INFORMAL LEAVE-TAKING WISHES IN DUTCH: A FUNCTIONAL DISCOURSE GRAMMAR ACCOUNT

Evelien Keizer
Universität Wien

Wim Honselaar
Universiteit van Amsterdam

ABSTRACT

Our aim in this paper is to describe and analyse Dutch constructions like *Werk ze!* and *Slaap ze!*, which consist of a verb (stem) immediately followed by the invariable element *ze*. Although these ze-constructions formally resemble imperative constructions, they are used to express the wish that the Addressee will enjoy the action described by the verb. As it turns out, however, the ze-construction is characterized by numerous formal and (discourse)functional restrictions, which pose a challenge to any formal treatment of the construction. In this paper, we first provide a detailed description of the specific (discourse)pragmatic, semantic, morphosyntactic and phonological properties of the ze-construction. Subsequently, we discuss some previous analyses of the construction, which are shown to be inadequate and/or implausible. Finally, we propose a new FDG analysis in which the element *ze* is regarded as a particle triggered by an Optative operator at the layer of the Illocution. This analysis, it is argued, is not only more successful in accounting for the distinguishing features of the construction, but in addition shows that FDG, by including a separate level for the analysis of the pragmatic and discoursal aspects of utterances, is particularly suitable for dealing with constructions of this kind.

KEY WORDS: FDG, Dutch, ze-construction, optative.

RESUMEN

El objetivo de este artículo es describir y analizar construcciones del neerlandés del tipo *Werk ze!* y *Slaap ze!*, formadas por un verbo (raíz) seguido inmediatamente del elemento invariable *ze*. Aunque desde un punto de vista formal estas construcciones con *ze* se asemejan a construcciones imperativas, se usan para expresar el deseo de que el Oyente disfrute de la acción descrita por el verbo. Sin embargo, dicha construcción se caracteriza por un gran número de restricciones formales y (discursivo-)funcionales, que constituyen un reto para cualquier análisis formal de la misma. En este artículo, primeramente se ofrece una descripción detallada de las propiedades (discursivo-)funcionales, semánticas, morfosintácticas y fonológicas específicas de esta construcción. Seguidamente, se discuten algunos análisis previos de la construcción, que estimamos son inadecuados y/o poco convincentes. Finalmente, proponemos un nuevo análisis, dentro de la GDF, en el que el elemento *ze* se considera una partícula desencadenada por un operador Optativo al nivel de la Ilocución. Se sostiene que este análisis no es sólo más adecuado a la hora de dar cuenta de los rasgos distintivos de la construcción, sino que además demuestra que la GDF, al incluir un nivel separado para el análisis de los aspectos pragmáticos y discursivos de los enunciados, constituye un modelo particularmente adecuado para dar cuenta de construcciones de este tipo.

PALABRAS CLAVE: GDF, neerlandés, construcción-*ze*, optativo.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our aim in this paper is to present an FDG analysis of an informal leave-taking wish in Dutch (the "ze-construction") that seems to be unique among the European languages. An example is given in (1):

(1)   tennis   ze!
        play_tennis-IMP   ZE
        'enjoy playing tennis!'

The meaning of the construction is something like 'enjoy X', where X stands for an activity expressed by means of a verb, e.g. *tennissen* 'to play tennis' in example (1); the predicate slot can be filled by a large number of verbs and seems to be quite productive.[1]

Although the ze-construction has not been studied in any great detail, some descriptions can be found, either or not accompanied by a short analysis. In the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (*WNT*; the extensive on-line historical dictionary of the Dutch language), the construction is mentioned in the entry for the third person plural pronoun *zij*,[2] where the element *ze* is described as a dummy object. The reader is further informed that there are no examples of this use of *ze* from text materials before 1921. The *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (*ANS*, the standard grammar of the Dutch language) provides some examples (under the heading of imperatives) but offers no analysis.[3] We are, however, informed of the fact that the construction is used only in the Netherlands, not in Flanders. In *Onze Taal*, a well-known popular-scientific journal about the Dutch language, we read that the origin of the construction is not known, but that it is unlikely that *ze* has ever been a direct object, since it typically combines with intransitive verbs.[4]

So far, very few theoretical accounts have been given of the ze-construction. In one of these, Coppen ("Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje"[5]; "Werk ze!") characterizes the construction as a good luck wish. The element *ze* is not analysed as a direct object but as the subject of an (otherwise unexpressed) resultative small clause. Hengeveld and Mackenzie (348), on the other hand, follow *WNT* in analysing the element *ze* as a dummy object.

Together, these previous accounts (and those by Coppen in particular) provide many of the specific semantic and syntactic characteristics of the construc-

---

[1] Since the constructions is typically used in informal conversations, quantitative data, extracted from tagged corpora, is not available. The discussion and analysis in this paper therefore makes use of data found on the Internet, as the largest source of (more or less) spontaneous, informal language. Examples were found by searching for a particular verb + *ze*).

[2] See <http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=WNT&id=M088992>

[3] See <http://www.let.ru.nl/ans/e-ans/02/04/04/body.html>

[4] See <http://www.onzetaal.nl/taaladvies/advies/werk-ze-werkze-werkse>

[5] See <http://www.neder-l.nl/bulletin/1997/05/970517.html>

tion. These form the basis of Section 2, which, however, also identifies a number of additional semantic and syntactic features. Section 3 subsequently briefly describes the phonological and orthographic properties of the construction. Next, Section 4 provides a detailed discussion of the construction's discourse-pragmatic functions. In this section use is made of many authentic examples, taken from the Internet. The question of how to analyse the construction is taken up again in Section 5, which, after an evaluation of some existing treatments, offers an FDG analysis which, it is argued, can explain the specific formal and functional features of the ZE-construction described in Sections 2-4. Finally, Section 6 presents a brief conclusion.

2. SEMANTIC AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES

The ZE-construction consists, minimally, of the stem of a verb in first position, followed by the invariable element *ze*, identical with the reduced subject/object form of the third person plural pronoun. Whereas the verb performs its usual predicative function and can be interpreted as an imperative, the status of the element *ze* is problematic. For the time being we will therefore gloss it simply as ZE; in Section 5 we will return to the question of how this element can best be analysed.

The verb *tennissen* in example (1) can be substituted with numerous other verbs, e.g. *zingen* 'to sing', *schilderen* 'to paint', *werken* 'to work', *tuinieren* 'to garden', *volleyballen* 'to play volleyball', *kamperen* 'to camp' and *wandelen* 'to walk':

(2)   zing / schilder / werk / tuinier / kampeer / wandel /... ze !
        sing-IMP / paint-IMP / work-IMP / garden-IMP / camp-IMP / walk-IMP
           /... ZE
        'enjoy singing / painting / working / gardening / camping / walking
           ... !'

There are, however, some major restrictions on the verbs allowed in the construction:

(a) they must be intransitive, or at least pseudo-intransitive, i.e. they cannot take a direct object, as shown in example (3), where *het portret* 'the portrait' is the direct object of *schilderen* 'to paint':

(3)   *Schilder   ze   *het portret*!
        paint-IMP   ZE   the portrait
        'Enjoy painting the portrait!'

(b) reflexive verbs are not allowed, as shown in (4) (see also Coppen, "Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje"; Coppen, "Werk ze!"):

(4)   *Vermaak   ze   *je*!
        enjoy-IMP   ZE   REFL
        'Enjoy yourself!'

(c) separable complex verbs, which are common in Dutch, are excluded. As shown in example (5), the use of such verbs as *overblijven* 'to stay for school dinners' and *overwerken* 'to work overtime' is not allowed:

(5)   a.   *Blijf   ze   *over*!
            stay-IMP   ZE   over
            'Enjoy staying for school dinners!'
        b.   *Werk   ze   *over*!
            work-IMP   ZE   over
            'Enjoy working overtime!'

(d) copular predicates, such as *zijn* 'to be' and *worden* 'to become', are not acceptable; this may, of course, be due to the fact that these verbs require a complement:

(6)   *Wees*   ze   gerust!
        be-IMP   ZE   at-ease
        'Enjoy being at ease!'

(7)   *Word*   ze   rijk!
        become-IMP   ZE   rich
        'Enjoy becoming rich!'

(e) modal verbs, such as *willen* 'to want', *mogen* 'to be allowed', *moeten* 'to must' etc. do not occur in the ZE-construction:[6]

(8)   a.   *Moet*   ze   werken!
            must-IMP   ZE   work-INF
        b.   *Moet*   ze   (zelf maar eens) tennissen!
            must-IMP   ZE   (EMPH PART PART) tennis-INF

What we do occasionally find, however, is constructions with the semi-auxiliary *gaan* 'to go', accompanied by an infinitive, as in (9):

(9)   Tim, ik zou   zeggen: *Ga* ze gewoon lekker *spelen*! (Internet)
        Tim, I   would say: go ZE simply   nicely play-INF
        'Tim, I would say, just go and enjoy the game!'

Apart from these restrictions on the verbs used in the construction, other semantic and syntactic restrictions can be identified. Thus it seems that the action

---

[6] Imperative forms of modal verbs are seldom used. Proeme (40-41), however, gives several examples, such as: **Moet** *maar eens honderd brieven schrijven!*, 'Imagine yourself having to write a hundred letters!'.

denoted by the predicate has to be both continuous and telic. Consequently, when verbs such as *reizen* 'to travel' or *zwerven* 'to roam', which are typically interpreted as consisting of a sequence of subactions, are inserted in the ZE-construction, the result is not quite acceptable:

(10)   ??*Reis*   /   ??*Zwerf*   ze!
       travel-IMP   /   roam-IMP   ZE
       'Enjoy traveling / roaming!'

Modification is possible, but also restricted. Locative and temporal adjuncts are acceptable, as shown in (11) and (12) respectively:

(11)   Tennis   ze *vanmiddag*   /   *vanavond* / *nog (even)*! (Internet)
       tennis-IMP ZE this-afternoon /   tonight   /   still (a.while)
       'Enjoy playing tennis this afternoon / tonight / for a moment!'

(12)   a.   Tennis   ze   *in Perth*!
            tennis-IMP   ZE   in Perth
            'Enjoy playing tennis in Perth!'
       b.   Hockey-ze   *daarboven*! (Internet)
            hockey-IMP   up.there
            'Enjoy playing hockey up there!'

The same is true for comitative objects, such as *met de hond* 'with the dog' in (13):

(13)   Wandel   ze   *met de hond*! (Internet)
       walk-IMP   ZE   with the dog
       'Enjoy walking with the dog!'

Manner adverbials, on the other hand, seem to be excluded:

(14)   a.   ??*Tennis   ze   *geconcentreerd*!
            tennis-IMP   ZE   concentratedly
            'Enjoy playing tennis concentratedly!'
       b.   *?Slaap   ze   *zacht*.
            sleep-IMP   ZE   softly
            'Enjoy sleeping softly.'

Evaluative adverbials, however, do occur, in particular *lekker* 'pleasantly, nicely':

(15)   Tennis   ze   *lekker*! (Internet)
       tennis-IMP ZE   pleasantly
       'Enjoy playing tennis with pleasure!'

Interestingly, however, the evaluation must always be positive; negative evaluations, such as *beroerd* 'miserably' or *harkerig* 'stiffly', do not occur.

A final important restriction consists in the fact that ZE-constructions cannot be negated:

(16) *Tennis   ze *niet*!
      tennis-IMP ZE   not

3. PHONOLOGICAL AND ORTHOGRAPHIC FEATURES

In the ZE-construction it is invariably the verb that carries tonic stress, while the element *ze* is always unstressed. Together the two elements form a single phonological word. Sometimes this is also reflected in the written form; on the Internet, for instance, one can find several orthographic variants, including cases in which the verb and *ze* are written as one word, as in (17), or cases in which the two elements are connected by a hyphen, as in (18), or an apostrophe, as in (19):

(17) Speelze! (Internet)
      play-IMP-ZE
      'ENJOY PLAYING!'

(18) Speel-ze! (Internet)
      pay-IMP-ZE
      'Enjoy playing!'

(19) Schrijf'ze! (Internet)
      write-IMP-'-ZE
      'Enjoy writing!'

In addition, phonetic spelling is widely used, reflecting either progressive assimilation (as in (20), with *-se* instead of *-ze* after voiceless consonants) or regressive assimilation (as in (21), where the voiceless final sibilant of the verb becomes voiced before *ze*):

(20) Werkse! (Internet)
      work-IMP-ZE
      'Enjoy working!'

(21) Leez   ze! (Internet)
      read-IMP   ZE
      'Enjoy reading!'

4. DISCOURSE AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES

The ze-construction is also characterized by a number of highly specific discourse and pragmatic features. Stylistically, the construction is colloquial, used mainly in informal conversation (and some forms of writing, e.g. informal letters, emails, blogs etc.).[7] Its function is to express a wish: the speaker expresses the wish that the addressee will derive some pleasure from performing the action described. The construction is, however, quite restricted in its use. Thus, it seems to be used only with respect to actions that have been mentioned in the preceding context (that is to say, which are situationally "given") and which are about to start or will start in the not too far away future (as explicitly indicated in examples like (9), with the inchoative verb *gaan* 'to go'). When, for instance, a speaker says to his friend that he/she is going to play tennis, or when he/she leaves home for the tennis court, equipped with rackets etc., this friend might say: *Tennis ze!* 'Enjoy playing tennis!'. If, on the other hand, a speaker is discussing politics with a friend and considers his friend's views so interesting that he wants to urge her to write down her ideas, it would be quite inappropriate for him to say, out of the blue, *Schrijf ze!* 'Enjoy writing!'. Use of this expression would, however, be fully acceptable—although probably ironical—if that friend has just informed the speaker that she intends to write down her ideas.

An additional (implicational) characteristic of the ze-construction seems to be a certain lack of involvement on the part of the speaker in the activity described; the speaker seems to distance himself locally/temporally/psychologically from (any future actions of) the addressee. The speaker utters a wish with respect to a future action in which he himself is not involved, neither physically nor emotionally. Therefore, it would be inappropriate for players of the same team to use the ze-construction at the start of a match. As a consequence of the distant position of the speaker, the construction is often used ironically, as in (22), where the speaker may wish the Addressee a 'very pleasant' time knowing full well how much the Addressee hates meetings.

(22) Nou,   vergader   ze! (Internet)
      well,   meet-IMP   ZE
      'Well, enjoy the meeting!'

Note also that if both speech participants were to attend the same meeting, use of the ze-construction would be inappropriate.

Finally, as in regular imperatives, the addressee must in principle be in control of the action; therefore, the ze-construction is not acceptable with verbs as

---

[7] Rather surprisingly, the ze-construction is hardly found in the corpus of spoken Dutch (*Corpus Gesproken Nederlands*). All examples found in the corpus, however, confirm the observations made in this section.

slagen 'to succeed' (in (23)) and *genezen* 'to recover' (in (24)), since these actions are beyond the control of the subject:

(23) *Slaag   ze!
      succeed-IMP   ZE
      'Enjoy getting through!'

(24) *Genees   ze!
      recover-IMP   ZE
      'Enjoy getting well again!'

A further requirement is that performing the action in question must take some time, i.e. that it is continuous or durative (since otherwise it cannot be enjoyed); momentaneous actions, such as *stoppen* 'to stop' (in (25)) and *vertrekken* 'to depart' (in (26)) do therefore not occur:

(25) *Stop   ze!
      stop-IMP   ZE
      'Enjoy stopping!'

(26) *Vertrek   ze!
      depart-IMP   ZE
      'Enjoy departing!'

In addition, since the construction is used to express the wish that the addressee enjoys the action, verbs with negative associations, such as *condoleren* 'to offer ones condolences' or *villen* 'to skin' (in (27)), or even neutral verbs, such as *zagen* 'to saw' or *antwoorden* 'to answer' (in (28)), which designate actions that are usually not associated with any kind of pleasure, do not occur:

(27) *Condoleer /   *Vil   ze!
      offer-IMP-condolences /   skin-IMP   ZE
      'Enjoy offering your condolences!' / 'Enjoy skinning!'

(28) *Zaag /   *Antwoord   ze!
      saw-IMP /   answer-IMP   ZE
      'Enjoy sawing!' / 'Enjoy answering!'

Interestingly enough, the action should not be too important to the hearer or in general; this requirement can easily be associated with the psychologically distant position of the speaker, mentioned above. Therefore, important and/or solemn actions, such as denoted by *soleren* 'to perform a solo' or *declameren* 'to declaim', are not acceptable in the ZE-construction:

(29)   *Soleer /   *Declameer   ze!
       perform-IMP-a-solo /   declaim-IMP   ZE
       'Enjoy performing a solo!' / 'Enjoy declaiming!'

If, however, such actions are referred to in the construction, the speaker is either trivializing these actions or is being ironic, like, for instance, with the verb *regeren* 'to rule' in (30):

(30)   Nou,   regeer   ze!
       well   rule-IMP-the-country   ZE
       'Well, enjoy ruling the country!'

A next—conversational—characteristic of the construction is that it is always used at the end of a conversation: it is a closing formula, in particular in situations where two people are taking leave of each other. Occasionally, it is followed by stereotype polite reactions on the part of the addressee, such as *Dank je!* 'Thanks'. This end-of-conversation signal is quite often reinforced by the introductory particle *nou* 'well', which is frequently used at the end of a move, as for instance in: *Nou, dan ga ik maar.* 'Well, I think I'd better go now.', or by phrases like (*Nou,) ik zou zeggen, ...* 'Well, I would say, ...':

(31)   Ik   zou   zeggen: lach   ze. (Internet)
       I   would   say: laugh-IMP   ZE
       'I would say: have fun!'

Other particle combinations, following the ZE-construction, are *dan maar* 'in that case' and *dan nog maar even (lekker) verder* 'a bit longer in that case', as illustrated in (32) and (33):

(32)   Werk   ze   dan   maar!
       work-IMP ZE   then   only
       'In that case, enjoy working!'

(33)   Maf   ze   dan   nog   maar   even   verder!
       kip-IMP ZE   then   still only   for.a.moment further
       'In that case, keep on kipping!'

The particles in (32) and (33) also serve to stress the speaker's lack of involvement in the (actions of) the addressee and the rather routine nature of the response.

Occasionally, other wishes accompany the ZE-construction, such as *succes ermee* 'good luck' (in (34)), *tot ziens* / *tot kijk* 'goodbye' (in 35)) and *veel plezier* 'lots of fun' (in (36)):

(34)　　Nou　　speel　　ze,　succes　　ermee! (Internet)
　　　　well　　play-IMP　ZE,　success　　it-with
　　　　'Well, enjoy playing, and good luck!'

(35)　　Nou　　speel　　ze,　en　　tot ziens/kijk. (Internet)
　　　　well　　play-IMP　ZE,　and　　goodbye'
　　　　'Well, enjoy playing, and goodbye!'

(36)　　Verhuis　　ze:　　-)　veel plezier! (Internet)
　　　　move-IMP　ZE:　　-)　lots-of fun
　　　　'Well, enjoy moving house: lots of fun!'

In conclusion, the ZE-construction can be characterized as a semi-productive construction in which the verbal slot can be filled with a wide, although restricted, range of verbs. It is used as an informal closing formula, expressing the positive and at the same time rather uninvolved and casual wish that the addressee may enjoy a specific previously announced action.

5. ANALYSIS

5.1. Previous analyses

As mentioned in Section 1, only two theoretical accounts have been proposed of the ZE-construction. One of these accounts is that by Hengeveld and Mackenzie (348), who offer an analysis of the construction within the framework of FDG. This account, however, is only very brief, as Hengeveld and Mackenzie merely use the construction to illustrate the existence of dummy objects—in this case the element *ze*. However, given the fact that dummies, at the clausal level, "occur in situations in which no interpersonal or representational material is inserted in an obligatory slot" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 347), such an analysis is not very convincing, since the morphosyntactic templates associated with intransitive verbs (one-place predicates) do not contain an obligatory object position.

An alternative analysis is offered by Coppen ("Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje," "Werk ze!"), who rejects the *ze*-as-object analysis in favour of an analysis of *ze* as the (impersonal) subject of an (otherwise unexpressed) small clause. This analysis is inspired by a number of parallels between the ZE-construction and another kind of construction involving small clauses: the resultative (see for example, Aarts, *Small Clauses*, "Verb-Preposition"; Keizer).

Coppen ("Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje," "Werk ze!") notes the following similarities:

1. In both types of construction the small clause indicates the result of the action described by the verb. Thus, in the resultative construction in (37a), the action of eating results in Jan's stomach being full. In the ZE-construction in

(37b) only the subject of the small clause (*ze*) is expressed. The secondary predicate, which is merely implied, will be taken to predicate some kind of (predictable) result with regard to the subject of the small clause. In other words, an expression like *Eet ze!* really means something like 'Eet zodaning dat ze ... jeweetwel!' ('Eat in such a way that they ... you know!').

(37)   a.   Jan   at   z'n   buik-je   rond.   (Resultative)
            Jan   ate   his   stomach-DIM   round
            'He ate his fill (of something).'
       b.   Eet   ze!   (ZE-construction)
            eat-IMP   ZE
            'Enjoy eating!'

2. Both constructions only allow for a particular kind of verb, namely those that do not require a direct object. Thus, although *eat* is generally regarded as a transitive verb, in (37a) the phrase *z'n buikje* 'his little stomach' does not function as the direct object of *at* 'ate'; it is definitely not 'the thing eaten'. Such an analysis is confirmed by the fact that such constructions can also occur with intransitive verbs like *lopen* 'to walk', as shown in example (38b), where the noun phrase *zijn schoenen* 'his shoes' cannot be regarded as the direct object of the (intransitive) verb. As pointed out by Coppen, it is exactly these two kinds of verbs (intransitive verbs and intransitively used transitive verbs) that also occur in the ZE-construction (*Loop ze!* 'Enjoy walking!', *Eet ze!* 'Enjoy eating!').

(38)   a.   Piet   liep   z'n schoenen   stuk.   (Resultative)
            Piet   walked   his shoes   worn
            'He wore out his shoes (walking).'
       b.   Loop   ze!   (ZE-construction)
            walk-IMP   ZE
            'Enjoy walking!'

3. Neither the ZE-construction nor the Dutch resultative construction allow for separable complex verbs; in other words, they cannot combine with a particle (Coppen, "Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje"; Coppen, "Werk ze!"), as shown for the verb *doorlopen* 'to walk on' in (39a&b).

(39)   a.   *Piet   liep   z'n schoenen   stuk   <u>door</u>.   (Resultative)
            Piet   walked   his shoes   worn   through
            'Piet wore out his shoes.
       b.   *Loop   ze   <u>door</u>!   (ZE-construction)
            walk-IMP   ZE   through
            'Enjoy keeping on walking!'

4. Both constructions have a durative aspect (Coppen, "Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje"). According to Coppen, an expression like *Spring ze!* 'Enjoy jumping!' is therefore only appropriate when it is clear from the context that the addressee is about to perform a series of jumps (e.g. when he/she is a diver). Similarly, Coppen claims, resultatives have durative aspect, which explains why the construction in (40), with the momentaneous verb *ontploffen* 'to explode', is odd:

(40) ??De bom   ontplofte een gat   in het wegdek.   (Resultative)
the bomb   exploded   a hole   in the road-surface
'The explosion of the bomb caused a hole in the road surface.'

Although the analysis suggested by Coppen can account for some of the specific features of the ZE-construction, it also has a number of unlikely aspects to it. First of all, since the (secondary) predicate is never expressed, a small clause analysis is not very likely; moreover, since we cannot actually tell which action is implied, we cannot know whether the small clause has a resultative meaning. Moreover, if the subject of the small clause is indeed impersonal *ze*, referring vaguely to some unspecified third party, in order for the small clause analysis to make sense, we should somehow be able to relate this third party to the action described. In most cases, however, this does not seem to be possible: which third party could be involved in the case of *Slaap ze!* 'Sleep ZE!'?

Secondly, the claim that resultatives, like the ZE-construction, always have a durative aspect, is clearly incorrect, as shown by the following examples:

(41) James Bond   schoot zijn vijand   dood.   (Resultative)
James Bond   shot   his enemy   dead
'James Bond shot and killed his enemy.'

(42) De granaat   sloeg   een gat   in de muur.   (Resultative)
the grenade   hit   a hole   in the wall
'The shell blasted a hole in the wall.'

Thirdly, it is not true that the two constructions allow the same type of verb. As we have seen (and as also noted by Coppen, "Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje"; "Werk ze!"), the ZE-construction does not allow for reflexive verbs (see example (4) above). With resultatives, however, the use of reflexive verbs, such as *zich schamen* 'to be ashamed', is unproblematic:

(43) a. Ze   schrok   zich   een ongeluk.   (Resultative)
she   was-startled REFL   an accident
'That really gave her a fright.'
b. Hij   schaamde   zich   dood.   (Resultative)
he   shamed   REFL   dead
'He was utterly embarrassed.'

In addition, true resultatives allow for adverbs to be placed between the verb and the small clause, as in (44a); this is not possible in ZE-constructions, as shown in (44b):

(44) a. Jan   verft   morgen   de deur rood.   (Resultative)
          Jan   paints   tomorrow the door red
          'Tomorrow, Jan will paint the door red.'
      b. *Verf   morgen   ze!   (ZE-construction)
          paint-IMP tomorrow   ZE
          'Enjoy painting tomorrow!'

Finally, a number of restrictions mentioned in the preceding sections cannot be explained by Coppen's analysis, such as the fact that the ZE-construction cannot be negated, that manner adverbs seem to be excluded and that the action involved needs to have been announced in the context (note that none of these restrictions applies to resultatives). All in all, there seems to be reason enough to look for an alternative analysis.

5.2. The ZE-AS-PARTICLE ANALYSIS

Let us start our FDG analysis by looking at an aspect that Coppen does not discuss: the Illocutionary force of the ZE-construction. Following the form-oriented function-to-form approach of FDG, Dutch can be said to have (at least) the same six basic Illocutions as English, since it is only these Illocutions that are systematically coded in morphosyntactic and/or phonological form. Of these six, only the Imperative and the Optative are relevant to the analysis of the ZE-constructions. As can be seen from example (45a), Imperatives are formed by placing the stem of the verb in first position, leaving the subject (typically) unexpressed.[8] Optatives, on the other hand, are characterized by the use of the modal verb *mogen* 'may'. In example (45b), the (archaic) subjunctive form of this verb appears in first position; the construction in example (45b') contains the verb *mogen*, but takes the form of a (finite) subclause introduced by the conjunction *dat* 'that':

(45) a. Koop   een boek!   (Imperative)
          buy   a book
          'Buy a book!'
      b. Moge   Ruud   veel boeken   kopen.   (Optative)
          may   Ruud   many books   buy
          'May Ruud buy many books.'

---

⁸ The subject of an Imperative can be expressed in case of emphasis (typically expressing irritation), as in *Doe JIJ het dan!* ('YOU do it then!).

b'. Dat   Ruud   (maar)   veel   boeken   mag   kopen. (Optative)
    that   Ruud   PART   many   books   may   buy
    'May Ruud buy many books.'

Given its function of expressing a wish, the ZE-construction could be ar-
gued to belong to the category of Optatives. In terms of its form, however, it much
more resembles the Imperative. This means that, in keeping with the form-oriented
function-to-form approach of FDG, the ZE-construction will be analysed as having
the Imperative Illocution. That this is quite a common strategy is clear from such
expressions as *Geniet ervan!* 'Enjoy it!' or *Loop lekker!* Lit. 'Run enjoyably', which
are imperative in form, but intended as wishes. At the same time, however, the
ZE-construction clearly differs from regular Imperatives in that they contain the
element *ze*, which explicitly marks them as wishes. We propose that this element
be regarded (synchronically) as a particle triggered by an Optative operator on the
Imperative Illocution; in this way both the (Imperative) form and the (Optative)
meaning can be captured in the following underlying representation:

(46) $(A_1: [(opt F_1: IMP (F_1)) (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_1)] (A_1))$

The next question is, of course, whether such an analysis can account for the
specific features of (restrictions on) the ZE-construction described in this paper. Let
us start with the fact that the construction does not allow for verb-particle combina-
tions. This can now easily be explained by the fact that the particle position is already
occupied by the element *ze*. Another important restriction, as we have seen, is that
the construction does not allow for the expression of a direct object. According to
Coppen, this explains why verbs that require the presence of a direct object (such
as *verorberen* 'to eat with relish', *ontmoeten* 'to meet' en *haten* 'to hate') are excluded
from the construction. In our view, however, neither the observation nor the explana-
tion is correct. That fact that the expression *Haat ze!* 'Hate + ZE' is distinctly odd, is
that it is hard to think of a context in which it could be used: people do not usually
announce that they are about to hate someone. The questionability of *Ontmoet ze!*
'Meet + ZE' can be explained by the fact that the verb *ontmoeten* 'to meet' describes
a momentaneous action; in addition, the action can hardly be planned. Finally,
the expression *Verorber ze!* 'Eat with relish + ZE' may indeed seem unacceptable in
isolation, since in that case the imperative interpretation (with *ze* as direct object of
verorberen) is clearly dominant. If, however, we imagine a context in which someone
has just announced his/her intention to eat some delicious strawberries, the expres-
sion *Nou, verorber ze!* 'Well, eat with relish + ZE' becomes quite acceptable. Note
that the same applies to reflexive verbs. Consider in this respect the chat dialogue
(from "Youandmiep") in example (47), where the reflexive verb *zich amuseren* 'to
enjoy oneself' is used in the ZE-construction, but without the reflexive pronoun:

(47)   A: Ik   ga   me   amuseren!
    I   go   me   amuse
    'I'm going to enjoy myself.'

B: Amuseer   ze!
    amuse-IMP   ZE
    'Have fun!'

(<http://youandmiep.wordpress.com/2012/02/09/do-not-search-for-love-love-has-to-find-you/>)

In other words, the restriction on the ZE-construction is not so much that the verb cannot be a transitive or reflexive verb, but rather that the (implied) direct object cannot be expressed.

But why is it then that direct objects cannot appear in the ZE-construction? Here, we think, a functional explanation can be provided. Just as in imperatives (see example (45a)), the subject (or rather the Actor argument) of a ZE-construction is not expressed. This may, of course, be accounted for by the fact that the implied subject/Actor is always the Addressee, and as such fully identifiable. Now, one of the features of the ZE-expression is that the action described is activated. This means that, even if a direct object (or Undergoer) can be assumed to be present, there is no need to express it, since it is given in the context; as a result the construction simply lacks a direct object position.[9]

More generally, it appears that the ZE-construction simply cannot contain any new information, i.e. there seems to be a 'givenness restriction' on the use of the construction. This, then, may also account for that fact that the construction typically contains no adjuncts: either the information these adjuncts provide has already been activated, in which case, being given, it need not be included, or this information has not been activated, in which case it is blocked by the givenness restriction. Note in addition that, as far as the wish expressed by the construction is concerned, the how, where and when of the action performed is irrelevant; what the speaker expresses is the hope that the Addressee will enjoy performing the action. This is particularly clear in the case of manner adverbs. Consider, for instance, example (48), where A announces that he/she intends to work hard that day. B responds by expressing the wish that A enjoys his/her work. Clearly, B does not express the hope that A will enjoy working hard; what B hopes for is that A will enjoy his/her work despite the fact that he/she will have to work hard.

(48)   A: Ik zal vandaag hard moeten werken om m'n deadline te halen.
           I will today   hard have-to work   to my deadline to catch
           'I will have to work hard today to meet my deadline.'
        B: Nou   werk ze (*hard), hè!
           well,   work-IMP ze (*hard),   TAG
           'Well, enjoy working (*hard!)'

---

⁹ Implicit arguments can, of course, be found in other kinds of constructions as well (e.g. true Imperatives like *Bestel nu!* 'Order now!'). The difference, however, is that in these other constructions the direct object can still be expressed, whereas in the ZE-construction this is not an option. This may be accounted for by the fact that a felicitous use of the ZE-constructions always requires the action (and therefore the direct object, if any) to be activated.

The fact that occasionally time and place adjuncts are included (as in example (10)) can be explained by another discourse-pragmatic feature of the expression, namely that, on a default use of the construction, the action denoted by the verb is about to start or will start sometime soon. Adding a time or place adjunct serves the function of indicating that the speaker realizes that this is not the case, but nevertheless chooses to use the construction to wish the addressee a pleasant time.

Another important restriction on the ze-construction mentioned in Section 2 is the impossibility to negate the construction. This can be explained by the fact that, although the expression—due to the presence of an Optative operator—functions as a wish, it has the basic Illocution of Imperative. Negation of the expression can only be interpreted as relating to this basic Illocution, i.e. as ordering the Addressee not to perform the action; it does not affect the wish. Given the function of the construction, this is only logical. Thus, negating the wish would either mean expressing the hope that the Addressee would not enjoy the action (in which case the Optative operator would be inappropriate), or that the addressee would enjoy not performing the action. This, however, would not make any sense either, since the ze-construction is only used when we already know that the Addressee is going to perform a particular action, the specific function of the construction being to express the hope that the Addressee will enjoy this action.

Further restrictions on the use of the ze-construction can be explained in terms of the interaction between the Grammatical Component and the Contextual Component. Thus, speakers will only use the construction when certain contextual criteria are fulfilled, i.e. only at the end of a conversation (or dialogue) and only for relatively unimportant, everyday actions that do not (psychologically or physically) involve the speaker. If these contextual requirements are not fulfilled, use of the construction will be inappropriate.

Finally, it may be objected that analysing *ze* as an Optative particle is an ad-hoc solution, since the particle *ze* does not appear in any other kind of construction. This, however, is often the case with other particles of this kind. The Dutch mitigating particle *maar*, for instance, is used only in Declaratives and Imperatives, while use of the Emphasizing particle *dan* is restricted to the Imperative (Vismans 5, 62; see also Hengeveld and Mackenzie 83). The fact that this optative use of the element *ze* is restricted to a certain type of Imperative can therefore be seen as confirmation of the view that this element functions as a particle.

Let us end this section by applying the analysis proposed to the particular instance of the ze-construction in (49) and demonstrate how this construction will be dealt with at the four levels of representation.

(49)   Werkse!
         work-IMP-ZE
         'Enjoy working!'

As already indicated in the underlying representation given in (46) above, at the Interpersonal Level the expression in (49)—and indeed any ze-construction—will be analysed as an Imperative with an Optative operator. The communicative

content contains only one Act of Transcription (evoking the property denoted by the verb):

(50) $(A_1: [(opt\ F_1: IMP\ (F_1))\ (P_1)_S\ (P_2)_A\ (C_1: (T_1)\ (C_1))]\ (A_1))$

At the Representational Level the verb is specified (f_2). The type of verb must be compatible with the Imperative Illocution (i.e. the speaker must have control over the action), while the Property denoted by the verb must be compatible with the Optative function of the expression (i.e. it must be clear, in the given context, that the action can be enjoyed by the Addressee). The highest layer of representation is the State-of-Affairs; since the utterance does not have a truth value, it has no Propositional Content. Operators are not allowed: it is impossible to mark the expression for tense, modality or negation. In (50) no modifiers are present; in other cases, modifiers may occur at the layer of the State-of-Affairs (e.g. Time modifiers) or the Configurational Property (e.g. extra participants), but typically not at the layer of the Lexical Property (manner adverbs).[10]

(51) $(e_1: (f_1: (f_2: werken_V\ (f_2))\ (f_1))\ (e_1))$

At the Morphosyntactic Level, the expression consists of two Words, one Lexical word (corresponding to the verb) and one Grammatical word (*ze*). The Lexical word consists of the stem of the verb and makes up a Verbal phrase. Together the Verbal phrase and the Grammatical word *ze* form a Clause:

(52) $(Le_1: (Cl_1: (Vp_1: (Vw_1: /\ wɛrk\ /\ (Vw_1))\ (Vp_1))\ (Gw_1: /\ zə\ /\ (Gw_1))\ (Cl_1))\ (Le_1))$

Finally, at the Phonological Level, the expression in (49) corresponds to a single Phonological Word. This Phonological Word contains two syllables, the first of which is stressed (as indicated by the stress operator s). At the layer of the Intonational Phrase, we find the fall operator (f), indicating a falling tone. Note also that in the second syllable assimilation takes place: due to the fact that the first syllable ends in a voiceless consonant, the first consonant of the second syllable is devoiced.

(53) $(U_1: (f\ IP_1: (PP_1: (PW_1: (s\ s_1: /\ wɛrk\ /\ (s_1))\ (s_2: /\ sə\ /\ (s_2))\ (PW_1))\ (PP_1))\ (IP_1))\ (U_1))$

---

[10] Note that an adverb like *lekker* 'pleasantly, nicely' seems to serve more as an intensifier (reinforcing the wish) than as a manner modifier. If so, it would be more appropriate to analyse it as an Illocution modifier at the Interpersonal Level.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have shown that the Dutch ᴢᴇ-construction carries considerably more (discourse-pragmatic) information than has been assumed so far. Existing descriptions and analyses of the construction do not, for instance, provide a full account of its discourse function (as a wish at the end of a conversation), nor do they include the requirement that the action designated by the verb must have been mentioned in the immediately preceding discourse. One aim of this paper has therefore been to provide a more complete characterization of the construction, listing its distinctive discourse, pragmatic, semantic, morphosyntactic and phonological properties. Subsequently, an attempt has been made to propose an analysis of the construction within the framework of ғᴅɢ. After identifying some weaknesses in previous analyses, we have proposed an alternative treatment in which the element *ze* functions as an Optative operator on an Imperative Illocution. It has been argued that such an approach can account both for the specific features of the construction and the restrictions on its use. Moreover, on the proposed analysis, there is no need to regard the construction as idiomatic; instead, it is regarded as a semantically transparent, semi-productive construction.

WORKS CITED

Aᴀʀᴛs, Bas. *Small Clauses in English: The Non-Verbal Types*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992.

—— "Verb-Preposition Constructions and Small Clauses in English." *Journal of Linguistics* 25 (1989): 277-290.

Cᴏᴘᴘᴇɴ, Peter-Arno. "Linguïstisch Miniatuurtje XXXV: 'Maf ze!'" *Neder-L. Col: 9705.17*. Elektronisch tijdschrift voor de Neerlandistiek, 1997. Web. 6 February 2013. <http://www.neder-l.nl/bulletin/1997/05/970517.html>.

—— "*Werk ze*!: Een Succeswens Ontrafeld." *Onze Taal* 7-8 (1998): 192-194.

Corpus Gesproken Nederlands 1998-2003. Nederlandse Taalunie [Dutch Language Union]. Den Haag, 2009. Hard disk.

E-ANS: Electronic Version of Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst. Ed. Walter Haeseryn, Kirsten Romijn, Guido Geerts, Jacobus de Rooij, and Maarten C. van den Toorn. Rev. ed. Groningen/Deurne: Martinus Nijhoff uitgevers/Wolters Plantyn, 1997. Web. 25 October 2010. <http://ans.ruhosting.nl/overeans/index.html>.

Hᴇɴɢᴇᴠᴇʟᴅ, Kees, and J. Lachlan Mᴀᴄᴋᴇɴᴢɪᴇ. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A Typologically-Based Theory of Language Structure*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.

Kᴇɪᴢᴇʀ, M. Evelien. "Verb-Preposition Constructions in Functional Discourse Grammar." *Lingua* 119.8 (2009): 1186-1211.

Onze Taal: Electronic Journal. Den Haag: Genootschap Onze Taal. Web. 25 October 2010. <http://www.onzetaal.nl/tijdschrift>.

Pʀᴏᴇᴍᴇ, Henk. *Studies over het Poolse, Nederlandse en Russische werkwoord [Studies on the Verb in Polish, Dutch and Russian]*. Diss. Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, 1991.

Vismans, Roel. *Modal Particles in Dutch Directives: A Study in Functional Grammar.* Diss. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1994.

Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal (wnt): Electronic Dictionary Published by the Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie (INL). Updated 2 July 2010. Web. 25 October 2010. <http://gtb.inl.nl/>.