



Dutch Nominalised Infinitives As Non-Identical Twins

Maaïke Schoorlemmer

Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS



Universiteit Utrecht

DUTCH NOMINALISED INFINITIVES AS NON-IDENTICAL TWINS*

Maaïke Schoorlemmer

UiL OTS, Trans 10, 3512 JK Utrecht, the Netherlands

schoorlemmer@let.uu.nl

+ 31-30-253.6183 (phone)/6000 (fax)

November, 2001

Abstract:

Dutch nominalised infinitives have been notoriously difficult to analyse, partly because they seem to show mixed verbal and nominal properties interspersed across the structure. In this paper, it is argued that at least two types of such infinitives should be distinguished, one which contains a high level of verbal functional structure, and one that differs at least in not projecting TP. On the basis of this distinction it is possible to show that Dutch nominalised infinitives have much more predictable properties than could previously be identified. They show evidence of conforming to a model of analysing mixed categories in terms of category switch within the constituent.

In order to account for the seemingly interspersed nature of nominal and verbal properties in Dutch nominalised infinitives I propose that Dutch *of*-phrases (*van*-phrases) may merge inside the VP, provided they have access to nominal functional structure for feature checking. I will show that if D° is filled by a special type of non-deictic demonstratives *van*-phrases may even occur in SpecDP.

1 Introduction

Languages differ with respect to the grammatical means available to them to use verbal constituents in nominal contexts or to nominalise them. A language like Russian, for example, uses an array of nominal affixes to derive deverbal nouns including complex event nominals (Grimshaw 1990), and allows subject bare infinitives. English, in addition to this, has the option of deriving gerunds, with a mixture of verbal and nominal properties.

- (1) John's never wanting to see his father again frightened me

Dutch also has the possibility of deriving a nominalisation that is more verbal than a complex event nominal and more nominal than a bare infinitive. Since the verb form in it is infinitival, the structure is generally referred to in the literature as 'nominal infinitive' or 'nominalised infinitive'.

- (2) a. Het oproepen van getuigen door de officier
the summon-INF of witnesses by the coroner
b. Dat afschuwelijke overlast veroorzaken van jou
that terrible trouble cause-INF of you

* For judgments, discussion and valuable suggestions on earlier versions of this paper I would like to thank Peter Ackema, Ana Bravo, Jenny Doetjes, Wim van Gelder, Heleen Hoekstra, Ellen-Petra Kester, Anne-Marie Mineur and Eddy Ruys, as well as the participants of the Syntax-Semantics Interface Group at UiL OTS. All errors remain my own. This research was supported by the Dutch Organisation of Scientific Research NWO.

The following is a list of properties of such infinitives, as they have been identified in the literature (Reuland 1983, Van Haaften *et al* 1985, Hoekstra and Wehrmann 1985, Reuland 1988, Hoekstra 1997, De Wit 1997).

Nominal Properties

- They are introduced by a determiner
- They can be modified by adjectives
- A subject or object may be expressed in a *van*-phrase
- The *van*-phrase always occurs in a post-head position
- There can be only one *van*-phrase

Verbal properties

- They can be modified by adverbs
- Argument PPs can precede or follow the head
- (Bare accusative) direct objects must precede the verb
- They may contain complex verbal structures
- They show the same clustering properties as clauses (with one exception)

The literature on Dutch nominalised infinitives, extensive as it is, treats all these nominalisations as birds of a feather. At the same time, however, it has proved extremely hard to pinpoint any restrictions on combinations of properties, apart from some well-known exceptions. In this paper, I propose to clarify some of the murkier areas by identifying different types of nominalised infinitives in Dutch. I will show that nominalised infinitives with preverbal objects should be divided into at least two different types, which differ in the level of verbal syntactic structure they contain. In this way, it will be possible to identify differences in the content and syntactic status of *van*-phrases and on the semantic type and syntactic category of modifiers.

I will differentiate between two types: nominalised infinitives introduced by a specific type of demonstrative pronoun on the one hand and nominalised infinitives that can occur with different determiners but which most commonly have a definite article on the other. I will refer to these classes as expressive infinitives and plain infinitives respectively.

The paper will be organised as follows. In section 2, I will present some initial evidence to differentiate plain and expressive infinitives, and I will make an explicit proposal for the structure of expressive infinitives based on a more general model for the derivation of mixed categories. In section 3, I will introduce the properties of expressive demonstratives on the basis of DPs with nominal heads. Section 4 shows that expressive infinitives share all these special properties, from which I conclude that they contain expressive demonstratives. In section 5, I argue that, as opposed to plain infinitives, expressive infinitives share subject properties with bare infinitives. On the basis of this, I propose that expressive infinitives include the structural level of TP, and that plain infinitives do not. In section 6, I introduce a further category of secondary expressive infinitives whose properties confirm various predictions from section 5. Conclusions and further comments are presented in section 7.

2 Formulating the Distinction between Expressive and Plain Infinitives

There are two different types of nominalised infinitives in Dutch. One takes a definite article, the other type takes an expressive demonstrative. I will call them PLAIN and EXPRESSIVE INFINITIVES. I will argue that they show substantial syntactic differences.

2.1 Initial Evidence for a Distinction

Here is some initial evidence that these two different classes should be distinguished. Some combinations of modifiers, verbs and auxiliaries occur only in one type, not the other. The following example cannot occur as an expressive nominalised infinitive.

- (3) a. Het nooit meer gebeld hebben van Tanja
 the never anymore phoned have-INF of Tanja
 'Tanya's never having phoned back'
 b. *Dat nooit meer gebeld hebben van Tanja
 that never anymore phonedhave-INF of Tanja

Alternatively, some combinations of elements resist usage in a plain nominalised infinitive.

- (4) a. Dat afschuwelijke overlast veroorzaken van jou
 that terrible trouble cause of you
 b. ??Het afschuwelijke overlast veroorzaken van jou
 the terrible trouble cause of you

There is a further difference between these two types of nominalised infinitives. In an expressive nominalised infinitive the *van*-phrase (the PP expressing a possessor whose cognate is the English *of*-phrase may express the subject of the event described in the infinitive (as in (4a) and (5)).

- (5) a. Dat eeuwige eten van Tanja
 that eternal eat-INF of Tanja
 b. Dat eeuwige beledigen van Tanja
 that eternal insult-INF of Tanja

Expression of the object in this *van*-phrase is possible, but not with all types of DPs. A bare plural object is possible, a definite object is not.

- (6) a. *Dat eeuwige eten van die appels
 that eternal eat-INF of those apples
 b. *Dat eeuwige beledigen van die schele
 that eternal insult-INF of that cross-eyed
 c. Dat afschuwelijke pesten van brildraggers
 that awful tease-INF of people-with-glasses
 d. Dat vreselijke martelen van gevangenen
 that terrible torture-INF of prisoners

In plain nominalised infinitives it is perfectly fine to express any direct object in a *van*-phrase.

- (7) a. Het eten van die appels

	the	eat-INF	of	those	apples			
b. Het	beledigen	van	die/de		schele			
	the	insult-INF	of	that/the	cross-eyed			
	'insulting that cross eyed person'							
c. Het	oproepen	van	getuigen/hen		door	de	officier	
	the	summon-INF	of	witnesses/them	by	the	coroner	
d. Het	lezen	van	dit	moeilijke	boek/ervan			
	the	read-INF	of	this	complex	book/of-it		

It turns out, then, that the expression of objects in *van*-phrases is unrestricted in plain infinitives, but severely restricted in some expressive infinitives. I will return to expressive infinitives with object *van*-phrases in section 6, arguing that they are in fact not expressive infinitives, but what I will refer to as 'secondary expressive infinitives': expressive variants of plain infinitives.

In this paper, I will provide an analysis of the different arguments that may surface as *van*-phrases in different types of nominalised infinitives. I will not provide an analysis of the specific contrasts in examples (3) and (4), which I only use to illustrate the existence of the different types of infinitives.

2.2 General Framework

Before making a specific proposal about the syntactic structure of these two types of nominalised infinitives, let me explain my agenda. Elsewhere (Schoorlemmer 1999), I have proposed a model for the analysis of mixed categories that hinges on the following ideas.

- Verbal and nominal constituents (extended projections in Grimshaw 1991's terms) project functional projections along equivalent models, leading to a form of equivalence between the following pairs of nominal and verbal functional projections: AspP and NumP (both pertaining to cardinality), TP and PosP (both linking the referent of the projection to an entity in a larger discourse frame -- a subject or a (pre-nominal) possessor), CP and DP, which are both instrumental in embedding the structure in a higher one.¹
- I assume a fixed ordering of functional projections, as presented in the previous paragraph. A completely nominal and a completely verbal constituent therefore look like (8a) and (8b) resp.²

- (8) a. [DP [PosP [NumP [NP]]]]
 b. [CP [TP [AspP [VP]]]]

- The idea is then that in a mixed category, instead of projecting the next high up verbal functional projection, a head is merged that projects its nominal equivalent.
- A further assumption, one that I motivate at length in Schoorlemmer (1999), is that there is a fixed direction for this type of switch, which among other things prevents switching back to the original category within the same constituent.

This paper is not intended as a detailed presentation of and argumentation for this model. Yet I do intend to use its descriptive potential to see whether the phenomena encountered in Dutch nominalised infinitives fit this model, and whether the distinctions between different types of nominalised infinitives can be described in terms of it. Ideas like this have previously been pursued in Abney (1987), Schoorlemmer (1995), Siloni (1997) and Borsley and Kornfilt (1999). One crucial prediction in our model is that a language may have mixed categories that differ in the structural level at which they switch to nominal properties. In this paper, I will present massive evidence to corroborate this prediction for V-to-N derivatives in Dutch.

2.3 Predictions

My first proposal for the structure of expressive infinitives is the following:

- (9) Expressive infinitives are DPs containing
 - a. an expressive demonstrative, as well as
 - b. a bare infinitive
- (9)' Plain infinitives are DPs not containing a bare infinitive

Let us first look at the structural implications of this proposal. On the basis of the fact that bare infinitives may occur as independent constituents in a sentence my assumption is that they are CP in that context. As a result, we might think of the structure of expressive infinitives in terms of the DP dominating that bare infinitive CP.

- (10) [DP *dat* [AP] [CP]]

Our prediction is now that any CP constituent can occur in a structure dominated by an expressive demonstrative pronoun, including, in particular, ordinary finite sentences. Examples of such cases are given in (11).

- (11) a. Dat continue "als ik groot ben" van jou
 that constant [when I grow up] of you
- b. Dat constante "morgen ga ik naar huis" van jou
 that constant [tomorrow go I home] of you
- c. Dat zeurderige "in de tuin zit iedereen te lezen" van jou
 that whining [in the garden everybody's reading] of you
- d. Dat "zijn we d'r al" van jou
 that [are we there yet] of you

The striking thing about these examples is their interpretation: they are interpreted as quotations, as something that is said by someone, not something that happens. If both bare infinitives and finite clauses inside the expressive demonstrative are CPs, then the question is why only finite clauses receive this quotation interpretation. I propose that the quotation interpretation derives from having a CFC (complete functional complex, Chomsky 1995) inside the noun phrase.³

Further evidence for the interpretational effect of having a CFC dominated by an expressive demonstrative comes from PPs in this position. Like finite clauses, they are only felicitous with a quotation interpretation.

- (12) a. Dat (luidkeelse) "aan tafel" van jou
 that loud-and-clear to table of you
 'Your calling everybody to dinner loud and clearly'
- b. Dat (voorspelbare) "je bed in" van jou
 that predictable your bed into of you
 'Your predictably saying "into your bed" all the time'

An interpretation that would be equivalent to the event interpretation of expressive infinitives with bare infinitives would be one where, e.g., the PP expresses a location where the subject is often to be found. This interpretation is impossible.

In the absence of a quotation interpretation of expressive infinitives I conclude that bare infinitives inside expressive infinitives do not project all the way up to CP. I propose that it is TP, as in the structure in (13).

(13) [DP dat [TP]]

In this structure, the functional level that would derive a verbal CFC has been replaced by its nominal counterpart DP. This is precisely the type of structure that is predicted to be possible under the hypothesis put forward here and in Schoorlemmer (1999). It is compatible with the properties of both bare infinitives and clauses and their behaviour in structures with expressive demonstratives.

Under the proposal in (9) adjectival modifiers occupy the same position as adjectival modifiers in any DP. Adverbial modifiers in expressive infinitives are contained in the bare infinitival.

- (14) a. Dat **eeuwig** de beste willen zijn van jou
 that eternally the best want-INF be-INF of you
 'Your always wanting to be best'
- b. Dat **eeuwig** de beste willen zijn van jou
 that eternal the best want-INF be-INF of you
 'Your never-ending talk of being best'

In example (14a), the adverbial modifier (lacking adjectival inflection) is interpreted as part of the infinitival clause. In (14b) the adjectival modifier (with inflection) is interpreted as a nominal modifier, whose semantics is part of the value judgment rather than a modifier of the infinitival clause. I will return to the role of the latter type of modification below.

By the proposal in (9)', the prediction is also that plain infinitives do not have the structure in (13).⁴ I will argue that plain infinitives differ from expressive infinitives at least in lacking the verbal functional level of TP, in other words that they have the structure in (15).

(15) [DP het [PosP [AspP]]]

In order to evaluate this proposal we have to see to what extent properties of both expressive demonstratives and bare infinitivals carry over to expressive infinitives. In the next section, I will properly introduce the use of expressive demonstratives in Dutch noun phrases.

3 Defining Expressive Demonstratives

The expressive demonstratives is commonly used in Dutch noun phrases to convey D-linking (Pesetsky 1987) of the phrase as well as a sense of value judgment of its content. Some examples of noun phrases with expressive demonstratives, or EXPRESSIVE NOUN PHRASES, are given below.

- (16) a. Dat fijne zoontjevan jou/Tanja heeft hier de boel op stelten gezet
 that nice sonny of you/Tanja made quite a mess here
- b. Die vreselijke thriller van jou staat nu eindelijk op de band
 that terrible thriller of you I finally managed to record on tape
- c. Die eeuwige microfoon van jou wil ik nou wel eens zien
 that eternal microphone of you want I now finally see
 'I'd like to finally see that great microphone you always go on about'

In these cases, the demonstrative in combination with the *van*-phrase expresses the fact that the referent of the noun is well-known to both hearer and listener, i.e. it expresses D-linking, it expresses that the referent of the *van*-phrase is responsible for its introduction into the discourse, and also that there is something particularly annoying about it or that it is talked about too much. Haeseryn *et al.* (1997) states that there seems to be a very close link between the use of an expressive demonstrative and the appearance of a *van*-phrase. It also observes that the *van*-phrase usually contains a pronoun. In this section, I want to identify the defining property of expressive demonstratives that sets them apart from any other type of demonstrative.

3.1 Expressive Demonstratives and Evaluation

The defining property of expressive demonstratives is that they introduce an element of evaluation, a value judgment. This value judgment always has a negative flavour. In most cases, the evaluation is expressed in an adjective, as illustrated in (16). However, it can also be expressed by choosing a head noun with appropriate evaluative semantics or even by intonation.

- (17) a. Die trut van jou
 that bitch of you
 b. Dat blaadje van jou
 that little-journal of you
- (18) a. Dat bedrIjf van u
 that company of you example
 (suggesting, e.g., it's more like a money laundering operation)
 b. Dat bOEK van u
 that book of you
 (suggesting, e.g., it hasn't gone beyond the manuscript)

I will now show that it is this property that sets apart expressive demonstratives from a very close relative, which I will call 'resumptive demonstratives'. Resumptive demonstratives are illustrated in the following examples.

- (19) a. Die microfoon (waar jij het over had)
 that microphone (that you talked about)
 b. Die man gisteren
 that man yesterday
 c. Die hond van hem
 that dog of him

Resumptive demonstratives refer back to an entity previously introduced into the discourse, to remind the listener of its precise identity.

- (20) a. Die man gisteren, weet je nog, die zo vervelend was in het park,
 that man yesterday, remember, who was such a pain in the park,
 die kom ik vaker tegen
 I've run into him before
 b. Die hond van hem, weet je wel die grote, die is ontzettend vals geworden
 that dog of him, you know the big one, he has turned very vicious

If its use turns out to be inappropriate, for example because the listener does not in fact know what the speaker is talking about, a question with *welke* 'which' can be asked for clarification.

- (21) "Waar is die tas nou gebleven?" "Welke, die gele?"
 Where has that bag gone which one, the yellow one

There is no sense of value judgment in such noun phrases, and no sense, as a result, of a *van*-phrase expressing it.

All of this is different in noun phrases with expressive demonstratives. In expressive noun phrases the precise identity of the entity expressed in the noun phrase has already been well-established, and the expressive noun phrase is used to make a statement.

- (22) a. Dat afschuwelijke jasje van hem
 that awful jacket of him
 b. Die vreselijke oorbellen van haar
 those terrible earrings of her
 c. Dat gore petje van jou
 that dirty little-cap of you

So unlike resumptive demonstratives, which are used to *perform* D-linking, in expressive demonstratives D-linking is *presupposed*.⁵ This presupposed D-linking is necessary in order for the value judgment that is always expressed in such noun phrases to be appropriate. Crucially, a question asking 'which' is totally inappropriate when referring to a DP with an expressive demonstrative (cf (21)).

- (23) I "Waar is die stomme tas van jou nou gebleven?"
 Where has that stupid bag of you gone
 II #"Welke, die gele?"
 Which one, the yellow one?

The response given in the example has the effect of treating the earlier utterance as containing a resumptive demonstrative, not an expressive one, denying the value judgment by ignoring it. A more appropriate response would be:

- (23)' II Dat is helemaal geen stomme tas, hoor, hij is juist prachtig!
 That is not a stupid bag at all, it's a great bag!

The value judgment that is intrinsic in expressive noun phrases allows such noun phrases to be used as exclamations. Examples like those in (22) are quite natural in isolation with an exclamatory intonation. This is not the case in either ordinary different noun phrases or ones with resumptive demonstratives.

- (24) a. *Die microfoon (waar jij het over had)!
 that microphone (that you talked about)
 b. *Die man gisteren!
 that man yesterday
 c. *De hond van hem!
 that dog of him

Expressive demonstratives always introduce a value judgment, and they do so on the basis of *presupposed* D-linking. Resumptive demonstratives *establish* D-linking.

3.2 Expressive Demonstratives, Contrast and Genericity

One way of describing the semantic effect of an expressive demonstrative is to say that the head or its modifier is perceived as inherently contrasted, both semantically and intonationally. So, even though the content of a *van*-phrase cannot be contrasted (see below), the head certainly can.

- (25) a. Dat (eeuwige) tAAltje van die Engelsen dat gaat nog, maar dat
 that (eternal) lingo of those English is not so bad, but that
 Eten (van ze), dat is echt niet te pruimen
 food (of them), that I really cannot stomach
- b. Dat blAAdje van die vent dat gaat nog, maar
 that little-magazine of that guy is not so bad, but
 die kOp (van hem), die hoef ik niet te zien
 that face (of him), that I don't want to see

This inherent contrast corresponds to the fact that the noun phrase expresses the object of focus and/or conversation.

Expressive demonstratives also have a certain generic flavour about them, which does not refer to the generalness or type reading of the noun included, but to the fact that the noun included is *typically the object of focus and/or conversation*. The most salient illustration of this property is that any noun phrase containing an expressive demonstrative can be modified using the adjective *eeuwig* 'eternal'.

- (26) a. Dat eeuwige konijn van hem (daar praat hij altijd over)
 that eternal rabbit of him is (he always talks about it)
- b. Die eeuwige oorbellen van haar (die draagt ze altijd, daar praat ze altijd over)
 those eternal earrings of her (she always wears them, she always talks about them)

The adjective does not modify a property of the noun itself, but a property of the extent to which the noun is the focus of attention. In combination with the expressive demonstrative pronoun, it expresses the fact that this focus of attention is particularly unpleasant. It should be emphasised, however, that adding this adjective does not *change* the reading, it merely expresses the fact that the unpleasantness of talking about X is the fact that it never stops. Without the adjective continuity is also implied, but is not focused upon as the source of the unpleasantness.

There is no other determiner, demonstrative or otherwise, that brings about this type of reading.

- (27) a. *Dat eeuwige konijn gisteren
 that eternal rabbit yesterday
- b. *Dit eeuwige konijn
 this eternal rabbit
- c. *Een/Het eeuwige konijn
 a/the eternal rabbit

- d. *Eeuwige konijnen
eternal rabbits

The possibility of using *eeuwig* 'eternal' will from now on be treated as a diagnostic for identifying true expressive demonstratives.

3.3 Expressive Demonstratives and Other Modifiers

The value judgment expressed in noun phrases with expressive demonstratives is usually expressed with an adjective. This adjective can be preceded by *eeuwig* 'eternal'.⁶

- (28) a. Dat eeuwige vreselijke huis van jou
that eternal terrible house of you
b. Die eeuwige gruwelijke oorbellen van haar
those eternal atrocious earrings of her
c. Dat eeuwige fantastische rapport van hem
that eternal great report-card of him

Instead of *eeuwig* 'eternal', other adjectives expressing frequency or durativity can be used.

- (29) a. Die constante telefoon
that constant telephone
b. Die eeuwige boeken van jou
those eternal books of you
c. Dat continue huiswerk
that continuous homework
d. Dat voortdurende gezeur
that constant whining

The adjective expressing the value judgment can also easily cooccur with other, ordinary qualifying adjectives.

- (30) a. Dat vreselijke nieuwe huis van jou
that terrible new house of you
b. Die gruwelijke rode oorbellen van haar
those atrocious red earrings of her

Apart from the special property of expressive demonstratives that the noun phrase allows modification by *eeuwig* 'eternal', they are also only natural with adjectives that belong to the colloquial register. Highbrow frequency adjectives like *frequent* or *herhaaldelijk* 'repeatedly' degrade the examples by making them sound artificial (this is what # in (31) is meant to convey).

- (31) a. #Dat herhaaldelijke boegeroep van jullie
that frequent boo-call of you
b. #Dat frequente huiswerk van jou
that frequent homework of you

3.4 Expressive Demonstratives As Nondeictic Demonstratives

Ordinary deictic demonstratives in Dutch come in two variants: proximate and non-proximate.

- (32) a. Dit boek en dat boek
 this book and that book
 b. Dit boek is werkelijk prachtig
 this book is truly great
 c. Dit boek hier, dat boek daar
 this book here, that book there

I will follow Ellen-Petra Kester's (p.c) suggestion that in any particular language, nondeictic demonstratives will all be either proximate or non-proximate. In English, they are proximate, given proximate indefinite demonstratives (see note 5), in Dutch they are non-proximate. Both resumptive and expressive demonstratives are non-proximate, see examples (19) for resumptive demonstratives, and those in (33) which show that an expressive reading is impossible with a proximate demonstrative.⁷

- (33) a. Dat/*dit boek van jou is echt niet te lezen
 that/this book of you is really not to read
 b. Die/*deze fiets van jou zal wel gejat zijn
 that/this bike of you has probably been stolen

3.5 Expressive Demonstratives and Optional *van*-phrases

In noun phrases with expressive demonstratives, a *van*-phrase may refer to the subject of the main clause or to a different entity. The *van*-phrase expresses the conversational source of the entity expressed in the noun phrase, apart from (optionally) possession, kinship etc.

- (34) a. Die (eeuwige) moord van jou (die jij gezien hebt, die je op moet lossen,
 that eternal murder of you (that you saw, that you must resolve,
 waar je over wil schrijven, maar in ieder geval waar jij over verteld hebt)
 that you want to write about, but in any case that you first mentioned)
 b. Die geweldige loodgieter van jou (die bij jou reparaties doet,
 that great plumber of you (who does your repairs,
 waar je over verteld hebt)
 whom you talked about)
 c. Dat vreselijke hotel van jou (waar je gelogeed hebt, waar je over verteld
 hebt)
 that awful hotel of you (where you stayed, that you talked about)

This thematic role of conversational source is not found in any other type of noun phrases, as illustrated in the examples below.

- (35) a. *Deze moord van jou
 this murder of you
 b. *De moord van jou
 the murder of you
 c. *Een moord van jou
 a murder of you

Let me be a little more specific about the semantics of the expressive demonstrative and the *van*-phrase in an expressive noun phrase. The expressive demonstrative seems to act like some sort of psychological predicate, with the speaker as the experiencer and the entity

expressed in the noun as the target of emotion. The semantics of an expression like (36a) could be expressed as in (36b) (where S stands for speaker).

- (36) a. *Dat* [_w N] *van* y]
 b. there is a w AND S hates w
 c. there is a w AND S hates w AND y is responsible for w => S blames y for w

The entity expressed in the *van*-phrase (y), if present, is interpreted as the entity responsible for the presence or properties of w, in other words the one that gets the blame.

3.6 No Focus on *van*-phrases

A further property of *van*-phrases in expressive demonstratives pertains to focus. I've already observed that the head of an expressive noun phrase is intrinsically focused, see section 3.2. In contrast, *van*-phrases in expressive noun phrases cannot be contrastively focused.

- (37) a. *Dat* (*eeuwige) taaltje van die FrAnsen, dat zal ik nooit begrijpen,
 that eternal lingo of those French, I will never understand,
 maar dat van de ItaliAnen, dat is helemaal hopeloos.
 But that of the Italians, that is entirely hopeless
- b. *Dat* (*eeuwige) blaadje van die hUUrdsvereniging dat lees ik nog wel,
 that eternal little journal of the tenants cooperation that I read,
 maar dat van de Actiegroep, dat is helemaal hopeloos
 but that of the protest group, that is entirely hopeless

As is clear from the second example (37b) a contrast is not absent because the *van*-phrase is clitic. My assumption is that the *van*-phrase in an expression containing an expressive demonstrative has already been established as a topic in the discourse, which makes it unsusceptible to any contrastive reading.

3.7 Expressive Demonstratives As Demonstratives

A *van*-phrase in noun phrase with a demonstrative comes with an additional requirement: in order for it to be fully natural it must contain a personal pronoun, a proper name or, in the case of a full DP, an additional demonstrative.⁸

- (38) a. *Dit* huis van meneer Jansen/de buurman/jou
 this house of Mr J/ the neighbour/you
 b. ??*Dit* huis van de rijke man
 this house of the rich man
 c. *Dit* huis van die rijke man
 this house of that rich man

This is also true for expressive demonstratives, as illustrated in (39) and in, e.g., (35).⁹

- (39) a. *Die* poenigheid van die lui/ *de lui
 that flashiness of those people/the people
 b. *Dat* vreselijke zoontje van dat mens/*het mens
 that terrible sonny of that woman/the woman
 c. *Dat* taaltje van die/?de Fransen, daar zal ik nooit wat van begrijpen
 that lingo of those/the French, I'll never understand it

Oddly enough, it does not seem to apply to resumptive demonstratives. Resumptive demonstratives cannot be modified by *eeuwig* 'eternal', and their *van*-phrases can be contrasted. Noun phrases with resumptive demonstratives do take ordinary definite *van*-phrases, provided the *van*-phrases are contrastively focused. Compare the examples in (40) whose *van*-phrases contain definite articles to those in (25), where the *van*-phrases contain and must contain demonstrative pronouns.

- (40) a. Dat taaltje van de FrAnsen, daar zal ik nooit wat van begrijpen,
 that lingo of the French, I'll never understand
 maar dat van de ItaliAnen, dat is helemaal hopeloos.
 but that of the Italians, that is entirely hopeless
- b. Dat blaadje van de hUUrdsvereniging dat lees ik nog wel,
 that journal of the tenants association that I read
 maar dat van de Actiegroep, dat is helemaal hopeloos
 but that of the pressure group, that is entirely hopeless

As a result, one more contrast between expressive and resumptive demonstratives has been identified: resumptive demonstratives do not require demonstrative *van*-phrases.

3.8 Conclusion

In this section, I have identified the defining properties of expressive demonstratives in Dutch, contrasting them to both ordinary demonstratives and resumptive demonstratives. In the following table, I've listed all relevant properties and the behaviour of the two types of demonstratives with them. For further contrast, I've added definite articles, whose properties in most cases have not been illustrated in the text, but which are known from different sources.

(41)	Expressive demonstrative	resumptive demonstrative	definite article
Value judgment	always, negative	optional, pos. or neg.	optional, pos. or neg.
D-linking	presupposed	instrumental	instrumental
Head Focus	always	(optional)	optional
'Generic flavour'	always	never	optional (different)
Focus on <i>van</i>-phrase	never	optional	optional
Definite article in <i>van</i>-phrase	never	optional	optional

Noun phrases with expressive demonstratives show the following unique cluster of properties:

- they always contain a negative value judgment
- they present the head of the noun phrase as something that is usually a salient element in the discourse and modifiable by *eeuwig* 'eternal',
- they can be modified by colloquial adjectives expressing frequency and/or a value judgment, apart from any adjectives normally modifying the noun
- they include an optional *van*-phrase that minimally expresses the conversational source of the head
- the *van*-phrase must contain a demonstrative, a pronoun or a proper name
- the *van*-phrase cannot be contrasted
- the demonstrative must be non-proximate.

In the next section, I will argue that expressive infinitives share all these properties.

4 Expressive Demonstratives in Nominalised Infinitives

Under my proposal, expressive infinitives contain expressive demonstratives exactly like those described in the previous section. This hypothesis makes the prediction that the special properties of expressive demonstratives found in the previous section carry over to expressive infinitives. So we expect 1. a negative value judgment, 2. modification by *eeuwig* 'eternal', 3. modification by other adjectives expressing frequency and/or a value judgment, 4. optional *van*-phrases expressing the verbal equivalent of conversational source (a subject), 5. a *van*-phrase that contains a demonstrative, a pronoun or a proper name, and 6. *van*-phrases that cannot be contrasted. Finally, we expect 7. only non-proximate demonstratives. I will now show that each of these predictions is fulfilled.

4.1 Value Judgments

Expressive infinitives, like noun phrases with expressive demonstratives, inevitably express a derogatory value judgment about the event. This can be seen from examples like (4a) and (6c,d) in section 2.1. In those cases, the value judgment is expressed explicitly by an adjective. The same can be achieved by using intonation or vocabulary that expresses disapproval.

- (42) a. Dat praten van die mensen, ik vind het wat (heavy intonation)
that talk-INF of those people, I think it's crazy
b. Dat wouwelen in de ruimte van jou
that waffle-INF in the air of you

Observe that non-expressive infinitives may of course also force an expressive reading by using adjectives, but they are perfectly natural without any, or without any intonation or vocabulary forcing an expressive reading. This is clear from examples like (7) in section 2.1.

In the previous section, we observed that presupposed D-linking is a precondition for this inherent value judgment. It can be observed in a context like the following:

- (43) "Dat eeuwige volksdansen van die mensen, dat is toch niet om aan te zien."
That eternal folk dance-INF of those people, it is impossible to watch.
"O, doen ze dat? Dat wist ik helemaal niet."
They do that, do they? I didn't know that.

The reply questions the presupposed D-linking. This is impossible in the absence of such a presupposition, as is observed in plain infinitives.

- (44) "Het volksdansen van mijn bovenburen is niet om aan te zien."
the folk dance-INF of my upstairs neighbours is impossible to watch
#"O, doen ze dat? Dat wist ik helemaal niet."
They do that, do they? I didn't know that.

4.2 Focus

The inherent contrast present in these expressions allows a contrastive reading to obtain very easily.

- (45) a. Dat praten van die mensen, dat gaat nog wel,
 that talk-INF of those people, that's all right,
 maar als ze gaan zingen...
 but when they start singing ...
 'it's bad enough these people talking all the time, but wait when they start singing ...'
- b. Dat boekenlezen van jou daar kan ik nog inkomen,
 that books read-INF of you, that I can imagine,
 maar om ze nou te gaan overschrijven...
 but copying them ...

It turns out that the value judgment effect is so strong that even with neutral vocabulary a value judgment reading is forced, but in order for it to be appropriate in such cases heavy intonation is required.

Also, like noun phrases with expressive demonstratives, modification with *eeuwig* 'eternal' is entirely natural, as illustrated below (see also examples (3) and (5) from section 2.1).

- (46) a. Dat eeuwige op die rammelkast fietsen van jou
 that eternal on that wreck cycle-INF of you
- b. Dat eeuwige de rommel opruimen van jou
 that eternal the mess clear-INF of you

The interpretation of *eeuwig* is similar to the interpretation of conversational salience expressed in noun phrases, viz one of (too high a) frequency of the event. This type of modifier cannot be used in non-expressive infinitives.¹⁰

- (47) a. *Het eeuwige op oude rammelkasten fietsen van Jan
 the eternal on old wrecks cycle-INF of J.
- b. *Het eeuwige rommel opruimen van Jan
 the eternal the mess clear-INF of J.

Expressive infinitives allow modification by *eeuwig* even when the infinitival clause has telic aspectuality.

4.3 Adjectival Modification

Just like in noun phrases with expressive demonstratives, in expressive infinitives we find (colloquial) adjectives expressing value judgments.

- (48) a. Dat bezopen mensen niet uitnodigen van jou
 that crazy people not invite-INF of you
 'that crazy way of yours of not inviting anyone'
- b. Dat stuitende overlast veroorzaken van jou
 that revolting trouble make-INF of you
- c. Dat overdreven geld inzamelen van hem
 that exaggerated donations collect-INF of him
 'that hobby of his of raising funds that is completely over the top'
- d. Dat vreselijke met vriendinnen bellen van jou
 that awful with friends phone-INF of you
 'that awful habit of yours of always talking on the phone with friends'

Also, we find adjectives reinforcing the value judgment already expressed in the choice of vocabulary.

- (49) a. Dat enorme opscheppen over vrouwen van hem
 that enormous brag-INF about women of him
 b. Dat oeverloze over postzegels wouwelen van hem
 that endless about stamps waffle-INF of him
 c. Dat niet te stuiten doorjakkeren van hem
 that not to stop continue-to-race-INF of him
 'that habit of his of just speeding on'

Finally, as expected we find alternative frequency expressing adjectives.

- (50) a. Dat constante boeroepen van jou
 that constant boo-call-INF of you
 b. Dat eeuwige niet willen slapen van jou
 that eternal not want sleep-INF of you
 c. Dat continue vee afmaken van ons
 that continuous cattle slaughter-INF of us
 d. Dat voortdurende zeuren om aandacht van jou
 that continuous whine-INF for attention of you

In the previous section, we saw that adjectives ordinarily qualifying the nouns in question can cooccur with those expressing frequency or value judgments. In the same way, adverbial modifiers that normally cooccur with the infinitival clause in question may cooccur with these adjectives

- (51) a. Dat constante keihard boeroepen van jou
 that constant loud-and-clear boo-INF of you
 b. Dat eeuwige keihard werken van jou
 that eternal very-hard work-INF of you
 c. Dat eeuwige vliegensvlug het beste stukje pakken van jou
 that eternal-infl very-quickly the best piece snatch-INF of you
 'Your eternally snatching away the best piece'

In both nominal and nominalised structures with expressive demonstratives, therefore, the evidence confirms an analysis of these structures that includes a nominal structural layer hosting these adjectives that can sit on top of an 'unfinished' verbal structure.

4.4 *Non-proximate Demonstratives*

Expressive infinitives contain a nondeictic and obligatorily non-proximate demonstrative.

- (52) a. Dat/*Dit afschuwelijke overlast veroorzaken van jou
 that/this terrible trouble make-INF of you
 b. Dat/*Dit irritante aan de weg timmeren van jou
 that/this irritating profile-raise of you

4.5 *Optional Subject van-phrases*

In expressive infinitives the subject *van*-phrase is optional. This is not a trivial statement, because in plain infinitives *van*-phrases are obligatory.

- (53) a. Het nooit meer gebeld hebben *(van Tanja) vond ik heel erg
 the never anymore called have-INF (of Tanja) found I very bad
 b. Dat afschuwelijke overlast veroorzaken (van jou) moet nu ophouden
 that awful trouble make-INF (of you) must now stop
 'that awful trouble making of yours should stop now'

The semantic role of conversational source that we found on *van*-phrases in expressive noun phrases in infinitival constructions is reserved exclusively for subjects.

- (36) a. *Dat* [_w VP] *van* y]
 b. there is w AND S hates w (AND y is responsible for w => S blames y for w)

As in noun phrases, the entity expressed in the *van*-phrase (y), if present, is interpreted as responsible for w. In section 5, I will argue that there is a structural reason why the *van*-phrase always expresses the subject.

4.6 *No Focus on the van-phrase*

Like *van*-phrases in expressive noun phrases, *van*-phrases in expressive adjectives cannot be contrasted.

- (54) a. *Dat eeuwige boekjes herlezen van kinderen is nog wel te pruimen,
 that eternal books reread-INF of children I can bear,
 maar van volwassenen vind ik het raar
 but of adults I think it is weird
 b. *Dat eeuwige niet willen luisteren van Tineke
 that eternal not want-INF listen of T.
 dat kennen nu wel, maar van jou is dat nieuw
 that we know by now, but of you it is new

As in the case of expressive nominals, similar examples without *eeuwig* are possible, in which case the determiner is a resumptive demonstrative and the infinitive is not an expressive infinitive. In such infinitives the *van*-phrase can be contrasted.

- (55) a. Dat boekjes herlezen van kinderen is nog wel te pruimen,
 that books reread-INF of children I can bear,
 maar van volwassenen vind ik het raar
 the but of adults I think it is weird
 b. Dat niet willen luisteren van Tineke dat kennen nu wel,
 that not want-INF to-listen of T. that we know by now,
 maar van jou is dat nieuw
 but of you it is new

4.7 Demonstratives inside the *Van*-phrase

Like *van*-phrases in noun phrases with expressive demonstratives, those in expressive infinitives require either a personal pronoun, a proper name or another demonstrative DP. The examples in (20) and others above illustrate the use of personal pronouns in such *van*-phrases. Here are some with full DPs inside the *van*-phrase.

- (56) a. Dat 's nachts rondspoken van die lui/*de lui,
 that at-night walking-about-INF of those people/the people,
 daar krijg ik wat van
 that makes me sick
- b. Dat nooit eens van ophouden weten van die ballen/*de ballen
 that never prt. of stopping know-INF of those rich-bastards/the rich-bastards
- c. Dat afschuwelijke slingeren van *(die) fietsen in de sneeuw
 that terrible meander-INF of those bikes in the snow
- d. Dat afschuwelijke wankelen van *(die)/*de hijskranen
 that terrible sway-INF of those/the cranes

As predicted, they are fully grammatical only with demonstratives.

In the previous section, I identified a number of properties special to expressive noun phrases as opposed to noun phrases lacking an expressive demonstrative. It has turned out that expressive infinitives share all these properties, and that plain infinitives do not.

	Expressive Infinitive	Plain Infinitive
Value judgment	always negative	optional, pos. or neg.
D-linking	presupposed	instrumental
Head Focus	always	optional
'Generic flavour'	always	optional (different)
Focus on <i>van</i>-phrase	never	optional
Definite article in <i>van</i>-phrase	never	optional

My claim has been that expressive infinitives are structurally composed of expressive demonstratives and (some level of projection of) bare infinitives. From the evidence presented in this section I conclude that my proposal as expressed in (8) and (13) is correct.

5 The Clausal Structure of Expressive Infinitives

So far in this paper, the emphasis has been on evidence for expressive demonstratives in expressive infinitives. Our proposal in section 2 comprises a further hypothesis, which is that expressive infinitives contain the verbal projection TP, and that plain infinitives do not. By this hypothesis, specific properties of bare infinitives should be found in expressive infinitives, but not plain infinitives. In this section, I will argue this point focusing on the properties of subjects and subject *van*-phrases in these constructions. I will show that the distribution and properties of arguments in these three constructions can only be explained if we assume that subject *van*-phrases in expressive infinitives occur in SpecTP.

Some of the diagnostics for the presence in expressive infinitives of expressive demonstratives have focused on the properties of the *van*-phrases cooccurring with such

demonstratives. From now on, I will refer to such *van*-phrases as 'expressive *van*-phrases'. Expressive *van*-phrases have been found to differ from *van*-phrases that occur in plain infinitives. I will refer to this latter type of *van*-phrases as 'plain *van*-phrases'.

In this section, I will argue that the similarity between bare and expressive infinitives involves the presence in both of verbal projection TP. I will argue that the presence of a head T° and its unique properties allow the subject of the projection containing it to raise into its specifier. Alternatively, no such raising is possible in plain infinitives in which the projection corresponding to TP is PosP.

5.1 Subject or PRO

There is a well-known restriction on the occurrence of PRO, which is that it must be interpreted as human. In control, therefore, we find only human subjects (57), whereas raising is not restricted in this way (58).

- (57) a. John wanted to leave
 b. *The picture wanted to be on the wall

- (58) a. John seemed to leave
 b. The picture seemed to be on the wall

I assume that the following statement holds:

- (59) The empty subject PRO is lexically specified [+hum].

Subject of bare infinitives show evidence of being PRO. Bare infinitives are fine when the empty subject is interpreted or interpretable as human (60a-b), whereas with verbs that must not take human subjects they are ungrammatical (60c-d).

- (60) a. 's Nachts in gehorige huizen rondspoken levert problemen op
 at night in thin-walled houses walk-about-INF causes problems
 b. Nooit eens van ophouden weten is een kinderachtige eigenschap
 never prt. of stopping know-INF is a childish property
 'never knowing when to stop is a childish property'
 c. *Roesten is een gevolg van een vochtig klimaat
 rust-INF is a consequence of a wet climate
 d. *Doorbuigen is een teken van een te hoge belasting
 bend-through-INF is a sign of a too high pressure

Expressive infinitives have optional *van*-phrase subjects. Without such subjects, the structures show evidence for the presence of PRO as an empty subject.

- (61) a. Dat 's nachts rondspoken, daar krijg ik wat van
 that at night walk-about-INF that makes me sick
 b. Dat nooit eens van ophouden weten is erg kinderachtig
 that never prt. of stopping know-INF is very childish
 c. *Dat eeuwige roesten kost me handenvol geld
 that eternal rust-INF costs me hands-full money
 d. *Dat eeuwige doorbuigen kost me handenvol geld
 that eternal bend-through-INF costs me hands-full money

The question is now what the status is of a *van*-phrase subject in such structures. There are two options: it either replaces PRO or doubles it as an adjunct (more or less like a passive by-phrase). In the first case, the human restriction is predicted to disappear when a subject *van*-phrase is added, in the second case it is not. What we find is that adding a subject *van*-phrase in expressive infinitives derived from verbs with obligatorily non-human subjects makes them entirely natural (see the examples in (62)).

- (62) a. Dat 's nachts rondspoken van die lui, daar krijg ik wat van
 that at night walk-about-INF of those people, that makes me sick
 b. Dat nooit eens van ophouden weten van die ballen
 that never prt. of stopping know-INF of those rich-bastards
 c. Dat eeuwige roesten van die fietsen
 that eternal rust-INF of those bicycles
 d. Dat eeuwige doorbuigen van die buis
 that eternal bend-through-INF of those tube

Some further examples are given in (63) involving transitive verbs.

- (63) a. Dat eeuwige was verpesten van die regen
 that eternal laundry ruin-INF of that rain
 b. Dat eeuwige geluid dempen van die dubbele ramen
 that eternal noise muffle-INF of those double windows
 c. Dat eeuwige bosgrond bedelven van dat vuilnis
 that eternal forest-land cover-INF of that rubbish
 d. Dat eeuwige kelders onder water zetten van die stortbuien
 that eternal basements under water put-INF of those storms

The fact that non-human subject *van*-phrases do occur in expressive infinitives (62) can only mean that PRO is *replaced* by the *van*-phrase, not controlled by it. In other words, the *van*-phrase itself is the subject.¹¹

A more complex picture is presented by plain infinitives. With intransitive verbs, non-human subjects are fine.

- (64) a. Het roesten van fietsen is een gevolg van het vochtige klimaat
 the rust-INF of bicycles is a consequence of the wet climate
 b. Het doorbuigen van buizen is een teken van een te hoge belasting
 the bend-through-INF of tubes is a sign of a too high weight

With transitive verbs, however, non-human subjects are unacceptable.

- (65) Het volgende onderwerp op de agenda is
 the next topic on the agenda is
 a. *het was verpesten van de regen
 the laundry ruin-INF of the rain
 b. ??het geluid dempen van dubbele ramen
 the sound muffle-INF of double glazing
 c. *het bosgrond ruïneren van het zwerfvuil
 the woodland ruin-INF of the rubbish
 d. *het kelders onder water zetten van stortbuien
 the basements under water put-INF of storms

'the flooding of basements by storms'

It turns out, then, that subject *van*-phrases in plain infinitives are true subjects only when the verb is intransitive. When the verb is transitive a PRO subject is present, which causes ungrammaticality of non-human subjects. It follows that the *van*-phrase must be an adjunct doubling the subject.

To summarise, we have found that PRO subjects are present in bare infinitives and transitive plain infinitives. There is no evidence for such subjects in intransitive plain infinitives and expressive infinitives. If anything, this pattern seems to unify plain and bare infinitives, rather than expressive and bare infinitives. In the next subsection, I will show that the explanation for this pattern lies in the similarity between expressive and bare infinitives, despite appearances to the contrary. In this section, I will argue for the following view on the distribution of PRO and *van*-phrase subjects in the three types of infinitives discussed so far: bare, expressive and plain infinitives.

In plain infinitives with intransitive verbs and in expressive infinitives there is no evidence for the presence of PRO. I conclude that the *van*-phrases that we do find in these constructions should actually be treated as true subjects. It follows that they are base generated inside the VP. In a nominalised infinitive, under any analysis, higher nominal structure dominates lower verbal structure, as evidenced by the presence of a (low) verbal lexical head and a (high) determiner. *Van*-phrases belong to the nominal domain, so when they can be shown to be true subjects they must have moved from the original position inside the VP.

I will assume that the presence of nominal structure has a role to play in licensing nominal elements like *van*-phrases. As a result, in an all-verbal environment like a bare infinitive PRO subjects are the only ones available due to the standardly assumed absence of both tense and nominative case. I will show that this type of explanation extends to the distribution of PRO plain infinitives derived from transitive verbs, but for a different reason. In such infinitives, subjects will turn out to be unable to move to a higher nominal position across the object. Being thus stuck in a low position inside the VP they can only be PRO. A *van*-phrase adjunct can be merged in a higher, subject-like position controlling the lower PRO.

5.2 The Internal and External Syntax of *Van*-phrases

A crucial assumption I am making about the structure in which *van*-phrases occur is that they are specifiers. Furthermore, my assumption is that they can and must be right-specifiers by virtue of being intrinsically non-agreeing elements.

By Kayne's LCA (Kayne 1994), specifiers and adjuncts must occur to the left of the head of the projection. In order to account for apparent right specifiers or adjuncts, it has been proposed in the literature that the remainder of the structure moves to the specifier, which ends up as right-peripheral as a result of this. Hoekstra (1999) provides an account of plain infinitives that follows this approach, which runs as follows. In a plain infinitive, the determiner *het* selects a CP complement containing the infinitive. At the level of TP, we find that whichever complement ends up as a *van*-phrase raises to SpecTP, leaving a trace in the VP. Subsequently, the VP raises to SpecCP. As a result of this raising, C° is spelled out as *van*. This results in the following structure.

- (66) a. [DP D° [CP [VP t_j]_i C° [TP [DP]_j t_i]]]
 b. het boeken lezen van Jan
 the books read-INF of John

There are numerous problems with this analysis both for plain and expressive infinitives. At least some of these problems are directly due to the part of the analysis involving the raising operation designed to avoid right specifiers or adjuncts, which I will now briefly address.

First of all, as explicitly stated by Hoekstra, the analysis predicts a correlation between specificity, scrambling of direct objects and occurring in a *van*-phrase. However, this correlation doesn't exist. Object *van*-phrases may contain bare plural DPs, and definite DPs may occur as preverbal accusative objects.¹²

- (67) a. Het roken van sigaren is ongezond (Hoekstra 1999:165 (3a))
 the smoke-INF of cigars is unhealthy
 b. Het de kandidaat alsmaar niet willen ontvangen van hem
 the the candidate all-the-time not want-INF receive-INF of him
 'His persistently not wanting to receive the candidate'

Another problem is that, under his proposal, the occurrence of a zero determiner correlates with raising of a bare verb, not a VP, in a structure lacking CP, as this raising is interpreted along the lines of raising of proper names to D° (Longobardi 1994). Again, the prediction goes wrong because generic plain infinitives lacking articles may still take *van*-phrase objects (see also section 6.2).

- (68) a. Roken van sigaren is ongezond
 smoke-INF of cigars is unhealthy

A further problem concerns the constituency of the *van*-phrase. Subject *van*-phrases of plain infinitives WH move in questions, which cannot be accounted for under this proposal without further assumptions.

- (69) a. Van welke fiets heeft het roesten je verrast?
 Of which bike has the rust-INF you surprised
 'Which bike's rusting surprised you?'
 b. Van welk kind neemt het dikke boeken lezen ziekelijke vormen aan?
 Of which child takes the thick books read-INF sick shapes on
 'Which child's reading thick books is getting pathological?'

I conclude that this approach creates more problems than it solves, and therefore will not be adopted in this paper. I do nevertheless want to retain Hoekstra's insight that *van*-phrases do not function as PPs with respect to scope -- they behave as DPs, the PP layer doesn't seem to exist for scope purposes.

Van-phrases do not agree with the lexical heads in whose projection they occur. Observe that crosslinguistically, whenever a noun allows two different types of nominal satellites, one preceding the noun and one following the noun, the noun may only ever agree with the one preceding it, and only the prenominal satellite ever agrees with the noun. In other words, in such languages, postnominal satellites are intrinsically non-agreeing. This is true for both genitive morphological case marking and PP-like structures like Dutch *van*-phrases.¹³

Why should *van*-phrases be intrinsically non-agreeing elements? I propose that DPs with oblique case across languages are of category KP (where K stands for Case), with KP dominating DP (see Toman 1994, and others). In languages without morphological case, like Dutch, K° may be instantiated as a preposition, which is another way of saying that there are PPs whose head is functional only. K° is like a preposition in lacking any nominal φ-features and in blocking the φ-features of the DP it dominates from view, i.e. from being agreed with.

K° has a value for case, presumably [+genitive], so the question is how this case feature is checked. I'm assuming that the case value of K° is like a structural case feature in that it needs checking by a functional head, for example by Num° . K° itself may check the number feature of its checking head, but only default ϕ -features -- the ϕ -features of the DP dominated by K° are not available for external checking.

This view on the structural nature of *van*-phrases and oblique case-marked DPs more generally explains why lexical heads across languages do not agree with such elements: there is only ever one feature to agree with, which doesn't vary with the ϕ -features of the DP included. On the basis of KP being functional it also predicts no effect of the presence of *van* on the DP's scope properties.

In the absence of any agreement resulting from checking KP's case feature, there seems to be no reason why such checking should be restricted to just a single functional projection. For this reason, I assume that it is possible in any functional projection, provided it is nominal.¹⁴ For the same reason, it is possible to merge adjunct *van*-phrases in any specifier of a nominal functional projection -- in principle. Checking case in SpecDP will be subject to a special restriction, as discussed below.

I now want to discuss the conditions under which *van*-phrases may occur in SpecPosP, a position ordinarily reserved for possessors, i.e. DPs expressing possession that precede the head noun and in many languages show some form of agreement with it. In Schoorlemmer (1998) I argue that Pos° may have a plus or minus value for its [pos] feature. It may only ever agree with a possessor in its specifier if it is [+pos], in which case either or both the possessor and the head may show agreement. Furthermore, in languages like Dutch a positive value of Pos° precludes a lexical determiner.

What are the consequences of this model for non-agreeing possessor specifiers like *van*-phrases? I propose that such possessors may occur only when Pos° is [-pos], which allows Pos° to check the genitive feature and only has default ϕ -features available to check against those of KP.¹⁵

5.3 *Subjects in Plain and Expressive Infinitives*

Let me now return to our original question: why don't we find raised subject *van*-phrases in transitive plain infinitives? Let us take a look at the kind of structure such a subject occurs in. Recall the structure of plain infinitives introduced in section 2:

(70) [DP [PosP [AspP [VP]]]]

The direct object raises to SpecAspP, a verbal functional head, for checking. The nominal functional position dominating it, Pos° , has a negative value for its [+/-pos] feature, and as a result doesn't attract the *van*-phrase. It turns out that under the circumstances, subject *van*-phrases do not raise to any higher position. What we have to conclude is that (non-agreeing) *van*-phrases are unable to raise to SpecPosP of their own accord, they cannot cross a lower licensed argument (see below) and there is nothing to attract them to that position. The structure of such infinitives is as follows:

(71) [DP *het* [PosP Pos° [AspP DPⁱ [VP PRO [tⁱ V^o]]] KP_{PosP}]]

In transitive plain infinitives subjects do not raise to SpecPosP, they must remain in-situ without formal licensing and therefore they can only be PRO. *Van*-phrases do occur in such structures, which I assume are adjuncts merged in SpecPosP. From this position they control PRO inside the VP.

What we have to assume is that the case feature on KP can itself target a functional head for case-checking. However, given the situation in these transitive plain infinitives, we must conclude that it cannot see across an unsuitable projection. My assumption is that any projection whose specifier is already filled, in other words whose ϕ -features have been erased after checking, is an unsuitable projection. Under this proposal, we can account for the absence in transitive plain infinitives of *van*-phrase subjects raising to SpecPosP, and for adjuncts being merged into that position instead.

In an intransitive plain infinitive SpecAspP is not a potential landing site for any constituent. I assume that for the purposes of raising the subject of the intransitive verb, it simply doesn't exist. Consequently, there is no problem for the subject raising to SpecPosP.

(72) $[_{DP} \text{ het } [_{PosP} \text{ Pos}^\circ \ [_{AspP} \text{ Asp}^\circ \ [_{VP} \text{ t}^i \text{ V}^\circ]]] \text{ KP}^i_{PosP}]$

As opposed to transitive plain infinitives, transitive expressive infinitives allow raising of *van*-phrase subjects across objects. It is probably clear by now what the explanation is for the ability of expressive infinitives to have raised subjects even when they are derived from transitive verbs: instead of PosP, the structure includes TP whose head carries an EPP feature. In order to check this feature, T° attracts the subject to raise to its specifier. I assume that this happens irrespective of the status of the subject as KP or DP.

(73) $[_{DP} \text{ dat } [_{TP} \text{ T}^\circ \ [_{AspP} \text{ DP}^i \text{ Asp}^\circ \ [_{VP} \text{ t}^j \text{ [t}^i \text{ V}^\circ]]]] \text{ t}^j_{TP} \text{ KP}^j_{DP}]$

The fact that movement of the KP to SpecDP is triggered by the EPP feature immediately explains why such movement is restricted to subjects in expressive infinitives.

My assumption is that T° does not check KP's case feature, either because, being untensed, it cannot check case features at all, or because it cannot check genitive as a nominal functional head. I therefore propose that, having checked the EPP feature on T° , the *van*-phrase raises on to SpecDP to have its case feature checked. D° being a nominal functional head, it is perfectly capable of checking KP's case feature under Spec-head agreement. Raising of KP to SpecDP needs to cross no other specifiers, and therefore happens under the same conditions as, e.g., subject raising to SpecPosP in intransitive plain infinitives.

In this section, I have argued on the basis of the properties of the subjects of expressive and plain infinitives that expressive, but not plain, infinitives include a verbal projection TP that allows the subject to raise to a subject position across the direct object. I have proposed a specific view on the structure and distribution of *van*-phrases, in which *van* is assumed to be the spellout of a nominal functional head, the effect of which is (among other things) the accessibility of the DPs ϕ -features for agreement. I have proposed that such non-agreeing DPs occur as right-specifiers.

6 Expressive *Van*-phrases

In section 5, I proposed that case feature checking on KP is possible in any nominal functional projection, and therefore that it is possible to merge KP adjuncts at any level. However, it doesn't seem to be the case that adjunct *van*-phrases can be merged in just any DP. In this final section, I will first provide some illustration of the inability of *van*-phrase adjunct to be merged in a particular context, and then make a proposal as to the nature of the restriction. I will introduce a further type of nominalised infinitive that combines properties of both expressive and plain infinitives, so-called 'secondary expressive infinitives'. The properties of these infinitives will confirm my hypothesis about the conditions on the occurrence of KP in SpecDP.

6.1 Restricting *van*-phrases in *SpecDP*

There is a second type of plain infinitives in Dutch in which the argument expressing the *van*-phrase is the direct object.

- (74) a. het treiteren van honden
 the pester-INF of dogs
 b. het bestuderen van vreemde verschijnselen
 the study-INF of strange phenomena

There doesn't seem to be a difference in the level of verbal projection between these structures and those with accusative objects. Both allow modifying adverbs, for example.

75.

- (75) a. Het schaamteloos **buren beledigen** van Jan heeft hem onmogelijk gemaakt
 the shamelessly neighbours insult-INF of John has him impossible made
 'John's shamelessly insulting neighbours has made him generally disliked'
 b. Het constant **de telefoon aannemen** van Jan heeft hem zeer geliefd gemaakt
 the constantly the phone answer-INF of John has him very loved made
 'John's constantly answering the phone has made him very well-liked'
- (76) a. Het schaamteloos **beledigen van burens** hoort niet bij nette omgangsvormen
 the shamelessly insult-INF of neighbours belongs not to good manners
 b. Het constant **aannemen van de telefoon** hoort niet bij mijn taak
 the constant answer-INF of the phone belongs not to my duties

The question is then in what position the *van*-phrase object occurs. In the absence of an apparent distinction in verbal projection levels we must conclude that the *van*-phrase object raises to *SpecAspP* just like the accusative object does. It then raises on to *SpecPosP* for genitive checking. Since it raises to *SpecPosP* *through* the accusative position, nothing blocks raising to *SpecPosP*.

- (77) [DP [_{PosP} Pos^o [_{AspP} tⁱ Asp^o [_{VP} DP [tⁱ V]]] KPⁱ_{PosP}]]

By the reasoning provided earlier, it is clear that the subject *van*-phrase cannot raise to *SpecDP* across the object. However, given that merging adjuncts in *SpecDP* is possible in principle, we might expect a subject *van*-phrase adjunct to be merged there. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

- (78) a. *Het martelen [van gevangenen] [van de cipiers]
 the torture-INF of prisoners of the wardens-PL
 b. *Het treiteren [van honden] [van slechte bazen]
 the pester-INF of dogs of bad masters
 c. *Het bestuderen [van vreemde verschijnselen] [van jullie]
 the study-INF of strange phenomena of you-PL
 d. *Het vasthouden [van tasjes en sleutels] [van haar]
 the hold-INF of handbags and keys of her

What it looks like, then, is that *van*-phrases in *SpecDP* are restricted to expressive *van*-phrases. The reason for this I attribute to the following restriction on the occurrence of *van*-phrases in *SpecDP*:

- (79) a. A *van*-phrase in SpecDP must get its case feature checked there
 b. Expressive demonstratives, not articles, may check features by Spec-head agreement in DP

The fact that expressive *van*-phrases are restricted to DPs with expressive demonstratives can now be attributed to the effect of Spec-head agreement with such demonstratives at the DP level. Definite articles do not have a feature that is in any sense argument-related, and therefore they cannot check the case of a specifier.¹⁶

By this proposal, in nominalised infinitives all and only expressive *van*-phrases are predicted to occur in SpecDP. We can test this prediction on the basis of a construction that combines properties of plain and expressive infinitives.

6.2 Secondary Expressive Infinitives

In ordinary noun phrases, there is a whole range of possible determiners that may dominate the structure. As we have seen, an article may be replaced by, among other things, an expressive demonstrative. Given that plain infinitives normally come with a definite article, and given the parallel between ordinary noun phrases and plain infinitives, we predict that the definite article may be replaced by an expressive demonstrative even in the case of a plain infinitive! The examples in (80) illustrate such a case, which I will refer to as SECONDARY EXPRESSIVE INFINITIVES; to contrast them to the 'primary' expressive infinitives that have been the object of scrutiny so far.

- (80) a. Dat eeuwige treiteren van honden
 that eternal pester-INF of dogs
 b. Dat eeuwige bestuderen van vreemde verschijnselen
 that eternal study-INF of strange phenomena

Secondary expressive infinitives are variants of plain infinitives, which explains their ability to take *van*-phrase objects.¹⁷ The evidence for their status as plain infinitives includes the fact that they constitute a proper subset of plain infinitives, as well as the fact that they share a host of properties with generic (article-less) plain infinitives (Schoorlemmer 2001). These properties include the inability to take *van*-phrase subjects and the restriction on object *van*-phrases to exclude definite DPs.¹⁸

- (81) a. *(Het) saaie boeken lezen van studenten
 the boring books read-INF of students
 b. *(Het) wachten van asielzoekers
 the wait-INF of asylum seekers
- (82) a. *(Het) vasthouden van het tasje is pijnlijk bij reumatiek
 the hold-INF of the handbag is painful with rheumatism
 b. *(Het) opslaan van het kernafval moet 's nachts gebeuren
 the put-in-storage-INF of the nuclear-waste must at night happen

Recall the proposed syntactic structure of plain infinitives from section 2, repeated as (83).

- (83) [DP [PosP [AspP [VP]]]]

On the basis of the identity of plain and secondary expressive infinitives, this is also the structure of secondary expressive infinitives.

By hypothesis (79) expressive *van*-phrases in SpecDP are possible only in a constituent dominated by an expressive demonstrative. It follows that in a secondary expressive infinitive we might expect an expressive *van*-phrase in addition to the object *van*-phrase. This is in fact what we find.

- (84) a. Dat eeuwige treiteren van honden van jullie
 that eternal pester-INF of dogs of you-PL
 b. Dat eeuwige bestuderen van vreemde verschijnselen
 that eternal study-INF of strange phenomena
 van die wetenschappers
 of those scientists-PL

This is the only environment in which a subject and an object *van*-phrase are combined in a single nominalised infinitive. As in other plain infinitives with object *van*-phrases, the object *van*-phrase is in SpecPosP. As in other expressive infinitives, the subject *van*-phrase is in SpecDP. These positions are reflected in the order, with the the object *van*-phrase in the lower right specifier immediately following the infinitival form, and the subject *van*-phrase in the higher specifier following the object. This is the only possible order in such structures.

- (85) [DP *dat* [_{PosP} Pos° [_{AspP} tⁱ Asp° [_{VP} t^j [tⁱ V]] KPⁱ_{PosP}] KP^j_{DP}]

There is only one difference between plain and secondary expressive infinitives, which is the nature of the determiner. It turns out that it is this one difference that determines whether or not a *van*-phrase may occur in SpecDP in these structures. I conclude that hypothesis (79) about the distribution of such *van*-phrases has been confirmed, as well as the assumption that the specifics of expressive *van*-phrases are due to Spec-head agreement with expressive demonstratives, and therefore are restricted to that position.

6.3 Adjunct Expressive Van-phrases

Now recall that subject *van*-phrases like those in (84) by hypothesis occur in the same structural configuration as subject *van*-phrases in plain infinitives, and therefore in a structure lacking TP. As a result, it is predicted to have adjunct properties, as opposed to *van*-phrases in ordinary expressive infinitives, which are raised subjects in their own right. Evidence that the subject is indeed an adjunct in these cases comes from transitive verbs that require or allow non-human subjects. If the apparent subject *van*-phrases in secondary expressive infinitives are adjuncts controlling PRO they are expected to disallow non-human subjects.

- (85) a. *Dat eeuwige verpesten van was van die regen
 that eternal ruin-INF of laundry of that rain
 b. *Dat eeuwige dempen van geluid van die dubbele ramen
 that eternal muffle-INF of sound of those double windows
 c. *Dat eeuwige bedelven van (meer) bosgrond van dat vuilnis
 that eternal cover of more forest-land of that refuge
 d. *Dat eeuwige onder water zetten van kelders van die stortbuien
 that eternal under water put-INF of basements of those storms

The prediction is correct. Comparing these examples to those in (63) in the previous section confirms that there is a distinction in subject status between *van*-phrases in ordinary, primary and secondary expressive infinitives.

In this last section I have argued that raising or merger of KP into SpecDP is possible provided there is an expressive demonstrative occupying D°. I have shown that secondary expressive infinitives provide just the environment necessary to show this, and that the properties of these infinitives in turn confirm the analysis of subject raising versus adjunct subject merger subject argued for in these last two sections.

7 Conclusions

In this paper, my goal has been to make a distinction between two different types of nominalised infinitives in Dutch, those that nominalise as complements of expressive demonstratives and those that take ordinary definite articles. I have shown that expressive infinitives show all relevant properties of expressive noun phrases. I then explored the hypothesis that expressive infinitives share their entire verbal setup with bare infinitives, only excluding the top CP level. When looking at the properties of subjects in all types of infinitives I was able to confirm this hypothesis, and also to show that plain infinitives are different.

Notice that the classification of nominalised infinitives established in this paper has established the relevance to the precise structure of these constructions of a host of previously ignored properties, including the distinction between plain and expressive *van*-phrases. The distinction between plain and expressive infinitives has turned out to be crucial in the analysis of the argument properties and structure of either type. Returning to the various nominal and verbal properties of nominalised infinitives introduced in section 1, we find the following distinctions:

Plain Infinitives:

- A subject or object may be expressed in a *van*-phrase
- when the verb is transitive, a subject *van*-phrase is an adjunct controlling PRO
- There can be only one *van*-phrase
- (accusative) direct objects precede the verb

(Primary) Expressive infinitives:

- A subject may be expressed in a *van*-phrase
- a subject *van*-phrase raises from the VP
- There can be only one *van*-phrase
- Direct objects must precede the verb

Secondary expressive infinitives:

- a subject or object may be expressed in a *van*-phrase
- when the verb is transitive, a subject *van*-phrase is an adjunct controlling PRO
- subject and object *van*-phrases may cooccur

So far, my results have confirmed the overall approach to mixed categories in terms of a category switch somewhere along the projection line. We have found two different types of V→N mixed categories in Dutch, which have been shown to differ with respect to the level of verbal functional structure present. I have also introduced an approach to *van*-phrases in terms of non-agreeing KP in right specifiers, which has turned out a fruitful way of dealing with such constituents.

Having established this clear dividing line within the class of nominalised infinitives in Dutch, as well as the value of the approach to mixed categories in terms of the category

switch, my next task will be to tackle the empirical and theoretical questions raised in this paper. They include an analysis of the generic properties of expressive demonstratives, a more detailed account of the requirements for definite preverbal objects in plain infinitives, and a further elaboration of the approach to *van*-phrases proposed in this paper.

References

- Abney, S.P. (1987). *The English Noun Phrase in its sentential aspect*. Dissertation MIT.
- Ackema, P. and A. Neeleman (2000). 'M-selection and phrasal affixation', in *Working Papers in Linguistics* 12, 307-342. London: UCL.
- Borsley, R. and J. Kornfilt (1999). 'Mixed and Extended Projections', in R. Borsley (ed.) *The Nature and Function of Syntactic Categories*; *Syntax and Semantics* 32, p. 101-131. San Diego: Academic Press
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT-Press.
- Giusti, G. (1999). 'The functional structure of noun phrases: a bare phrase structure approach', University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics vol. 9, n.1-2.
- Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument structure*. Cambridge: MIT-Press.
- Grimshaw, J. (1991). 'Extended Projection'. Ms. Brandeis University, Waltham.
- Van Haaften, T. et al (1985). 'Nominalisaties in het Nederlands', in *Glott* 8:67-104.
- Haeseryn, W. et al, (1997), *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (second edition). Groningen:Martinus Nijhoff Uitgevers.
- Hoekstra, J. (1997). *The Syntax of infinitives in Frisian*. Diss. University of Groningen. Ljouwert: Fryske Academy.
- Hoekstra, T. (1999). 'Nominal and verbal projections', in D. Adger et al. *Specifiers; Minimalist Approaches*, p. 163-187. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoekstra, T. and P. Wehrmann (1985). 'De nominale infinitief', in *Glott* 8: 257-275.
- Kayne, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT-Press.
- Longobardi, G. (1994). 'Reference and proper names: a theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form', *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 609-665.
- Pesetsky, D. (1987). 'Binding Problems with Experiencer Verbs', in *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 126-40.
- Reuland, E. (1983). 'Governing -ing', *Linguistic Inquiry* 14
- Reuland, E. (1988). 'Relating morphological and syntactic structure', in M. Everaert et al (eds.) *Morphology and Modularity*, 303-337. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ritter, E. (1991). 'Two functional categories in Noun Phrases: Evidence from Modern Hebrew', in F. Rothstein (ed.) *Syntax and Semantics* 26. 37-62. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Schoorlemmer, M. (1995). *Participial Passive and Aspect in Russian*, dissertation Utrecht University.
- Schoorlemmer M. (1998). 'Possessors, Articles and Definiteness', in *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determinate Phrase*, 55-86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schoorlemmer M. (1999). 'Structure building and mixed categories: a research program'. Ms. Utrecht University.
- Schoorlemmer M. (2001) 'Expressive Demonstratives in Dutch Nominalised Infinitives ', ms. Utrecht University.
- Siloni, T. (1997) *Noun Phrases and Nominalizations; The Syntax of DPs*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Szabolci, A. (1994). 'The Noun Phrase', in F. Kiefer and K. Kiss (eds) *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian*, 179-274. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Toman, J. (1994). 'Case As a Functional Projection: A Note on an issue in Parametrization', in J. Toman (ed.) *[Formal] Approaches to [Slavic] Linguistics, the Ann Arbor Meeting*, 173-181. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

- De Wit, P. (1997). *Genitive Case and Genitive Constructions*. Doctoral Dissertation Utrecht University.
- Zwart C. J.-W. (1997). *In the Morphosyntax of Verb Movement. The minimalist approach to the syntax of Dutch*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

¹ For motivation of the nominal structural levels see, among others, Abney 1987 (DP), Szabolci 1994 (PosP), Ritter 1991 (NumP).

² The occurrence of both DP and PosP in a single structure is directly reflected in Italian and German examples like the following:

(i) *il mio libro*
the my book

(ii) *dieses unser Land*
this our country

³ By our proposal about the structure of mixed categories in section 2, a CP cannot be dominated by DP. Observe that, by turning into a quote, the CP in fact behaves as a syntactic head, not an XP. See Ackema & Neeleman 2000.

⁴ It has been proposed that demonstratives are not determiners, but constituents in SpecDP that move there from a lower point in the structure (Giusti 1999). The occurrence of expressive demonstratives in expressive infinitives containing bare infinitives directly contradicts such an assumption for expressive demonstratives, because of the absence of any lower nominal structure that demonstratives might originate from.

⁵ English nondeictic demonstratives are slightly different again: they not only perform D-linking but actually introduce new elements into the discourse. This is why their behaviour is basically indefinite, as in (i). Any Dutch nondeictic demonstratives are definite, as illustrated in (ii).

(i) *There was this man in the park*

(ii) **Er lag dat boek van jou op tafel*
there was that book of you on table

⁶ In example (28c) the positive wording in combination with the (derogatory) expressive demonstrative leads to an ironic interpretation.

⁷ E.-P. Kester (p.c.) provides the following facts to show that in Dutch proximate demonstratives are always deictic, as opposed to non-proximate demonstratives.

(i) **dit boek daar*
this book there

(ii) *dat boek hier*
that book here

⁸ Examples with expressive demonstratives are colloquial, but not otherwise stylistically marked. In these constructions, it is possible to replace the higher demonstrative with a definite determiner, retaining the expressive demonstrative interpretation but adding a mock upper-class stylistic effect.

(i) *De poenigheid van die mensen, dat is toch iets vreselijks*
the flashiness of those people, that is something terrible

(ii) *het gezeur van dat mens, dat is toch iets vreselijks*
the whining of that woman, that is something terrible

I will ignore this effect from now on.

Observe that this is probably the origin of DPs with definite determiners with the same semantics as expressive demonstratives and the same stylistic effect as in the previous examples.

(iii) *de man verdient het*
the man deserves so

⁹ The ungrammatical examples in (39) do not allow contrastive stress in the first place.

(i) **die lui, niet deze lui*
those people, not these people

(ii) **dat mens, niet dit mens*
that woman, not this woman

It turns out that there are DPs that can never be contrasted, probably because they are epithets.

¹⁰ The adjectival modifier does work in some cases, but here the existence of a fully nominal derivate of the verb cannot be excluded.

(i) *?Het eeuwige voortbestaan van de vete*
the eternal go-on-INF of the feud

(ii) *?het eeuwige wisselen van de seizoenen*

the eternal alternate-INF of the seasons

Even in these cases, there is a preference for the non-inflected, adverbial form of the modifier.

¹¹ Non-human *van*-phrase subjects in expressive infinitives are subject to the same semantic effect as human subjects, which is that they are attributed responsibility for (the nature of) the event. The result is that they are, to some extent, humanised.

¹² Definite preverbal objects in nominalised infinitives are subject to some restrictions, mainly the presence of an adverb in the structure.

- (i) **het de kandidaat afzeggen van hem*
the the candidate cancel-INF of him

In Dutch, definite direct objects scramble. My assumption is that the adverb forces extension of the verbal structure to include AspP, which in turn allows scrambling of definite objects. The ungrammaticality of the example is therefore due to the absence of a scrambling site.

¹³ A counterexample to this generalization would be, for example, a language with obligatorily prenominal possessive pronouns, genitive complements that (may) occur postnominally, and in which agreement is found between the head noun and the genitive complement (either on the noun or on the genitive).

¹⁴ This correctly excludes *van*-phrases from bare infinitives, which have been argued to contain only verbal structure up to and including CP (see section 2).

¹⁵ It follows that nominalised infinitives will only ever have possessor subjects (arguments or adjuncts) in the absence of *van*-phrase objects. This prediction seems to be correct, as is illustrated in the following examples.

- (i) *Haar dikke boeken lezen begint belachelijk te worden*
her thick books read-INF begins ridiculous to become:
'her reading thick books is beginning to become ridiculous'
- (ii) **Haar lezen van dikke boeken begint belachelijk te worden*
her read-INF of thick books begins ridiculous to become

¹⁶ We might take this reasoning one step further, and claim that expressive *van*-phrase do not have a genitive feature but an expressive feature, which in fact requires checking by D° . The problem with such an approach is that it predicts any argument *van*-phrase with this feature to be able to raise to SpecDP. This makes the wrong predictions for objects, which never occur as expressive *van*-phrases

¹⁷ These examples are equivalent to the expressive infinitives with *van*-phrase objects briefly mentioned in section 2.1, examples (6c, d). It turns out that they should not be treated on a par with ordinary expressive infinitives.

¹⁸ The examples in (82) can be saved by contrastive stress on either the verb or the *van*-phrase.