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In this paper, we would like to show that data as in (1) are cases of exclamative movement at S-Structure, within a non-clausal structure:

(1) a. Etonnante, cette histoire! 'Astonishing this story!'
    
    b. Un génie, cet enfant! 'A genius, this child!'

Even though these constructions can be interpreted as copular sentences, we argue that these phrases are not clausal and, moreover, they do not correspond to a small clause structure. More generally, a small clause is viewed as a subject-predicate verbless construction where the invisible verb is construed as the copula. Within the construction in (1), however, there is no possible finite counterpart to refer to since the copula cannot surface, contrary to what is usually observed in embedded or adjoined small clauses:

(2) a. *Etonnante, cette histoire est! 'Astonishing, this story is!'
    
    b. *Un génie, cet enfant est! 'A genius, this child is!'

(3) a. Je considère [cet enfant intelligent]
    Je considère [que cet enfant est intelligent]
    'I consider that this child is intelligent'
    
    b. Une fois [Jean parti]... Une fois [que Jean est parti]... 'Once that Jean is gone...'

We therefore argue that the structures in (1) do not exhibit the status of a reduced proposition but rather represent a NP type of structure, as also suggested by Milner (1982:267:fn2). This analysis is thus in line with the conclusions of Grimshaw (1979) who has argued that exclamatives (E type structures) correspond to more than one syntactic category, and that NP and S' each correspond to more than one semantic type. More specifically, we defend the general idea that these structures in (1) lack a Tense operator and correspond to a moment in discourse rather than a moment in time.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 1, we note several facts about these exclamative constructions and we introduce a revised definition of the notion "small clause" illustrating more clearly how the structures in (1) do not match the definition of a small
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clause. In section 2, we propose that these structures form a DP constituent with the movement of the adjoined predicate from an A' position to another adjoined A' position. The semantic restrictions on these moved predicates are then studied closely and it can be observed that they must belong to a certain syntactic and semantic category. In particular, the predicate is an adjoined modifier, it cannot be an argument. It must also bear an intensity reading and an individual-level reading, as defined by Kratzer (1989) and Diesing (1989). In section 3, we provide arguments for the DP configuration and for the A' movement. We argue that the chain has properties of a variable even though the movement within the domain of the noun phrase is always local. We note also that this movement never induces Weak crossover or Strong crossover effects, phenomena which have usually been observed to obtain with variables. The movement analysis is supported by the fact that Subjacency is obeyed. Section 4 introduces similar facts from Moroccan Arabic which provide further support for our analysis, illustrating how such exclamative predicates are really DP structures and not TPs. Section 5 summarizes our findings.

1. What is a Small Clause?

Following the projection principle, an NP and a predicative expression which together function as an argument of a verb form a single constituent and this constituent is commonly referred to as a Small Clause (cf. Chomsky 1981). Stowell (1983) has proposed a version of this analysis which treats a small clause as a maximal projection of its predicate and also as a structure without an INFL node. Various nodes have therefore been proposed to account for the predicate expression: AP, NP, PP and also a CP node. Embedded small clauses are usually complements of ergative or copula verbs which do not assign Case to the NP subject. Moreover, the predicative expression is not considered a complement of this verb: "Jean, arrivera [t malade]" (Jean will arrive ill). However, since T and Agr have been split into two independent functional heads (Pollock 1989), there is now an array of possibilities in the literature for defining the internal structure of a small clause and the question therefore arises as to what a small clause corresponds to.

In general, a small clause can be viewed as a subject-predicate sequence not supported by an overt tensed verbal form. If a finite verb must merge with both T and Agr then a small clause can be defined as a sequence with a non-trace abstract T node that is the non-overt counterpart of an otherwise legitimate T. The time frame of the clause is understood through an anaphoric Tense or a time adverbial which fixes the time frame of the clause to the tense of the matrix (Stowell 1982, Enc 1987). This anaphoric Tense must necessarily be bound in a local domain. It can therefore be claimed that small clauses present an abstract form of the functional node T which is bound by an operator:

(4) [PAST [Je T considérerais [PAST [Marie T intelligente]]]]
    'I considered Mary intelligent'  

However, a problem raised by such a proposal is to explain the difference between an abstract T in infinitives, as proposed in Stowell (1982), and an abstract T in a small clause without a verbal form, as in (4). One way to solve this would be to say that both of these Tense operators are anaphoric but only infinitivs exhibit a verbal form. This distinction, we argue, could serve to explain the structural difference between a small clause and a full clause. In other words the main difference lies in the presence or absence of a lexical verb form. In a full clause this verbal form can merge to AGR (or INFP for infinitives as in Kayne 1990) and T but in a small clause there is no verbal form.

---

1. As claimed by Mouchaweh (1986), Kayne (1984), Haïk (1985) and others.
We therefore claim that in a matrix (small) clause, as in Israeli Hebrew, verbless copular constructions in the present tense would present an abstract \( T \) but no verbal form. The AGR node would sometimes be filled by a pronominal element, called an \( H \) element.¹ The equative must contain \( H \) in order to be well-formed while the predicative in (5b) allows \( H \) optionally:

(5)  

a.  
ha–melex *(hu) david (Rapoport 1987)  
the king \( H \) david  
'The king is David'

b.  
Dani (hu) more  
Dan \( H \) teacher  
'Dan is a teacher'

Fassi Fehri (1988) has shown that such verbless copular constructions in Arabic are in fact tensed clauses as can be seen by the use of time adverbs in the present tense only:

(6)  

a.  
Zayd–un mari:d–un l–?a:na (Fassi Fehri 1988)  
Zayd–Nom. ill–Nom. now  
'Zayd is now ill'

b.  
*Zayd–un mari:d–un ?amsi  
Zayd–Nom. ill–Nom. yesterday  
'Zayd is ill yesterday'

In a similar way, it is easy to show that the phrases in (1) do not correspond to a reduced form of a clause since the use of time adverbials is not readily available:

(7)  

a.  
*Etonnante, cette histoire demain (tou à l’heure)!  
’Astonishing this story tomorrow (soon)’

b.  
*Un génie, cet enfant hier!  
’A genius this child yesterday’

However, many questions remain with this new definition of the small clause. For example, we must establish the distinction between constructions with an empty anaphoric \( T \) from constructions with a lexical anaphoric \( T \). One important difference to note, at least in French, is that one does not find Nominative Case assignment, clitic forms or any form of negation linked to a tensed verb when there is an empty anaphoric \( T \):⁴

---

2. For a more detailed study of Israeli Hebrew copular constructions, see Doron (1986) and Rapoport (1987). Rapoport (1987) first proposed the notion of "matrix small clauses" for such constructions.

3. We do not agree with Heggie (1989) who treats the \( H \) element in AGR in Hebrew as a lexicalization of the copula in the present tense.

4. From the discussion above it is not clear whether nominal constructions in Hebrew, Arabic, Haitian Creole, etc., would be considered full matrix clauses with an anaphoric \( T \) or a reduced clause with no verbal form. This question is beyond the scope of this article and we leave it open for further research.
2. An analysis within a DP configuration

2.1 There could be several distinct possible analyses for the exclamative constructions in (1). On one account, it could be argued that the matrix clause is truncated as in (9) with a right-dislocated NP:

(9) (C’est) incroyable, cette histoire!
    (It is) incredible, this story

On a second account, the structure could be analysed as a reduced clause headed by AGRP but without a Tense operator. This type of structure would basically reproduce a subject-predicate sequence which underlies an empty copula. This hypothesis, as discussed below, is certainly an unsizeable step. A third account treats the construction as a nominal structure and uses a DP configuration to illustrate the internal organisation of the structure. We will return to the first account below. The derivations of the second and third account are diagrammed in the figures that follow:

(10) A
    / \        B
   / \        / \  
étonnantei AGRP  étonnantei DP
   / \        / \  
   / \        / \  
   / \        / \  
cette AGR’ NP  spec D’
 / \   / \   / \    / \  
cette AP  NP  AP  
      / \  
histoire e1   historie e1
      / \  
      / \  
      / \  
      / \  

We believe that the second account, i.e. the structure presented in (10A), would be difficult to defend mainly because the basic structure would not always show up in French:

(11) a. *Cette histoire belle
    'This story beautiful'

b. Belle, cette histoire!
    'Beautiful this story'

Such so-called nominal constructions with no verb be in the present tense of a matrix clause are manifested in various grammars such as Hebrew, Arabic, Haitian Creole, Russian, Turkish, Hungarian (among others). This construction is not observed in French. Another problem raised with the analysis in (10A) is to explain why the trace of the predicate could be governed by a functional head and not by a lexical head. Exclamative constructions in general do not exhibit this property:

(12) Quelle charmante jeune fille Annalou est devenue!
    'What a charming young lady A. has become!'

On the basis of these considerations and others that will follow, we will not consider the structure in (10A) as a plausible representation for the structures in (1).

In the third account, (10B), it can be claimed that there exists a movement of the predicate to an adjoined position. We posit that this movement is analogous to the one in question forms and that the predicate is marked with a [+wh] feature, as also hypothesized by Milner (1982) in his study of exclamative constructions.

We will begin by noting several facts about these exclamative phrases. First, let us consider that agreement between the modifier and the head is obligatory in order to identify the movement of the predicate. The lack of such agreement as in (9) shows clearly that the structure is not a case of predicate movement. We therefore leave aside the study of cases such as the following:

(13) Etonnant, cette histoire!
    'Astonishing--masc. this--fem. story'

The movement involved in (1) displaces at S-structure a maximal projection of a XP predicate and this predicate can be identified as a AP or a subclass of PNP (Predicate Noun Phrase). Referential NPs and PPs as in (14b) are thus excluded:

(14) a. *Le professeur, ce Jean!
    'The professor, this Jean!

b. *Dans la maison, cette femme!
    'In the house, this woman!

We therefore claim that this predicate phrase is a modifier, and not an argument, as defined by Grimshaw (to appear) where the relation between the head and the modifier is one of predication in which the modifier is predicated of the external argument R of the head noun (cf. Williams 1981). In a phrase like Cette histoire étonnante, étonnante is coindexed with the R argument of histoire.

Only modifiers can appear in the predicate position, complements are excluded. This predicts correctly, that a possessive complement as in (15a) and a referential modifier as in (15b) never occur in this construction:

(15) a. *De Reagan, cette défaite!
    'Reagan's this defeat!

6. Contreras (1987) has argued that there is a categorial difference between referential NPs and Predicate Nominal Phrases. He also claims that PNP are distinct from APs.
b. *Marocaine, cette guerre contre l’Algérie! ’Moroccan this war against Algeria!’

Grimshaw (to appear) has also argued that the CPs associated with nouns like knowledge and attempt are complements not modifiers, contrary to CP complements with nouns like decision which would be modifiers:

(16) a. Their attempt to climb the mountain (Grimshaw)
   b. *Their attempt was to climb the mountain
   c. Cette tentative de grimper la montagne ’This attempt to climb the mountain’
   d. *De grimper la montagne, cette tentative! ’To climb the mountain, this attempt!’

However, CP complements with nouns like decision which can be related to the head via predication across a copula also cannot appear in exclamative predicate constructions:

(17) a. The decision was to leave at 6 (Grimshaw)
   b. *De partir à 6 heures, cette décision! ’To leave at 6, this decision!’

One could conclude from the facts above in (16) and (17) that CP nodes are excluded altogether from the possible exclamative predicates. In French, however, there is an infinitival verbal form, preceded by the preposition à, which can be related to the head via predication across a copula and which could possibly be identified as a CP node:

(18) a. A surveiller, ce jeune homme! ’To be watched this young man!’
   b. A suivre, cette affaire! ’To be followed up this business!’

Huot (1977:531) has argued, however, that such infinitival forms in (18) are APs and her main argument is based on the fact that certain infinitival forms of this type can be coordinated with APs as in the following examples:

(19) a. Cette affaire est dangereuse et à suivre ’This business is dangerous and to be followed up’

7. Referential adjectives can also be used as modifiers or as predicative adjectives. This is illustrated in the following example:

(i) Très marocain, ce comportement! ’Very Moroccan, this behaviour!’

For more discussions and examples on this topic, cf. Giorgi and Longobardi (to appear).

8. I would like to thank Alan Ford for bringing this example to my attention.
b. Voici un jeune homme très important et à surveiller de près
   'Here is a very important young man and to be watched closely'

It can therefore be hypothesized that the predicates in (18) belong to the syntactic category AP and are modifiers, in the terms of Grimshaw (to appear).

2.2 APs and Predicate Noun Phrases

As noted above, these exclamatory predicates can only admit a particular semantic category of APs and PNPs. Adjectives belonging to a referential class, as defined by Giorgi and Longobardi (to appear) are ruled out from these phrases; objective adjectives such as those of colour and classifying adjectives are also excluded:

(20) a. *Solaire, (nucléaire), (électrique), cette énergie!
   'Solar, (nuclear), (electric), this energy!'

b. *Rouge, cette voiture!
   'Red, this car!'

c. *Critiqué, cet article!
   'Criticized, this paper!'

d. *Cassé, ce verre!
   'Broken, this glass!'

e. *Laid, ce type!
   'Ugly, this guy!'

However, when these adjectives appear with a degree form, they become acceptable:

(21) a. Beaucoup trop rouge, cette voiture!
   'Much too red, this car!'

b. Affreusement laid, ce type!
   'Terribly ugly, this guy!'

c. Très critiqué, cet article!
   'Very criticized, this paper!'

Only those predicates which never bear a degree word as in (22a), referential adjectives as in (22b) or pseudo-(colour)adjectives as in (22c), are completely ruled out:

(22) a. *Très cassé, ce verre!
   'Very broken, this glass!'

b. *Très solaire, cette énergie!
   'Very solar this energy!'

c. *Beaucoup trop blanche, cette nuit!
   'Much too white, this night!'

The most widely accepted category of adjectives for these predicates are subjective ones like psychological adjectives. This category can appear with or without a degree form:
(23) a. Admirable, son film!
   'Admirable, his movie!'

b. (Merveilleusement) superbe, le mec!
   '(Marvellously) superb, the guy!'

c. (Très) intelligent, cet enfant!
   '(Very) intelligent, this child!'

In the same vein, the semantic class of PNPs which expresses a form of appreciation is acceptable here, contrary to nouns of function or profession:

(24) a. Un génie, ce petit!
   'A genius, this little one!'

b. Une perle, cette Diane!
   'A pearl, this Diane!'

c. *Une linguiste, cette femme!
   'A linguist, this woman!'

d. *Professeur, ce Jean!
   'Professor, this Jean!'

Such PNPs in (24c, d) also become acceptable, however, when they are accompanied by an adjective expressing a degree of appreciation:

(25) a. Une linguiste étrange, cette femme!
   'A strange linguist, this woman!'

b. Excellent professeur, ce type!
   'Excellent professor, this guy!'

This last set of facts clearly illustrates how the predicate here is not only identified as a syntactic category but also as a semantic one.

2.3 Individual Level Predicates

As is well known, predicates can also be classified semantically in terms of stage level or individual level predicates. A number of grammatical phenomena can be sensitive to this distinction as discussed in Kratzer (1989), Diesing (1989) and many others in the literature. We would like to demonstrate that exclamative predicates as in (1) can only extract predicates which bear an individual level interpretation. The following sentences illustrate some uses in which the proposed semantic difference between the two types of predicates is confirmed by an extraction contrast:

(26) a. *Disponible, ce papa!
   'Available, this dad!'

9. This distinction can be termed roughly as temporary states for stage level predicates and more or less permanent states for individual level predicates. Cf. Diesing (1989).
b. *Assis sur une chaise, ce vieux monsieur!
   'Sitting on a chair, this old man!'

c. *Les mêmes, ces mecs!
   'The same, these guys!'

These predicates are all identified as stage level predicates. It is interesting to note here that if an adverb which introduces a semantic notion of permanent state is inserted, the movement of the predicate is then available:

(27) a. Jamais disponible, ce papa!
   'Never available, this dad!'

b. Toujours assis sur une chaise, ce vieux monsieur!
   'Always sitting on a chair, this old man!'

c. Tous les mêmes, ces mecs!
   'All the same, these guys!'

These aspectual markers (toujours, jamais, tous) introducing the predicate in (27) have a property in common: they all bear a generic interpretation which gives the predicate a meaning of homogeneity in duration (cf. Franckel 1989). The generic value can appear through various forms as is more clearly demonstrated with the following examples:

(28) a. ??Toujours en train de casser cet objet, ce type!
   'Always breaking this object, this guy!'

b. Toujours en train de casser la vaisselle, ce type!
   'Always breaking the dishes, this guy!'

In (28a), the complement of casser is related to a specific object, giving the sentence a more constrained interpretation than the one in (28b) where we find a more acceptable generic interpretation.

Speas (1990) has argued that predicate nominals are never stage level predicates. We also reach the same conclusion but we believe that a further distinction must be established, following our discussion above in section 2.1. The individual level predicate nominal must bear more or less a meaning of appreciation and cannot correspond to a name of function in order to be accepted in such exclamative phrases.

Another distinction concerning the semantics of these predicates can be noted through the expression of inalienable possession:

(29) a. Un nez extraordinaire, cette Cléopâtre!
   'An extraordinary nose, this Cleopatra!'

b. *Un nez cassé, ce boxeur!
   'A broken nose, this boxer!'

Example (29a) expresses a permanent state while in (29b) we find a temporary state excluded with such predicates. These examples in (29) also present a different characteristic which distinguishes them from the rest of the examples of this construction. We note indeed that with inalienable possession, it is impossible to claim the presence of an abstract copula as proposed for instance with the schema in (10A): "Cette Cléopâtre a (*est) un nez extraordinaire" (This Cleopatra has (*is) an extraordinary nose).
This last fact lends further support to a DP analysis with an adjoined predicate for those constructions. On the contrary, an analysis in terms of a clausal construction with a non-overt copula would run into problems here.

2.4 Alienable vs Inalienable Possession

There is a very clearcut distinction in this construction between alienable possession predicates and predicates expressing inalienable possession since only inalienable possession predicates, as in (30), can be extracted:

(30)  
a. Une taille magnifique, cette femme!  
     'A magnificent figure, this woman!'

b. Des yeux superbes, cet enfant!  
     'Superb eyes, this child!'

c. Un dynamisme incroyable, cette fille!  
     'An incredible dynamism, this girl'

d. Un culot renversant, ce type!  
     'An astounding self-assurance, this guy!'

(31)  
a. *Un livre très intéressant, cet auteur!  
     'A very interesting book, this author!'

b. *Un mari très riche, cette femme!  
     'A very rich husband, this woman!'

c. *Une voiture splendide, ces gens!  
     'A splendid car, these people!'

Tellier (1990), in her study of inherent possessors in underived nominals, distinguishes two classes of underived nouns and shows that these nouns differ along the argument/adjunct axis: there is one class where "the relation between head noun and possessor expresses a transitory, or "external" possession relation" and with the other group, the possession relation is intrinsic or "internal". The first class corresponds to concrete Ns (livre, table, voiture, etc.) and the genitive possessor of these Ns is an adjunct. Nouns of the second class include kinship terms, body parts and intrinsic characteristics. Such relational Ns assign a possessor theta-role which is linked to a position in the syntax. Extending her claim to double-Dont constructions (DDC) which she analyses as parasitic gap constructions (PGC), Tellier observes that when a non-relational N appears in a DDC construction, as in (32b), the alienable possessor is not necessarily interpreted as coreferent with the real gap, contrary to what is noted with relational Ns, as in (32a):

(32)  
a. Ce garçon, dont l'énergie se lisait dans les yeux bleus de (Tellier)  
     'This boy, of whom the energy could be read in the blue eyes'

b. *Un collectionneur dont les objets rares sont disposés sur la table de  
     'A collector of whom the rare objects are displayed on the table'

Exclamative NP predicates expressing inalienable possession concern only body parts and intrinsic characteristics which bear a form of appreciation with an intensity reading:
(33) a. *Ma soeur merveilleuse, cette fille!
   'My marvellous sister, this girl!'

b. Des yeux formidables, cet enfant!
   'Fantastic eyes, this child!'

c. Un dynamisme incroyable, cette femme!
   'An incredible dynamism, this woman!'

Kinship terms are unacceptable here because the relation with the head noun is one of a possessive complement and, as we have noted above, the predicate phrase must be a modifier, not an argument.

We would like to end this section by proposing that the distinction noted by Tellier (1990) be generalized in terms of stage level and individual level predicates, as is almost implicit in Tellier's own terms. A relational N expressing a transitory possession could be encompassed under the more general term "stage level" predicate while non-relational Ns (with an intensity reading) referring to intrinsic characteristics or body parts would be equivalent to individual level predicates. However, contrary to what is observed in Tellier's inalienable constructions which assign obligatorily a possessor theta-role, as in "elle a levé le doigt e" (She raised her finger), we do not find the same pattern with exclamative predicates. There is no possible analogy here mainly because these predicates are not part of a complex predicate with the verb (cf. Guéron 1983). Exclamative predicates are adjunct modifiers, as noted above.

3. A DP Structure with an A' Chain

To summarize the analysis thus far, we have proposed that this construction is a NP structure type with an A' movement of the predicate phrase. The question now raised is the following: is the structure a counterpart to Topicalization as proposed by Chomsky (1977,1981), where a wh-item is moved through an empty operator in Spec,CP or is it rather a counterpart to Topicalization as an instance of adjunction to IP, as proposed by many others (Baltin 1982, Rochemont 1989, Lasnik & Saito (to appear))?

We argue that the second account is to be preferred over the first one. Stowell (1983), Browning (1987) and Tellier (1988) have argued that a null operator may not bind a variable in an adjunct position. Example (34), from Stowell (1986), illustrates an ungrammatical instance of Null Operator extraction from adjunct position:

(34) *This way is impossible [OP₁ [ PRO to learn the language [e ] ]] (Stowell)

Note that similarly, our structure with an empty operator would be illicit: the topologized predicate is not a R-expression and an empty operator must be bound by a R-expression. Moreover, the predicate phrase is not lexically governed nor Case-marked and there is an autonomous-theta-marking between the N and the adjective, in the sense of Higginbotham (1985).

10. See Haïk (1985) who has proposed, for a different type of sentence, that exclamative predicates were operators at LF.
It can also be observed that the determiner in our phrases must be a deictic. It fills a node which plays an important role in this construction. Indefinite Ds are ruled out here, as is true also of referential NPs in subject position.41

(35)  
  a. Etonnante, la petite!`
    'Astonishing, the small one!'
  
  b. Superbe, le mec!`
    'Superb, the guy!'
  
  c. Admirable, son film!
    'Admirable, his movie!'
  
  d. *Intéressant, un livre!
    'Interesting a book!'

The complement of D' is presented as a NP with an adjoined AP or PNP. Recall that the agreement features on N and A must match within this configuration.

As is well known (Milner 1982, HaK 1985), arguments for a wh-analysis such as WCO or SCO effects or ECP effects are not available in exclamative structures because they must be root phrases or clauses and also because pronouns are usually not found in this construction:

(36)  
  a. Admirable, ce travail!
    'Admirable, this work!'
  
  b. *Admirable, je considère que ce travail!
    'Admirable, I consider that this work!'
  
  c. *Admirable, il!
    'Admirable, Cl-3p.!' 
  
  d. ?*Superbe, lui!
    'Superb, him!'

11. As is well known, cf. Guéron (1989), the subject of a predicate must be definite:

(i) *Une maison est belle
    'A house is beautiful!

12. We notice, however, the unacceptability of "*Un génie, l'enfant" (A genius, this child). We have no explanation for this result here but we note that with a PNP, the NP "l'enfant" can be interpreted as a generic and not as a deictic. The result is much clearer if such a generic reading is completely excluded as in:

(i)  
  a. Un génie, l'enfant de cette femme!
    'A genius, the child of this woman!'
  
  b. *Aucun savoir-vivre, les gens!
    'No good manners, these people!'
  
  c. Aucun savoir-vivre, les gens de ce pays!
    'No good manners, the people from this country!'
The impossibility of an iterative movement is also illustrated in the following example:

(37)  

a. Des yeux magnifiques, cette femme!  
'Magnificent eyes, this woman!' 

b. *?Des yeux que tout le monde considère toujours magnifiques, cette femme!  
'Eyes that everyone always considers magnificent, this woman!'

In this last example, the PNP "des yeux magnifiques" is separated in two parts and the adjective, which is the central element in the PNP, is left behind in the predicate phrase of the embedded small clause. The situation creates a violation of the adjacency condition on the movement of exclamative predicate phrases.

The examples in (36b) and (37b) clearly serve to illustrate how the movement of the predicate must be subjacent. In (36b), an IP node creates a blocking category between the predicate and its trace (cf. Chomsky 1986):

(38)  

\[ \text{admirable}_q [\text{je considère [que] [ce travail]}_q \text{q}] \]

In (38), \(\alpha\) dominates \(\beta\) and creates a blocking category for the movement of the predicate. Note also that a DP configuration would not allow an intervening IP node in its structure:

(39)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
/ \setminus \\
\text{IP} \\
/ \setminus \\
\text{DP}
\end{array}
\]

In (37b), the adjective in the Predicate Noun Phrase cannot be embedded within a relative. Such a constraint also falls under Subjacency since movement is involved, as illustrated below:

(40)  

\[ [\text{Des yeux}_q] \text{ que tout le monde considère toujours [e}_q \text{ magnifiques}, \text{ cette femme [e}_q \text{]} \]

It was also hypothesized, in section 2.1 above, that the \(X^*\) modifier in the predicate position of the exclamative phrase is not referential, it rather occupies an adjunct position. This proposal is thus in line with Rizzi (1990) who has distinguished arguments from adjuncts on the basis of their semantic properties. As is now well known, arguments are referential elements but adjuncts are not. It is therefore non-problematic to assume that the movement here in the exclamative phrase has properties of a variable: a maximal projection is moved as in an A' chain from an adjunct position to another adjunct position.

4. Exclamative Predicates in Moroccan Arabic

Such exclamative phrases are also possible in Moroccan Arabic. In contrast with Classical Arabic which has a VSO basic order with some SVO sentences (Fassi Fehri 1990), Moroccan Arabic has a SVO basic order. In "nominal sentences", the subject–predicate order is always observed and when the copula is present in the past or future tense, the order is Subject–Verb–Predicate:
(41) a. Ahmed mrid
    Ahmed ill
    'Ahmed is ill'

b. Ahmed kan mrid
    'Ahmed was ill'

We agree with Fassi Fehri (1987, 1990) who proposes that "nominal sentences" in Arabic be headed by an abstract T and AGR. However, within exclamative constructions as in (42), we claim, as proposed above for similar phrases in French, that unlike nominal sentences they are not headed by an abstract T and AGR. They are rather assigned a DP structure with an A'-movement of the predicate to the Topic position as illustrated above in (10B), section 2:

(42) a. zwina had ddar!
    'Beautiful this house!'

b. magrabiyya had lhafla!
    'Moroccan this feast!'

c. giba lgadiyya dial-ʊ!
    'Mysterious the affair of-his!'

Our main argument for positing a non-clausal structure for this phrase is based on the impossibility of finding time adverbials with such exclamative predicates:

(43) a. *zwina had ddar lbarah!
    'Beautiful this house yesterday!'

b. *magrabiyya had lhafla lyum!
    'Moroccan this feast today!'

Moreover, the copula in the past or future tense is excluded from this structure, showing very clearly the distinction with the so-called nominal sentences, as in (41) above:

(44) a. *zwina had ddar kan!
    'Beautiful this house was!'

b. *magrabiyya had lhafla gadykun!
    'Moroccan this feast will be!'

As can be observed, exclamative predicates in Moroccan Arabic share many of the characteristics found in the similar French constructions: First, only non-referential elements (adjuncts) can be moved. Referential NPs are excluded:

(45) *l-mudir had ssyyd!
    'The director, the man!'

Agreement between the adjective and the NP is also an important element in this construction and it is obligatory:

13. Most of the data in this section are drawn from Merizak (in preparation).
(46) *żwin had ḏdar!
    'Beautiful-masc. this house!'

Referential adjectives which function as arguments, as defined by Giorgi and Longobardi (to appear) are also excluded from this construction:

(47) *magnetically had ḏhar m'a ljazzā'ir!
    'Moroccan this war with Algeria!'

Predicate Noun Phrases as in (48) are found:

(48) a. wāhs had ḏdrī!
    'A monster this child!'

b. musība had ssyyid!
    'A catastrophe this man!'

As also observed for French, only predicates which can be defined as individual level can be moved:

(49) a. mtuwwar had ḏdrī!
    'Intelligent this child!'

b. *(dasman) gayb had l'ustad!
    '(Always) absent this professor!'

c. *(kamlīn) kif kif had nnās!
    '(All) the same these people!'

Objective adjectives like colour adjectives without a degree form and classifying adjectives are also ruled out in Moroccan Arabic (cf. section 2.2 above):

(50) a. *khla had lqahwa!
    'Black this coffee!'

b. khla bla giyas had lqahwa!
    'Extremely black this coffee!'

c. *dariyya had lgunbuia!
    'Atomic this bomb!'

The movement of the predicate is also local and obeys the adjacency constraint on the movement of the predicate as illustrated below:

(51) a. eajīb had ńktāb!
    'Marvellous this book!'

b. *eajīb tandun bli tatetabar had ńktāb!
    marvellous think-I that consider-you this book
    'Marvellous I think that you consider this book!'

Among the differences noted between the French and the Moroccan exclamative predicates, it has been observed that certain PPs expressing source or origin are acceptable in this construction in Moroccan Arabic only:
(52)  
  a. m–Fransa had ttumubil!
      'From France this car!
  b. mn–u lgalat!
      'Of-him this error!
  c. ??m–Imaktaba had lktâb!
      'From the library this book!

However, PPs expressing possession are clearly excluded:

(53)  
* m–imalik had lintisâr!
      'Of the king this victory!

These facts could indicate that if most PPs are arguments, a subclass of PPs in this grammar could be adjuncts. We leave this question open pending further research.

We also note that Moroccan Arabic does not establish a distinction between alienable possession and inalienable possession concerning body parts, for instance. Both types are ruled out in this construction, contrary to what is observed in French (section 2.3 above):

(54)  
  a. * tumubil eaşîba had nnâs!
      'A splendid car these people!
  b. * eyûn zwînin had ddrîl!
      'Beautiful eyes this child!

The surprising similarity between the two grammars of exclamative predicates and also the fact that a copula in the past and future tense is always excluded from this construction supports our analysis that T (or an abstract Tense) must be rejected in the deep structure of this construction. We therefore propose that a DP configuration is also the right analysis for Moroccan exclamative predicate structures of this type.

5. Conclusion

This paper was devoted to the analysis of an exclamative construction in French and subsequently in Moroccan Arabic. We argued that this structure does not match the definition of a small clause, where a small clause is defined as a clausal structure with an abstract Tense. More specifically, we argued against an analysis in terms of a clausal construction with a non–overt copula and it was claimed that the construction is best analysed as a nominal structure.

We proposed a DP configuration to illustrate how the adjoined predicate or modifier forms an A’–chain from an A’–position to another A’–position. It was also shown that the movement is always local, as in all exclamative constructions, and it obeys the adjacency constraint. The predicate is an adjunct modifier, never an argument and it corresponds to an individual level predicate, in French as well as in Moroccan Arabic.
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