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1 INTRODUCTION: X + THAT-CLAUSE

Belgian Dutch allows for sentences of the type in (1):

(1) {Misschien/Goed} da Kris komt.
perhaps/ good that Kris comes
“It is {perhaps the case/good} that Kris is coming.”

(2) Het is {misschien zo/goed} da Kris komt.
it is perhaps so/ good that Kris comes
“It is {perhaps the case/good} that Kris is coming.”

Main claim of this talk: (1) is derived from (2) via IP-ellipsis

2 THE BASIC DATA: WHAT IS X?

Overview:
2.1. The classification
2.2. Adverbs
2.3. Adjectives
2.4. Adjective-adverbs
2.5. Summary

2.1. The classification

Dutch: no morphological distinction between adverbs and adjectives
distribution:

(3) Adjective: a. een vreemde zaak (attributive use)
   a strange case
   Dat hij niet komt, is jammer.
   that he not comes is unfortunate
   “That he doesn’t come, is unfortunate.”

(4) (Sentential) Adverb: Kim slaapt misschien.
   Kim sleeps perhaps
   “Kim sleeps perhaps.”

(5) Ambiguous: a. de waarschijnlijke winnaar
   the probable winner
   b. Kim slaapt waarschijnlijk.
   Kim sleeps probably
   “Kim sleeps probably.”

label: adjective-adverb

This categorization is reflected in the construction het is X (zo) dat IP ‘it is X (so) that IP’ which is semantically equivalent to X + that-clause:
(6) Het is ADV za(d)t IP
   a. Het is misschien *(zo) da Kris komt.
      it is perhaps so that Kris comes
      “It is perhaps the case that Kris is coming.”
   b. Het is goed *(zo) da Kris komt.
      it is good so that Kris comes
      “It is good that Kris is coming.”
   c. Het is waarschijnlijk *(zo) da Kris komt.
      it is probably so that Kris comes
      “It is probably the case that Kris is coming.”

2.2. Adverbs

(7) a. Misschien da Kris komt.
      perhaps that Kris comes
      “It is perhaps the case that Kris is coming.”
   b. *Altijd da Kris komt.
      always that Kris comes
      “It is always the case that Kris is coming.”

(8) [MoodSpeech Act] [MoodEvaluative] [MoodEvidential] [MoodEpistemic] [MoodIrrealis] [MoodNecessity] [MoodPossibility] [Tpast] [Tonce] [Tthen] [Tfuture]
   [AspHabitual] [AspUsually] [AspRepetitive] [AspAgain] [AspOnce] [AspIntentionally] [AspCelerative(I)] [AspQuickly] [AspTerminative] [AspAlready] [AspNo Longer] [AspContinuous] [AspStill]
   [AspPerfect?] [AspAlways] [AspJust] [AspSoon] [AspDuration] [AspBriefly] [AspGeneric] [AspProgressive] [AspCharacteristically?] [AspProspective] [AspAlmost] [AspAlmost] [AspCelerative(II)] [AspComplete] [AspProperly] [AspWell] [AspCelerative(II)] [AspFast] [AspEarly] [AspAgain] [AspOften] [AspCompletive(I)] [AspCompletive(II)]

(9) The adverbs occurring in X + *that*-clause are restricted to those found in the higher Mod-nodes.

(10) ModEpistemic: wellicht ‘perchance’, alllicht ‘most likely’ and blijkbaar ‘apparently’
(11) ModIrrealis: misschien ‘perhaps’

2.3. Adjectives


2.4. Adjective-adverbs

(14) Waarschijnlijk da Kris komt.
      probably that Kris comes
      “It is {probably the case/probable} that Kris is coming.”

Like the adverbs they can be situated in the Mod-nodes of Cinque’s hierarchy.

(15) ModEpistemic: waarschijnlijk ‘probably’ and klaarblijkelijk ‘obviously’
(16) ModNecessity: zeker ‘certainly’
(17) ModPossibility: mogelijk ‘possibly’
2.5. Summary

Three groups of words occurring in X + that-clause: **adverbs, adjectives and adjective-adverbs**. This is reflected in the construction “het is X (zo) dat IP”:

- Het is ADV *(zo) dat IP
- Het is ADJ (*zo) dat IP
- Het is ADJ-ADV (zo) dat IP

**adverbs and adjective-adverbs**: Mod-nodes

**adjectives**: evaluative Mood

3 THE ANALYSIS: IP-ELLIPSIS

Analysis of X + that-clause: **ellipsis**

(18) a. Waarschijnlijk da Sofie Jella heeft gebeld.
   probably that Sofie Jella has called
   “It is probably the case that Sofie has called Jella.”

b. Het is waarschijnlijk zo da Sofie Jella heeft gebeld.
   it is probably so that Sofie Jella has called
   “It is probably the case that Sofie has called Jella.”

(19) a. Logisch da Reiner ook komt!
   logical that Reiner also comes
   “It is logical that Reiner also comes.”

b. Het is logisch da Reiner ook komt!
   it is logical that Reiner also comes
   “It is logical that Reiner also comes.”

→ (18)a/(19)a are derived from (18)b/(19)b through IP-ellipsis

Overview:

3.1. The non-elliptical ‘base sentence’
3.2. Ellipsis of het is X (zo) dat(t) IP

3.1. The non-elliptical ‘base sentence’

3.1.1. X can be more than a single phrase

(20) Het is misschien niet slecht da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is perhaps not bad that Jessica it her told has
   “It is perhaps not bad that Jessica told her.”
misschien niet slecht does not form a constituent: they cannot be fronted together

(21) *Mischien niet slecht is het da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   perhaps not bad is it that Jessica it her told has
   “It is perhaps not bad that Jessica told her.”

What can occur as X?

(22) a. Het is misschien wel niet slecht da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is perhaps PRT not bad that Jessica it her told has
   “It is perhaps not bad that Jessica told her.”
   (PRT stands for ‘particle’)
   b. Het is x wel niet slecht da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is not bad that Jessica it her told has
   “It is not bad that Jessica told her.”
   c. Het is x x niet slecht da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is not bad that Jessica it her told has
   “It is not bad that Jessica told her.”
   d. Het is x x x jammer da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is unfortunate that Jessica it her told has
   “It is unfortunate that Jessica told her.”
   e. *Het is uiteraard wel niet x da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is indeed PRT not that Jessica it her told has
   f. *Het is allicht x x x da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is most-likely that Jessica it her told has

Het is ADV PRT NEG ADJ da Jessica het haar verteld heeft

The predicate position is obligatorily filled, the others are optional. When no adjectival predicate is available, the semantically weak zo ‘the-case’ is inserted:

(23) a. *Het is misschien da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is perhaps that Jessica it her told has
   b. Het is misschien zo da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is perhaps so that Jessica it her told has
   “It is perhaps the case that Jessica told her.”

zo is a dummy predicate, occurring in the same position as the adjective.

(24) *Het is jammer zo da Jessica het haar verteld heeft.
   it is unfortunate so that Jessica it her told has
   Zo is disallowed in X + that-clause: it get elided together with het ‘it’ and is ‘is’.

(25) *Misschien zo da Kris komt.
    perhaps so that Kris comes
3.1.2. ModP

(26) CP
    C'
    C°
    IP
    DP
    het
    I'
    I
    is
    ModP
    AdvP
    Mod'
    Mod
    PrtP
    wel
    PolP
    wel/niet
    VP
    V
    PredP
    AP
    schlecht
    Pred'
    Pred°
    CP
    da Kris komt

→ CP is the **internal argument** of the adjectival predicate and sits in the complement position of PredP (cfr. Merchant (1998) and references cited there). The AP is the specifier of this PredP.

→ The dat-clause can move along with the AP or stay behind

(27) a. Heel slecht da ge het hem verteld heb is het misschien wel niet. very bad that you it him told have is it perhaps PRT not
   “It’s not very bad that you told him.”

b. Heel slecht is het misschien wel niet da ge het hem verteld heb. very bad is it perhaps PRT not that you it him told have
   “It’s not very bad that you told him.”

→ (27)a: fronting of PredP > < (27)b: fronting of AP

3.1.3. Summary

- more than one phrase in X: AdvP + particle wel + negation/affirmation + predicate
- \([\text{Mod}_\text{ADV} \text{Mod}^0 [\text{PrtP wel} \text{ PolP niet/wel} \text{ VP V [PredP AP [Pred}^0 \text{ CP ]]}]]\]

3.2 Ellipsis of het (zo) da(t) IP

3.2.1. What is elided? What survives?

- X + that-clause with an adjectival predicate
  → het is ‘it is’ deleted
  → survivors: AdvP, particle wel, PolP, adjective and the CP da Wim erbij was
  (without linguistic context)

(28) a. Misschien wel nie slecht da Wim erbij was. perhaps PRT not bad that Wim there was
   “Perhaps it’s not bad that Wim was there.”

b. Misschien goed da Wim erbij was. perhaps good that Wim there was
   “Perhaps it’s good that Wim was there.”
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3. X + *that*-clause with *zo* as the predicate
   → *het is* deleted
   → *zo is deleted*, as well

3.2 Belgian Dutch sluicing

   a. *Misschien wel* *zo* dat Yves komt.
      
      perhaps *PRT* so that Yves comes
      
      “It is perhaps the case that Yves comes.”

   b. Misschien *wel dat* Yves komt.
      
      *PRT* that Yves comes
      
      “It is perhaps the case that Yves comes.”

3.2.2 Brussels Dutch sluicing

   a. Antoon heeft iemand gezien.
      
      Antoon has someone seen
      
      “Antoon has seen someone.” –“Who?”

   b. *Ik weet* *wie* *met* Marsha gedanst heeft, maar ik weet *niet* *wie* *met* Kaat.
      
      I know who with Marsha danced has but I know not who with Kaat
      
      “I know who danced with Marsha, but I don’t know who with Kaat.”

   c. Barbara heeft waarschijnlijk een dossier ingediend, en ik weet ook *wie* *zeker*.
      
      Barbara has probably a file submitted and I know also who CERTAINLY did.

   d. Barbara heeft zeker geen dossier ingediend, maar ik weet *niet* *wie*.
      
      Barbara has certainly no file submitted and I don’t know *who*.

**Ellipsis repair effect:** “the overt movement of the demonstrative pronoun to SpecCP [...] is only allowed if the lower part of the movement chain is elided [...] [S]luicing is crucially needed to rescue what would otherwise be an illegitimate derivation” (Van Craenenbroeck 2004: 60)

(32) da is *wie dat* Antoon gezien heeft
    
    *that* is who *that* Antoon seen has

(33) [FoceP *Wie* [FoceP *da* is *t* dat *Antoon gezien heeft?]]
    
    Who *that* is *that* Antoon seen has
    
    = SPADING

(34) *Wie* *da* is *t* *dat* Antoon gezien heeft?
    
    *who* *that* *that* Antoon seen has

(35) a. Ik *weet* *wie* met Marsha gedanst heeft, maar ik *weet* *niet* *wie* *met* Kaat.
      
      I know who with Marsha danced has but I don’t know not who with Kaat

   b. Ik *weet* *wie de* appel gepakt heeft, maar ik *weet* *niet* *wie de* banaan.
      
      I know who the apple taken has but I don’t know not who the banana

(36) a. Barbara heeft waarschijnlijk een dossier ingediend, en ik *weet* ook *wie* *zéker*.
      
      Barbara has probably a file submitted and I know also who CERTAINLY did.
      
      “Barbara probably submitted a file and I know who CERTAINLY did.”

   b. Barbara heeft zeker geen dossier ingediend, maar ik *weet* *niet* *wie*.
Barbara has certainly no file submitted but I know not who zeker wel.  

certainly AFF  

“Barbara certainly didn’t submit a file, but I don’t know who certainly DID.”

c. Barbara heeft misschien wel een dossier ingediend, en ik weet ook wie Barbara has perhaps PRT a file submitted and I know also who misschien wel niet.  

perhaps PRT not  

“Barbara perhaps submitted a file and I also know who perhaps HASN’T.”

What follows the wh-word in (36) is ModP: [ModP misschien [PrtP wel [PrtP niet …]]]  

These elements do not co-occur with da: they occupy the same position: the [Spec,FocP].

(37) ForceP  

wie Force’  

Force’0 FocP  

{ da } Foc’  

→ IP ellipsis

(38) *Barbara heeft waarschijnlijk een dossier ingediend, maar ik weet niet wie da zéker.  

Barbara has probably a file submitted but I know not who thatdem certainly-AFF

Just like the demonstrative pronoun da, ModP can only move in sluicing:

(39) a. Ik weet dat Barbara zeker geen dossier heeft ingediend, maar ik weet I know that Barbara certainly no file has submitted but I know niet wie het zeker wel is dat een dossier heeft ingediend.  

not who it certainly AFF is that a file has submitted  

“I know that Barbara certainly didn’t submit a file, but I don’t who certainly DID submit a file.”

b. *…maar ik weet niet wie zeker wel het is dat een dossier heeft submitted  

but I know not who certainly AFF it is that a file has ingediend.

The same pattern is found in X + that-clause: ModP can only be fronted as a whole if the IP, consisting of het is, is deleted.

(40) a. *Waarschijnlijk dan wel nie slecht is het da ge het hem gezegd hebt.  

probably PRT PRT not bad is it that you it him said have  

b. *Waarschijnlijk dan wel nie slecht da ge het hem gezegd hebt is het.  

probably PRT PRT not bad that you it him said have is it  

c. Waarschijnlijk dan wel nie slecht da ge het hem gezegd hebt.  

probably PRT PRT not bad that you it him said have  

“It is probably not bad that you said it to him.”
SPADING

⇒ SPADING involves a cleft sentence
⇒ *da* can only move if the following IP is elided.
⇒ ModP can only move if the following IP is elided.
⇒ ModP occupies the same position as the demonstrative pronoun *da* in SPADING:
  
  \[ [\text{Spec, FocP}] \]

X + THAT-CLAUSE

⇒ X + that-clause involves a cleft-like sentence
⇒ ModP can only move as a whole when IP is elided
⇒ Does ModP sit in [Spec, FocP] in X + that-clause, as well?

Sluices with ModP remnants and sentences like ModP + that-clause should receive parallel analyses.

3.2.3. IP Ellipsis in X + that-clause

The analysis:

\[ \uparrow \]

\[ \text{ModP in X + that-clause moves to a position higher than IP, to [Spec,FocP]. This movement only occurs when the IP is elided.} \]

\[ \text{\& unlike sluicing} \]

\[ \uparrow \]

\[ \text{The} \text{-} \text{clause complement of PredP is not necessarily E-GIVEN (Merchant 2001).} \]

\[ \text{When there is no antecedent, deletion of the CP would violate the recoverability requirement operative in ellipsis. The only elements allowed to stay in the IP are} \]

\[ \text{the semantically empty 'het' 'it', 'is' 'is' and zo 'the case' predicate.} \]

\[ \text{\& unlike sluicing} \]
4 REMAINING ISSUE: THE DISAPPEARANCE OF ZO

 dummy predicate zo is needed in the non-elliptical sentence when there is no adjective:

(42) a. Het is misschien zo da Maarten ook gaat.
     “It is perhaps the case that Maarten is also going.”

   b. *Het is misschien da Maarten ook gaat.

   zo is excluded from X + that-clause:

(43) a. Misschien da Maarten ook gaat.
     “It is perhaps the case that Maarten is also going.”


   zo is moved out of the ModP before the latter goes to [Spec,FocP]

   remaining questions:
   What is the landing site of zo?
   What triggers this movement?
   Why is this movement dependent on the movement of ModP?

5 CONCLUSION

 main claim: X + that-clause involves IP-ellipsis

 underlying structure: Het is X dat-clause ‘it is X that-clause’

 x = ModP; containing an adverb, the particle wel, negation or affirmation and an
   (adjectival) predicate

 ModP only moves out of the IP in case of ellipsis
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