(2) Hij heeft deze artikelen [zonder PRO en te lezen] opgeborgen
he has these articles without to read filed

This means that the very contrast that gave rise to the concept of parasitic gap in English and the Scandinavian languages is apparently absent in Dutch. Even if adjectives were not islands in Dutch, which they are, the nature of the gap in (2) and the way it is licensed by the attendant (deze artikelen) would remain mysterious.

2. Two strategies

2.1. NP-adjunction

A first result was achieved when it was argued by the authors referred to above that (2) is actually a true parasitic gap construction. Notice, in fact that (2) has the structure ...[vp DO-adjunct-V]. Under a strict Aspects-style interpretation, in which the VP is the exclusive domain of strictly subcategorized complements to V, such a structure would be excluded.

Suppose, then, that the adjunct is generated outside the VP as a daughter of the predicate phrase (VP) and that the direct object (and other complements to V) can freely be attached to the left of VP. These assumptions yield (3) as an analysis of (2).

(3) Hij heeft [VP deze artikelen[VP zonder PRO en te lezen][VP t
opgeborgen]]

On the reasonable additional assumption that deze artikelen in (3) is in an A-position, this reduces (2) to a standard case of the parasitic gap construction.

This analysis is not entirely without problems, however. Observe, first, that it is not completely obvious that the adjoined NP is indeed in an A-position. In fact, its position is in many ways comparable to that of clitics which, in French for example, do not license parasitic gaps.

(4a) Il les a imprimés sans corriger
he them has printed without correcting

b. Il y a consenti sans résister ec
he to-it has agreed without resisting

If these facts are accounted for by assuming that French clitics, though in an A-position, nevertheless head A-chains (cf. Chomsky (1982)), the trace in (3) can no longer automatically be taken to license a parasitic gap.

Consider now the fact that the gap in the adjunct in (2) alternates freely with the corresponding pronoun:

(5) Hij heeft deze artikelen [zonder ze te lezen] opgeborgen
he has these articles without them to read filed
If (5) has the same structure as (3) and if by hypothesis the adjoined NP is in an *A*-position, we would expect this sentence to exhibit a weak crossover (WCO) violation. But it does not.*

There is, however, also some positive evidence for the NP-adjunction hypothesis. Neijt (1979) argues that emphatic coordinating conjunctions may only conjoin maximal projection categories. E.g.

(6)a. Hij heeft zowel de grote kinderen als de kleine kinderen he has both the big children and the small children

*Hij heeft de zowel grote kinderen als kleine kinderen uitgenodigd

However there is one important set of exceptions to this generalization: parts of the VP may also be emphatically conjoined:

(7) Hij heeft deze artikelen zowel gelezen als opgeborgen

be has these articles both read and filed

Under the assumption that the direct object in (7) has been adjoined to VP, Neijt’s generalization can be maintained. But there is an important difference between his solution for (7) and solution (3) for the parasitic gap case. *Als* is so because in (7) the dual gap structure, being in a coordinated structure, must have arisen through across-the-board (ATB) application of NP-adjunction as indicated in (8).

(8) Hij heeft deze artikelen zowel gelezen als opgeborgen

This observation leads us to examine a different strategy in accounting for the problem caused for the parasitic gap theory by examples like (2).

2.2 The ATB-hypothesis

In a situation like that described in 1. one can adopt two strategies. One is to maintain that the phenomena in question exist, that the theory is essentially correct, and that it is possible to account for the divergences on more or less independent grounds. The other one is to say that the phenomena are only superficially similar but are fundamentally different, requiring another elaboration of the theory. Koster, Bennis, and Hoekstra (op. cit.) have adopted the first strategy as briefly summarized in 2.1. As we have shown, however, their approach is not without its problems and, more importantly, invites one to reexamine the relationship between parasitic gap structures on the one hand and ATB constructions on the other. As a consequence we will adopt the second strategy and argue that what looks like a parasitic gap construction in Dutch (i.e. examples like (1) and (2)) is in reality the result of ATB rule application. In adopting this strategy we find ourselves adopting the original approach of Ross (1967), who pointed out the existence of the English parasitic gap construction in the context of his analysis of ATB phenomena.

The ingredients of our hypothesis are the following:
A. Dutch adjectives introduced can be analyzed in a given structure either as subordinate or as coordinator. The generalization implicit in the traditional notion ‘conjunction’ makes that term particularly usable.
B. To the extent that the parasitic gap construction in Dutch is less than fully acceptable, this is to be attributed not to a weak violation of the bijection principle but, quite prosaically, to the fact that a subordinate is forced into being analyzed as a coordinator.
C. The ATB-theory of Williams (1978) must be extended to permit simultaneous analysis of nonconstituents.
D. In addition to rightward linearization other forms of linearization must be allowed, including left adjacent linearization as argued for independently in De Vries (1983).

With this in mind, consider the analysis of (1) and (2).

(9) Welke artikelen heeft hij opgeborgen

*Welke artikelen heeft hij zonder [VP te lezen]

(10) Hij heeft [VP deze artikelen opgeborgen]

*Hij heeft [VP deze artikelen zonder [VP te lezen]]

The star indicates the position in which the lower line is linearized. As (10) shows, we retain the rule of NP-adjunction, but we will argue below that it is to be regarded as the leftward equivalent of Right Node Raising. We immediately note that this approach gives us an equally prosaic handle on the fact that finite adjectives do not allow the dual gap option.

(11) Welke artikelen heeft hij zonder dat hij v/z had gelezen opgeborgen read filled

It seems reasonable to assume that the subordinating complementizer dat which follows the prepositional conjunction zonder forces the analysis as subordination, thereby disallowing an ATB derivation.

Another fact which immediately follows from our analysis is that the parasitic gap must be subjacent to its antecedent, as noted in Contreras (1984). A typical subjacency violation in the Dutch case is shown in (12).
Much more strikingly, however, there is a further parallelism constraint which defines any analysis along the lines of the Saffir proposal but follows straightforwardly from the ATB hypothesis. The structure of the argument is as follows. Whenever we have a dual gap structure, this must by hypothesis be the result of ATB extraction. ATB is only possible if the conjunction is analysed as a coordinating conjunction in the structure in question. But now any further extraction of an independent element from one of the two conjuncts in such a structure will violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint (as subsumed under the ATB theory). Since the adjunct is an island even when analysed as a subordinating construction, the relevant cases are those where an asymmetric extraction takes place from the non-adjunct part of the clause. Schematically:

The pertinent cases can indeed be constructed and show the effect expected on the ATB hypothesis. For reasons of space we limit the discussion to a few of the many theoretically possible cases. Consider first (16).

(16) Hij heeft er [zonder ech [ec naar] te verlangen] he has there without really for to long Jan [t om] gevraagd
Jan for asked 'He has asked Jan for it without really longing for it'

(16) is a regular case of a dual gap structure arising from ATB r-movement. By replacing Jan by a wh-phrase and applying asymmetric wh-extraction, we get the pattern of (13).

(17) Wie heeft hij er [zonder ech [ec naar] te verlangen] who has there without really for to long
er [t om] gevraagd?
'Who has he asked for it without really longing for it?'

As expected, the variant in which the ec in the adjunct has an internal r-pronoun of its own to bind it is grammatical because no ATB movement applies and hence no coordinate structure analysis is imposed.

(18) Wie heeft hij er [zonder ech [ec naar] te verlangen][t om] gevraagd?
Similarly, when the second movement itself is not asymmetric but also across-the-board, the result is grammatical too.
3.2. Backward anaphora

The constraint against backward pronominalization in coordinate conjoined structures, while not very well understood, provides us with another diagnostic criterion to test whether dual gap structures are indeed instances of coordination. Consider (23).

(23) Ik heb er [zonder Piet/`hem [ec van] te beschuldigen] i have there without Piet/him of to accuse Jan [t voor] bestraft Jan for punished
'I have punished Jan for it without accusing Piet/him of it'

(23) is a simple case of ATB r-movement, therefore the analysis as coordination is forced and as a consequence backward pronominalisation is excluded. Note that when the parasitic gap is replaced by a full NP, there is no ATB, analysis as coordination is possible and backward pronominalisation is perfectly acceptable as shown in (24).

(24) Ik heb er [zonder hem van andere misdaden te I have there without him of other crimes to beschuldigen] Jan [t voor] bestraft accuse Jan for punished

These facts provide further interesting evidence for the ATB hypothesis.

3.3. NP-adjunction as Left Node Raising

A more circumstantial-type of evidence emerges when we examine the rule of NP-adjunction somewhat more closely. It turns out, in fact, that the adjoined NP has the property of being left peripheral with respect to each conjunct. In other words, whenever the adjoined NP must have originated in a non-left-peripheral position in either one or both of the conjuncts for independent reasons, the result is ungrammatical. This is the mirror image property of Right Node Raising (or right peripheral deletion in the left hand conjunct). It seems reasonable, therefore, to call the NP-adjunction rule in question Left Node Raising (or left peripheral deletion in the right hand conjunct). If we are correct in concluding that we have here a significant symmetry in properties, it follows that parasitic gap structures involving NP-adjunction must be instances of coordinate conjoined structures. LNR is limited to conjoined structures, and so, we may infer, is LAR.

The essential facts are given in (25)-(28).
4. Generalizing the result

4.1 Insubordination

The conclusion we have reached, viz. that certain conjunctions which are generally taken to be subordinating conjunctions, remove in specific cases the coordinating conjunctions, is by no means a revolutionary one. Facts of a similar nature are well-known from traditional grammar. Let us name such phenomena ‘insubordination’. Consider a case of ATB-movement with emphatic coordinating conjunctions.

(29) \( H_j \) is er noch gek \( t_3 \) op noch vies \( t_4 \) van he is there neither crazy about nor disgusted with 'He is neither crazy about it nor disgusted with it'

A case like (29) has a close parallel in (30) with the subordinator ofschoon ('though').

(30) \( H_j \) is er, ofschoon niet gek \( t_3 \) op toch niet vies \( t_4 \) van he is there though not crazy about still not disgusted with

That ofschoon is otherwise subordinating is shown by the fact that it always imposes subordinate word order (i.e. no verb second), as opposed to noch-noch which displays main clause or embedded word order depending on whether the coordination itself is embedded or not. This is illustrated in (31) and (32).

(31a) \( H_j \) komt ofschoon hij niet wil he comes though he not wants

(31b) \( H_j \) komt ofschoon hij wil niet

(31c) \( H_j \) komt ofschoon hij niet

(32a) \( H_j \) is noch thuis, noch is hij op kantoor he is neither at-home nor is he at the office

(32b) \( H_j \) is thuis, noch hij op kantoor is

(32c) Ik denk noch dat hij thuis is noch dat hij I think neither that he at-home is nor that he

Such cases of insubordination are, of course, by no means limited to Dutch. Cases very close to (30) are found in English, for example.

(33) John is while sternly opposed to, nevertheless mighty interested in, censorship

Another area in which insubordination is at work is the syntax of comparisons. While than-clauses behave like subordinate clauses in many ways, they nevertheless exhibit a number of properties.
treatment, while Benis and Bos (forthcoming) postulates 'exceptional' government to the right just in case the COMP of complement sentences contains a trace of wh-movement. Clearly any account that does away with either disjunction or exceptional government will be preferable. However, these analyses are internally inconsistent. Consider (37).

(37) ? Dit is een boek [waar ik ec] van denk | dat Jan ec
This is a book which I of think that Jan
naar verlangt
to longs
'This is a book about which I think that Jan longs for it.'

This sentence is near perfect and exemplifies a licit parasitic gap structure in Dutch. Interestingly, Benis and Bos discuss this very construction. On their analysis ec is a parasitic gap, while ec is the real gap in conformity with uniform branching. If correct, their analysis predicts a grammatical outcome if an appropriate pronoun substitutes for the parasitic gap but an ungrammatical result if the real gap is replaced by a pronoun. Both predictions are wrong, falsifying their account (as well as Koster).]

(38) a. Dit is een boek waar ik er van denk dat Jan ec naar
verlangt
b. Dit is een boek waar ik t van denk dat Jan er naar
verlangt
It is clear from (38b) that the real gap is the empty category governed by van.

We are left, then, with an updated reformulation of the question we raised earlier: why do parasitic gaps in Dutch have the distribution of real gaps, while in English parasitic gaps and real gaps do not have a completely identical distribution?

A second, more promising, approach to the problem of the apparent non-existence of parasitic gaps in Dutch is to adopt a movement analysis of parasitic gaps as proposed in Contreras (1984) and further developed by Chomsky in 1983 class lectures. On this approach, parasitic gap constructions no longer violate the Biclon Principle of Koopman and Sportiche (1982), but if they do the result is ungrammatical (cf. * which articles did John file t disengaged with ec). As a consequence, Kayne's connectedness proposal loses much of its independent motivation since the various subject-nonsuch asymmetries that gave rise to it are now subsumed under the bounding theory. Suppose that we adopt Chomsky's condition on chain-composition (39).

(39) a. Dit is een boek waar ik er van denk dat Jan ec naar
verlangt
b. Dit is een boek waar ik t van denk dat Jan er naar
verlangt
It is clear from (38b) that the real gap is the empty category governed by van.
(39) Chain-composition at $S$-structure.
Chains $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ and $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_m)$ compound iff, the
head of the $\beta$-chain is subjacent to the foot of the
$\alpha$-chain.

Condition (39) correctly rules out parasitic gaps in island contexts but allows cases like (40).

(40) $\exists \xi_1$ Which articles $\xi_1$ did John [VP [VP file t] [PP without
$\exists \xi_2$ [S PRO reading ec ]]]

In (40) $\alpha$, the head of the 'parasitic' chain, is subjacent to $t$, the
foot of the 'licensing' chain. No principle of grammar is violated. Note that on a movement theory of parasitic gaps, there
is the possibility of a unifying account of the bounded properties of
all empty categories at $S$-structure. To illustrate, in (40) the
parasitic gap, ec, is subjacent to its locally $\lambda$-binding empty
operator, which in turn is subjacent to the licensing variable
that is locally bound by the subjacent operator in the matrix
COMP. In order to derive the contrast between (34) and (35) let us
finally assume the following reformulation of the subjacency
condition, a simplified version of Chomsky's (1983, class
lectures), which does not affect the present argument.

(41) a. $\xi$ is subjacent to $\beta$ iff there $t$. at most a
single category $\gamma$ such that
(1) $\gamma$ is a bounding category for $\xi$, and
(2) $\gamma$ contains $\xi$ but not $\beta$

b. Let $\xi$ be a maximal projection containing $\beta$.
Then $\xi$ is a bounding category for $\beta$ iff
(1) $\xi$ is not lexically governed, or
(2) $\xi$ immediately dominates $\gamma$, $\gamma$ a bounding category for $\beta$.

This reformulation of subjacency, incorporating the notions of
maximal projection and lexical government, has the virtue of no
longer stipulating specific categories as bounding nodes, assimilates the account of parasitic gaps to instances of move-$\alpha$, and relativizes the concept of bounding. Maximal projections are
bounding categories for elements they contain relative to
configurations of government.

We can now rephrase the question of the non-existence of
parasitic gaps in adjunct phrases of Dutch as follows: Why is
chain-composition excluded in Dutch sentences involving adjunct
phrases but not in their English equivalents? Apparently, the head
of the parasitic chain is not subjacent to the foot of the

(42) $\exists \xi_1$S$_1$NR(PP [VP [VP [VP [VP file t] [PP without
$\exists \xi_2$ [S PRO reading ec ]]]])

In English without lexically governs S$_2$, which therefore is not a
bounding category for the empty operator O. However, PP is a
bounding category by (41b) since it is a maximal projection which
is lexically un governed. As a consequence, VP is a bounding
category too, by the recursive step of (41b). We predict,
therefore, that (4) adjuncts are extraction-islands (since
movement to the COMP of S$_2$ crosses at least the bounding
categories VP and PP), and (4) a CA in (42) is accessible (qua
subjacency) to O. Independent principles of grammar rule out a
movement from the operator position into $\exists \xi_1$, but leave chain-
composition unaffected. Chomsky's chain-composition thus explains
the not quite identical distribution of real and parasitic gaps.

What about Dutch? If zonder does not lexically govern S$_2$, then
S$_2$ as well as PP (and VP) are bounding nodes, explaining why
parasitic gaps are ruled out in the core cases of parasitic gap
structures, viz. adjunct phrases. In fact, it makes perfect sense to
make the differences between Dutch and English parasitic gap
structures to an independently motivated difference in government
properties, illustrated by (43) and (44).

(43) It is ilegal for *[John] to bet]

(44) Het is onwettig om *[Jan te wedden]

Dutch has no exceptional case-marking under conditions of
government by a preposition. Dutch prepositions only govern
elements in their subcategorization frames unlike English, where
prepositions govern more freely. In this respect Dutch is more
like French (see Kayne (1981) for important discussion). As
convincingly shown by Kayne, liberal languages like English and
the Scandinavian languages allow preposition stranding and license
exceptional case-government, differing in these respects from
Romance languages and Dutch. Moreover, prepositional heads of
adjuncts freely take sentential complements in Dutch (zonder dat,
zonder te, cf. (11), (18)), but not in English, where prepositions
can only be followed by personal complements (*without that/to) or
introduce tensed prepositional sentences (after, before). It is
interesting to observe that both Bennis & Hoekstra and Koster need
an additional auxiliary hypothesis, unnecessary on our approach,
in order to make their account coherent: zonder is a prepositional
head of a PP-projection if its object is a tensed object but a
prepositional complementizer if the adjunct clause is tenseless,
thereby avoiding a contradiction of unidirectional government or
global harmony. Given subjacency (41) none of these complications
are needed. We propose, then, that the differences between Dutch
and English with respect to parasitic gaps reduce to a single
difference in the governing properties of prepositions. Note that
our account allows for the possibility of parasitic gaps in
periphrastic relatives like (37).
5. A stab at the theory

5.1. Strings vs. constituents

In discussing the first cases of ATL movement in (8) and (9) above, we have suppressed the important problem of verb second (V2). In (8), represented below as (45), V2 applies to an ATB fashion:

(45) Hij heeft deze artikelen, zowel de gelesen als de opgeborgen.

The (auxiliary) finite verb originates in the final position of the VP and is moved into second position. But this derivation is not available for example (9), because there the finite verb is only part of the matrix conjunct, not of the adjunct. This means that either V2 has to apply in a non-ATB fashion as in (46) or the finite verb has to be outside the simultaneously analysed chunk of the sentence as in (47).

(46) Welke artikelen, heeft hij zonder de opgeborgen te lezen.

(47) Welke artikelen, heeft hij zonder de opgeborgen te lezen.

(46) violates the very core of the ATB theory. But (47) also has a troublesome consequence. In (46) the vertical lines delimiting the simultaneously analysed part of the sentence can be taken to coincide with the left and right VP brackets. But in (47) the part between vertical lines corresponds to no syntactic constituent at all. This latter consequence may have to be accepted and incorporated into the theory of coordination.

5.2. Linearisation

As noted above, it appears that in order for our approach to adjuncts to work left adjacent linearisation has to be assumed. Observe, though, that this assumption depends on whether the adjunct is always on the bottom line in the simultaneously analysed strings as in the notation we have been using. For ease of exposition we will continue to assume left adjacent linearisation. It appears, then, that there are four 'landing sites' for linearisation, left and right adjacent and left and right peripheral. Schematically:

(48) \[ L_9 \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad L_9 \]

\[ \text{LP} \quad \text{RA} \quad \text{RP} \]

RA and RP can be illustrated with the embedded variant of (45).

(49) \[ \ldots \text{dat hij deze artikelen, zowel de gelesen als de opgeborgen heeft} \]

(50) a. \[ \ldots \text{dat hij deze artikelen zowel gelesen als opgeborgen heeft} \]

b. \[ \ldots \text{dat hij deze artikelen zowel gelesen als opgeborgen heeft als opgeborgen} \]

LA in what we have been using for adjunct cases as in (9) and (10). LP is attested in a few marginal cases precisely in the area of insubordination. Consider (51).

(51) [Behalve Jan de krant] gelooft ik niet dat er iemand except Jan the newspaper believe I not that there someone iets gekocht heeft 'Except for John the newspaper. I don't believe anybody has bought anything'!

The fronted part consists of a prepositional adjunct introducer followed by what is apparently a clause to which gapping has applied. It is clear, then, that the theory of linearisation will by no means be a trivial one. A particularly interesting restriction concerns the adjunct cases as compared with cases like (49/50). Consider (52) and (53).

(52) Ik weet niet welke artikelen, hij zonder de opgeborgen te lezen heeft.

(53) a. \[ \ldots \text{Ik weet niet welke artikelen hij opgeborgen zonder te lezen heeft} \]

b. \[ \ldots \text{Ik weet niet welke artikelen hij opgeborgen heeft zonder te lezen} \]

Why should RA linearisation be excluded here and permitted in (49/50)? Descriptively speaking, the generalisation may very well be the difference in status of the finite verb in the two cases. In (49) the finite verb 'completes' (in the terminology of De Vries (1983)) both lines that precede it. In (52), on the other hand, heeft completes only the top line. The difference might be pictorially represented as in (54).

(54) a. \[ \ldots \text{Ik weet niet welke artikelen hij opgeborgen heeft zonder te lezen} \]
The establishing of a formal link between (54) and the linearization possibilities given in (48) is one of the many intriguing problems awaiting solution when the theory of coordination and incoordination is further elaborated along these lines. For the time being, however, we hope to have established at least the fact that parasitic gaps in Dutch must be analysed in terms of ATB movement and that these gaps are therefore parasitic in a non-standard sense only.

FOOTNOTES

1. Such a leftward adjunction rule has earlier been proposed by Kerstens (1975) and De Haan (1979).

2. It is not impossible to avoid this problem. One could say, e.g., that adjectives are freely generated inside or outside the VP, and that in (5) it is inside the VP, thereby weakening the Aspects-position on the VP. Or one could distinguish between operator-like A-positions such as COMP and non-operator-like A-positions such as the [NP, VP] in (3) and assume that WCO-effects arise from the former only.

3. Note that this presupposes that the predicate phrase is not a projection of V.

4. For the sake of convenience, we will continue to refer to the gap in the adjunct as 'parasitic gap'.

5. The suggestion to regard (some) parasitic gaps as "a special kind of ATR" was made independently in Torris (1983) and Uhmann (1982). For an earlier suggestion that some types of adverbal clause are coordinate-like with respect to analogical extensions of ATB type rules, see the interesting work of Grosu (1980).

6. The pattern in (12) arises through ATB movement of an E-clitic. See section 3.1. for more discussion.

7. For extensive discussion of the [ε]–distinction and extraction from PF, see Van Riemsdijk (1978).

8. For reasons unclear to us some speakers regard dual gap structures involving the reflexive clitic zich as less grammatical.

9. We leave open the question as to whether the second reading corresponds to a structure with a prwub in the subject position or one which is essentially passive with an implicit agent phrase. On the latter assumption, the gloss for (22b) should be 'I have the book leafed through'.

10. The interesting idea that many instances of parasitic gaps in English might be derived by means of ENR was suggested by Joan Bresman, as reported in footnote 11 of Engdahl (1983).

11. See, for example, Jespersen (1940) and Paardekooper (s.d.).

13. It might be argued that (38a) is not entirely convincing as an argument against uniform branching since it is also a WCO violation. Note, however, that normally WCO effects are suppressed in relative clause constructions. No mitigating effect is observed here.

There is some further evidence confirming the conclusion reached in the text. Consider (1).

(1) Dit is een boek [waar ik ec van denk [dat [iedereen [die er naar verlangt]] ec] op zal vragen]

'This is a book about which I think that everyone who longs for it will ask for it!

Crucially, (1) is near perfect like (37), but still involves 'WCO'. On the unidirectional government/global harmony approach there is no basis for explaining the difference between (1) and (38a), just another 'WCO' effect on their analysis. Note that the difference is not due to a difference in cross-over, viz. strong in (38a) and weak in (1), since (37) would now be incorrectly ruled out as a SCO violation. In other words, the only way in which the unidirectional or global harmony analyses of (1) could be maintained is to make crucial use of a 'WCO' to explain (38a). This, as we have shown in this footnote, is not a viable way out.

14. Other candidates for licit parasitic gap structures in the sense of Chomsky (1982) are examples of the following type.

(1) Dit zijn incomplete systemen waar ieder
those are incomplete systems that every
onderzoek [naar ernstig door belemmerd wordt]
underlying research [due to serious being hampered]
investigation into seriously by impeded is

15. Observe that in view of examples like (49) and (52) below it appears that the rule of verb raising sometimes applies in an ATB fashion (as in (49)) but sometimes doesn't (as in (52)). We believe it is possible to flesh out a way to derive ATB-effects from binding that is consistent with the simultaneous analysis of coordination and insubordinating constructions like (8) and (9). Space prevents elaboration here.


17. Some speakers of Dutch find NP-1 raising as in (53b)

somewhat less acceptable than LA linearization. Note that (53b) poses an additional problem for Bennis and Hoekstra as well as for Koster: the adjunct clause is in a non-canonical
government configuration and, hence, (53b)) should be on a

pass with ungrammatical (34).