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Introduction

This chapter will discuss the distribution of noun phrases within the clause, and the differences between the types of noun phrase in this respect: pronouns, for example, behave differently from definite noun phrases, which in their turn behave differently from indefinite noun phrases. Sections 8.1 and 8.2 discuss the distribution of noun phrases in their core functions as arguments and predicates, respectively. Section 8.3 concludes the discussion with some remarks on the adverbial use of noun phrases. This chapter will be relatively short given that some of the issues discussed here are discussed in more detail elsewhere. For example, the use of noun phrases as arguments of nouns is extensively discussed in Chapter 2, and similar chapters can be found in Broekhuis & Corver (in prep).

8.1. Noun phrases as arguments

Noun phrases are typically used as arguments of a verb or one of the three other major categories N, A and P. This section mainly focuses on their distribution as arguments of the verb, that is, in the clausal domain. In Section 8.1.1, we start with a discussion of the argument functions the noun phrase can have. This is followed in 8.1.2 by a discussion of the restrictions on wh-movement and topicalization. Section 8.1.3 provides a discussion of scrambling, that is, the placement of the noun phrase in the middle field of the clause. In 8.1.4, we conclude with a discussion of the restrictions on noun phrases in the expletive construction.

8.1.1. Syntactic functions of noun phrases

Noun phrases can occur in all argument functions. Some typical examples are given in (1) to (4). In (1) the noun phrase acts as the (nominative) subject of the clause, in (2) as the (accusative) direct object, in (3) as the (dative) indirect object, and in (4), finally, as the complement of a preposition: the primeless examples in (4) involve a prepositional indirect object and the primed ones involve PP-complements of the verb, but examples could also be given for PPs with, e.g., an adverbial function. The (a)- and (b)-examples of each set illustrate, respectively, non-neuter and neuter singulars, and the (c)-examples exemplify plurals. For each of these types a definite and an indefinite example are given. The definite noun phrases are headed by the definite article de/het ‘the’, but they can be replaced by any other type of definite noun phrase: replacing the noun phrase de man ‘the man’ by, e.g., noun phrases like die man ‘that man’ or mijn vriend ‘my friend’, a personal pronoun like hij/hem ‘he/him’ or the universal quantifier iedereen ‘everyone’ does not affect the grammaticality judgments. Neither will the grammaticality judgments change when we replace the indefinite singular noun phrase een man/kind by the existential quantifier iemand or the indefinite plural DP [∅ mensen] ‘persons’ by some other plural indefinite noun phrase like verschillende/veel/vier mensen ‘several/many/four persons’.
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(1)  • Subject
   a.  De man was afwezig.  a’. Er was een man afwezig.
      the man was absent  there was a man absent
   b.  Het kind was afwezig.  b’. Er was een kind afwezig.
      the child was absent  there was a child absent
      the people were absent  there was people absent

(2)  • Direct object
   a.  Hij genas de/een man.
      he healed the/a man
   b.  Hij genas het/een kind.
      he healed the/a child
   c.  Hij genas de/∅ mensen.
      he healed the/∅ people

(3)  • Indirect object
   a.  Hij gaf de/een man nieuwe hoop.
      he gave the/a man new hope
   b.  Hij gaf het/een kind nieuwe hoop.
      he gave the/a child new hope
   c.  Hij gaf de/∅ mensen nieuwe hoop.
      he gave the/∅ people new hope

(4)  • Complement of PP
   a.  Hij gaf het boek aan de/een man.  a’. Jan wacht op de/een man.
      he gave the book to the/a man    Jan waits for the/a man
      he gave the book to the/a child    Jan waits for the/a child
   c.  Hij gaf boeken aan de/∅ mensen.  c’. Jan wacht op de/∅ mensen.
      he gave books to the/∅ people    Jan waits for the/∅ people

In the examples above, two things leap to the eye. First, it can be observed that the plural indefinite noun phrases in the (c)-examples in (4) give rise to a marked result. This is related to the fact that the indefinite noun phrase has a nonspecific reading; when the plural noun phrase has a generic reading, as in (5), the result is fine.

(5)  a.  Jan geeft graag aan goede doelen.
      Jan gives gladly to good causes
      ‘Jan likes to give to charity.’
   b.  Jan houdt van zebra’s.
      Jan is fond of zebras
      ‘Jan loves zebras.’

Second, it can be noted that the indefinite subjects in the primed examples in (1) normally occur in an expletive construction. This also has to do with the fact that the indefinite noun phrase is construed non-generically. We will come back to this in Section 8.1.4 below.
8.1.2. Noun phrases in clause-initial position

This section is confined to *wh*-movement and topicalization of noun phrases, and discusses some restrictions on these operations that are related to the type of noun phrase moved. But first consider the examples in (6). These examples show that topicalization may only target the initial position of the main clause, whereas *wh*-movement may target the initial position of both main and embedded clauses. Note that when the initial position of an embedded clause is filled by a *wh*-phrase, the interrogative complementizer *of* ‘whether’ can but need not be overtly realized.

(6)  a. Wat heeft Jan met plezier gelezen?
    what has Jan with pleasure read
   a’. Dat boek heeft Jan met plezier gelezen.
    that book has Jan with pleasure read
   b. Ik weet niet [wat Jan met plezier gelezen heeft].
    I know not what COMP Jan with pleasure read has
   b’. *Ik denk [dat boek Jan met plezier gelezen heeft].
    I think that book COMP Jan with pleasure read has

Realizing *of* in embedded questions is often stigmatized as being substandard, and is not often found in writing; cf. http://taaladvies.net/taal/advies/vraag/592/ for more discussion. In some Southern dialects *dat* is used instead of *of*. For some speakers it is even possible to realize both: Jan vroeg [*wie dat hij bezocht had*] ‘Jan asked who he had visited’. See, e.g., De Rooij (1965) and Hoekstra & Zwart (1994) for more details.

8.1.2.1. Wh-movement

Noun phrases can only be *wh*-moved when they are interrogative. This means that the noun phrase must be an interrogative personal pronoun like *wie* or *wat*, or be explicitly marked as being interrogative by having an interrogative determiner or quantificational modifier. Some typical cases are given in (7). This section will discuss a number of additional restrictions on *wh*-movement of noun phrases.

(7)  a. Wie/Wat heeft hij meegenomen? [personal pronoun]
    who/what has he prt.-brought
    ‘Who/what did he bring with him?’
   b. [Wiens boek] heeft hij gestolen? [possessive pronoun]
    whose book has he stolen
    ‘Whose book did he steal?’
   c. [Welk/Wat voor een boek] heeft hij gelezen? [demonstrative pronoun]
    which/what for a book has he read
    ‘Which/What kind of book did he read?’
   d. [Hoeveel boeken] heeft hij gelezen? [quantifier/numeral]
    how.many books has he read
    ‘How many books did he read?’
I. Wh-movement is obligatory

It is generally claimed that movement of interrogative noun phrases is obligatory; when the movement does not apply, the interrogative meaning is normally lost. The examples in (8), for example, are not true questions but receive an echo interpretation: sentences like these, in which the question word is heavily stressed, are used when the speaker did not properly hear what the addressee just said, to express astonishment on the part of the speaker about what he has just heard, or in teacher-pupil interaction as test questions.

(8)  
(a)  Hij heeft WIE/WAT meegenomen?  
    he   has who/what prt.-brought

(b)  Hij heeft WELK boek gelezen?  
    he   has which book read

   ‘Which book did he read?’

(b′)  Hij heeft WAT voor een boek gelezen?  
    he   has what for a book    read

c.  Hij heeft WIENS boek gestolen?  
    he   has whose book stolen

d.  Hij heeft HOEVEEL boeken gelezen?  
    he   has how.many books    read

Still, we have observed from our own language behavior that strings like those given in (8) are occasionally also used as “true” questions when given a more interrogative intonation pattern (with a fall in pitch after the question word). Since we do not know of any independent studies that indicate that this use is more generally found, we leave this as an issue for future research, while stating that using examples without wh-movement as true wh-questions is certainly the exception rather than the rule.

II. Superiority effects in multiple questions

A clear and systematic exception to the general rule that a wh-phrase must be moved into clause-initial position can be found in so-called multiple questions that contain more than one wh-phrase. In this case, the requirement that a wh-phrase be moved is overruled by the fact that only a single constituent can be placed into clause-initial position. Generally speaking, it is the wh-phrase that is superior (≈ closest to the target position) that is moved. The effects of this so-called °superiority condition can be observed most clearly in embedded clauses like (9). Example (9a) shows that, when both the subject and the direct object are wh-phrases, it is the subject that occupies the clause-initial position; moving the object instead, as in (9a′), gives rise to a severely degraded result. Example (9b) shows that to a slightly lesser degree the same contrast holds for examples where both the direct and (bare) indirect object are questioned; it is clearly preferred that the indirect object undergoes wh-movement, not the direct object. Example (9c), finally, shows that when the indirect object is periphrastic, it is the direct object that preferably undergoes movement.
(9)  a.  Ik vroeg [[welke jongen], t₁ welk boek gelezen had].
    I asked which boy which book read had

   a’. *Ik vroeg [[welk boek], welke jongen t₁ gelezen had].

   b.  Ik vroeg [[welke jongen], hij t₁ welk boek aangeboden had].
   I asked which boy he which book prt.-offered had

   b’. ??Ik vroeg [[welk boek], hij welke jongen t₁ aangeboden had].

   c.  Ik vroeg [[welk boek], hij t₁ aan welke jongen aangeboden had].
   I asked which book he to which boy prt.-offered had

   c’.  ?Ik vroeg [[aan welke jongen], hij welk boek t₁ aangeboden had].

The gradual increase in acceptability of the primed examples in (9) is probably related to the fact that the order of the subject and direct object is really fixed in Dutch, whereas it is not entirely impossible to have an accusative DP preceding a dative one, and it is certainly not uncommon to have a periphrastic indirect object preceding the direct object.

Judgments are less clear in the case of main clauses. As expected, all speakers agree that the primeless examples in (10) are preferred to the primed ones, but many speakers find that the latter are much better than the primed ones in (9). So far, it is not clear what causes the contrast between the primed examples in (9) and (10).

(10)  a.  [Welke jongen], heeft t₁ [welk boek] gelezen?
    which boy has which book read

     a’. *[Welk boek], heeft [welke jongen] t₁ gelezen?

     b.  [Welke jongen], heeft hij t₁ [welk boek] aangeboden?
     which boy has he which book prt.-offered

     b’. *[Welk boek], heeft hij [welke jongen] t₁ aangeboden?

     c.  [Welk boek], heeft hij t₁ aan [welke jongen] aangeboden?
     which book has he to which boy prt.-offered

     c’.  ?[Aan welke jongen], heeft hij [welk boek] t₁ aangeboden?

It seems that the wh-phrases in the primed examples in (10) must be of the same sort in order to be able to violate the superiority condition; as soon as one of the two DPs headed by a demonstrative is replaced by an interrogative personal pronoun, the results seem to get worse. Again, it is not clear what causes this effect.

(11)  a.  *?[Welk boek], heeft [wie] t₁ gelezen?
     a’. *?[Wat], heeft [welke jongen] t₁ gelezen?

     b.  *?[Welk boek], heeft hij [wie] t₁ aangeboden?
     b’. *?[Wat], heeft hij [welke jongen] t₁ aangeboden?

     c.  ??[Aan welke jongen], heeft hij [wat] t₁ aangeboden?
     c’.  ?[Aan wie], heeft hij [welk boek] t₁ aangeboden?

III. Long wh-movement and subject-object asymmetries

Wh-movement need not target the initial position of the minimal clause containing the moved argument, but may also trigger the initial position of some higher clause. In order for this to be possible the clause containing the wh-phrase must be the complement of a limited set of so-called bridge verbs, generally a verb taking a propositional complement like the verbs of saying or thinking.
It has been argued that in many languages there is an asymmetry between subjects and objects (as well as other non-subjects) with respect to this kind of “long” *wh*-movement. Whereas objects can undergo long movement, subjects cannot unless the language has some special proviso that makes this movement possible: *Who do you think (*that) *he* came*, for example, shows that dropping the complementizer *that* makes extraction of the subject possible in English. In traditional generative grammar this led to the empirical generalization that a complementizer cannot be followed by a subject trace, which was formulated as the °Complementizer-trace Filter in (13), in which C and *ti* stand for, respectively, the complementizer and the trace of the subject.

\[(13)\] Complementizer-trace Filter: *[ ... C *ti* ...].

At first sight, Dutch seems well-behaved with respect to this filter: whereas the examples in (12) are fully grammatical, example (14a) is marked (although not as bad as its English translation with the overt complementizer *that*). On closer inspection, however, it turns out that the acceptability of examples of this sort is influenced by the type of noun phrase: °D-linked noun phrases like *welke jongen* do not readily allow this movement whereas non-D-linked noun phrases like *wie* do.

\[(14)\] a. *Welke jongen* denk je [dat *ti* het boek zal krijgen]?
\hspace{1em} which boy think you that the book will get
\hspace{1em} ‘Which boy do you think (*that) will get the book?’

b. *Wie* denk je [dat *ti* het boek zal krijgen]?
\hspace{1em} who think you that the book will get
\hspace{1em} ‘Who do you think (*that) will get the book?’

A possible reason for the difference in acceptability of these two examples may be that, despite appearances, the traces of the two *wh*-phrases do not occupy the same position in the clause. This can be made clearer by considering embedded clauses that do not contain a definite object, like those in (15).

\[(15)\] a. *Welke jongen* denk je [dat (er) *ti* heeft gelogen]?
\hspace{1em} which boy think you that there has lied
\hspace{1em} ‘Which boy do you think (*that) has lied?’

b. *Wie* denk je [dat *(er) *ti* heeft gelogen]?
\hspace{1em} who think you that there has lied
\hspace{1em} ‘Who do you think (*that) has lied?’

As can be seen in (15b), the example with *wie* requires that the embedded clause contain the expletive *er*. Since the expletive normally precedes the indefinite subject (cf. *Gisteren heeft er iemand gelogen* ‘Yesterday, someone lied’) and can therefore
be assumed to occupy the regular subject position, we may conclude that the subject trace does not occupy the regular subject position of the clause in (15b); see Section 8.1.4 for more discussion. If this is a general property of non-D-linked interrogative personal pronouns, the same must hold for (14b). When we now reformulate the generalization given earlier such that it expresses that a complementizer cannot be followed by a trace in the regular subject position, we can conclude that Dutch behaves in accordance with this generalization. Since this chapter is clearly not the place to exhaustively discuss all intricacies of (long) wh-movement, we will end our discussion at this point.

8.1.2.2. Topicalization

The notion of topicalization refers to the movement process that places some constituent into the clause-initial position of the main clause. The name was probably invented to express that topicalization plays a role in determining the information structure of the clause by moving the discourse topic (the entity the discourse is about) into the first position of the clause. Although this idea might be on the right track, it may not be entirely correct for Dutch since the constituent that fills this position may perform several functions, the pragmatic function of expressing the discourse topic being only one of these. In the following we will discuss some questions concerning topicalization. We start with the question whether clause-initial subjects occupy the same position as other topicalized noun phrase, then continue with the information-structural function of topicalization, and conclude with a short discussion of long topicalization.

I. Topicalization of subject and object pronouns

In the unmarked case, the initial constituent of a main clause is the subject. As we have already seen in the discussion of example (1) in Section 8.1.1, nearly all noun phrase types can function as the clause-initial subject, the only exception being °weak noun phrases, which normally occur in the expletive construction, in which case it is not the subject itself but the expletive that fills the clause-initial position. A noteworthy property of clause-initial subjects is that they may also surface as weak (phonetically reduced) pronouns, with the exception of the third person singular masculine form -ie, which always follows the finite verb in second position, and the second person plural pronoun, which simply lacks a weak subject form in most varieties of Dutch.

(16) Clause-initial subject pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST PERSON</td>
<td><em>Ik/</em>’k ben ziek. ‘I am ill.’</td>
<td>*Wij/We zijn ziek. ‘We are ill.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND PERSON</td>
<td>Jij/Je bent ziek. ‘You are ill.’</td>
<td>Jullie/*’Je zijn ziek. ‘You are ill.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD PERSON</td>
<td>MASCULINE</td>
<td>FEMININE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hij/</em>-ie is ziek. ‘He is ill.’</td>
<td>*Zij/Ze is ziek. ‘She is ill.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this respect, clause-initial subjects differ from topicalized object pronouns, which must always be realized in their strong form. Note that the neuter object pronoun *het
cannot be used at all, which is due to the fact that it is always pronounced in its weak form (cf. Section 5.2.1.1.5); instead, the neuter demonstrative *dit* ‘this’ or *dat* ‘that’ is normally used.

(17) Clause-initial object pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>*Mij/<em>Me heeft Peter niet gezien.</em></td>
<td><em>Ons heeft Peter niet gezien.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Peter didn’t see ME.’</td>
<td>‘Peter didn’t see US.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>*Jou/<em>Je heeft Peter niet gezien.</em></td>
<td>*Jullie/<em>Je heeft Peter niet gezien.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Peter didn’t see YOU.’</td>
<td>‘Peter didn’t see YOU.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td><strong>MASCULINE</strong></td>
<td><strong>FEMININE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hem/</em>’m heeft Peter niet gezien.*</td>
<td><em>Haar/</em>’r heeft Peter niet gezien.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Peter didn’t see HIM.’</td>
<td>‘Peter didn’t see HER.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NEUTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dit/</em>’t heeft Peter niet gezien.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Peter didn’t see IT/THIS.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussion above has shown that subject and object pronouns differ in that the latter must be stressed in clause-initial position, whereas the former need not be. This difference between subject and object pronouns has been used to argue that, despite appearances, clause-initial subjects are not topicalized, but rather occupy the regular subject position, which may perhaps also account for the fact that the expletive *er*, which is generally assumed to occupy the subject position, can also be used clause-initially; cf. 8.1.4. This conclusion, if correct, has various theoretical ramifications in that it presupposes that in subject-initial main clauses, the finite verb does not occupy the C(omplementizer)-position but is placed in the lower I(nflection)-position, which in turn implies that the I-position is to the immediate right of the subject position: \[\text{IP subject I + V}_{\text{fin}} \ [\text{VP ... }v_{\text{fin}} (V)]\]. This breaks radically with the more traditional view on the syntax of Dutch, according to which the I-position is in the right periphery of the clause, following the base-positions of the verb(s). Since this is not the place to elaborate on these theoretical consequences, we refer the reader to Zwart (1997) and Broekhuis (2000/2008) for relevant discussion.

II. Information structure

As was mentioned in the introduction to this section, the notion of topicalization suggests that this movement plays a role in determining the information structure of the clause by moving the discourse topic into the first position of the clause. A potential problem for such a claim is that clause-initial subjects need not be topics. It seems, however, that this problem can be set aside, as we saw in the previous subsection that there are reasons to assume that these subjects are actually not topicalized but occupy the regular subject position. Therefore, it seems indeed possible to maintain that topicalization applies for information-structural reasons. However, we will see below that the preposed phrase need not be a discourse topic, but may also be presented as a contrasted or emphatic °focus; see, e.g., Neeleman & Van de Koot (2008).
A. Focus

The fact that object pronouns must be stressed in topicalized position suggests that they are always focused in this position. In the examples in (17) we are simply dealing with emphatic focus, but focus may also be contrastive, as in (18).

(18)  a.  MIJ heeft Peter niet gezien, maar HEM wel.  
      me has Peter not seen, but him AFF  
      ‘Peter didn’t see me, but he did see him.’

  b.  JOU heeft Peter niet gezien, maar MIJ wel.  
      you has Peter not seen but me AFF  
      ‘Peter didn’t see you, but he did see me.’

That focus may be involved in topicalization is also clear from the fact that the topicalized phrase can be preceded by focus particles like zelfs ‘even’, alleen ‘only’ and slechts ‘only’, as in (19). These examples also show that these emphatically focused topicalized phrases can incorporate any type of noun phrase: in (19a), we are dealing with a proper noun and a pronoun; in (19b), the topicalized phrase is definite, and in (19c) we are dealing with an indefinite noun phrase containing a numeral/quantifier.

(19)  a.  Zelfs JAN/HEM heb ik niets verteld.  
      even Jan/him have I nothing told  
      ‘Even Jan/him, I didn’t tell anything.’

  b.  Alleen de/die MAN heb ik niets verteld.  
      only the/that man have I nothing told  
      ‘Only the/that man I have told nothing.’

  c.  Slechts WEINIG/VIER mensen heb ik gezien.  
      only few/four people have I seen

The examples in (20) show that the subject can also receive contrastive or emphatic focus. Contrastive focus can be found in (20a), and emphatic focus in (20b). Note that in the latter example the indefinite subject has been moved across the expletive er into clause-initial position; the fact that the expletive may be present shows (i) that subjects can be topicalized, and (ii) that topicalized indefinite noun phrase can even be construed non-specifically. The latter fact is conclusive for showing that topicalized phrases need not be discourse topics.

(20)  a.  JAN wordt ontslagen, maar PETER niet.  
      Jan is fired, but Peter not  
      ‘Jan will be fired, but not Peter.’

  b.  Slechts WEINIG/VIER mensen kwamen (er) naar de lezing.  
      only few/four people came there to the talk

B. Topic

Topicalized phrases need not be discourse topics, but they certainly can function as such, as is shown by example (21a). Given the fact that discourse topics are always related to the previous discourse or to the non-linguistic context, in this function topicalized noun phrases typically surface as definite noun phrases, as in the first
sentence in (21a), or, probably more commonly, as definite pronouns. When the discourse topic is very prominent, as in (21b), it can occasionally be dropped.

(21) a. De man stond op het punt te vertrekken. Hij pakte zijn tas, maar ...
    the man stood on the point to leave he took his bag but
    ‘The man was about to leave. He took his bag, but ...’

b. Q: Weet jij waar mijn sleutels zijn?
    know you where my keys are
    A: Nee, (die) heb ik niet gezien.
    no those have I not seen
    ‘Do you know where my keys are? No, I haven’t seen them.’

III. Long topicalization

The examples in (6) above have shown that, unlike *wh*-movement, topicalization cannot target the initial position of an embedded clause. This does not imply, however, that it is impossible to topicalize some constituent that is part of an embedded clause; topicalization may also target the initial position of a higher main clause. In (22), we give an example of such long topicalization of a direct object, which is perfectly acceptable provided that the moved phrase is assigned contrastive accent.

(22) Dat BOEK, denk ik [dat hij ti wil hebben].
    that book think I that he wants to have
    ‘That book, I think he would like to have.’

The examples in (23) involve “long” topicalization of a subject. In these cases there is a clear contrast between definite and specific indefinite noun phrases, on the one hand, and nonspecific indefinite noun phrases, on the other. Only the latter are acceptable, provided that the moved phrase is emphatically stressed. Again, this can be accounted for by referring to the generalization in (13) that a complementizer cannot be followed by a trace in subject position. When a nonspecific indefinite noun phrase is topicalized, it is not moved from the regular subject position, which is occupied by the expletive, but from some position following it. When we are dealing with a definite or specific indefinite noun phrase, the expletive is not present and movement proceeds from the regular subject position, resulting in unacceptability.

(23) a. ??De JONGEN, denk ik [dat ti gelogen heeft].
    the boy think I that he lied has
    b. Een JONGEN, denk ik [dat ??(er) ti gelogen heeft].
    a boy think I that there lied has

Since this chapter is not the place to exhaustively discuss all intricacies of (long) topicalization, we will end our discussion at this point.

8.1.3. Object noun phrases in the middle field of the clause: Scrambling

Generally, nominal objects can occupy various positions in the so-called “middle field of the clause, that is, that part of the clause bounded to the left by the
C(omplementizer)-position, which is filled by the complementizer in embedded clauses and by the finite verb in main clauses, and bounded to the right by the verbs in clause-final position (if present). This variation in word order especially relates to the position of the nominal object relative to adverbial phrases of various sorts: for instance, the noun phrase *zijn auto* ‘his car’ in (24) can either follow or precede the modal adverb *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’.

(24) a.  dat Jan waarschijnlijk zijn auto verkoopt.
    that Jan probably his auto sells
    ‘that Jan will probably sell his car.’

   a′.  dat Jan zijn auto waarschijnlijk verkoopt.

   b.  Jan heeft waarschijnlijk zijn auto verkocht.
       Jan has probably his car sold
       ‘Jan probably sold his car.’

   b′.  Jan heeft zijn auto waarschijnlijk verkocht.

Since the direct object is generally assumed to be base-generated within the VP, it is expected to be adjacent to the main verb, as in the primeless examples in (24). In order to account for the word orders in the primed examples, it has been assumed that Dutch has a SCRAMBLING rule that may move the arguments of the verb from their VP-internal base-position into a position preceding the adverbs. The structures of the primed examples in (24) are therefore assumed to be as indicated in (25).

(25) • Scrambling
    a.  [ ... C ... DP₁ ... ADV ... [VP ... t₁ V]].

    b.  dat Jan zijn auto, waarschijnlijk [VP t₁ verkoopt]

    c.  Jan heeft zijn auto, waarschijnlijk [VP t₁ verkocht]

Actually, it can be argued that there are various types of scrambling (cf., e.g., Neeleman 1994b); for example, there is a rule of Focus-movement, which optionally places emphatically or contrastively focused phrases, and a rule of Neg-movement (Haegeman 1995), which obligatorily places negative phrases into a more leftward position in the middle field. We will not discuss these two movement types here, given that they are not restricted to nominal objects, but restrict our attention to the type of scrambling in (25a), which is limited to nominal objects and can be recognized by the fact that the moved phrase is never accented. We will see that word order variations like those in (24) are typically related to the information structure of the clause: scrambled noun phrases normally belong to the presupposition (“old” information) whereas noun phrases that are not scrambled are instead part of the “focus” (“new” information) of the clause. Other effects of scrambling may be that the moved noun phrase is assigned a special (e.g., generic or partitive) meaning.

8.1.3.1. Clauses containing a clause adverb

This section discusses the distribution of nominal objects in clauses containing a clause adverb such as modal adverbs or adverbs of frequency. It will be shown that the position of the noun phrase is intimately related to the information structure of the clause, especially the distinction between focus and presupposition, that is,
“new” and “old” information. These notions will be explained in Subsection I. We start with a discussion of definite noun phrases and personal pronouns, which is followed by a discussion of indefinite and quantified noun phrases.

I. Definite noun phrases

Definite nominal objects can occur both to the left and to the right of a clause adverb. The placement of the noun phrase to the left or to the right of such an adverb is not free, however, but intimately related to the information structure of the clause. Consider the examples in (26). The direct object *het boek* in (26a) follows the modal adverb *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’ and is construed as part of the “new” information or focus of the clause; due to the prosodic structure of Dutch clauses, the sentence accent naturally falls on the direct object, which enhances a focus interpretation for this noun phrase. In (26b), on the other hand, the object has been scrambled to the left of the adverb, and as a result it no longer receives sentence accent; scrambled nominal objects cannot be interpreted as (part of the) focus, but are rather construed as topics of discussion, belonging to the “old” information or presupposition of the utterance (Verhagen 1986).

(26)  a. Hij heeft waarschijnlijk het boek gelezen.
    he   has   probably      the book  read
  b. Hij heeft het boek waarschijnlijk gelezen.
    he   has   the book probably       read

At this point a remark on the terminology is in order. The notions “new” and “old” information may be confusing since the former suggests that the referent of the noun phrase *het boek* in (26) is not part of the domain of discourse (domain D), whereas the latter suggests that it is. This is clearly not the case, since in both cases the hearer is assumed to be able to uniquely identify this referent. The notions rather refer to the information structure of the clause; the “old” information refers to the entities currently under discussion, whereas the “new” information refers to entities that may be part of the background of the discourse (that is, part of domain D) but were so far not a topic of discussion. In order to avoid the misleading connotations of the notions of “new” and “old” information, we will generally use the notions “focus” and “presupposition” in this work (despite the fact that the former can be easily confused with the notion of CONTRASTIVE or EMPHATIC FOCUS).

The distinction between presupposition and focus is especially clear in question-answer contexts. A question like (27a) introduces the referent of *het boek* as a topic of discussion, and therefore the answer preferably has the noun phrase in front of the adverb, that is, presents the noun phrase as “old” information; in actual speech, this is made even clearer by replacing the noun phrase *het boek* by the personal pronoun *het*, which typically refers to “old” information (see II below).

(27)  a. Wat heeft Jan met het boek gedaan?    [question]
    what has Jan with the book done
  b. ??Hij heeft waarschijnlijk het boek gelezen.  [answer = (26a)]
  b’. Hij heeft het boek waarschijnlijk gelezen.  [answer = (26b)]
A question like (28a), on the other hand, clearly does not presuppose the referent of the noun phrase *het boek* to be a topic of discourse, and now the preferred answer has the noun phrase following the adverb. The answer in (28b’) with the nominal object preceding the adverb is only possible when the context provides more information, e.g., when the participants in the discourse know that Jan had the choice between reading a set of articles or reading a certain book; in that case the nominal object preceding the adverb is likely to have contrastive accent.

(28)  
a. Wat heeft Jan gelezen?                          [question]  
       what has Jan read  

b. Hij heeft waarschijnlijk het boek gelezen.     [answer = (26a)]

b’. *?Hij heeft het boek waarschijnlijk gelezen. [answer = (26b)]

That the noun phrase *het boek* refers to “new” information is also clear from the fact that replacing the noun phrase *het boek* by the personal pronoun *het* gives rise to an infelicitous result: using the pronoun makes the answer uninformative since it presupposes (contrary to fact) that the identity of the referent is already known to the person asking the question.

Note that in (28) the activity of reading is still presupposed as a topic. This is not the case in an example like (29), but in this case also the utterance with the direct object following the adverb is strongly preferred. The answer with the nominal object preceding the adverb is only possible when the context provides more information, e.g., when the participants in the discourse know that Jan had the choice between reading the book or following a crash course in linguistics. Note that (29) shows that (26a) can be construed not only with the noun phrase *het boek*, but also with the complete verb phrase *het boek gelezen*, as “new” information.

(29)  
a. Wat heeft Jan gedaan?                           [question]  
       what has Jan done  

b. Hij heeft waarschijnlijk het boek gelezen.     [answer = (26a)]

b’. *?Hij heeft het boek waarschijnlijk gelezen. [answer = (26b)]

To conclude we want to note that according to some research the informational-structural effect described above are tendencies not absolute rules.

II. Referential personal pronouns

Referential personal pronouns are typically used to refer to active topics of discussion. Therefore, we correctly predict them to normally occur in a position preceding the clause adverbs. This is clear from the fact that in an example like (30a), the pronoun *het* must precede the adverb *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’.

(30)  
Jan heeft <het> waarschijnlijk <*het*> gelezen.
       Jan has it probably read
‘Jan has probably read it.’

The requirement that personal pronouns precede the clause adverbs can, however, be overruled in contrastive contexts by assigning contrastive focus accent to the pronoun. Given the fact that weak pronouns cannot be assigned accent, this is only possible with strong pronouns. Some illustrative examples are given in (31); the
primed examples show that in these cases placement of the contrastively focused pronoun in front of the adverb is also possible, and even seems to be preferred by some. Note that the ungrammatical variant of (30) cannot be saved by assigning contrastive accent to the pronoun *het*, due to the fact that *het* normally cannot be assigned accent; cf. Section 5.2.1.1.5.

(31) a. Jan kiest waarschijnlijk (**MIJ**/*me* als begeleider, niet JOU.
    Jan chooses probably **me/me** as supervisor, not you
a’. Jan kiest MIJ waarschijnlijk als begeleider, niet JOU.
b. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk (**HEM**/*’m uitgenodigd, niet HAAR.
    Jan has probably **him/him** prt.-invited not her
b’. Jan heeft HEM waarschijnlijk uitgenodigd, niet HAAR.

When the negative adverb *niet* ‘not’ is placed in the first conjunct, both orders are completely acceptable; this is illustrated in (32). The difference between the primeless and the primed examples is that in the former the negative adverb *niet* acts as constituent negation and in the latter as sentential negation; cf. Section 8.1.3.4.

(32) a. Jan kiest waarschijnlijk niet MIJ als begeleider, maar JOU.
    Jan chooses probably not **me** as supervisor, but you
a’. Jan kiest MIJ waarschijnlijk niet als begeleider, maar wel JOU.
    Jan chooses me probably not as supervisor, but AFF. you
b. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk niet HEM uitgenodigd, maar HAAR.
    Jan has probably not **him** prt.-invited but her
b’. Jan heeft HEM waarschijnlijk niet uitgenodigd, maar wel HAAR.
    Jan has him probably not prt.-invited but AFF. her

III. Indefinite noun phrases

Scrambling of indefinite nominal objects across a clause adverb is possible in some but not all constructions, and when it does occur, scrambling has important semantic repercussions: scrambling may change the *°scope relation between the indefinite noun phrase and some other quantified expression, or force a generic reading of the moved noun phrase.

A. Scope

The examples in (33) show that (both nonspecific and specific) indefinite nominal objects cannot readily appear to the left of a modal adverb like *waarschijnlijk*.

(33) a. dat Jan waarschijnlijk een vriend zal bezoeken.
    that Jan probably a friend will visit
a’. *dat Jan een vriend waarschijnlijk zal bezoeken.
b. dat Jan waarschijnlijk [NP Ø vrienden] zal bezoeken.
    that Jan probably friends will visit

However, scrambling of indefinite nominal objects is often possible when the clause adverb expresses frequency, and coincides with a difference in scope. First,
consider example (34a), in which the indefinite noun phrase follows the adverbial phrase *elke dag* ‘every day’. This example contends that Jan has the habit of watching (at least) one program a day on TV, where the program may change from day to day. However, when the speaker has a specific television program in mind that Jan watches every day (e.g., the eight o’clock news), he is not likely to use example (34a); he would probably use an example like (34b) instead, where *één* is stressed so that we cannot determine whether we are dealing with the indefinite article *een* ‘a’ or the numeral *één* ‘one’. The fact that a nonspecific indefinite bare plural like *programma’s* in the primed examples cannot be placed in front of the adverb, however, suggests the latter.

(34)  a.  dat Jan *elke dag* een programma op tv bekijkt.
that Jan *every day* a program on TV watches
   a’. dat Jan *elke dag* programma’s op tv bekijkt.
that Jan *every day* programs on TV watches
   b.  dat Jan *één programma* op tv *elke dag* bekijkt.
that Jan *a/one program* on TV *every day* watches
   b’. ??dat Jan programma’s op tv *elke dag* bekijkt.
that Jan programs on TV *every day* watches

This suggestion is further supported by the fact that a plural noun phrase preceded by a numeral show the same difference in reading as (34a&b): (35a) expresses that Jan watches two programs every day, where the programs may change from day to day, whereas (35b) expresses that Jan watches the same two programs every day.

(35)  a.  dat Jan *elke dag* twee programma’s op tv bekijkt.
that Jan *every day* two programs on TV watches
   b.  dat Jan twee programma’s op tv *elke dag* bekijkt.
that Jan two programs on TV *every day* watches

From this we may conclude that the difference in scope between the indefinite noun phrase and the universally quantified adverbial phrase is reflected in the linear order of the two: in (35a) the universal operator expressed by the temporal adverbial phrase has scope over the existential operator implied by the indefinite noun phrase (*∀t ∃x*), and in (35b) the scope relation is inverted (*∃x ∀t*).

B. Genericity

Another possible effect of scrambling is that the indefinite noun phrase receives a generic interpretation. Consider the examples in (36). Example (36a) expresses that Jan is reading something which is probably a bestseller (or, alternatively, that Jan is doing something, which is probably reading a bestseller). Example (36a’), on the other hand, expresses that bestsellers are likely to be read by Jan. The same pattern is even clearer in (36b&b’): (36b) expresses that Jan generally reads some bestseller, whereas (36b’) expresses that most bestsellers are read by Jan. The (c)-examples provide similar examples with plural noun phrases: (36c) expresses that Jan generally reads bestsellers, whereas (36c’) expresses that most bestsellers are read by Jan.
(36) a. dat Jan waarschijnlijk een bestseller leest.
that Jan probably a bestseller reads
a’. dat Jan een bestseller waarschijnlijk leest.
b. dat Jan meestal een bestseller leest.
that Jan generally a bestseller reads
b’. dat Jan een bestseller meestal leest.
c. dat Jan meestal bestsellers leest.
that Jan generally bestsellers reads
c’. dat Jan bestsellers meestal leest.

Scrambling of indefinite nominal objects is also possible, and is perhaps even preferred, when the noun phrase contains an attributive adjective like volgende ‘next’ or nieuwe ‘new’ or an ordinal numeral, as in the examples in (37). The indefinite noun phrases in these examples seem comparable to English noun phrases containing free choice any: Jan will turn down any invitation that comes next; the Security Council will condemn any attack that comes next. Since we are not aware of any discussion of data like these in the literature, we will leave these for future research; see also example (64) for comparable examples with the negative adverb niet ‘not’.

(37) a. Jan zal een volgende/nieuwe uitnodiging waarschijnlijk afslaan.
Jan will a next/new invitation probably turn down
‘Jan will probably turn down any invitation that comes next/new invitation.’
a’. ?Jan zal waarschijnlijk een volgende/nieuwe uitnodiging afslaan.
b. De Veiligheidsraad zal een nieuwe/tweede aanval waarschijnlijk veroordelen.
the Security Council will a new/second attack probably condemn
‘The Security Council will probably condemn a subsequent/second attack.’
b’. ?De Veiligheidsraad zal waarschijnlijk een nieuwe/tweede aanval veroordelen.

IV. Quantified noun phrases and quantifiers
This subsection discusses scrambling of quantified nominal objects and quantifiers, and its semantic effects. Existentially, universally and negatively quantified noun phrases are discussed in separate sections. Before we start we want to note that the felicitousness of a certain word order is often determined not only by the quantifier in question, but also by the meaning of the predicate; certain orders may be infelicitous because they give rise to an improbable reading with some predicates. In the following we will abstract away from these effects of the choice of the predicate but simply select predicates that give rise to felicitous results.

A. Existentially quantified noun phrases
The placement of an existentially quantified nominal object with respect to a modal adverb like waarschijnlijk ‘probably’ seems to depend on the nature of the quantifier. When the quantifier normally triggers a nonspecific reading of the noun phrase, as does enkele ‘some’ in (38a&a’), the nominal object is preferably placed after the adverb. When the quantifier allows both a nonspecific and a specific reading, as does veel ‘many’ in (38b&b’), the nominal object can readily occur on either side of the adverb. When the quantifier normally triggers a specific reading,
as does *sommige* ‘some’ in (38c’), the nominal object is preferably placed in front of the adverb. In all cases, a nominal object in front of the adverb is construed as specific, whereas one following the adverb is construed as nonspecific (unless it is assigned emphatic focus).

(38) a.  dat Jan waarschijnlijk enkele boeken weggooit.
   that Jan probably some books throws.away
   a’.  ??dat Jan enkele boeken waarschijnlijk weggooit.

b.  dat Jan waarschijnlijk veel boeken weggooit.
   that Jan probably many books throws.away
   b’.  dat Jan veel boeken waarschijnlijk weggooit.

c.  ??dat Jan waarschijnlijk sommige boeken weggooit.
   that Jan probably some books throws.away
   c’.  dat Jan sommige boeken waarschijnlijk weggooit.

Note that we have avoided the use of the notions of weak and strong quantifier (cf. Section 6.2.1, sub II) in the description of the data in (38): since we will see in the next subsection that the (strong) universal quantifier *alle* is preferably placed after the °clause adverbs, we cannot say that strong quantifiers are preferably scrambled, whereas weak quantifiers are preferably left in their position to the right of the clause adverbs. Nevertheless, this seems to provide an apt description of the behavior of the strong/weak existential quantifiers.

In (35), we have observed that scrambling of indefinite nominal objects affects the scope relations in the clause. When we are dealing with a noun phrase containing an existential quantifier, the same effect can be observed. Consider the examples in (39). In (39a) the frequency adverb has scope over the quantified noun phrase *veel boeken* ‘many books’: as a result the sentence expresses that it is often the case that Jan is reading many books. In (39b), on the other hand, it is the noun phrase that has scope over the adverb: as a result the sentence expresses that there are many books that Jan often reads.

(39) a.  dat Jan vaak veel boeken leest.
   that Jan often many books reads
   b.  dat Jan veel boeken vaak leest.

This difference in interpretation can also be held responsible for the fact that an adverb like *meestal* ‘usually’ cannot follow a quantified nominal object: whereas it makes perfect sense to claim that Jan usually reads many books, it seems weird to say that many books are usually read by Jan. Similarly, it may account for the fact that a strong noun phrase like *sommige boeken* ‘some books’, which presupposes a certain set of books and is therefore specific, cannot readily be used in the position following the adverb.

(40) a.  dat Jan meestal veel boeken leest.
   that Jan usually many books reads
   a’.  ??dat Jan veel boeken meestal leest.

b.  *dat Jan vaak sommige boeken leest.
   that Jan often some books reads
   b’.  dat Jan sommige boeken vaak leest.
The existential personal pronouns *iemand* ‘someone’ and *iets* ‘something’ also allow both a nonspecific and a specific interpretation. As in the quantified noun phrases discussed above, the availability of these readings depends on whether the noun phrase occurs to the right or to the left of the adverb. Note that the specific readings in the primed examples are not completely natural.

(41)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{dat Jan waarschijnlijk iemand uitnodigt.} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan probably someone prt.-invites} \\
& \quad \text{a’}. \text{?dat Jan iemand waarschijnlijk uitnodigt.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{dat Jan waarschijnlijk iets aan Peter wil geven.} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan probably something to Peter wants give} \\
& \quad \text{b’}. \text{?dat Jan iets waarschijnlijk aan Peter wil geven.}
\end{align*}
\]

Again, the position of the nominal object affects the scope readings: whereas the frequency adverb has scope over the existential pronouns in the primeless examples of (42), the pronouns have scope over the adverb in the primed examples. As a result, (42a) contends that it has often been the case that Jan insulted some person or other, whereas (42a’’) expresses that there is a certain person who has often been insulted by Jan. Similarly, (42b) contends that it has often been the case that Jan dropped something, whereas (42b’’) expresses that there is a certain thing that has often been dropped by Jan. Observe that, in contrast to the primed examples in (41), the primed examples in (42) are impeccable.

(42)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{dat Jan vaak iemand heeft uitgescholden.} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan often someone has prt.-insulted} \\
& \quad \text{a’}. \text{dat Jan iemand vaak heeft uitgescholden.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{dat Jan vaak iets laat vallen.} \\
& \quad \text{that Jan often something drops} \\
& \quad \text{b’}. \text{dat Jan iets vaak laat vallen.}
\end{align*}
\]

**B. Universally quantified noun phrases**

The examples in (43) suggest that universally quantified phrases have some preference for the position following the modal adverb *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’, but both orders seem to be grammatical. The difference between the two examples seems to be related to the information structure in the clause. In (43b), it is only the action of inviting that is part of the focus of the clause. Example (43a) is compatible with various information structures: the focus of the clause can be formed by the full VP *alle studenten uitnodigen*, the noun phrase *alle studenten*, or the quantifier *alle* — in the first two cases sentence stress falls on the noun *studenten*, and in the third case on the quantifier *alle*.

(43)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Marie zal waarschijnlijk alle studenten uitnodigen.} \\
& \quad \text{Marie will probably all students prt.-invite} \\
& \quad \text{‘Marie will probably invite all students.'} \\
& \quad \text{b. (Marie zal alle studenten waarschijnlijk uitnodigen.}
\end{align*}
\]

The two examples also seem to differ in interpretation. Example (43a) can be interpreted either as referring to a single event of inviting all the students or as
referring to several separate events of inviting a student or subgroup of students, whereas (43b) strongly favors the latter interpretation. This meaning difference is probably related to the scope of the modal adverb *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’. In (43b) the universally quantified phrase is outside the scope of the modal adverb, and, as a result, it is claimed for each individual student that he will probably be invited. In (43a), on the other hand, the universally quantified phrase is within the scope of the modal adverb, and, as a result, it is claimed that it is probably the case that all students will be invited, where it is immaterial whether they are invited individually or as a group. The universal quantifiers *iedereen* ‘everyone’ and *alles* ‘everything’ also seem to prefer the position to the right of the modal adverb, but again both orders seem to be acceptable.

(44) a. dat Jan waarschijnlijk iedereen/alles meeneemt.  
   that Jan probably everyone/everything prt.-takes  
   ‘that Jan probably takes everyone/everything with him.’
   b. ?dat Jan iedereen/alles waarschijnlijk meeneemt.

Universally quantified nominal objects can readily occur on both sides of the adverbs of frequency. This gives rise to a difference in interpretation, which can again be expressed in terms of scope: in (45a’), the universally quantified noun phrase is outside the scope of the adverb, and as a result it is claimed for each individual book in the relevant domain of discourse that John often takes it with him; in (45a), on the other hand, the universally quantified noun phrase is within the scope of the frequency adverb, and as a result it is claimed that it is often the case that John takes all books with him. Examples (45b&b’) show that the same thing holds for universal quantifiers such as *alles* ‘everything’.

(45) a. dat Jan vaak alle boeken meeneemt.  
   that Jan often all books prt.-takes  
   ‘that Jan often takes all books with him.’
   a’. dat Jan alle boeken vaak meeneemt.
   b. dat Jan vaak alles meeneemt.  
   that Jan often everything prt.-takes  
   ‘that Jan often takes everything with him.’
   b’. ?dat Jan alles vaak meeneemt.

C. Negative quantifiers

Given that the negative quantifiers *niemand* ‘nobody’ and *niets* ‘nothing’ do not allow a specific interpretation, it does not come as a surprise that such noun phrases must follow the modal adverbs, as is illustrated by (46a&b). Another factor that may play a role here is that, in general, negative phrases tend to follow the modal adverbs. This even holds for subjects, as is shown in (46c).

(46) a. dat Jan <*niemand> waarschijnlijk <*niemand> uitnodigt.  
   that Jan nobody probably invites  
   b. dat Jan <*niets> waarschijnlijk <*niets> aan Peter wil geven.  
   that Jan nothing probably to Peter wants give
   c. dat <*niemand> waarschijnlijk <*niemand> dat boek gelezen heeft.  
   that nobody probably that book read has
However, unlike modal adverbs, the negative quantifiers can precede the frequency adverbs. The two examples in (47), which are the negative counterparts of the primed examples in (42), respectively express that there is not a certain person who has often been insulted by Jan and that there is not a certain thing that has often been dropped by Jan.

(47)  a. dat Jan niemand vaak heeft uitgescholden.
     that Jan nobody often has prt.-insulted
     b. dat Jan niets vaak laat vallen.
     that Jan nothing often drops

The examples in (48) show that the negative quantifiers can also follow the adverbs of frequency. In these examples the quantifier is in the scope of the adverb: (48a) expresses that it is often the case that Jan does not want to see anyone and (48b) that it is often the case that Jan does not want to eat anything.

(48)  a. dat Jan vaak niemand wil zien.
     that Jan often nobody wants see
     ‘that Jan often doesn’t want to see anyone.’
     b. dat Jan vaak niets wil eten.
     that Jan often nothing wants eat
     ‘that Jan often doesn’t want to eat anything.’

V. Interplay of indirect and direct objects

In the subsections above, we have seen that scrambling is related to several meaning aspects of the clause: scrambling affects the information structure of the clause, it affects the scope relations between quantifiers, and it may trigger a partitive or generic reading of the moved nominal object. This section will show that there are also syntactic constraints on this movement.

So far, we have mainly considered scrambling of the direct object in the clause, but indirect objects behave in more or less the same way. This implies that in double object constructions like (49), there are various word order possibilities. In (49a), neither of the objects is scrambled, which leads to an interpretation according to which both the indirect and the direct object are part of the focus of the clause. In (49b), the indirect object is scrambled, but the direct object is not, which leads to an interpretation according to which the indirect object is part of the presupposition, and the direct object is part of the focus of the clause. In (49c), both objects are scrambled, which leads to a reading according to which they are both part of the presupposition. Given this, one would expect that it is also possible to scramble just the direct object, that is, to move the direct object across the indirect object. As is shown in (49d), however, this is not possible, from which we must conclude that the indirect object blocks movement of the direct object. In order to express that it is only the indirect object that belongs to the focus of the clause, one has to use (49a) with sentence accent on the noun moeder (and not on the direct object, as would normally be the case), or a construction with a periphrastic indirect object: dat Jan het boek waarschijnlijk aan zijn moeder heeft gegeven ‘that Jan probably has given the book to his mother’.
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(49) a. dat Jan waarschijnlijk zijn moeder het boek heeft gegeven.
    that Jan probably his mother the book has given
    ‘that Jan probably has given his mother the book.’
    b. dat Jan zijn moeder waarschijnlijk het boek heeft gegeven.
    c. dat Jan zijn moeder het boek waarschijnlijk heeft gegeven.
    d. *dat Jan het boek waarschijnlijk zijn moeder heeft gegeven.

    When the two objects are personal pronouns, they are considered to be part of
    the presupposition of the clause (unless they are assigned emphatic or contrastive
    focus), as a result of which they must precede the adverb. Remarkably, this results
    in a change of order of the two objects: the ungrammaticality of (50c) shows that
    the direct object may no longer follow the indirect object, but must precede it, as in
    (50d).

(50) a. *dat Jan waarschijnlijk haar het heeft gegeven.
    b. *dat Jan haar waarschijnlijk het heeft gegeven.
    c. *dat Jan haar het waarschijnlijk heeft gegeven.
    d.   dat   Jan het  haar waarschijnlijk heeft gegeven.
         that Jan it her probably has given
         ‘that Jan probably has given it to her.’

    When only the indirect object is a pronoun, we correctly predict that it must
    precede the adverb (unless it is assigned emphatic focus). The direct object may
    either follow or precede the adverb, depending on whether it is seen as part of the
    focus or the presupposition of the clause.

(51) a. *dat Jan waarschijnlijk haar het boek heeft gegeven.
    b.  dat   Jan haar waarschijnlijk het boek heeft gegeven.
         that Jan her probably the book has given
         ‘that Jan probably has given her the book.’
    c.  dat Jan haar het boek waarschijnlijk heeft gegeven.

    When only the direct object is a pronoun, it must be scrambled. In that case, the
    indirect object cannot remain in its position after the adverb (unless, perhaps, when
    it is emphatically stressed), which is probably due to the fact that it would block
    scrambling of the direct object in this position; cf. example (49d). Note that, as is
    shown in (52c&d), the pronoun can either precede or follow the indirect object. The
    question mark within parentheses in (52d) is used to indicate that this example
    seems fully acceptable but marked compared to the periphrastic construction dat
    Jan het waarschijnlijk aan zijn moeder heeft gegeven ‘that Jan has probably given
    it to his mother’.

(52) a. *dat Jan waarschijnlijk zijn moeder het heeft gegeven.
    b.  *dat Jan het waarschijnlijk zijn moeder heeft gegeven.
    c.  ?dat Jan zijn moeder het waarschijnlijk heeft gegeven.
         that Jan his mother it probably has given
         ‘that Jan probably has given it to his mother.’
    d. (?)dat Jan het zijn moeder waarschijnlijk heeft gegeven.
The examples in this subsection suggest that scrambling of the direct object is not possible across the indirect object when the latter occurs in the position following the clause adverb, that is, when the latter is not scrambled. Here it must be noted that this constraint applies not only to scrambling but also to wh-movement and topicalization (Haegeman 1991 and Den Dikken 1995). The examples in (53) show that wh-movement of the direct object gives rise to a marginal result when the indirect object follows the clause adverb waarschijnlijk but is perfectly acceptable when the indirect object is scrambled. This shows that the relevant constraint is not based on some “preference rule” that wants to keep the order of the indirect and direct object fixed in order to facilitate parsing, because this would leave the contrast between the primeless and primed examples in (53) unexplained. Therefore, some deeper principle must be at work here; see Broekhuis (2000/2008) for a proposal.

(53)  a. *Wat heeft hij vaak zijn moeder aangeboden?
     a′. Wat heeft hij zijn moeder vaak aangeboden?
     ‘What did he often offer to his mother?’

     b. *Dat boek heeft hij vaak zijn moeder aangeboden.
     b′. Dat boek heeft hij zijn moeder vaak aangeboden.
     ‘That book he has often offered to his mother.’

8.1.3.2. Clauses containing a VP adverb

The previous section has shown that nonspecific nominal objects cannot readily be scrambled across a clause adverb. We may not, however, conclude from this that nonspecific nominal objects categorically resist scrambling. Consider the examples in (54), which show that nonspecific indefinite nominal objects may either precede or follow °VP adverbs of time and place. The sentences differ in the assignment of the sentence accent. In the primeless examples, sentence accent is preferably assigned to the nominal head of the indefinite object, whereas in the primed examples it is preferably assigned to the nominal head of the complement of the adverbial PP. This corresponds to the prominence within the focus field of the clause, that is, within the part of the clause expressing “new” information, which can roughly be defined as that part of the middle field of the clause following the clause adverbs. In the primeless examples the object is the most prominent element in the focus field, whereas in the primed examples it is the adverbial phrase that is most prominent; cf. Broekhuis (2007/2008).

(54)  a. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk in de tuin een BOEK gelezen.
     Jan has probably in the garden a book read
     ‘Jan probably read a book in the garden.’
     a′. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk een boek in de TUIN gelezen.

     b. Jan heeft mogelijk al in de pauze een kop KOFFIE gedronken.
     Jan has possibly already during the break a cup of coffee drunk
     ‘Jan has possibly already drunk a cup of coffee during the break.’
     b′. Jan heeft mogelijk al een kop koffie in de PAUZE gedronken.
The hypothesis that the orders in (54) are related to prominence within the focus field predicts that the orders in the primed examples are only possible when the VP adverb can be interpreted as part of the focus of the clause. Since indefinite nominal objects are more likely to be part of the focus of the clause than, e.g., adverbial pro-forms such as daar ‘there’ and toen ‘then’, it does not really come as a surprise that the primed examples in (55) are unacceptable.

(55)  a.  Jan heeft waarschijnlijk daar een boek gelezen.
    Jan has probably there a book read
    ‘Jan probably read a book there.’
    a’. *Jan heeft waarschijnlijk een boek daar gelezen.
    b.  Jan had mogelijk toen een kop koffie gedronken.
    Jan had possibly then a cup of coffee drunk
    ‘Jan had possibly drunk a cup of coffee then.’
    b’. *Jan had mogelijk een kop koffie toen gedronken.

In (56), we show that similar facts can be found with nonspecific indefinite nominal objects containing a quantifier or a numeral. Substituting a pro-form for the adverbial phrase in the primed examples in (56) leads to unacceptability.

(56)  a.  Jan heeft waarschijnlijk in de tuin enkele/twee BOEken gelezen.
    Jan has probably in the garden some/two books read
    a’. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk enkele/twee boeken in de TUIN gelezen.
    b.  Jan heeft waarschijnlijk in de pauze enkele/twee koppen KOFFie gedronken.
    Jan has probably during the break some/two cups of coffee drunk
    b’. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk enkele/twee koppen koffie in de PAUze gedronken.

Definite nominal objects, on the other hand, do not readily follow the VP adverbs. The primeless examples in (57) seem grammatical but are certainly marked compared to the primed ones. The primeless examples also show that they are preferably pronounced with an emphatic or contrastive focus accent on the noun, indicated by means of small caps. In the primed examples the adverbial PP can be replaced by the pro-forms daar ‘there’ and toen ‘then’; this is most likely when these pro-forms are assigned emphatic or contrastive focus.

(57)  a.  ?Jan heeft waarschijnlijk in de tuin het BOEK gelezen.
    Jan has probably in the garden the book read
    a’. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk het boek in de tuin gelezen.
    b.  ?Jan heeft waarschijnlijk in de pauze zijn KOFFie genuttigd.
    Jan has probably during the break his coffee drunk
    b’. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk zijn koffie in de pauze genuttigd.

It must be noted however, that examples like (57a&b) are fully acceptable when we are dealing with more or less fixed collocations like het gras maaien ‘to mow the grass/lawn’ in (58).
Syntactic uses of noun phrases

(58) a. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk in de tuin het gras gemaaid.
    `Jan has probably in the garden the grass mown`
    ‘Jan has probably mown the lawn in the garden.’

b. Jan heeft waarschijnlijk in de pauze het gras gemaaid.
    `Jan has probably during the break the grass mown`
    ‘Jan has probably mown the lawn during the break.’

The examples in this section have shown that we cannot claim that scrambling of nonspecific indefinite nominal objects is categorically blocked, since scrambling of such noun phrases is possible across VP adverbs. The effect of this kind of scrambling seems to be related to prominence in the focus field (the field expressing the new information of the clause). This fact has received little attention in the literature so far, and we believe that more research is needed in order to obtain a better understanding of the factors that affect the order of the constituents in the focus field of the clause. Furthermore, we want to refer the reader to Slioussar (2007) for relevant discussion pertaining to scrambling in Russian, which can perhaps partly be carried over to Dutch.

8.1.3.3. Clauses containing an adverb to the left of a clause adverb

Whereas VP-adverbs must occur to the right of clause adverbs, there are also adverbial phrases that may occur to the left of typical clause adverbs like the modal verb *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’. This holds, for example, for the time and place adverbs in (59). Example (59a) shows that such time adverbs may co-occur with time adverbs that function as VP-adverbs; the former are used to restrict the relevant time interval during which the event may in principle take place (time interval $j$ in the tense representations given in Section N1.5), whereas the latter pinpoint the time at which the event denoted by the main verb actually takes place (time interval $k$). In (59b), the two adverbial phrases of place exhibit similar behavior: the first restricts the location at which the event can in principle take place, whereas the second pinpoints the actual place where it takes place.

(59) a. Jan zal morgen waarschijnlijk om drie uur vertrekken.
    `Jan will tomorrow probably at 3 o’clock leave`
    ‘Tomorrow, Jan will probably leave at 3 o’clock.’

b. Jan zal in Amsterdam waarschijnlijk bij zijn tante logeren.
    `Jan will in Amsterdam probably with his aunt stay`
    ‘In Amsterdam Jan will probably stay with his aunt.’

The examples in (60) show that although scrambling of a definite noun phrase across the clause adverb is possible, scrambling across the higher locational or temporal adverbial phrase gives rise to a marked result; placing the noun phrase in front of the higher place/time adverb normally requires that the adverbial phrase be assigned accent.
The behavior of definite pronouns differs markedly from that of definite noun phrases; the pronoun must cross not only the clause adverb but also the higher place/time adverb.

The contrast between the examples in (60) and (61) suggests that definite pronouns must be moved into some more leftward position than definite noun phrases.

8.1.3.4. Clauses containing the negative adverb niet ‘not’

In clauses with a neutral intonation pattern, the negative adverb niet ‘not’ expressing sentential negation normally cannot be followed by a direct object. Since niet can be followed by other types of constituents, like the PP-complement op zijn vader in (62b), we cannot account for the fact that the noun phrase het boek must precede the negation by assuming that the negative adverb niet and the verb are somehow conflated; the fact that the PP-complement follows the negative adverb suggests that the latter is external to the VP. If so, we must conclude that nominal objects must be scrambled to a position in front of the negative adverb.

Example (63a) shows that indefinite nominal objects can normally neither precede nor follow the negative adverb; rather, they require that sentential negation be expressed by means of the negative article geen ‘no’, as in (63b). Note that the examples in (63a) are acceptable when een is stressed, in which case we are probably dealing with the numeral één ‘one’; see 8.1.3.1, sub III, for similar data with clause adverbs. The example with the nominal object preceding the negative adverb then receives a specific interpretation, and the one with the nominal object following the negative adverb receives a “not a single” reading. For a more extensive discussion of the negative article geen and data of this sort, see Section 5.1.5.
An exception to the rule that indefinite nominal objects cannot precede the negative adverb *niet* are indefinite noun phrases containing an attributive adjective like *volgende* ‘next’ or *nieuwe* ‘new’ or an ordinal numeral, as in the examples in (64). Indefinite noun phrases of this type are also exceptional in that they can precede modal adverbs like *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’; cf. example (37). Note that the indefinite nominal object cannot follow the negative adverb *niet*, which is of course in accordance with the general rule that noun phrases cannot follow a negative adverb. The negative article *geen* ‘no’ cannot be used in examples of this kind.

(64)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.  Jan zal een volgende/nieuwe uitnodiging niet afslaan.</td>
<td>Jan will a next/new invitation not turn down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a’ <em>Jan zal niet een volgende/nieuwe uitnodiging afslaan.</em></td>
<td>‘Jan won’t turn down any invitation that comes next/new invitation.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.  De Veiligheidsraad zal een nieuwe/tweede aanval niet veroordelen.</td>
<td>The Security Council will a new/second attack not condemn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. <em>De Veiligheidsraad zal niet een nieuwe/tweede aanval veroordelen.</em></td>
<td>‘The Security Council will not condemn a subsequent/second attack.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the discussion above we can conclude that the negative adverb *niet* cannot be followed by a noun phrase. Note, however, that (65a), where the nominal object is assigned contrastive focus, is acceptable; in this case we are not dealing with sentential negation but with constituent negation, which is clear from the fact that the negative adverb is preferably pied piped by topicalization of the noun phrase. This example therefore does not conflict with the general rule that noun phrases cannot follow sentential negation.

(65)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.  Hij heeft niet het/een BOEK gelezen (maar het/een ARTIKEL).</td>
<td>he has not the/a book read, but the/an article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He didn’t read the BOOK (but the ARTICLE).’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may be different in the case of (66), where it is not simply the object *het boek* that is contrasted but the whole VP *het boek gelezen*. In this case, the negative adverb is preferably stranded by topicalization of the VP, although pied piping is at least marginally possible. If this indicates that we are dealing with sentential negation, example (65b) must be seen as an exception to the general rule that noun phrases cannot follow sentential negation.

(66)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.  Hij heeft niet [VP het/een BOEK gelezen] (maar [VP de/een FILM gezien]).</td>
<td>he has not the/a book read but the/a movie seen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He didn’t read the book, but saw the film.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.  &lt;Niet&gt; [VP het/een boek gelezen] heeft hij &lt;niet&gt; (maar [VP de/een film gezien]).</td>
<td>(maar [VP de/een film gezien]).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is not easy to decide whether indefinite nominal objects preceding sentential negation allow a nonspecific interpretation or not. Although the noun phrase *vier boeken* can be placed either before or after the clause adverb *waarschijnlijk*, a nonspecific interpretation is not readily obtained. Rather, the nominal object following *waarschijnlijk* seems to be interpreted specifically (and the one preceding it seems to prefer a partitive reading). It seems that the quantifier *iemand* ‘someone’ in (67b) also receives a specific interpretation in both positions, although the judgments seem a bit murky in this case.

(67)  a. Jan heeft *vier boeken* waarschijnlijk *vier boeken* niet gelezen.
     Jan has four books probably not read
     ‘Jan has probably not read four books.’
     b. Jan heeft *iemand* waarschijnlijk *iemand* niet gezien.
     Jan has someone probably not seen
     ‘Jan has probably not seen someone.’

A clearer picture arises in the case of the adverbs of frequency. In (68a), the nominal object precedes the adverbial phrase, and therefore we are clearly dealing with a specific indefinite noun phrase. As we have seen in Section 8.1.3.1, sub III, indefinite nominal objects following adverbs of frequency must be given a nonspecific interpretation. The fact that example (68b) is marked therefore suggests that indefinite nominal objects preceding the negative adverb *niet* cannot readily receive a nonspecific interpretation. For completeness’ sake, (68c) shows that, in accordance with our earlier observation, the indefinite nominal object cannot follow the negative adverb *niet* either.

(68)  a. Jan heeft twee boeken al drie keer niet kunnen lenen.
     Jan has two books already three times not can borrow
     ‘Already three times Jan couldn’t borrow two books.’
     b. ??Jan heeft al drie keer twee boeken niet kunnen lenen.
     c. * Jan heeft al drie keer niet twee boeken kunnen lenen.

It is not clear whether there is a syntactic reason for the fact that indefinite nominal objects preceding the negative adverb *niet* cannot readily be construed as nonspecific: since the negative adverb normally follows the clause adverb (cf. (62a)), there is no *a priori* reason to assume that scrambling of a nonspecific indefinite nominal object across it is blocked. It might just as well be the case that there are more pragmatic reasons to assume that nonspecific indefinite nominal objects cannot precede and, hence, fall outside the scope of negation: it simply does not seem very informative to claim about some unidentified entity that a certain proposition does not apply to it. Of course, it does make sense to have a nonspecific nominal object within the scope of negation, since that would amount to having a negative existential quantifier, as in the English example *I didn’t see a thing*. However, Dutch uses special negative forms in such cases: the negative article *geen* ‘no’, and the negative quantifiers *niets* ‘nothing’ and *niemand* ‘nobody’.

8.1.3.5. Conclusion

This section has discussed scrambling of nominal objects and has shown that different types of noun phrases have different scrambling options: generally speaking, we can say that definite pronouns scramble more often than definite noun phrases.
phrases, which, in turn, scramble more often than indefinite noun phrases. Further, we have seen that the domains in which scrambling applies differ for the different types of noun phrases. Indefinite noun phrases can cross certain VP-adverbs but not clause adverbs; definite noun phrases may cross clause adverbs when they are part of the presupposition of the clause but cannot readily cross adverbs that precede these clause adverbs; definite pronouns, finally, must precede the clause adverbs as well as the adverbs preceding them.

In the literature, the fact that scrambling of nominal objects may involve different domains of application is not generally taken into account, with the result that the occurrence of a presuppositional definite noun phrase after any adverb is sometimes taken as counterevidence for the claim that such noun phrases must scramble; cf. De Hoop (2000/2003) and Van Bergen & De Swart (2010). The primeless examples in (69) suggest that this view is too simple: scrambling of the definite noun phrase can only be observed when a clause adverb like *waarschijnlijk* is present (or discourse particles like *maar*; cf. Zwart 2011). It therefore does not come as a surprise either that the primed examples in (69) allow two readings: one in which the definite noun phrase is part of the focus and one in which it is part of the presupposition of the clause.

(69)  a.  Jan zal morgen <het boek> *waarschijnlijk* <het boek> lezen.  
    ‘Jan will probably read the book tomorrow.’
   a’. Jan zal morgen het boek lezen.

   b.  Jan zal thuis <het boek> *waarschijnlijk* <het boek> lezen.  
    ‘Jan will probably read the book at home.’
   b’. Jan zal thuis het boek lezen.

Although we cannot exclude beforehand the possibility that presuppositional definite noun phrases may fail to scramble under certain conditions, we believe that we can only gain a deeper insight in the factors involved when we first investigate more thoroughly the properties of the adverbs that may precede them. This is clearly a topic for future research.

8.1.4. Subject noun phrases in the expletive construction

Expletive constructions are typically used to introduce a new entity into the domain of discourse. Generally speaking, these constructions are only possible when the subject is an indefinite or weak noun phrase; this is normally referred to as the DEFINITENESS EFFECT. This is illustrated in (70): whereas the expletive construction with the indefinite noun phrase *een man* in (70a) is perfect, the corresponding construction with the definite noun phrase *de man* in (70b) is ungrammatical.

(70)  a.  Er staat *een man* voor de deur.  
    ‘There stands a man in front of the door’
   b. *Er staat *de man* voor de deur.
    ‘There stands the man in front of the door’
It is, however, not correct to claim that definite noun phrases are categorically excluded in the expletive construction. When the expletive construction contains a definite subject that is explicitly marked as introducing a new “topic”, the result is acceptable. This marking typically involves the adjective *volgende* ‘following’, which is used to announce a list of “new” topics, as in (71a&b). Another option that seems to favor this construction is the adverb *nog* in (71b&b′). Note that examples like (71b′) are also possible with noun phrases introduced by the distal demonstrative pronoun, but not with the proximate one; this is discussed in Section 5.2.3.2.2, sub II.

(71) a. Er waren de *volgende* gastsprekers op de conferentie: ... 
there were the following invited speakers at the conference

  b. .. en dan zijn er *nog* de *volgende* problemen: ten eerste, ...
  ‘.. and then are there still the following problems first

     .. and then we still have the following problems: first ...

  b′. .. maar dan/nu is er ook *nog* het probleem van de afvalverwerking.
  ‘.. but then/now is there also still the problem of waste disposal

     .. but then/now we still have the problem of waste disposal.’

It is generally assumed that the expletive *er* occupies the canonical subject position, and that the indefinite subject occupies some lower position in the clause, presumably its base-position within the VP. If so, the expletive construction is just another case (in addition to scrambling) that shows that indefinite noun phrases resist leftward movement within the middle field of the clause.

I. Specific/nonspecific readings

The indefinite noun phrase in an expletive construction can either be specific or nonspecific. The most plausible reading of (72a) is the one where the speaker is not able to identify the person in question, whereas the most plausible reading of (72b) is that at least the speaker is able to identify the person in question in discourse. These examples also show that the nonspecific indefinite noun phrase in (72a) must follow the adverb, that is, cannot be scrambled. The specific one in (72b), on the other hand, can more readily be placed in the position in front of the adverb, which indicates that it can at least marginally be scrambled. In the case of a quantifier like *iemand* ‘someone’ in (72c), scrambling is even the normal means to make the distinction between the two interpretations: when the quantifier follows the adverb, it is preferably construed as nonspecific, whereas it must be construed specifically when it precedes it.

(72) a. Er is <*een man*> gisteren <*een man*> overreden.
there is a man yesterday run.over

  ‘A man was run over yesterday.’

  b. Er is <*een broer van mij*> gisteren <*een broer van mij*> overreden.
there is a brother of mine yesterday run.over

  c. Er is <*iemand*> gisteren <*iemand*> overreden.
there is someone yesterday run.over
The examples in (73) show that the nonspecific indefinite noun phrase is not commonly used without the expletive, whereas the specific one can be used without the expletive. For completeness' sake, note that we have put aside the fact that in some varieties of Dutch, examples like (73a) are also acceptable without the expletive; we are only discussing the varieties here that do not allow this.

(73)  a.  Gisteren is *(er) een man overreden.
     b.  Gisteren is (er) een broer van mij overreden.
     c.  Gisteren is (er) iemand overreden.

It must be noted, however, that the expletive is sensitive not only to the type of its subject, but also to the presence or absence of some presupposition in the clause; cf. Bennis (1986). Consider the examples in (74). In (74a) the adverbial phrase voor mijn huis follows the indefinite subject and is construed as part of the °focus of the clause: since there is no other presupposition, the expletive must be realized. However, when the adverbial phrase precedes the subject, it can (but need not) be construed as the presupposition of the clause; when it is, the expletive may be dropped.

(74)  a.  Gisteren is *(er) een man voor mijn huis overreden.
     ‘Yesterday, a man was run over in front of my house.’
     b.  Gisteren is (er) voor mijn huis een man overreden.

Something similar can be observed in (75). Although for some unknown reason (75a) is perhaps somewhat marked on a nonspecific interpretation of the subject, it seems that this reading does require the expletive to be present, which is consistent with the fact that the object is preferably interpreted as a nonspecific indefinite noun phrase. In (75b), which may again be somewhat marked on a nonspecific interpretation of the subject, the expletive can be readily left out; this is related to the fact that the definite object het boek can (but need not) be interpreted as part of the presupposition of the clause. In (75c), which readily allows a nonspecific interpretation of the subject, the expletive cannot be used, which is due to the fact that the object pronoun het must be construed as part of the presupposition of the clause; see Broekhuis (2007/2008) for more discussion.

(75)  a.  dat *(er) een man een boek gekocht heeft.
     b.  dat *(er) een man het boek gekocht heeft.
     c.  dat *(er) een man het gekocht heeft.

From the data in (73) to (75), we may conclude that, in the absence of a presupposition, the expletive must be realized when the subject is nonspecific. An exception must be made, however, for nonspecific indefinite noun phrases modified by certain attributive adjectives or restrictive relative clauses. The primed examples in (76) show that they can be placed in the regular subject position, that is, the position occupied by the expletive in the primeless examples. Probably, the
attributive adjective/relative clause makes the noun phrase sufficiently specific to occupy this position.

(76) a. Daarna werd er nog een tachtig jaar oude man binnengelaten.
   after.that was there PRT an eighty year old man prt.-admitted
   a’. Daarna werd een tachtig jaar oude man nog binnengelaten.
   b. Daarna werd er nog een man die te laat kwam binnengelaten.
      after.that was there PRT a man who too late came prt.-admitted
      b’. Daarna werd een man die te laat kwam nog binnengelaten.

The examples in (77) show that modified noun phrases are even preferably placed in the regular subject position when the clause contains sentential negation. Note that these examples must not be confused with examples like Er is een tachtig jaar oude man niet goed geworden ‘An eighty year old man became unwell’, where the negative adverb is construed with the adjectival predicate. In these cases we are probably dealing with constituent negation (niet goed ‘not well’ = onwel ‘ill’).

(77) a. ?Er werd een tachtig jaar oude man niet binnengelaten.
   there was an eighty year old man not prt.-admitted
   a’. Een tachtig jaar oude man werd niet binnengelaten.
   b. ??Er werd een man die te laat kwam niet binnengelaten.
      there was a man who too late came not prt.-admitted
      b’. Een man die te laat kwam, werd niet binnengelaten.

A second exception involves examples in which the head of the indefinite subject receives contrastive accent. So whereas an indefinite subject like een man in (78a) normally cannot occur without the expletive, it can when the noun man is contrastively stressed, as in (78a’). When the noun phrase contains a numeral or quantifier, as in (78b), the expletive may also be dropped when contrastive accent is assigned to the numeral/quantifier, although in this case the noun phrase is likely to receive a partitive reading; cf. De Hoop (1992).

(78) a. *Een man is gearresteerd.
    a man has.been arrested
    a’. Een MAN is gearresteerd (niet een vrouw).
    a man has.been arrested not a woman
    b. Er zijn twee studenten gearresteerd.
       there are two students arrested
       ‘Two students are arrested.’
    b’. TWEE studenten zijn gearresteerd (niet drie).
       two students are arrested not three
       ‘Two (of the) students are arrested.’

II. Partitive/non-partitive readings

That nonspecific indefinite noun phrases are normally preferably introduced by an expletive is also clear from the fact that such noun phrases may invoke special semantics when they occur in the regular subject position. Consider the (a)-examples in (79). Example (79a) merely claims that some student was arrested.
When the indefinite noun phrase is placed in regular subject position, the indefinite article is preferably stressed so that we cannot immediately observe whether we are dealing with the article or the numeral één ‘one’. The preferred reading of the primed example is a partitive one: it is claimed that a certain student from a contextually determined set of students was arrested — the interpretation of the indefinite noun phrase comes rather close to één van de studenten ‘one of the students’; cf. Section 4.1.1.6.1. The (b)-examples in (79) show that the same phenomenon can be found in cases that unambiguously involve a numeral or a quantifier.

(79) a. Er is gisteren een student gearresteerd.
    there is yesterday a student arrested
    ‘A student was arrested yesterday.’
   a’. EÉN student is gisteren gearresteerd.
   b. Er zijn gisteren twee/enkele studenten gearresteerd.
      there were yesterday two/some students arrested
      ‘Two/some students were arrested yesterday.’
  b’. TWEE/ENKELE studenten zijn gisteren gearresteerd.
      two/some students were yesterday arrested
      ‘Two/some of the students were arrested yesterday.’

As we noted above, it cannot be immediately be observed whether we are dealing in (79a’) with the indefinite article or the numeral één ‘one’. The fact illustrated in (80) that the indefinite plural noun phrase studenten cannot occur in the regular subject position suggests the latter. This supports our earlier conclusion that unmodified nonspecific indefinite noun phrases normally cannot occur in regular subject position.

(80) a. Er zijn gisteren [NP ∅ studenten] gearresteerd.
    there are yesterday students arrested
    ‘Students were arrested yesterday.’
   b. *?[[NP ∅ Studenten] zijn gisteren gearresteerd.

III. Generic/non-generic readings

A further difference between the expletive construction and the construction with the indefinite noun phrase in the regular subject position is that the noun phrase can never be interpreted generically in the former. Consider the examples in (81): the indefinite noun phrase in the expletive construction in (81a) cannot be interpreted generically, whereas example (81b) must be construed generically. The difference can be made clearer by putting the examples in the past tense: (81a’) is still acceptable and expresses that it used to be the case that some hippo was lying in the water; (81b’), on the other hand, is weird since it suggests that hippos in general have changed their habit of normally lying in the water. Note that (81b’) becomes acceptable on a specific or partitive interpretation when we stress een: it used to be the case that a certain hippo or one of the hippos was lying in the water.
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The examples in (82) show that the same pattern arises in the case of plural indefinite noun phrases. Again, the primed (b)-example is unacceptable due to non-syntactic factors, given that it suggests that hippos in general have changed their habit of normally lying in the water.

Summarizing, we can say that (unmodified) nonspecific indefinite subjects introduced by the indefinite article *een*/*∅* must normally be part of an expletive construction. Specific indefinite subjects, on the other hand, may either be part of an expletive construction or occupy the regular subject position. Indefinite subjects with a partitive or generic interpretation, finally, cannot occur in an expletive construction but must occupy the regular subject position.

To conclude this section on the expletive construction we want to mention that narratives pose an exception to the general rule that nonspecific indefinite noun phrases headed by an indefinite article do not occur in the regular subject position. A story might well begin as in (84), where the function of the noun phrase *een man* is clearly to introduce some new discourse entity without the implication that the speakers would be able to uniquely identify the intended referent. The sentence in (84) is acceptable only when the discourse is continued with a story about this person sitting in the waiting room.

(83) Filler of the regular subject position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>EXPLETIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONSPECIFIC INDEFINITE SUBJECT</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC INDEFINITE SUBJECT</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTITIVE/Generic INDEFINITE SUBJECT</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(84) Een man zit in de wachtkamer bij de dokter en ...
a man sits in the waiting room of the doctor and
‘A man is sitting in the waiting room of the doctor, and ...’
8.2. Predicative use of the noun phrase

This section discusses the use of the noun phrase as a complementive (predicative complement of the verb) in predicative constructions such as the copular and the vinden ‘consider’ construction. We will start by discussing the “normal” predicative use of noun phrases in 8.2.1. This is followed in 8.2.2 by a discussion of the more special behavior of noun phrases denoting professions/social functions. Section 8.2.3 concludes with a discussion of examples like het/dat zijn aardige jongens ‘It/That are nice boys’, which are special given that a singular neuter pronoun may function as logical SUBJECT of a plural nominal predicate.

8.2.1. Nominal predicates

Nominal complementives can be divided into three types. In the first type, the nominal predicate and its logical SUBJECT are in a set/subset relation: the latter is argued to be part of the set denoted by the former. In this type the nominal predicate is typically preceded by an indefinite article (een or ∅). In the second type, the nominal predicate and its SUBJECT are identified: the latter is claimed to be identical to the former. In this case the predicate can be preceded by a wider set of determiners, including the definite article de/het and demonstrative and possessive pronouns. In the third type the predicate is a bare noun phrase, that is, not preceded by a determiner at all. This type usually occurs with verbs that select a predicate introduced by als or tot; bare nominal predicates may sometimes also occur in copular or vinden-constructions, but since these cases exhibit various special properties, we will discuss them separately in Section 8.2.2.

(85)  a. Jan is een goede vriend van mij.                [set/subset]
      Jan is a good friend of mine

       b. Jan is de directeur van deze school.            [identificational]
       Jan is the director of this school

       c. Zij zullen Jan tot voorzitter benoemen.        [als/tot + bare noun]
       they will Jan to chairman appoint
       ‘They will appoint Jan as chairman.’

I. The set/subset relation

In the copular construction and the vinden-construction, a nominal predicate denotes a non-singleton set and it is claimed that the SUBJECT of the predicate is part of this set. In the copular constructions in the (a)-examples in (86) the SUBJECT of the predicate is the subject of the clause, and in the vinden-constructions in the (b)-examples it is the accusative object of the clause. These examples also show that the nominal predicate and its SUBJECT agree in number. Example (86c) is added to show that, for some unknown reason, resultative constructions with a “truly” nominal predicate are not common: resultative verbs generally take a nominal predicate introduced by als or tot; cf. Subsection III below.

(86)  a. Jan is [PRED een aardige jongen].
      Jan is a nice boy

       a’. Jan en Peter zijn [PRED ∅ aardige jongens].
       Jan and Peter are nice boys
II. The identification relation

The examples in (86) above illustrate the use of indefinite noun phrases as predicates. Definite noun phrases can be used in the same way. The main difference is that whereas the use of an indefinite noun phrase expresses that its SUBJECT is part of the denotation of the NP, the use of a definite noun phrase implies that the SUBJECT exhausts it. For example, (87a) expresses that Peter is just part of the set of students that are supervised by Marie, whereas (87b) implies that Peter is the only student that is supervised by Marie. The (b)-examples in (87) therefore differ from those in the (a)-examples in not expressing a set/subset relation, but an identification relation.

\[(87)\]
\[
a. \text{Peter is [PRED een student die door Marie begeleid wordt].} \\
   \text{Peter is a student who by Marie supervised is}
\]
\[
a'. \text{Peter en Jan zijn [PRED studenten die door Marie begeleid worden].} \\
   \text{Peter and Jan are students who by Marie supervised are}
\]
\[
b. \text{Peter is [PRED de student die door Marie begeleid wordt].} \\
   \text{Peter is the student who by Marie supervised is}
\]
\[
b'. \text{Peter en Jan zijn [PRED de studenten die door Marie begeleid worden].} \\
   \text{Peter and Jan are the students who by Marie supervised are}
\]

That we are dealing with an identification relation does not mean, however, that both DPs are referring expressions. That this is not the case will become clear when we consider the referential behavior of the coordinated DPs in (88). The plural marking on the finite verb in (88a) shows that the coordinated subject de dokter en de burgemeester ‘the physician and the mayor’ is also necessarily plural. This shows that there is a one-to-one relation between the number of articles and the number of referents: each conjunct refers to a separate person. This is, however, not the case in (88b), where the coordinated DP functions as a predicate: there is simply one person who can be identified both as the physician and as the mayor of the village under discussion. Example (88b’) shows that predicative definite noun phrases can also be coordinated by means of conjunctions other than en ‘and’. Note that the adverbs tevens ‘also’ and ook ‘also’ in (88b&b’) emphasize the fact that the persons denoted by the coordinated predicative noun phrases are actually the same; see also the discussion of the examples in (97) below.
(88) a. De dokter en de burgemeester komen/*komt morgen langs.
    the physician and the mayor come/comes tomorrow prt.
    ‘The physician and the mayor will visit us tomorrow.’

b. Jan is de dokter en (tevens) de burgemeester van dit dorp.
    Jan is the physician and also the mayor of this village

b’. Jan is niet alleen de dokter maar ook de burgemeester van dit dorp.
    Jan is not only the physician but also the mayor of this village

Examples like (88b&b’) clearly show that definite nominal predicates do not refer to some entity in the domain of discourse; the function of the definite articles is to express that the sets denoted by the nominal predicates dokter van dit dorp and burgemeester van dit dorp have just one member. The construction as a whole expresses that the members of these two singleton sets are identical and can be identified with the referent of the subject of the clause, Jan. See Alexiadou et al. (2007: prt II, §2.3) for more discussion.

The examples in (89) show that, in constructions expressing an identification relation, it is often possible to interchange the positions of the two noun phrases. At first sight it is not clear what this tells us. It may be the case that the two word orders differ in underlying syntactic structure, that is, differ with respect to which noun phrase performs which syntactic function (subject or complementive). However, it may also be the case that the two orders have the same underlying syntactic structure but that one of the two is derived by topicalization, an option that can be argued for independently on the basis of examples like Aardig is hij niet ‘Nice, he is not’.

(89) a. Marie is de beste leerling van deze klas.
    Marie is the best pupil of this group

a’. De beste leerling van deze klas is Peter.

b. Peter en Marie zijn de beste leerlingen van deze klas.
    Peter and Marie are the best pupils of this group

b’. De beste leerlingen van deze klas zijn Peter en Marie.

The option of having two different underlying structures seems to be refuted by the data in (90): if the proper noun(s) need not act as the subject but can also act as the predicate, the primed examples should be fully acceptable, which they are not. However, they are not as bad as one would expect: especially when the proper nouns are given emphatic accent, the result is reasonably acceptable, and it yields at least quite a contrast with examples like *dat aardig Jan niet is, in which aardig is unequivocally a predicate.

(90) a. dat Marie de beste leerling van deze klas is.
    that Marie the best pupil of this group is

a’. dat de beste leerling van deze klas PETER/??Peter is.

b. dat Peter en Marie de beste leerlingen van deze klas zijn.
    that Peter and Marie the best pupils of this group are

b’. dat de beste leerlingen van deze klas PETER EN MARIE/??Peter en Marie zijn.
Another prediction would be that in the vinden-constructions the two noun phrases are also interchangeable. As can be seen in (91), however, there is a strong preference for the proper noun(s) to precede the definite noun phrase: the primed examples in (91) require heavy stress on the proper nouns, and even then the result is marginal at best. From this, it seems that we can safely conclude that the proper noun acts as the SUBJECT and the definite noun phrase acts as the predicate in these examples.

(91)  a.  dat ik Marie de beste leerling van deze klas vind.
       ‘that I consider Marie the best pupil of this group.’
   a’. *dat ik de beste leerling van deze klas Marie vind.
   b.  dat ik Peter en Marie de beste leerlingen van deze klas vind.
       ‘that I consider Peter and Marie the best pupils of this group’
   b’. *Ik de beste leerlingen van deze klas Peter en Marie vind.

Note in passing that the test in (91) is only available when the nominal predicate is evaluative; when it expresses an objective property, the vinden-construction always gives rise to an unacceptable result. This is illustrated in the (b)-examples of (92).

(92)  a.  Peter is de (beste) voorzitter van de vereniging (ooit).
       Peter is the best chairman of the association ever
   b.  Ik vind Peter de *(beste) voorzitter van de vereniging.
       I consider Peter the best chairman of the association
   b’. *Ik vind de (beste) voorzitter van de vereniging Peter.

That the definite noun phrase functions as the complementive can also be supported by the fact that when the clause contains a first or second person personal pronoun, the verb must agree with the pronoun: the copula verb in the examples in (93) must be the second person form bent ‘are’ and cannot be the third person form is ‘is’. Similar facts concerning number agreement can be found in (94).

(93)  a.  Jij bent/*is de beste leerling van deze klas.
       you are/is the best pupil of this group
   b.  De beste leerling van de klas bent/*is jij.
       the best pupil of the group are/is you

(94)  a.  De kinderen zijn/*is het grootste probleem.
       the children are/is the biggest problem
       ‘The children are the biggest problem.’
   b.  Het grootste probleem zijn/*is de kinderen.
       the biggest problem are/is the children
       ‘The biggest problem is the children.’

Note in passing that the agreement facts in Dutch crucially differ from the corresponding ones in English. For example, in English, inversion of the subject and the predicate will result in verb agreement with the preposed predicate, as will be clear from the rendering of example (94b). Furthermore, the subject pronoun will
surface as an object form: cf. De beste kandidaat ben ik/*mij vs. The best candidate is me/*I. Since this is not the place to discuss these differences between English and Dutch, we refer the reader to Den Dikken (2006: Ch.4, fn.43), who argues that these differences are related to the fact that predicate inversion may result from topicalization in Dutch, but not in English.

The discussion above has shown that even in predicative constructions expressing identity, there can be a fixed division of labor between the two noun phrases. This leads to the question what determines whether a certain noun phrase acts as the SUBJECT or the predicate. Just as in the case of regular predicative constructions, this seems to be related to inclusion relations. Whereas proper nouns normally refer to some specific entity in the domain of discourse, the referents of definite noun phrases are primarily presented as members of a larger set denoted by the NP. For example, the definite noun phrase de beste leerling van de klas ‘the best pupil(s) of the group’ does not simply refer to a certain individual, but to an individual who is characterized as being a member of a larger subset denoted by the NP leerling van deze klas ‘pupil of this group’. The facts reviewed above suggest that it is always the noun phrase presented as part of a larger superset that is taken as the predicative part of the construction.

In fact, it seems that this can be made even more precise. The examples in (95), which involve two definite noun phrases, suggest that it is the noun phrase presented as part of the largest superset that is taken as the complementive. In the most plausible extra-linguistic context to utter the primeless examples in (95), the set of tulips will be considerably smaller than the total set of flowers exhibited at the exhibition, and the primed examples unambiguously show that, as a result of this, it is the noun phrase de mooiste bloem van deze tentoonstelling that functions as the complementive, given that example (95b′) is at best marginally acceptable with strong emphatic accent on the noun phrase deze blauwe tulp.

(95)  a.  Deze blauwe tulp  is de mooiste bloem van deze tentoonstelling.
    this blue tulip     is the most.beautiful flower of this exhibition
   a′.  Ik vind deze blauwe tulp de mooiste bloem van deze tentoonstelling.
        I   consider this blue tulip    the most.beautiful flower of this exhibition
  b.  De mooiste bloem van deze tentoonstelling is deze blauwe tulp.
  b′.  *Ik vind de mooiste bloem van deze tentoonstelling deze blauwe tulp.

Of course, there are still many cases where it is not so clear which of the two noun phrases must be considered the predicate of the construction. This is illustrated by the examples in (96). The embedded clauses show that the two definite noun phrases may both act as the predicate of the copular construction. The difference between (96a′) and (96b′) is that in the former the noun phrase de voorzitter van deze vergadering is taken to be a referential expression, the referent of which is known to both the speaker and the addressee, whereas in the latter it is taken to be a property assigned to the referent of the referential noun phrase de decaan van de universiteit. This shows that the assignment of referential or predicative status may be dependent on properties of the discourse; in (96a′), the referent of the noun phrase de voorzitter van deze vergadering is assumed to be known to the addressee, whereas the referent of de decaan van de universiteit is not:
it is the purpose of the sentence to express that the two noun phrases have the same referent.

(96)  a.  De voorzitter van deze vergadering  is  de decaan van de faculteit.
    the chairman of this meeting          is the dean of the faculty
    a’.  dat   de voorzitter van deze vergadering  de decaan van de faculteit  is.
        that the chairman of this meeting is the dean of the faculty
    b.  De decaan van de faculteit is de voorzitter van deze vergadering.
    b’.  dat de decaan van de faculteit de voorzitter van deze vergadering is.

The primeless examples in (96) are semantically ambiguous, but the two interpretations are generally associated with two different intonation patterns. When the sentences are interpreted with the first noun phrase as a referential expression, it can be pronounced with a neutral, continuous intonation contour. On the alternative, inverse interpretation, some special intonational clue is needed, for example by inserting a brief intonation stop before the second noun phrase, and/or by placing emphatic or contrastive focus on it. The alternative, inverse interpretation can also be blocked by means of adverbs like ook ‘also’ or tevens ‘also’: in examples like (97) the second noun phrase must be construed as the predicate.

(97)  a.  De voorzitter van deze vergadering  is ook de decaan van de faculteit.
    the chairman of this meeting                      is also the dean of the faculty
    b.  De decaan van de universiteit   is tevens  de voorzitter van deze vergadering.
          the dean of the faculty                      is also     the chairman of this meeting

III. Nominal predicates introduced by als/tot

In some cases, the nominal predicate must be introduced by als or tot, or, less commonly, voor. In some cases this seems to be an idiosyncratic property, given that verbs like beschouwen ‘to consider’ and benoemen ‘to appoint’ obligatorily take such a predicate: in (98a), the als-phrase cannot be dropped without shifting the meaning of the verb to something like “to observe”; in (98b), the tot/als-phrase can be dropped, but will then be implied.

(98)  a.  Ik  beschouw  Jan  #(als  een veelbelovende student).
    I consider Jan as a promising student
    ‘I consider Jan a promising student.’
    b.  We  benoemen  Jan morgen    (tot/als  voorzitter).
          we appoint Jan tomorrow     as      chairman

There are also some more or less fixed collocations with the verb houden and the preposition voor. Some examples are given in (99); in the (a)-example voor is followed by a noun phrase and in the (b)-example by an adjective.

(99)  a.  Ze   hielden   hem voor  de dader.
    they consider him FOR the perpetrator
    b.  Je   zult  het niet voor   mogelijk houden,   maar ...
        you will it not FOR possible consider but
        ‘You won’t believe it, but ...’
Using a nominal predicate introduced by *tot* is the normal way of expressing a result. Whereas bare adjectival predicates like *boos* or *dood* can be used in all kinds of resultative constructions, the option of using a bare nominal predicate seems to be restricted to the verb *maken*.

(100) a. Ik maak Peter boos.
   I make Peter angry

   a’. Jan sloeg de mug dood.
      Jan hit the mosquito dead

   b. We maken Peter het hoofd van de afdeling.
      we make Peter the head of the department

   b’. We slaan Peter tot ridder.
      we hit Peter to knight

   ‘We knight Peter.’

We must add immediately that, in accordance to what we have already observed with respect to the examples in (98), many cases of the sort in (100b’) seem to be lexically restricted. An example like (101a) is unacceptable, despite the fact that it seems to make perfect sense semantically; cf. the acceptability of (101b) with the adjectival complementive *fit*.

(101) a. Marie zwom zich *(??tot)* wereldkampioen op de honderd meter schoolslag.
   Marie swam REFL to world.champion on the hundred meter breaststroke

   b. Marie zwom zich fit
      Marie swam REFL fit

   ‘Jan swam herself fit.’

All of the examples discussed above involve a set/subset relation. The predicative *als*-phrase can, however, also be used to express an identity relation, in which case the noun phrase is typically definite.

(102) a. Ik beschouw Jan als de beste leerling in jaren.
   I consider Jan as the best pupil in years

   ‘I consider Jan the best pupil in years.’

   b. Ik beschouw Jan als de aanstichter van de rel.
      I consider Jan as the instigator of the riot

Finally, example (103) shows that noun phrases introduced by *als* can also be used as ‘supplementives. Note that the noun phrase in this example does not contain an article, just like the noun phrase in (98b). This is a typical property of predicatively used nouns denoting a profession or social function; we will discuss this extensively in Section 8.2.2, where we will also discuss examples like (103) in more detail.

(103) Als student werkte Marie in het ziekenhuis.
     as student worked Marie in the hospital

     ‘As a student, Marie worked in the hospital.’
8.2.2. Noun phrases denoting a profession or social function

Predicative nouns denoting a profession or social function are unique in that we find a three-way alternation between noun phrases headed by a definite article, noun phrases headed by an indefinite article and bare noun phrases. The use of “*” in (104a) indicates that the bare noun phrase involves a rise in the intonation contour, which, in neutral contexts, is lacking in the other two cases. That the choice of determiner is not semantically innocuous will be evident from the general survey below; see also Haeseryn et al. (1997: §4.5.6).

(104)  a. Hij is * dokter.                                [bare NP]
       he is physician
     ‘He is a physician (by profession).’
   b. Hij is de dokter.                                 [definite article]
       he is the physician
     ‘He is the physician.’
   c. Hij is een dokter.                                [indefinite article]
       he is a physician
     ‘He behaves like/has features typical of a physician.’

I. No article → function/profession

The interpretation of dokter ‘doctor’ in (104a) is that of the profession/social function; it predicates the property of being a doctor by profession of the subject. The nominal predicate receives what we will call a “professional” reading and is interpreted “objectively”. This objective interpretation is clear from the fact that bare NPs cannot enter the vinden-construction in (105a), which inherently expresses a subjective evaluation by the referent of the subject of the clause. Further, it is clear from the fact illustrated in (105b) that subjective modifiers cannot be added to the bare noun phrase. Finally, the predicative noun cannot have an inherently positive or negative connotation, as is the case with schoolfrik in (105c).

(105)  a. *Ik vind hem schoolmeester.
       I consider him schoolmaster
   b. *Jan is goede schoolmeester.
       Jan is good schoolmaster
   c. *Jan is schoolfrik.
       Jan is pedant schoolmaster

This places the bare NP apart from the predicatively used noun phrases introduced by the indefinite article een ‘a’ in (106), which may but need not denote the profession of being a schoolmaster; cf. the discussion in Subsection III below.

(106)  a. Ik vind hem een schoolmeester.
       I consider him a schoolmaster
   b. Jan is een goede schoolmeester.
       Jan is a good schoolmaster
   c. Jan is een schoolfrik.
       Jan is a pedant schoolmaster
Note that this semantic distinction between bare NPs and indefinite noun phrases introduced by the article *een* is typical for the domain of nominal predicates, and does not occur elsewhere. For instance, the examples in (107) show that the preposition *zonder* ‘without’ can take either a bare noun phrase or an indefinite noun phrase as its complement, but it seems difficult to discern any describable semantic difference between the two examples. Note that evaluative modifiers can be used in both cases, and that the noun may express an inherently subjective connotation such as *pillendraaier* (lit.: someone who makes pills).

(107) a. We kunnen niet op safari zonder (goede) dokter/pillendraaier.  
    *we can not on safari without good physician*  
    ‘We cannot go on a safari without a (good) physician.’

b. We kunnen niet op safari zonder *een* (goede) dokter/pillendraaier.  
    *we can not on safari without a good physician*  
    ‘We cannot go on a safari without a (good) physician.’

As was already mentioned in 8.2.1, sub III, predicative bare noun phrases can also be used on their “professional” reading in phrases introduced by *als*, *tot*, and occasionally *voor*. On this reading, the noun phrase must be bare, that is, it cannot be introduced by the indefinite article *een*.

(108) a. Jan werkt *als* (*een*) dokter in een ziekenhuis.  
    *Jan works as a physician in a hospital*  
    ‘Jan is practicing his profession as a physician in a hospital.’

b. Als (*een*) dokter komt Jan vaak bij de mensen thuis.  
    *as a physician comes Jan often with the people at home*  
    ‘In his capacity of physician, Jan visits a lot of people at home.’

c. Jan is benoemd tot/als (*een*) hoogleraar in de taalkunde.  
    *Jan is appointed as a professor in the linguistics*  
    ‘Jan is appointed as professor in linguistics.’

   d. Jan studeert voor (*een*) leraar.  
    *Jan studies for a teacher*  
    ‘Jan is studying to become a teacher.’

This does not mean that examples like (109a′) are ungrammatical. However, when an indefinite article is present, the noun phrase loses its “profession” reading, and the example can only be used in a metaphorical sense: example (109a′) means that Jan drives very fast. This metaphorical use of *als*-phrases is very productive, but always involves a noun phrase introduced by an indefinite article *een*.

(109) a. Jan rijdt *als* autocoureur (voor Porsche).  
    *Jan drives as a racing driver for Porsche*  
    ‘Jan is employed (by Porsche) as a racing driver.’

   a′. Jan rijdt *als* een autocoureur.  
    *Jan drives like a racing driver*

   b. Jan hijgt *als* *(een)* werkpaard.  
    *Jan pants like a workhorse*

   c. Jan rookt *als* *(een)* schoorsteen.  
    *Jan smokes like a chimney*
All examples so far involve nouns denoting [+HUMAN] entities. It is therefore useful to show that inanimate noun phrases can sometimes also be used in article-less constructions, both in the copular construction and as the complement of *als*. This is illustrated in (110).

\[(110)\]
\[
a. \quad \text{Dit zinsdeel is (het) onderwerp van de zin.}
\]
\[
\text{this constituent is the subject of the clause}
\]
\[
b. \quad \text{Dit zinsdeel fungeert als (het) onderwerp van de zin.}
\]
\[
\text{this constituent functions as the subject of the clause}
\]

II. Definite article → uniqueness in context

Like its article-less counterpart, the definite nominal predicate in (104b), *Hij is de dokter* ‘He is the physician’, has the objective ‘professional’ reading as a profession or social function. As usual, the semantic contribution of the definite article is that of uniqueness in the domain of discourse; example (104b) can be used in contexts in which there is an implicit institution or social unit (say, a neighborhood or a hospital) in which the referent of the subject can be uniquely identified by means of the nominal predicate: “He is the doctor in this village”. Examples like these are usable also in a play-script kind of context: “He is the actor that plays the doctor in this play”. The definite article is obligatory when the noun phrase contains a superlative or some other element that implies that the noun phrase has unique reference.

\[(111)\]
\[
a. \quad \text{Jan is de/*een/*Ø knapste dokter.}
\]
\[
\text{Jan is the/a/Ø most.handsome/skilled physician}
\]
\[
\text{‘Jan is the most handsome/skilled physician.’}
\]
\[
b. \quad \text{Jan was de/*een/*Ø eerste dokter}
\]
\[
\text{Jan was the/a/Ø first physician}
\]

III. Indefinite article *een* → subjective and/or characteristic

No statement about the professional occupation of the subject need be implied by the indefinite nominal predicate in (104c), *Hij is een dokter* ‘He is a physician’. In this example, the predicate can also be interpreted subjectively and express that, in the eyes of the speaker, the subject behaves like a doctor or shows features in his behavior which typify doctors (e.g., wearing a white coat all the time, or using lots of Latinate medical terms). The difference can be made clearer by considering example (112), which involves the verb *lijken* ‘to seem’, and in which the modal particle *wel* emphasizes the fact that the addressee is not really a schoolmaster but only resembles one.

\[(112)\]
\[
\text{Je lijkt wel *(een) schoolmeester als je zo praat.}
\]
\[
\text{you seem PRT a schoolmaster when you like that talk}
\]
\[
\text{‘You resemble a schoolmaster when you talk like that.’}
\]

That nominal predicates preceded by an indefinite article may be of an inherent subjective/evaluative or metaphorical nature is also supported by the fact that examples like (113a) can be used as an insult comparable to the one in (113b). Interestingly, the primeless examples alternate with the constructions in the primed
examples, which feature a bare noun phrase that acts as the antecedent of relative pronoun that functions as a predicate in the relative clause.

(113) a. Je bent een vervelende schoolmeester!
you are a tedious schoolmaster
a′. Vervelende schoolmeester, die/dat je bent!
tedious schoolmaster that you are
b. Je bent een grote klootzak!
you are a big scrotum
‘You are a big bastard!’
b′. Grote klootzak die/dat je bent!
big scrotum that you are

The primed examples pose several questions. First, it is unclear why the bare noun phrase does not receive the objective, professional reading discussed in Subsection I. Second, it is not clear why the bare noun phrase can function as the antecedent of the relative clause given that the indefinite article in the primeless examples is obligatory. Third, it is not clear why the relative pronoun can be die, which normally cannot function as the predicate of a relative clause. Finally, the relative clause is omissible. We will not attempt to address these questions here, but leave them to future research.

The interpretation of a nominal predicate that is part of a supplementive als-phrase also depends on the presence or absence of the indefinite article; cf. Van den Torn (1981: 50). In (114a), the bare NP must be construed under the “profession” reading, whereas (114a′) instead expresses that Jan’s talking resembles the speech of a vicar; see also the discussion of example (109). Example (114b) expresses that Marie lived in lodgings when she was a student, whereas (114b′) just compares Marie’s mode of housing to that of a student.

(114) a. Jan spreekt als dominee.
Jan speaks as vicar
‘Jan speaks in his capacity of vicar.’
a′. Jan spreekt als een dominee.
Jan speaks as a vicar
‘Jan talks like a vicar.’
b. Als student woonde Marie op kamers.
as student lived Marie on rooms
‘As a student Marie lived in lodgings.’
b′. Als een student woonde Marie op kamers.
as a student lived Marie on rooms
‘Like a student Marie lived in lodgings.’

To conclude this subsection, it might be interesting to point out that the interpretation of the definite genitival nominal predicate in (115a) comes relatively close to examples with an indefinite noun phrase in that it denotes a set of typical properties of a certain real-world entity. It is different, however, in that it need not denote a profession and requires that the subject be a noun phrase denoting certain behavior (or a pronoun that takes such a noun phrase as its antecedent). By far the
most conspicuous feature is the “mock archaic” use of genitive case: the genitive
determiner *des*, which was originally the masculine or neuter article, is now also
used with feminine/plural noun phrases, as in (115b&c), and with proper nouns like
*Ajax*, as in (115d). For more discussion and representative examples, see

(115)  a.  Dat is *des* kinds.
     that is the child\_gen
     ‘That’s how children are.’
   b.  Ontrouw is *des* vrouw/\-des mensen(s).
     infidelity is the\_masc,\_gen woman\_gen/person
     ‘Infidelity is a typical female trait.’
   c.  IJdelheid is *des* vrouwen/\-des mensen(s).
     vanity is the\_masc,\_gen woman\_gen/person
     ‘Vanity is a typical human trait.’
   d.  Verdedigen is niet *des* Ajax.
     to defend is not the\_masc,\_gen Ajax
     ‘A defensive attitude is not typical for Ajax.’

IV. Differences between the three types of nominal predicates
There are a number of ways in which the three types of nominal predicates
discussed in the previous subsections exhibit different syntactic behaviors, which
are related to their semantic properties. Here we will discuss some without claiming
that we are discussing the differences exhaustively.

A. Modification of the predicate by means of the PP *van beroep* ‘by profession’
To bare *dokter* in (104a) can readily be added *van beroep* ‘by profession’, as seen in
(116a), whereas it is impossible to add *van beroep* to the nominal predicates in
(104b&c). This suggests that only (104a) inherently expresses an occupation.

(116)  a.  Jan is dokter *van beroep*.
      Jan is physician by profession
   b.  *Jan is de dokter *van beroep*.
      Jan is the physician by profession
   c.  *Jan is een dokter *van beroep*.
      Jan is a physician by profession

B. The nominal predicate as SUBJECT of a nominal predicate headed by *beroep*
The (a)-examples in (117) show that a bare nominal predicate can also be used as
the logical SUBJECT of a ‘second order predicate headed by *beroep* ‘profession’. It is
impossible, however, to use nominal predicates preceded by a definite or indefinite
article as the SUBJECT of such a predicate; cf. examples (117b&c). Again, this
suggests that only bare nouns inherently express an occupation.

(117)  a.  Dokter is een mooi beroep.
      physician is a nice profession
   a’.  Ik vind dokter een mooi beroep.
      I consider physician a nice profession
b. *De dokter is een mooi beroep.
   the physician is a nice profession

c. *Een dokter is een mooi beroep.
   a physician is a nice profession

C. Pluralization

The examples in (86) have shown that nominal predicates and the noun phrases they are predicated of normally agree in number. The examples in (118b&c) show that this also holds for the indefinite and definite predicative noun phrases in (104b&c). Example (118a), however, shows that the bare noun phrase in (104a) does not exhibit plural morphology when its SUBJECT is plural.

(118)  a. Zij zijn *dokter.                                [bare NP]
   they are physicians
   ‘They are physicians (by profession).’

b. Zij zijn de doktoren.                             [definite article]
   they are the physicians
   ‘They are the physicians.’

c. Zij zijn ∅ doktoren.                              [indefinite article]
   they are physicians
   ‘They behave like/have features typical of real physicians.’

One problem, however, is that we cannot be absolutely sure whether number agreement is impossible with bare nominal predicates. This is due to the fact that the plural indefinite article is phonetically empty, so that the only difference between (118a) and (118c) is the rising intonation contour in the former. Fortunately, the earlier findings in (116) and (117) can be used as additional support for the conclusion that the bare noun phrase cannot be plural. As we have seen in (116), the bare noun phrase dokter, but not the indefinite noun phrase een dokter, can be modified by the PP van beroep. As is shown in (119a), the plural noun phrase doktoren cannot be modified by this PP either, so we may conclude that the plural noun phrase contains the indefinite zero article ∅. Similarly, we have seen that the bare noun phrase dokter, but not the indefinite noun phrase een dokter, can be used as the SUBJECT of a nominal predicate headed by beroep ‘profession’. Since the plural noun phrase doktoren cannot be used in (119b), we must again conclude that the plural noun phrase contains the article ∅. From, this we can safely conclude that the bare noun phrase dokter does not have a plural counterpart.

(119)  a. Zij zijn dokter/∅ doktoren van beroep.
   they are physician(s) by profession

b. *Doktoren is/zijn een mooi beroep.
   physicians is/are a nice profession

D. Modifiers

The examples in (120a) show that the bare noun phrase dokter cannot be modified by the adjective echt ‘real/true’, whereas this is possible in the other two examples. In (120b), echte is used to distinguish the genuine doctor from the quacks surrounding him. The semantic import of echte in (120c) depends on whether accent
is assigned to the adjective or to the noun. In the first case, the semantic contribution of *echt* is similar to *echt* in (120b): Jan is not a quack. In the latter case, it enhances the “subjective” interpretation of the predicative noun phrase: Jan truly behaves like a doctor.

(120) a.  *Jan is echte dokter.*  
    Jan is real physician  
  b.  Jan is de echte dokter.  
    Jan is the real physician  
    ‘Jan is the real physician (and not one of the quacks).’  
  c.  Jan is een echte dokter.  
    Jan is a real physician  
    ‘Jan really is a true doctor/behaves like a true physician.’

The ungrammaticality of (120a) seems to confirm our earlier conclusion drawn from the examples in (105) that bare nominal predicates have an “objective” interpretation. In order to maintain this conclusion, we must show, however, that the ungrammaticality of (120a) is not the result of some general restriction on modification of bare nominal predicates, but results from the fact that the bare noun phrase resists only modification of a certain type. That there is a selective restriction on modification is clear from the difference in grammaticality between (121) and (122). The difference lies in the semantic contribution made by the modifiers in question; modification of the type denoted by the predicate nominal is possible, whereas modification of specific tokens who have this function is not. It must be noted, however, that the collocations in (122) border on compounding.

(121) a.  Jan is dokter     (*met grote vakkennis).  
    Jan is physician with great professional knowledge  
  b.  Jan is dokter     (*die goed voor zijn patiënten zorgt).  
    Jan is physician who well for his patients cares

(122) a.  Jan is gediplomeerd    dokter.  
    Jan is diploma-bearing physician  
  b.  Jan is doctor in de medische wetenschappen.  
    Jan is doctor in the medical sciences

E. Placement

Complementives are normally placed left-adjacent to the verbs in clause-final position, and cannot be scrambled to the left of clause adverbs like *waarschijnlijk* ‘probably’ or *natuurlijk* ‘of course’. This also holds for the predicative noun phrases in (123a&c), which cannot occur in any other position in the middle field of the clause than the one indicated.

(123) a.  dat hij <*leraar> waarschijnlijk <*leraar> wordt.  
    that he teacher probably become  
    ‘that he will probably become a teacher.’  
  b.  dat hij <*de leraar> waarschijnlijk <*de leraar> is.  
    that he the teacher probably is  
    ‘that he probably is the teacher.’
c. dat hij <*een schoolfrik> natuurlijk <*een schoolfrik> is.
   that he a pedant.schoolmaster of course is
   ‘that he of course behaves like a pedant schoolmaster.’

It seems, however, that the definite noun phrases behave differently with respect to
the negative adverb niet: whereas, e.g., adjectival complementives must follow this
adverb, as shown in (124a), the (b)-examples in (124) show that definite predicative
noun phrases may occur on either side of it. The interpretation is similar to that with
direct objects: when the noun phrase follows niet, we are dealing with constituent
negation; when the noun phrase precedes niet, we are dealing with sentential
negation.

(124)  a.  dat Jan <*aardig> niet <aardig> is.
       that Jan nice not is
       ‘that Jan isn’t nice.’

       b.  dat Jan niet de DIRECTEUR is (maar de EIGENAAR).
       that Jan not the director is but the owner
       ‘that Jan isn’t the manager.’

It is less clear whether the placement of definite predicative noun phrases is also
more free with other adverbs that normally follow the clause adverbs: placement of
the definite predicative noun phrase in (125b) in front of al ‘already’ gives rise to a
much better result than movement of the nominal predicate in (125a&c), but it still
seems marked compared to its placement left-adjacent to the verb cluster.

(125)  a.  Jan heeft altijd <*directeur> al <directeur> willen zijn.
    Jan has always director already want be

    b.  Jan heeft altijd <*de directeur> al <de directeur> willen zijn.
    Jan has always the director already want be

    c.  Jan heeft altijd <*een directeur> al <*een directeur> willen zijn.
    Jan has always a director already want be

8.2.3. Copular constructions with a singular neuter pronoun as subject

This section concludes the discussion of nominal complementives with a look at of
copular constructions like (126), which have given rise to a debate about whether
the neuter pronoun het/dat/dit or the noun phrase aardige jongens functions as
subject of the construction. In our discussion below, we will use examples headed
by the copula zijn ‘to be’, but such constructions also occur with other copulas like
worden ‘become’ or blijven ‘to stay’.

(126)  a.  Het is een aardige jongen.       a’. Het zijn aardige jongens.
       it is a nice boy                     it are nice boys

       b.  Dat/Dit is een aardige jongen.   b’. Dat/Dit zijn aardige jongens.
       that/this is a nice boy              that/this are nice boys

Bos (1961), following De Groot (1949:153), argued that it is the noun phrase that
functions as subject and the pronoun that functions as predicate. One reason is that
the finite verb in the primed examples in (126) agrees in number with the plural
noun phrase, not with the singular pronoun; the examples in (127) show that plural agreement is normally not possible when the pronoun *het/dat/dit* functions as subject of an adjectival or prepositional copular construction.

(127) a. Het/Dit/Dat is/*zijn* kapot.
    it/this/that  is/are  broken
   b. Het/Dit/Dat is/*zijn* in de tuin.
    it/this/that  is/are  in the garden

Another reason to assume that the pronouns function as predicates is that when the nominal predicate is replaced by a pronoun, the latter will appear in its nominal form; this cannot, of course, be shown for the second person, plural pronoun given that the subject and object form are identical.

(128) a. Dat ben ik/*mij.
    that am I/me
   a’. Dat zijn wij/*ons.
    that are we/us
   b. Dat ben jij/*jou.
    that are you/you
   b’. Dat zijn jullie.
    that are you
   c. Dat is zij/*haar.
    that is she/her
   c’. Dat zijn zij/*hen.
    that are they/them

The claim that the pronouns in (126) function as predicates of the copular constructions was challenged by Merckens (1961), who argued that these examples are actually ambiguous. This is illustrated by the examples in (129), the meanings of which will become clear from the English translations. The function of the left-dislocated constituents in these and the following examples is to force the intended subject/predicate reading on the pronoun *dat*.

(129) a. Jan en Piet, dat zijn aardige jongens.
    Jan and Piet  that are  nice boys
   a’. Jan en Piet, ik denk dat dat aardige jongens zijn.
    ‘Jan and Piet are nice boys.’
   b. Behulpzaam, dat zijn aardige jongens.
    helpful  that are  nice boys
   b’. Behulpzaam, ik denk dat aardige jongens dat zijn.
    ‘Nice boys are helpful.’

The same ambiguity is apparent from embedded clauses like those in (130), given that subject pronouns are normally right-adjacent to the complementizer and predicates left-adjacent to the verbs in clause-final position; cf. *Ik vind dat dat mooi is ‘I think that that is beautiful’ versus *Ik vind dat mooi dat is. This means that *dat functions as a subject in (130a) and as a predicate in (130b). The primed examples show that this conclusion is supported by the interpretation of these examples.

(130) a. Jan en Piet, ik denk dat dat aardige jongens zijn.
    Jan and Piet  I  think that  that nice boys  are
   a’. *Behulpzaam, ik denk dat dat aardige jongens zijn.
    helpful  I  think that  that nice boys  are
   b. Behulpzaam, ik denk dat aardige jongens dat zijn.
    helpful  I  think that  nice boys  that are
   b’. *Jan en Piet, ik denk dat aardige jongens dat zijn.
    Jan and Piet  I  think that  nice boys  that are
A similar contrast can be found in yes-no questions, where the subject pronoun normally appears right-adjacent to the verb in sentence initial position: ‘Is dat mooi? ’ versus *‘Is mooi dat?’.” This means that dat functions as a subject in (131a) and as a predicate in (131b). The primed examples show again that this conclusion is supported by the interpretation of these examples.

(131) a. Jan en Piet, zijn dat aardige jongens? [dat = subject]
     Jan and Piet, are that nice boys
     a’. *Behulpzaam, zijn dat aardige jongens?
         helpful are that nice boys
     b. Behulpzaam, zijn aardige jongens dat?
         helpful are nice boys that [dat = predicate]
     b’. *Jan en Piet, zijn aardige jongens dat?
         Jan and Piet are nice boys that

A piece of indirect evidence not mentioned by Merckens in favor of the claim that we are dealing with ambiguous structures is provided by the vinden-constructions in (132). Given that the complementive always follows its logical SUBJECT in the middle field of the clause, the fact that both orders are possible in (132) show that dat may function either as the subject or as the complementive of the construction; again this is supported by the interpretations of these examples.

(132) a. Marie zal [SC dat aardige jongens] vinden. [dat = subject]
     Marie will that nice boys consider
     b. Marie zal [SC aardige jongens dat] vinden. [dat = predicate]
     Marie will nice boys that consider

A final piece of evidence involves pronominalization. Consider the discourse chunk in (133), in which participant B is backing up participant A’s claim that Jan and Piet are nice boys. In B’s reaction the noun phrase aardige jongens is not replaced by the referential personal pronoun zij, as would be expected if this noun phrase were the subject of the sentence, but by dat, as would normally be the case when we are dealing with a predicate. Observe that the copula is plural in this case despite the fact that normally the pronouns het and dat are both syntactically singular.

(133) a. Het zijn aardige jongens. [speaker A]
     it are nice boys
     b. Dat zijn het zeker! [speaker B]
     that are it for.sure

The discussion above has conclusively shown that Bos’ claim that the neuter pronouns in the copular constructions in (126) can only function as the predicate of the construction cannot be maintained; the structures are syntactically ambiguous in the sense that the pronoun can function either as the subject or as the predicate of the copular construction. In fact, there is even reason to assume that, due to its sentence-initial position, the pronoun het ‘it’ in example (126a) must be interpreted as the subject of the copular construction. The reason for this is that sentence-initial het normally functions as subject; the object pronoun het, for example, cannot be topicalized as will be clear from the grammaticality contrast between Hij zag het
‘He saw it’ and *Het zag hij. The (b)-examples in (134) show that the ban on topicalization also holds for het when it functions as a complementive; whereas the primeless example is ungrammatical with, the corresponding primed example without topicalization is fully acceptable (although perhaps less preferred than its counterpart with dat, which is indicated here with a question mark.

(134)  a.  Jan en Piet, dat/het zijn aardige jongens.  
Jan and Piet that/it are nice boys
b.  *Behulpzaam, dat/*het zijn aardige jongens.  
helpful that/it are nice boys
b′.  Behulpzaam, aardige jongens zijn dat/*het.  
helpful nice boys are that/it

The remainder of this section will pinpoint some special properties of the copular construction under discussion. We have already seen in (126) and (127) that the predicate must be nominal; adjectival and prepositional complementives are excluded. The contrast between the primeless and primed examples in (135) show, however, that it is not the case that any nominal predicate can be used: whereas the predicate can either contain an article or be bare when the subject is a noun phrase or a regular pronoun, the pronouns het, dat, and dit require that an article be present.

(135)  a.  Jan/Hij is een aardige jongen.  a′.  Het/Dat/Dit is een aardige jongen.
Jan/he is a kind person it/that/this is a nice boy
b.  Jan/Hij is leraar.  b′.  *Het/Dat/Dit is leraar.
Jan/he is teacher it/that/this is teacher
‘Jan is a teacher.’

The examples in (127) show again that although the pronouns het, dit and dat are syntactically singular, the examples in (136) can be used to refer to sets of entities.

(136)  a.  Jan, dat is een aardige jongen.
Jan that is a nice boy
b.  Jan en Peter, dat zijn aardige jongens.
Jan and Peter that are nice boys

Although the pronouns het, dit and dat are syntactically neuter, they can be used to refer to non-neuter antecedents. This is already clear from example (136a) but even more conspicuous in examples like (137a) where the predicate does agree in gender with the antecedent of the pronoun dat. For completeness’ sake, (137b) provides an example in which the antecedent differs both in number and gender from the pronoun dat.

(137)  a.  De snelste auto, dat is deze/die.
the fastest car that is this/one/that/one
b.  De snelste auto’s, dat zijn deze/die.
the fastest cars that are this/one/that/one

In the examples above, the antecedent of the neuter pronoun is referential in the sense that it denotes a (possibly singleton) set of entities. The examples in (138)
show that the antecedent can also be generic, although it seems that the indefinite generic noun phrase in (138c) is somewhat marked.

(138)  a.  De walvis, dat is een zoogdier.
       the whale    that is a mammal
 b.  Walvissen, dat zijn zoogdieren.
       whales     that are mammals
 c.  Een walvis, dat is een zoogdier.
       a whale     that is a mammal

The markedness of (138c) may be related to the fact that examples in which the antecedent of the neuter pronoun is quantified are also marked; whereas the generic example in (139a) is fully acceptable, the corresponding quantificational construction in (139b) is degraded.

(139)  a.  Katten, dat zijn leuke huisdieren.
       Cats     that are nice pets
 b.  ??Sommige/alle katten, dat zijn leuke huisdieren.
       some/all cats     that are nice pets

8.3. Adverbal use of the noun phrase

Section 8.3.1 will show that, under certain conditions, noun phrases can be used as adverbal phrases of time. Other adverbial uses are not readily possible, although Section 8.3.2 will briefly discuss some examples where the adverbially used noun phrase is non-temporal.

8.3.1. Temporal phrases

This section is divided into four parts. Subsection I focuses on adverbially used definite noun phrases, and also discusses certain more general properties of adverbially used noun phrases. Subsection II and III continue with a discussion of indefinite and quantified noun phrases, respectively. Subsection IV will specifically consider noun phrases whose nominal head is a name for a conventional unit of time, like a day of the week, a month of the year, etc.

I. Definite noun phrases

In order for a noun phrase to be usable as an adverbial phrase of time, it must be possible to construe the nominal head as denoting a certain time interval or a certain point on the time axis. This is, of course, typically the case with nouns denoting certain conventional time spans, like *dag* ‘day’, *ochtend* ‘morning’, *maand* ‘month’, etc. However, nouns denoting certain durative events, like *wedstrijd* ‘match’ or *lezing* ‘lecture’, can also be used in this way. In the subsections below, we will start by discussing examples in which the adverbially used noun phrase refers to a certain time interval, followed by a discussion of examples in which it refers to a specific point in time. This section is concluded with a discussion of some differences between noun phrases used as time adjuncts and noun phrases used as arguments.
A. Adverbially used noun phrases referring to a time interval

In (140), we give some examples in which the adverbially used noun phrase refers to a certain time interval. It must be noted that all noun phrases are obligatorily modified by a quantifier-like element like *hele ‘whole’, *half ‘half’ and *godganse ‘whole blessed’; dropping these modifiers results in unacceptability.

(140)  a.  Jan bleef de ??(hele) morgen thuis.
Jan stayed the whole morning home
‘Jan stayed home the whole morning.’

b.  Marie zat de *(halve) lezing te gapen.
Marie sat the half lecture to yawn
‘Mary was yawning during large parts of the lecture.’

c.  Jan zit de *(godganse) dag te kletsen.
Jan sits the whole blessed day to chatter
‘Jan is chattering during the whole blessed day.’

d.  Hij heeft zijn *(hele) leven in Amsterdam gewoond.
he has his whole life in Amsterdam lived
‘He has always lived in Amsterdam.’

B. Adverbially used noun phrases referring to a certain point on the time axis

In (141), we give some examples in which the adverbially used noun phrase refers to a specific point in time. These noun phrases typically contain a modifier which clarifies the position of the referent of the noun phrase on the time axis.

(141)  a.  Marie kwam de volgende ochtend/dag weer thuis.
Marie came the next morning/day again home
‘Marie came home again the next morning.’

b.  Marie was de week voor Pasen nog in Frankrijk.
Marie was the day before Easter still in France
‘Marie was the week before Easter still in France.’

c.  Ik ben de volgende les weer aanwezig.
I am the next lesson again present
‘I will be present again for the next lesson.’

Unlike in adverbially used noun phrases referring to a time interval, the modifiers in noun phrases referring to specific point in time can be dropped provided that there is some other means to take over their function, e.g., by using a demonstrative pronoun instead of a definite article. Using a demonstrative may also save the ungrammatical examples in (140a&b), but at the expense of the durative reading: in an example like *Jan bleef die morgen thuis ‘Jan stayed home that morning’, the adverbial phrase refers to a certain point on time axis, not to a time interval.

(142)  a.  Marie kwam de/*de ochtend weer thuis.
Marie came that/the morning again home

b.  Marie was die/*de week nog in Frankrijk.
Marie was that/the week still in France

c.  Ik ben *die/*de les weer aanwezig.
I am that/the lesson again present
C. Differences between nominal time adjuncts and the direct object

Since the adverbial phrase has the form of a regular noun phrase, it can easily be confused with a direct object. In example (143a), the noun phrase can only be used as an adverbial phrase since it does not satisfy the selectional properties of the main verb: *de hele dag* does not refer to a danceable entity. Nevertheless, at first sight this example closely resembles example (143b), where the noun phrase *de hele dag* does function as the direct object of the main verb *verprutsen* ‘to botch/spoil’.

(143) a. Jan danste de *(hele/halve/godganse) avond. [adjunct]
   Jan danced the whole/half/god.blessed night
b. Jan verprutste de *(hele/halve/godganse) avond. [argument]
   Jan spoiled the whole/half/god.blessed night

There are, however, several differences between these examples, all related to the fact that *de hele avond* functions as an adjunct in (143a), but as an object in (143b). A first difference, illustrated in (144), is that the noun phrase is optional in (143a), whereas it must be realized in (143b). A second difference, also illustrated by these examples, is that (143a) can be paraphrased by means of the *en doet dat*-test, whereas (145a) cannot; cf. °adverb tests in the glossary.

(144) a. Jan danste (en hij deed dat de hele/halve/godganse avond).
   Jan danced and he did that the whole/half/god.blessed night
b. *Jan verprutste (en hij deed dat de hele/halve/godganse avond).
   Jan spoiled and he did that the whole/half/god.blessed night

Finally, the examples in (145) show that passivization of (143a) gives rise to an impersonal passive, whereas passivization of (143b) results in promotion of the noun phrase to subject.

(145) a. Er werd de hele/halve/godganse avond gedanst.
   there was the whole/half/god.blessed night danced
b. De hele/halve/godganse avond werd verprutst.
   the whole/half/god.blessed night was spoiled

An example like (146a) is genuinely ambiguous between the two readings. The verb *spelen* ‘to play’ can be used transitively as in *een etude spelen* ‘to play/perform an etude’ or as an intransitive verb like in (*met poppen*) *spelen* ‘to play (with dolls)’. In the active construction in (146a), the verb can be construed in both ways. When the noun phrase is dropped or the sentence is paraphrased by means of the *en doet dat*-test, as in (146b), only the intransitive reading survives. The passive construction can be also used to disambiguate the sentence: when the passive construction is impersonal, as in (146c), we are dealing with intransitive *spelen*; when the noun phrase is promoted to subject, as in (146c’), we are dealing with transitive *spelen*.

(146) a. Jan speelde het hele concert.
   Jan played the whole concerto/concert
   ‘Jan played the whole concerto’ or ‘Jan played during the whole concert’
b. Jan speelde (en hij deed dat het hele concert).
   Jan played and he did that the whole concert
c. Er werd het hele concert gespeeld.  
there was the whole concert played

c′. Het hele concert werd gespeeld.  
the whole concerto was played

In this specific case, the addition of an instrumental PP can also have a disambiguating effect since the referent of the complement of the preposition met may make clear which use of spelen is intended: in Jan speelde het hele concert met zijn poppen ‘Jan played with his dolls during the whole concert’, the verb is clearly used intransitively. Verbs that yield a similar ambiguity as spelen are zingen ‘sing’ and fluiten ‘to whistle/to play the flute’.

II. Indefinite noun phrases

Indefinite noun phrases normally refer to a certain time interval, as in (147). In these cases, the noun typically denotes a conventional time unit like uur ‘hour’, dag ‘day’, maand ‘month’, etc. Often these nouns surface in their diminutive form.

(147) a. Hij komt een uurtje/uur op visite.  
he comes an hour dim/hour on visit

b. Hij is een jaartje/jaar in Frankrijk geweest.  
he is a year dim/year in France been

III. Quantified noun phrases

Indefinite noun phrases containing a numeral or a quantifier like enkele ‘some/several’ may also be used to refer to a time interval. In such cases the noun normally denotes a conventional time unit. Some examples are given in (148). Note that the noun sometimes appears in its singular form when preceded by a cardinal numeral; see Section 6.1.1.3, sub IIB, for discussion.

(148) a. Hij is drie weken op vakantie geweest.  
he is three weeks on holiday been

‘He has been on holiday for three weeks.’

b. Hij heeft drie uur/uren liggen slapen.  
he has three hours lie sleep

‘He has been sleeping for three hours.’

c. Hij heeft enkele uren vastgezeten in de lift.  
he has some hours sat.stuck in the elevator

‘He has been stuck in the elevator for some hours.’

On the frequency reading, the noun must denote a time unit that is relatively short. Some nouns that typically appear as the head of a noun phrase used as a frequency adverb are ochtend ‘morning’, middag ‘afternoon’, avond ‘night’, but not week ‘week’ or maand ‘month’. Consider the examples in (149). In an example like (149a), the noun phrase drie avonden ‘three nights’ refers to three separate points in time, whereas twee weken ‘two weeks’ in (149b) is instead interpreted as referring to a certain time interval.
Syntactic uses of noun phrases

(149) a. Ik heb deze week drie avonden gedanst.
    I have this week three nights danced
    ‘This week, I have danced on three nights.’
  b. Ik heb deze maand twee weken gewandeld.’
    I have this month two weeks walked
    ‘This month, I have walked for two weeks.’

In addition to the nouns denoting a conventional time unit, nouns like keer or maal ‘time’ in (150a) are typically used in these contexts: note that these nouns normally take the singular form when preceded by a numeral, but the plural form when preceded by a quantifier like enkele ‘several’. Occasionally, examples like (150b) can also be found, where the noun denotes a set of durative events.

(150) a. Ik heb deze maand twee keer/enkele keren gewandeld.’
    I have this month two time/several times walked
    ‘This month, I have walked two/several times.’
  b. Jan is drie lessen afwezig geweest.
    Jan is three lessons absent been
    ‘Jan has been absent at three lessons.’

On the frequency reading, there seems to be no restriction on the quantifier in the noun phrase; whereas the universal quantifiers alle ‘all’ and elke ‘every’ and the quantifier sommige ‘some’ are not possible in noun phrases referring to a time interval, they can appear in noun phrases used as adverbial phrases of frequency.

(151) a. Ik heb deze week alle avonden gedanst.
    I have this week all nights danced
    ‘This week I have danced all nights.’
  b. Ik heb deze week elke avond gedanst.
    I have this week each night danced
    ‘This week I have danced every night.’
  c. Ik heb deze week sommige avonden gedanst.
    I have this week some nights danced
    ‘This week I have danced some nights.’

IV. Names of days, months, seasons, etc.

The previous subsection has shown that noun phrases headed by names of days, months, seasons, and other conventionally distinguished time units can be used as adverbial phrases. There is, however, a rather complicated system that determines whether these nouns can or must be accompanied by a determiner. Further, the names of some of these time units may feature in noun phrases exhibiting genitive case; some examples are given in (152).

(152) a. names of days: ’s maandags ‘on Monday(s)’, dinsdags ‘on Tuesday(s)’,
    ’s woensdags, donderdags, vrijdags, ’s zaterdags, ’s zondags
  b. seasons: ’s zomers ‘in the summer’, ’s winters ‘in the winter’, *’s herfts,
    *’s lentes
  c. other conventional time units: ’s morgens ‘in the morning’, ’s middags ‘in the afternoon’, ’s avonds ‘in the evening’, ’s nachts ‘at night’, etc.
Note that the nouns in these genitive phrases are generally preceded by the reduced form of the genitive article des ‘the’ and inflected with the genitive ending -s. Since modern Dutch does not make use of the case-inflected forms of the noun and the determiner, the forms in (152) must be considered lexicalized, which is also supported by the fact that the genitive article is missing in the case of dinsdags, donderdags and vrijdags, and the fact that the nouns herfst ‘fall’ and lente ‘spring’ do not have these genitive counterparts.

A. Names of days

Noun phrases headed by the name of a day can readily be used as adverbial phrases. When preceded by a determiner, they refer to a time interval, and are then preferably modified by a quantifier like heel ‘whole’, as in (153a). When they are not preceded by a determiner, they refer to a specific point of time, which may either precede or follow the speech time: a noun phrase like maandag ‘Monday’ in (153b&b′) can either refer to a time before or after the speech time; the actual reading depends on the tense of the modified clause and can be made explicit by adding a modifier like afgelopen ‘last’ or komende ‘next’. Note that when a PP-modifier is used, as in (153c), a determiner must be used.

(153)  a.  Jan heeft de hele maandag gewandeld.
     Jan has the whole Monday walked
     ‘Jan has walked all Monday.’

     b.  (Afgelopen) maandag was ik in Antwerpen.
         last Monday was I in Antwerp
         ‘Last Monday, I was in Antwerp.’

     b′.  (Komende) maandag ben ik in Antwerpen.
         next Monday am I in Antwerp
         ‘Next Monday, I will be in Antwerp.’

     c.  We komen *(de) zondag voor/na Pasen bij je op bezoek.
         we come the Sunday before/after Easter at you on visit
         ‘We come to visit you the Sunday after Easter.’

The genitive form can also be used to refer to a certain point in time. The difference between the adverbial phrase maandag in (153b&b′) and ’s maandags in (154a) is that the former refers to the Monday immediately preceding or following the speech time, whereas the latter refers to a certain Monday within a contextually determined span of time, e.g., the Monday during the Easter weekend; using this genitive form to refer to the Monday immediately preceding or following the speech time gives rise to an unacceptable result. The genitive form is also very common as a frequency adverb; example (154b) shows that in this use the genitive form alternates with the adverbial PP op maandag.

(154)  a.  ’s Maandags heb ik lekker gewandeld.
     on Monday have I nicely walked
     ‘On Monday I made a nice walk.’

     b.  ’s Maandags/Op maandag ga ik vaak naar de film.
         on Mondays go I often to the movies
         ‘On Mondays, I often go to the movies.’
B. Names of months

Noun phrases containing the names of months can also be used adverbially. They then refer to a certain time interval, and are normally modified by a quantifier like *heel* ‘whole’, as in (155a). Using the modifier *half* ‘half’, as in (155b), leads to ambiguity: it can express that the proposition holds for a large part of the month, or that it holds around the 15th of that month. In the latter use it has a similar function as the numeral in (155c), in which case, however, the adverbial phrase is preferably realized as a PP headed by *op ‘at’*.

(155)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>*Jan is *<em>(heel) April in de Verenigde Staten.</em></td>
<td>‘Jan will be in the US during April.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Jan is <em>half April in de Verenigde Staten.</em></td>
<td>‘Jan will be in the US during a large part of April/around April 15th.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Jan is <em>(op) 13 April in de Verenigde Staten.</em></td>
<td>‘Jan will be in the US on April 13th.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noun phrases headed by the names of months are not used to refer to a certain point in time, nor do the names of months appear in genitive phrases. Instead, a PP is used, headed by the temporal preposition *in ‘in’*:

in januari ‘in January’. Note that the names of months are normally not preceded by a determiner.

C. Names of seasons

Noun phrases headed by the name of a season can be used adverbially to refer to a certain time interval, as in (156a). Unlike the names of months, names of seasons must then be preceded by a determiner. Normally, a modifier like *heel* ‘whole’ is present. When used to denote a certain position on the time axis, the noun phrase optionally contains a determiner, as shown in (156b). As is shown in (156c), a modifier like *komende* is required, unless the determiner is a demonstrative.

(156)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>*Ik ben <em>(de) hele lente/zomer/herfst/winter in de Verenigde Staten.</em></td>
<td>I am the whole spring/summer/fall/winter in the United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Ik ga <em>(de) komende lente/zomer/herfst/winter niet op vakantie.</em></td>
<td>I go the next spring/summer/fall/winter not on holiday</td>
<td>‘I won’t go on holiday next spring/summer/fall/winter.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Ik ga deze/<em>de winter niet op vakantie.</em></td>
<td>I go this/the winter not on holiday</td>
<td>‘I won’t go on holiday this (coming) winter.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the genitive form to refer to a certain season within a contextually determined time is not very natural: using (157a) to refer to, say, the winter of 1981 seems forced. It is very common, however, to use the genitive form as an adverbial phrase of frequency, as in (157b). In this use, the genitive form alternates with the PP *in de winter ‘in winter’*; this option is, of course, the only one available for the nouns *lente ‘spring’* and *herfst ‘fall’*, since they do not have a genitive form.
D. Names of other conventional time units

Other conventional time units are expressed by nouns like weekend ‘weekend’, dag ‘day’, week ‘week’, ochtend ‘morning’ or avond ‘night’. When a noun phrase headed by these nouns refers to a time interval, as in the (a)-examples of (158) and (159), it is preceded by a determiner and a modifier like heel ‘whole’ is required. When the noun phrase is used to refer to a certain point on the time axis, as in the (b)-examples, the determiner can often be left out. The (c)-examples show that the use of a modifier is obligatory unless the determiner is a demonstrative. When the noun phrase contains a PP-modifier, as in the (d)-examples, the determiner is obligatory.

(158) a. Ik ben *(het) hele weekend in Antwerpen.
   I am the whole weekend in Antwerp
b. Ik was het vorige weekend/vorig weekend in Antwerpen.
   I was the last weekend/last weekend in Antwerp
c. Ik ben dat/ het weekend in Antwerpen.
   I am that/that weekend in Antwerp
d. Ik kom het weekend voor/na Pasen bij je op bezoek.
   I come the weekend before/after Easter at you on visit
   ‘I come to visit you the weekend before/after Easter.’

(159) a. Ik ben *(de) hele dag/avond thuis.
   I am the whole day/evening home
b. Hij komt *(de) komende dag/avond weer thuis.
   He comes the next day/evening again home
c. Hij komt *die/de dag/avond weer thuis.
   He comes that/day again home
d. Ik kom de dag voor/na Pasen bij je op bezoek.
   I come the day before/after Easter at you on visit
   ‘I come to visit you the day before/after Easter.’

Note, however, that dropping the determiner in (159b) is somewhat marginal. It may be the case that the use of the bare noun phrases komende dag and komende avond is blocked by the existence of the lexical forms morgen ‘tomorrow’ and morgenavond ‘tomorrow night’. This is supported by the fact that noun phrases like vorige/afgelopen week ‘last/the past week’ or volgende maand ‘next month’, for which such lexical items do not exist, are perfectly acceptable without the determiner: actually, in these cases the determiner cannot be used.
Syntactic uses of noun phrases

(160) a. Ik was (*de) vorige/afgelopen week/maand in Amsterdam.  
I was the last/past week/month in Amsterdam  
*I was in Amsterdam last/the past week/month.*  
b. Ik ga (*de) volgende week/maand naar Amsterdam.  
I go the next week/month to Amsterdam  
*I go to Amsterdam next week/month.*

Nouns denoting a certain part of the day also allow a genitive form: ’s morgen ‘in the mornings’, ’s middags ‘in the afternoon(s)’, ’s avonds ‘in the evening/night(s)’, ’s nachts ‘in the night(s)’, etc. These genitive phrases can either refer to the morning, afternoon, etc. of a contextually defined day, or be used as an adverbial phrase of frequency.

(161) a. Hij kwam ’s avonds doodmoe thuis.  
he came in the evening dead.tired home  
*The evening of that day, he came home dead tired.*

b. ’s Morgens werkt hij thuis.  
in the morning(s) works he home  
*In the morning(s), he works at home.*

The genitive form ’s avonds and ’s morgen in (161) cannot refer to the night/morning of the day that includes the speech time: in order to do that, one has to make use of the form vanavond ‘tonight’/vanmorgen ‘this morning’. Other forms featuring the morpheme van that have a similar blocking effect are: vandaag ‘today’, vanmiddag ‘this afternoon’ and vannacht ‘tonight’. Perhaps these forms are related to the phrases van de week ‘some time this week’, van de maand ‘some time this month’, van de winter ‘some time last/next winter’.

(162) a. Ik ben vanavond thuis.  
I am tonight home

b. Hij was vanmorgen ziek.  
he was this.morning ill

Finally, note that there are no genitive forms of the nouns dag ‘day’, week ‘week’, maand ‘month’ or jaar ‘year’ that can be used in the contexts in (161). There do exist archaic genitive forms like daags and ’s jaars that occur in formal language, but these forms do not have the same function as the genitive forms in (161); some examples are daags na die ontmoeting ‘a day after that meeting’ and tweemaal daags/’s jaars ‘twice a day/year’.

8.3.2. Non-temporal adverbial phrases

This section briefly mentions some examples where noun phrases are or seem to have been used as non-temporal adverbial phrases. First we can mention noun phrases following the measure verbs like kosten ‘to cost’, duren ‘to last’ in (163). Since it is generally assumed that these measure noun phrases do not act as direct objects, we may assume that they are adverbial in nature. However, since we are clearly dealing with phrases selected by the verb it can also be argued that we are dealing with complements of a special sort.
Syntax of Dutch: nouns and noun phrases

(163) a. Dat boek kost tien euro.
    that book costs ten euro
b. De voorstelling duurt twee uur.
    the show lasts two hours
    ‘The show will last two hours.’

The use of measure phrases is very productive in examples like (164a) and (164b) where they act as modifiers of the PP naast het doel and the AP diep, respectively. Examples like these are extensively discussed in Chapter P3 and Section A3.1.4.2.

(164) a. Jan schoot de bal drie meter naast het doel.
    Jan shot the ball three meter next to the goal
b. De schat ligt drie meter diep.
    the treasure lies three meter deep

Finally, we want to note the idiomatic example in (165a), where the phrase een uur in de wind seems to be used as an ‘intensifier of the verb stinken ‘to stink’. In the Van Dale dictionary, the meaning of een uur in this construction is described as “as far as one can go in an hour”, so that the meaning of (165a) is something like “One can even smell Jan if one travels an hour against the wind”. Therefore, een uur seems to act here as a measure phrase modifying the PP in de wind. Another example of a similar kind is given in (165b).

(165) a. Jan stinkt een uur in de wind.
    Jan stinks an hour in the wind
    ‘Jan stinks extremely badly.’
b. Er is hier een uur in de omtrek geen café te vinden.
    there is here an hour in the surroundings no bar to find
    ‘In whatever direction one goes from here, one will not be able to find a bar for an hour.’

8.4. Bibliographical notes

The literature on wh-movement and topicalization is vast, and we will only be able to mention to some of the most prominent contributions to the discussion here. The core properties of these movements have been described by Chomsky (1977). An extensive discussion of the so-called ‘complementizer-trace phenomenon can be found in Chomsky & Lasnik (1977), and the object-subject asymmetry has played an important role in the formulation of the Empty Category Principle in Chomsky (1981). The ‘Superiority Condition is taken from Chomsky (1973), and has later been subsumed under the Relativized Minimality Condition proposed in Rizzi (1990). This section did not fully discuss all of the intricacies involved in these movements. For example, we barely scratched the issue related to the domain from which long wh-movement is possible (cf. Huang 1982). For the moment we confine ourselves to making reference to the papers collected in Cheng & Corver (2006) for a review of the current state of the art. We will return more extensively to issues concerning these movements in Broekhuis & Corver (in prep).

The literature on scrambling is also vast but, unlike the case of wh-movement and topicalization, it has not yet led to a clear consensus on the nature of the
operation. The existing approaches to object scrambling can be divided into three different groups depending on whether it is considered to be A- or A’-movement, or to involve base-generation; a representative sample of these approaches can be found in Corver & Van Riemsdijk (1994). Webelhuth (1989/1992) has shown that Dutch/German object scrambling has properties of both A- and A’-movement, a fact that is often referred to as “Webelhuth’s paradox. This has given rise to the claim that the notion of scrambling actually refers to (at least) two different types of movement; cf., e.g., Vanden Wyngaerd (1988/1989), Déprez (1989), Mahajan (1990), Neeleman (1994b), and Broekhuis (2008). The type of scrambling discussed in this chapter is of the A-movement sort.

Again, it is not possible to give a representative overview of the literature concerning the expletive construction and the so-called definiteness effect. Some important contributions have already been mentioned in the bibliographical notes to Chapter 6.

A classical study on Dutch copular constructions with a nominal predicate is Blom & Daalder (1977). More recent studies concerning nominal predicates are Moro (1997) and Den Dikken (2006); we refer the reader to these studies for additional references. There are not many studies on the adverbial use of noun phrases; our discussion on the use of noun phrases as temporal adjuncts is mainly built on the discussion found in the more traditional grammars. For the use of noun phrases as measure phrases, see Klooster (1972) and Corver (1990).