sliedrecht Dutch (spoken in the province of South-Holland/The Netherlands) and Nijkerk Dutch (spoken in the province of Gelderland/the Netherlands):

- (106) a. Ik heb een wit knijn en jij een zwart(e). (Sliedrecht Dutch)  
 I have a white rabbit and you a black(-e)  
 'I have a white rabbit and you a black one.'  
 b. Ik het een wit knien en jie een zwart(e). (Nijkerk Dutch)  
 I have a white rabbit and you a black(-e)

Quite interestingly, in certain variants of Dutch, the two strategies can be formally distinguished from each other on the basis of DP-internal contextual effects. One such variant is Ossendrecht Dutch.

In Ossendrecht Dutch (spoken in the province of Northern Brabant/The Netherlands) we find the adjectival paradigm in (107) for indefinite singular noun phrases. This paradigm displays a three-way gender distinction in the adjectival form.

- (107) a. ne leuken opa (masculine gender indefinite)  
 a nice-en grandfather  
 b. een leuke oma (feminine gender indefinite)

<sup>55</sup> One other analysis is that NPE involves an covert pro-form with either a default gender feature or without a gender feature. In both cases the default inflectional affix *-e* is expected to occur on the adjective (see also discussion about Frisian and Zierikzee Dutch in section 6.3 above). This affix could be argued to be the result of an agreement relation between the adjective and the covert pro-form with default gender features. A problem with this analysis will be discussed in footnote 59 below.

- c. a nice-*e* grandmother  
 een leuk kind (neuter gender indefinite)  
 a nice child

According to our informants, two adjectival forms are possible in the ellipsis patterns in (108) and (109), a bare form A (*zwart/groot*) and a non-bare form A+*e* (*zwarte/grote*). What is interesting is that this difference in (adjectival) form correlates with a difference in the form of the indefinite article/indefinite demonstrative:<sup>56</sup>

- (108) a. Ik heb een wit konijn, en jij [*een zwart*]. (konijn = neuter)  
 I have a white rabbit and you a black  
 ‘I have a black rabbit and you a white one.’  
 b. Ik heb een wit konijn, en jij [*ne zwarte*].  
 I have a white rabbit and you a black-*e*  
 ‘I have a white rabbit and you a white one.’
- (109) [talking about houses] (huis ‘house’ = neuter)  
 a. [Zo’n groot] ziede maar zelden!  
 So a big see-you but rarely  
 ‘You hardly ever see such a big one (i.e. house).’  
 b. [Sonne grote] ziede maar zelden!  
 So-ART<sub>masc</sub> see-you but rarely  
 ‘You hardly ever see such a big one (i.e. house).’

In (108a)-(109a), we find the indefinite article *een* and the related indefinite demonstrative form *zo’n*, which can combine with neuter nouns (cf. *een leuk kind* in (107c) and *zo’n leuk kind*, ‘such a nice child’). In (108b)-(109b), on the contrary, we find the form of the indefinite article/demonstrative (*ne/sonne*), which is typically associated with masculine gender. We propose that the elided noun phrase in (108a)-(109a) instantiates the pattern in (105a), and that the one in (108b)-(109b) instantiates the pattern in (105b). Importantly, the pro-form *e* in the b-examples is taken to be a genderless pro-form (just like the Frisian and Zierikzee Dutch pro-form *en*). We further assume that the masculine form of the indefinite article *ne* in (108b) and the indefinite demonstrative *sonne* in (109b) are used as default forms.

Turning now to Standard Dutch, consider again the facts in (110):

- (110) a. Jan heeft [*een wit konijn*<sub>[+neuter]</sub>] en Marie heeft [*een zwarte*]/%[*een zwart*].  
 Jan has a white rabbit and Marie has a black-*e*/a black  
 ‘Jan has a white rabbit and Marie has a black one.’  
 b. Jan heeft [*een witte hond*<sub>[-neuter]</sub>] en Marie heeft [*een zwarte* —].  
 Jan has a white-*e* dog and Marie has a black-*e* —  
 ‘Jan has a white dog and Marie has a black one.’

We propose that Dutch essentially behaves like Frisian. Recall that the two languages display the same behavior with respect to the morphological inflection on the attributive adjective modifying an overt noun. For both languages it holds that the attributive adjective is always followed by a schwa (i.e.

<sup>56</sup> Other dialects from the DiDDD- project which display this phenomenon are: Groenlo Dutch (province of Gelderland/The Netherlands), Vorstenbosch Dutch (province of Northern Brabant/The Netherlands) and Maasbree Dutch (province of Limburg/The Netherlands). Consider, for example, the following pair from Maasbree Dutch:

- (i) [Talking about sweet candies] (zuurke ‘candy’ = neuter)  
 a. Ik wil *zo’n groot geel*, niet *zo’n klein geel*  
 I want such a big yellow, not such a small yellow  
 b. Ik wil *zonne grote gele*, niet *zonne kleine gele*  
 I want such-a big-*e* yellow-*e*, not such-a small-*e* yellow-*e*  
 ‘I want such a big yellow one, not such a small yellow one.’

orthographically *-e*), except when the noun phrase is indefinite, neuter and singular. For Frisian, we argued that a surface form like *in lytse* (a small-*e*, ‘a small one’) has the following more abstract representation:  $[_{DP} \text{ in } [_{NP} \text{ lyts-}e [_{NP} \text{ ONE}]]]$ . Importantly, however, this inflected form was impossible when *ONE* was associated with a neuter singular antecedent noun. It was shown that Frisian in these cases exhibits the pronominalization strategy for NPE. More specifically, a weak (genderless) pro-form *en* occupies the N-position, as in *in lytsen* (a small-*en*, ‘a small one’). Importantly, this pronominal form could ‘replace’ both a non-neuter noun and a neuter noun.

We would like to propose now that in standard Dutch—but arguably also dialects such as Sliedrecht Dutch and Nijkerk Dutch; see (106)—we have the same two systems of NPE as in Frisian: i.e. (i) the elision strategy, where presence of agreement morphology on the adjective is crucial for the licensing of the silent noun *ONE*, and (ii) the pronominalization strategy, i.e. the presence of a phonologically weak pro-form. The difference between Frisian and Dutch is that in Frisian the inflection (*-e*) and the pro-form (*-en*) are distinguishable in pronunciation, whereas in Dutch they are not; the pro-form is *e*, and thus phonologically identical to (i.e. homophonous with) the adjectival inflection *-e*. The simultaneous similarity (i.e. as regards the available NPE-strategies) and difference (i.e. as regards the form of the pro-form) between Frisian and Dutch is depicted in the following table:<sup>57</sup>

(111)

	Elision strategy		Pronominalization strategy	
	Indef. common sg	Indef. Neuter sg.	Indef common sg	Indef neuter sg
Frisian	<i>in swarte</i>	<i>%in swart</i>	<i>in swarten</i>	<i>in swarten</i>
Dutch	<i>een zwarte</i>	<i>%een zwart</i>	<i>een zwarte</i>	<i>een zwarte</i>
Underlying Representation	<i>in swarte ONE</i> <i>een zwarte ONE</i>	<i>%in swart-Ø ONE</i> <i>%een zwart-Ø ONE</i>	<i>in swart en</i> <i>een zwart e</i>	<i>in swart en</i> <i>een zwart e</i>

As is clear from the ‘Dutch’ row, the elision strategy and the pronominalization strategy with common nouns results in the same surface representation. However, the underlying representation is quite different. On the basis of micro-comparative syntactic research (e.g. comparison with Frisian) that the existence of two NPE-strategies can be motivated for Dutch.

Just as we did for the Frisian and Zierikzee Dutch NPE-patterns with a sequence of adjectives provided in (102) and (100) respectively, we should make the following additional remark about standard Dutch. When the adjectival remnant consists of a sequence of adjectives, the leftmost adjective clearly carries an inflectional marker *-e*, as in:

- (112) Jan heeft [een groot wit konijn<sub>[+neuter]</sub>] en Marie heeft [een kleine zwarte]  
 Jan has a big white rabbit and Marie has a small-*e* black-*e*  
 ‘Jan has a big white rabbit and Marie has a small black one.’

Recall from the Frisian example in (102) (but the same holds for the Zierikzee Dutch example in (100)) that certain speakers find the form *in grutte swarten* (a big-*e* black-*en* ‘a big black one’) quite acceptable. We proposed that the *e* on *grutte* is a default inflection, inserted because the pro-noun *en* does not carry a gender feature. We further argued that this same default inflection showed up on the adjective adjacent to the pro-form *en*, but that it did not surface as result of haplology; i.e. the inflection *-e* (schwa) is deleted since it precedes another schwa.

<sup>57</sup> Remember from our discussion of Frisian that we take its pro-form *en* to be gender-less. Thus, strictly speaking, the fourth and fifth column in (111) can be reduced to a single column. In what follows, we will argue that this absence of gender-specification also applies to the Dutch weak pro-form *e*. Thus, also for this language the two columns can be reduced to one. We have simply included two separate columns for expository purposes.

We will argue that this Frisian state of affairs also holds for Dutch. This implies that the NPE-pattern *een kleine zwarte* in (113) has the following representation:<sup>58</sup>

- (113) [een [NP kleine [NP zwarte [NP e]]]] (= een kleine zwarte)

In summary: by taking a micro-comparative perspective on NPE in Dutch, we have identified two NPE-strategies in Standard Dutch, viz. the elision strategy and the pronominalization strategy. An important aid in our analysis of Dutch NPE was Frisian. The latter language formally distinguishes the pro-form and the adjectival inflection, viz. *en* versus *-e*. In Dutch, the pro-form and the inflectional marker are homophonous, i.e. *-e*. As a consequence of that, the pro-form strategy is difficult to identify. We further showed that there are Dutch dialects which make use of a single strategy: the elision/agreement strategy (Asten Dutch) or the pronominalization strategy (Zierikzee Dutch).

We close off this section with the two NPE-examples from Standard Dutch that were discussed in (90) and (91) above and which can now be analyzed as instances of the pro-form strategy. The relevant examples are repeated here as (114) and (115), respectively:

- (114) a. Ik heb gisteren [een groot / grote pianist] horen spelen.  
I have a big/big-*e* pianist hear play  
'I have heard a great / big pianist yesterday.'  
b. Ik heb gisteren [een echt grote] horen spelen.  
I have yesterday a real big-*e* hear play  
'I have heard a truly big/great one yesterday.'
- (115) a. het doorbakken(\**e*) konijn                      b. het doorbakken\*(-*e*)  
the well-baked(*e*) rabbit                              the well-baked(*e*)  
'the well-baked rabbit'                                      'the well-baked one'

Recall that the presence of the *e*-ending on the adjective *groot* 'big/great' in (114a) affects its meaning: when it is present, the adjective means 'big', whereas it means 'great' when it is absent. As shown in (114b), the adjective must carry an *e*-suffix independent of its meaning, when it occurs as an adjectival remnant in an ellipsis context. So, also in this case the *e*-suffix obligatorily shows up when the noun is elided. Consider next the examples in (115). (115a) shows that adjectives that are derived from past participles cannot show inflection in attributive contexts. However, as shown in (115b), these participial adjectives need to get the inflection when used in ellipsis contexts.

In view of the previous discussion, we propose that the *e* in (114b) and (115b) is a weak pro-form that substitutes for N. The representations of the two NPE-patterns are given in (116):

- (116) a. [DP een [NP echt grote [NP e]]]  
b. [DP het [NP doorbakken [NP e]]]

As indicated in (116a), we will assume that *groot* 'big' gets a default inflection *-e* (see the discussion in and around example (113) above). This inflection is subsequently eliminated, however, as a result of haplology.

In section 3 on Afrikaans and in section 4 on Frisian we have used a test in order to determine whether a certain ending appearing on adjectives in NPE-contexts is an adjectival inflection or not. In particular we have argued that the ending is not an adjectival inflection if it does not appear on all adjectives when the remnant of NPE contains more than one adjective (see example (102) from Frisian). For standard Dutch this test does not work so good, since in this language the pro-form is homophonous to the adjectival

<sup>58</sup> Thus, in *swarten* and *een zwarte* in columns 4 and 5 in (111) are more precisely represented as follows:

- (i) a. [in [NP swarte [NP en]]]  
b. [een [NP zwarte [NP e]]]

inflection. There is one context, however, where the adjectives do not (overtly) agree with the pro-form *e*, namely when the adjectives are derived from past participles (see (115) above). This means that if the remnant of ellipsis consists of more than one adjective derived from a past participle, we expect only the last one to carry an *e*-ending. This ending is not, as we argued above, an adjectival inflection but a weak pro-form. This prediction is borne out by the data in (117).

- (117) a.       het gezouten(\*-e) visje  
              the salted-e fish  
              ‘the salted fish’  
      b.       het gebakken(\*-e) visje  
              the fried-e meat  
              ‘the fried meat’  
      c.       het gezouten(\*-e) gebakken\*(-e)  
              the salted-e fried-e  
              ‘the salted fried meat’

These data once again confirm that the Dutch *-e* is homophonous between an adjectival inflection and a weak pro-form.<sup>59</sup>

## 7. Conclusion

This article investigated the syntax of NP-ellipsis featuring an adjectival remnant. Our investigation had as its starting point the general statement found in the literature that the elision strategy for NPE is typically found in languages displaying inflectional morphology (i.e. agreement) on the adjectival remnant (e.g. French), while the pronominalization strategy is found in languages that do not display any morphology on the adjective (e.g. English). Our specific aim in this article was to show that there are languages that appear to make use of the elision/agreement strategy but which, on closer inspection, turn out to use the pronominalization strategy (say, *one*-insertion). More specifically, these pro-forms were characterized as phonologically weak pronouns. We tried to provide evidence for this ‘weak pronoun’ strategy by taking a micro-comparative perspective on a number of closely related languages and dialects, more specifically English, Afrikaans, Frisian and (dialectal variants of) Dutch. From a morphophonological perspective, these weak pro-forms have the appearance of inflectional morphemes: they typically attach to an adjacent host and very often they are also homophonous with inflectional morphemes present in the language. On the basis of the morphosyntactic behavior of these items (e.g. Afrikaans *-e*, Frisian *-en*, Zierikzee Dutch *-en*, Dutch *-e*), it was shown that the elements at hand were in fact weak (i.e. enclitic) pronominals and not inflectional suffixes. An important piece of empirical evidence in our investigation was the morphosyntactic behavior of adjectival remnants consisting of a sequence of adjectives. The impossibility of sequences such as *\*n grote swarte* (a big-*e* black-*e*, ‘a big black one’ (e.g. rabbit)) in Afrikaans and *\*in gruten swarten* (a big-*en* black-*en*, ‘a big black one’) in Frisian was taken as evidence that Afrikaans *e* and Frisian *en* are not adjectival inflectional morphemes, but rather phonologically weak pro-forms that occupy the N-position of the nominal projection.

A further outcome of our investigation was that there are languages/dialects with a single NPE-strategy (cf. the elision strategy of Asten Dutch, and the pronominalization strategy of Zierikzee Dutch) but also languages/dialects that display more than one strategy (cf. Frisian, standard Dutch). Even though Afrikaans appears to make use of both strategies, it was argued that this language actually makes use of only the pronominalization strategy.

<sup>59</sup> These data also provide an argument against the analysis put forward in footnote 55 that the *e*-ending on adjectives in NPE-cases of a neuter singular indefinite noun are actually agreement affixes resulting from the agreement relation between the adjective and a covert pro-form with default gender features or without gender features. If the *e*-ending would be an agreement affix, we would expect it to appear on both adjectives.

We close off this article with a few descriptive remarks on the typology of pronouns. Ever since Kayne's (1975) seminal study on Romance personal pronouns, it has generally been recognized that a distinction should be made between two linguistically (i.e. phonologically, morphologically and syntactically) distinct classes of pronouns, namely clitic pronouns (e.g. Italian *lo* 'him') and strong pronouns (e.g. *lui* 'him'). Also for the Germanic languages, the existence of this distinction within the pronominal system was noted (see among others, Koster (1978), Holmberg (1991), Cardinaletti (1998), Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), Corver & Delfitto (1999)). The Germanic counterparts of the Romance clitic pronouns were referred to as 'weak pronouns', where 'weak' refers to their phonologically reduced status (compare e.g. the Dutch strong pronoun *hem* 'him', pronounced /hɛm/, and its weak counterpart *'m*, pronounced /əɪm/).<sup>60</sup> In the present article, we saw that within the class of indefinite pronominals (i.e. pro-NPs like English *one*), we come across this same distinction. Afrikaans, for example, clearly displayed this distinction with the forms *een* versus *e* (compare: *in swart een* and *in swarte* 'a black one'). In short, the clitic/weak versus strong distinction is something which is found at the level of both definite pronominals (i.e. pro-Ds) and indefinite pronominals (i.e. pro-Ns). A second dichotomy that has been observed in the (definite) pronominal system (i.e. pro-D) is that between phonologically overt pronominals (e.g. *he*, *him*) and phonologically empty ones (e.g. *pro*, *PRO*); see Chomsky (1981). As amply illustrated in this article, also this distinction holds for the indefinite pronominal system (i.e. pro-N). Compare, for example, the overt pronoun *one* and the silent pro-form *ONE* (cf. Kayne 2003). Although the above remarks about the typology of pronominal systems, admittedly, remain quite descriptive, we think they point towards an important characteristic of natural language grammar, viz. the parallelism (i.e. unity) in grammatical behavior of different subsystems (in casu: pronominal systems) of grammar.

### Acknowledgements

The research reported on in this article is part of a larger research project entitled *Diversity in Dutch DP Design* (DiDDD), which is financially supported by The Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). We are grateful to the informants of this project for providing us with the relevant data of their Dutch dialect. We would further like to thank our informants for Afrikaans and Frisian for their help with and discussion of the data from their languages. For Afrikaans: Theresa Biberauer, Frenette Southwood, and Johan Oosthuizen. For Frisian: Siebren Dyk, Eric Hoekstra, Jarich Hoekstra, Bouke Slofstra, Janneke Spoelstra, Willem Visser. The content of this article was presented at a 2008 UCLA-minicourse entitled 'The study of syntactic microvariation: perspectives and tools', which was sponsored by a joint collaborative grant from the Universities of California and the University of Utrecht. We would like to thank Hilda Koopman and Ed Stabler for very useful discussion.

### References

- Abney, S. 1987. The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge.
- Barbiers, S. 2005. Variation in the morphosyntax of *ONE*. The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 8, 159-183.
- Bennis, H., N. Corver & M. den Dikken. 1998. Predication in nominal phrases. The journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics 1, 85-117.
- Bolinger, D. 1972. Degree Words. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bont, A.P. de. 1958. Dialekt van Kempenland. Meer in het bijzonder d'Oerse taol. Deel 1. Klank- en vormleer en enige syntactische bijzonderheden. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V.
- Borer, Hagit. 2005. Structuring Sense. Volume I: In Name Only. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Broekhuis, Hans, Evelien Keizer and Marcel den Dikken, (2003). Nouns and noun phrases, ms. Modern grammar of Dutch. Occasional papers 4, Tilburg.
- Cardinaletti, A. 1998. On the Deficient/Strong Opposition in Possessive Systems. In: Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase, eds. A. Alexiadou & C. Wilder, 17-53. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

---

<sup>60</sup> See Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) for arguments that the (Germanic) class of weak pronouns is grammatically distinct from the (Romance) class of clitic pronouns.

- Cardinaletti, A. & M. Starke (1999). The Typology of Structural Deficiency: A Case Study of the Three Classes of Pronouns. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, vol. 8 of *Language Typology*, ed. H. van Riemsdijk, 145-233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, N. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. 1994. On the evidence for partial N-movement in the Romance DP. In: *Paths towards Universal Grammar*, ed. G. Cinque et al., 85-110. Georgetown University Press: Washington DC.
- Corver, N. 1990. *The Syntax of Left Branch Extractions*. Doctoral dissertation, Tilburg University, Tilburg.
- Corver, N. 2008. Uniformity and Diversity in the Syntax of Evaluative Vocatives. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 11, 43-93.
- Corver, N. & D. Delfitto. 1999. On the nature of pronoun movement. In: *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, vol. 8 of *Language Typology*, ed. H. van Riemsdijk, 799-861. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Corver, N. & M. van Koppen. 2006. Let's Focus on Noun Phrase Ellipsis. Ms., Utrecht University.
- Corver, N. & M. van Koppen. To appear. Ellipsis in Dutch possessive noun phrases: a comparative approach. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*.
- Corver, N., M. van Koppen, H. Kranendonk & M. Rigterink. 2007. The Noun Phrase: Diversity in Dutch DP Design. *Nordlyd* 34:1, 73-85.
- Corver, N. & H. van Riemsdijk. 2001. *Semi-lexical Categories*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Déchaïne, R.-M. & M. Wiltschko. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 409-442.
- Deunk, G.H. 1977. *Grammatica van het Winterswijkse*, deel 2. Sasland, Groningen.
- Dikken, M. den. 2006. *Relators and linkers. The syntax of predication, predicate inversion, and copulas*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Donaldson, B. 1993. *A Grammar of Afrikaans*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Emonds, J. 1985. *A unified theory of syntactic categories*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Emonds, J. 2000. *Lexicon and Grammar: The English Syntacticon*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grohmann, K. 2003. Prolific Domains: On the Anti-Locality of Movement. *Dependencies (Linguistik Aktuell 66)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hoekema, T. 1996. *Beknopte Fries Vormleer*. Leeuwarden/Ljouwert.
- Hoekstra, J. 1997. Absolutely intensifying adjectives and the emphatic marker *-E* in North Frisian (Fering-Öömrang), West Frisian and other West Germanic languages. In: *Us Wurk 46* (special issue dedicated to Bo Sjölin), eds. G. de Haan & O. Vries.
- Holmberg, A. 1991. The distribution of Scandinavian weak pronouns. In: *Clitics and their Hosts*, eds. H. van Riemsdijk & L. Rizzi, 155-173.
- Jackendoff, R. 1977. *X-bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 1975. *French Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. 2003. Silent years, silent hours. In: *Grammar in Focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack*, vol 2, eds. L-O. Delsing et al, 209-226. Lund: Wallin and Dalholm.
- Kayne, R. 2005. On the syntax of Quantity in English (originally circulated in 2002). In: R Kayne (2005), *Movement and Silence*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, R. 2007. *Several, few and many*. *Lingua*, 117 (special issue: *Linguistic Perspectives on Numerical Expressions*, eds. N. Corver, J. Doetjes & J. Zwarts), 832-858.
- Kester, E.-P. 1996. *The nature of adjectival inflection*. Doctoral dissertation. Utrecht University.
- Koster, J. 1978. *Locality Principles in Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kranendonk, H. 2008. Numerals and grammatical nouns in NP-ellipsis. A micro-comparative approach. Handout, talk at st@r-meeting, Rutgers University.
- Lakoff, G. 1970. Global Rules. *Language* 46: 627-639.
- Lobeck, A. 1991. The Phrase Structure of Ellipsis. In: *Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*, ed. Susan Rothstein, 81-103. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lobeck, A. 1995. *Ellipsis: functional heads, licensing and ellipsis*. OUP
- Meer, G. van der. 1987. *It is in dregen baas* (de 'bûgings' *-(e)n* bij eigenskipswurden). *Us Wurk* 36, 97-111.
- Muysken, P. & H. van Riemsdijk. 1986. Projecting Features and Featuring Projections. In: *Features and Projections*, eds. P. Muysken & H. van Riemsdijk, 1-30. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Postal, P. 1966. On so-called pronouns in English. In: *Modern studies in English*, eds. D. Reibel & S. Schane, 201-223, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.



- Panagiotidis, P. 2003a. Empty Nouns. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21.2: 381-432.
- Panagiotidis, P. 2003b. *One*, Empty Nouns and Theta Assignment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34: 281-292.
- Pesetsky, D. and E. Torrego. 2001. T-to-C movement: causes and consequences. In: *Ken Hale: a Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, 355-426. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Peters, P. 1938. Het zelfstandig gebruikte adjectief en het geslacht. *Onze Taaltuin* VII, 22-25.
- Popkema, J. 2006. *Grammatica Fries*. Utrecht: Het Spectrum B.V.
- Ross, J.R. 1967. Constraints on variables in Syntax. Doctoral Dissertation MIT.
- Schütze, C. 2001. Semantically Empty Lexical Heads as Last Resorts. In: *Semi-lexical Categories*, eds. N. Corver & H. van Riemsdijk, 127-187. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Systra, O.H. & J.J. Hof. 1925. *Nieuwe Friesche Spraakkunst*. Leeuwarden: Van der Velde.
- Tamminga, D.A. 1963. It is in dregen baas. Op 'e taelhelling. *Losse trochseden fan Frysk taellibben* I. 265-267. Boalsert.
- Torrego, E. 1987. On empty categories in nominals. Ms. Umass, Boston.
- Valois, D. & Royle. 2008. Partitivity, atomization, and Noun-Drop: a longitudinal study of French child language. Université de Montréal.