13

Binding and control

Of the many dependencies in the syntax of Dutch discussed in chapter 7, those involving the interpretation of semi-referential expressions ('binding') and missing subjects of infinitival clauses ('control') have featured more prominently in the recent history of syntactic theory than most of the others. For example, discussion of wh-movement in Dutch has never played a significant role in the development of syntactic theory. We therefore feel somewhat justified in restricting ourselves to the theoretical discussion of Dutch binding and control phenomena in this final chapter.

13.1 Binding

The distribution and interpretation of semi-referential elements (pronouns, anaphors) in Dutch, studied widely and intensively from the mid-1970s on, has proved a useful playground for the implementation and assessment of theories of binding formulated for English. The point of reference is typically a version of the Binding Theory of Chomsky (1981: 188), summarized in (13.1).

(13.1) *Binding Theory (after Chomsky 1981: 188)*
- (i) An anaphor is bound in a local domain (Principle A)
- (ii) A pronominal is free in a local domain (Principle B)
- (iii) A referential expression is free (Principle C)

where α binds β if and only if α and β are coindexed (coreferential) and α c-commands β (Chomsky 1981: 184), and α c-commands β if and only if all nodes dominating α dominate β (cf. Chomsky 1981: 166).

Three questions recur in the literature on binding in Dutch: (i) the proper identification of the various semi-referential elements (e.g. *zichzelf*, *zich*, *elkaar*, *hemzelf*, *hem*; see section 7.1) as anaphors or pronominals for the Binding Theory; (ii) the definition of the local domain for these elements; (iii) the proper analysis of situations where anaphors and pronominals are not in complementary distribution (see (7.24–25)).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

The relevance of c-command for binding of anaphors (including reciprocals) in Dutch was articulated early on by Daalder and Blom (1976). Daalder and Blom (1976: 402f) more particularly showed that the antecedent must c-command the anaphor at Deep Structure (i.e. prior to movement), using examples like (13.2) (binding relations indicated by italic print).

(13.2) a. **[Over *zich-zelf*]** vertel ik *ze* niets **[e]**
about REFL-self tell:1SG 1SG:NOM 3PL nothing GAP
'I tell them nothing about themselves.'

b. … omdat *zich* voor het voorzitterschap nog *niemand*
because REFL for DEF.N.SG presidency yet no one
heeft aan ge-meld
have:3SG on GE-announce:D
'… because no one nominated himself for the presidency yet.'
(*zich aanmelden* = sign up)

In (13.2a) the PP *over zichzelf* 'about themselves' is moved from a position c-commanded by *ze* 'them' (indicated by the gap), and *ze* binds *zichzelf*; in (13.2b) Daalder and Blom (1976: 402) argue that reflexive *zich* is moved via cliticization from a position c-commanded by *niemand* 'no one.' The finding that binding requires c-command allowed Blom and Daalder to determine the relative hierarchical positions of the indirect object and the direct object in the Dutch middle field, as discussed in sections 4.3.1 and 9.2.2 (see (9.39)).

As for locality, Daalder and Blom (1976: 406) showed that anaphor binding in Dutch is subject to the Tensed S Condition and the Specified Subject Condition of Chomsky (1973), i.e. the antecedent cannot be found outside a finite clause or a noun phrase with an explicit possessor in its specifier (the possessor being the subject of the noun phrase). See (7.12b) for the Tensed S Condition and (13.3) for the Specified Subject Condition.

(13.3) *Tasman* las {een/ *mijn} boek over *zich-zelf*
Tasman read:PAST.SG INDF.SG POSS:1SG book about REFL-self
'Tasman read {a/(intended) my} book on himself.'

At this point in time, it seemed as if anaphor binding in Dutch worked in a similar way to binding in English. However, the formulation of the Binding Theory was complicated by the grammaticality in English of examples like (13.4), which are absent from Dutch (13.5) (see Koster 1985: 142f).

(13.4) *John* said that a picture of *himself* hung in the office.

(13.5) **Jan* zei dat er een foto van *zich-zelf*
John say:PAST.SG C LOC INDF.SG picture of REFL-self

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

in het kantoor hing
in DEF.N.SG office hang:PAST.SG
(intended: same as (13.4))

The possibility of anaphor binding across the tensed clause boundary in (13.4), normally impossible, necessitated a precise definition of the local domain of (13.1), such that only an anaphor contained within a subject could be bound from outside the clause (see Chomsky 1981: 207f and 1986b: 171f). As noted by Koster, this complication is unnecessary for Dutch, so that the local domain for binding can be roughly identified as a finite clause (see Koster 1985: 148). (Reinhart and Reuland 1991: 289 argued that *himself* in (13.4) is not an anaphor but a logophor, suggesting that the complication of the Binding Theory is unnecessary for English as well.)

Unlike English, Dutch has two locally bound anaphors, *zichzelf* and *zich*, both subject to Principle A (13.1i) and generally in complementary distribution with pronominals like *hem* 'him,' but each with its own distribution (see the discussion in section 7.1). The question of the proper identification of the local domains for binding of *zich* and *zichzelf* informed much of the early literature on binding in Dutch (Vat 1980, Everaert 1980, 1981, 1986, 1991, Koster 1985, 1987: chapter 6, Corver *et al*. 1987) while later studies focused more on the (semantic) conditions under which *zich* and *zichzelf* could be felicitously used (Reinhart and Reuland 1993, Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 1998, Reuland 2001).

Vat (1980), following Huybregts (1979), took the distribution of *zich* to reveal the existence of two different *zich* elements, one appearing with inherently reflexive predicates (13.6a) and another appearing inside preposition phrases (13.6b).

(13.6) a. Tasman vergis-te zich-(*zelf)
Tasman err-PAST.SG REFL-self
'Tasman was wrong.'

b. Tasman leg-de de kokosnoot naast zich-(*zelf) neer
Tasman put-PAST.SG DEF.CG.SG coconut beside REFL-self down
'Tasman put the coconut down beside him.'

In the analysis of Vat (1980), *zich* in (13.6a) is an anaphor, restricted in its distribution to nonargument positions, but *zich* in (13.6b) is a nonlocally bound pronoun, being free within the preposition phrase (satisfying Principle B (13.1b) on the nonstandard assumption that the PP defines a local domain relevant to binding) and bound within the clause (satisfying Principle A (13.1a)).

This analysis was refined by Koster (1985: 147), who took *zich* to be an anaphor throughout, but defined a small and a big local domain for Principle A, where the smaller domain, relevant to examples like (13.6b), was defined by the presence

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

of a preposition (or a subject). In Koster's (1985) analysis, then, *zichzelf* has to be bound in both the big and the small local domain, whereas *zich* has to be bound in the big local domain, but free in the small local domain.

The concept of shifting local domains for binding was explored more in Koster (1987: 321f), allowing him to account for the pattern in (13.7).

(13.7) a. *Tasman* schoot op *zich-*(zelf)*
Tasman shoot:PAST.SG up REFL-self
'Tasman fired at himself.'

b. Cook las dat *Tasman* de Maori-s op *zich-(*zelf)*
Cook read:PAST.SG C Tasman DEF.PL Maori-PL up REFL-self
zag schiet-en
see:PAST.SG shoot-INF
'Cook read that Tasman saw the Maoris fire at him (sc. at Tasman).'

Zich is excluded in (13.7a) but must be used in (13.7b) if it is to be bound by *Tasman*; binding of *zich* by *Cook* in (13.7b) is also excluded. In Koster's (1987) analysis, domain extension occurs when one head locally governs the projection of another (creating a 'dynasty' of governors), as in (13.7a), where *schoot* 'fired' governs *op* 'at,' creating a V–P dynasty with *Tasman* as its subject (the 'd-subject'). Koster (1987: 331) then proposes that *zich* must be free in the minimal domain containing a d-subject, but bound in the minimal CP. In (13.7a), *zich* cannot be used, as it would be bound in the minimal domain containing a d-subject (the entire clause), but it can be used when bound outside the minimal domain containing a d-subject (the infinitival clause *de Maoris op zich(zelf) schieten* 'the Maoris shoot at him' in (13.7b); note that in this analysis, the infinitive *schieten* 'fire' undergoes a rightward movement as well; see section 11.2), though not when bound outside CP (e.g. by *Cook* in (13.7b)).

These conditions are overruled by a more general condition stating that both *zich* and *zichzelf* must be bound in their minimal XP (where S is the maximal projection for V; see Koster 1987: 27) and come into play only when the minimal XP lacks an antecedent. Binding of *zich* in (13.6a) then follows from the general condition, whereas the more specific conditions become relevant in (13.7), as the PP *op zich(zelf)* lacks an antecedent for *zich(zelf)*.

A different approach to the distribution of *zich* and *zichzelf* was proposed in Everaert (1981, 1986), paving the way for the influential analysis of Reinhart and Reuland (1993). The core idea in the various analyses of Everaert (1981, 1986, 1991) appears to be that *zich* with inherent reflexive predicates (like *vergissen* 'be wrong' in (13.6a)) is not a true argument of the verb, and that this presents the core case from which conditions on the use of *zich* are to be derived (see Everaert 1991: 84). In cases like (7.8), repeated here as (13.8), the predicate can apparently

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

be thought of as being reflexive or transitive, allowing for both *zich* and *zichzelf* to occur (see Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 666; see also Ter Meulen 2000).

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

On this approach, *zich* is excluded in (13.7a) on the assumption that *zich(zelf)* is the internal argument of the chain *schieten op* 'fire at' (much as in Koster's 1987 dynasty analysis; cf. Everaert 1981: 78). In (13.7b), Everaert (1986: 202) observed that *zich* is an argument of the embedded predicate *schieten op* 'fire at' but not of the matrix predicate *lezen* 'read,' suggesting that *zich* is an anaphoricity marker for non-coarguments (Everaert 1986: 203).

Reinhart and Reuland (1993) proposed to relate the distribution of *zich* and *zichzelf* to the reflexivity of the predicate, assuming that reflexive predicates must be either inherently reflexive (as with *zich vergissen* 'be wrong') or 'reflexive-marked' by a *self*-element (as in *zich-zelf*). Crucially, *zich* is not a reflexive-marking element, but a bound pronoun appearing where reflexive-marking is not necessary (as in (13.6a)) or possible (as in (13.7b), where the antecedent is an argument of a different predicate).

In Reinhart and Reuland's theory, the fact that *zich* cannot generally be replaced by a true pronominal like *hem* 'him' was accounted for via a separate requirement, the Chain Condition, stating that the dependent element in a local binding relation must not be both case-marked and 'referentially independent' (see Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 696), where referential independence is taken to be an inherent property of both pronominals and referential expressions (Reinhart and Reuland 1993: 659).

The distribution of *zich* and *zichzelf* in the complement clause of perception verbs, illustrated in (7.10) and repeated here as (13.9), makes an analysis in terms of predication not straightforward:

(13.9) 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
Tasman see:PAST.SG REFL already DEF.N.SG South Land
ontdek-ken
discover-INF
'Tasman already imagined discovering the South Land.'

The problem here is that *zag* 'saw' + *ontdekken* 'discover' must form a complex predicate in (13.9a) for *zichzelf* to act as a reflexive marker, but must not form

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

a complex predicate in (13.9b) for *zich* to appear as a pronoun bound by a non-coargument. Reinhart and Reuland (1993: 678) proposed to solve this problem by defining the notion 'predicate' differently for Principle A and for Principle B. For Principle B, as we have seen in connection with (13.7b), 'predicate' is defined in terms of argument structure (hence: semantic predicate), so that *zag* 'saw' and *ontdekken* 'discover' in (13.9b) do not form a complex predicate, and *zich* can appear; but for Principle A, 'predicate' is defined in terms of grammatical functions (hence: syntactic predicate), so that *zag* 'saw' and *ontdekken* 'discover' in (13.9a) do form a complex predicate, and *zichzelf* can appear. The distinction is motivated by the observation that the arguments of the infinitival complement clause of a perception verb appear in a grammatical function position in the matrix clause middle field (see section 4.2, ex. (4.42)). This allowed Reinhart and Reuland (1993) to reformulate Principle A as a condition on interpretation, stating that when an anaphor occurs, its syntactic predicate must be interpreted as reflexive.

A third approach to the distinction between *zich* and *zichzelf* is found in Kerstens (1983: 162), Van der Leek (1988: 226), and Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd (1998: 360), and was used in our presentation of the distinction in section 7.1. On this approach, *zich* and *zichzelf* differ not in their argument status, but in their referential properties. The key observation leading to this account lies in the duplicating effect of *zichzelf* in examples like (7.9) from Voskuil and Wehrmann (1990), repeated here.

(13.10) 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)

Paraphrasing Van der Leek (1988), one might say that the binding of *zichzelf* by *Münchhausen* in (13.10a) indicates that the two persons involved in the act of pulling are the same, while the binding of *zich* by *Münchhausen* in (13.10b) indicates that there is just one person involved in the act of pulling.

In the analysis of Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd (1998), this observation was formalized by taking *zich* to be a clitic in the functional head position TENSE, mediating between the subject and the verb, and expressing that a time slice of the subject is simultaneous with a time slice of the predicate. The interpretation of *zichzelf* is derived from that of *zich*, but is crucially affected by the additional focus marker *zelf* 'self,' allowing for "a wider range of reflexive interpretations," such as the duplication effect (Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd 1998: 371; see also

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

Koster 1994: 62 for a similar analysis in pragmatic terms, with *zelf* 'self' bringing in unexpected subject-orientation).

In the literature on binding in Dutch, occasional reference is made to prosodically weak *hem* [əm] 'him,' with or without the focus marker *zelf* 'self' (e.g. Vat 1980: 130, Koster 1985: 141, Reinhart and Reuland 1991: 309, Reuland and Koster 1991: 14 and 24–25). Weak *hem* alternates with *zich* in contexts like (13.6b) and (13.7b), but not where *zich* is locally bound (as in (13.6a), (13.8), (13.9b), and (13.10b)). Weak *hemzelf* is reported to occur in *picture*-noun contexts like (13.5) (e.g. Koster 1985: 141), but as De Vries (1999: 146 note 28) observes, judgments on the distribution of weak *hemzelf* vary and its status for the Binding Theory is as yet unclear.

13.2 Control

The idea that infinitival clauses like (7.81a), repeated here as (13.11), contain an empty subject (PRO), controlled by an argument of the matrix clause, has been an integral part of the theory of Government and Binding of Chomsky (1981), though ideas about the nature of PRO have varied (cf. Hornstein 2000).

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

It was noted in Postma (1984: 150) that the properties of the Dutch possessive demonstrative *diens* (see (7.26–27)) yield proof of the existence of PRO. As Postma (1984) showed, *diens* is obviative with respect to (local and nonlocal) subjects (13.12), but must be bound by a non-c-commanding antecedent (13.13a) or a non-subject (13.13b).

(13.12) a. **Tasman* relativeer-de *dien-s* ontdekking-en
Tasman downplay-PAST.SG DEM:DIST.AN-POSS.M discovery-PL
(intended) 'Tasman downplayed his (own) discoveries.'

b. **Tasman* vond het niet leuk dat de
Tasman find:PAST.SG 3SG.INAN NEG amusing C DEF.SG
VOC *dien-s* ontdekkingen relativeer-de
VOC DEM:DIST.AN-POSS.M discovery-PL downplay-PAST.SG
(intended) 'Tasman didn't like how the VOC [Dutch East India Company] downplayed his (Tasman's) discoveries.'

(13.13) a. *Tasman-s* baas relativeer-de *dien-s*
Tasman-POSS boss downplay-PAST.SG DEM:DIST.AN-POSS.M

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

ontdekking-en
discovery-PL
'Tasman's boss downplayed his (i.e. Tasman's) discoveries.'

b. De VOC beloof-de *Tasman dien-s*
DEF.SG VOC promise-PAST.SG Tasman DEM:DIST.AN-POSS.M
ontdekking-en bekend te mak-en
discovery-PL known to make-INF
'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] promised Tasman that they would publicize his (Tasman's) discoveries.'

As Postma (1984) noted, (13.13b), with the subject control verb *beloven* 'promise,' contrasts with (13.14), with the object control verb *gebieden* 'order.'

(13.14) *De VOC gebood *Tasman dien-s*
DEF.SG VOC order:PAST.SG Tasman DEM:DIST.AN-POSS.M
ontdekking-en bekend te mak-en
discovery-PL known to make-INF
(intended) 'The VOC [Dutch East India Company] ordered Tasman to publicize his (Tasman's) discoveries.'

Since *Tasman* is not a subject, the ungrammaticality of (13.14) is unexpected, unless the infinitival clause *diens ontdekkingen bekend te maken* 'to publicize his discoveries' contains an empty subject PRO, controlled by *Tasman*. In that case the ungrammaticality simply follows because *diens* must be obviative with respect to a subject (see also Sybesma 2002: 174, 179).

The nature of the empty category PRO has been the subject of considerable debate. Chomsky (1981: 191) argued that PRO acts as both an anaphor (in obligatory control contexts like (13.15a)) and a pronominal (in nonobligatory control contexts like (13.15b)), so that PRO had to be subject to both Principle A and B of the Binding Theory (cf. (13.1)).

(13.15) a. *Obligatory control*
Cook tried PRO to pacify the Hawaiians.

b. *Nonobligatory ('optional') control ('arbitrary PRO')*
It will be difficult PRO to pacify the Hawaiians.

Given that Chomsky's (1981: 188) definition of the local domain relevant to binding in (13.1) (the 'governing category') referred to the governor of the anaphor/pronominal, PRO could only exist if it had no governor, so that the local domain relevant to binding of PRO could not be established, and PRO would satisfy principles A and B of the Binding Theory vacuously. This led Chomsky (1981: 191) to formulate the PRO Theorem, stating that PRO is ungoverned.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

Koster (1984) argued that in Dutch, infinitival complement clauses with an obligatorily controlled subject PRO may be transparent for government from outside the clause. Recall from section 6.1.3 that infinitival complement clauses in Dutch can be either extraposed (13.16a) or integrated with the matrix clause ('verb raising' (13.16b) or 'third construction' (13.16c)) (see also chapter 11).

(13.16) a. Tasman heeft ge-probeer-d *(om)* *het* *Zuidland*
Tasman have:3SG GE-try-D C DEF.N.SG South Land
te *vind-en*
to find-INF
'Tasman tried to find the South Land.'

b. Tasman heeft *het* *Zuidland* prober-en *te* *vind-en*
Tasman have:3SG DEF.N.SG South Land try-INF to find-INF
(same as a.)

c. Tasman heeft *het* *Zuidland* ge-probeer-d *te* *vind-en*
Tasman have:3SG DEF.N.SG South Land GE-try-D to find-INF
(same as a.)

Constructions with extraposed infinitival control clauses allow impersonal passivization in Dutch (the position of PRO indicated as in the analysis of Koster 1984):

(13.17) Er werd ge-probeer-d (om) PRO het
LOC PASS.AUX:PAST.SG GE-try-D C PRO DEF.N.SG
Zuidland te vind-en
South Land to find-INF
'Attempts were made to find the South Land.'

In contrast, constructions with integrated infinitival control clauses do not allow impersonal passivization:

(13.18) *Er werd PRO het Zuidland ge-probeer-d
LOC PASS.AUX:SG PRO DEF.N.SG South Land GE-try-D
te vind-en
to find-INF
(intended: same as (13.17))

Koster (1984: 434–435) proposed to account for these facts by assuming that PRO can be either bound (as an anaphor) or controlled, and that *governed* PRO must be bound. In (13.17), then, PRO is ungoverned (as in Chomsky's analysis) and not bound but controlled (allowing for control by an implicit antecedent; see also Bennis and Hoekstra 1989c: 14). But the ungrammaticality of (13.18) shows

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

that PRO is subject to a more stringent condition here, which Koster identified as Principle A of the Binding Theory (13.1a). Since no antecedent for PRO can be found in the impersonal construction, the ungrammaticality could be identified as a Binding Theory violation.

The upshot of the analysis is that PRO is governed in transparent infinitival constructions like (13.16b/c), and hence that the PRO-Theorem is invalid. As Koster (1984) pointed out, applying his analysis to English leads to the conclusion that obligatory control PRO in English is always governed (hence an anaphor), since impersonal passivization with obligatory control infinitivals is invariably ungrammatical:

(13.19) *It was tried to discover the South Land.

Koster's analysis explicitly suggested a closer connection between control and binding/A-movement, which was explored again much later in analyses identifying obligatory control as raising (A-movement) (O'Neil 1995, Hornstein 1999). A problem remained, however, in that the analysis was unable to account for the distribution of PRO (i.e. for the fact that obligatory control PRO cannot be replaced by an overt noun phrase; see Vanden Wyngaerd 1987: 105 and Petter 1998: 59).

The distinction between (obligatory) controlled and (nonobligatory) arbitrary PRO was critically reviewed, using Dutch data, in Bennis and Hoekstra (1989c), leading to the conclusion that PRO is invariably an anaphor, and by Petter (1998), leading to the conclusion that PRO is invariably a pronoun. Crucially, Bennis and Hoekstra (1989c: 14) assume that anaphors may be bound by implicit, nonlexical arguments (i.e. arguments selected by the verb but not expressed). These play a role in contexts of nonobligatory control like (13.15b), and the obligatory control nature becomes apparent when the implicit argument is made explicit, as in (13.20), where *Cook* controls the interpretation of PRO.

(13.20) It will be difficult for Cook [PRO to pacify the Hawaiians].

One of the observations made by Bennis and Hoekstra (1989c) in this context is that (obligatory) control in Dutch allows split antecedents, in examples like (7.86).

The analyses of control phenomena in Dutch by Bennis and Hoekstra (1989c) and Petter (1998) call into question the traditional distinction between obligatory and nonobligatory control. This has been overlooked in later treatments of control, building on the split between obligatory and nonobligatory control to motivate a movement analysis for obligatory control (e.g. Hornstein 1999: 73).

The question of whether modal verbs in their deontic reading are control verbs (cf. section 7.2.2) was dealt with by Klooster (1984: 118, 1986), where the

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015

suggestion was first made for Dutch (for English, see Hofmann 1966: VII.11f [1976: 92f]), and Barbiers (1995: 161–162), who rejected it. Klooster (1986: 122) argued that deontic modal verbs are binary predicates, selecting for a noun phrase subject and a propositional object, whereas epistemic modals are unary predicates, taking just a single propositional argument. On this analysis, it follows naturally that constructions with epistemic modal verbs involve raising, while constructions with deontic modal verbs involve control.

Barbiers (1995), however, showed that deontic modal verbs in Dutch can have a nonpropositional complement, in examples like (13.21) (cf. (7.80)).

(13.21) a. Tasman moet bekend-er
Tasman must:SG known-CMP
'Tasman needs to be better known.'
b. Tasman moet aan dek
Tasman must:SG on deck
'Tasman has to be on deck.'

The examples in (13.21) lack an epistemic interpretation. Note that adjectival and prepositional predicates can occur in raising constructions, but not in control constructions:

(13.22) a. Tasman {schijn-t / *probeer-t} bekend-er
Tasman seem-3SG / try:3SG known-CMP
'Tasman {appears / (intended) is trying} to be better known.'
b. Tasman {is / *probeer-t} aan dek
Tasman be:3SG / try:3SG on deck
'Tasman {is / (intended) is trying to be} on deck.'

This is the opposite of what would be expected if the deontic/epistemic dichotomy involved a difference between control and raising.

The phenomenon of controller shift (see (7.87–88)), though apparently somewhat starker in Dutch than in English, has not received due attention in the theoretical literature on Dutch (on English, see in particular Farkas 1988 and Sag and Pollard 1991). Exceptions include Van Haaften (1991: 233f) and Petter (1998: 228f).

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 15 Nov 2026 at 12:05:19, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977763.015