This appendix provides an alphabetical list of notions that may not be familiar to the reader. In the unhoped-for case that the reader does not find what he is looking for here, we refer the reader to the internet version of the excellent and freely accessible *Lexicon of Linguistics* edited by Johan Kerstens, Eddy Ruys and Joost Zwarts: //www2.let.uu.nl/Uil-OTS/Lexicon/.

**Absolute met-construction:**
A prepositional phrase headed by the preposition *met* ‘with’. The complement of *met* consists of a noun phrase and some other category which is predicated of this noun phrase. Some examples are given within brackets in (i).

(i) a.  [Met Peter ziek] kunnen we die vergadering niet houden.  
    with Peter ill can we that meeting not keep  

b.  [Met Peter in het ziekenhuis] kunnen we die vergadering niet houden.  
    with Peter in the hospital can we that meeting not keep

**Acl-construction:**
The abbreviation Acl stands for *Accusativus cum Infinitivo* (accusative with infinitive). The Acl-construction is an infinitival clause, in which the subject is not left implicit but realized as an accusative noun phrase. Such constructions only occur as the complement of the causative/permissive verb *laten* ‘to make/let’ and perception verbs like *zien* ‘to see’ and *horen* ‘to hear’. In (i) the accusative subject of the infinitival clause is given in italics.

(i) a.  Jan laat [het meisje/haar een liedje zingen]  
    Jan lets the girls/her a song sing  

b.  Jan zag/hoorde [het meisje/haar vertrekken]  
    Jan saw/heard the girl/her leave

**Across-the-Board movement:**
Examples (ib&b′) show that subextraction from a coordinated structure is normally excluded; cf. °Coordinate Structure Constraint. This does not hold, however, when the movement applies in a so-called Across-the-Board fashion, that is, affects all conjuncts: (ic) is acceptable due to the fact that the *wh*-phrase *wat* ‘what’ is in a sense moved from (related to an interpretative gap in) both conjuncts.

(i) a.  Jan heeft [[een boek van Peter gestolen] en [een CD/boek aan Marie gegeven]].  
    Jan has a book from Peter stolen and a CD/book to Marie given  

b.  *Wat, heeft Jan [[ti van Peter gestolen] en [een boek aan Marie gegeven]]?  
    what has Jan from Peter stolen and a book to Marie given  

b′.  *Wat, heeft Jan [[een boek van Peter gestolen] en [ti aan Marie gegeven]]?  
    what has Jan a book from Peter stolen and to Marie given  

c.  Wat, heeft Jan [[ti van Peter gestolen] en [ti aan Marie gegeven]]?  
    what has Jan from Peter stolen and to Marie given
**Adicity:**
The adicity (or valency) of a lexical head (verb, noun, adjective, preposition) concerns the number of arguments this lexical head takes. A monadic head takes one, a dyadic head takes two, and a triadic head takes three arguments. Lexical heads that do not take any arguments are called avalent.

**Adjunct:**
A constituent in the domain of a lexical head H that is not selected by H. The notion of adjunct stands in opposition to the notion of argument, which is a constituent that is selected by H. Adjuncts and arguments differ in that the first are normally optional, whereas the latter are generally obligatory (or at least semantically implied). The PP *in de keuken* ‘in the kitchen’ in (i) is optional and can be considered an adjunct, whereas the noun phrase *de aardappelen* ‘the potatoes’ is virtually obligatory, and should be considered an argument of the verb *schillen* ‘to peel’.

(i)  a. Jan schilt *de aardappelen* (in de keuken).
    b. Jan schilt *(de aardappelen)* in de keuken.
       Jan peels the potatoes in the kitchen

**Adverb:**
The notion of adverb does not denote a set of entities with a certain categorial status, as do the notions verb, noun, adjective and preposition, but rather a set of lexical elements that can perform a certain syntactic function in the clause, more specifically that of an adverbial phrase. Our use of the notion of adverb should therefore be seen as shorthand for “adverbially used adjective” given that many adverbs exhibit adjectival properties: they may be used attributively or predicatively in other contexts, or exhibit typical syntactic or morphological properties like the ones given in (i).

(i)  a. Modification by *erg/heel/zeer* ‘very’
    b. Comparative and superlative formation
    c. *On-* prefixation
    d. Having an adjectivizing suffix

Despite the fact that we do not acknowledge the existence of a lexical category “adverb”, it cannot be denied that there are certain adverbs, like the °intensifiers *zeer* ‘very’ and *heel* ‘very’ mentioned in (i.a), for which there is no direct syntactic or morphological evidence that they are adjectival in nature. However, the fact that they cannot be inflected for tense and agreement shows that they are not verbs, and the fact that they can neither be preceded by a determiner nor appear in an argument position strongly suggests that they are not nouns either. Therefore, we provisionally conclude that they must be adjectives, which is supported by the fact that they share the semantic property of being able to modify an adjective.

**Adverb tests:**
In cases of modification of a verbal projection, at least two types of adverbial phrases must be distinguished. The first type involves modification of the proposition expressed by the clause, which is therefore referred to as a clause adjunct. Clauses that contain this type of adverbial phrase can be paraphrased as in
Glossary (ia); a concrete example is given in (ia′ & a″). The second type involves modification of the verb (phrase) only, and is referred to as a VP adjunct. Clauses that contain this type of adverbial phrase can be paraphrased as in (ib), in which the pronoun must be construed as identical to the subject of the clause; a concrete example is given in (ib′ & b″).

(i)  a. Clause adjunct: Het is ADVERB zo dat CLAUSE
    a′. Jan werkt natuurlijk.
    Jan works of course
    a″. Het is natuurlijk zo dat Jan werkt.
     it is of course the case that Jan works
    b. VP adjunct: [CLAUSE subjecti ...,] en pronouni doet dat ADVERB
    b′. Jan lacht hard.
     Jan laughs loudly
    b″. Jan, lacht en hij, doet dat hard.
     Jan laughs and he does that loudly

Amplifier:
See °Intensifier.

Anticipatory pronoun/pronominal PP:
Clauses may have argument status with respect to a lexical head. Generally, however, they do not occur in the regular argument position, but are extraposed. For instance, if the argument position is part of a verbal projection, it may optionally be occupied by the pronoun het ‘it’, which is called the anticipatory pronoun, as in (i). If the clause is part of a prepositional complement, the anticipatory pronominal PP er-P may optionally occur, as in (ii). See °R-extraction for a discussion of the fact that the anticipatory pronominal PP er over is split.

(i)  Jan betwijfelt (het) of      Marie komt.
     Jan doubts it whether Marie comes
     ‘Jan doubts whether Marie will come.’
(ii) Jan is (er) boos (over) dat Marie niet komt.
     Jan is there angry about that Marie not comes
     ‘Jan is angry that Marie will not come.’

Argument:
An argument is a constituent in the domain of a lexical head H that is selected by H. The notion of argument stands in opposition to that of °adjunct, which is a constituent that is not selected by H. Arguments and adjuncts differ in that the first are normally obligatorily present (or at least semantically implied), whereas adjuncts are optional. In (i), the noun phrase de aardappelen ‘the potatoes’ is virtually obligatory and can be considered an argument of the verb schillen ‘to peel’, whereas the PP in de keuken ‘in the kitchen’ is optional and can be considered an adjunct.

(i)  a. Jan schilt *(de aardappelen) in de keuken.
    b. Jan schilt de aardappelen (in de keuken).
     Jan peels the potatoes in the kitchen
The notion of argument is usually associated with verbs: verbs have argument structures, specifying the number and thematic roles of their arguments. An intransitive verb like *lachen* ‘to laugh’, for example, has one (agentive) argument, a transitive verb like *lezen* ‘to read’ has two arguments, an agent and a theme, and a ditransitive verb like *geven* ‘to give’ has three arguments. The arguments of these verbal predicates fill slots in the predicate frame implied by these verbs: *lachen* is a one-place predicate **LACHEN** (x) and the agentive argument fills the single argument slot; *lezen* is a two-place predicate **LEZEN** (x,y) and the two arguments fill the two respective slots in the predicate frame; *geven* is a three-place predicate and again the three arguments fill the slots in the predicate frame **GEVEN** (x,y,z).

(ii)  

• Predicate  
  a. LOPEN\textsubscript{V} (Agent)  
    walk  
  b. LEZEN\textsubscript{V} (Agent, Theme)  
    read  
  c. GEVEN\textsubscript{V} (Agent, Theme, Recipient)  
    give  

• Example  
  a’. [Jan]\textsubscript{Agent} [loop\textsubscript{opt}]\textsubscript{Pred}  
    Jan walks  
  b’. [Marie]\textsubscript{Agent} [leest een krant]\textsubscript{Pred}  
    Marie reads a newspaper  
  c’. [Jan]\textsubscript{Agent} [geeft Marie een boek]\textsubscript{Pred}  
    Jan gives Marie a book

The arguments in the predicate frame of two- and three-place predicates are not all of the same nature: filling the y and z slots in a sense completes the predicate, as a result of which it can be predicated of the argument placed in the x slot. In syntactic terms, the argument filling the x slot of a predicate normally corresponds to the subject of the clause, whereas the arguments filling the y and z slots correspond to the objects of the clause. Since the objects have the function of creating a complete predicate, they are often referred to as the complements or INTERNAL ARGUMENTs of the verb. The subject, on the other hand, will be referred to as the EXTERNAL ARGUMENT of the verb, the argument the complete verbal predicate is predicated of. In the lexical frames in (ii), the external argument is underlined in order to distinguish it from the complements. Note that there are several complications that are not discussed here: for instance, unaccusative verbs are assumed not to have an external argument but to be predicated of their internal argument.

Since adjectives and nouns function as predicates as well, they also take arguments. This is shown in (iii), where the adjectival/nominal noun phrase is predicated of the noun phrase *Jan*, which therefore functions as the external argument. Since the usual labels for semantic roles are created especially for expressing the roles of the arguments in the event structure denoted by verbal predications, we will simply refer to the external argument of non-verbal predicates as the REFERENT (Ref), that is, the entity with regard to which the property denoted by the adjectival/nominal noun applies.

(iii)  

• AARDIG\textsubscript{A} (Ref)  
  a. [Jan]\textsubscript{Ref} is [aardig]\textsubscript{Pred}  
    Jan is nice  
  a’. Ik vind [Jan]\textsubscript{Ref} [aardig]\textsubscript{Pred}.  
    I consider Jan nice

• GENIE\textsubscript{N} (Ref)  
  b. [Jan]\textsubscript{Ref} is [een genie]\textsubscript{Pred}  
    Jan is a genius  
  b’. Ik vind [Jan]\textsubscript{Ref} [een genie]\textsubscript{Pred}.  
    I consider Jan a genius
**Binding:**

A noun phrase (typically a pronoun) is said to be bound when it is coreferential with a c-commanding antecedent. Noun phrases differ with respect to the syntactic domain within which they must or can be bound. This is clear from the fact illustrated by the examples in (ia&b) that reflexive and referential personal pronouns like *zichzelf* and *hem* are in complementary distribution. Referential expressions like *de jongen* in (ic) normally remain free (= not bound) within their sentence.

(i)  

a. Ik *denk* dat Jan *zichzelf/*hem bewondert.  
   I think that Jan himself/him admires  
   ‘I think that Jan admires himself.’

b. Jan *denkt* dat ik *hem/*zichzelf bewonder.  
   Jan thinks that I him/himself admire  
   ‘Jan thinks that I admire him.’

c. *Jan* *denkt* dat ik *de jongen* bewonder.  
   Jan thinks that I the boy admire

Data like (i) have given rise to the formulation of the three binding conditions in (ii), in which the notion of local domain has not been defined. For the examples in (i), we may provisionally assume that it refers to the minimal clause containing the relevant noun phrase, but there are data that complicate matters; cf. Section 5.2.1.5, sub III, for a more detailed discussion.

(ii)  

- **Binding conditions**
  a. Anaphors like *zichzelf* ‘himself’ must be bound within their local domain.
  b. Pronouns like *hem* ‘him’ must be free (= not bound) within their local domain.
  c. Referential expressions like *Jan* or *de jongen* ‘the boy’ must be free.

**C-command:**

C-command refers to an asymmetric relation between the constituents in a phrase, which is generally defined in structural terms of a tree diagram: $\alpha$ c-commands $\beta$ if (i) $\alpha \neq \beta$, (ii) $\alpha$ does not dominate $\beta$, and (iii) the node that immediately dominates $\alpha$ also dominates $\beta$. When we restrict ourselves to clauses and ignore the verbs, this relation can also be expressed by the functional hierarchy in (i), where $A > B$ indicates that $A$ c-commands $B$ and everything that is embedded in $B$. This means, for example, that the subject c-commands the nominal objects, the periphrastic indirect object, the PP-complement(s) and all the adjuncts of its clause, including everything that may be embedded within these constituents.

(i)  

- **C-command hierarchy:** subject $>$ indirect object-NP $>$ direct object $>$ indirect object-PP $>$ PP-complement $>$ adjunct

Many restrictions on syntactic relations can be expressed by appealing to this notion: movement, for example, is only possible when the landing site c-commands the base position of the moved element, and binding of an anaphor or a pronoun is only possible when the antecedent c-commands it.
Clause adverb:
See ‘adverb tests.

Complement:
The arguments of a lexical head H, with the exception of the subject. In generative grammar, complements are generally called internal arguments, whereas the subject is called the external argument; an exception is the subject of an unaccusative verb, which is generally assumed to be an internal argument. Internal arguments of verbs are generally obligatorily present (or at least semantically implied), whereas external arguments can occasionally be suppressed, for instance in the passive construction.

Complementive:
This notion refers to the predicative complement of the verb in copular, resultative or vinden-constructions. In (i) some examples are given with adjectival predicates. A complementive may also be a nominal or a (spatial) adpositional phrase, e.g., Jan is leraar ‘Jan is a teacher’ and Jan heeft het boek in de kast gelegd ‘Jan has put the book on the shelves’. In neutral sentences complementives are left-adjacent to the clause-final verb. This is especially clear with PP-complementives as these differ from other PPs in that they cannot undergo PP-over-V: *Jan heeft het boek gelegd in de kast.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(i) a. } & \text{ Jan is erg aardig.} \\
& \text{ Jan is very nice} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ Jan slaat de hond dood.} \\
& \text{ Jan hits the dog dead} \\
\text{c. } & \text{ Ik vind Jan erg aardig.} \\
& \text{ I consider Jan very nice}
\end{align*}
\]

Complementizer-trace Filter:
In the generative literature from the last three decades, it has been argued that there is an asymmetry between subjects, on the one hand, and objects and adjuncts, on the other, with respect to “long” movement, that is, wh-extraction from clauses. Whereas objects and adjuncts can undergo long movement, subjects cannot unless the language has some special proviso that makes this movement possible, such as dropping the complementizer, as in English, or changing the form of the complementizer, like the so-called que/qui alternation in French. This is illustrated for English in (i).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(i) a. } & \text{ Who, do you think (*that) ti bought the book?} \\
& \text{b. What, do you think (that) John ti bought?} \\
\text{c. } & \text{ When, do you think (that) John bought the book ti?}
\end{align*}
\]

In traditional generative grammar this was accounted for by the generalization that a complementizer cannot be followed by a subject trace: *[ ... C ti ...]. This generalization was originally formulated as the that-trace or complementizer-trace filter in Chomsky & Lasnik (1977), but was later derived as one of the empirical consequences of the Empty Category Principle (ECP), formulated in Chomsky (1981).
Conjunction Reduction:
Within a coordinated structure, deletion of a phrase within a conjunct under identity with a phrase within the other conjunct. If the deleted phrase belongs to the first conjunct, the deletion operation is referred to as BACKWARD Conjunction Reduction; if the deleted phrase belongs to the second conjunct, the operation is referred to as FORWARD Conjunction Reduction.

(i) a. [Jan kocht een blauwe __] en [Peter kocht een groene auto].
Jan bought a blue and Peter bought a green car
b. [Jan kocht een boek] en [__ leende een plaat].
Jan bought a book and borrowed a record

Backward Conjunction Reduction is also known as Right Node Raising because early transformational grammar derived examples like (ia) by rightward movement of the apparently deleted element simultaneously from the left and the right conjunct; cf. °Across-the-Board movement. This movement analysis is controversial given that it forces us to assume movements that are not independently motivated: in (i), for example, the movement analysis has to assume that the head noun auto can be extracted from the complex noun phrase een blauwe/groene auto, which is not attested in more uncontroversial cases of leftward movement. The existence of Forward Conjunction Reduction is also controversial; examples like (ib) can readily be derived by assuming that some lower verbal projections are coordinated: Jan [[kocht een boek] en [leende een plaat]].

Constituency Test:
Test involving movement of a string of words into the sentence-initial position, that is, the position immediately preceding the finite verb in main clauses. Any string of words that can occupy this position in Dutch is considered a constituent. Satisfying this test is sufficient for assuming constituency, but not necessary given that constituents can be embedded within larger constituents that may function as °islands for extraction. The test provides pretty reliable results when it comes to the determination of the clausal constituents (the arguments and the adjuncts of the clause). Other tests that are occasionally used are coordination and clefting.

Coordinate Structure Constraint:
This constraint prohibits movement of a conjunct out of a coordinated structure: for example, wh-movement of the second conjunct in (ia) is impossible, as shown in (ia’). The constraint also prohibits subextraction from one of the conjuncts: for example subextraction from the second conjunct in (ib) is excluded, as shown in (ib’). An exception to the ban on subextraction is when the movement applies in a so-called °Across-the-Board fashion, that is, simultaneously affects all conjuncts.

Jan has an article and a book read
a’. *Wat, heeft Jan [[een artikel] en [ti ]] gelezen?
what has Jan an article and read
D-linking/D-linked:
The notion of D-linking is a pragmatic notion that stands for Discourse-linking and refers to the ability of certain *wh*-phrases to refer to referents pre-established in the domain of discourse (domain D). A *wh*-phrase like *welke auto* ‘which car’ is always D-linked: a question containing this *wh*-phrase requires an answer that refers to some entity that is part of domain D. A *wh*-phrase like *wat* ‘what’ can but need not be D-linked: a question containing this *wh*-phrase may but need not require an answer that refers to some entity that is part of domain D. A *wh*-phrase like *wat voor een auto* ‘what kind of car’ is never D-linked: a question containing this *wh*-phrase cannot be answered by referring to an entity that is part of domain D. The distinction between D-linked and non-D-linked *wh*-phrases is relevant for the description of several syntactic phenomena; cf. Pesetsky (1987). In this work we will also use this notion for non-interrogative phrases.

DO-subject:
The subject of a passive or an °unaccusative verb. This notion is used to express that the subjects of unaccusative and passive verbs have various properties in common with the direct objects of transitive verbs. Other notions that can be found in the literature referring to the same notion are DERIVED SUBJECT and LOGICAL OBJECT.

Expletive:
The element *er* in existential or presentational constructions like (ia&b). Example (ic) shows that, unlike the English expletive *there*, expletive *er* can also occur in transitive clauses, provided that the direct object is nonspecific indefinite. The fact that (ic) is marked with a definite object may be part of a more general phenomenon: expletive *er* is often disfavored (though acceptable) in the presence of some presuppositional element. This is illustrated in (ic’) by means of the locational pro-form *daar* ‘there’. See Section 8.1.4 for more discussion.

(i) a. dat er een probleem met de verwarming is.
    that there a problem with the heating is
    ‘that there is a problem with the heating.’

b. dat er een man op straat loopt.
    that there a man in the street walks
    ‘that there is someone walking in the street.’

c. dat er iemand een/*het lied zingt.
    that there someone a/the song sings

c’. dat (?”er) daar iemand een lied zingt.
    that there there someone a song sings
Extraposition:
A movement operation that is assumed to place a clause to the right of the verbs in clause-final position. Under the traditional OV-analysis of Dutch, complement clauses are base-generated to the left of the main verb, as in (ib), and obligatorily moved to the right of the verb. Extraposition of PPs is called "PP-over-V. Extraposition of noun phrases and APs is not possible in Dutch.

(i)  
   a.  dat Jan [dat hij ziek is] denkt ⇒
   b.  dat Jan t, denkt [dat hij ziek is],

Since the publication of Kayne (1994), there is a still-ongoing debate concerning whether (ib) is derived from (ia) by means of Extraposition or whether the complement is base-generated to the right of V; cf. Baltin (2006) and Broekhuis (2008: ch.2) for a review of a number of the currently available proposals. In this work, we will use the notion of Extraposition as a purely descriptive term in order to refer to the placement of the clause to the right of the verb.

Floating quantifier:
Floating quantifiers are quantifiers that are associated with noun phrases occurring elsewhere in the sentence, but with which they do not form a syntactic constituent. An example is allen in (i) which is associated with the subject of the clause die jongens.

(i)  
   a.  Die jongens zijn allen vertrokken.
      those boys are all left
      ‘Those boys have all left.’

The notion of a floating quantifier reveals a particular transformational outlook on the phenomenon: it is often assumed that the quantifier and the noun phrase it quantifies underlyingly form a constituent which is split up in the course of the syntactic derivation via either movement of the quantifier or movement of the remnant noun phrase; cf. Kayne (1975) and Sportiche (1988). There are, however, also analyses according to which floating quantifiers are independently generated adjuncts; cf. Doetjes (1997). We refer the reader to Bobaljik (2003) for a discussion of the various approaches. In this work floating quantifier is used as a pre-theoretical notion.

Focus:
The notion of focus is used in several different ways that should be kept strictly apart; see De Swart and De Hoop (2000) for a more extensive discussion of this notion.

I. When we are concerned with the information structure of the clause, the notion focus refers to the “new” information of the clause. As such it is opposed to the notion of presupposition, which refers to the “old” information in the clause.

II. The notion of focus is also used for certain elements in the clause that are phonetically emphasized by means of accent. Often, a distinction is made between emphatic, contrastive and restrictive focus. EMPHATIC focus simply highlights one of the constituents in the clause, as in (ia). CONTRASTIVE focus is normally used
when one or more specific referents are part of the domain of discourse to which
the proposition does not apply, and can also be used to deny a certain
presupposition on the part of the hearer, as in (ib). RESTRICTIVE focus implies that
the proposition in question is not true of any other referents: a specific, restricted set
is selected and a proposition is said to hold for this set only. It is often used for
restrictive adverbial phrases like van Jan in (ic): assigning focus to this phrase
suggests that the other relevant persons in the discourse did not yet hand in the
assignment.

(i) a. Ik heb hem een BOEK gegeven.
   ‘I have given him a BOOK.’
b. Nee, ik heb hem een BOEK gegeven (en geen PLAAT).
   ‘No, I gave him a BOOK (not a RECORD).’
c. Van Jan heb ik de opdracht al ontvangen.
   ‘From Jan, I have already received the assignment.’

Freezing:
The phenomenon that extraction from certain moved constituents is not possible.
For example, if a prepositional complement occupies its “unmarked” position
immediately to the left of the clause-final verb(s), °R-extraction is possible, as
shown by (ia’). However, if it occupies a position more to the left, R-extraction is
excluded, as is shown by (ib’). In the primed examples the stranded preposition and
its moved complement are given in italics.

(i) a. dat Jan al tijden op dat boek wacht.
   ‘that Jan has already been waiting for that book for ages.’
   a’. het boek waar Jan al tijden op wacht
   ‘the book that Jan has already been waiting for for ages’
   b. dat Jan op dat boek al tijden wacht.
   b’. *het boek waar Jan op al tijden wacht

Head-final Filter on attributive adjectives:
The Filter in (i) requires that the adjective carrying the attributive -e/-∅ ending be
adjacent to the noun it modifies. The filter is formulated such that it allows
recursive patterns such as [NP een mooi grote Amerikaanse [N auto]]
‘a beautiful big American car’.

(i) • Head-final Filter on attributive adjectives: *[NP.... [AP ADJ XP] N#], where
XP is phonetically non-null and N# is a bare head noun or a noun preceded
by an adjective phrase: [(AP) N].

Implied subject:
See °PRO.
Individual-level predicate:
See °Stage-level predicate.

Intensifier:
An adverbial modifier of a scalar adjective that specifies the degree to which the property denoted by the adjective holds. There are three types of intensifiers: AMPLIFIERS, which scale upwards from a tacitly assumed norm, DOWNTONERS, which scale downwards from the assumed norm, and NEUTRAL INTENSIFIERS, which are neutral in this respect.

Island for extraction:
An island for extraction is a constituent out of which extraction cannot take place. A distinction can be made between strong and weak islands. Strong islands are constituents out of which extraction is blocked categorically, whereas weak islands are constituents out of which only certain elements (especially adjunct phrases) cannot be extracted.

Lexical Integrity Constraint:
Constraint according to which no syntactic process may affect a subpart of a word. For example, wh-movement may not apply to the first part of the compound CD-speler in (ia).

Logical SUBJECT (vs. grammatical subject):
The constituent of which some other constituent in the clause is predicated. This notion of logical SUBJECT coincides with the notion of external °argument in generative grammar and is thus based on the °thematic relations within the clause. It differs from the traditional notion of (grammatical) subject that is used to refer to the nominative argument in the clause. In (ia), for example, the adjective leeg ‘empty’ is predicated of the noun phrase de fles ‘the bottle’, which therefore functions as the logical SUBJECT of leeg. Although this is not controversial, we will assume in this work that the predicate and its SUBJECT form a SMALL CLAUSE, that is, a complex constituent headed by the predicative element; cf. Stowell (1981/1983). More examples are given in (ib&c), where the noun phrases Peter and de boeken function as the SUBJECT of, respectively, a nominal and a prepositional predicate.

(i)  

a. Jan kocht [een [N CD-speler]]
   Jan bought a CD player

b. Wat, kocht Jan [een [N tī speler]]?
   what bought Jan a player

(i)  

a. Jan gooide [sc de fles leeg].
   Jan threw the bottle empty

b. Jan noemde [sc Peter een leugenaar].
   Jan called Peter a liar

c. Jan zette [sc de boeken in de kast].
   Jan put the books on the shelves
**Middle field:**
The middle field of the clause is defined as that part of the clause bounded to the right by the verbs in clause-final position (if present), and to the left by the complementizer in an embedded clause or the finite verb in second position of a main clause. The middle field of the examples in (i) is given in italics.

(i)  
\[\text{a. Gisteren heeft Jan met plezier dat boek gelezen.}\]
\[\text{yesterday has Jan with pleasure that book read}\]
\[\text{b. Ik denk [dat Jan met plezier dat boek gelezen heeft].}\]
\[\text{I think that Jan with pleasure that book read has}\]

It is important to realize that the middle field of a clause is not a constituent, but simply refers to a set of positions within the clause. This set of positions includes the base positions of the nominal arguments of the verb within VP (but not the verb itself), as well as a variety of positions external to VP such as the positions of the adverbial phrases and positions that can act as a landing site for, e.g., °scrambling.

**Modifier:**
In the nominal domain, modifiers are normally used to restrict the denotation of the modified noun. Modification of nouns is typically obtained by means of adjectival and prepositional phrases, as well as relative clauses. Some typical examples, in which the modifiers are italicized, are given in (i).

(i)  
\[\text{a. een mooi boek}\]
\[\text{a beautiful book}\]
\[\text{b. het huis op de hoek}\]
\[\text{the house on the corner}\]
\[\text{c. de man [die hier gisteren was]}\]
\[\text{the man who here yesterday was}\]
\[\text{‘the man who was here yesterday’}\]

**Negative polarity:**
Negative polarity items are constituents that cannot occur in all environments, but require some other element, like negation, in their environment to license them. Typical examples are the ook maar-phrases in (i): this phrase is licensed in (ia) by the negative noun phrase niemand, but blocked in (ib) due to the absence of such a negative constituent. Example (ic) shows that negative polarity items can also occur in, e.g., hypothetical contexts.

(i)  
\[\text{a. Niemand heeft ook maar iets gezegd.}\]
\[\text{nobody has OOK MAAR something said}\]
\[\text{‘Nobody has said anything at all.’}\]
\[\text{b. *Jan heeft ook maar iets gezegd.}\]
\[\text{Jan has OOK MAAR something said}\]
\[\text{c. Als er ook maar iets tegenzit, raakt hij in paniek.}\]
\[\text{if there OOK MAAR something go.against become he in panic}\]
\[\text{‘If anything at all goes wrong, he panics.’}\]
Operator:
A term borrowed from predicate calculus, where it refers to those elements that
combine with a formula $\varphi$, thereby creating a new formula $OP\varphi$. Examples of such
operators are the existential operator $\exists x$, the universal operator $\forall x$, and the negative
operator $\neg$. In generative syntax, this notion is extended to expressions from natural
languages such as *iemand* ‘someone’, *iedereen* ‘everyone’, *niet* ‘not’, and *wh-*
phrases such as *wie* ‘who’ and *wat* ‘what’.

Parasitic gap:
An empty element in the sentence that is assumed to be licensed by the antecedent
of another empty element in the sentence. In (ia), the empty object position in the
infinitival clause headed by the verb *lezen* ‘to read’ is assumed to be licensed by the
antecedent of the trace that occupies the object position of the verb *opbergen* ‘to
file’. The empty position within the adjunct clause *zonder te lezen* cannot be the
trace of the moved *wh*-phrase *wat* ‘what’ since adjuncts are °islands for extraction.
The structure of (ia) is therefore as indicated in (ib), in which $t$ stands for the trace
of *wat*, and PG is the parasitic gap.

(i) a. Wat heb je *zonder te lezen* opgeborgen?
   what have you without to read prt.-filed
   ‘What did you file without reading?’
   b. Wat heb je *[zonder PG te lezen]* $t$ opgeborgen.

Often, it is assumed that PG is actually a trace of a phonetically empty operator OP
that is moved into the initial position of the adjunct clause. In Dutch, parasitic gaps
are licensed not only by *wh*-movement, but also by scrambling. This is shown in
(iiia), which is assumed to have the structure in (iib), where $t$ is the trace of the
moved direct object *dat boek*, and PG stands for the parasitic gap licensed by
scrambling.

(ii) a. Jan heeft *dat boek* zonder te lezen opgeborgen.
   Jan has that book without to read prt.-filed
   b. Jan heeft *dat boek* *[zonder PG te lezen]* $t$ opgeborgen.

Passive:
Dutch has two forms of Passive. The first form is the so-called regular passive
illustrated in (ib) and (iib), which requires the presence of the auxiliary *worden* ‘to
be’ or *zijn* ‘to have been’ and promotes the direct object to subject. The second
form is the so-called semi- or *krijgen*-passive, illustrated in (iic), which requires the
presence of the auxiliary *krijgen* ‘to get’ and promotes the indirect object to subject.

(i) a. Jan verkocht *de boeken*.
   Jan sold the books
   b. Het boek werd verkocht.  
   the books were sold
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(ii) a. Jan bood Marie de boeken aan.
     Jan offered Marie the books prt.

b. De boeken werden Marie aangeboden.
     the books were Marie prt.-offered

c. Marie kreeg de boeken aangeboden.
     Marie got the books prt.-offered

The 

(iii) a. Jan gaf Marie de boeken aan.
     Jan gave Marie the books prt.

b. *Marie kreeg de boeken gegeven.
     Marie got the books given

c. Marie kreeg de boeken.
     Marie got the books

Pied Piping:
In interrogative clauses the sentence-initial position must be occupied by a wh-word; cf. (ia). Occasionally, however, wh-movement may or must involve a larger constituent that contains the wh-word. In (ib), for example, the preposition must be moved along with the wh-element wie ‘who’. This phenomenon is called pied piping; the wh-element wie pied pipes the proposition op. Pied piping also occurs in the case of other movement types.

(i) a. Wie heb je gezien? b. Op wie heb je gewacht?
     who have you seen for whom have you waited
     ‘Who did you see?’ ‘For whom did you wait?’

PP-over-V:
Many adpositional phrases can occur both in a position preceding and in a position following the verb(s) in clause-final position. Some examples are given in (i). In traditional generative grammar, it is assumed that the order in (ia) is the base order and that the other orders are derived by ‘extraposition of the PPs: (ib) is derived by PP-over-V of the adverbial adjunct of place op het station ‘at the station’, example (ic) by PP-over-V of the PP-complement of the main verb, op zijn vader ‘for his father’, and example (id) by PP-over-V of both PPs. Observe that the PPs occur in inverted order in (ia) and (id), that is, PP-over-V of more than one PP results in a mirroring of the original order; cf. Koster (1974).
(i) a. Jan heeft op het station op zijn vader gewacht.
   ‘Jan has waited for his father at the station.’
   b. Jan heeft op zijn vader gewacht op het station.
   c. Jan heeft op het station gewacht op zijn vader.
   d. Jan heeft gewacht op zijn vader op het station.

PP-over-V seems to be related to the information structure of the clause. In Dutch
the presence of °expletive er signals that the clause does not contain a constituent
expressing a presupposition. Given the fact that the expletive is optional in (iia), we
must conclude that the PP in het stadion can be interpreted either as part of the
focus of the clause or as a presupposition. However, the obligatory presence of the
expletive in (iib) indicates that the postverbal PP must be part of the focus of the
clause; see also Koster (1978), Guéron (1980), Scherpenisse (1985), and Bennis
(1986).

(ii) a. dat (er) in het stadion gevoetbald wordt.
   ‘People are playing soccer in the stadium.’
   b. dat *(er) gevoetbald wordt in het stadion.

The traditional assumption that PP-over-V involves extraposition of the PP (Koster
1973/1974) has recently been challenged, and many alternative proposals are
available at this moment; see, e.g., Kayne (1994), Koster (2000), Barbiers (1995),
Kaan (1997), Bianchi (1999), De Vries (2002), and Broekhuis (2008) for relevant
discussion. Since it is descriptively simpler, we adopt the traditional view in the
main text, but it must be kept in mind that this is not the generally accepted view at
the present moment.

Preposition stranding:
See °R-extraction.

Presupposition:
See °focus.

PRO:
A phonetically unrealized pronominal noun phrase that may act as the subject of,
e.g., an infinitival clause. PRO may be controlled by (= construed as coreferential
with) some noun phrase in the matrix clause, as in (i), or be interpreted as having
arbitrary reference, as in (ib).

(i) a. John tries [PRO to fix the sink].
   b. It is nice [PRO to visit Mary].

Projection:
Each lexical head L is assumed to form a projection (= a larger structure) LP by
combining with its arguments and (optional) modifiers. Generally, it is assumed
that a projection is hierarchically structured: first, L combines with its complement(s) and after that it combines with its subject and modifiers. Evidence
for this comes, e.g., from °binding: a subject can bind an object but not vice versa.
In current generative grammar it is commonly assumed that functional heads (like complementizers, numerals or determiners) project a so-called functional projection FP by combining with some lexical projection LP or some other functional projection. For example, the noun phrase de drie kleine kinderen ‘the three little children’ is assumed to have the structure in (i): first, the lexical N kinderen ‘children’ combines with its attributive modifier kleine to form the lexical projection NP; after that, the numeral drie ‘three’ forms the functional projection NumP by combining with the NP; finally, the determiner de ‘the’ combines with the NumP, and forms the functional projection DP.

(i) [DP de [NumP drie [NP kleine kinderen]]]

the three little children

Quantitative er;
Indefinite (but not definite) noun phrases containing a cardinal numeral or a weak quantifier may co-occur with so-called quantitative er. A noun phrase associated with quantitative er is characterized as containing an interpretative gap [e]. The descriptive content of this gap must be recoverable from the discourse or the extra-linguistic context. The nature of the gap is currently subject to debate. Quantitative er and its associate noun phrase are discussed in more detail in Section 6.3.

(i) a. Jan heeft twee boeken en Piet heeft er [drie [e]].
   Jan has two books and Piet has ER three

   b. Jan heeft weinig boeken maar Marie heeft er [veel [e]].
   Jan has few books but Marie has ER many

Raising verb:
Verbs like schijnen/lijken ‘to seem’ and blijken ‘to appear’ that allow the subject of an infinitival object clause to surface as the subject of the main clause. This can be illustrated by means of the examples in (i): the noun phrase that functions as the subject of the finite clause in (ia) surfaces as the subject of the main clause in (ib).

(i) a. Het schijnt [dat Jan ziek is].
   it seems that Jan ill is
   ‘It appears that Jan is ill.’

   b. Jan schijnt [ti, ziek te zijn].
   Jan seems ill to be
   ‘Jan seems to be ill.’

It is generally assumed that Raising verbs are unaccusative verbs. This implies that the anticipatory pronoun in (ia) is an internal argument of the verb, and that in (ib) the noun phrase Jan is moved into the subject position of the clause by means of movement, which accounts for the trace in the subject position of the infinitival clause. The movement of the subject is often referred to as Subject Raising.

R-extraction:
In Dutch, Preposition Stranding is not possible through movement of an NP-complement of the adposition, but only through extraction of an R-pronoun (er/waar) from pronominal PPs like er onder ‘under it’ or waar onder ‘under what’.
Stranding of the preposition may be the result of, e.g., scrambling of the R-pronoun, as in (ia), or wh-movement or relativization, as in (ib&b’). Generally, we use italics to indicate the parts of the discontinuous PP. A comprehensive discussion of R-extraction is given in Chapter P5.

(i) a. Jan heeft er gisteren naar gevraagd.
    Jan has there yesterday for asked
    ‘Jan asked for it yesterday.’

    b. Waar heeft Jan naar gevraagd?
    where has Jan for asked
    ‘What did Jan ask for?’

    b’. het boek waar Jan naar gevraagd heeft
    the book where Jan for asked has
    ‘the book that Jan has asked for’

R-pronominalization:
The process of creating a pronominal PP, that is, a PP consisting of a preposition and an °R-pronoun.

R-pronoun:
In Dutch, prepositions cannot be followed by third person, neuter pronouns like het ‘it’ or iets ‘something’. So, whereas (ia) is fully acceptable, (ib) is excluded: the neuter pronoun is obligatorily replaced by a so-called R-pronoun er/daar/ergens/..., as in (ib’). Occasionally, the replacement by an R-pronoun is optional, e.g., in the case of the quantificational pronouns iets ‘something’ or niets ‘nothing’ in (ic). See Chapter P5 for extensive discussion.

(i) a. naar hem/haar ‘to him/her’
    b. *naar het
    b’. er naar ‘to it’
    c. naar (n)iets
    c’. (n)ergens naar
    ‘to something/nothing’
    ‘to something/nothing’

Scope:
In semantics, the scope of an °operator is the subformula it is combined with; if ∀x combines with a formula ϕ, thus forming the formula ∀x(ϕ), all elements included by ϕ are in the scope of the operator ∀x. In generative grammar, it is assumed that syntactic operators such as iemand ‘someone’, iedereen ‘everyone’, niet ‘not’, wie ‘who’ and wat ‘what’ are operators that take scope. The scope of these elements may or may not be reflected by their actual position in the sentence. By extension, we will also use the notion scope to indicate which part of the structure is modified by a certain modifier.

Scrambling:
The word order of Dutch in the °middle field of the clause is relatively free. Generally this is accounted for by assuming that Dutch has a set of “short” leftward movements that target clause-internal positions. In this way constituents may be moved across adverbial phrases, thus giving rise to word order variation. This is illustrated in (i).
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(i)  a.  Jan zal waarschijnlijk morgen dat boek kopen.
    ‘Jan will probably buy that book tomorrow.’
  b.  Jan zal waarschijnlijk dat boek morgen kopen.
  c.  Jan zal dat boek waarschijnlijk morgen kopen.

Scrambling is not a unitary phenomenon but actually functions as a cover term for several types of movement. In the prototypical case, scrambling is related to the information structure of the clause. In an example like (ia), in which the noun phrase het boek is not scrambled, the noun phrase typically belongs to the "focus ("new" information) of the clause. In (ic), where it is scrambled, it belongs to the PRESUPPOSITION ("old" information) of the clause; in this example it is rather the adverb morgen that constitutes the focus of the clause. Scrambling can, however, also apply for other reasons. In (iia′), for example, the scrambled AP zo aardig is assigned emphatic focus, and in (iib′), scrambling of the PP voor niemand is forced due to the presence of negation on the nominal complement of the preposition.

(ii)  a.  dat Jan nog nooit zo aardig geweest is.
    ‘that Jan has never been that nice before.’
  a′.  dat Jan ZO aardig nog nooit geweest is.
  b.  *dat Jan aardig voor niemand is.
    ‘that Jan isn’t nice for anybody.’
  b′.  dat Jan voor niemand aardig is.

There are many controversies concerning the nature of scrambling, including the question of whether movement is involved, and, if so, whether this movement has properties normally associated with A-movement (like the movement that places the subject into the regular subject position), or with A′-movement (like wh-movement or topicalization), or with both; cf. °Webelhuth’s paradox. There is a vast literature on scrambling; here we mention only some important more recent contributions: Verhagen (1986), Vanden Wyngaerd (1988/1989), Grewendorf & Sternefeld (1990), De Hoop (1992), Corver & Van Riemsdijk (1994), Neeleman (1994b), and Broekhuis (2000/2008).

Second order predicate:
Second order predicates are predicates that denote properties, not entities, and are characterized by the fact that their °logical SUBJECT is itself a predicate, which therefore need not be a noun phrase; typical examples are given in (i). In the generative literature, the use of predicates as SUBJECTs in constructions of the type in (i) is sometimes referred to in terms of the notion “honorary NP”; cf. Safir (1983).

(i)  a.  Onder het bed is een goede schuilplaats.
    ‘under the bed is a good hiding place’
  b.  Rood is een mooie kleur.
    ‘red is a nice color’
Small clause:
See ²logical SUBJECT.

Stacking:
The term stacking refers to constructions containing two or more modifiers of the same kind, in which one modifier has ³scope over the other. Some examples of constructions with stacked restrictive relative clauses are given in (i).

(i)  
• Stacked restrictive relative clauses
  a. De [[studenti [diei hier net was]]j [diej Engels studeert]] is mijn vriend.
     the student who here just was who English studies is my friend
     ‘The student who was just here who studies English is my friend.’
  b. De [[man[ [die, hier net was]]j [diej Russisch sprak]] is een bekend schrijver.
     the man who here just was who Russian spoke is a well-known writer
     ‘The man that was just here who spoke Russian is a well-known writer.’

As indicated by the bracketing and indexing, the first relative clause in (ia) modifies the antecedent student ‘student’, while the second relative clause modifies the sequence student die hier net was ‘student who was just here’. The structure of these sentences differs from those in examples (iia&b), which illustrate cases of nesting and coordination, respectively. In (iia), the second relative clause modifies an element contained in the first R-clause; in (iib), the two relative clauses modify the same antecedent.

(ii)  
  a. De man[ [die, gisteren een boekj kocht [datj over WO II gaat]] is mijn vriend.
     the man who yesterday a book bought which about WW II goes is my friend
     ‘The man who bought a book yesterday which is about the war is my friend.’
  b. De man[ [die, hier net was] en [diej Russisch sprak] is een bekend schrijver.
     the man who here just was and who Russian spoke is a well-known writer
     ‘The man who was just here and who spoke Russian is a well-known writer.’

Stage-level:
A stage-level predicate expresses a transitory property of the entity it modifies. The stage-level predicates stand in opposition to the individual-level predicates, which denote a more permanent property. This distinction seems to be syntactically relevant in several respects. Stage-level adjectives, for instance, can be used in (i) expletive copula, (ii) resultatives and (iii) absolute met-constructions, (iv) allow the copula worden ‘to become’, and (v) can be combined with a time adverb such as vandaag, whereas these patterns lead to a weird result in the case of the individual-level adjectives.

(i)  
  a. Er is iemand ziek/²intelligent.
     there is someone ill/intelligent
  b. De spaghetti maakte Jan ziek/²intelligent.
     the spaghetti made Jan ill/intelligent
c.  [Met Jan ziek/intelligent] kan de vergadering niet doorgaan.
    with Jan ill/intelligent can the meeting not take place

d.  Jan wordt ziek/intelligent.
    Jan becomes ill/intelligent

e.  Jan is vandaag ziek/intelligent.
    Jan is today ill/intelligent

Strong:
See °weak.

Superiority condition:
The superiority condition (Chomsky 1973) states that when a transformation can in principle be applied to two constituents in the structure, it has to be applied to the one that is superior. Some constituent A is superior to constituent B if A °c-commands B, but B does not c-command A. For the constituents mentioned in our c-command hierarchy in (i), c-command and superiority are interchangeable notions. When we define these notions in structural terms, however, they may differ in various respects. More recent (relativized) versions of the superiority condition are the Relativized Minimality Condition proposed in Rizzi (1990) and the Locality Conditions proposed in Chomsky (1995) and later work.

(i)  C-command hierarchy: subject > indirect object-NP > direct object >
     indirect object-PP > PP-complement > adjunct

Supplementive:
The supplementive is a constituent of the clause that denotes a property of the subject or the direct object. This is illustrated in (ia&b) by means of supplementive adjectives. In (ia), the adjective *dronken* ‘drunk’ denotes a property of the subject Jan, and in (ib) the adjective *leeg* ‘empty’ denotes a property of the direct object *de fles* ‘the bottle’.

(i)  a.  Jan ging *dronken* naar huis.
    Jan went drunk to home
    ‘Jan went home drunk.’

    b.  Marie zet *de fles leeg* in de kast.
    Marie puts the bottle empty into the cupboard
    ‘Marie is putting the bottle into the cupboard empty.’

The relation between the supplementive and the clause is one of “simultaneousness” or “material implication”. The property expressed by the supplementives in (i) holds at the same time as the action expressed by the clause. Example (ib), for instance, can be paraphrased as “Marie puts the bottle in the cupboard while it (=the bottle) is empty”. In (ii), we give an example in which the relation is a material implication: “that you will iron your shirt smoother when it is wet”. The supplementive is extensively discussed in Section A6.3.

(ii)  dat je je overhemd nat gladder strijkt.
     that you your shirt wet smoother iron
     ‘that you will iron your shirt smoother wet.’
**Thematic role/relation:**
A thematic role is a formal means to express the semantic relation between a head and its arguments. It is often assumed that there are different thematic roles that can be assigned to arguments, e.g., AGENT, THEME (or PATIENT), GOAL and SOURCE.

**Topicalization:**
Topicalization is a movement operation that places some constituent in the clause-initial position of a main clause, that is, into the position in front of the finite verb. In (i), the italicized phrases are topicalized, although it has been suggested that the subject in (ia) has not been topicalized but occupies the regular subject position; see Section 8.1.2.2 for relevant discussion.

(i) a. *Marie* heeft *dat boek* gisteren op de markt gekocht.
   Marie has that book yesterday at the market bought
   ‘Marie bought that book at the market yesterday.’

   b. *Dat boek* heeft Marie gisteren op de markt gekocht.

   c. *Gisteren* heeft Marie *dat boek* op de markt gekocht.

   d. *Op de markt* heeft Marie gisteren *dat boek* gekocht.

Pragmatically seen, a topicalized phrase can have several functions. It may be the topic of discourse: in (ia), for example, the discussion is about Marie, in (ib) about the book, etc. The topicalized phrase may also be used contrastively, for instance to contradict some (implicitly or explicitly made) supposition in the discourse, as in (ii). In these cases, the topicalized phrase receives contrastive accent.

(ii) a. *MARIE* heeft *het boek* gekocht *(niet JAN).*
    Marie has the book bought not Jan

   b. *BOEKEN* heeft *ze* gekocht *(geen PLATEN).*
    books has she bought not records

**Trace (t):**
A formal means of marking the place a constituent once held before it was moved to another position. The trace and the moved constituent are generally coindexed.

**Unaccusative verb:**
Unaccusative verbs never take an accusative object. The subject of these verbs stands in a similar semantic relation with the unaccusative verb as the direct objects with a transitive verb. This is quite clear in the pair in (i); the nominative noun phrase *het glas* ‘the glass’ in the unaccusative construction (ib) stands in the same relation to the verb as the accusative noun phrase *het glas* in the transitive construction in (ia).

(i) a. *Jan* breekt *het glas.*
    Jan breaks the glass

   b. *Het glas* breekt.
    the glass breaks

It is assumed that the subject in (ib) originates in regular direct object position but is not assigned accusative case by the verb, so it must be moved into subject position, where it can be assigned nominative case. For this reason, we call the subject of an
unaccusative verb a °DO-subject. The fact that (ib) has a transitive alternate is an incidental property of the verb *breken* ‘to break’. Some verbs, such as *arriveren* ‘to arrive’, only occur in an unaccusative frame.

It is often assumed that regular intransitive verbs and unaccusative verbs have three distinguishing properties: (a) intransitives take the perfect auxiliary *hebben* ‘to have’, whereas unaccusatives take the auxiliary *zijn* ‘to be’; (b) the past/passive participle of unaccusatives can be used attributively to modify a head noun that corresponds to the subject of the verbal construction, whereas this is not possible with intransitive verbs; (c) the impersonal passive is possible with intransitive verbs only. These properties are illustrated in (ii) by means of the intransitive verb *lachen* ‘to laugh’ and the unaccusative *arriveren* ‘to arrive’, cf. Hoekstra (1984a).

(ii)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intransitive</th>
<th>Unaccusative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Jan heeft/*is gelachen.</td>
<td>a’. Jan is/*heeft gearriveerd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan has/is laughed</td>
<td>Jan is/has arrived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. *de gelachen jongen</td>
<td>b’. de gearriveerde jongen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the laughed boy</td>
<td>the arrived boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Er werd gelachen.</td>
<td>c’. *Er werd gearriveerd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there was laughed</td>
<td>there was arrived</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are, however, cases that show only part of the prototypical behavior of unaccusative verbs. Locational verbs like *hangen*, for example, enter an alternation similar to the verb *breken* in (i), but nevertheless the verb *hangen* in (iiib) does not exhibit the behavior of the verb *arriveren* in (ii). It has been suggested that this might be due to the fact that there is an aspectual difference between the verbs *arriveren* and *hangen*: the former is telic whereas the latter is not.

(iii)  

| Jan hangs the coat into the wardrobe | the coat hangs in the wardrobe |

**Verb-Second:**

The phenomenon in Dutch that the finite verb normally occupies the so-called second position of the main clause, that is, is preceded by precisely one constituent (see also °constituency test). In embedded clauses the finite verb is placed in clause-final position, just like the non-finite verbs, which is generally considered as its “base”-position; Verb-Second is often used for the movement placing the finite verb in second position.

**VP adverb:**

See °adverb tests.

**Weak:**

The notions of weak and strong have two different uses, depending on whether we are dealing with pronouns, or with noun phrases, determiners and quantifiers.
I. The notions of **WEAK** and **STRONG PRONOUN** refer to the phonetic shape of the pronouns: the former refers to the phonetically reduced form and the latter to the phonetically non-reduced form.

II. An easy way to distinguish **WEAK** and **STRONG NOUN PHRASES** is to consider their behavior in °expletive constructions; cf., e.g., Milsark (1974/1977) and Barwise & Cooper (1981). Whereas weak noun phrases may enter such constructions, the strong ones may not. Thus, example (ia) shows that indefinite noun phrases are weak. Example (ib) is only acceptable on a generic reading, which shows that generic noun phrases are strong.

(i) a. Er loopt een kat op het dak.
   there walks a cat on the roof
   ‘There is a cat walking on the roof.’

b. #Een kat loopt op het dak.
   a cat walks on the roof

Whether a certain noun phrase is weak or strong depends on the determiner or quantifier it contains, which, by extension, are therefore also referred to by means of the notions weak and strong. The examples in (ii) show that noun phrases containing a numeral or a quantifier like *veel* ‘many’ may be either weak or strong. This difference goes hand in hand with a semantic distinction: the weak noun phrases receive an existential interpretation in the sense that they introduce new entities into the domain of discourse, whereas the strong ones receive a partitive reading in the sense that they refer to a subset of a larger set of entities already present in the domain of discourse.

(ii) a. Er lopen twee/veel katten op het dak.
   there walk two/many cats on the roof
   ‘There are two/many cats walking on the roof.’

b. Twee/veel katten lopen op het dak.
   two/many cats walk on the roof
   ‘Two/Many of the cats walk on the roof.’

The examples in (iii), finally, show that definite noun phrases and noun phrases containing a quantifier like *alle* are strong.

(iii) a. *Er lopen de/alle katten op het dak.
   there walk the/all cats on the roof

b. De/alle katten lopen op het dak.
   the/all cats walk on the roof

**Webelhuth’s paradox:**

Webelhuth’s paradox refers to the fact that scrambling seems to simultaneously exhibit properties of A-movement (the type of movement applied to, e.g., the subject in passive constructions) and A’-movement (like *wh*-movement or topicalization). For example, the fact that scrambling feeds binding is a typical A-movement property (cf. Van den Wyngaerd 1988/1989), whereas the fact that scrambling licenses °parasitic gaps is generally considered an A’-movement
property (cf. Bennis & Hoekstra 1984). The binding facts are illustrated in (i), and
the parasitic gap facts in (ii).

(i)  
   a. *Hij heeft namens _elkaar_ de jongens bezocht.  
      he has on.behalf.of each.other the boys visited
   b. Hij heeft _de jongens_; namens _elkaar_ ti bezocht.  
      he has the boys on.behalf.of each.other visited
      ‘He visited the boys on behalf of each other.’

(ii)  
      he has without to look.at the bookprt.-filed
      he has the book without to look.at prt.-filed
      ‘He filed the book without looking (at it).’

A plausible solution to Webelhuth’s paradox is to assume that the notion of
scrambling is not a unitary phenomenon, but actually refers to (at least) two
different types of movement (cf. Vanden Wyngaerd 1988/1989; Déprez 1989;
Mahajan 1990; Neeleman 1994b). The fact that the object in (iii) is able to both
bind the anaphor and to license the parasitic gap can then be accounted for as
follows: the object is not moved into its surface position in one fell swoop, but in
two steps. The first step involves A-movement and enables binding of the anaphor
_elkaar_ ‘each other’. The second step involves A′-movement and licenses the
parasitic gap.

(iii)    Hij had de gasten; [zonder pg te bekijken] t′; aan elkaar t′ voorgesteld.  
      he had the guests without to look.at to each(other introduced
      ‘He had introduced the guests to each other without looking (at them).’

_Wh-movement:_
Movement of a _wh_-phrase such as _wie_ ‘who’ or _wat_ ‘what’ into clause-initial
position.

(i)  
   a. Wie_; heeft Jan gisteren ti ontmoet?  
      who has Jan yesterday met
      ‘Who did Jan meet yesterday?’
   b. Wat_; heb je vandaag ti gedaan?  
      what have you today done
      ‘What did you do today?’