7

Dependencies

This chapter covers a range of syntactic phenomena, each involving some kind of dependency. The subsections deal with the distribution and interpretation of pronouns (section 7.1), raising (A-movement) and control (section 7.2), negation (section 7.3), quantification (section 7.4), focus and topic (section 7.5), and wh-movement (A′-movement, section 7.6).

7.1 Semi-referential expressions ('binding')

Reflexivity in Dutch is expressed by means of pronouns. The pronoun inventory of Dutch contains a special object pronoun *zich* used when the subject of a reflexive clause is third person. *Zich* does not express number or case.

(7.1) a. Tasman schaam-t zich
Tasman shame-3SG REFL
'Tasman is ashamed.'

b. De Maori-s scham-en zich
DEF.PL Maori-PL shame-PL REFL
'The Maoris are ashamed.'

Elsewhere, simple (weak) pronouns are used:

(7.2) a. Ik schaam me
1SG.NOM shame OCL:1SG
'I am ashamed.'

b. Jij schaam-t je
2SG.NOM shame-2SG OCL:2
'You are ashamed.'

c. Wij scham-en ons
1PL:NOM shame-PL 1PL:OBJ
'We are ashamed.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

d. Jullie scham-en je / jullie
2PL shame-PL OCL:2 / 2PL
'You are ashamed.'

Before the seventeenth-century standardization of the Dutch language, the use of the special reflexive *zich* was not widespread, and simple pronouns were used in the third person as well (as in Frisian and Old English). Several dialects (mostly West and East Flemish and the dialects spoken in North-Noordholland, in Friesland and adjacent areas; see Barbiers and Bennis 2003: 5 and Barbiers *et al.* 2005) still use the third-person pronoun instead of the special reflexive (data from the online Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch dialects Dynasand, www.meertens.knaw.nl/sand/, accessed February 18, 2010):

(7.3) *Midsland (Ameland) dialect*

Jan	herinner-t	um	dat	verhaal	wel
John	remember-3SG	3SG.M.ACC	DEM:DIST.N	story	AFF

'John remembers that story.'

Examples (7.1–3) illustrate the use of pronominal elements in inherently reflexive contexts. Where the identification of the object with the subject is not forced by the meaning of the verb, the object (i.e. *zich* or a pronoun) is marked by the focus element *zelf* 'self':

(7.4) a. Tasman noem-t zich-zelf
Tasman mention-3SG REFL-self
'Tasman mentions himself.'

b. De Maori-s noem-en zich-zelf
DEF.PL Maori-PL mention-PL REFL-self
'The Maoris mention themselves.'

(7.5) a. Ik noem me-zelf
1SG.NOM mention OCL:1SG-self
'I mention myself.'

b. Jij noem-t je-zelf
2SG.NOM mention-2SG OCL:2-self
'You mention yourself.'

c. Wij noem-en ons-zelf
1PL:NOM mention-PL 1PL:OBJ-self
'We mention ourselves.'

d. Jullie noem-en je-zelf/jullie-zelf
2PL shame-PL OCL:2-self / 2PL-self
'You mention yourselves.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

As can be seen, *zelf* 'self' is uninflected. It is also used as a floating focus element, as in (7.6), but it cannot be separated from a reflexively interpreted pronoun (7.7).

(7.6) a. Tasman zelf heeft de Maori-s be-groet
Tasman self have:3SG DEF.PL Maori-PL GE:APPL-greet:D
'Tasman himself greeted the Maoris.'

b. Tasman heeft de Maori-s (niet) zelf be-groet
Tasman have:3SG DEF.PL Maori-PL NEG self GE:APPL-greet:D
'Tasman did (did not) greet the Maoris himself.'

(7.7) Tasman noem-de zich (*niet) zelf (niet)
Tasman mention-PAST.SG REFL NEG self NEG
'Tasman didn't mention himself.'

Floating *zelf* is invariably construed with the subject (or with the objective-marked 'subject' in the infinitival complement of a perception verb). Thus, (7.6b) lacks the interpretation where Tasman failed to meet 'the Maoris themselves.' As a result, *zelf* in (7.7) is not construed with *zich* but with *Tasman*, and we end up with a simple reflexive (*zich*) in a not inherently reflexive context.

The use of the simple reflexive *zich* (and its pronominal counterparts in other persons) is not restricted to inherently reflexive contexts, however. With verbs like *wash* or *defend* we seemingly get free variation:

(7.8) Tasman verdedig-de zich(-zelf)
Tasman defend-PAST.SG REFL-self
'Tasman defended himself.'

As observed by Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd (1998), *zelf* here seems to mark the object as an independent participant in the event. In contexts where the object must be construed as an independent participant, *zelf* cannot be dropped. This is most dramatically the case in the Baron von Münchhausen story where the Baron extracted himself from a swamp by pulling his own hair. This tall story is described in (7.9a), whereas (7.9b) describes a normal event where the Baron pulled himself up by clutching some external object like an overhanging branch (Voskuil and Wehrmann 1990: 17):

(7.9) a. Münchhausen trok zich-zelf uit het moeras
Münchhausen pull:PAST.SG REFL-self out DEF.N.SG swamp
'Münchhausen pulled himself out of the swamp.' (i.e. by his hair)

b. Münchhausen trok zich uit het moeras
Münchhausen pull:PAST.SG REFL out DEF.N.SG swamp
'Münchhausen pulled himself out of the swamp.' (i.e. by a branch)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Likewise, the examples in (7.10) differ subtly:

(7.10) a. Tasman zag zich-zelf het Zuidland ontdek-ken
Tasman see:PAST.SG REFL-self DEF.N.SG South Land discover-INF
'Tasman saw himself discover the South Land.'

b. Tasman zag zich al het Zuidland ontdek-ken
Tasman see:PAST.SG REFL already DEF.N.SG South Land discover-INF
'Tasman already imagined discovering the South Land.'

The example in (7.10a), with the marker *zelf*, is appropriate in a dream context, where Tasman observes himself as someone else; in (7.10b), Tasman imagines discovering the South Land, and *zich* does not refer to a separate participant.

Note in this connection the pair in (7.11), as discussed in Ter Meulen (2000):

(7.11) a. Tasman scheer-t zich
Tasman shave-3SG REFL
'Tasman shaves, has a shave.'

b. Tasman scheer-t zich-zelf
Tasman shave-3SG REFL-self
'Tasman shaves himself.'

As Ter Meulen observes, (7.11a) is true in a situation where Tasman is not the actual person shaving him, but in (7.11b) Tasman must be the shaver as well as the shavee. This is because *zelf* marks the object as a separate participant, bound to the subject by the reflexive nature of the object. In (7.11a), *zich* is not necessarily a separate participant, creating the possibility of interpreting the predicate *zich scheren* as 'have a shave,' where it is conventionally determined that anyone can be the shaver.

Both *zich* and *zichzelf* require a local antecedent. The nature of the locality constraint is discussed in more detail in section 13.1, but a quick grasp of it is obtained by considering the contrast in (7.12):

(7.12) a. Ik dacht dat Tasman zich-zelf bedoel-de
1SG.NOM think:PAST.SG C Tasman REFL-self mean-PAST.SG
'I though that Tasman meant himself.'

b. *Tasman dacht dat ik zich-zelf bedoel-de
Tasman think:PAST.SG C 1SG.NOM REFL-self mean-PAST.SG
(intended: 'Tasman thought that I meant him (i.e. Tasman).')

In (7.12b), *zichzelf* has no antecedent inside the embedded clause, and the resulting sentence is ungrammatical. If the embedded clause is nonfinite, the same locality effect shows up when the clause is in the final field (7.13), but when the

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

nonfinite clause is integrated with the matrix clause, in the manner discussed in section 4.2, the antecedent may be found in the matrix clause as well (as in (7.10a), where *zichzelf* is an argument of the embedded predicate *ontdekken* 'discover').

(7.13) … dat de Maori-s Tasman beloof-de-n {hem / *zich-zelf}
C DEF.PL Maori-PL Tasman promise-PAST-PL 3SG.M.OBJ REFL-self
te spar-en
to spare-INF
'… that the Maoris promised Tasman to spare him.'

Also, the antecedent must precede and c-command the reflexive:

(7.14) Het geboorte-dorp van Tasman eer-t
DEF.N.SG birth-village of Tasman honor-3SG
{hem / *zich-zelf} met een museum
3SG.M.OBJ / REFL-self with INDF.SG museum
'The village where Tasman was born honors him with a museum.'

In (7.14), *Tasman* is contained inside the noun phrase *het geboortedorp van Tasman* 'the village where Tasman was born' and hence fails to c-command the object.

The precedence requirement does not apply when the reflexive is fronted into the initial field (the weak reflexive *zich* cannot be fronted):

(7.15) Zich-zelf noem-de Tasman niet
REFL-self mention-PAST.SG Tasman NEG
'Tasman didn't mention HIMSELF.'

Dutch possessive pronouns are not marked for anaphoricity. To disambiguate, the element *eigen* 'own' may be added to the possessive pronoun:

(7.16) Tasman kon z'n (eigen) handschrift niet lez-en
Tasman can:PAST.SG PCL:M.SG own handwriting NEG read-INF
'Tasman couldn't read his (own) handwriting.'

Possessive *z'n eigen* has a freer distribution than *zich(zelf)*, as it may take an antecedent outside its clause, and may precede its antecedent:

(7.17) a. Tasman vond dat z'n eigen handschrift onleesbaar
Tasman find:PAST.SG C PCL.M.SG own handwriting unreadable
was
be:PAST.SG
'Tasman considered his own handwriting to be illegible.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. Z'n eigen vader herken-de Tasman niet eens
PCL.M.SG own father recognize-PAST.SG Tasman NEG once
'His own father didn't even recognize Tasman.'

On the other hand, possessive *z'n eigen* cannot be tied to an antecedent contained within another potential antecedent:

(7.18) Tasman z'n journaal irriteer-de z'n (*eigen) vader
Tasman PCL.M.SG log irritate-PAST.SG PCL.M.SG own father
'Tasman's log irritated his father.'

It should be noted here that southern dialects of Dutch (as well as spoken Dutch more generally) also use *z'n eigen* (more generally *POSS eigen*) instead of *zich(zelf)* (see Barbiers and Bennis 2003; Barbiers *et al*. 2005):

(7.19) *Colloquial Dutch*
a. Tasman schaam-t z'n eigen
Tasman shame-3SG PCL:3SG.M own
'Tasman is ashamed'
b. Tasman noem-t z'n eigen
Tasman mention-3SG PCL:3SG.M own
'Tasman mentions himself.'

Used as a reflexive, *z'n eigen* must be tied to a local c-commanding antecedent in these varieties of Dutch.

Dutch has a reciprocal pronoun *elkaar* (< *elk-ander* [each-other]):

(7.20) Tasman en Cook heb-ben elkaar n-ooit ontmoet
Tasman and Cook have-PL RECP NEG-ever GE:meet:D
'Tasman and Cook never met.'

The reciprocal pronoun has the same distribution as *zich(zelf)* (modulo requirements on the plural/quantized nature of the antecedent), except that the reciprocal can also be used possessively:

(7.21) Tasman en Cook laz-en elkaar-s journaal-s
Tasman and Cook read:PAST-PL RECP-POSS journal-PL
'Tasman and Cook read each other's logs.'

The personal pronouns cannot be interpreted as coreferential with a local c-commanding antecedent (except in dialects where no special reflexive pronoun exists), but they can be tied to nonlocal or local non-c-commanding antecedents:

(7.22) a. Tasman noem-de hem
Tasman mention-PAST.SG 3SG.M.OBJ
'Tasman mentioned him.' (*him* ≠ Tasman)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. Tasman denk-t dat Cook hem noem-de
Tasman think-3SG C Cook 3SG.M.OBJ mention-PAST.SG
'Tasman thinks that Cook mentioned him.' (*him* = Tasman or someone else)

c. Tasman z'n vader noem-de hem niet
Tasman PCL.3SG.M father mention-PAST.SG 3SG.M.OBJ NEG
'Tasman's father didn't mention him.' (*him* = Tasman or someone else)

A bound variable interpretation of a personal pronoun is not marked by any special morphology:

(7.23) Elk-e ontdekking-s-reiziger denk-t dat hij
each-CG.SG discovery-LNK-traveler think-3SG C 3SG.M.NOM
een held is
INDF.SG hero be:3SG
'Every explorer thinks he's a hero.' (*hij* = one of the explorers referred to by *elke ontdekkingsreiziger* or someone else)

In certain contexts, personal pronouns and reflexives may both be used. These include adverbial PPs (7.24) and complement PPs of nouns (7.25).

(7.24) Tasman zag een wallaby naast zich / hem
Tasman see:PAST.SG INDF.SG wallaby next.to REFL / 3SG.M.OBJ
'Tasman saw a wallaby next to him.' (*hem* = Tasman or someone else)

(7.25) Tasman zag een schilderij van zich-zelf / hem
Tasman see:PAST.SG INDF.SG painting of REFL-self / 3SG.M.OBJ
'Tasman saw a painting of himself.'

In (7.24), it may be the case that the reflexive is used when the location *naast X* 'next to X' is viewed from the subject's perspective, and that the pronoun is used when the location is viewed from the speaker's perspective, but these judgments are hard to ascertain. In (7.25), it seems that the reflexive can only be used when Tasman is the painter of the picture (see Broekhuis 1994: 59).

Obviation is not systematically expressed in Dutch, but demonstratives used instead of pronouns do generate an obviative effect. Compare:

(7.26) a. Tasman publiceer-de zijn journaal
Tasman publish-PAST.SG POSS:3SG.M log
'Tasman published his log.' (*his* = Tasman or someone else)

b. Tasman publiceer-de dien-s journaal
Tasman publish-PAST.SG DEM:DIST-POSS.M log
'Tasman published his log.' (*his* = someone other than Tasman)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

The possessive demonstrative *diens* has the special property of forcing an obviative reading with respect to the subject (Postma 1984):

(7.27)
Tasman beloof-de Cook dien-s journaal te publicer-en
Tasman promise-PAST.SG Cook DEM:DIST-POSS.M log to publish-INF
'Tasman promised Cook to publish his journal.' (*his* ≠ Tasman)

Demonstrative pronouns in Dutch can be either proximate (*dit*, *deze*) or distal (*dat*, *die*), referring to locations relatively close to or far away from the speaker. In addition, distal demonstratives are used to refer to a discourse topic (7.28a) or a left-dislocated element (7.28b):

(7.28) a. {Dat / *dit} wist ik niet
DEM:DIST/PROX.N know:PAST.SG 1SG.NOM NEG
'I didn't know.'

b. Tasman, {die /*deze} ken ik niet
Tasman DEM:DIST/PROX.CG know:SG 1SG.NOM NEG
'Tasman, I don't know (him).'

Proximal demonstratives are used to refer to the immediate subject of conversation (7.29a), as well as cataphorically (7.29b):

(7.29) a. [standing on the beach of Tasmania]
{Dit / *dat} is het eiland dat Tasman
DEM:PROX/DIST.N be:SG DEF.N.SG island REL:N.SG Tasman
ontdek-t heeft
GE:discover-D have:3SG
'This is the island Tasman discovered.'

b. Ik wil alleen {dit / *dat} zeg-gen: (*etc.*)
1SG.NOM want:SG alone DEM:PROX/DIST.N say-INF
'I just want to say this: (etc.).'

In (7.29b), *dit* 'this' refers cataphorically to what the speaker is going to say next (indicated by *etc.*).

7.2 Raising and control

7.2.1 Raising and control diagnostics

Infinitival complement clauses in Dutch lack an (overt) subject. More precisely, they lack an argument which corresponds to the subject of the finite counterpart of the infinitival clause:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.30) a. Tasman heeft het Zuidland ge-vond-en
Tasman have:3SG DEF.N.SG South Land GE-find-N
'Tasman found the South Land.'

b. Tasman schijn-t — het Zuidland ge-vond-en
Tasman seem-3SG DEF.N.SG South Land GE-find-N
te heb-ben
to have-INF
'Tasman seems to have found the South Land.'

c. Tasman beweer-t — het Zuidland ge-vond-en
Tasman claim-3SG DEF.N.SG South Land GE-find-N
te heb-ben
to have-INF
'Tasman claims to have found the South Land.'

As is well known, the types in (7.30b) and (7.30c) differ in the sense that *Tasman* is an argument of the matrix verb *beweren* 'claim' in (7.30c), but not of the matrix verb *schijnen* 'seem' in (7.30b). Consequently, there is reason to believe that *Tasman* in (7.30b) is really the subject of the infinitival clause, and has been raised to the position of subject of the matrix clause, whereas *Tasman* in (7.30c) is the subject of the matrix clause and controls the interpretation of the infinitival clause. The two types of constructions (hence 'raising' and 'control' constructions) are distinguished in Dutch by the following diagnostics.

First, the subject of a raising construction may be part of an idiom expressed in the embedded infinitival clause:

(7.31) *Raising*
De pleuris schijn-t uit ge-brok-en te zijn
DEF.PL pleurisy seem-3SG out GE-break-N to be:INF
'All hell seems to have broken loose.' (lit. 'There seems to have been an outbreak of pleurisy.')

No examples of control constructions can be given where this is also the case.

Second, control constructions require an agentive subject (or at least a subject matching the particular selection restrictions of the matrix verb), even if the infinitival verb requires a nonagentive subject. In raising constructions, no such requirement exists:

(7.32) a. *Raising*
De lading kokosnot-en schijn-t ge-arriveer-d te zijn
DEF.CG.SG cargo coconut-PL seem-3SG GE-arrive-D to be:INF
'The coconut cargo seems to have arrived.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. *Control*
De lading kokosnot-en beweer-t ge-arriveer-d te zijn
DEF.CG.SGcargo coconut-PL claim-3SG GE-arrive-D to be:INF
(intended: 'The coconut cargo claims to have arrived.')

If the matrix verb in (7.32b) is passivized, its selection restrictions change to the effect that an agentive subject is no longer required:

(7.33) De lading kokosnot-en word-t beweer-d ge-arriveer-d
DEF.CG.SG cargo coconut-PL PASS.AUX-3SG GE:claim-D GE-arrive-D
te zijn
to be:INF
'The coconut cargo is claimed to have arrived.'

Third, and following from the second distinction, the use of expletive subjects in control constructions is highly limited: expletive subjects occur only when the matrix clause is an existential (7.34a) or impersonal passive (7.34b) construction.

(7.34) a. Er beweer-t iemand het Zuidland ge-vond-en
LOC claim-3SG someone DEF.N.SG South Land GE-find-N
te heb-ben
to have-INF
'Someone claims to have found the South Land.'

b. Er word-t ge-probeer-d het Zuidland te vind-en
LOC PASS.AUX-3SG GE-try-D DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
'People are trying to find the South Land.'

But in raising constructions, the expletive subject originates in the embedded clause. In (7.35a), for instance, the embedded infinitival clause contains an impersonal passive construction, and the ensuing expletive shows up as the matrix clause subject (cf. the ungrammatical control counterpart in (7.35b)).

(7.35) a. Er schijn-t ge-zoch-t te word-en
LOC seem-3SG GE-search-D to PASS.AUX:INF
'People seem to be searching.'

b. *Er probeer-t ge-zoch-t te word-en
LOC try-3SG GE-search-D to PASS.AUX:INF
(intended: 'People try to be searching.')

Semi-expletives such as weather *it* are likewise allowed in raising constructions and disallowed in control constructions:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.36) a. Het schijn-t te regen-en
3SG.N seem-3SG to rain-INF
'It seems to be raining.'

b. *Het probeer-t te regen-en
3SG.N try-3SG to rain-INF
(intended: 'It tries to rain.')

A fourth difference between raising and control constructions is that raising verbs are generally morphologically defective in lacking a past ('perfective') participle:

(7.37) a. *Tasman heef-t (even) ge-schen-en het Zuidland
Tasman have-3SG short.while GE-seem-N DEF.N.SG South Land
te vind-en
to find-INF
(intended: 'Tasman briefly seemed to find the South Land.')

b. Tasman heef-t (even) ge-probeer-d het Zuidland
Tasman have-3SG short.while GE-try-D DEF.N.SG South Land
te vind-en
to find-INF
'Tasman briefly tried to find the South Land.'

Note, however, that raising verbs also lack the infinitive that replaces the past participle in transparent infinitival clauses (the Infinitive-Pro-Participio effect, see section 4.2), unlike many control verbs:

(7.38) … dat Tasman het Zuidland heeft {prober-en / *lijk-en}
C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land have-3SG try-INF seem-INF
te vind-en
to find-INF
'… that Tasman {tried/seemed} to find the South Land.'

Raising constructions also cannot be passivized (compare (7.39) with (7.34b)):

(7.39) *Er word-t ge-schen-en het Zuidland te vind-en
LOC PASS.AUX-3SG GE-seem-N DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
(intended: 'People seem to find the South Land.')

The absence of a passive is independent of the absence of a morphological past participle with raising verbs, since raising verbs which (marginally) allow the formation of a past participle, such as *blijken* 'appear, turn out,' also cannot be passivized:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.40) Het Zuidland {is / *werd} ge-blek-en on-vind-baar
DEF.N.SG South Land be:3SG / PASS.AUX:SG GE-appear-N NEG-find-ABLE
te zijn
to be:INF
'It turned out that the South Land could not be found.'

Fifth, when the infinitival complement of a raising verb is replaced by a finite complement clause, the matrix subject is replaced by expletive *het* 'it.' Compare (7.41) with (7.30b).

(7.41)
Het schijnt dat Tasman het Zuidland ge-vond-en heeft
3SG.N seem-3SG C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land GE-find-N have:3SG
'It seems that Tasman found the South Land.'

This replacement is possible with all raising verbs (see appendix 4 for the full list). In contrast, when the infinitival complement of a control verb is replaced by a finite complement clause, the subject of the matrix clause stays as it was. Compare (7.42) with (7.30c).

(7.42) Tasman beweer-t dat hij het Zuidland ge-vond-en
Tasman claim-3SG C 3SG.M.NOM DEF.N.SG South Land GE-find-N
heeft
have:3SG
'Tasman claims that he found the South Land.'

A sixth difference between raising and control constructions in Dutch is that the infinitival complement of a raising verb is typically transparent and integrated with the matrix clause in the way described in section 4.2. In contrast, the complement of a control verb (while sometimes integrated as well) may always appear as a separate constituent in the final field ('extraposition'). Compare:

(7.43) *Raising*

a. … dat Tasman het Zuidland schijn-t te heb-ben
C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land seem-3SG to have-INF
ge-vond-en
GE-find-N
'… that Tasman seems to have found the South Land.'

b. *… dat Tasman schijn-t het Zuidland te heb-ben
C Tasman seem-3SG DEF.N.SG South Land to have-INF
ge-vond-en
GE-find-N
(intended: same as (7.43a))

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.44) *Control*

a. … dat Tasman het Zuidland probeer-t te vind-en
C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land try-3SG to find-INF
'… that Tasman is trying to find the South Land.'

b. …dat Tasman probeer-t het Zuidland te vind-en
C Tasman try-3SG DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
(same as (7.44a))

In the a-examples, the integration of the infinitival clause and the matrix clause is shown by the position of the object of the infinitival clause, *het Zuidland* 'the South Land,' in the middle field of the matrix clause. In the b-examples, the infinitival clause as a whole appears in the final field, to the right of the matrix verb.

Presumably in connection with this, the infinitival complement in raising constructions lacks a complementizer, while the infinitival complement in control constructions may be introduced by the complementizer *om*:

(7.45) Tasman {probeer-t / *schijn-t} om het Zuidland
Tasman try / seem-3SG C DEF.N.SG South Land
te vind-en
to find-INF
'Tasman {is trying / seems} to find the South Land.'

Likewise, infinitival complements of control verbs (but not raising verbs) may be fronted (7.46) and pronominalized (7.47).

(7.46) Het Zuidland te vind-en {probeer-t / *schijn-t} Tasman
DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF try / seem-3SG Tasman
'It's finding the South Land that Tasman {tries/seems}.'

(7.47) Tasman {probeer-t / schijn-t} het Zuidland te vind-en
Tasman try / seem-3SG DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
en Cook {probeer-t / *schijn-t} dat ook
and Cook try / seem-3SG DEM:DIST.N too
'Tasman {is trying / seems} to find the South Land, and so {is / does} Cook.'

As a final difference between raising and control constructions, note that with certain control verbs the controller is not the subject but the object (see also below):

(7.48) De VOC droeg Tasman op het Zuidland
DEF.CG.SG VOC carry:PAST.SG Tasman up DEF.N.SG South Land

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

te vind-en
to find-INF
'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] ordered Tasman to find the South Land.'
(*op-dragen* 'order')

In (7.48), the understood subject of the infinitival clause is the matrix object *Tasman*. This is never the case in raising constructions (only two impersonal raising verbs, restricted to the formal register, *voorkomen* 'appear to sb.' and *dunken* 'methinks,' take an internal argument, which cannot control the event expressed in the complement clause).

7.2.2 Modal verbs

Like raising and control verbs, modal verbs select an infinitival complement with a missing subject. See appendix 3 for a complete list of modal verbs in Dutch. The properties of modal verbs are illustrated here using the verb *moeten* 'must,' representing both deontic modality (obligation, (7.49a)) and epistemic modality (probability, (7.49b)).

(7.49) a. Tasman moet van de VOC het Zuidland
Tasman must:SG of DEF.CG.SG VOC DEF.N.SG South Land
vind-en
find-INF
'Tasman is under orders from the Dutch East India Company to find the South Land.'

b. Tasman moet de Maori-s verkeerd begrep-en
Tasman must:SG DEF.PL Maori-PL wrong GE:understand-N
heb-ben
have-INF
'Tasman probably misunderstood the Maoris.'

The modal verbs in Dutch, on all readings, share a number of properties with raising verbs. Most notably, the infinitival complement of a modal verb lacks a complementizer and is invariably integrated with the matrix clause:

(7.50) a. … dat Tasman van de VOC *het* *Zuidland*
C Tasman of DEF.CG.SG VOC DEF.N.SG South Land
moet *vind-en*
must:SG find-INF
'… that Tasman is under orders from the VOC [Dutch East India Company] to find the South Land.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. * … dat Tasman van de VOC moet *het*
c Tasman of DEF.CG.SG VOC must:SG DEF.N.SG
Zuidland vind-en
South Land find-INF
(intended: same as a.)

(7.51)
a. … dat Tasman *de Maori-s verkeerd begrep-en* moet
c Tasman DEF.PL Maori-PL wrong GE:understand-N must:SG
heb-ben
have-INF
'… that Tasman probably misunderstood the Maoris.'

b. * … dat Tasman moet *de Maori-s verkeerd begrep-en*
c Tasman must:SG DEF.PL Maori-PL wrong GE:understand-N
heb-ben
have-INF
(intended: same as a.)

In (7.50–51), material belonging to the infinitival complement of the modal verb is in italics. In the grammatical examples ((7.50a) and (7.51a)), the modal and the infinitival verb(s) form a cluster, and the remaining embedded clause material appears in the matrix clause middle field. In the ungrammatical examples ((7.50b) and (7.51b)), the entire infinitival clause appears in the final field ('extraposition'). This is independent of the deontic (7.50) or epistemic (7.51) interpretation of the modal verb.

Modal verbs also generally fail to impose selectional restrictions on the subject:

(7.52) a. Die kokosnot-en moet-en in ge-lad-en word-en
DEM:DIST.PL coconut-PL must-PL in GE-load-N PASS.AUX-PL
'Those coconuts need to be loaded.' (deontic)

b. Die kokosnot-en moet-en voedzaam zijn
DEM:DIST.PL coconut-PL must-PL nutritious be:INF
'Those coconuts are presumably nutritious.' (epistemic)

Some deontic readings do require the subject to be a responsible agent, namely the volitional (dispositional) reading in (7.53) and the 'directed deontic' reading in (7.49a) (see Barbiers 1995 for discussion of the various readings):

(7.53) Tasman MOET het Zuidland vind-en
Tasman must$_{\text{HIGH PITCH}}$:SG DEF.N.SG South Land find-INF
'Tasman is obsessed with finding the South Land.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

In (7.49a), the obligation of the event referred to by the infinitival clause happening is imposed on an agent, *Tasman*, which therefore cannot be inanimate. In other ('nondirected') deontic readings, such as (7.52a), no such restriction holds.

Modal verbs are also like raising verbs in that they lack a passive. This is even true of the modal verbs in a deontic reading requiring an agentive subject:

(7.54) *De Maori-s word-en van de VOC door Tasman
DEF.PL Maori-PL PASS.AUX-PL of DEF.CG.SG VOC through Tasman
goed behandel-en ge-moet-en
well treat-INF GE-must-N
(intended: 'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] requires that the Maoris be treated well by Tasman.')

The ungrammaticality of (7.54) is not due to a gap in the morphological paradigm, since modal verbs do allow the formation of a past participle (e.g. *willen* 'want' in (4.31); cf. (7.59a)).

The above diagnostics (clause union, absence of selection restrictions on the subject, lack of a passive) suggest that modal verbs in Dutch share important properties with raising verbs. What about the other diagnostics separating raising verbs from control verbs?

First, epistemic modal verbs allow subjects to be part of an idiom contained in the infinitival clause ('idiomatic subjects'):

(7.55) De pleuris moet uit ge-brok-en zijn
DEF.CG.SG pleurisy must:SG out GE-break-N be:INF
'Probably all hell broke loose.' (epistemic)

It will not come as a surprise that deontic verbs do not allow idiomatic subjects in their volitional and directed deontic readings (7.56a), but the more relevant observation is that idiomatic subjects may appear with nondirected deontic modals (7.56b).

(7.56) a. *De pleuris MOET uit brek-en
DEF.CG.SG pleurisy must$_{\text{HIGH PITCH}}$:SG out break-INF
(intended: 'The pleurisy is obsessed with breaking loose.') (volitional deontic)

b. De pleuris moet nu maar uit brek-en
DEF.CG.SG pleurisy must:SG now but out break-INF
'Let all hell break loose now.' (non-directed deontic)

Second, weather *it* (Dutch *het*) freely appears with epistemic modals (7.57a), and not with volitional/directed deontic modals (7.57b), but it does appear with nondirected deontic modals (7.57c).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.57) a. Het moet ge-regen-d heb-ben
3SG.N must:SG GE-rain-D have-INF
'It probably rained.' (epistemic)

b. *Het MOET regen-en
3SG.N must$_{\text{HIGH PITCH}}$:SG rain-INF
(intended: 'It is obsessed with raining.') (volitional deontic)

c. Het moet nu maar eens gaa-n regen-en
3SG.N must:SG now but once go-INF rain-INF
'We need to get some rain now.' (nondirected deontic)

More generally, expletive subjects properly belonging to the embedded clause may appear as the subject of a modal verb in all its readings:

(7.58) a. Er moet ge-dans-t word-en
LOC must:SG GE-dance-D PASS.AUX-INF
'People are apparently dancing.' (epistemic)
'We have to dance.' (directed deontic)

b. Er MOET ge-dans-t word-en
LOC must$_{\text{HIGH PITCH}}$:SG GE-dance-D PASS.AUX-INF
'People are obsessed with dancing.' (volitional deontic)

This is unlike control constructions, where the expletive subject can only originate in the matrix clause (cf. (7.34–35)).

Unlike raising verbs, deontic modal verbs may appear in the 'perfect':

(7.59) a. Tasman heeft het Zuidland moet-en vind-en
Tasman have:3SG DEF.N.SG South Land must-INF find-INF
'Tasman had to find the South Land.' (directed deontic)
(*moeten* is the infinitive replacing the past participle *gemoeten* in this construction)

b. *Tasman heeft een held moet-en zijn
Tasman have:3SG INDF.SG hero must-INF be:INF
(intended: 'Tasman apparently was a hero.') (epistemic)

To express the indended meaning of (7.59b), the epistemic modal stays in the present tense, and the infinitive is put in the relative past ('perfect'):

(7.60) Tasman moet een held ge-wees-t zijn
Tasman must:SG INDF.SG hero GE-be-D be:INF
'Tasman apparently was a hero.' (epistemic)

This test (appearance in the 'perfect') neatly separates epistemic and deontic modal verbs along the same lines as raising and control verbs. However, it

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

may be that the alternative expression of the type in (7.60) yields a blocking effect, potentially weakening the evidence that deontic modality involves control.

Epistemic and deontic modal verbs also differ in that epistemic modal verbs may freely appear in a construction with an impersonal subject (*het* 'it') and a finite embedded clause:

(7.61) a. Het moet wel dat Tasman het Zuidland
3SG.N must:SG AFF C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land
ge-zie-n heeft
GE-see-N have:3SG
'It is probably the case that Tasman sighted the South Land.' (epistemic)

b. ??Het moet dat Tasman het Zuidland vind-t
3SG.N must:SG C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land find-3SG
(intended: 'Tasman must find the South Land.') (deontic)

This is another property separating raising verbs from control verbs (see (7.41)). However, a deontic modal (7.61b) with an expletive subject replacing the original subject is better than expected if deontic *moeten* 'must' were a control verb. It is also much better than (7.62), where the original subject has been retained, as in control constructions (see (7.42)):

(7.62) *Tasman moet dat hij het Zuidland vind-t
Tasman must:SG C 3SG.M.NOM DEF.N.SG South Land find-3SG
(intended: 'Tasman must find the South Land.') (deontic)

(The only deontic modal verb allowing (7.62) is volitional *willen* 'want,' but then the subject of the embedded clause need not be coreferential with the subject of *willen*, suggesting we have moved away from its modal use. (7.62) is not allowed on the volitional deontic reading of other modal verbs.)

Finally, if deontic and epistemic modal verbs are to be distinguished in terms of control vs. raising, one expects only deontic modal verbs to allow fronting and pronominalization of their infinitival complements. (7.63) illustrates fronting and pronominalization with deontic modal verbs:

(7.63) a. Het Zuidland vind-en moest Tasman van de
DEF.N.SG South Land find-INF must:PAST.SG Tasman of DEF.CG.SG
VOC
VOC
'Finding the South Land is what the VOC [Dutch East India Company] required of Tasman.' (directed deontic)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. Tasman moest het Zuidland vind-en en Cook
Tasman must:PAST.SG DEF.N.SG South Land find-INF and Cook
moest dat ook
must:PAST.SG DEM:DIST.N also
'Tasman had to find the South Land and so did Cook.' (directed deontic)

However, fronting of the infinitival complement is allowed with epistemic modals as well (7.64a), and pronominalization with epistemic modals, while not perfect, is better than expected (7.64b).

(7.64) a. Het Zuidland ge-zie-n heb-ben moet Tasman wel
DEF.N.SG South Land GE-see-N have-INF must:SG Tasman AFF
'Tasman must have sighted the South Land.' (epistemic)

b. ?Tasman moet het Zuidland ge-zie-n heb-ben
Tasman must:SG DEF.N.SG South Land GE-see-N have-INF
en Cook moet dat ook wel
and Cook must:SG DEM:DIST.N also AFF
'Tasman must have sighted the South Land, and so must Cook.'

Table 7.1 summarizes the control vs. raising properties of the various types of modal verbs in Dutch, based on the properties of *moeten*.

Table 7.1 *Raising vs. control properties of modal moeten 'must'*

Syntactic property	Raising / control	Modal		Notes on special deontic readings	Raising vs. control Replicated?
		Epistemic	Deontic		
complementizer	– / +	–	–		✗
extraposition	+ / –	+	+		✗
selection restrictions	– / +	–	–	volitional + dir. deontic +	✗ (✓)
passive	– / +	–	–		✗
idiomatic subject	+ / –	+	–	nondir. deontic +	✓ (✗)
weather *it*	+ / –	+	–	nondir. deontic +	✓ (✗)
expletive in main cl.	+ / –	+	+		✗
perfect	– / +	–	+		✓
impersonal subject (& finite complement)	+ / –	+	?		?
full subject (& finite complement)	– / +	–	–		✗
fronting	– / +	+	+		✗
pronominalization	– / +	?	+		?

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

As the table shows, the raising vs. control verb dichotomy is not clearly replicated in the epistemic vs. deontic modal verb dichotomy (see also Barbiers 1995: 162). Epistemic modal verbs behave like raising verbs for ten out of twelve tests considered here, but deontic modal verbs behave like control verbs for only five out of twelve tests. Moreover, of these twelve tests for which raising and control verbs invariably differ, epistemic and deontic modal verbs show identical behavior for seven of them.

7.2.3 Raising

A limited number of verbs in Dutch enter into the alternation illustrated in (7.65):

(7.65)

a. Het schijn-t dat Tasman Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t heeft
DEF.N.SG seem-3SG C Tasman New Zealand GE:discover-D have:3SG
'It appears that Tasman discovered New Zealand.'

b. Tasman schijn-t Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t te heb-ben
Tasman seem-3SG New Zealand GE:discover-D to have-INF
'Tasman appears to have discovered New Zealand.'

In (7.65a), the verb *schijnen* 'seem, appear' takes a finite complement clause, and the main clause features an expletive subject *het* 'it.' In (7.65b), *schijnen* takes a nonfinite complement clause. The expletive subject now no longer appears, and the subject of the complement clause appears as the matrix clause subject (when pronominal, it assumes the nominative case form).

Verbs entering into this alternation ('raising verbs') include *schijnen* 'seem,' *lijken* 'seem,' *blijken* 'turn out,' *heten* 'be reputed,' *iemand dunken* 'seem to someone,' *iemand voorkomen* 'appear to someone,' and *iemand toeschijnen* 'seem to someone.' (The experiencer with *voorkomen* and *toeschijnen* is obligatory and productive; *lijken* also allows an experiencer, but productivity seems limited, in the sense that only a speaker/addressee experiencer is fully acceptable; *dunken* is archaic.)

If the entire construction in (7.65) is embedded, it becomes clear that the infinitival clause in (7.65b) is transparent, in the sense that *schijnen* 'seem' forms a cluster with the verbs of the embedded clause, and all material associated with the embedded verb appears to the left of the cluster of verbs (7.66b):

(7.66)

a. … dat het schijn-t dat Tasman Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t
C DEF.N.SG seem-3SG C Tasman New Zealand GE:discover-D
heeft
have:3SG
'… that it appears that Tasman discovered New Zealand.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. … dat Tasman Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t schijn-t te heb-ben
c Tasman New Zealand GE:discover-D seem-3SG to have-INF
'… that Tasman appears to have discovered New Zealand.'

One of the raising verbs, *lijken* 'seem,' is regularly construed with the (affirmative/attenuating) modal particle *wel* (inducing the complementizer *of* rather than *dat*):

(7.67) Het lijk-t wel of Tasman Nauru ge-mis-t heef-t
DEF.N.SG seem-3SG AFF C Tasman Nauru GE-miss-D have-3SG
'It (almost) seems as if Tasman missed Nauru.'

If the embedded clause is nonfinite, and the construction as a whole is also embedded, the object of the (most deeply) embedded verb appears to the left of the particle *wel* which is associated with the raising verb *lijken*:

(7.68) … dat Tasman Nauru wel ge-mis-t lijk-t te heb-ben
C Tasman Nauru AFF GE-miss-D seem-3SG to have-INF
'… that Tasman (almost) seems to have missed Nauru.'

This suggests that when the complement clause of the raising verb is nonfinite, both the subject and the object of the complement clause are positioned in the matrix clause middle field (see section 4.3 on the position of modal particles in the Dutch middle field).

Three of the raising verbs (*dunken*, *voorkomen*, and *toeschijnen*, all 'seem/appear to someone') take an experiencer indirect object:

(7.69)
a. Mij dunk-t dat Tasman een groot zeevaarder was
1SG:OBJ 'think'-3SG C Tasman INDF:SG great seafarer be:PAST.SG
'Methinks that Tasman was a great seafarer.'

b. Het kom-t mij voor dat Tasman … *etc.*
it come-3SG 1SG:OBJ for C Tasman
'It appears to me that Tasman was a great seafarer.'

c. Het schijn-t mij toe dat Tasman … *etc.*
it seem-3SG 1SG:OBJ to C Tasman
'It seems to me that Tasman was a great seafarer.'

When these raising verbs take a nonfinite complement, no cluster formation occurs:

(7.70) a. … dat Tasman mij voor kom-t een groot zeevaarder
C Tasman 1SG:OBJ for come-3SG INDF:SG great seafarer

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

ge-wees-t te zijn
GE-be-D to be:INF
'… that Tasman appears to me to have been a great seafarer.'

b. *… dat Tasman mij een groot zeevaarder ge-wees-t
C Tasman 1SG:OBJ INDF:SG great seafarer GE-be-D
voor kom-t te zijn
for come-3SG to be:INF
(intended: same as a.)

The extraposition of the complement clause illustrated in (7.70a) is not possible with the other raising verbs (those not taking an experiencer object).

I use the term 'raising' to refer to the phenomenon that an argument of an embedded verb realizes its grammatical function in the matrix clause (see section 8.1). The examples show that in Dutch raising constructions, both subjects and objects realize their grammatical function in the matrix clause.

Raising is strictly local, in the sense that raising is not possible out of finite clauses ('hyper-raising') or across an overt subject ('super-raising') (see Ura 1994 for nonlocal raising in a range of languages). Dutch also lacks proleptic constructions like (7.71), where the 'raised' subject is represented by a resumptive element in the embedded clause:

(7.71) *Tasman lijk-t (als) of hij Nauru ge-zie-n heeft
Tasman seem-3SG as if 3SG.M.NOM Nauru GE-see-N have:3SG
'Tasman seems as if he saw Nauru.'

Apparently, prolepsis is not employed as a strategy to salvage nonlocal raising. Prolepsis does occur with objects in constructions like (7.72):

(7.72) Cook denk-t van Tasman dat hij Nauru ge-zie-n
Cook think-3SG of Tasman C 3SG.M.NOM Nauru GE-see-N
heeft (*hij* = *Tasman*)
have:3SG
'Cook considers Tasman to have seen Nauru.'

But since prolepsis is apparently not an alternative to raising in Dutch (see 7.71), an analysis of (7.72) in terms of object raising is doubtful.

As (7.70a) shows, subject raising is not blocked by an experiencer, but the fact that the embedded clause appears in extraposition when an experiencer is present (see (7.70b)) suggests that the experiencer does interfere with raising-to-object.

Raising to object position is also found in 'accusativus-cum-infinitivo' ('Exceptional Case-Marking') constructions of the type in (7.73):

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.73) Cook zag Tasman/hem de Maori-s begroet-en
Cook see:PAST.SG Tasman/3SG.M.OBJ DEF:PL Maori-PL greet-INF
'Cook saw Tasman/him greet the Maoris.'

In (7.73), *Tasman* is an argument of the embedded verb *begroeten* 'greet' and is realized as an object in the matrix clause. The object realization is evident from the objective case where the raised element is a pronoun (*hem* in (7.73)). If the construction as a whole is embedded, we again notice how the verbs form a cluster and the noun phrases are lined up in the middle field of the matrix clause:

(7.74) … dat Cook Tasman de Maori-s zag begroet-en
C Cook Tasman DEF.PL Maori-PL see:PAST.SG greet-INF
'… that Cook saw Tasman greet the Maoris.'

This construction is found with verbs of perception (*zien* 'see,' *horen* 'hear') and causative verbs (*laten* 'let,' *doen* 'do'), but not with verbs of cognition and expectation like *consider/expect* (except archaically with *menen* 'believe,' *achten* 'deem'). The construction does not allow for passivization:

(7.75) *Tasman werd de Maori-s zie-n groet-en
Tasman PASS.AUX:PAST.SG DEF.PL Maori-PL see-INF greet-INF
(intended: 'Tasman was seen greeting the Maoris.')

Curiously, some verbs of cognition and expectation, which do not allow raising to object (7.76a), do show up in the passive construction (7.76b):

(7.76)

a. *De VOC acht Tasman het Zuidland
DEF.CG.SG VOC consider:SG Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land
te vind-en
to find-INF
(intended: 'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] expects Tasman to find the South Land.')

b. Tasman word-t ge-acht het Zuidland te vind-en
Tasman PASS.AUX-3SG GE-consider:D DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
'Tasman is expected to find the South Land.'

Geacht worden 'be considered,' however, does not require verb cluster formation in the embedded construction, and in fact takes an optional complementizer *om*, suggesting that no raising out of the complement clause takes place:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.77)

… dat	Tasman	ge-ach-t	word-t	(om)	het	Zuidland
c	Tasman	GE-consider-D	PASS.AUX-3SG	C	DEF.N.SG	South Land
te	vind-en					
to	find-INF					

'… that Tasman is expected to find the South Land.'

Dutch lacks adjectives like *likely* which trigger raising to subject in English. This circumstance, combined with the nonraising character of *geacht worden* 'be considered,' makes it difficult to show raising in Dutch across more than two clauses, as in English (7.78):

(7.78) a. Tasman seems to be likely to find the South Land
b. Tasman seems to be considered to be likely to find the South Land

Raising verbs in Dutch also function as copulas, selecting a predicative instead of a clausal complement:

(7.79) a. Tasmanië lijk-t een eiland
Tasmania seem-3SG INDF.SG island
'Tasmania seems an island.'

b. Het Zuidland bleek on-vind-baar
DEF.N.SG South Land appear:PAST.SG NEG-find-able
'The South Land turned out not to be found.'

c. Cook scheen in de veronderstelling dat hij
Cook seem:PAST.SG in DEF.CG.SG supposition C 3SG.M.NOM
een god was
INDF.SG god be:PAST.SG
'Cook seemed to believe that he was a god.' (lit. 'seemed in the belief')

For this reason, raising verbs are grouped with copular verbs (like *zijn* 'be,' *worden* 'become,' *blijven* 'remain') in the Dutch grammatical tradition, and are called *koppelwerkwoorden* 'copular verbs.'

In this connection, note that modal verbs (but only deontic modal verbs) show the same copular use, although the predicate must be of the type betraying a polarity transition (Barbiers 1995: 163f):

(7.80) a. Tasman moet weg
Tasman must:SG away
'Tasman has to go.'
b. Het zeil moet hog-er
DEF.N.SG sail must:SG high-CMP
'The sail must [be raised] higher.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

7.2.4 *Control*

Control constructions in Dutch are illustrated in (7.81):

(7.81) a. Tasman probeer-t het Zuidland te vind-en
Tasman try-3SG DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
'Tasman is trying to find the South Land'

b. Tasman beloof-t de VOC het Zuidland
Tasman promise-3SG DEF.CG.SG VOC DEF.N.SG South Land
te vind-en
to find-INF
'Tasman promises the VOC [Dutch East India Company] to find the South Land.'

c. De VOC vraag-t Tasman het Zuidland te vind-en
DEF.CG.SG VOC ask-3SG Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] asks Tasman to find the South Land.'

The embedded clause in a control construction is nonfinite, with its unexpressed subject grammatical function controlled by either the subject (7.81a,b) or the object (7.81c) of the matrix clause.

The controller can also be understood, as in:

(7.82) Het was moeilijk het Zuidland te vind-en
3SG.N be:PAST.SG difficult DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
'It was difficult to find the South Land.'

When the construction as a whole is embedded, we get the usual patterns of verb clustering (7.83a), extraposition (7.83b), or a mixture of both, the 'third construction' (7.83c):

(7.83)

a. … dat Tasman het Zuidland heeft prober-en te vind-en
C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land have:3SG try-3SG to find-INF

b. … dat Tasman heeft ge-probeer-d (om) het Zuidland
C Tasman have:3SG ge-try-D C DEF.N.SG South Land
te vind-en
to find-INF

c. … dat Tasman het Zuidland heeft ge-probeer-d (*om)
C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land have:3sg ge-try-D C
te vind-en
to find-INF

(all) '… that Tasman tried to find the South Land.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

In (7.83a), the object of *vinden* 'find,' *het Zuidland* 'the South Land,' is realized in the matrix clause middle field (raising-to-object), and the verbs form an inseparable cluster; the matrix verb *proberen* 'try' takes the form of an infinitive instead of the expected participial form. In (7.83b), the entire embedded infinitival clause is realized to the right of the matrix verb *proberen* 'try,' i.e. in extraposition (to the right of the right clausal bracket signaled by the matrix verb); the clause in extraposition may show the infinitival complementizer *om*. In (7.83c), the complementizer *om* is absent, and the object is realized in the matrix clause middle field, but the matrix verb *proberen* does not take on the infinitival morphology, suggesting a mix of the properties of (7.83a) and (7.83b).

Controlled clauses may appear in the complement of nouns, adjectives, and prepositions as well:

(7.84) a. Tasman z'n poging (om) het Zuidland
Tasman PCL:3SG.M attempt C DEF.N.SG South Land
te vind-en (N)
to find-INF
'Tasman's attempt to find the South Land.'

b. Tasman was bezig (om) het Zuidland
Tasman be:PAST.SG busy C DEF.N.SG South Land
te ontdek-ken (A)
to discover-INF
'Tasman was busy discovering the South Land.'

c. zonder (*om) het Zuidland te vind-en
without C DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
'without finding the South Land'

Controlled adjunct clauses are introduced by prepositions, as in (7.84c).

For some reason, control complements are rarely selected by adjectives in Dutch. An adjective–infinitive combination in English is typically circumscribed in Dutch:

(7.85)

English	*Dutch*		
desirous to …	vol	verlangen	om…
	full	desire	C
able to …	in	staat	om …
	in	state	C
is eager to …	wil	graag…	
	wants	eagerly	

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

The understood subject of the embedded infinitival clause may be controlled by a combination of grammatical functions of the matrix clause ('split antecedents'):

(7.86)

Tasman	stel-de	Cook	voor	(om)	samen	het	Zuidland
Tasman	put-PAST.SG	Cook	for	C	together	DEF.N.SG	South Land
te	zoek-en						
to	seek-INF						

'Tasman proposed to Cook to look for the South Land together.'
(*voorstellen* = propose)

The adverb *samen* 'together' needs to be associated with a plural antecedent, indicating that the understood subject of the infinitival clause must be controlled by both *Tasman* and *Cook*.

A striking feature of control constructions in Dutch is that the choice of the controller is affected by the modality of the embedded infinitival:

(7.87) a.

Tasman	vroeg	Cook	om	de	Maori-s	te	begroet-en
Tasman	ask:PAST.SG	Cook	C	DEF.PL	Maori-PL	to	greet-INF

'Tasman asked Cook to salute the Maoris.' (Cook salutes the Maoris)

b.

Tasman	vroeg	Cook	om	de	Maori-s	te	mog-en
Tasman	ask:PAST.SG	Cook	C	DEF.PL	Maori-PL	to	may-INF
groet-en							
greet-INF							

'Tasman asked Cook to be permitted to salute the Maoris.' (Tasman salutes the Maoris.)

(7.88)

a.

Tasman	beloof-de	Cook	om	de	Maori-s	te	begroet-en
Tasman	promise:PAST.SG	Cook	C	DEF.PL	Maori-PL	to	greet-INF

'Tasman promised Cook to salute the Maoris.' (Tasman salutes the Maoris)

b.

Tasman	beloof-de	Cook	om	de	Maori-s	te	mog-en
Tasman	promise:PAST.SG	Cook	C	DEF.PL	Maori-PL	to	may-INF
begroet-en							
greet-INF							

'Tasman promised Cook to be permitted to salute the Maoris.' (Cook salutes the Maoris.)

Introducing the permissive modal auxiliary *mogen* in the infinitival clause has the effect that the interpretation of the understood subject shifts. With verbs like *vragen* 'ask,' the controller shifts from the matrix clause object to the matrix clause subject (7.87); with verbs like *beloven* 'promise,' the controller shifts from the matrix clause subject to the matrix clause object (7.88).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

7.3 Negation

Negation in Dutch is expressed by the lexical item *niet*, composed of the negative prefix *n-* (cf. *n-iet-s* 'nothing,' *n-ergens* 'nowhere,' *n-ooit* 'never') and the element *iet* (cf. *iet-s* 'something,' *iet-wat* 'somewhat, a little bit'), which appears to have the meaning 'a small amount.'

7.3.1 Types of niet

Paardekooper (1986: 848) distinguishes four different types of *niet*, each with their own syntactic distribution (terminology adapted):

Polar *niet*

This is the ordinary sentential negation marker, appearing in the middle field to the right of the discourse particles (see (4.90)):

(7.89) … dat Tasman de Maori-s maar niet begroet-te
C Tasman DEF.PL Maori-PL just NEG greet-PAST.SG
'… that Tasman decided not to greet the Maoris.'

Focal *niet*

This is the negation marker featuring in a coordination structure expressing opposition:

(7.90)
Tasman heeft niet Australië ontdek-t maar (wel) Tasmanië
Tasman have:3SG NEG Australia GE:discover-D but AFF Tasmania
'Tasman didn't discover Australia but (he did discover) Tasmania.'

Polar and focal *niet* behave differently in that focal *niet* fails to license negative polarity items:

(7.91) Ik denk niet dat Tasman ook maar iets ge-daan
1SG.NOM think:1SG NEG C Tasman MIN INDF.INAN GE-do:N
heeft (polar *niet*)
have:3SG
'I don't think Tasman did anything$_{NPI}$.'

(7.92) *Ik denk dat niet Tasman ook maar iets ge-daan
1SG.NOM think C NEG Tasman MIN INDF.INAN GE-do:N
heeft maar (wel) Cook (focal *niet*)
have:3SG but AFF Cook
(intended: 'I think that not Tasman did anything$_{NPI}$ but Cook.')

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

The distribution of focal *niet* is also different, as focal *niet* attaches to the constituent in focus (i.e. the constituent which expresses a member of a pair of alternatives).

Interrogative *niet*

This is the negation marker featuring in a yes/no-question. Its placement is much freer than with polar *niet*:

(7.93)

Heeft	(niet)	Tasman	(niet)	toen	(niet)	(maar)	(niet)	de	Maori-s
have:3SG	NEG	Tasman		then		just		DEF.PL	Maori-PL
(niet)	(maar)	(niet)	begroet?					(interrogative *niet*)	
			GE:greet:D						

'Didn't Tasman then decide to greet the Maoris?'

Unlike polar and focal *niet*, interrogative *niet* cannot be emphasized.

Tag *niet*

This is the negation marker used in clause-final position, meaning *isn't it*, turning a statement into a yes/no-question:

(7.94)

Tasman	heeft	Tasmanië	ontdek-t,	niet?	(tag *niet*)
Tasman	have:3SG	Tasmania	GE:discover-D	NEG	

'Tasman discovered Tasmania, isn't it?'

Interrogative *niet* and tag *niet* fall outside the scope of this section.

Constituent negation in Dutch is done using focal *niet*:

(7.95)

Niet	Tasman	heeft	Australië	ontdek-t	*(maar	Cook)
NEG	Tasman	have:3SG	Australia	GE:discover-D	but	Cook

'It was not Tasman who discovered Australia, but Cook.'

A construction containing constituent negation is severely degraded without expression of the alternative, such as *maar Cook* 'but Cook' in (7.95), except when focal *niet* is combined with a quantifier such as *iedereen* 'everyone' (see (7.152)).

Polar *niet* can be used to negate a sentence with wide and narrow focus (so association with focus is not a prerogative of focal *niet*). A wide-focus sentence (where the entire proposition is presented as new) is negated by stressing polar *niet*:

(7.96) *Negation of wide focus*

a. Positive:

Tasman	heeft	AUSTRALIË	ontdek-t
Tasman	have:3SG	Australia	GE:discover-D

'Tasman discovered AUSTRALIA.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. Negative:
Tasman heeft Australië NIET ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG Australia NEG GE:discover-D
'Tasman did NOT discover Australia.'

A narrow-focus sentence (where the stressed element is presented as new, against the background of the unstressed material) may be negated by polar *niet* in two ways: either the narrow-focus constituent and the negative marker are both stressed (7.97), or the negative marker is placed in front of the narrow-focus constituent (7.98).

(7.97) *Negation of narrow focus: bipolar focusing*
a. Positive:
TASMAN heeft Australië ontdek-t
a′. Tasman heeft AUSTRALIË ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG Australia GE:discover-D
(a) 'It's Tasman who discovered Australia.'
(a′) 'It's Australia that Tasman discovered.'

b. Negative:
TASMAN heeft Australië NIET ontdek-t
b′. Tasman heeft AUSTRALIË NIET ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG Australia NEG GE:discover-D
(b) 'Tasman is not the one who discovered Australia.'
(b′) 'Australia is not a country that Tasman discovered.'

(7.98) *Negation of narrow focus: scope by position*
a. Positive:
Tasman heeft Tasmanië BIJ TOEVAL ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania by accident GE:discover-D
'It's by accident that Tasman discovered Tasmania.'

b. Negative:
Tasman heeft Tasmanië NIET BIJ TOEVAL ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania NEG by accident GE:discover-D
'It is not by accident that Tasman discovered Tasmania.'

A high adverbial in focus, like *in 1642* 'in 1642' in (7.99), cannot be negated through bipolar focusing:

(7.99) *Negation of focused high adverbial*
a. Positive:
Tasman heeft IN 1642 Australië ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG in 1642 Australia GE:discover-D
'It's in 1642 that Tasman discovered Australia.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. Negative:
*Tasman heeft IN 1642 Australië NIET ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG in 1642 Australia NEG GE:discover-D
(intended: 'It's not in 1642 that Tasman discovered Australia.')

(This sentence has an irrelevant reading where *in 1642* is a frame-setting topic: 'In 1642, it's not the case that Tasman discovered Australia.')

Instead, the word order must be adjusted so as to allow negation by scope:

(7.100) *Negation of focused high adverbial*
Tasman heeft Australië NIET IN 1642 ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG Australia NEG in 1642 GE:discover-D
'It's not in 1642 that Tasman discovered Australia.'

7.3.2 Negation with indefinites

A clause containing an existentially interpreted indefinite noun phrase is not negated through *niet*, but by the negative determiner *geen* 'no':

(7.101) *Negation with indefinite objects*
a. Positive:
Tasman zag Maori-s
Tasman see:PAST.SG Maori-PL
'Tasman saw Maoris.'

b. Negative:
Tasman zag geen Maori-s
Tasman see:PAST.SG INDF:NEG Maori-PL
'Tasman didn't see any Maoris.'

With a specific indefinite object, *niet* continues to be used:

(7.102) *Negation with a specific indefinite object*
a. Positive:
Tasman wou een Maori (maar) straf-fen
Tasman want:PAST.SG INDF.SG Maori just punish-INF
'Tasman wanted to punish a (particular) Maori.'
(the position of the indefinite object to the left of the discourse particle *maar* 'just' signals the object's specific reading; cf. (4.74))

b. Negative:
Tasman wou een Maori (maar) niet straf-fen
Tasman want:PAST.SG INDF.SG Maori just NEG punish-INF
'Tasman didn't want to punish a (particular) Maori.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Geen is also used with the associate of an expletive (7.103) and with predicative noun phrases (7.104):

(7.103) *Negation of expletive construction*

a. Positive:

Er	war-en	Maori-s	op	het	strand
LOC	be:PAST-PL	Maori-PL	on	DEF.N.SG	beach

'There were Maoris on the beach.'

b. Negative:

Er	war-en	geen	Maori-s	op	het	strand
LOC	be:PAST-PL	INDF:NEG	Maori-PL	on	DEF.N.SG	beach

'There were no Maoris on the beach.'

(7.104) *Negation with noun phrase predicates*

a. Positive:

Tasman	was	een	held
Tasman	be:PAST.SG	INDF.SG	hero

'Tasman was a hero.'

b. Negative:

Tasman	was	geen	held
Tasman	be:PAST.SG	INDF:NEG	hero

'Tasman was no hero.'

Indefinite subjects also take on *geen* when they are interpreted existentially:

(7.105) *Negation with indefinite subjects*

a. Geen Maori deed iets (existential)
INDF:NEG Maori do:PAST.SG INDF:INAN
'There was no Maori who did anything.'
(*Een Maori deed niets)

b. Maori-s drink-en niet (generic)
Maori-PL drink-PL NEG
'Maoris don't drink.'
(*Geen Maoris drinken)

Substitution of *niet* by *geen* works with polar, focal, and interrogative *niet*, but with focal *niet* (7.106) and interrogative *niet* (7.107) it is not obligatory:

(7.106) Tasman was {geen / niet een } held maar een
Tasman be:PAST.SG INDF:NEG NEG INDF.SG hero but INDF.SG
lafaard
coward
'Tasman was not a hero but a coward.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.107) Is Tasman {geen / niet een } held?
be:3SG Tasman INDF:NEG NEG INDF.SG hero
'Isn't Tasman a hero?'

Geen and *niet een* also alternate with singular indefinite noun phrases modified by a relative clause:

(7.108) Tasman zocht {geen / niet een} Maori die
Tasman seek:PAST.SG INDF:NEG NEG INDF.SG Maori REL:CG
Engels kon
English can:PAST.SG
'Tasman was not looking for a Maori who spoke English.'

Geen never appears with fronted indefinites:

(7.109) a. *Geen Maori-s zag Tasman
INDF:NEG Maori-PL see:PAST.SG Tasman
(intended: 'Tasman didn't see any Maoris.') (cf. (7.101b))

b. Maori-s zag Tasman niet
Maori-PL see:PAST.SG Tasman NEG
'Tasman didn't see any Maoris.'

c. Maori-s zag Tasman geen (Southern Dutch)
Maori-PL see:PAST.SG Tasman INDF:NEG
(same as b.)

Negative indefinite pronouns like *niets* 'nothing' and *niemand* 'no one' behave differently, in that they can be fronted:

(7.110) a. De Maori-s zag-en n-iemand
DEF.PL Maori-PL see:PAST.PL NEG-INDF.HUM
'The Maoris saw no one.'

b. N-iemand zag-en de Maori-s
NEG-INDF.HUM see:PAST.PL DEF.PL Maori-PL
'The Maoris saw no one.'

When the indefinite pronoun receives a specific interpretation, conflation with the negative prefix *n-* does not take place, with or without fronting:

(7.111) a. De Maori-s zag-en iemand niet
DEF.PL Maori-PL see:PAST.PL INDF.HUM NEG
'The Maoris overlooked a particular person.'

b. Iemand zag-en de Maori-s niet
INDF.HUM see:PAST.PL DEF.PL Maori-PL NEG
'The Maoris overlooked a particular person.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

7.3.3 Negation in complex clauses

The phenomenon of Neg-raising (or Neg-transportation; see Horn 1978), where the negation of a finite embedded clause is expressed in the matrix clause, shows up with a limited number of matrix verbs, including *denken* 'think,' *geloven* 'believe,' *vinden* 'find, judge,' *hopen* 'hope,' and *verwachten* 'expect':

(7.112) Ik denk (niet) dat het Zuidland (niet) bestaa-t
1SG.NOM think:1SG NEG C DEF.N.SG South Land exist-3SG
(either way) 'I think that the South Land does not exist.'

Composite negative markers like *geen* 'no' (7.113) and *niemand* 'no one' (7.114) are split up when the negation appears in the higher clause:

(7.113) a. Ik denk dat er geen Zuidland is
1SG.NOM think C LOC INDF:NEG South Land be:3SG
'I think there is no South Land.'

b. Ik denk niet dat er een Zuidland is
1SG.NOM think NEG C LOC INDF.SG South Land be:3SG
(same as a.)

(7.114) a. Ik denk dat er n-iemand woon-t
1SG.NOM think C LOC NEG-INDF.HUM live-3SG
'I think that no one lives there.'

b. Ik denk niet dat er iemand woon-t
1SG.NOM think NEG C LOC INDF.HUM live-3SG
(same as a.)

Note that when the expression *niet meer* 'not anymore, no longer' is split under Neg-raising, *meer* is substituted by *nog* 'still':

(7.115) a. Ik denk dat hij niet meer leef-t
1SG.NOM think C 3SG.M.NOM NEG more live-3SG
'I think he no longer lives.'

b. Ik denk niet dat hij nog leef-t
1SG.NOM think NEG C 3SG.M.NOM still live-3SG
(same as a.)

With nonfinite complement clauses, we have to distinguish extraposition constructions and verb clustering constructions.

In verb clustering constructions, the negative marker associated with the embedded clause shows up in the middle field of the matrix clause:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.116) … dat Tasman de Maori-s niet zag aarzel-en
c Tasman DEF.PL Maori-PL NEG see:PAST.SG hesitate-INF
geweld te gebruik-en
violence to use-INF
'… that Tasman saw the Maoris not hesitate to use violence.'

In (7.116), the negative marker *niet* is part of a collocation *niet aarzelen* 'not hesitate,' meaning 'be prepared to.' The matrix verb *zag* 'saw' and the embedded verb *aarzelen* 'hesitate' form a cluster, and *niet* appears in the matrix clause middle field (along with the embedded clause object *de Maoris* 'the Maoris' (the external argument of the embedded verb *aarzelen* 'hesitate'; note that *aarzelen* itself takes a third embedded clause, *geweld te gebruiken* 'to use violence,' which appears in extraposition).

With extraposed infinitival clauses, the negative marker stays in situ (7.117), except with the few verbs which allow Neg-raising and take infinitival complement clauses (such as *hopen* 'hope' in (7.118)):

(7.117) … dat Tasman probeer-de om niet gek te word-en
c Tasman try-PAST.SG c NEG crazy to become-INF
'… that Tasman tried not to go crazy.'

(7.118)
… dat ik niet hoop dat ooit mee te mak-en
c 1SG.NOM NEG hope DEM:DIST.SG INDF.TEMP with to make-INF
'… that I hope never to experience that.'
(*mee-maken* = experience)

7.3.4 Negative polarity

Dutch has a large and growing inventory of negative polarity expressions (see Hoeksema, in prep.). These expressions form a heterogeneous group, roughly identified by the circumstance that they must appear in a negative context (negative polarity items [NPIs] in boldface throughout this section):

(7.119)
Tasman dacht *(niet) dat er **ook maar iemand** woon-de
Tasman think:PAST.SG NEG c LOC MIN INDF.HUM live-PAST.SG
'Tasman didn't think that anyone (at all) was living there.'

Morphologically, a number of NPIs are fused with the negative marker (i.e. they involve the negative determiner *geen* 'no'):

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.120) *Fused negative polarity items*

a. arbitrary small amount:

geen	**zak**	
INDF:NEG	scrotum	'nothing'

b. arbitrary slice of time or degree:

voor	**geen**	**goud**	
for	INDF:NEG	gold	'under no circumstances'
in	**geen**	**jar-en**	
in	INDF:NEG	year-PL	'in years'

c. (quantum of) awareness:

geen	**flauw**	**idee**	
INDF:NEG	faint	idea	'not a clue'

These NPIs can appear only with a higher clause negative marker *niet*, in which case *geen* is defused into *niet* … *een*:

(7.121)

Ik	denk	niet	dat	hij	er	**een**	**zak**
1SG.NOM	think:1SG	NEG	C	3SG.M.NOM	LOC	INDF.SG	scrotum
van	begrijp-t						
of	understand-3SG						

'I don't think he understands any of it.'

(*er* is the locative variant of the 3SG.N pronoun *het* 'it,' the complement of *van* 'of')

Other contexts where a fused NPI is defused include clauses with a negative subject (7.122a), clauses selected by a negative verb (7.122b) or by a negative preposition (7.122c), and relative clauses/conditionals (7.122d):

(7.122) a.

N-iemand	begrijp-t	er	**een**	**zak**	van
NEG-INDF.HUM	understand-3SG	LOC	INDF.SG	scrotum	of

'No one understands anything of it.'

b.

Ik	ontken	dat	ik	er	**een**	**zak**	van
1SG.NOM	deny:1SG	C	1SG.NOM	LOC	INDF.SG	scrotum	of
begrijp							
understand:1SG							

'I deny that I understand anything of it.'

c.

zonder	er	**een**	**zak**	van	te	begrijp-en
without	LOC	INDF.SG	scrotum	of	to	understand-INF

'without understanding anything of it'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

d. ieder-een die er **een** **zak** van
UNIV:DSTR-one REL:CG LOC INDF.SG scrotum of
begrijp-t
understand-3SG
'everyone who understands anything of it'

Defusion of a fused NPI contained within a PP is often problematic:

(7.123) a. *N-iemand doe-t dat **voor** **goud**
NEG-INDF.HUM do-3SG DEM.DIST:INAN for gold
(intended: 'No one will do that under any circumstances.')

b. N-iemand heeft dat **in** **jar-en** ge-daan
NEG-INDF.HUM have:3SG DEM.DIST:INAN in year-PL GE-do:N
'No one has done that in years.'

Note that the order P–*geen*–N (for *niet*–P–N) is not used outside NPIs:

(7.124) a. Hij schrijf-t niet met een pen (**met geen pen*)
3SG.M.NOM write-3sg NEG with INDF.SG pen
'He doesn't write with a pen.'

b. Het is **met** **geen** **pen** te be-schrijv-en
3SG:N be:3SG with INDF:NEG pen to APPL-write-INF
'It is utterly indescribable.'

Another large class of NPIs involves verbs expressing some form of inability:

(7.125) *Inability NPI-verbs*
er **toe** **doe-n** 'matter'
LOC to do-INF

kun-nen **uit-staa-n** 'can stand'
can-INF out-stand-INF

iets **uit-hal-en** 'be to any avail'
INDF.INAN out-get-INF

kun-nen **tip-pen** **aan** **iets** 'match something in quality'
can-INF touch-INF on INDF.INAN

(7.126) a. Ik **kan** hem *(niet) **uit-staa-n**
1SG.NOM can:SG 3SG.M.OBJ NEG out-stand-INF
'I can't stand him.'

b. N-iemand **kan** hem **uit-staa-n**
NEG-INDF.HUM can:SG 3SG.M.OBJ out-stand-INF
'No one can stand him.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

These NPIs are licensed in all known NPI-licensing contexts, including those characterized by subjects with monotone-decreasing but not anti-additive determiners, such as *hoogstens* 'at most':

(7.127) a. *Hoogstens Tasman begreep er {**een zak /**
at most Tasman understand:PAST.SG LOC INDF.SG scrotum
ook maar iets} van
MIN INDF.INAN of
(intended: 'Only Tasman, if anyone, understood anything of it.')

b. Hoogstens Tasman **kan tip-pen aan** Cook
at most Tasman can:SG touch-INF on Cook
'Only Tasman, if anyone, can hold a candle to Cook.'

Finally, Dutch has a range of frequent but isolated NPIs:

(7.128) *Isolated NPIs*
a. minimizing: **ook maar {iets / iemand / enig *X*}**
also just something / someone / any X
'anything/anyone'
b. degree: **bijster** 'rather'
c. negative modal verb: **hoeven** 'need'
d. temporal: **ooit** 'ever'
e. polarity transition: **meer** 'anymore'

The minimizing expressions built on *ook maar* (7.128a) have a distribution similar to the fused NPIs, in that they cannot be combined with a local negative marker (see also (7.127a)):

(7.129) a. *Tasman heeft niet **ook maar iets** ge-daan
Tasman have:3SG NEG MIN INDF.INAN GE-do:N
(intended: 'Tasman didn't do anything.')

b. Ik denk niet dat Tasman **ook maar iets**
1SG.NOM think:SG NEG C Tasman MIN INDF.INAN
ge-daan heeft
GE-do:N have:3SG
'I don't think Tasman did anything.'

In addition, *ook maar*-expressions cannot be directly selected by a (negative) verb:

(7.130) a. *Tasman ontken-de **ook maar iets**
Tasman deny-PAST.SG MIN INDF.INAN
(intended: 'Tasman denied every single thing.')

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. Tasman ontken-de **ook maar** **enig-e** betrokkenheid
Tasman deny-PAST.SG MIN INDF-CG involvement
'Tasman denied any involvement.'

c. Tasman ontken-de dat hij **ook maar** **iets**
Tasman deny-PAST.SG C 3SG.M.NOM MIN INDF.INAN
ge-daan had
GE-do:N have:PAST.SG
'Tasman denied that he did anything.'

The degree NPI *bijster* (7.128b) is illustrated in (7.131):

(7.131) Tasman was *(niet) **bijster** intelligent
Tasman be:PAST.SG NEG rather intelligent
'Tasman was not particularly intelligent.'

Unlike (most) other types of NPI, *bijster* is not licensed in the context of relative or conditional clauses:

(7.132) *Ieder-een die **bijster** intelligent is …
UNIV:DSTR-one REL:CG rather intelligent be:3SG
(intended: 'Everyone who is particularly intelligent…')

The negative modal verb *hoeven* (7.128c) stands in for *moeten* 'must' in a negative clause (where the negation has scope over the modal):

(7.133) *moeten ~ hoeven*

a. Positive:
Je moet kom-en
2SG must:SG come-INF
'You have to come.'

b. Negative:
Je **hoef-t** niet te kom-en
2SG need-2SG NEG to come-INF
'There is no need for you to come.'

c. Negative:
#Je moet niet kom-en
2SG must:SG NEG come-INF
'You have the obligation not to come.'
(In Southern Dutch dialects spoken in Belgium, (7.133c) also has the interpretation of (7.133b).)

Like the NPI-verbs in (7.125), *hoeven* is licensed in a wide range of contexts, but (unlike these verbs) not in the context of relative and conditional clauses (7.134a) or in a negative implicature context like (7.134b) (cf. 7.135):

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.134) a. *Als je **hoef-t** te kom-en
if 2SG need-2SG to come-INF
(intended: 'If you must come.')

b. *Het verbaas-t me dat je **hoef-t** te kom-en
3SG.N surprise-3SG 1SG.OBJ C 2SG need-2SG to come-INF
(intended: 'I'm surprised that you have to come.')

(7.135)
Het verbaas-t me dat Tasman **kan** **tip-pen** **aan** Cook
3SG.N surprise-3SG 1SG.OBJ C Tasman can:SG touch-INF on Cook
'It surprises me that Tasman can hold a candle to Cook.'

Ooit 'ever'(7.128d) is an indefinite time adverbial in Southern Dutch dialects, encroaching more and more on the standard language (Hoeksema 1999), where it is originally an NPI, fused with the negative prefix *n-* to yield *nooit* 'never,' instead of cooccuring with a local negative marker *niet*:

(7.136) a. Tasman vind-t het Zuidland n-**ooit**
Tasman find-3SG DEF.N.SG South Land NEG-ever
'Tasman will never find the South Land.'

b. Ik denk niet dat Tasman het Zuidland **ooit**
1SG.NOM think:1SG NEG C Tasman DEF.N.SG South Land ever
vind-t
find-3SG
'I don't think that Tasman will ever find the South Land.'

Finally, *meer* 'anymore' (7.128e) has a very limited distribution, occuring only with a clause-mate negative marker *niet* and with a local negative subject. In all other contexts, *meer* is replaced by *nog* 'still':

(7.137) a. Ik denk dat hij niet **meer** kom-t
1SG.NOM think:SG C 3SG.M.NOM NEG more come-3SG
'I think that he won't come anymore.'

b. Ik denk niet dat hij **nog** kom-t
1SG.NOM think:SG NEG C 3SG.M.NOM still come-3SG
'I think that he won't come anymore.'

In addition to these NPIs, Dutch has a limited number of expressions which do not occur without the negative marker *niet*, but are not licensed in any other NPI-licensing contexts, such as *niet mals* 'serious' (lit. 'not tender').

Note that NPI-fronting across the NPI-licensing negative element is not possible:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.138) a. N-iemand heeft **ook maar** **iets** ge-daan
NEG-INDF.HUM have:3SG MIN INDF.INAN GE-do:N
'No one did anything.'

b. ***Ook maar** **iets** heeft n-iemand ge-daan
MIN INDF.INAN have:3SG NEG-INDF.HUM GE-do:n
(intended: same as a.)

Fused NPIs, on the other hand, can be fronted:

(7.139) a. Hij begrijp-t er **geen** **zak** van
3SG.M.NOM understand-3SG LOC INDF:NEG scrotum of
'He doesn't understand anything of it.'

b. **Geen** **zak** begrijp-t hij er van
INDF:NEG scrotum understand-3SG 3SG.M.NOM LOC of
(same as a.)

7.4 Quantification

7.4.1 Inventory of quantifiers

The universal quantifiers of Dutch are listed in (7.140).

(7.140) a. *Collective*
al-le 'all'
UNIV:COLL-PL

b. *Distributive*
ieder(-e) 'every' elk(-e) 'each'
UNIV:DSTR-AGR UNIV:DSTR-AGR

c. *Exhaustive*
beid-e 'both' al-le *n* 'all *n*'
both-PL UNIV:COLL-PL (numeral)

The root *al* also appears as a noun in the noun phrase *het al* 'the universe.' As a determiner, it occurs only in the plural, unlike the distributive universal quantifiers *ieder* and *elk*, which occur only in the singular and display the attributive adjective agreement morphology pattern (see (2.25–27)).

The difference between *ieder* and *elk* is felt only when the cardinality of the set of elements quantified over is given (*elk*) or open (*ieder*):

(7.141) a. Tasman was vertrouwd met {elk / *ieder}
Tasman be:PAST.SG familiar with UNIV:DSTR

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

van zijn twee schep-en
of POSS:3SG.M two ship:PL-PL
'Tasman was familiar with each of his two ships.'

b. Tasman onderzocht {ieder-e / *elk-e} mogelijk-e
Tasman examine:PAST.SG UNIV:DSTR-CG.SG possible-CG.SG
oplossing
solution
'Tasman examined every possible (i.e. imaginable) solution.'
(*elke* is grammatical when *mogelijke* is interpreted as a predicate of *oplossing* 'solution' and gets the interpretation 'feasible, viable,' yielding 'Tasman examined each of the viable solutions.')

Of the exhaustive quantifiers, *beide* 'both' may be preceded by a determiner (or possessive or demonstrative pronoun), whereas *alle n* is obligatorily followed by such an element:

(7.142) a. (de) beid-e eiland-en
DEF.PL both-PL island-PL
'both islands'

b. al-le twee *(de) eiland-en
UNIV:COLL-PL two DEF.PL island-PL
'all two islands, both islands'

An additional form, *allebei* 'both,' behaves like *alle n*.

All universal quantifiers also appear in floating position, although floating *alle* is considered formal and is replaced by *allemaal* in the spoken language. Note that the distributive floating quantifiers show no agreement:

(7.143) a. Tasman heeft de schep-en toen maar
Tasman have:3SG DEF.PL ship:PL-PL then just
{%al-le / allemaal / elk / beid-e / al-le twee / allebei}
UNIV:COLL-PL / all / UNIV:DSTR / both-PL / all-PL two / both
verbran-d
GE:burn-D
'Tasman then decided to just burn {all/all two/both} ships.'

b. Tasman gaf de Maori-s toen maar {elk/ieder}
Tasman give:PAST.SG DEF.PL Maori-PL then just UNIV:DSTR
vijf kral-en
five bead-PL
'Tasman then decided to just give the Maoris five beads each.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

The absolute forms of the collective universal quantifiers are *iedereen* 'everyone' (composed of the distributive quantifier *ieder* and the numeral *een* [en] 'one') for human beings and *alles* 'everything' for inanimate entities.

The converse of the universal quantifier *alle* 'all' is *geen* 'no' and the converse absolute forms are *niemand* 'no one' (for *iedereen*) and *niets* 'nothing' (for *alles*). Universal quantification is denied by adding the negative marker *niet*, yielding *niet alle* 'not all,' *niet iedereen* 'not everyone' and *niet alles* 'not everything' (see Jaspers 2005). Note that *niet iedereen* etc. differ from other forms of constituent negation in that the expression of an alternative is not required (see (7.95)):

(7.144) Niet ieder-een vind-t Tasman een held
NEG UNIV:DSTR-one find-3SG Tasman INDF.SG hero
'Not everyone thinks Tasman is a hero.'

The distributive universal quantifiers (*ieder*, *elk*) have no converse forms, and are denied by the negative marker *niet* as well (yielding *niet iedere* and *niet elke*). Finally, the exhaustive universal determiners (*beide*, *alle n*) are denied through the negative marker *niet* (where *niet allebei de* [lit. 'not both the'] takes the place of nonexistent **niet beide*), but also have converse forms in *geen van beide* [lit. 'none of both'] 'none of them' and *geen van de n* [lit. 'none of the *n*'].

The converse forms of the universal quantifiers also appear in floating position:

(7.145) a. Tasman heeft de Maori-s toen maar
Tasman have:3SG DEF.PL Maori-PL then just
{allemaal / geen van al-le-n} begroet
all INDF:NEG of UNIV:COLL-PL-HUM GE:greet:D
'Tasman then decided to just greet {all of / none of} the Maoris.'
(the *-n* suffix appears on absolute adjectives construed with nouns referring to a human entity)

b. Tasman heeft de Maori-s toen maar
Tasman have:3SG DEF.PL Maori-PL then just
{allebei / geen van beid-e-n} begroe-t
all INDF:NEG of both-PL-HUM GE:greet-D
'Tasman then decided to just greet {both/neither} of the Maoris.'

The existential quantifiers in Dutch (ignoring the indefinite singular determiner *een* [ən] and its zero plural counterpart) are *sommige* 'some,' *enkele* 'some,' and *enige* 'some.' Of these, *enkele* and *enige* are adjectives (*enkel* 'single,' *enig* 'unique'), but *sommige*, which lacks a transparent etymology, cannot be used as an attributive or predicative adjective.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Sommige also stands out in that *sommige* (unlike its English cognate *some*) is not a weak determiner in the sense of Milsark (1974), as it does not appear on the associate of an existential construction (see De Hoop 1995):

(7.146) Er stond-en {enkel-e /enig-e /*sommig-e} Maori-s
LOC stand:PAST-PL some-PL some-PL some-PL Maori-PL
op het strand
up DEF.N.SG beach
'There were some Maoris standing on the beach.'

Instead, *sommige* is a partitive quantifier, where the subset referred to is defined in terms of a particular quality, not in terms of quantity (De Hoop 1995: 434). That is, (7.147a) is interpreted as (7.147b) and not as (7.147c).

(7.147) a. Sommig-e Maori-s war-en getatouëerd
some-PL Maori-PL be:PAST-PL tattooed
'Some Maoris were tattooed.'
b. A particular subset of the Maoris had tattoos
c. A (small) number of Maoris had tattoos

Enkele is ambiguously used as a partitive quantifier and as a paucal existential quantifier. As a partitive quantifier, *enkele* differs from *sommige* in that the subset referred to is defined in terms of quantity alone. That is, (7.148) has the meaning in (7.147c) and lacks the meaning in (7.147b):

(7.148) Enkel-e Maori-s war-en getatouëerd
some-PL Maori-PL be:PAST-PL tattooed
'Some Maoris were tattooed.'

The existential quantifiers cannot be used as floating quantifiers, and lack a converse (negative) form. To negate a proposition containing an existential quantifier, the existential determiner is replaced by *niet een* [en] 'not one' or *geeneen* (lit. 'not-one one') 'not one' (cf. (7.146); note that the plural is lost under negation):

(7.149)
Er stond {niet een / geen-een} Maori op het strand
LOC stand:PAST.SG NEG one INDF.NEG-one Maori up DEF.N.SG beach
'There was not a single Maori on the beach.'

7.4.2 Scope relations

The scope of quantifiers in Dutch is generally a function of precedence. Thus, (7.150) lacks the inverse-scope reading where the negation marker *niet* takes scope over the quantified subject *iedereen* 'everyone':

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.150) ?Ieder-een ken-t Tasman niet
UNIV:DSTR-one know-3SG Tasman NEG
'Everyone is ignorant of Tasman.' (∀ > ¬)
(not) 'It is not the case that everyone knows Tasman.' (*¬ > ∀)

(7.150) is marked questionable because of the presence of a preferred alternative (7.151).

(7.151) N-iemand ken-t Tasman
NEG-INDF.HUM know-3SG Tasman
'Nobody knows Tasman.'

The reading of 'It is not the case that everyone knows Tasman' is achieved by the denied universal quantifier *niet iedereen*:

(7.152) Niet ieder-een ken-t Tasman
NEG UNIV:DSTR-one know-3SG Tasman
'Not everyone knows Tasman.' (¬ > ∀)

With two quantifiers, the inverse-scope reading appears to be difficult as well. First of all, indefinite subjects in Dutch lack an existential reading:

(7.153) Iemand heeft Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t
INDF.HUM have:3SG New Zealand GE:discover-D
'Some particular person discovered New Zealand.'
(not: 'There is a person who discovered New Zealand.')

The existential reading is expressed in an existential construction with the locative expletive *er* 'there,' even in transitive clauses:

(7.154) Er heeft iemand Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t
LOC have:3SG INDF.HUM New Zealand GE:discover-D
'Someone discovered New Zealand.'
'There is a person who discovered New Zealand.'

Consequently, an indefinite subject always takes scope over a quantified object:

(7.155)
Iemand heeft elk eiland een naam ge-gev-en
INDF.HUM have:3SG UNIV:DSTR:N.SG island INDF.SG name GE-give-N
'Someone (a particular person) gave each island its name.' (∃ > ∀)
(not: 'Each island was given its name by one person or other') (*∀ > ∃)

But the transitive expletive construction with an indefinite associate also lacks the inverse-scope reading:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.156) Er heeft iemand elk eiland een naam
LOC have:3SG INDF.HUM UNIV:DSTR:N.SG island INDF.SG name
ge-gev-en
GE-give-N
(same as (7.155))

To get the reading of 'Each island was given its name by one person or other,' *elk eiland* 'each island' must be made subject. In that case, the wide-scope reading of the indefinite nonsubject is lost:

(7.157) Elk eiland heeft van iemand een naam
UNIV:DSTR:N.SG island have:3SG of INDF.HUM INDF.SG name
ge-kreg-en
GE-get:PAST-N
'Each island got a name from someone (or other).' (∀ > ∃)
(not: 'There is a particular person that each island got its name from') (*∃ > ∀)

It has been observed for German (e.g. Büring 1997) that inverse scope is facilitated by a particular intonational pattern (pitch rising on the first quantifier and falling back on the second). There is a similar effect in Dutch (7.158b), but the strategy is rarely employed, it seems.

(7.158) a. ?Al-le eiland-en zijn nog niet ontdek-t
all-PL island-PL be:PL still NEG GE:discover-D
'All islands are still undiscovered.' (∀ > ¬)
(not: 'It is still not the case that all islands have been discovered.') (*¬ > ∀)

b. ?… maar[2] al[3]-le[3] ei[3]lan[3]d-en[3] zijn[3] nog[3] niet[4] ont[1]dek-t[1]
but all-PL island-PL be:PL still NEG GE:discover-D
'It is still not the case that all islands have been discovered' (¬ > ∀)
(not: 'All islands are still undiscovered.') (*∀ > ¬)

A fronted quantified expression generally takes scope in the position where its grammatical function is identified (i.e. a fronted object is interpreted for its scope in the object position). This is illustrated in (7.159):

(7.159) a. Tasman gaf al-le Maori-s enkel-e kral-en
Tasman give:PAST.SG all-PL Maori-PL single-PL bead-PL
'Tasman gave all Maoris a few beads.' (∀ > ∃)
(not: 'There were a few beads that Tasman gave to all the Maoris.') (*∃ > ∀)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. En^{2}ke^{2}l-e^{2} kra^{4}l-en^{1} gaf^{1} Tas^{1}man^{1} al^{1}-le^{1} Ma^{1}o^{1}ri-s^{1}
single-PL bead-PL give:PAST.SG Tasman all-PL Maori-PL
'Tasman gave all Maoris a few beads.' (∀ > ∃)
(not: 'There were a few beads that Tasman gave to all the Maoris.') (*∃ > ∀)

The inverse-scope reading can be brought out again by a particular intonational pattern, with pitch rising on *enkele* 'a few' and falling again on *alle* 'all':

(7.160) En^{3}ke^{3}l-e^{3} kra^{3}l-en^{3} gaf^{3} Tas^{3}man^{3} al^{4}-le^{1} Ma^{1}o^{1}ri-s^{1}
single-PL bead-PL give:PAST.SG Tasman all-PL Maori-PL
'There were a few beads that Tasman gave to all the Maoris.' (∃ > ∀)
(not: 'Tasman gave all Maoris a few beads.') (*∀ > ∃)

When a wh-phrase crosses over a quantified noun phrase, ambiguity results:

(7.161) Welk-e kral-en heb-ben al-le Maori-s ge-koz-en ?
which-PL bead-PL have-PL all-PL Maori-PL GE-choose:PAST-N
'Which beads did all Maoris choose?' (*wh* > ∀, ∀ > *wh*)

The question in (7.161) can be felicitously answered by a pair-list, indicating wide scope of the wh-phrase, or by a single answer ('all Maoris picked these beads'), indicating wide scope of the quantified noun phrase.

7.5 Focus and topic

7.5.1 Focus

I use the term 'focus' here to refer to a particular information status signaling that the element 'in focus' is selected over an alternative. In Dutch, focus is expressed through pitch accent. The following examples involve contrastive focus:

(7.162) a. Tas^{4}man^{1} heeft^{1} Tas^{1}ma^{1}ni^{1}ë^{1} ont^{1}dek-t^{1}
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania GE:discover-D
'TASMAN discovered Tasmania (not Cook).'

b. Tas^{2}man^{2} heeft^{2} Tas^{2}ma^{4}ni^{1}ë^{1} ont^{1}dek-t^{1}
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania GE:discover-D
'Tasman discovered TASMANIA (not the Cook Islands).'

c. Tas^{2}man^{2} heeft^{2} Tas^{2}ma^{2}ni^{2}ë^{2} ont^{2}dek-t^{41}
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania GE:discover-D
'Tasman DISCOVERED Tasmania (he didn't just visit there).'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

A special case of contrastive focus is when the pitch accent rests on the auxiliary:

(7.163) Tas²man² heeft⁴ Tas¹ma¹ni¹ë¹ ont¹dek-t¹
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania GE:discover-D
'Tasman DID discover Tasmania.'

Here the entire proposition is selected over the alternative of its opposite (in this case that Tasman did not discover Tasmania), leading to an affirmation of the truth of the statement ('verum focus'). This accent pattern also applies to negative clauses:

(7.164) Tas²man² heeft⁴ Tas¹ma¹ni¹ë¹ niet¹ ont¹dek-t¹
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania NEG GE:discover-D
'Tasman DIDN'T discover Tasmania.'

In contrastive focus ('narrow focus'), the accented element has relatively high pitch, whereas the rest of the clause is pronounced with low and level intonation (i.e. secondary accents are suppressed).

When focus is not contrastive ('wide focus'), the sentence melody is unmarked, in the sense that both primary and secondary accents are heard. In this case, the proposition as a whole is (somewhat trivially) presented as being selected over an alternative. Compare (7.165) to (7.162b):

(7.165) Tas³man³ heeft² Tas²ma⁴ni¹ë¹ ont¹dek-t¹
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania GE:discover-D
'Tasman discovered Tasmania.'

As noted in section 4.3.1, narrow and wide focus can be detected using focus particles like *only* (Dutch *alleen maar*), which allows one to make the alternative explicit. In contrastive focus, only the high pitched element receives an alternative (marked by boldface):

(7.166) Hier² staa-t² al²leen³ maar² dat² Tas²man² Tas²ma⁴ni¹ë¹
LOC:PROX stand-3SG alone just C Tasman Tasmania
ont¹dek-t¹ heeft¹ niet³ dat²-ie² **Aus²tra⁴li¹ë¹**
GE:discover-D have:3SG NEG C-SCL:3SG.M.NOM Australia
ont¹dek-t¹ heeft¹
GE:discover-D have:3SG
'Here it only says that Tasman discovered TASMANIA, not that he discovered Australia.'

In a wide-focus construction, any constituent containing the accented element, up to the entire clause, may receive an alternative:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.167) Hier^{2} staa-t^{2} al^{2}leen^{3} maar^{2} dat^{2} Tas^{2}man^{2} Tas^{2}ma^{4}ni^{1}ë^{1}
LOC:PROX stand-3SG alone just C Tasman Tasmania
ont^{1}dek-t^{1} heeft^{1}
GE:discover-D have:3SG

a. … niet^{3} dat^{2}-ie^{2} **we^{3}reld^{2}-be^{2}roemd^{4}** **is^{1}**
NEG C-SCL:3SG.M.NOM world-famous be:3SG

b. … niet^{3} dat^{2} **Lut^{3}je^{2}gast^{2}** **we^{3}reld^{2}-be^{2}roemd^{4}** **is^{1}**
NEG C Lutjegast world-famous be:3SG
'Here it only says that Tasman discovered TASMANIA, not that {he/ Lutjegast} is world famous.'
(Lutjegast is Tasman's birth place.)

In (7.167a), the focused part is the entire embedded clause save the subject *Tasman*, and hence the alternative leaves the subject unchanged (represented by the unaccented subject clitic *-ie*); in (7.167b), the entire clause is focused, and the alternative is a completely different clause.

Within a phrase, the pitch accent that signals focus falls on the most deeply embedded constituent:

(7.168) a. een^{2} ei^{4}land^{1}
INDF.SG island
'an island'

b. een^{2} ei^{3}land^{2} met^{2} palm^{4}-bo^{1}m-en^{1}
INDF.SG island with palm-tree-PL
'an island with palm trees'

c. een^{2} ei^{3}land^{2} met^{2} palm^{3}-bo^{2}m-en^{2} en^{2} ko^{4}kos^{1}no^{1}t-en^{1}
INDF.SG island with palm-tree-PL and coconut-PL
'an island with palm trees and coconuts'

In wide-focus clauses, the pitch accent therefore falls on the (direct) object, not on the verb (see also (7.165)):

(7.169) a. Tas^{3}man^{3} heeft^{2} een^{2} ei^{4}land^{1} ont^{1}dek-t^{1}
Tasman have:3SG INDF.SG island GE:discover-D
'Tasman discovered an island.'

b. Tas^{3}man^{3} heeft^{2} de^{2} Ma^{2}o^{3}ri-s^{3} kra^{4}l-en^{1} ge^{1}-ge^{1}v-en^{1}
Tasman have:3SG DEF.PL Maori-PL bead-PL GE-give-N
'Tasman gave the maoris beads.'

Extraposition of part of the object does not affect the distribution of the pitch accent:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.170) a. Tas[3]man[3] heeft[2] een[2] ei[3]land[2] met[2] palm[4]bo[1]m-en[1]
Tasman have:3SG INDF.SG island with palmtree-PL
ont[1]dek-t[1]
GE:discover-D

b. Tas[3]man[3] heeft[2] een[2] ei[3]land[3] ont[3]dek-t[3]
Tasman have:3SG INDF.SG island GE:discover-D
met[3] palm[4]bo[1]m-en[1]
with palmtree-PL
(both) 'Tasman discovered an island with palm trees.'

Likewise, a relative clause or complement clause associated with the object will carry the nuclear pitch accent:

(7.171) Tas[3]man[3] heeft[2] een[2] ei[3]land[3] ont[3]dek-t[3] dat[2] vol[3]
Tasman have:3SG INDF.SG island GE:discover-D REL:N.SG full
palm[4]bo[1]m-en[1] staa-t[1]
palmtree-PL stand:3SG
'Tasman discovered an island that is full of palm trees.'

(7.172) Tas[3]man[3] heeft[2] de[2] op[3]dracht[3] ge[3]-kre[3]g-en[3]
Tasman have:3SG DEF.SG assignment GE-get:PAST-N
om[2] het[2] Zuid[4]land[1] te[1] vind[1]-en[1]
C DEF.N.SG South Land to find-INF
'Tasman got the assignment to find the South Land.'

Other elements in the final field (independent complement clauses, adjunct clauses, adjunct PPs) also carry the nuclear pitch accent:

(7.173) a. Tas[3]man[3] heeft[2] be[2]weer-d[3] dat[3] hij[3] het[3]
Tasman have:3SG GE:claim-D C 3SG.M.NOM DEF.N.SG
Zuid[4]land[1] ge[1]-zie-n[1] heeft[1]
South Land GE-see-N have:3SG
'Tasman claimed that he saw the South Land.'

b. Tas[3]man[3] is[2] ge[2]-stor[3]v-en[3] zon[3]der[3] het[3] Zuid[4]land[1]
Tasman be:3SG GE-die:PERF-N without DEF.N.SG South Land
ge[1]-zie-n[1] te[1] heb[1]-ben[1]
GE-see-N to have-INF
'Tasman died without having seen the South Land.'

The object carrying the nuclear pitch accent occupies its normal position in the middle field, i.e. it need not be adjacent to the verb:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.174)

Tas[3]man[3]	heeft[2]	(waarschijnlijk)[2]	Nau[4]ru[1] (waarschijnlijk)[1]	ge[1]-zie-n[1]
Tasman	have:3SG	probably	Nauru	GE-see-N

'Tasman probably saw Nauru.'

However, an object preceding an adverb or a discourse particle is generally interpreted as GIVEN, in which case it is out of focus (not part of the material for which the speaker has an alternative in mind) and deaccented. The pitch accent then falls on some other category, often the verb:

(7.175)

Tas[3]man[3]	heeft[2]	Nau[2]ru[2]	(waar[2]schijn[3]lijk[3])	ge[2]-zie-n[41]
Tasman	have:3SG	Nauru	probably	GE-see-N

'Tasman probably saw Nauru.'

This also occurs when the object is a pronoun:

(7.176)

Tas[3]man[3]	heeft[2]	ze[2]	ge[2]-zie-n[41]
Tasman	have:3SG	3PL	GE-see-N

'Tasman saw them.'

There is a difference, though, because the pitch accent in (7.176) signals wide focus (with the entire clause in focus), whereas the pitch accent in (7.175) signals narrow focus on the verb *gezien* 'seen.'

When a secondary predicate ('Small Clause predicate') or verbal particle is present, the nuclear pitch accent does not shift to the verb but to the predicate or particle:

(7.177)

Die[3]	reis[3]	heeft[2]	Tas[2]man[2]	be[2]roemd[4]	ge[1]-maak-t[1]
DEM:DIST.CG	voyage	have:3SG	Tasman	famous	GE-make-D

'That voyage made Tasman famous.'

(7.178)

Tas[3]man[3]	heeft[2]	de[2]	Ma[2]o[2]ri-s[2]	terug[4]	ge[1]-stuur-d[1]
Tasman	have:3SG	DEF.PL	Maori-PL	back	GE-send-D

'Tasman sent the Maoris back.'

The contrastive pitch accent signaling narrow focus may be carried by two (or more) elements, indicating multiple alternatives:

(7.179)

Tas[4]man[2]	heeft[23]	Tas[3]ma[5]ni[1]ë[1]	ont[1]dek-t[1]
Tasman	have:3SG	Tasmania	GE:discover-D

'Tasman discovered Tasmania (not Cook the Cook Islands).'

This is the construction that gives rise to gapping when the alternative is made explicit:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.180) Tas[4]man[2] heeft[23] Tas[3]ma[5]ni[5]ë[5] ont[5]dek-t[5] en[2] Cook[4] de[4]
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania GE:discover-D and Cook DEF.PL
Cook[5]-ei[1]lan[1]d-en[1]
Cook-island-PL
'Tasman discovered Tasmania and Cook the Cook Islands.'

The intonation pattern of (7.179), with two peaks, must be distinguished from the pattern of (7.181), where the pitch rises on the first of two intonationally prominent elements (*Cook*), climbs even higher on the second (*kralen* 'beads') before falling down again, and stays high in between the two intonationally prominent elements (see Keijsper 1984: 34, Büring 1996: 46):

(7.181) Ik[2] denk[2] dat[2] Cook[4] ze[4] zelfs[4] geen[4] kra[5]l-en[1]
1SG.NOM think:1SG C Cook 3PL even INDF:NEG bead-PL
ge[1]-ge[1]v-en[1] zou[1] heb[1]-ben[1]
GE-give-N MOD:PAST.SG have-INF
'I think that Cook would not even have given them beads.'

This 'flat hat' or 'bridge' pattern combines a topic element (*Cook*) with a (narrow) focus element (*kralen* 'beads'), and relates the two. If the focus element is the subject, and the topic element the object, a reordering takes place that is not otherwise possible in the grammar of Dutch:

(7.182) a. *… dat die kral-en Cook ge-gev-en heeft
C DEM.DIST:PL bead-PL Cook GE-give-N have:3SG
(intended: '… that Cook gave those beads.')

b. … dat[2] zul[4]k-e[4] kra[4]l-en[4] zelfs[4] Cook[5] niet[1] zou[1]
C such-PL bead-PL even Cook NEG MOD:PAST.SG
ge[1]v-en[1]
give-INF
'… that not even Cook would give such beads.'

The pattern in (7.182b) is called 'focus scrambling' in Neeleman (1994a: 395).

In intransitive constructions, the location of the nuclear pitch accent depends on the nature of the verb. With unaccusative verbs, the subject is accented, but with unergative verbs, it is not:

(7.183) a. Tas[4]man[1] is[1] ge[1]-ko[1]m-en[1]
Tasman be:3SG GE-come-N
'Tasman came.'

b. Tas[3]man[3] heeft[2] ge[2]-zwom[4]-men[1]
Tasman have:3SG GE-swim:PAST-N
'Tasman swam.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Particles associated with focus, such as *alleen* 'only' and *zelfs* 'even,' are normally initial to the focused constituent, but may also float further to the right:

(7.184) a. Zelfs[3] Tas[4]man[1] wist[1] er[1] van[1]
even Tasman know:PAST.SG LOC of

b. Tas[4]man[1] wist[1] er[1] zelfs[1] van[1]
Tasman know:PAST.SG LOC even of
(both) 'Even Tasman knew about it.'
(*er* is the locative variant of the 3SG.N pronoun *het* 'it', which is the complement of *van* 'of')

Under conditions that allow Neg-raising (see section 7.3.3), the focus particles may also appear in a matrix clause:

(7.185) Ik[2] {denk / *beweer}[2] zelfs[3] dat[2] Tas[4]man[1] er[1] van[1]
1SG.NOM think:1SG claim:1SG even C Tasman LOC of
wist[1]
know:PAST.SG
'I think/claim that even Tasman knew about it.'

7.5.2 Topic

I use the term 'topic' here to designate a constituent referring to an identifiable entity which the remainder of the clause may be construed as a comment upon. Such constituents are typically definite (or, if not definite, generic/specific), and quite generally demonstrative pronouns.

Topics in Dutch appear in the initial field, triggering subject–verb inversion:

(7.186) a. Dat kon Tasman niet wet-en
DEM:DIST.N.SG MOD:PAST.SG Tasman NEG know-INF
'Tasman could not know that.'

b. Maori-s (die) mocht Tasman niet zo
Maori-PL DEM:DIST.PL like:PAST.SG Tasman NEG such
'Tasman didn't like Maoris much.'

In (7.186a), the topic is the demonstrative pronoun *dat*, in (7.186b) it is the generic plural *Maori's* 'Maoris.' As (7.186b) shows, topics that are not themselves demonstrative pronouns may generally be resumed by a demonstrative pronoun, which is then also fronted.

The fronting illustrated in (7.186) is standardly referred to as topicalization. Topics are not marked by pitch accent, but a topic, like any other element, may be contrastively stressed if necessary:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.187) Ma[2]o[4]ri-s[4] (die[4]) mocht[41] Tas[1]man[1] niet[1] zo[1], maar[1]
Maori-PL DEM:DIST.PL like:PAST.SG Tasman NEG such but
Tas[1]ma[4]ni[4]ër-s[4] wel[41]
Tasmanian-PL AFF
'Tasman didn't like Maoris much, but he did Tasmanians.'

Topicalization in embedded clause is restricted to the 'focus scrambling' type in (7.182b).

Topics are easily dropped:

(7.188) (Dat) wist ik niet
DEM.DIST:N.SG know:PAST.SG 1SG.NOM NEG
'I didn't know.'

Not all clause-initial elements are topics in the sense in which the term is used here. Elements of temporal and locative deixis and adverbs/adverbials also occur in initial position (and also trigger subject–verb inversion). In the spoken language, when such elements compete with a topic for the first position, an apokoinou construction may result, where the finite verb follows both the initial element and the topic (and hence appears twice):

(7.189)
Dan **was** je tegenstander die **was** neer
then be:PAST.SG POSS:2SG opponent DEM.DIST:CG be:PAST.SG down
'Then your opponent was down.'

In the literature on Dutch, sometimes reference is made to an alternative to topicalization, where the fronted element is resumed by a personal pronoun *in situ* ('hanging topic left dislocation'):

(7.190) (*)Tasman, ik ken hem niet
Tasman 1SG.NOM know:1SG 3SG.M.OBJ NEG
'Tasman, I don't know him.'

This construction does not appear to be actually used by speakers of Dutch.

7.6 Wh-movement

7.6.1 Fronting of interrogative elements

Interrogative pronouns and phrases in Dutch are fronted:

(7.191) a. Tasman heeft **in** **1642** Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG in 1642 New Zealand GE:discover-D
'Tasman discovered New Zealand in 1642.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. **Wanneer** heeft Tasman Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t?
Q:TEMP have:3SG Tasman New Zealand GE:discover-D
'When did Tasman discover New Zealand?'

This happens in both main (7.191b) and embedded clauses (7.192):

(7.192) a. Hier staa-t dat Tasman **in 1642** Nieuw Zeeland
DEM.LOC:PROX stand-3SG C Tasman in 1642 New Zealand
ontdek-t heeft
GE:discover-D have:3SG
'Here it says that Tasman discovered New Zealand in 1642.'

b. Hier staa-t niet **wanneer** Tasman Nieuw Zeeland
DEM.LOC:PROX stand-3SG NEG Q:TEMP Tasman New Zealand
ontdek-t heeft
GE:discover-D have:3SG
'Here it doesn't say when Tasman discovered New Zealand.'

When two interrogative elements are present, only one can be fronted:

(7.193) a. Tasman heeft **in 1642 Nieuw Zeeland** ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG in 1642 New Zealand GE:discover-D
'Tasman discovered New Zealand in 1642.'

b. **Wanneer** heeft Tasman **wat** ontdek-t?
Q:TEMP have:3SG Tasman Q:INAN GE:discover-D
'When did Tasman discover what?'

c. **Wat** heeft Tasman **wanneer** ontdek-t?
Q:INAN have:3SG Tasman Q:TEMP GE:discover-D
'What did Tasman discover when?'

d. *__Wanneer__ **wat** heeft Tasman ontdek-t?
Q:TEMP Q:INAN have:3SG Tasman GE:discover-D

Dutch does not have a strategy of salvaging multiple fronting via coordination:

(7.194) *__Wanneer__ **en wat** heeft Tasman ontdek-t?
Q:TEMP and Q:INAN have:3SG Tasman GE:discover-D
(intended: 'When did Tasman discover what?')

A phrase containing an interrogative element may be fronted along with the interrogative element ('pied-piping'):

(7.195) a. Tasman heeft **de hoofdman van die Maori-s**
Tasman have:3SG DEF.SG chief of DEM:DIST.PL Maori-PL

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

begroet
GE:greet:D
'Tasman greeted the chief of those Maoris.'

b. **Van welk-e Maori-s** heeft Tasman de hoofdman
of which-PL Maori-PL have:3SG Tasman DEF.SG chief
begroet?
GE:greet:D
'Which Maoris did Tasman greet the chief of?'

c. **De hoofdman van welk-e Maori-s** heeft Tasman
DEF.CG.SG chief of which-PL Maori-PL have:3SG Tasman
begroet?
GE:greet:D
'The chief of which Maoris did Tasman greet?'

When the interrogative element is a specifier, pied-piping is obligatory:

(7.196) a. **Welk-e Maori-s** heeft Tasman begroet?
which-PL Maori-PL have:3SG Tasman GE:greet:D
'Which Maoris did Tasman greet?'

b. ***Welk-e** heeft Tasman **Maori-s** begroet?
which-PL have:3SG Tasman Maori-PL GE:greet:D

As we have seen (sections 2.2, 5.5), the pronominal complement of a (core) adposition takes on locative morphology. When questioned, the locative morphology remains:

(7.197) a. Tasman had **er** niet **op** ge-reken-d
Tasman have:PST.SG LOC NEG up GE-count-D
'Tasman had not counted on it.'
(*op het* 'on it' > *er op*)

b. **Waar** had Tasman niet **op** ge-reken-d?
Q:LOC have:PAST.SG Tasman NEG up GE-count-D
'What is it that Tasman hadn't counted on?'

When the complement of the adposition does not take on locative morphology (e.g. with [+HUMAN] pronouns), the adposition is again pied-piped:

(7.198) a. Tasman had niet **op ze** ge-reken-d
Tasman have:PAST.SG NEG up 3PL GE-count-D
'Tasman had not counted on them.'

b. **Op wie** had Tasman niet ge-reken-d?
up Q:HUM have:PAST.SG Tasman NEG GE-count-D
'Who is it that Tasman hadn't counted on?'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

In complex clauses, an interrogative element belonging to the embedded clause is fronted in the matrix clause:

(7.199) a. Cook dacht dat Tasman **Nieuw Zeeland** ontdek-t
Cook think:PAST.SG C Tasman New Zealand GE:discover-D
had
have:PAST.SG
'Cook thought that Tasman had discovered New Zealand.'

b. **Welk land** dacht Cook dat Tasman ontdek-t
which:N.SG land think:PAST.SG Cook C Tasman GE:discover-D
had?
have:PAST.SG
'Which country did Cook think that Tasman had discovered?'

Dutch lacks the 'partial movement' strategy, where an invariant operator occupies the first position of the main clause, and the interrogative element appears in the leftmost position of the embedded clause.

When an interrogative element moves from an embedded clause to the matrix clause, the declarative complementizer *dat* may be supplemented with the interrogative complementizer *of*:

(7.200) a. Cook dacht (*of) dat Tasman **Nieuw Zeeland**
Cook think:PAST.SG C:INT C:DECL Tasman New Zealand
ontdek-t had
GE:discover-D have:PAST.SG
'Cook thought that Tasman had discovered New Zealand.'

b. **Welk land** dacht Cook (of) dat
which:N.SG land think:PAST.SG Cook C:INT C:DECL
Tasman ontdek-t had?
Tasman GE:discover-D have:PAST.SG
'Which country did Cook think that Tasman had discovered?'

This is not possible with fronting of noninterrogative material ('topicalization,' section 7.5.2):

(7.201) In 1642 dacht ik (*of) dat Tasman
in 1642 think:PAST.SG 1SG.NOM C:INT C:DECL Tasman
Nieuw Zeeland ontdek-t had
New Zealand GE:discover-D have:PAST.SG
'It's in 1642 that I thought that Tasman discovered New Zealand.'

Likewise, addition of *of* is excluded in relative clauses, regardless of the (demonstrative or interrogative) morphology of the relative pronoun:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.202) Nieuw Zeeland is het land dat/wat ik
New Zealand be:3SG DEF.N.SG land REL:N.SG 1SG.NOM
dacht (*of) dat Tasman ontdek-t had
think:PAST.SG C:INT C:DECL Tasman GE:discover-D have:PAST.SG
'New Zealand is the land that I thought Tasman had discovered.'

It has been observed that in actual spoken and written Dutch, long-distance fronting is rare outside the context of chunks like *denk je* 'do you think' (Verhagen 2005).

7.6.2 *Conditions on wh-movement*

For ease of presentation, the relation between a fronted interrogative expression and the position in which it would occur when not interrogative (or when some other interrogative element is fronted, as in (7.193)) is described as a movement relation, and the original position of the moved element is described as a gap ([e]). Conditions on wh-fronting can then be described as conditions on the relation between the moved element and the gap. In this subsection I briefly review these conditions as they apply to Dutch.

Coordinate structure

A gap of a moved wh-phrase may not be (part of) a member of a coordinate structure:

(7.203) a. Tasman heeft **Tasmanië en Nieuw Zeeland** ontdek-t
Tasman have:3SG Tasmania and New Zealand GE:discover-D
'Tasman discovered Tasmania and New Zealand.'

b. ***Welk land** heeft Tasman **Tasmanië en [e]**
which land have:3SG Tasman Tasmania and GAP
ontdek-t?
GE:discover-D
(intended: 'Which land did Tasman discover in addition to Tasmania?')

c. ***Welk eiland** heeft Tasman **[e] en Nieuw Zeeland**
which island have:3SG Tasman GAP and New Zealand
ontdek-t?
GE:discover-D
(intended: 'Which island did Tasman discover in addition to New Zealand?')

Subject island

A phrase with the grammatical function of subject may not contain a gap associated with a fronted wh-expression:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.204) a. [Dat Tasman **Tasmanië** ontdek-t heeft]
C Tasman Tasmania GE:discover-D have:3SG
is algemeen bekend
be:3SG general known
'That Tasman discovered Tasmania is commonly known.'

b. ***Welk eiland** is [dat Tasman **[e]** ontdek-t
which island be:3SG C Tasman GAP GE:discover-D
heeft] algemeen bekend?
have:3SG general known
(intended: 'Of which island is it commonly known that Tasman discovered it?')

In (7.204b), the gap is contained in a subject clause. When the subject position is occupied by expletive *het*, the clause appears in extraposition and remains opaque:

(7.205) a. Het is algemeen bekend
3SG:INAN be:3SG general known
[dat Tasman **Tasmanië** ontdek-t heeft]
C Tasman Tasmania GE:discover-D have:3SG
'It is commonly known that Tasman discovered Tasmania.'

b. ***Welk eiland** is het algemeen bekend
which island be:3SG 3SG:INAN general known
[dat Tasman **[e]** ontdek-t heeft]?
C Tasman GAP GE:discover-D have:3SG
(intended: 'Which island is it of which it is commonly known that Tasman discovered it?')

In contrast, complement clauses may host a gap:

(7.206) a. De VOC maak-te bekend
DEF.SG VOC make-PAST.SG known
[dat Tasman **Tasmanië** ontdek-t heeft]
C Tasman Tasmania GE:discover-D have:3SG
'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] announced that Tasman discovered Tasmania.'

b. **Welk eiland** maak-te de VOC bekend
which island make-PAST.SG DEF.SG VOC known
[dat Tasman **[e]** ontdek-t heeft]?
C Tasman GAP GE:discover-D have:3SG
'Which island did the VOC announce that Tasman discovered it?'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Noun phrase island

A clause contained within a noun phrase is opaque:

(7.207) a. De VOC heeft [het gerucht
DEF.SG VOC have:3SG DEF.N.SG rumor
[dat Tasman **Tasmanië** ontdek-t heeft]]
C Tasman Tasmania GE:discover-D have:3SG
bevestig-d
GE:confirm-D
'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] confirmed the rumor that Tasman discovered Tasmania.'

b. ***Welk eiland** heeft de VOC [het gerucht
which island have:3SG DEF.SG VOC DEF.N.SG rumor
[dat Tasman **[e]** ontdek-t heeft]] bevestig-d?
C Tasman GAP GE:discover-D have:3SG GE:confirm-D
(intended: 'Which island is it that the VOC confirmed the rumor that Tasman discovered it?')

This is also true if the clause appears in extraposition (see also (7.205)):

(7.208)
***Welk eiland** heeft de VOC het gerucht bevestig-d
which island have:3SG DEF.SG VOC DEF.N.SG rumor GE:confirm-D
[dat Tasman **[e]** ontdek-t heeft]?
C Tasman GAP GE:discover-D have:3SG
(intended: same as (7.207b))

The definiteness of the noun phrase does not appear to be a factor determining opacity here:

(7.209) ***Welk eiland** heeft de VOC [gerucht-en
which island have:3SG DEF.SG VOC rumor-PL
[dat Tasman **[e]** ontdek-t heeft]] verspreid?
C Tasman GAP GE:discover-D have:3SG GE:spread:D
(intended: 'Which island is it that the VOC [Dutch East India Company] spread rumors that Tasman discovered it?')

Definite noun phrases appear to be opaque more generally:

(7.210) a. Cook vond [die boek-en **over** **Tasmanië**]
Cook find:PAST.SG DEM.DIST:PL book-PL about Tasmania
onbetaalbaar
unpayable
'Cook found those books about Tasmania too expensive.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. *__Over welk eiland__ vond Cook
about which island find:PAST.SG Cook
[die boek-en **[e]**] onbetaalbaar?
DEM.DIST:PL book-PL GAP unpayable
(intended: 'Which island is it that Cook found those books about it too expensive?')

Seeming exceptions like (7.211) apparently allow a construal of the fronted PP with some element outside the noun phrase:

(7.211) a. Cook heeft alleen de zuidelijk-e eiland-en
Cook have:3SG alone DEF.PL southern-PL island-PL
van de Cook-eilanden bezocht
of DEF.PL Cook-Islands GE:visit:PAST:D
'Cook only visited the southern islands of the Cook islands.'

b. **Van welk-e eiland-en** heeft Cook alleen
of which-PL island-PL have:3SG Cook alone
de zuidelijk-e eiland-en **[e]** bezocht?
DEF.PL southern-PL island-PL GAP GE:visit:PAST:D
'Of which islands did Cook only visit the southern islands?'

In (7.211a), *van de Cook-eilanden* 'of the Cook Islands' can also be placed in front of *alleen de zuidelijke eilanden* 'only the southern islands' (7.211b), and *de zuidelijke eilanden* 'the southern islands' can be replaced by a name (7.211c):

(7.212) a. Cook heeft van de Cook-eilanden alleen
Cook have:3SG of DEF.PL Cook-Islands alone
de zuidelijk-e eiland-en bezocht
DEF.PL southern-PL island-PL GE:visit:PAST:D
(same as (7.211a))

b. Cook heeft (alleen Rarotonga) van de
Cook have:3SG alone Rarotonga of DEF.PL
Cook-eilanden (alleen Rarotonga) bezocht
Cook-Islands alone Rarotonga GE:visit:PAST:D
'Of the Cook Islands, Cook visited only Rarotonga.'

This loose construction of the PP is not possible in (7.210), unless the predicate is replaced by one which the PP can be easily construed with:

(7.213) a. *Cook vond over Tasmanië die boek-en
Cook find:PAST.SG about Tasmania DEM.DIST:PL book-PL
onbetaalbaar
unpayable
(intended: 'Cook found those books about Tasmania too expensive.')

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

b. Cook heeft (over Tasmanië) die boek-en
Cook have about Tasmania DEM.DIST:PL book-PL
(over Tasmanië) ge-lez-en
about Tasmania GE-read-N
'About Tasmania, Cook read these books.'

The minimal pair in (7.214) suggests that indefinite noun phrases are opaque in a way similar to definite noun phrases:

(7.214) **Over welk eiland** heeft Cook een boek
about which island have:3SG Cook INDF.SG book
{ge-lez-en/*verlor-en}?
GE-read-N GE:lose:PAST-N
(intended: 'Which island did Cook read/lose a book about?')

Over welk eiland 'about which island' allows a construal with *gelezen* 'read' but not with *verloren* 'lost.' The fact that wh-fronting is possible only when construal with an element outside the noun phrase *een boek* 'a book' is possible, indicates that the wh-element is not associated with a noun-phrase-internal gap in these cases, suggesting that noun phrases in Dutch are generally opaque (see further section 12.1.3).

Adjunct island

A gap associated with a fronted wh-expression may not be contained within an adjunct clause:

(7.215) a. Tasman vond Tasmanië [toen hij
Tasman find:PAST.SG Tasmania then 3SG.M.NOM
het Zuidland zocht]
DEF.N.SG South Land seek:PAST.SG
'Tasman found Tasmania when he was looking for the South Land.'

b. ***Welk land** vond Tasman Tasmanië
which land find:PAST.SG Tasman Tasmania
[toen hij **[e]** zocht]?
then 3SG.M.NOM GAP seek:PAST.SG
(intended: 'Which land is such that Tasman found Tasmania while he was looking for it?')

This judgment on the opacity of adjunct clauses is much starker than the judgments on the opacity of subject clauses and noun phrases more generally, and has about the same status as the judgment on the opacity of coordinate structures.

Nonfinite adjunct clauses are no different:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.216) a. Tasman vond Tasmanië [door **het**
Tasman find:PAST.SG Tasmania through DEF.N.SG
Zuidland te zoek-en]
South Land to seek-INF
'Tasman found Tasmania by looking for the South Land.'

b. *__Welk land__ vond Tasman Tasmanië
which land find:PAST.SG Tasman Tasmania
[door **[e]** te zoek-en]?
through GAP to seek-INF
(intended: 'Which land is such that Tasman found Tasmania while he was looking for it?')

In contrast, adjunct PPs seem transparent:

(7.217) a. Die kokosnot-en war-en voor **de** **lunch**
DEM.DIST:PL coconut-PL be:PAST-PL for DEF.SG lunch
'Those coconuts were intended for lunch.'

b. **Waar** war-en die kokosnot-en voor **[e]**?
Q.LOC be:PAST-PL DEM.DIST:PL coconut-PL for GAP
'What were these coconuts intended for?'
(*waar* is the locative counterpart of the INAN.SG interrogative pronoun *wat* 'what'; NB the gap is wrongly placed, see below)

However, (7.217b) must be related to (7.218a), not to (7.217a), because the locative morphology is not brought about by fronting but by the dissociation of the preposition and its complement (preposition stranding). As the nonadjacency of *daar* 'that' (lit. 'there') and *voor* 'for' in (7.218b) shows, there is no reason for positing the gap internal to the PP (making the representation in (7.217b) erroneous in this respect).

(7.218) a. Die kokosnot-en war-en **daar** voor
DEM.DIST:PL coconut-PL be:PAST-PL DEM.DIST:LOC for
'Those coconuts were intended for that.'

b. Die kokosnot-en war-en **daar** niet voor
DEM.DIST:PL coconut-PL be:PAST-PL DEM.DIST:LOC NEG for
'Those coconuts were not intended for that.'

To find out about the transparency of adjunct PPs, then, one needs to consider constructions where preposition stranding is not an option, such as the complex PP in (7.219). As (7.219b) shows, complex adjunct PPs may not contain a gap associated with the fronted wh-expression:

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.219) a. Die kokosnot-en zijn voor **bij** **de** **lunch**
DEM.DIST:PL coconut-PL be:PL for by DEF.SG lunch
'Those coconuts were intended for lunch.'
(lit. 'for at lunch')

b. ***Bij** **welk-e** **maaltijd** zijn die kokosnot-en
by which-CG.SG meal be:PL DEM.DIST:PL coconut-PL
voor **[e]**?
for GAP
(intended: 'Which meal are these coconuts intended for?')

Weak islands

Weak islands are domains which may contain a gap associated with a fronted complement, but not a gap associated with a fronted adjunct (see Cinque 1990: 161 note 2). The argument/adjunct asymmetry is felt to some extent in Dutch as well, but judgments are subtle and the dominant feeling appears to be that the relevant extractions are impossible.

Embedded interrogatives constitute a weak island ('wh-island'):

(7.220) a. De Hawaïan-en vroeg-en Cook waarom hij
DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL ask:PAST-PL Cook why 3SG.M.NOM
het heiligdom vernietig-d had
DEF:DEF.N.SG sanctuary GE:destroy-D have:PAST.SG
'The Hawaiians asked Cook why he had destroyed the sanctuary.'

b. ***Welk** **heiligdom** vroeg-en de Hawaïan-en Cook
which sanctuary ask:PAST-PL DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL Cook
waarom hij **[e]** vernietig-d had?
why 3SG.M.NOM GAP GE-destroy-D have:PAST.SG
(intended: 'Which sanctuary is it that the Hawaiians asked Cook why he had destroyed it?')

(7.221) a. De Hawaïan-en vroeg-en Cook welk heiligdom
DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL ask:PAST-PL Cook which sanctuary
hij met vuur vernietig-d had
3SG.M.NOM with fire GE:destroy-D have:PAST.SG
'The Hawaiians asked Cook which sanctuary he had destroyed by fire.'

b. ***Hoe** vroeg-en de Hawaïan-en Cook welk heiligdom
how ask:PAST-PL DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL Cook which sanctuary
hij **[e]** vernietig-d had?
3SG.M.NOM GAP GE:destroy-D have:PAST.SG

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(intended: 'Which way is it that the Hawaiians asked Cook why he had destroyed the sanctuary in that way?')

The argument/adjunct asymmetry characteristic of weak island effects is present in that (7.220b) is more readily interpretable than (7.221b), but both examples are ungrammatical.

Complements of factive verbs also constitute weak islands ('factive islands'). Compare:

(7.222) a. De Hawaïan-en {zei-den/ betreur-d-en} dat Cook
DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL say:PAST-PL regret-PAST-PL C Cook
het heiligdom met vuur vernietig-d had
DEF.N.SG sanctuary with fire GE:destroy-D have:PAST.SG
'The Hawaiians said/regretted that Cook had destroyed the sanctuary by fire.'

b. **Welk heiligdom** {zei-den/ betreur-d-en} de
which sanctuary say:PAST-SG regret-PAST-SG DEF.PL
Hawaïan-en dat Cook **[e]** met vuur vernietig-d
Hawaiian-PL C Cook GAP with fire GE:destroy-D
had?
have:PAST.SG
'Which sanctuary did the Hawaiians say/regret that Cook destroyed by fire?'

c. **Hoe** {zei-den/ *betreur-d-en} de Hawaïan-en
how say:PAST-SG regret-PAST-SG DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL
dat Cook het heiligdom **[e]** vernietig-d had?
C Cook DEF.N.SG sanctuary GAP ge:destroy-d have:PAST.SG
(intended: 'Which is the manner such that the Hawaiians said/regretted that Cook destroyed the sanctuary in that manner?')

In (7.222) a comparison is made between extraction out of the complement of verbs of saying (*zeggen* 'say') and out of the complement of factive verbs (*betreuren* 'regret'), and between extraction of arguments and adjuncts. Here again an argument/adjunct asymmetry is visible in that extraction of arguments out of factive complements (7.222b) is fine, whereas extraction of adjuncts out of factive complements (7.222c) is bad. With verbs of saying, both types of extraction are fine.

Embedded clauses associated with the pronoun *het* 'it' also constitute weak islands ('extraposition island'):

(7.223) a. Cook vond het tijd om het heiligdom
Cook find:PAST.SG 3SG.N time C DEF.N.SG sanctuary

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

met vuur te vernietig-en
with fire to destroy-INF
'Cook thought it was time to destroy the sanctuary by fire.'

b. ?**Welk heiligdom** vond Cook het tijd om **[e]**
which sanctuary find:PAST.SG Cook 3SG.N time C GAP
met vuur te vernietig-en?
with fire to destroy-INF
'Which sanctuary did Cook think it was time to destroy by fire?'

c. ***Hoe** vond Cook het tijd om het
how find:PAST.SG Cook 3SG.N time C DEF.N.SG
heiligdom **[e]** te vernietig-en?
sanctuary GAP to destroy-INF
(intended: 'What is the manner such that Cook thought it was time to destroy the sanctuary in that manner?')

Clauses associated with *het* 'it' are often backgrounded, witness their low and level intonation. In those cases, the argument/adjunct asymmetry disappears, as both types of extraction are impossible:

(7.224) a. De^{2} Ha^{2} wa^{2} ïa^{3}n-en^{2} had^{2}-den^{2} het^{2} ge^{2}-zie-n^{41}
DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL have:PAST-PL 3SG.N GE-see-N
dat^{1} Cook^{1} het^{1} hei^{1} lig^{1} dom^{1} met^{1} vuur^{1} ver^{1} nie^{1} tig^{1}-de^{1}
C Cook DEF.N.SG sanctuary with fire destroy-PAST.SG
'The Hawaïans had seen it, that Cook destroyed the sanctuary by fire.'

b. ***Welk**^{3} **hei**^{3}**lig**^{3}**dom**^{3} had^{3}-den^{3} de^{3} Ha^{3}wa^{3}ïa^{3}n-en^{3} het^{3}
which sanctuary have:PAST-PL DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL 3SG.N
ge^{3}-zie-n^{41} dat^{1} Cook^{1} **[e]** met^{1} vuur^{1} ver^{1} nie^{1} tig^{1}-de^{13}?
GE-see-N C Cook GAP with fire destroy-PAST.SG
(intended: 'Which sanctuary is it that the Hawaiians witnessed it that Cook destroyed it by fire?')

c. ***Hoe**^{3} had^{3}-den^{3} de^{3} Ha^{3}wa^{3}ïa^{3}n-en^{3} het^{3} ge^{3}-zie-n^{41}
how have:PAST-PL DEF.PL Hawaiian-PL 3SG.N GE-see-N
dat^{1} Cook^{1} het^{1} hei^{1} lig^{1} dom^{1} **[e]** ver^{1} nie^{1} tig^{1}-de^{13}?
C Cook DEF.N.SG sanctuary GAP destroy-PAST.SG
(intended: 'Which is the manner such that the Hawaiians witnessed it that Cook destroyed the sanctuary in that manner?')
(NB (7.222c) without the indicated gap has an irrelevant grammatical reading in which *hoe* 'how' is construed with the matrix verb *zien* 'see,' yielding *How did the Hawaiians witness that Cook destroyed the sanctuary?*)

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

A final context constituting weak islands involves simple negative clauses. Here the asymmetry between argument and adjunct extraction appears to be quite weak:

(7.225) a. Cook heeft het heiligdom niet met vuur vernietig-d
Cook have:3SG DEF.N.SG sanctuary NEG with fire GE:destroy-D
'Cook did not destroy the sanctuary by fire.'

b. **Welk heiligdom** heeft Cook **[e]** niet met vuur
which sanctuary have:3SG Cook GAP NEG with fire
vernietig-d?
GE:destroy-D
'Which sanctuary did Cook not destroy by fire?'

c. ?**Hoe** heeft Cook het heiligdom niet **[e]**
how have:3SG Cook DEF.N.SG sanctuary NEG GAP
vernietig-d?
GE:destroy-D
(intended: 'What is the manner such that Cook did not destroy the sanctuary in that manner?')

Left branch

Dutch does not allow a gap associated with a fronted wh-expression to occur in the possessor position of a noun phrase, obeying the Left Branch Condition of Ross (1967: 114):

(7.226) a. Cook had **Tasman-s** journaal ge-lez-en
Cook have:PAST.SG Tasman-POSS:M log GE-read-N
'Cook had read Tasman's log.'

b. ***Wie-z'n** had Cook **[e]** journaal ge-lez-en?
Q:HUM-POSS:M have:PAST.SG Cook GAP log GE-read-N
(intended: 'Whose log had Cook read?')

To question a possessor, the entire possessive noun phrase must be fronted (*pied-piping*):

(7.227) **Wie-z'n** **journaal** had Cook **[e]** ge-lez-en?
Q:HUM-POSS:M log have:PAST.SG Cook GAP GE-read-N
'Whose log had Cook read?'

Nevertheless, Dutch shows extraction out of the left branch of a nominal constituent in at least two cases (as studied extensively in Corver 1990): *wat voor*-split (7.228b) and measure/degree phrase extraction (7.230c, 7.231c).

(7.228) a. **Wat** **voor** **(een)** **journaal** had Cook **[e]**
Q:INAN for INDF.SG log have:PAST.SG Cook GAP

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

ge-lez-en?
GE-read-N
'What kind of log had Cook read?'

b. **Wat** had Cook **[e]** voor (een) journaal
Q:INAN have:PAST.SG Cook GAP for INDF.SG log
ge-lez-en?
GE-read-N
(same as a.)

As (7.228) shows, the expression *wat voor X* 'what kind of X' in Dutch can be fronted by pied-piping, or can be split, with only the element *wat* 'what' fronting. On most analyses (including Bennis 1983 and 1995, Den Besten 1985, but not Reuland 1983 and Corver 1990), *wat* is a left-branch modifier of the *wat voor*-phrase, making (7.228b) an example of left-branch extraction.

As discussed by De Hoop (1992: 182f), *wat voor*-split also occurs with scrambled objects and with noun phrases associated with expletive *er*:

(7.229) a. **Wat** heeft Tasman **[e]** voor matroz-en gisteren
Q:INAN have:3SG Tasman GAP for sailor-PL yesterday
aan land ge-stuur-d?
on land GE-send-D
'What kind of sailors did Tasman send ashore yesterday?'

b. **Wat** heb-ben er gisteren **[e]** voor matroz-en
Q:INAN have-PL LOC yesterday GAP for sailor-PL
kokosnot-en verzamel-d?
coconut-PL GE:collect-D
'What kind of sailors were collecting coconuts yesterday?'

If noun phrases that are not adjacent to the verb in final position are on left branches in the structure of the Dutch clause, as seems reasonable, the *wat voor*-split test indicates that extraction out of left-branch elements is (quite generally) possible in Dutch.

Left-branch extraction involving adjective/degree phrases is illustrated in (7.230–231).

(7.230) a. Het eiland was erg goed bereikbaar
DEF.N.SG island be:PAST.SG very good reachable
'The island could be reached very easily.'

b. **Hoe goed bereikbaar** was het eiland **[e]**?
how good reachable be:PAST.SG DEF.N.SG island GAP
'How easily could the island be reached?'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

c. **Hoe** **goed** was het eiland **[e]** bereikbaar?
how good be:PAST.SG DEF.N.SG island GAP reachable
(same as b.)

(7.231) a. Cook leef-de vel-e jar-en lat-er dan Tasman
Cook live:PAST.SG many-PL year-PL late-CMP than Tasman
'Cook lived many years later than Tasman.'

b. **Hoe-veel** **jar-en** **lat-er** **dan** **Tasman** leef-de
how-many year-PL late-CMP than Tasman live:PAST.SG
Cook **[e]**?
Cook GAP
'How many years later than Tasman did Cook live?'

c. **Hoe-veel** **jar-en** leef-de Cook **[e]** lat-er dan
how-many year-PL live-PAST.SG Cook GAP late-CMP than
Tasman?
Tasman
(same as b.)

In (7.230), the adjective *bereikbaar* 'reachable' is modified by the degree phrase *erg goed* 'very well.' Questioning the degree phrase can be done by pied-piping the entire adjective phrase (7.230b) or by subextracting the degree phrase from the adjective phrase (7.230c). In (7.231), the adjective *laat* 'late' appears in the comparative form *later*, which leads Corver (1990) to analyze the adjective phrase as a whole as a Degree Phrase (see section 12.1.2). *Vele jaren* 'many years,' then, is a modifier of this Degree Phrase, and may be questioned, again, by either pied-piping (7.231b) or subextraction (7.231c).

7.6.3 Gaps

This section contains some observations relating to the gaps left behind under wh-movement.

Complementizer–gap phenomena

First of all, a gap in subject position may cooccur with a complementizer:

(7.232)
Wie dacht je dat **[e]** Tasmanië ontdek-t had?
who think:PAST.SG 2SG C GAP Tasmania GE:discover-D have:PAST.SG
'Who did you think discovered Tasmania?'

(7.233) Cook wist niet **wie** of **[e]** Tasmanië
Cook know:PAST.SG NEG who C:INT GAP Tasmania

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

ontdekt-t had
GE:discover-D have:PAST.SG
'Cook didn't know who discovered Tasmania.'

With intransitive embedded clauses, something like a '*that*-trace effect' (illegitimacy of a complementizer–subject gap combination) appears to show up:

(7.234) %**Welk eiland** dacht Cook dat **[e]**
which island think:PAST.SG Cook C GAP
verdwen-en was?
GE:disappear:PAST-N be:PAST.SG
'Which island did Cook think had vanished?'

Judgments have been reported to vary on the status of cases like (7.234), giving rise to a stratification of Dutch into two variants, Dutch A, where (7.234) is judged acceptable, and Dutch B, where it is not (see Maling and Zaenen 1978, Pesetsky 1982: 311). For speakers who do not accept (7.234), the '*that*-trace effect' disappears after insertion of the locative expletive *er* (or other adverbial material; see Reuland 1985):

(7.235) **Welk eiland** dacht Cook dat er **[e]**
which island think:PAST.SG Cook C LOC GAP
verdwen-en was?
GE:disappear:PAST-N be:PAST.SG
(same as (7.234))

Maling and Zaenen (1978) find that speakers' judgments on (7.234–235) covary with their judgments on impersonal passives with or without *er*:

(7.236) Gisteren werd (er) door het hel-e
yesterday PASS.AUX:PAST.SG LOC by DEF.N.SG whole-DEF.SG
dorp ge-dans-t en ge-zong-en
village GE-dance-D and GE -sing:PAST-N
'Yesterday there was singing and dancing by the entire village.'

This suggests that the Dutch A/B distinction reflects inter-speaker variation in the distribution of expletives, and is not directly related to the setting of a *that*-trace (or 'null subject') parameter (see Koster 1987: 206).

Parasitic gap phenomena

Parasitic gaps (gaps occurring in the context of another gap, as in English *Which papers did you file [e] without reading [e]?*) in Dutch are generally considered to be more marginal than in English (e.g. Neeleman 1994a: 400). Parasitic gaps can be found in the context of a gap associated with a fronted wh-expression

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(or 'topic,' or relative pronoun) (7.237), but also in the context of a (shifted) noun phrase in the middle field (7.238).

(7.237) **Welk eiland** is Tasman zonder [e] te bezoek-en **[e]**
which island be:3SG Tasman without PGAP to visit-INF GAP
voor-bij ge-var-en?
fore-by GE-sail-N
'Which island did Tasman sail by without visiting?'
(NB *bezoeken* 'visit' is an obligatorily transitive verb.)

(7.238) Tasman is het eiland zonder [e] te bezoek-en
Tasman be:3SG DEF.N.SG island without PGAP? to visit-INF
voor-bij ge-var-en
fore-by GE-sail-N
'Tasman sailed by the island without visiting it.'

In (7.237), the boldface gap is associated with the fronted wh-expression, making the gap in the adjunct clause *zonder [e] te bezoeken* 'without visiting' a parasitic gap (PGAP). If the gap in (7.238) is similar to the parasitic gap in (7.237), *het eiland* 'the island' in (7.238) must have been moved in a way similar to *welk eiland* 'which island' in (7.237) suggesting the presence of a gap as indicated in (7.239), on which the gap in the adjunct clause 'parasitizes' (Bennis and Hoekstra 1984).

(7.239) Tasman is **het eiland** zonder [e] te bezoek-en **[e]**
Tasman be:3SG DEF.N.SG island without PGAP to visit-INF GAP
voor-bij ge-var-en
fore-by GE-sail-N
'Tasman sailed by the island without visiting it.'

The difference between the parasitic gaps and the other gaps is that the parasitic gaps may be filled by weak pronouns:

(7.240) **Welk eiland** is Tasman zonder (het) te bezoek-en {**[e]** / *het}
which island be:3SG Tasman without 3SG:N to visit-INF GAP / 3SG:N
voor-bij ge-var-en?
fore-by GE-sail-N
'Which island did Tasman sail by without visiting?'

(7.241) Tasman is **het eiland** zonder (het) te bezoek-en
Tasman be:3SG DEF.N.SG island without 3SG:N to visit-INF
{**[e]** / *het} voor-bij ge-var-en
GAP / 3SG:N fore-by GE-sail-N
'Tasman sailed by the island without visiting it.'

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Gaps similar to parasitic gaps are also found in passive constructions (7.242) and in nominal infinitives (7.243) (see Neeleman 1994b: 90, attributing the observations to De Hoop and Kosmeijer [1992] and Den Dikken and T. Hoekstra [personal communication]):

(7.242) Zulk-e eiland-en word-en altijd zonder [e] te bezoek-en
such-PL island-PL PASS.AUX-PL always without GAP to visit-INF
voor-bij ge-var-en
fore-by GE-sail-N
'Such islands are always sailed by without visiting them.'

(7.243) De VOC verbood Tasman het zonder [e] te
DEF.SG VOC prohibit:PAST.SG Tasman DEF.N.SG without GAP to
bezoek-en voor-bij var-en van onbekend-e eiland-en
visit-INF fore-by sail-INF of unknown-PL island-PL
'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] forbade Tasman to sail by unknown islands without visiting them.'

Since English lacks parasitic gaps in constructions like (7.238), (7.242), and (7.243), it may be that these examples represent a different kind of phenomenon (see Huybregts and Van Riemsdijk 1985, Zwart 1993a: 309f, Postal 1994: 113, Neeleman 1994b: 87f; see also Kathol 2001 for relevant observations from German).

A difference between the parasitic gap construction in (7.237) and the apparent parasitic gap constructions in (7.238), (7.242), and (7.243) is that only the construction in (7.237) is grammatical when the adjunct clause is finite:

(7.244) a. **Welk eiland** is Tasman zonder dat hij
which island be:3SG Tasman without C 3SG.M.NOM
[e] kon bezoek-en voor-bij ge-var-en?
PGAP MOD:PAST.SG visit-INF fore-by GE-sail-N
'Which island did Tasman sail by without being able to visit?'

b. *Tasman is **het eiland** zonder dat hij
Tasman be:3SG DEF.N.SG island without C 3SG.M.NOM
[e] kon bezoek-en voor-bij ge-var-en
PGAP MOD:PAST.SG visit-INF fore-by GE-sail-N
(intended: 'Tasman sailed by the island without being able to visit it.')

c. *Zulk-e eiland-en word-en altijd zonder dat je
such-PL island-PL PASS.AUX:PL always without C 2SG.NOM
[e] kun-t bezoek-en voor-bij ge-var-en
GAP MOD-2SG visit-INF fore-by GE-sail-N

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(intended: 'Such islands are always sailed by without one being able to visit them.')

d. *De VOC veroordeel-de Tasman voor het
DEF.SG VOC sentence:PAST.SG Tasman for DEF.N.SG
zonder dat hij **[e]** wil-de bezoek-en
without C 3SG.M.NOM GAP want-PAST.SG visit-INF
voor-bij var-en van onbekend-e eiland-en
fore-by sail-INF of unknown-PL island-PL
(intended: 'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] sentenced Tasman for sailing by unknown islands without wanting to visit them.')

The examples in (7.244b,c,d) require substitution of a weak object pronoun (*het* 'it' in 7.244b, *ze* 'them' in 7.244c,d) in place of the gap.

The antecedent of a parasitic gap (the fronted phrase with which the gap is associated) must be a noun phrase. This is shown by the minimal pair in (7.245), where the a-example involves PP-fronting (pied-piping) and the b-example preposition stranding:

(7.245) a. ***Waar naar** is Tasman zonder [e] op zoek te zijn
Q:LOC to be:3SG Tasman without PGAP up search to be:INF
[e] toe ge-zeil-d?
GAP towards GE-sail-D
(intended: 'In the direction of which [land] did Tasman sail without being on the lookout for it?')
(*waar* = the locative realization of *wat* 'what'; *op zoek zijn* = be searching)

b. **Waar** is Tasman zonder [e] naar op zoek te zijn
Q:LOC be:3SG Tasman without PGAP to up search to be:INF
[e] naar toe ge-zeil-d?
GAP to towards GE-sail-D
'In the direction of which [land] did Tasman sail without being on the lookout for it?'

Parasitic gaps with preposition stranding works only when the preposition is stranded with both gaps:

(7.246) ***Waar** is Tasman zonder [e] te wil-len bezoek-en
Q:LOC be:3SG Tasman without PGAP to want-INF visit:INF
[e] naar toe ge-zeil-d?
GAP to towards GE-sail-D
(intended: 'In the direction of which [land] did Tasman sail without wanting to visit it?')

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Even without this complication, it can be shown that Dutch lacks parasitic gap constructions of the type of English *a man who close friends of admire*, where the parasitic gap is contained within a subject:

(7.247) *een eiland **dat** iedereen die [e] ken-t
INDF.SG island REL:N.SG everyone REL:CG.SG PGAP know-3SG
[e] bewonder-t
GAP admire-3SG
(intended: 'an island that everyone who knows, admires')

A further property of parasitic gaps in Dutch is that they, unlike their English counterparts (see Postal 1994: 83–84), can appear in positions from which passivization is disallowed:

(7.248) a. Tasman liet de Maori-s straf-fen
Tasman cause:PAST.SG DEF.PL Maori-PL punish-INF
'Tasman let the Maoris be punished.'

b. *De Maori-s werd-en lat-en straf-fen
DEF.PL Maori-PL PASS.AUX-PL cause-INF punish-INF
(intended: 'The Maoris were caused to receive punishment.')

c. **Welk-e** **Maori-s** heeft Tasman door [e] te lat-en
which-PL Maori-PL have:3SG Tasman by PGAP to cause-INF
straf-fen **[e]** van zich vervreem-d?
punish-INF GAP of REFL GE:alienate-D
'Which Maoris did Tasman alienate by causing them to be punished?'

Parasitic gaps associated with fronted clauses behave like gaps associated with nouns in that they require an otherwise illicit (stranded) preposition to appear (see Postal 1994: 82). This can be shown using verbs like *overtuigen* 'convince' and *balen* 'be upset,' which require a preposition when construed with a noun, but not when construed with a clause:

(7.249) a. Ik heb Jeroen overtuig-d (*van) dat
1SG.NOM have:1SG Jerry GE:convince-D of C
Tasman een schurk was
Tasman INDF.SG crook be:PAST.SG
'I convinced Jerry that Tasman was a crook.'

b. Ik heb Jeroen overtuigd *(van) de noodzaak
1SG.NOM have:1SG Jerry GE:convince-D of DEF.SG need
'I convinced Jerry of the necessity.'

When the complement clause of these verbs is fronted, the preposition must appear, either pied-piped (7.250a) or stranded (7.250b).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

(7.250) a. *(Van) dat Tasman een schurk was
of C Tasman INDF.SG crook be:PAST.SG
heb ik Jeroen overtuig-d
have:1SG 1SG.NOM Jerry GE:convince-D
(same as (7.249a))

b. Dat Tasman een schurk was *(**daar**)
C Tasman INDF.SG crook be:PAST.SG DEM.DIST:LOC
heb ik Jeroen **[e]** van overtuig-d
have:1SG 1SG.NOM Jerry GAP of GE:convince-D
(same as (7.249a))

As can be seen in (7.250b), preposition stranding requires that the fronted clause be resumed by a demonstrative *daar* 'there' (the locative realization of demonstrative *dat* 'that'). When a parasitic gap is associated with a fronted clause, the preposition must be stranded:

(7.251) a. *Van dat Tasman een schurk was heb
of C Tasman INDF.SG crook be:PAST.SG have:1SG
ik Jeroen zonder [e] te bal-en [e]
1SG.NOM Jerry without PGAP to be.annoyed-INF GAP
overtuig-d
GE:convince-D
(intended: 'I convinced Jerry that Tasman was a crook without being annoyed by it [i.e. by his being a crook].')

b. Dat Tasman een schurk was *(**daar**)
C Tasman INDF.SG crook be:PAST.SG DEM.DIST:LOC
heb ik Jeroen zonder [e] van te
have:1SG 1SG.NOM Jerry without PGAP of to
bal-en **[e]** van overtuig-d
be.annoyed-INF GAP of GE:convince-D
'I convinced Jerry that Tasman was a crook without being annoyed by it [i.e. by his being a crook].'

This shows that a parasitic gap associated with a clause behaves like a noun phrase gap in Dutch.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 14 Nov 2026 at 21:16:57, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.009