

## Non-temporal *dan* and the grammar of V2\*

Liliane Haegeman (Dialing, Ghent University)

Andreas Trotzke (University of Konstanz; Autonomous University of Barcelona)

### Abstract

This paper discusses a pattern in which a finite verb is preceded by a locative PP which combines with an initial or final occurrence of the adverb *dan* ('then') and which may look like a violation of the V2 constraint. The paper is relevant in the context of how to handle what look like exceptions to the V2 pattern, a point that is sometimes neglected in the formal literature though Zwart (2008a) draws attention to the importance of also capturing such recalcitrant data. Based on standard arguments for constituency, it will be shown that the adverb, which has a non-temporal reading, and the associated PP form one constituent. Thus, a pattern that might at first appear to be a violation of V2 in fact is shown to be in line with the constraint.

**Keywords:** verb second, Dutch, non-temporal *dan*, constituency

### 1. Starting point: verb second

The empirical focus of our contribution is a phenomenon referred to in the literature as V2 transgressions (Catasso 2015), patterns in which the verb second (V2) constraint unexpectedly seems to be flouted. The descriptive label 'V2' covers the descriptive generalization that in languages like Dutch the finite verb of the root clause tends to occupy the linearly second position, being preceded by one constituent. V2 has received a lot of attention in the literature, and is relevant on a number of theoretical dimensions, as illustrated by papers in *Nederlandse Taalkunde* such as Zwart (2008a,b), Barbiers, Koenenman, and Lekakou (2010), Den Dikken (2010b) and Postma (2011).

---

\* The material in this paper was presented at the workshop *Particles in German, English and beyond*, Saarland University, on January 21, 2019 and at the *Annual meeting of the LAGB* at QMUL, September 9-12, 2019. We thank both audiences for their feedback. Special thanks are due to Marcel den Dikken, Patrick Grosz, Marieke Meelen, Coppe van Urk and two anonymous reviewers for the present volume for insightful comments on the presentations and our paper. Of course, we are solely responsible for the way we have handled their comments. Andreas Trotzke gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Beatriu de Pinós program (Generalitat de Catalunya/Secretariat for Universities and Research of the Ministry of Economy and Knowledge; grant no. 2017-BP00031).

### 1.1 Verb second

The analysis of V2 interacts with and impacts on various theoretical developments. As shown by Den Besten (1983), for instance, the emergence of the binary branching structure, according to which clauses display the hierarchy of binary projections in (1a), seems particularly adapted to capture the alternation between verb final subordinate clauses (1b) and verb second root clauses (1c): in the former, the conjunction *dat* ('that') fills the C position and in the latter, the finite verb *heeft* ('has') occupies C and one constituent is located in SpecCP:

(1) a. CP > TP > VP

b. [CP [C *dat*] [TP Jan gisteren een nieuwe wagen gekocht heeft]]

that Jan yesterday a new car bought has

c. [CP Gisteren [C heeft] [TP Jan een nieuwe wagen gekocht]].

yesterday has Jan a new car bought

With further theoretical developments came Rizzi's (1997) proposal that the CP layer of the clause should be decomposed into an array of functional heads, including heads encoding those discourse functional properties that are syntactically relevant such as Top or Foc. This development obviously raised the question as to how to capture the V2 restriction: if an array of distinct projections is available to host fronted constituents, as illustrated in English (2b), why are the same projections apparently not simultaneously available in V2 languages such as Dutch (2c)? This issue was tackled, among others, in the articles in *Nederlandse Taalkunde* listed above.

(2) a. ForceP > TopP > FocP > TopP > TopP > FinP

b. [TopP Baked beans [FocP on no account [Foc will] [FinP I eat again]]].

c. \* [TopP Bonen in tomatensaus [FocP in geen geval [Foc zal [FinP ik eten]]].

beans in tomato-sauce on no account will I eat



knowledge is typical of the Ghent variety: an adjunct is followed unexpectedly by the formative *die*, a demonstrative pronoun, while the expected resumptive would be *dan* (3c).

- (4) a. Zonder entwat te zeggen Wansje loat zen zwiins achter  
 without something to say Wansje leaves his pigs behind  
 (Oostende, Winkler 1974: 364; Zwart 2008: 199 [4])
- b. Volgende vrijdag die komt hij terug.  
 next Friday *die* comes he back

Zwart (1997, 2008a) reconciles the pattern in (4a) with the V2 requirement in terms of Rizzi's (1997) articulated left periphery; for Haegeman and Greco (2018) the initial adjunct in (4a) is extra-sentential along the lines of Broekhuis and Corver (2016). We refer to the papers cited for discussion. Adopting Rizzi's (1997) articulated left periphery, De Clercq and Haegeman (2018) reinterpret (4b) as a regular V2 pattern. We refer to their paper for discussion.

In this paper we turn to a pattern briefly discussed in Zwart (2005: 288).

## 2. Non-temporal *dan* and the left periphery

### 2.1 Starting point

(5a) illustrates the use of the temporal adverb *dan* as an initial constituent in a V2 clause, (5b) shows the adverb in medial position. In this use, *dan* is near-equivalent to *daarna* ('thereafter'), its function is to link one event to another preceding event.

- (5) a. (En) dan gaan we naar Gent.  
 (and) then go we to Ghent
- b. (En) we gaan dan naar Gent.  
 (and) we go then to Ghent.

The data in (6) seem to illustrate a V2 transgression: what at first sight looks like the same temporal adverbial *dan* combines with a locative PP *naast the kerk* ('next to the church'). In

(6a) *dan* precedes the locative PP, in (6b) it follows it.<sup>1</sup> In (6), *dan* has a non-temporal reading and it is not equivalent to *daarna*; it has a sequencing function, linking a location with a preceding step when a route is being described.

- (6) a. (En) dan naast de kerk woont mijn tante.  
(and) then next the church lives my aunt  
b. (En) naast de kerk dan woont mijn tante.

Mentioning non-temporal *dan*, Zwart (2005: 28) briefly discusses (7) (his [42b]), with a locative PP *in dezelfde landstreek* ('in the same area') followed by non-temporal *nu* ('now'). That the adverb *nu* receives a non-temporal reading is shown by the fact that while the adverb *nu* ('now') encodes the present time, its clausal context in (7) is past time. For Zwart (2005), *nu* in (7) is 'extra-dependent'. Though the concept of extra-dependency is not defined in great detail in his paper, and no genuine diagnostics are given to detect extra-dependency, Zwart (2005) seems to analyze extra-dependent elements as interpolations.

- (7) In dezelfde landstreek nu waren herders.  
in the-same area now were shepherds  
'Now there were shepherds in that same countryside.'

We add that a similar pattern is discussed in recent work by van der Wouden (2015, 2019, this volume), who refers to the pattern as 'the Barabbas construction'. His conclusions, based on a much wider range of particles that seem to lead to V3 linear orders are rather different from ours: Van der Wouden (this volume) suggests that in apparent V3 root clauses in Dutch with a particle preceding the finite verb, the particle occupies a Wackernagel position.

## 2.2 Goal

This paper will offer a descriptive inventory of the distributive properties of non-temporal *dan* in (6), in which we show that non-temporal *dan* is a co-constituent of the adjacent locative PP, and thus we can conclude that the pattern does not violate the V2 constraint.

---

<sup>1</sup> A first impression is that Flemish speakers may be slightly more tolerant of non-temporal *dan* in (6) than speakers originating from the Netherlands, but we do not have precise data to back this up. It is unclear which factors might underlie the variation across speakers.

### 3. Against a resumption analysis of final *dan*

One argument for treating the sequence of *dan* + PP in (6) as a constituent is that it is the preverbal string in a V2 pattern. However, for (6b), in which *dan* follows the PP, one might envisage the alternative analysis according to which, rather than being a co-constituent with the PP, *dan* is a resumptive element, and that the pattern we find is basically a CLD pattern, similar to that in (3c) with resumptive temporal *dan*, as schematized in (8):

- (8) En naast de kerk      [CP    dan    [C woont ] [TP            mijn tante]].  
 and next the church            *dan*        lives                    my aunt

However, a dislocation analysis for final *dan* in (6b) is implausible.

- (i) Regular dislocated constituents such as *op de tweede dag* in (3c) can be followed by an intonation break (indicated by the comma). This is not available with non-temporal *dan*.
- (ii) In CLD, the resumptive matches the dislocated constituent such that, for instance, temporal adjuncts are resumed by *dan* for present or future adjuncts and by *toen* for past adjuncts, and locative adjuncts are resumed by *daar* ('there'). Crucially, *dan* cannot resume a locative adjunct (9c):

- (9) a. En op de tweede dag,            dan/\*daar            gaan we naar Gent.  
       and on the second day,        then/\*there        go we to Ghent
- b. En op de tweede dag,            toen/\*dan/\*daar    gingen we naar Gent.  
       and on the second day,        then/\*then/\*there    went we to Ghent
- c. (En) [naast de kerk],            daar /\*toen/\*dan    woont mijn tante.  
       and next-to the church        /there/ then/\*then    lives my aunt

- (iii) In CLD, resumptive temporal *dan*, temporal *toen* and locative *daar* can be focused by *juist* ('just'), as in (10). Such focusing is not available with non-temporal *dan*.

- (10) a. En op de tweede dag,            juist dan            gaan we naar Gent.  
       and on the second day,        just then            go we to Ghent
- b. En op de tweede dag,            juist toen            gingen we naar Gent.  
       and on the second day,        just then            went we to Ghent
- c. (En) [naast de kerk],            juist daar            woont mijn tante.  
       and next-to the church        just there            lives my aunt

(iv) As shown in (11), non-temporal final *dan* itself combines with a CLD pattern in which a dislocated PP (*naast de kerk* ‘next to the church’) is resumed by locative *daar*, in two configurations: either *dan* follows the dislocated PP (11a) or it follows the resuming locative *daar* (11b). Assuming that *daar* is the designated resumptive for locatives, analyzing non-temporal *dan* as a resumptive entails that (11) instantiates a dual resumption.

- (11) a. (En) naast de kerk dan, daar woont mijn tante.  
 (and) next the church then, there lives my aunt
- b. (En) naast de kerk, daar dan woont mijn tante.  
 (and) next the church, there then lives my aunt

#### 4. Split PPs and intrusive *dan*

While it might be conceivable that *dan* and an adjacent locative PP do not constitute a constituent in (6), with initial or final *dan*, this analysis is unlikely for what we label ‘intrusive *dan*’, a pattern in which *dan* is sandwiched between a preposition and its R-pronoun complement.

In Dutch, a pronominal PP-complement takes the form of an R-pronoun (*daar, er* ‘there’), it usually shifts to the left of P (van Riemsdijk 1978).<sup>2</sup>

- (12) a. \*naast het/er/daar  
 next it/there/there
- b. daar/er naast  
 there/er next

---

<sup>2</sup> Though in directional source-goal PPs both *hier* and *daar* seem to remain in the complement position of the source (*van*) or goal (*naar*) preposition. We do not pursue this point here, it falls outside the scope of the paper.

- (i) a. van daar tot daar  
 from there to there
- b. van hier naar daar  
 from here to there

In locative PPs with R-complements, non-temporal *dan* may be initial (13a), final (13b), or ‘intrusive’ (13c). (14) are attested examples of intrusive *dan*.

- (13) a. (En) dan daar/er naast woont mijn tante.  
 (and) then there next lives my aunt  
 b. (En) daar/ernaast dan woont mijn tante.  
 c. (En) daar/er dan naast woont mijn tante
- (14) a. Je had Nik Kershaw  
 you had Nik Kershaw  
 als leuke vlotte (buur)jongen aan de ene kant  
 as nice cool neighbor on the one side  
 en de nerdy afstandelijke Thomas Dolby  
 and the nerdy distant Thomas Dolby  
 aan de andere kant.  
 on the other side  
 Daar dan tussen zat weer Howard Jones.  
 there then between sat again Howard Jones  
 <<https://www.musicmeter.nl/forum/18/10257>>  
 b. [...] En daar dan tussen zit een groot grijs gebied.  
 and there then between sits a large grey area  
 <[https://gathering.tweakers.net/forum/list\\_messages/1666438/22](https://gathering.tweakers.net/forum/list_messages/1666438/22)>

A PP containing an R-pronoun can be the focus of a pseudo-cleft sentence (15), including PPs featuring intrusive *dan* (15c). This again suggests that the string containing *dan* is a constituent. Observe, however, that in (15) non-temporal *dan* itself cannot constitute the focus of the cleft: the focal element is the preposition *naast*.

- (15) a. Waar (dat) mijn tante woont is [daar naast dan].  
 where (that) my aunt lives is there next then  
 b. Waar (dat) mijn tante woont is [dan daar naast].  
 where (that) my aunt lives is then there next  
 c. Waar (dat) mijn tante woont is [daar dan naast].  
 where (that) my aunt lives is there then next

## 5. Distribution of the constituent containing non-temporal *dan*

### 5.1 Embedding

PPs containing non-temporal *dan*, including those with intrusive *dan*, can be the complement of a preposition, as shown in (16) and (17):

- (16) a. Ik heb die lamp gekocht  
I have that lampshade bought  
[voor [dan naast die tafel]].<sup>3</sup>  
for then next that table
- b. [Voor [dan naast die tafel]] heb ik die lamp gekocht.  
for then next that table have I that lampshade bought
- (17) a. Ik heb dat gekocht [voor [daar dan naast]].  
I have that bought for there then next
- b. [Voor [daar dan naast]] heb ik die lamp gekocht.  
for there then next have I that lampshade bought

PPs containing non-temporal *dan* may be embedded in a nominal constituent (18a,b), see Corver (1990: 37-38).

- (18) a. [Het bureau [daar dan naast]] is voor de doctoraatsstudenten.  
the office there then next is for the PhD-students
- b. De doctoraatsstudenten kan je vinden  
the PhD-students can you find  
[in [het bureau [daar dan naast]]].  
in the office there then next

---

<sup>3</sup> An anonymous reviewer for this paper who accepts non-temporal *dan* in general finds the examples in (16) hard to accept while accepting those in (17). This confirms that there is variation among speakers and suggests that the acceptability of the patterns may depend on a number of factors.

The PP with non-temporal *dan* may function as the predicate of a *met* ('with') small clause:

- (19) a. Er was een landhuis [met nog een cottage er/?daar (dan) naast].  
 there was a manor with PART a cottage there (then) next
- b. Er was een landhuis [met er/?daar (dan) naast nog een cottage].  
 there was a manor with there (then) next PART a cottage

## 5.2 Extraposition

PPs containing non-temporal *dan* may be extraposed: in (20) the extraposed constituent is an adjunct, in (21) it is associated with a nominal.<sup>4</sup> Assuming that extraposition is structure-dependent, then this would confirm that *dan* forms a constituent with the PP.

- (20) a. Ze hebben nog een huis gehad [dan daar naast].  
 they have PART a house had then there next
- b. Ze hebben nog een huis gehad [daar dan naast].  
 they have PART a house had there then next
- c. Ze hebben nog een huis gehad [daar naast dan].  
 they have PART a house had there next then
- (21) a. De doctoraatsstudenten kan je in het bureau  
 the PhD-students can you in the office  
 vinden [dan daar naast].  
 find then there next
- b. De doctoraatsstudenten kan je in het bureau  
 the PhD-students can you in the office  
 vinden [daar dan naast].  
 find there then next
- c. De doctoraatsstudenten kan je in het bureau  
 the PhD-students can you in the office  
 vinden [daar naast dan].  
 find there next then

---

<sup>4</sup> An anonymous reviewer for this article finds (20) and (21) "strange." For Liliane Haegeman they are fully acceptable, with possibly the (a) examples slightly less good than the (b) and (c) examples.

## 6. Conclusion and issues for further research

### 6.1 Non-temporal *dan* and V2

The arguments lined up above show that not only intrusive non-temporal *dan* but also PP initial or PP final non-temporal *dan* forms a constituent with the PP. This means that (6a) and (6b), which might appear problematic for the V2 generalization, turn out not to be a problem because, since *dan* and the PP are one constituent, (6) is in line with regular V2 patterns: the finite verb is preceded by just one constituent.

The question, of course, arises as to the internal structure of the *dan*-containing PP. Ultimately, any analysis will depend on one's theoretical position. We refer to Trotzke and Haegeman (2019) for one proposal, which combines the cartographic articulation of the internal structure of PPs as in Koopman (2000), Den Dikken (2010a), Aelbrecht and Den Dikken (2013), and Broekhuis and Dikken (2018), among many others, with recent work on discourse particles (as in Bayer and Trotzke 2015). Caution is needed, though, in formulating analytical hypotheses because, as shown in the next section, PPs are not the only constituents that may host non-temporal *dan*.

### 6.2 Extending the empirical data

While Trotzke and Haegeman (2019) formulate an analysis for the syntax of the PP which accommodates the distribution of non-temporal *dan*, including its distribution related to focusing *juist* ('just'), a point not discussed here, it should be pointed out that non-temporal *dan* can also display its sequencing function in other contexts, such as, for instance, in a nominal projection. (22) contains some illustrations of non-temporal *dan* in the nominal domain. We hasten to add that additional patterns are possible which, for reasons of space, we cannot discuss here. In (22a) and in (22b), a string consisting of the nominal *de jongste zoon* ('the youngest son') in combination with non-temporal *dan* forms the first constituent of a V2 clause. In (22c), non-temporal *dan* is associated with the possessor *die man*, which is doubled by the possessive pronoun *zijn*. In (22d), non-temporal *dan* precedes the definite determiner associated with the nominal *zoon*; it is preceded by the R-pronoun complement of the

prepositional *van*, a pattern reminiscent of the PP-internal intrusive *dan* pattern discussed in Section 4.<sup>5</sup>

- (22) a. De jongste zoon dan is getrouwd met mijn zus.  
the youngest son dan is married with my sister
- b. (en) dan de jongste zoon is getrouwd met mijn zus.  
and then the youngest son is married with my sister
- c. Die man dan zijn jongste zoon is getrouwd met mijn zus.  
that man then his youngest son is married with my sister
- d. Daar dan de jongste zoon van is getrouwd met mijn zus.  
there then the youngest son of is married to my sister

The ultimate analysis of the syntax of non-temporal *dan* should obviously also capture those data.

## References

- Aelbrecht, Lobke & Marcel den Dikken (2013). Preposition doubling in Flemish and its implications for the syntax of Dutch PPs. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 16, 33-68.
- Barbiers, Sjef, Koeneman, Olaf & Marika Lekakou (2010). Vragen aan de linkerperiferie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 15, 284-307.
- Bayer, Josef & Andreas Trotzke (2015). The derivation and interpretation of left peripheral discourse particles. In: Josef Bayer, Roland Hinterhölzl & Andreas Trotzke (eds.), *Discourse-oriented syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 13–40.
- Besten, Hans den (1983/89). On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In Werner Abrahams (ed.), *On the formal syntax of the Westgermania*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 47-131. Reprinted in Hans den Besten. (1989). *Studies in Westgermanic syntax*. PhD dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Brabant. Amsterdam & Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

---

<sup>5</sup> For movement of R-pronouns in the nominal domain, see Corver (1990: 37-8).

- Broekhuis, Hans & Norbert Corver (2016). *Syntax of Dutch. Verbs and verb phrases. Volume 3: Chapter 14: Main clause-external elements*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. <http://www.oapen.org/>.
- Broekhuis, Hans & Marcel den Dikken (2018). Tot (aan) het einde ((aan) toe): The internal syntax of a Dutch complex PP. *Glossa* 3 (104), 1–19.
- Catasso, Nicholas (2015). On postinitial *aber* and other syntactic transgressions: some considerations on the nature of V2 in German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 27 (4), 317-365.
- Corver, Norbert (1990). *The syntax of left branch extractions*. PhD dissertation Tilburg University.
- De Clercq, Karen & Liliane Haegeman (2018). The typology of V2 and the distribution of pleonastic DIE in the Ghent dialect. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01342>.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (2010a). On the functional structure of locative and directional PPs. In: Guglielmo Cinque & Luigi Rizzi (eds.), *Mapping spatial PPs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 74–126.
- Den Dikken, Marcel (2010b). De linkerperiferie antwoordt. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 15, 308-309.
- Haegeman, Liliane & Ciro Greco (2018). West Flemish V3 and the interaction of syntax and discourse. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 21, 1–56.
- Koopman, Hilda (2000). Prepositions, postpositions, circumpositions, and particles. In Hilda. Koopman (ed.), *The syntax of specifiers and heads*. London: Routledge, 204–260.
- Koster, Jan (2000). Extraposition as parallel construal. Ms, University of Groningen.
- Postma, Gertjan (2011). Het verval van het pronomen *du*. Dialectgeografie en de historische syntaxis. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 16, 56-87.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van (1978). *A case study in syntactic markedness: the binding nature of prepositional phrases*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281-337.
- Trotzke, Andreas & Liliane Haegeman (2019). PP-internal particles in Dutch as evidence for PP-internal discourse structure. *Particles in German, English and beyond*, Saarland University, January 21, 2019.

- Vanacker, Valère F. (1977). Syntactische overeenkomsten tussen Frans-Vlaamse en Westvlaamse dialecten. In: *De Franse Nederlanden. Les Pays Bas français. Jaarboek. Ons Erfdeel*, 206-216.
- Vanacker, Valère F. (1980). Een Vlaams adverbiaal steuntje. In: Joep Kruijssen (ed.), *Liber Amicorum Weijnen, Een bundel opstellen aan Prof. dr. A. Weijnen bij zijn zeventigste verjaardag*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 73-78.
- van der Wouden, Ton (2015). A marked construction to mark a marked phenomenon: how to shift topics in Dutch, or, the Barabbas construction. In: Sander Lestrade, Peter de Swart, & Lotte Hogeweg (eds.), *Addenda: artikelen voor Ad Foolen*, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen, 539-572.
- van der Wouden, Ton (2019). Uit kracht dan van de bevoegdheid. *neerlandistiek.nl*, 15 oktober 2019.
- van der Wouden, Ton (this volume). Er is nog steeds geen partikelwoordenboek, hoewel echter het partikelonderzoek niet stilligt
- Velde, John te (2013). West Germanic left-dislocated adverbial clauses: the role of the semantic interface. *Interdisciplinary Journal for Germanic Linguistics and Semiotic Analysis* 18, 163-206.
- Vries, Mark de (2009). The left and right periphery in Dutch. *The Linguistic Review* 26, 291-327.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (1997). *Morphosyntax of verb movement. A Minimalist Approach to the Syntax of Dutch*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2005). Verb Second as a function of Merge. In: Marcel den Dikken & Christina Tortora (eds.), *The function of function words and functional categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 11–40.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2008a). Verb-second als speelbal van de grammaticatheorie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 13, 198-216.
- Zwart, Jan-Wouter (2008b). Naschrift. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 13, 220-225.

### **About the author(s)**

**Liliane Haegeman**, DiaLing, Ghent university

Liliane.haegeman@UGent.be

**Andreas Trotzke**, University of Konstanz, Autonomous University of Barcelona

andreas.trotzke@uni-konstanz.de