Timothy Colleman
Ghent University, research group GLIMS

The Dutch "semi-passives" with *krijgen/zien* and their German and English counterparts

This paper presents a constructionist analysis of the Dutch "semi-passive" constructions with *krijgen* 'to get' and *zien* 'to see' illustrated in (1) and (2) below, respectively, comparing these to a number of formally and/or semantically similar non-canonical passives in English and German. All Dutch examples included below are from the SoNaR corpus.

The construction with *krijgen* has already attracted a fair share of linguistic attention, but there is no agreement on its syntactic status and its semantic range of application (see, e.g., Colleman 2016 vs. Broekhuis 2016). I will bring in new data from the SoNaR and NLCOW corpora which allow for a more fine-grained identification of the formal and semantic subclasses of ditransitive verbs accommodated by this *krijgen*-construction in present-day Dutch. On the basis of a set of over 2,000 attested *krijgen*-passive instances, it will be shown that, on the one hand, the construction is found with certain types of verbs that are not readily found in the active double object construction, whereas, on the other hand, other types can be shown to occur with *krijgen* far less frequently than might be expected on the basis of their occurrence in the double object construction, or even not at all. The posited lexical and semantic constraints will be compared to those identified for the German *bekommen/kriegen*-passive in Leirbukt (1997), Lenz (2016), Oya (2016), etc.

The construction with *zien* has not yet been the subject of extensive grammatical research. Interestingly, as illustrated in (3) below, the *zien*-pattern attracts verbs from a number of semantic classes that are less readily used with *krijgen*, such as dispossession and deprivation verbs. The examples in (3) also show that the construction comes in a reflexive and a non-reflexive variant. This *zien*-construction bears a degree of functional resemblance to the English construction with "Experiencer *have*" in (4), which, in Kirchner (1952) already, is analysed as an "Ausweichkonstruktion" that speakers resort to in cases where the regular English ditransitive passive is not an option (cf. * *I was stolen seven bitcoins*). The Dutch and English constructions in (3) and (4), though structurally quite different, can be argued to occupy similar beneficiary/adversative niches in the respective networks of passive constructions. I will also address the question to what extent German can be said to possess a similar *sehen*-passive.

(1) De SP.A-Spiritfractie krijgt één schepenzetel toegewezen.
(2) Het Football Experience Center ziet zich een subsidie van 299.000 euro toegewezen.
(3) a. Wie wil reserveren kan dat beter zes weken van tevoren doen. Tom Cruise en Nicole Kidman zagen zich onlangs een tafel geweigerd.
b. De schepen … die in afwachting van de resultaten van het gerechtelijk onderzoek al zijn bevoegdheden zag afgepakt, blijft ervan overtuigd dat…
(4) "I had seven bitcoins stolen from me through fraud," Apple co-founder Steve Wozniak said at the Times' Global Business Summit. <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/02/26/>

References

Broekhuis, H. (2016). Syntax of Dutch: The data set. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 21: 297-327 ● Colleman, T. (2016). Over werkwoordalternanties in de *Syntax of Dutch*. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 21: 242–251 ● Kirchner, G. (1952). *Die zehn Hauptverben des Englischen im Britischen und Amerikanischen.* Halle: Niemeyer ● Leirbukt, O. (1997). *Untersuchungen zum bekommen-Passiv im heutigen Deutsch*. Tubingen: Niemeyer ● Lenz, A. (2013). *Vom* ›kriegen‹ *und* ›bekommen‹. *Kognitiv-semantische, variationslinguistische und sprachgeschichtliche Perspektiven*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter ● Oya, T. (2015). Das Rezipientenpassiv als Applikativkonstruktion. *Linguistische Berichte* 243: 295-325.

The pronoun interpretation problem in bilinguals: evidence from Dutch/German speaking children

Esther Ruigendijk[1], Regina Hert[1], Anike van Oosterom[2] & Petra Hendriks[2]
1 University of Oldenburg, Germany 2 University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Background Dutch-speaking children, like English-speaking children, make mistakes in the interpretation of pronouns until age 7 (Pronoun Interpretation Problem or PIP, Baauw et al., 2011; also called Delay of Principle B Effect, Chien & Wexler, 1990), whereas German-speaking children already interpret pronouns correctly from age 4 (Ruigendijk et al, 2010). This cross-linguistic difference is not yet fully understood. Explanations are sought in differences in the pronominal systems of the languages. We address the question: what happens if a bilingual child acquires a language with (Dutch) and one without (German) the PIP? There are in principle four logical possible outcomes: Dutch influences German: a PIP in both languages; German influences Dutch: no PIP in either language; bidirectional influence: smaller PIP in Dutch, increased PIP in German; no influence: a PIP in Dutch, no PIP in German. The aim of this study is to further our understanding of the PIP and its cross-linguistic differences.

Experiment We tested 21 Dutch-German bilingual children, age 3;8–6;11 (M = 5;7, 10 girls) that were recruited from the areas of Groningen (NL) and Oldenburg (DE) with a picture selection task (see Ruigendijk et al., 2010). The test consisted of transitive and ECM sentences with a reflexive or a personal pronoun. All started with an introduction sentence 'first the woman and girl VERB and then…' (8 items per condition, 32 in total, see (1) and (2) for examples). Each item was presented with three pictures: one depicting the pronoun interpretation, one the reflexive and one as a distractor depicting a different verb. Each child was tested in both languages, in separate sessions, with at least 1 week in between.

(1) Dutch… en daarna heeft de vrouw zichzelf/haar gekieteld
German**: …**, und dann hat die Frau sich/sie gekitzelt
'..., and then the woman tickled herself/her'

(2) Dutch: ... en daarna zag de vrouw zichzelf/haar applaudisseren
German**: ...** und dann sah die Frau sich/sie klatschen
'..., and then the woman saw herself/her applauding'

Results Whereas the children did not show a clear difference in performance on pronouns versus reflexives in transitive sentences in German, the same children did so in Dutch (Table 1). Furthermore, performance on pronouns in ECM sentences drops considerably in both languages (as has been reported before for monolinguals, e.g. Baauw et al. 2011). Finally, these bilingual children perform lower than monolingual children of the same age from earlier studies, in fact, in German they perform more like monolingual 3-4 year olds (Ruigendijk et al. 2010).

	Dutch		German	
	reflexive	pronoun	reflexive	pronoun
Transitive	79.9	63.6	78.6	74.4
ECM	82.6	48.4	79.2	63.7

Table 1: % correct

These results indicate that there is no cross-linguistic influence in pronoun interpretation. We find a PIP in Dutch, but not in German. The results also show that the PIP is not a task effect or a language-independent effect of processing or pragmatics (as has been argued before, Chien & Wexler, 1990; Conroy et al. 2009). Rather, the PIP seems to originate in the grammatical system of the specific language: the observed cross-linguistic difference may arise from the stronger ambiguity of Dutch pronouns compared to German pronouns.

References Baauw, S., S. Zuckerman, E. Ruigendijk & S. Avrutin. 2011. Principle B delays as a processing problem: Evidence from task effects. In Grimm, Muller, Hamann & Ruigendijk (eds.), *Production-comprehension asymmetries in child language*, 247–272. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. Chien, Y.-C. & K. Wexler (1990). Children's knowledge of locality conditions in binding as evidence for the modularity of syntax and pragmatics, *Language Acquisition* 1, 225–295. Conroy, A., Takahashi, E., Lidz, J., & Phillips, C. (2009). Equal treatment for all antecedents: How children succeed with Principle B. *Linguistic Inquiry, 40*(3), 446–486. Ruigendijk, E., Friedmann, N., Novogrodsky, R., & Balaban, N. (2010). Symmetry in comprehension and production of pronouns: A comparison of German and Hebrew. *Lingua*, 120(8), 1991–2005.

Comparing pronouns in Dutch and German: Can adults' object pronoun processing help explain cross-linguistic language acquisition differences?

Margreet Vogelzang[1], Regina Hert[2] & Esther Ruigendijk[1]
[1]University of Oldenburg, [2]University of Alberta

The way in which pronouns behave differently in Dutch (and English) compared to German points to a possible explanation for differences in language acquisition. For instance, a Dutch or English pronoun in a locative PP can refer back to the sentential subject, whereas a German pronoun cannot:

(1) De man$_i$ legt het boek naast *hem*$_i$ neer
The man$_i$ puts the book next to *him*$_i$
*Der Mann$_i$ legt das Buch neben *ihn*$_i$

This suggests that object pronouns in Dutch and English are functionally more ambiguous than in German, in the sense that the reference assignment of Dutch and English pronouns is not only based on a structural rule (i.e. 'pronouns cannot bind locally', cf. Principle B [1]), but also on discourse rules (e.g., Rule I [2]). In contrast, reference assignment of German object pronouns is more reliably based on this structural rule. Can this cross-linguistic difference explain why German children interpret object pronouns correctly [3], whereas Dutch (and English) children frequently incorrectly allow object pronouns like *him* in '*The hedgehog tickles him*' to refer to the sentential subject (Delay of Principle-B Effect (DPBE); e.g., [4])? We hypothesize that the difficulty for Dutch (and English) children in pronoun processing may be learning when an object pronoun can have a local referent and when not.

To examine this hypothesis, we investigate whether Dutch and German adults process object pronouns in different ways. In Dutch, Vogelzang et al. [5] found that more effort is needed to resolve pronominal compared to reflexive objects as measured by pupil size. They reason that this is due to reflexives being less ambiguous than object pronouns. Following this reasoning, we hypothesize that in German, where establishing object pronoun reference is argued to be more straightforward and therefore less ambiguous, there is no or less increased processing effort when resolving a pronominal compared to a reflexive object compared to Dutch.

We replicated the study of Vogelzang et al. in German, presenting German adults with auditory mini-stories (see the example in 2a-2c), of which the last clause contained either an **object pronoun** or a **reflexive**. Pupil size was recorded continuously during the sentence, and analyzed from the critical word in the last sentence (bold printed in 2c) onwards.

(2a) Der Igel hat ein Baumhaus gebaut.
The hedgehog has built a tree house.

(2b) Letzte Woche Freitag lief der Igel mit dem Panda durch den Wald nach Hause,
Last Friday the hedgehog walked home with the panda through the forest,

(2c) während der Igel **sich** / **ihn** über den dunklen Pfad beeilt / verfolgt hat.
*while the hedgehog hurried **himself** / followed **him** along a dark trail.*

Data collection and analysis is currently ongoing. Preliminary results show no differences between adults' processing of pronominal objects compared to reflexives in German. This suggests that in Dutch, traces of the DPBE, which only occurs in children, can still be seen in adults when sensitive, online measurements like pupil size are applied. In German, on the other hand, no DPBE occurs and thus no processing difficulties for object pronouns exist. We argue that these findings are a first step towards explaining why Dutch children have more problems interpreting object pronouns than German children.

[1] Chomsky, N., 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris Publications. [2] Grodzinsky, J., Wexler, K., Chien, Y.-C., Marakovitz, S., & Solomon, J. (1993). The Breakdown of Binding Relations. *Brain and Language*, *45*, 396–422. [3] Ruigendijk, E., Friedmann, N., Novogrodsky, R., & Balaban, N. (2010). Symmetry in comprehension and production of pronouns: A comparison of German and Hebrew. *Lingua*, *120*(8), 1991–2005. [4] Koster, C. (1993). *Errors in anaphora acquisition* (Doctoral dissertation). Groningen, The Netherlands: University of Groningen. [5] Vogelzang, M., Hendriks, P., & Van Rijn, H. (2017). Pupillary responses reflect ambiguity resolution in pronoun processing. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 31*(7), 876-885.

Juniorprof. Dr. Mirjam Schmuck
Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz
FB 05 • Deutsches Institut • Historische Sprachwissenschaft
Tel.: 06131-3925513, mschmu@uni-mainz.de

JOHANNES GUTENBERG UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ

Sparkle, wobble, chatter. Affix reanalysis and semantic enrichment: Iteration in German, Dutch, and English

Mirjam Schmuck, University of Mainz

The verbal suffixes *-el(e)n* and *-er(e)n* and their cognates represent a common feature of Germanic languages including German, Dutch, and English (GER *tröpfeln*, DUT *druppelen,* ENG *trickle*; GER *knattern,* DUT *knetteren*, ENG *clatter*). Being formally identical to diminutives, verbs derived with the suffix *-el(e)n* have also been referred to as "verbal diminutives". Semantically, the word formation products may display a diminutive or related meaning (e.g. attenuation, pejoration, cf. Jurafsky 1996, Weidhaas & Schmid 2015). However, there are many instances where diminutive semantics are absent and iterative meaning is predominant instead (GER *stammeln*, DUT *stamelen*, ENG *stumble*). How the derivational affix *-el(e)n* acquired an iterative meaning has remained unclear. The same holds true for iterative semantics of verbs ending in *-er(e)n,* mainly onomatopoetic words denoting sounds, particularly sounds of animals (GER *schnattern, zwitschern,* DUT *snateren*, *kwetteren,* ENG *chatter*, *twitter*). Sharing iterative semantics, both suffixes are partly competing (GER *schlittern*, Alemannic *schlitteln* 'to slither'; DUT *gaggelen*, *gakkeren* 'to cackle').

Whereas recent schema-based approaches (Weidhaas & Schmid 2015, Audring et al. 2017) have focused on modern languages, the present account aims at shedding new light on the rise of iterative semantics from a diachronic perspective. It is argued that, primarily, the suffixes *-el(e)n*, *-er(e)n* go back to verbs derived from *nomina instrumenti* ending in *-el*, *-er* (GER *Meißel*, *Stampfer*, ENG *chisel*, *stamper*, DUT *beitel*, *stamper*). After reanalysis (*-el+en* → *-elen*; *-er+en* → *-eren*) the word formation patterns became productive and gave rise to verb doublets (MLG *stōten* – *stotteren*) and onomatopoetic words (MLG *snapperen* 'chatter'), see (1)-(2):

(1) MHG *meiʒel* 'chisel' – *meiʒel-en* → *meiʒ-elen* 'to chisel'
(2) MLG *slenker* 'sling' – *slenker-en* → *slenk-eren* 'to dangle'

↓

MHG *snitzen* 'to carve' – *snitz-elen* 'to cut into pieces'
MLG *stōten* 'to exhale' – *stot(t)eren* 'to stammer'

Building on data drawn from historical dictionaries, it is argued that the semantics of the word formation patterns result from "affix telescoping", i.e. formal <u>and</u> functional fusion of two derivational affixes (cf. Haspelmath 1995). In the cases in point, the semantics of *-el(e)n/-er(e)n*-derivatives go back to *-el/-er* of *nomina instrumenti* with inherent iterative meaning. Other than *l*-diminutives, *nomina instrumenti* ending in *-el*, *-er* represent a common feature of the Germanic languages. Other sources, in particular diminutives and adjectival/comparative *-er* (DUT *beteren*, GER *bessern* ENG *to better*), are also discussed on the basis of historical data. The paper considers all three languages, however, the main focus is put on German and Dutch.

References

Audring Jenny, Booij, Geert & Jackendoff, Ray (2017): *Menscheln, kibbelen, sparkle*. Verbal diminutives between grammar and lexicon. In: Linguistics in the Netherlands 34, 1–15.

De Jager, Arie (1875): Woordenboek der frequentatieven in het Nederlandsch. Gouda.

Eichinger, Ludwig M. (2014): Bairische Wortbildung. Verben auf *-eln*. In: Krämer-Neubert, Sabine & Wolf, Norbert Richard (eds.): Bayerische Dialektologie: Akten der Internationalen Dialektologischen Konferenz 26.–28. Februar 2002. Heidelberg, 63–73.

Haspelmath, Martin (1995): The growth of affixes in morphological reanalysis. In: Booi, Geert & van Marle, Jaap (eds.), Yearbook of Morphology 1994. Dordrecht, 1–29

Jurafsky, Daniel (1996): Universal Tendencies in the Semantics of the Diminutive. In: Language 72/3, 533–578.

Kuhn, Hans (1961): Verbale *l*- und *r*-Bildungen im Schweizerdeutschen. Frauenfeld.

Weidhaas, Thomas/Schmid, Hans-Jörg (2015). Diminutive verbs in German: semantic analysis and theoretical implications. Morphology 25/2. 183–228.

Tanja Mortelmans
Universiteit Antwerpen

Semantic and constructional variation with verbs of seeming in English, Dutch and German

In my presentation, I want to address *seem*-type verbs in English (mainly *seem*, see e.g. Aijmer (2009)), German (*scheinen,* see e.g. Diewald 2001) and Dutch (*schijnen*, *lijken*, *blijken*, see e.g. Mortelmans 2017) from a contrastive perspective. All of them can express evidential (mostly inferential) meanings, as in the following example, taken from the Nicci French novel 'Sunday Morning Coming Down' and its translations in German and Dutch. It can be argued that EN *seem*, DU *lijken* and GE *scheinen* express a similar inferential meaning in (1): on the basis of the observable behaviour of the addressee, the speaker concludes (i.e. infers) that the addressee has a particular problem.

(1) EN You **seem** <u>to have</u> a problem answering any kind of questions. (NF, SMCD, 4, 15)
DU U **lijkt** sowieso moeite <u>te hebben</u> met het beantwoorden van vragen. (NF, ZBA, 4, 13)
GE Fragen zu beantworten **scheint** Ihnen überhaupt <u>schwerzufallen</u>. (NF, BS, 40)

At the same time, these verbs can be shown to exhibit a considerable amount of semantic and formal variability, i.e. with respect to the **constructional patterns** they can appear in, the actual **frequency** of these constructional patterns, the **degree of subjectivity** with which the speaker is construed, and the (types of) **meanings** they express (non-evidential, evidential (inferential, reportive), mirative). To give but one example: the Dutch verb *lijken* occurs remarkably more often than both other verbs as a matrix verb in constructions followed by *alsof* 'as if' (expressing a (non-evidential) unreal comparison); in English and especially in German, however, speakers seem to prefer different verbs or constructions here.

(2) DU Het **leek** <u>net alsof</u> hij ermee in gevecht was. (EN, NF 34)
EN He **looked** <u>as if</u> he was doing battle with it. (EN, NF 34)
GE Crawford **sah aus**, <u>als</u> würde er mit dem Ding kämpfen. (EN, NF 34)

This variation will be uncovered by means of a new corpus analysis on the basis of a self-compiled parallel German-Dutch-English corpus that consists of present-day literary crime novels written in either Dutch, German or English and their translations. The main aim of my presentation will consist in describing the different dimensions of variation and showing there is a correlation between (a preference for) particular constructional patterns and the meanings these verbs express. Furthermore, it will be shown that the evidential meaning is least conventionalized in Dutch *lijken*, somewhat more strongly conventionalized in English *seem* and most strongly present in German *scheinen*, which (of the three verbs) patterns most often as a (semi)-auxiliary with inferential meaning.

References

Aijmer, Karin (2009). *Seem* and evidentiality. Functions of Language 16:1, 63-88

Diewald, Gabriele (2001). *Scheinen*-Probleme: Analogie, Konstruktionsmischung und die Sogwirkung aktiver Grammatikalisierungskanäle. In: Modalität und Modalverben im Deutschen. Reimar Müller & Marga Reis (eds.), 87-110. Hamburg: Buske.

Mortelmans, Tanja (2017). Seem-type verbs in Dutch and German: *Lijken*, *schijnen* & *scheinen*. In: Evidentiality Revisited. Juana Isabel Marin Arrese, Gerda Haßler & Marta Carretero (eds), 123-148. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Indringers in de werkwoordsgroep: het Afrikaans in vergelijking met het Nederlands en het Duits

Peter Dirix & Liesbeth Augustinus (KU Leuven)

Het Binnengermaans wordt gekarakteriseerd door de vorming van werkwoordsgroepen op de tweede zinspool die gescheiden zijn van niet-verbale elementen. De constructies in (1), (2) en (4) bevatten een reguliere werkwoordsgroep in resp. Nederlands, Afrikaans en Duits. De werkwoordsgroep met *pseudocoördinatie* uit (3) treffen we enkel aan in het Afrikaans.

(1) NL … als iedereen vegetarisch **zou gaan eten** (OpenSoNaR)
(2) AF … dat hulle daar **kan gaan woon**. (Korpusportaal)
(3) AF … dat die werkers daar **staan en braai** met biere (Korpusportaal)
(4) DE … ob er den Schlüssel zum Haus nicht **hat finden können.** (Google)

Donaldson (1993), Ponelis (1993) en De Vos (2006) geven aan dat in het Afrikaans mogelijk is de werkwoordsgroep te onderbreken met niet-werkwoordelijke elementen, zoals in (5-6).

(5) AF Dat sy seker **moet** <u>'n woonstel</u> **koop**. (Ponelis 1993)
(6) AF Daar sal altyd iemand **sit en** <u>boeke</u> **lees**. (De Vos 2006)

In de literatuur is er echter onenigheid over welke indringers de werkwoordsgroep kunnen doorbreken. Volgens Donaldson (1993) en De Vos (2006) is doorbreking enkel mogelijk door indringers die uit één woord bestaan, terwijl Ponelis (1993) en Robbers (1997) ook doorbreking door volledige NP's en PP's vermelden. Verder is het onduidelijk in welke mate doorbreking van de werkwoordsgroep optioneel of verplicht is in het Afrikaans.
Om een accuraat beeld te krijgen van mogelijke indringers in Afrikaanse werkwoordsgroepen hebben we een corpusonderzoek uitgevoerd. De resultaten tonen aan dat in geschreven Afrikaans scheidbare partikels, kale naamwoorden en predicatief gebruikte adjectieven in beide types werkwoordsgroepen de meest voorkomende indringers zijn. Verder blijkt er een belangrijk verschil te zijn tussen reguliere werkwoordsgroepen en clusters met pseudocoördinatie. Voor de eerste groep is doorbreking optioneel voor elk type indringer. Voor werkwoordsgroepen met pseudocoördinatie is clusterdoorbreking verplicht in een aantal gevallen, bijvoorbeeld indien er een direct object of een predicatief adjectief bij het werkwoord staat, en onmogelijk in andere gevallen.
In het Nederlands en het Duits wordt doorbreking van de werkwoordelijke eindgroep over het algemeen minder aanvaard, maar empirische studies hebben aangetoond dat in informeel taalgebruik doorbreking niet ongewoon is (Augustinus 2014, Hendriks 2014, Dubenion-Smith 2010). We vergelijken de resultaten voor het Afrikaans met die voor het Nederlands en het Duits.

Bibliografie

Augustinus, Liesbeth & Van Eynde, Frank (2014) "Looking for Cluster Creepers in Dutch Treebanks. Dat we ons daar nog kunnen mee bezig houden" In: *Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands Journal* 4**:** 149-170.

De Vos, Mark (2006) "Quirky verb-second in Afrikaans: complex predicates and head movement." In: Jutta Hartmann, László Molnárfi (red.): *Comparative Studies in Germanic Syntax: From A(frikaans) to Z(urich German*). John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Phildelphia.

Donaldson, Bruce C. (1993) *A Grammar of Afrikaans.* Mouton de Gruyter, Berlijn.

Dubenion-Smith, Shannon A. (2010) "Verbal Complex Phenomena in West Central German: Empirical Domain and Multi-Causal Account." In: *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 22.2: 99-191.

Hendriks, Lotte (2014) "Variation in verb cluster interruption" In: *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2014*: 53-65.

Ponelis, Fritz (1993) *The Development of Afrikaans.* Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Robbers, Karin (1997) *Non-finite Verbal Complements in Afrikaans: A Comparative Approach*. Holland Academic Graphics, Den Haag.

Joanna Wall
Utrecht University & Meertens Institute

Perfect doubling in West Germanic: Not the sandwich it first seems

1. Introduction. Perfect doubling constructions consist of either two forms of the verb *have* combined with the participle of a transitive or unergative verb, like (1), or two forms of the verb *be* with the participle of an unaccusative verb. Whilst this paper will focus solely on *have* perfect doubling constructions, its conclusions should be equally applicable to the *be* variants.

(1) *Ik heb vandaag nog niet gerookt gehad.*
I have today still not smoked.PTCP had.PTCP
'I have not yet smoked today.' (South-eastern Dutch; Koeneman et al. 2011: 37)

Have perfect doubling is found in modern German (e.g. Rödel 2011; Zybatow & Weskott 2018) and Dutch dialects (Koeneman et al. 2011), but not attested in modern English or Dutch. These constructions have proven an analytical puzzle, none the least due to their semantic proximity to present perfects. In this talk, I present evidence for perfect doubling in the previously understudied *historical varieties of Dutch* (HVDs), and propose an analysis linking the possibility of perfect doubling to the varying properties of present perfects, modals and passives in Dutch, English and German.

2. Corpus study of HVDs. 512 instances of *have*-doubling were found in a large-scale corpus of approx. 83,000,000 word corpus covering 1050 to 1649. Firstly, based on syntactic characteristics, I show that these instances of *have*-doubling robustly include instances of perfect doubling, as opposed to other *have*-doubling variants found in, for instance, modern English. Secondly, based on an analysis of geographical distribution, I show that perfect doubling is crucially attested in Hollandic HVDs which formed the basis for modern Standard Dutch but where the construction is no longer attested.

3. Analysis. Adopting a Minimalist framework, my departure point is Brandner and Larsson's (2014) proposal that perfect doubling constructions are a combination of two semantically distinct present perfects. According to the standard typological classifications, I assume that one of these present perfects functions as a true perfect requiring current relevance whilst the other functions as a temporal past, lacking current relevance. I argue that the true perfect is found in English, German, Dutch dialects and modern Standard Dutch, whilst the temporal past is found in all varieties but English. Distancing the present analysis from Brandner et al.'s, I then propose a formal analysis based on Wurmbrand's (2001) restructuring account. Whilst primarily focusing on German infinitives, Wurmbrand does propose that present perfect *have* can merge in two distinct functional projections (ModP, AuxP) without any semantic distinction. In contrast, I argue that *have* merging in the lower projection (ModP) results in a true perfect, whilst *have* merging in a higher position, which I will argue to be TP rather than AuxP, results in a past. Supporting evidence for this proposal includes the differing interactions between modal verbs and present perfects in West Germanic varieties.

Whilst this analysis correctly rules out perfect doubling in English, it makes the seemingly problematic prediction that perfect doubling should be possible in modern Standard Dutch, a variety with both present perfects, i.e. the structural means. However, I make the novel claim that the lack of perfect doubling constructions in that variety is only apparent and results from a PF operation, blocking the spell out of the embedded participial form of *have.* This proposal is supported by parallel verbal constructions in modern Standard Dutch where a covert auxiliary has also been posited, like perfect passives (e.g. *het boek is verkocht* (**geworden*); van Bart et al. 1998) which feature only one overt auxiliary. In sum, I argue that perfect doubling is not the sandwich it first seems: whilst on the surface Dutch seems to parallel with English, it ultimately sides with German and Dutch dialects, namely in its structural means.

4. References. 1. Van Bart, P., J. Kerstens & A. Sturm. 1998. *Grammatica van het Nederlands. Een inleiding.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. 2. Brandner, E. & I. Larsson. 2014. *Perfect doubling and the grammaticalization of auxiliaries.* Abstract. DiGS16, 3–5 July 2014 Budapest. 3. Koeneman, O. N. C. J., M. Lekakou & S. Barbiers. 2011. "Perfect doubling." *Linguistic Variation* 11(1): 35-75. 4. Rödel, M. 2011. "New perspectives on double perfect constructions in German." *Tense across languages*, ed. by M. Rathert & R. Musan, 127-146. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 5. Wurmbrand, S. 2001. *Infinitives: restructuring and clause structure.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 6. Zybatow, T. & T. Weskott. 2018. "Das Doppelperfekt: Theorie und Empirie." *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 37(1): 83–124.

Evie Coussé – University of Gothenburg

Complex perfects in Germanic

Complex perfects are fascinating constructions in the Germanic languages. The examples below illustrate how the perfect auxiliary *have* may combine with a modal and a lexical verb in Dutch and German respectively.

(1) *Ik heb kunnen komen.* (Dutch)
I have can.INF come.INF

(2) *Ich habe kommen können.* (German)
I have come.INF can.INF

Complex perfects in Dutch and German are first and foremost known for their intricate patterns of word order variation in the subordinate clause, especially in regional and historical varieties (e.g. Coupé 2015). Another prominent issue, studied since at least Grimm (1837), is the unexpected coding of the auxiliary directly embedded under *have.* This auxiliary appears as a bare infinitive instead of the expected past participle, a phenomenon known as *Erzatsinfinitiv* or *infinitivus pro participio.*

A similar but perhaps less well-known case of unexpected coding may be found in complex perfects in Swedish. Some regional varieties code the lexical verb as a supine, as in (4), instead of an infinitive, as in the case in the Standard Swedish example (3), giving rise to a so-called *double supine* (Larsson 2014).

(3) *Jag har kunnat komma.* (Swedish)
I have can.SUP come.INF

(4) *Jag har kunnat kommit*. (regional Swedish)
I have can.SUP come.SUP

These examples only scratch the surface of the cross-linguistic variation found in complex perfects in Germanic. This paper wants to further flesh out the divergent coding of complex perfects in Dutch, German and English (aka the 'Germanic sandwich') and Swedish (adding a northern perspective) and analyze it from a diachronic construction grammar perspective (e.g. Coussé et al. 2018).

The central idea of the analysis is that complex perfects result from the innovative integration of two periphrastive verb constructions. In the examples above this is the simple *have* perfect and a modal construction. These multiple source constructions may impose conflicting selectional restrictions and formal coding on the new more complex construction (cf. 'form-function friction' in De Smet & Van de Velde 2013). It will be argued that the languages under investigation have solved these conflicts in diverging ways in the course of their history giving rise to synchronic cross-linguistic variation.

References

Coupé, G. (2015) *Syntactic extension.* Utrecht: LOT.

Coussé, E., P. Andersson & J. Olofsson (2018) *Grammaticalization meets construction grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

De Smet, H. & F. Van de Velde (2013) Serving two masters: form-function friction in syntactic amalgams. *Studies in Language* 37, 534-565.

Grimm, W. (1837) *Deutsche Grammatik VI.* Göttingen: Dieterich.

Larsson, I. (2014) Double supine. *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures Journal* 1, 300-306.