

# Expressive predicative coordination

---

Marta Ruda

Jagiellonian University in Kraków

marta.ruda@uj.edu.pl

States of emotional arousal have been observed to make available syntactic structures which sometimes differ in intriguing ways from what we observe in emotionally neutral language (see Corver 2013, 2016). For example, expressive English includes structures like *What, me mad?!*, even though the purpose of *\*Me Tarzan, you Jane* is to exemplify 'broken English'. Interestingly, in some languages predicative structures equivalent to the *Mad Magazine* example involve joining the two constituents with a coordinator (e.g. *Bronsky und schlau?!* (German); see Lambrecht 1990, Bücker 2012). At the level of semantics, guided by the presence of the coordinator in German, Potts & Roeper (2006) analyse these structures in general as conjunctions of entity-level expressions with predicates by means of a pair-formation (rather than Boolean) operator. Lambrecht (1990), Potts & Roeper (2006), and, in his brief comment concerning Dutch, Corver (2013) take the second conjunct to be a predicate and see the conjunction of an argument and a predicate as one of the key distinguishing aspects of this structure. However, based on novel data from Polish, including tests employing anaphoric binding, I will show here that the representation of expressive predicative coordinated structures can actually involve a conjunction of a noun phrase and a control structure, with PRO being obligatorily controlled by the first conjunct. This leads to the semantic representation suggesting a pair-formation operation involving an entity and a full proposition, rather than an entity and an unsaturated predicate.

Generally speaking, data of the type discussed here pose questions about the mental mechanisms employed when grammatical means available in affectively neutral language are reorganised and used in non-standard ways in expressive speech. I suggest that this issue can be viewed against the background of the distinction between core grammar and the periphery (Chomsky 1981, 1995). When considered from the point of view of computational rules rather than only, for example, morphological irregularities, the periphery starts where the core language system (narrow syntax, CI and SM interfaces) enters into interactions with other mental systems (the affect system in the case at hand, see (1); cf. also Corver 2016 for relevant discussion).

(1) Core: narrow syntax, CI and SM interfaces

*Periphery*: core + other interface (e.g. with the affect system)

**References:** • Bücker, J. 2012. *Sprachhandeln und Sprachwissen*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. • Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris. • Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. • Corver, N. 2013. Colorful spleeny ideas speak furiously. Ms., Utrecht University. • Corver, N. 2016. Emotion in the build of Dutch. Ms., Utrecht University. • Lambrecht, K. 1990. "What, me worry?" — 'Mad Magazine sentences' revisited. In K. Hall et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of BLS 16*, 215–228. Berkeley, CA: BLS. • Potts, C. & T. Roeper. 2006. The narrowing acquisition path. In L. Progovac et al. (eds.), *The syntax of nonsententials*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.