Discourse-related V1 declaratives in Dutch

Jacqueline van Kampen
Utrecht University

This paper discusses two types of discourse-related V1 declaratives in Dutch. The first type involves a missing argument. In the position before the finite verb a referential 3rd person pronoun is deleted. The deletion of the pronoun is constrained by the recoverability condition, which requires that its referential features can be reconstructed from context. I will argue that only the deletion of a *d(emonstrative)*-pronoun is "topic drop". Deleted topic *d*-pronouns are subject to the same syntactic conditions as overt topic *d*-pronouns. Like the overt *d*-pronoun, the deleted *d*-pronoun refers to the focus constituent of the preceding sentence. A deleted *p(ersonal)*-pronoun, by contrast, does not have a uniquely determined antecedent. The second type of V1 declarative is found in so-called "narrative inversion" in which all arguments are present, and no empty element needs to be postulated. Various types of narrative inversion and the kind of discourse relation they imply are discussed.

Keywords: Dutch, topic drop, subject drop, narrative inversion

1. Introduction

In the West-Germanic V2 languages, the sentence-initial position preceding the finite verb may remain phonetically empty as a result of deletion of the sentence-initial constituent. This deletion has been characterized by Huang (1984) as "topic drop", i.e. the omission of a topic constituent. Although the term "topic drop" implies that the deleted constituent must be a topic, there is so far no consensus about which deletion covers "topic drop". Consider the sentences in (1).

(1) a. *Jan$_i$ heeft gisteren [zijn dochter]$_k$ opgehaald. (Die$_k$) zag er slecht uit.*
   Jan has yesterday his daughter up-picked. *d*-pro saw there bad out
   'Jan picked up his daughter yesterday. She looked bad.'

   b. *[Het meisje]$_i$ had een rode jurk aan. (Ze$_i$) droeg daarbij zwarte sneakers.*
   the girl had a red dress on. *p*-pro wore thereby black sneakers
   'The girl wore a red dress. She wore with it black sneakers.'

In (1a) the *d(emonstrative)*-pronoun *die* ('that') is left out and in (1b) 3rd person *p(ersonal)*-pronoun *ze* ('she'). Whereas the deletion of a *d*-pronoun is typical for informal spoken Dutch, the deletion of a 3rd person *p*-pronoun is more common in written Dutch.

Jansen (1981: 113) notes that there are no clear syntactic means to determine whether a *p*-pronoun or a *d*-pronoun has been deleted. The choice between the two has been taken by him on an intuitive base. Here I will follow Van Kampen (1992, 1997, 2010) and argue that "topic drop" uniquely concerns the deletion of a *d*-pronoun (1a). The deletion of a 3rd person *p*-pronoun (1b), on the other hand, must be analyzed differently. To that aim, I will first compare overt *d*-pronouns with overt 3rd person *p*-pronouns (Sections 3–4). Section 5 will analyze the specific syntactic and discourse conditions for the deleted *d*-pronoun and the deleted 3rd person *p*-pronoun.

In (1) there is a deleted subject that is recoverable from the preceding sentence. V1 declaratives are also possible without argument deletion, as in (2). Without the subject-finite verb inversion, both clauses would be an independent V2 sentence.

(2) *Neemt zij de borden*, *doe ik de glazen.*   [Arthur Japin *Vaslav* p. 361][1]
     takes   she the plates,   do I the glasses
     'She takes the plates. I take the glasses.'

Although there is no argument deletion in (2), several authors have suggested that some kind of empty element occupies the sentence-initial position.

Sentences as in (2) have been tagged as "narrative inversion". Narrative inversion is a stylistic device that typically occurs at the beginning of a joke or a story. It also appears embedded in a conversation as an expression of indignation. It is a marked and not frequently used construction. I will present another type of narrative inversion that is quite frequent in spoken Dutch and does not have a specific stylistic effect, see (3).

(3) *(Dan) neem ik er   een kopje koffie bij.*
     (then) take I there a   cup   coffee with
     'I take a cup of coffee.'

The different types of narrative inversion will be discussed in Section 6. I will show that all V1 declaratives, with and without argument deletion, are necessarily discourse-related. However, whereas the deleted arguments in (1) must be syntactically present and recoverable from a discourse antecedent in order to be

---

1. Publication *De Arbeiderspers.*

interpreted, in the narrative inversion examples (2)–(3) the V1 declarative as such implies the discourse effect and no empty element should be postulated.

2.   Two types of sentence-initial deletion in Dutch

Deletion of a *d*-pronoun and of a 3rd person *p*-pronoun in (1) have two properties in common: (i) the deleted pronoun must have a local antecedent in the preceding sentence; (ii) it is restricted to sentence-initial position.

The deleted *d*-pronoun in (1a) is the subject of the sentence and it refers to a local antecedent, the object *zijn dochter* in the preceding sentence. The continuation in (4) shows that the *d*-pronoun cannot be deleted if it occurs sentence-internally. Note that the *d*-pronoun must carry stress (marked with small caps) when used sentence-internally. I will deal with stress assignment in Section 3.

(4)   *Op het eerste gezicht zag   *(DIE$_k$) er   slecht uit.*
      at   the first   sight   saw *d*-pro   there bad   out
      'She looked bad at first sight.'

The deleted *p*-pronoun in (1b) is the subject of the sentence and it refers to a local antecedent, the subject *het meisje* in the preceding sentence. It is again not possible to leave out the *p*-pronoun in sentence-internal position. See the continuation in (5).

(5)   *Daarbij   droeg *(ze$_i$) zwarte sneakers.*
      there with wore *p*-pro black   sneakers
      'She wore black sneakers with it.'

The similarities between the two types of deletion cannot be the entire story. If their properties would be identical, one could only make a distinction on intuitive grounds. A closer look at the two types of pronouns, though, will show that the *d*-pronoun has a specific discourse function, not only when it is overt, but also when it is deleted. That means that both are constrained by the same linguistic conditions. The *p*-pronoun, by contrast, does not have a specific discourse function. It is therefore in principle possible to establish on linguistic grounds whether a *d*-pronoun or a *p*-pronoun has been deleted.

3.   Distinction between *d*-pronouns and *p*-pronouns: Topics and canonical subjects

The features of the deleted pronoun must be recoverable from context ("recoverability of deletion" requirement, Chomsky & Lasnik 1977: 446f). Therefore, only unstressed pronouns can be deleted. Stressed preposed pronouns carry a contrastive accent that evokes a set of alternatives. It adds semantic information that cannot be deleted. Before I turn to the deletion of *d*-pronouns and *p*-pronouns, I will first discuss the differences between the two.

The characteristic property of a V2 language like Dutch is the topicalization of a non-subject *d*-pronoun or adverb. Topicalization of non-subject full DPs or PPs is rather rare. According to Overdiep (1937: 490) and Jansen (1981), more than 80% of the sentence-initial non-subject constituents in spoken Dutch is a *d*-pronoun or adverb. Note that only distal *d*-pronouns (*die, dat*) are used in Dutch for discourse reference.

Another property of Dutch is that sentence-initial *d*-pronouns need not and usually do not carry stress (Jansen 1981: 82). This holds for both subject and non-subject *d*-pronouns. Stress on a *d*-pronoun is only acceptable if it is used for contrast or emphasis as in (6b). In the unmarked case (6a) it has an undesirable contrastive effect.

(6)   a.   *DIE$_k$ *zag er*   *slecht uit.*
           d-pro saw there bad   out
      b.   *DIE*$_k$ *zag er*   *even slecht uit, zeg!*
           d-pro saw there prt   bad   out, say

Unstressed *d*-pronouns are restricted to sentence-initial position. They cannot appear freely in sentence-internal position. The unstressed subject *p*-pronoun does not have the sentence-initial restriction, see (7).

(7)   *Op het eerste gezicht zag *die*$_k$*/ze*$_k$ *er   slecht uit.*
       at   first   sight   saw *d*-pro/*p*-pro there bad   out

In sentence-initial position, only subject *p*-pronouns can appear without stress, non-subject *p*-pronouns need stress, see (8).

(8)   *HAAR/*d'r heeft hij opgehaald.*
       p-pro   has   he up-picked
       'He picked her up.'

For the present analysis it is important to make a distinction between canonical subjects in sentence-initial position and other sentence-initial constituents. Here I accept Zwart's (1993) idea to postulate separate specifier positions at the left

periphery, one for the canonical subject (specifier of TP) and one (or more) for topicalized or focused constituents (specifier of CP), see (9). When the canonical subject is in sentence-initial position, the finite verb moves no further than T(ense) which contains tense and agreement features.

(9) $[_{CP}$ Topic C Vfin $[_{TP}$ Subject T Vfin $[_{XP}$ ...X $[_{VP}$ ...V$]]]]$

The canonical subject is an unstressed *p*-pronoun or unstressed nominal constituent that occupies an A(rgument)-position, see (10).

(10)   Canonical subjects (unstressed) in SpecTP
       $[_{TP}$ $[_{Spec}$ Hij$_{subject}$ $[_T$ zag...$]]]$

The unstressed *d*-pronoun resembles a *wh*-pronoun in that it occupies SpecCP and functions as an operator that binds a trace in an empty A-position. The difference between the two is that the *d*-pronoun has an identified discourse referent, whereas the *wh*-pronoun has not.

(11)   Topics, operators (need no stress) in SpecCP
       $[_{CP}$ $[_{Spec}$ Die$_{topic}$ $[_C$ zag $[_{TP}$ $[_{Spec}$ t$_{die}$ $[_T$ t$_V$...$]]]]]]$

All preposed stressed constituents are also located in SpecCP.

4.   The discourse function of *d*-pronouns and *p*-pronouns

The two pronouns not only have a different position, they also have a different function. Both *d*-pronouns and *p*-pronouns are referential elements that need an antecedent, but only the *d*-pronoun has a specific discourse function. The V2 property of Dutch with its sentence-initial topic position before the finite verb in Cº-position makes that discourse function possible. When English lost the V2 rule, it also lost the topic *d*-pronoun with its specific discourse function (Los & Van Kemenade 2018).

Topic *d*-pronouns require a local antecedent. They refer unequivocally to the focus of the preceding sentence and change it into the topic of the new sentence. In the present view, *d*-pronouns are designated linguistic topics, whereas *p*-pronouns are not. I follow here Neeleman et al. (2009: 17) in distinguishing linguistic topics from expressions that merely index the current topic of discourse, see their example in (12).

(12)   *Maxine$_i$ was introduced to the queen on her birthday.*
       She$_i$ was wearing a special dress for the occasion.

Maxine in (12) introduces a new topic of discourse. It is a linguistic topic. The pronoun *she* in the continuation is indexed with the topic *Maxime*, but it is not a linguistic topic itself.

The focus-to-topic-shifting device of the *d*-pronoun is exemplified in (13).

(13) *[De advocaat]$_i$ heeft met [uw broer]$_k$ gesproken. Die$_k$ achtte hij$_i$*
       the lawyer   has   with your brother spoken.   *d*-pro found *p*-pro
       betrouwbaar.
       reliable
       'The layer spoke to your brother. He found him reliable.'

The *d*-pronoun *die* in (13) refers to the preceding focus *uw broer*. It cannot refer to the preceding subject/topic *de advocaat*.

The *p*-pronoun does not impose a restriction on its antecedent. The pronoun *hij* in (14) is ambiguous between reference to the subject *Jan* and the object *zijn vriend*.

(14) *Jan$_i$ heeft gisteren   [zijn vriend]$_k$ opgehaald. Hij$_{i/k}$ zag er   slecht uit.*
       Jan has yesterday his   friend   up-picked. *p*-pro saw there bad   out
       'Jan picked up his friend yesterday. He looked bad.'

(Unstressed) *p*-pronouns may but need not be indexed with the current topic.

5.   Recoverability of deletion

The "recoverability of deletion" requirement implies for non-pro-drop Dutch that a constituent can be deleted if (i) it is recoverable from an identifiable antecedent; and (ii) it consists of grammatical features only, i.e. lexical material cannot be deleted. For pronoun deletion in Dutch it holds that only unstressed *d*-pronouns and unstressed subject *p*-pronouns fulfill that requirement.

We have seen that *d*-pronouns have an unequivocally determined antecedent, whereas 3rd person *p*-pronouns do not have such an antecedent. Reference of a *p*-pronoun is freer than reference of a *d*-pronoun. Therefore, dropping a *p*-pronoun is more restricted than dropping a *d*-pronoun. In the next two subsections, I will compare the two.

5.1   Topic drop: Subject and object *d*-pronouns

The dropped *d*-pronoun may be subject or object, see (15).

(15) *Jan   heeft in Utrecht [een kast]$_k$ opgehaald.*
      John has   in Utrecht a cupboard picked up.

    a. *(die$_k$) zag er   mooi uit.*   (subject gap)
       d-pro looked nice.

    b. *(die$_k$) kon   hij gratis   meenemen.*   (object gap)
       d-pro could he for free with-take.
       "He could take it with him for free."

The *d*-pronoun in (15) meets the recoverability condition and consequently it can be deleted.

Firstly, the *d*-pronoun refers to a unique antecedent, the previous focus *kast*. The empty *d*-pronoun induces, just like an overt *d*-pronoun, a focus-to-topic shift.

Secondly, the deleted *d*-pronoun consists of grammatical features only. Lexical content cannot be deleted. This is illustrated in (16).

(16) *Jan   had [op [een fles   wijn$_j$]]$_k$ gehoopt.*
      John had for a   bottle of wine hoped
      'John hoped for a bottle of wine.'

    a. *(daar$_j$) had ik ook [t$_j$ op]$_k$ gehoopt.*
       d-pro had I also   for hoped

    b. **(daarop$_k$) had ik ook t$_k$ gehoopt.*
       d-pro for had I   also   hoped

In (16a) the preposition is stranded and only the *d*-pronoun *daar* is deleted. In (16b) the preposition is pied-piped with the *d*-pronoun and the entire PP is deleted. This leads to ungrammaticality.

Thirdly, only unstressed *d*-pronouns can be deleted. The example in (17) is from a grammaticality judgment test (based on a written questionnaire) in Thrift (2003). 61% of the 19 informants judged the pronominal omission ungrammatical in this type of sentence and 10% of them were uncertain about the grammaticality.

(17) *[Ik geef Jan   een cd.] Wat   doet Marie$_k$?   ?*(DIE$_k$) geeft Jan   een boek.*
      [I   give John a   cd.] What does Marie$_k$?   *d*-pro gives John a   book

The antecedent of the dropped subject is *Marie* in the second sentence. It is a *wh*-question of the type "what about" with a focus antecedent that will be interpreted contrastively (Neeleman et al. 2009). When that antecedent is taken up by a topic *d*-pronoun, that *d*-pronoun is also interpreted contrastively and gets stress. By consequence, it cannot be deleted.

5.2   Subject drop of 3rd person *p*-pronouns

Only canonical subject pronouns in SpecTP can be considered for deletion. A non-subject sentence-initial *p*-pronoun must get contrastive stress.

The deleted subject *p*-pronoun is not recoverable by a uniquely determined antecedent like the preceding focus. It is, though, possible to find a discourse antecedent for it. As a sentence-initial subject, the *p*-pronoun is by default indexed with the previous topic. Below, two cases are shorty discussed.

The first case typically appears in an enumeration in diaries and literary texts. In (18), the subject *p*-pronoun *ze* is deleted (Overdiep 1937: 486).

(18)   *Dan een [dame in een open rijtuig]$_i$ (Ze$_i$) houdt stil... (Ze$_i$) buigt over...*
         Then a lady in an open carriage.   *p*-pro stops...   *p*-pro bends over...

The subject in the first sentence *dame in een open rijtuig* introduces a new syntactic topic. The *p*-pronoun *ze* in the consecutive sentences is not a syntactic topic, it merely indexes the current topic. This explains why the *p*-pronoun can be deleted.

The second case appears in coordinated structures. In (19) the subject of the coordinated sentence can be deleted when it refers to the subject of the first sentence (Zwart 1993: 250f).

(19)   *[Deze trein]$_i$ rijdt   als intercity naar Utrecht en (hij$_i$) stopt alleen in*
         This   train   continues as intercity to   Utrecht and *p*-pro stops only   at
         Gouda.
         Gouda

Zwart argues that the deletion is grammatical when both antecedent and empty subject are in the same specifier position, i.e. SpecTP. This complies with the present analysis.

6.   Narrative inversion: No missing argument

The pronoun deletion discussed up till now is discourse-related and the empty constituent is recoverable by a local antecedent. Narrative inversion is different. There is no covert argument and a relation with the preceding discourse often seems absent. Narrative inversion may appear as the beginning of a joke, continued by subject-verb inversion, see (20).

(20)   *Komt een man bij de dokter; zegt de dokter...*
         comes a   man at the doctor; says the doctor...
         'A man goes to the doctor. The doctor says...'

Sentences with narrative inversion may also be embedded in a conversation as the continuation of a preceding sentence. In (21) the speaker expresses his indignation towards the propositional content with a V1 exclamative.

(21) *Ik naar die vent toe; begint ie ineens   tegen   me te schelden!*
      I   to   that guy prt; starts he suddenly against me to scold
      'I went over to that guy and he starts suddenly to scold me!'

Narrative inversion is a device with a special stylistic effect. I have put a semicolon between the two clauses, because there is a close discourse relation between the V1 clause and the following or preceding clause which is marked by a rising intonation at the end of the first clause. Note also that there is an irreversible temporal succession between the two clauses.

In order to account for the special effect, Zwart (1993) and Koeneman (2000) postulate an empty element in SpecCP. Under Zwart's asymmetric approach with the canonical subject in A-position, topicalization must be triggered by a topic feature, which in its turn enforces finite verb movement. Without an empty element, the finite verb would remain in Tense position, contrarily to fact. Therefore, there is an empty operator in SpecCP in narrative inversion, on a par with an empty operator in yes/no questions. The empty operator prevents the topicalization of another constituent. Zwart changed his position in a later (2005) publication. I will come back to that in Section 7.

Koeneman (2000) stresses that the discourse relation must be prominent in narrative inversion, as it is in topic drop. He postulates a discourse-linked variable in SpecCP. The shared discourse may be suggested as in (20) or given by the previous discourse as in (21).

The following subsections discuss the question as to whether the postulation of an empty element (operator, variable) in narrative inversion is justified and how the narrative inversion construction is discourse-related.

6.1   Narrative inversion in the main clause: Temporal succession

The narrative inversion constructions in (20) and (21) have in common that they constitute two main clauses. Instead of an empty operator or variable, it is also possible to argue for a deleted constituent in SpecCP. Broekhuis & Corver (2016: 1344f) consider the prototypical onset of a joke as an expletive construction in which expletive *er* has been deleted. The continuation might involve the omission of a temporal adverb.

(22) *(Er)   komt   een man bij de dokter*. ??~~*Dan*~~ *zegt de dokter...*
      There comes a   man at the doctor. Then   says the doctor...

The representation in (22), though, disregards the intonation pattern. The rising intonation of the first V1 clause indicates that there is a follow-up. The follow-up second sentence is again a V1 clause, an indication that it is closely connected to the preceding clause. Although the two clauses constitute a temporal succession, the overt realization of *dan* or some other temporal adverb would be odd, to say the least, and so would its deletion.

An argument against *er*-deletion in joke introduction comes from the internet. The sentence in (23) has expletive *er* in subject position. It shows that the deletion of *er* in (22) is not obvious.[2] A Google search yielded various examples of jokes that start with *komt/komen* ('come/comes'), *gaat* ('goes'), *zitten* ('sit'), *loopt* ('walks') followed by *er*.

(23) *Komt **er***   *een man bij de dokter…*
       Comes there a   man at the doctor…

The V1 exclamative in (21) constitutes a comparable case. Broekhuis & Corver (2016) consider the possibility of topic drop with a deleted topic *daar*. This is again not obvious. The presence of *daar* does not contribute a locative meaning to the exclamative. Corver (2016) analyzes *daar* in exclamative sentences as an expletive. The example in (24) from the internet now shows that expletive *daar* may show up in sentence-internal position as well.[3]

(24) *…; beginnen ze **daar** ineens   met die pokkeherrie!*
       …; start   they there suddenly with that loud noise!

It appears then that both occurrences of narrative inversion cannot be explained by assuming a deleted expletive, since the expletive may be realized sentence-internally.

The stylistic effect of narrative inversion does not just follow from the V1 structure that relates the sentence to the following or preceding discourse. It also follows from the specific intonation that relates the two sentences. The sentences cannot be uttered on their own and there is a temporal succession between the two events that cannot be reversed.

6.2   Narrative inversion in conditional or temporal clauses

Narrative inversion is also found in constructions that alternate with a conditional subordinate with *als.* They are typically attested in literary Dutch. The examples

---

2. https://www.sgxl.nl/mop-van-de-dag-komt-er-een-man-bij-de-dokter-5

3. http://footo.nl/110Dy/op-het-plein-bourtange.

below are from two novels by Arthur Japin who makes striking use of the construction: *Vaslav* (15 examples) and *Kolja* (23 examples).

The relation between the two clauses is intrinsic p→q and the condition (protasis) must precede the consequence (apodosis). Reversing the order would give the wrong meaning. The V1 protasis replaces the V-final subordinate with the complementizer *als*, see (25). The apodosis is a main clause with subject-finite verb inversion.

(25)   *Brandt een vuur op*, **dan** *ben ik tevreden.*
   burns a   fire   out, then am I   content
   'If a fire burns out, I am content.'   [*Vaslav* p. 108] (condition-consequence)

Temporal clauses constitute a parallel example in (26). The V1 clause replaces the V-final subordinate with the temporal complementizer *als/wanneer*, indicating a temporal succession. Again, reversing the order would give the wrong meaning.

(26)   *Staan wij daar*, *komt* *Kolja naar beneden.* [Kolja p. 97] (temporal succession)
   stand we   there, comes Kolja downstairs
   'When we are standing there, Kolja descend the stairs.'

Clearly, we are dealing here, as in examples (20)–(21), with two closely related clauses appearing in an irreversible order and marked by a rising intonation between the first and the second clause.

The traditional assumption is that a V1 conditional has the same structure as a conditional with *als*. Broekhuis & Corver (2016: 1299ff) remark that conditional clauses allow V1 only when they are left-dislocated followed by the resumptive *dan* in the SpecCP of the apodosis, as in (25). When the resumptive element is not present, the V1 conditional is marked.[4] This is corroborated by the V1 conditionals in Japin's novels. The consequence clause in (25) typically appears with resumptive *dan*. The temporal clause in (26), by contrast, typically appears without *dan*. Apparently, the temporal succession of the two clauses blocks the realization of temporal *dan*, as it does with the temporal succession of the V1 joke introduction. The insertion of (resumptive) *dan* would give the sentence an inappropriate conditional interpretation. Compare also the V-final conditional clause in (27a) with the V-final temporal clause in (27b).

(27)   a. *Als een vuur opbrandt*, **dan** *ben ik tevreden.*
    if   a   fire   out-burns out, then am I   content

---

4. V1 conditionals without *dan* are attested in persuasive texts like advertisements, newspaper articles and proverbs. See Broekhuis & Corver (2016: 1311ff) for a discussion and references.

b. *Als/wanneer wij daar staan*, *(*dan) komt   Kolja naar beneden.*
    when   we there stand, then   comes Kolja downstairs

There is another difference between the conditional and temporal V1 clauses. The temporal clauses mostly appear at the beginning of a new scene, cf. the joke introduction. The discourse setting is not given, it is only suggested. The temporal V1 construction is a syntactic way to merely suggest a shared discourse (Koeneman 2000: 154). This is not the case with the V1 conditional. Biezma (2011) shows that a V1 conditional is only used when it is entailed by prior discourse. This is again corroborated by the V1 conditionals in Japin's novel. They do not appear at the beginning of a new scene. The sentence in (25) is uttered after a previous discourse context about lighting the fire.

Axel & Wöllstein (2009) go a step further in their structural analysis. They advance syntactic and semantic arguments to support their claim that V1 conditionals are syntactically unintegrated in the apodosis. They are V1 declaratives with no SpecCP and adjoined to the apodosis, which is also a V1 declarative.

If the conditional and temporal sentences are unembedded, they have with the V1 sentences in Section 6.1 in common that they are (i) V1 declaratives without an empty constituent in SpecCP, and (ii) with a special stylistic effect that is marked by a rising intonation that (iii) links the two main clauses together in an irreversible order.

6.3   Narrative inversion in spoken Dutch: No stylistic effect

A corpus study of spoken Dutch reveals a different type of narrative inversion. The data come from adult conversations with children in two CHILDES corpora, Van Kampen Sarah corpus and Wijnen corpus (Blom & Wijnen 2013). See the examples in (28), which may involve an empty *dan* or *nou*.

(28) a. *(Nou) ben je   helemaal   kledder!*
          now   are you completely wet
          'You are soaking wet!'
      b. *(Dan) neem ik er   een kopje koffie bij.*
          then   take I there a   cup   coffee with
          'I take a cup of coffee.'
      c. *(Dan) gaan we morgen   weer naar de crèche.*
          then   go   we tomorrow again to   the nursery
          'We will go to the nursery again tomorrow.'

The sentences in (28) do not seem to constitute a temporal succession with the preceding or following sentence (Jansen 1981: 120f). There is also no specific stylistic effect, nor a rising intonation.

Narrative inversion of this type is very frequent in spoken Dutch. It constitutes 2/3 of all discourse-related V1 declaratives in the corpora, see Table 1. Copula constructions are excluded from the count.

Table 1. Percentages of V1 declaratives: a. narrative inversion and b. topic drop

Corpus	V1 declaratives (out of all finite declaratives)		a. Narrative inversion		b. Topic drop *d*-pronoun	
Kampen (mother) Files 1;11–2;04	117/630	19%	88/117	75%	29/117	25%
Wijnen (father) Files 2;07–3;02	91/619	15%	60/91	66%	31/91	34%

In (28) *dan* and *nou* are not temporal adverbs. The temporal *d*-adverb *dan* can also be deleted sentence-initially, but only if it takes up the preceding focus, *morgen* in (29). Temporal *dan*, whether realized or not, cannot be interpreted without a discourse antecedent.

(29) *Wat gaan we morgen$_k$ doen? (Dan$_k$) gaan we weer naar de crèche.*
      what go   we tomorrow do? then   go   we again to   the nursery
      'What will we do tomorrow? Then we will go again to the nursery.'

Non-temporal *dan* and *nou* have been tagged as discourse-sequencing particles. Unlike the temporal adverbs, they cannot be stressed. Sentences with an overt sequential particle *dan/nou* are also frequent in spoken Dutch. In the selected Wijnen files they even constitute 24% (151/619) of the finite declaratives.

The sequential particles *dan/nou* are mostly used in the corpus to mark a transition to a novel activity in the actual situation. In a detailed study of *nou*, Mazeland (2016: 390) argues that *nou* used this way works as a kind of transition marker which signals that the speaker is going to initiate a next stage. The sequential particles frame the action as a consequence of the preceding interaction. Whereas sequential *dan* operates backwards, sequential *nou* points onwards.

A closer look at the occurrences reveals that the V1 declaratives in the adult-child interaction also most of the times mark a transition to a novel activity. Although the V1 declarative does not form a sequence with a preceding or following clause, there is a shared discourse of a temporal succession in the situation. The deletion of sequential *dan/nou* has no additional stylistic effect and there is no rising intonation, since there is no close connection between two clauses.

Therefore, there are no specific restrictions on the omission of non-temporal *dan/nou*. The shared discourse effect might then be due to an empty sequential particle in SpecCP. However, such an empty particle would be completely vacuous, since the V1 declarative already implies the shared discourse effect in other narrative inversion constructions.

7.   Discussion

All V1 declaratives are somehow discourse-related. They cannot be uttered out-of-the-blue. V1 declaratives with an empty argument are constrained by recoverability of deletion. For non-pro-drop V2 Dutch it means that the empty argument is a deleted pronoun in sentence-initial position that must be recoverable by a local discourse antecedent. The antecedent of the deleted *d*-pronoun is the preceding focus constituent and the antecedent of the deleted 3rd person pronoun is the current topic. Focus-to-topic-shift and the maintenance of the current topic by indexing take place between two sentences.

Narrative inversion does not involve an empty argument and is not constrained by recoverability of deletion. When the V1 declarative has a stylistic effect, there is a close discourse relation with a following or preceding clause, marked by a rising intonation. The two clauses cannot be uttered on their own and there is an irreversible order between the them expressing a logical temporal or conditional-consequence succession.

Narrative inversion does not involve an empty expletive or adverb either. It is still possible to postulate an empty operator in SpecCP to account for the specific discourse effect as in Zwart (1993). The postulation of such an operator, though, would only save the hypothesis of a generic verb movement. There is no independent motivation. I will follow therefore Zwart (2005) in assuming that no empty operator is involved. The V1 construction as a whole is a direct dependent of a specific discourse factor, with concomitant positional marking by left edge spell-out of the finite verb. The operator then can be dispensed with and there is no empty SpecCP. Zwart (2005) includes V1 declaratives with topic drop in his analysis. However, since the features of the non-realized constituent must be recoverable, topic drop does imply an empty element (pronoun) in SpecCP, unlike narrative inversion.

Narrative inversion without a stylistic effect is also discourse dependent, but on a shared discourse factor in the situation as the instantiation of a novel action. If this is the case, no empty *dan/nou* needs to be postulated, since the discourse effect is already obtained by the V1 declarative itself.

References

Axel, Katrin & Angelika Wöllstein. 2009. "German verb-first conditionals as unintegrated clauses." *The fruits of empirical linguistics* ed. by Sam Featherston & Susanne Winkler. 1–35. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110216158.1

Biezma, María. 2011. "Conditional inversion and givenness." *Proceedings of SALT 21* ed. by Neil Ashton, Anca Chereches & David Lutz. 552–571. New Brunswick: Rutgers University.

Blom, Elma & Frank Wijnen. 2013. "Optionality of finiteness: evidence for a non-overlap stage in Dutch child language." *First Language* 33(3): 225–245. https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723713487612

Broekhuis, Hans & Norbert Corver. 2016. *Syntax of Dutch. Verbs and verb phrases*. Volume 3. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. https://doi.org/10.26530/OAPEN_614910

Chomsky, Noam & Lasnik, Howard. 1977. "Filters and Control." *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(3): 425–504.

Corver, Norbert. 2016. "Exclamative relatives in vocative noun phrases." *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 21(3): 79–93. https://doi.org/10.5117/NEDTAA2016.3.CORV

Huang, James. 1984. "On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns." *Linguistic Inquiry* 15(4): 531–574.

Jansen, Frank. 1981. *Syntaktische constructies in gesproken taal*. Amsterdam: Huis aan de Drie Grachten.

Kampen, Jacqueline van. 1992. "Underspecification of functional features." Paper presented at the *BUCLD*, October 23–25.

Kampen, Jacqueline van. 1997. "First steps in wh-movement." PhD dissertation, Utrecht University.

Kampen, Jacqueline van. 2010. "Anaforische middelen voor topicverschuiving." *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 15(2/3): 189–210. https://doi.org/10.5117/NEDTAA2010.2.DISC442

Koeneman, Olaf. 2000. "The flexible nature of verb movement." PhD dissertation, Utrecht University.

Los, Bettelou & Ans van Kemenade. 2018. "Syntax and the morphology of deixis: the loss of demonstratives and paratactic clause linking." *Atypical demonstratives: Syntax, semantics and pragmatics* ed. by Marco Coniglio. 127–158. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110560299-005

Mazeland, Harrie. 2016. "The positionally sensitive workings of the Dutch particle *nou*." *A family of discourse markers across the languages of Europe and beyond* ed. by Peter Auer & Yael Maschler. 377–408. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110348989-012

Neeleman, Ad, Elena Titov, Hans van de Koot & Reiko Vermeulen. 2009. "A syntactic typology of topic, focus and contrast." *Alternatives to cartography* ed. by Jeroen van Craenenbroeck. 15–51. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110217124.15

Overdiep, Gerrit. 1937. *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch*. Zwolle: Tjeenk-Willink.

Thrift, Erica. 2003. "Object drop in the LI acquisition of Dutch." PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1993. "Dutch syntax. A minimalist approach." PhD dissertation, University of Groningen.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 2005. "Verb second as a function of Merge." *The function of function words and functional categories* ed. by Marcel den Dikken & Christina Tortora. 11–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.78.03zwa

Address for correspondence

Jacqueline van Kampen
UiL OTS
Utrecht University
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

n.j.vankampen@uu.nl