

Cornips, L. 1998. Habitual *doen* in Heerlen Dutch. In Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade, Marijke van der Wal & Arjan van Leuvensteijn (eds.), *DO in English, Dutch and German. History and present-day variation*, Amsterdam/ Münster: Stichting Neerlandistiek/ Nodus Publikationen: 83-101.

## Habitual *doen* in Heerlen Dutch

Leonie Cornips

P.J. Meertens-Institute, KNAW & University of Amsterdam

### 1. Introduction

In this paper I will focus on the *doen+infinitive* construction in a regional Dutch variety, in particular, Heerlen Dutch. Heerlen is a town of 90,000 inhabitants situated in Limburg, a province in the southeast of the Netherlands, near the Belgian and German borders.

With respect to other Dutch dialect areas Heerlen occupies an exceptional position, since in the beginning of this century the expanding mining industry in the area attracted numerous workers from elsewhere in the Netherlands and abroad. This immigration altered the linguistic uniformity of Heerlen to one extent that the native population who spoke the local dialect of Heerlen became a minority. Subsequently, a new intermediate variety of Dutch emerged, namely Heerlen Dutch. Heerlen Dutch may be considered as the result of a process of language shift with the local dialect as the source and Standard Dutch as the target language (cf. see Cornips 1994a for a more extensive discussion). Nowadays, Heerlen is still a bilingual community; its inhabitants speak either the local dialect as their first language and Heerlen Dutch as a second language, or Heerlen Dutch as their first language. The local dialect of Heerlen is situated in the westernmost dialect-geographical transition zone of the Riparian dialects, a sub-branch of the Franconian dialect group, and for centuries it was heavily influenced by the German city of Cologne (German; Köln) (see Hinskens 1993: 80 for a more extensive discussion). Subsequently, the Heerlen dialect differs from Standard Dutch in all its linguistic aspects: lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactical. It is for this reason, that syntactic interference in Heerlen Dutch from the local dialect may well result in syntactic constructions that are marginal or even unacceptable in Standard Dutch. The declarative *doen+infinitive* construction with the frame NP<sub>1</sub>-doen-(NP<sub>2</sub>)-V in (1) is an illustration of this.<sup>1</sup> Note that in (1) (i) *doen* 'do' is not an auxiliary in the strict sense since it does not select a past participle but an infinitive and (ii) that *doen* carries all agreement and tense features (SD=Standard Dutch, HD=Heerlen Dutch):

- (1) ?SD/HDa. Zij *doet* werken /\*gewerkt  
           she does work<sub>inf</sub> /worked<sub>partc</sub>  
           'She is working'  
       ?SD/HDb. Zij *doet* haar huiswerk maken  
           she does her homework make<sub>inf</sub>  
           'She is doing her homework'

<sup>1</sup> From a syntactic point of view, what Heerlen Dutch distinguishes from Standard Dutch is not only the occurrence of the declarative *doen+infinitive* construction but also (i) dative objects appear in a much wider range of constructions and (ii) the reflexive *zich* has a wider set of uses in Heerlen Dutch than in Standard Dutch

The marginal status of the constructions in (1) in Standard Dutch, but not in Heerlen Dutch, is due to the fact that they belong to a specific domain of discourse. It has often been said that in Standard Dutch the *doen+infinitive* construction, such as in (1), does not belong to the adult grammar (cf. Giesbers 1983-84, Duinhoven 1994: 111). Instead, it frequently shows up in child language or in the speech of adults who are talking to children (Tieken 1990). Furthermore, in the literature it is argued that the *doen* construction in the Standard Dutch child grammar is similar to the *doen* construction that is used by adults in regional colloquial or dialect speech (cf. Giesbers 1983-84, Duinhoven 1994: 111). Since it is assumed that children use the *doen* construction in order to avoid the morphological complexity of compound verbs, it is also assumed that in regional Dutch varieties adults use the *doen* construction as an ‘avoidance’ strategy, too. In addition, Nuijtens (1962: 156) claims that dialect speakers who do not have a good command of Standard Dutch use *doen* frequently. All these claims can be captured as follows:

Figure 1: *The discourse domain of the doen+ infinitive construction*

**doen+infinitive** (cf. (1))

*in Standard Dutch*

- child grammar
- non-standard colloquial speech
- imperfect command by adult speakers

*in regional Dutch varieties, e.g. Heerlen Dutch*

- adult dialect speakers speaking SD as a second language
- avoidance strategy morphological compound verbs

In this talk, however, I will argue that the grammatical status of the regional *doen* construction has always been misunderstood due to its absence in Standard Dutch. The misunderstandings concerning this regional construction is a consequence of the assumption of linguists that grammars of regional varieties must reflect the grammar of the Standard language in some sense. I will argue that this assumption, and now I quote Harris (1984: 303) ”presupposes that standard and nonstandard syntactic variants are embedded in structurally identical grammars. That is to say, this idea “encourages the impression that differences between the standard and a particular vernacular are merely superficial and tend to obscure whatever deep-seated divergences there might exist between the two varieties”.

In this paper, I will demonstrate that in Heerlen Dutch the *doen* construction, such as in (1) is one way of expressing habitual aspect. What's more, on the basis of the expression of habitual aspect by means of adverbial expressions and compound predicates in Standard Dutch and Heerlen Dutch as well, I will argue that it is for this reason that *doen* in Heerlen Dutch favours the occurrence of infinitives that are compounded.

### 1.1 *The corpus of Heerlen Dutch*

Throughout this paper, the *doen* examples are drawn of my speech data corpus of Heerlen Dutch. The Heerlen Dutch data are collected by means of recording 33,5 hours of spontaneous speech. Furthermore, the total number of male speakers was 67 and, it is important to note that the spontaneous speech data consist only of speech of adult speakers.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The fact that the sex of speakers in this survey is held constant is merely made for the practical reason

The speakers were selected at random. Three speaker variables were taken into account in order to investigate the social distribution of the varieties of Dutch spoken in Heerlen, namely language background, education/occupation and age. The specification of these variables made it possible to investigate whether the speakers will show social stratification, in particular, with respect to the variable language background.

The speakers were divided into three language groups according to their language background, namely *immigrant*, *dialect* and *Heerlen Dutch*. Note, that with respect to the origin of the parent's speakers, the language group of immigrants is not so homogeneous as the other two language groups:

- IMMIGRANT: speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as their first language and whose parents were born outside the province of Limburg;  
 DIALECT: speakers who speak the local dialect as their first language and (Heerlen) Dutch as a second language;  
 HEERLEN DUTCH: speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as their first language and whose parents speak the local dialect as a first language.

Subsequently, the speakers were further subdivided into smaller groups according to their education/occupation and age. The variable education/occupation is based on a high to low scale, i.e. middle/high level employees and unskilled/skilled labour. With respect to the variable age, a distinction was made between those aged between 20 and 45 years or older than 60. The speaker variables are shown in Table 1. In each case two speakers with the same language background, education and age variable talked for one hour without interruption of any kind.

Table 1: *Number of speakers in each cell divided according to speaker variables*

	low level of education		high level of education		total
	young	old	young	old	
language					
IMM	3	6	5	5	19
DIA	5	6	8	10	29
HD	8	--	8	3	19
total	16	12	21	18	67

This paper is organized as follows. In the second section I will focus on the *doen+infinitive* construction in Standard Dutch and in various Dutch dialects. In the third section I will examine the social stratification of the regional *doen+infinitive* construction in Heerlen Dutch. Furthermore, I will discuss whether regional *doen* combines with infinitives that are compounded. In the fourth section, I will discuss habitual aspect in Standard/Heerlen Dutch which can be expressed by adverbial expressions of time and compound verbs. Finally, I will show that the *doen+infinitive* construction in Heerlen Dutch expresses habitual aspect. Moreover, I will demonstrate that it is for this reason that *doen* in Heerlen Dutch favours the occurrence of infinitives that are compounded.

## 2. The *doen+infinitive* construction in Standard Dutch

In Standard Dutch there are three types of *doen* constructions, all of which are grammatical in Heerlen Dutch (cf. ANS 1984). First, the construction in (2) involves causative *doen*. This

example is taken from Verhagen (1994: 260). Note that the second NP is the subject of the infinitive, as illustrated in (3):

HD/SD:

- (2) De zon *doet* de temperatuur oplopen  
 the sun does the temperature rise<sub>inf</sub>  
 'The sun makes the temperature to rise'

HD/SD:

- (3) De temperatuur loopt op  
 the temperature rises  
 'The temperature is rising'

Secondly, in Heerlen Dutch, as in Standard Dutch, *doen* can be used as part of an anaphoric *doen* construction, as illustrated in (4). Note that the infinitival clause is used as an adjunct:<sup>3</sup>

HD/SD:

- (4) die *deden* niks anders als koeltorens tekenen  
 (24: Ris)  
 they did<sub>pl-past</sub> nothing else than cooling towers draw<sub>inf</sub>  
 'they did nothing but draw cooling towers'

Finally, in the construction in (5) *doen* is used emphatically. Compared to causative and anaphoric *doen*, (5) shows an inverted pattern or topicalisation, namely, the infinitive *kaarten* 'play cards' precedes the auxiliary *hebben* 'have'. What is more, *doen* appears as a past participle in (5):

HD/SD:

- (5) jawel kaarten hebben we altijd veel *gedaan* (35: Berk)  
 yes play-cards<sub>inf</sub> have we always a lot done<sub>partc</sub>  
 'yes, we used to play cards a lot'

All the data discussed in this section relate to both Standard Dutch and Heerlen Dutch; however, there is also a regional *doen+infinitive* construction that, unlike the *doen+infinitive* construction in Standard Dutch, cannot be analyzed as either a causative, anaphoric or emphatic use of *doen*. Consequently, this kind of *doen* has a marginal status in Standard Dutch.

### 2.1 Various kinds of *doen+infinitive* constructions in Dutch dialects

Since the use of one *doen+infinitive* construction, as in (1), is widely spread in regional Dutch varieties, namely in the province of Groningen, Drenthe, Twente, Zeeland and southern Dutch, it is impossible to claim a clear-cut geographical distribution (cf. Giesbers 1983/4). What is more, it is not certain which kind of *doen+infinitive* is involved since various dialects realize this construction differently.<sup>4</sup> Consider, for example, the following examples of the *doen+infinitive* in the dialect of Groningen that is spoken in the northeast of

<sup>3</sup> In the transcripts presented throughout the paper, the figure appearing before the speaker's pseudonym refers to the number of the tape-recording.

<sup>4</sup> I will consider the *doen+infinitive* construction in some dialects only by way of example. I will give no

the Netherlands. Both examples in (6) indicate that in Groningen *doen*, in addition to the auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’ and an infinitive, appears as a past participle (cf. ter Laan 1953: 156):

*dialect of Groningen:*

- (6) a. Zai het heur òl mouder ‘n bult ploagen *doan*  
 she has her old mother many tease<sub>inf</sub> done<sub>partc</sub>  
 ‘She has often teased her old mother’
- b. Hai het in zien levent wat zoepen *doan*  
 he has in his life some drunk<sub>inf</sub> done<sub>partc</sub>  
 ‘He has done some drinking in his life’

However, for another Dutch northern area, e.g. Twente, I have been unable to find constructions in which *doen* functions as a past participle. (7) indicates that if an infinitive is involved, *doen* only appears as the auxiliary (cf. Bezoen 1948: 61, Nuijstens 1962). Note, that the *doen* constructions in (7) are similar to the Heerlen Dutch *doen* constructions in (1):

*dialect of Twente:*

- (7) a. dee *deuden* kloompen verkoopen  
 they did wooden shoes sell<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘they sold wooden shoes’
- b. daor *deuden* ze bomziede maken  
 there did they vinegar make<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘they produced vinegar there’
- c. ze *deuden* em aait plaogen  
 they did him always tease<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘they always teased him’

### 3. The Heerlen Dutch spontaneous speech data

Since several kinds of *doen+infinitive* appear in the Dutch dialects, let us begin by considering the speech data corpus of Heerlen Dutch (cf. Cornips 1994a/b). First of all, I will look at the level of group speech (Labov 1966/1972). The specification of the social variables of the speakers of Heerlen Dutch in my survey makes it possible to investigate whether the speakers will show social stratification, in particular, with respect to the variable language background (see Table 1). Hence, according to the claims, as schematized in Figure 1, we would expect to find that speakers who speak the local dialect as their first language and Standard Dutch as their second language would use the *doen+infinitive* construction more often than the other groups of speakers.

Furthermore, I will focus on possible linguistic constraints of the *doen+infinitive* construction in Heerlen Dutch. In doing so it becomes possible to examine the claim that the regional *doen+infinitive* construction is used as a strategy in order to avoid morphologically complex verbs (see Fig. 1).

#### 3.1 Social stratification of regional *doen* usage

The number of speakers that produce the construction under investigation, e.g. the regional *doen+infinitive* in spontaneous speech is 18. This is shown in Table 2. Table 2 also shows the proportions of speakers who used *doen*. In order to assess social stratification on the use or non-use of the *doen* construction, I analyzed these proportions by means of a  $\chi^2$  test. Table 2 reveals only significant results for the occupation/education variable. More specifically, it shows that the group of speakers with a low level of education/occupation use *doen* significantly more often than the other groups of speakers. Thus, the expectation put forward that the dialect speakers would use the regional *doen+infinitive* construction more often than monolingual speakers is not confirmed. Hence, table 2 displays that there is no significant correlation between the use or non-use of the *doen+infinitive* construction and the variable language background. For completeness sake, note that with respect to this variable, the speakers who speak a variety of Heerlen Dutch (HD) as their first language, unlike the speakers of the local dialect (DIA), use the *doen+infinitive* construction most often, namely a proportion of .31:

Table 2: *Proportions of speakers in each cell using regional doen (spontaneous speech)*

DOEN	low level of education		high level of education		total
	young	old	young	old	
language	2/3	2/6	0/5	0/5	4/19 .21
IMM	2/5	1/6	2/8	3/10	8/29 .27
DIA	5/8	--	1/8	0/3	6/19 .31
HD					
total	9/16	3/12	3/21	3/18	18/67

$\chi^2$  (level of education)=10.62 df=1 p<.005

#### 3.2 *The thematic role of the subject and the kind of infinitive in the Heerlen Dutch doen construction*

The 18 speakers discussed above produced 33 tokens of the regional *doen+infinitive* construction (cf. Cornips 1994b). In all instances encountered, the regional *doen+infinitive* construction always combines with human subjects who perform or do the action expressed

by the predicate, that is to say, the subjects are construed as agents: that is that *doen* co-occurs with infinitives which belong either to the class of the so-called intransitive, active (or unergative) verbs or transitive verbs, as illustrated in (8) and (9), respectively. It is important to note that *doen* in (8) and (9) cannot be considered as causative *doen* (cf. (2)):

*Heerlen Dutch:*

- (8) a. ...die *doet* ook nou in de tuinen werken... (2: Wybe)  
 he does also now in the gardens work<sub>inf</sub>  
 'he is also working in the gardens now'  
 b. ...die *doen* veel hobbyen hier boven ..(14: Gij)s  
 they do a lot pursue-hobbies<sub>inf</sub> here upstairs  
 'they are pursuing their hobbies upstairs here a lot'

*Heerlen Dutch:*

- (9) a. ...*doe* nou die mensen terughalen in het werk... (13: Michiel)  
 do<sub>imp</sub> ADV those people back-fetch<sub>inf</sub> in the job  
 'get those people back on the job'  
 b. ...dan *doen* ze dat daar opdat doek projecteren...(35: mr Arends)  
 then do they it there onthat screen project<sub>inf</sub>  
 'then they are projecting it onto that screen'

Since the subject has the thematic role of agents, *doen* expectedly does not occur with infinitives which belong to the intransitive, unaccusative class, as demonstrated in (10). Generally, it is assumed that the grammatical subjects of unaccusative verbs, such as in (10), are themes (see Levin&Rappaport Hovav 1995 for a more extensive discussion of unaccusative verbs):

- (10) HD a. \*Jan *doet* sterven  
 Jan does die<sub>inf</sub>  
 HD b. \*Marie *doet* arriveren  
 Marie does arrive<sub>inf</sub>

Nor did my corpus contain any instances in which *doen* combines with subjects that have the thematic role of experiencer:

- (11) HD a. ?\*Jan *doet* het antwoord weten  
 Jan does the answer know<sub>inf</sub>  
 HD b. ?\*Marie *doet* het gebouw herkennen  
 Marie does the building recognise<sub>inf</sub>

### 3.3 Compound verbs

As mentioned above, it is assumed that the regional *doen+infinitive* construction is used as an avoidance strategy. Such a function of *doen* would be stylistic rather than syntactic in that its use would serve as to avoid the morphological complexity of compound verbs. The spontaneous speech data, however, show that about two third of the 33 tokens concern infinitives that are not compounded at all.

Only 9 out of 33 tokens concern infinitives that to a certain extent belong to the class of morphological complex verbs. This is illustrated for the infinitives *banden opleggen* ‘fit tyres’ and *zaalvoetballen* ‘play indoor football’ in (12a) (cf. (9a)) and (12b), respectively. Note that the infinitives are compounded of the verb and its direct object, namely *opleggen* ‘put-on’ plus *banden* ‘tyres’, and the verb *voetballen* ‘football’ plus NP *zaal* ‘hall’ denoting a location in (12a) and (12b), respectively.

- (12) a. ...die *doen* (...) *banden opleggen* dus op die auto's...  
 (12: Anton)  
 they do tires put-on<sub>inf</sub> ADV on those cars  
 'they are fitting tires onto those cars'
- b. ...*doe* een keer in de week nog *zaalvoetballen*...(30: Rob)  
 do one time in the week ADV hall-football<sub>inf</sub>  
 '[I] play indoor football once a week'

The following tokens show that the nine compound infinitives contain (i) verbs with direct objects, (ii) verbs with particles, such as *terug* 'back' and *apart* 'apart' (see also *op-halen*, *op-leggen* and *na-kijken* in (13)) and (iii) intransitive verbs in which nouns denoting locations are incorporated, as demonstrated in (13), (14) and (15), respectively:

- (13)  $V_{trans.} + NP_{D.O.}$   
 zuurstof halen 'get oxygen'  
 auto's spuiten 'spray-paint car'  
 melkbussen ophalen 'collect milk cans'  
 auto nakijken 'check car'
- banden opleggen (cf. (13a)) 'fit tyres'
- (14)  $V + particle$   
 terughalen (cf. (10a)) 'fetch back'  
 apart zetten 'set apart'
- (15)  $V_{intr.} + prep. NP$   
 voetballen 'play-football'  
 zaalvoetballen (cf. 13b)) 'play-indoor-football'

Table 3 gives an overview of the data discussed so far. Strikingly, 5 out of 7 transitive compound infinitives involve direct objects:

Table 3: *The distribution of doen according to [ $\pm trans$ ] and [ $\pm compound$ ] (spontaneous speech)*

Heerlen Dutch	subject has thematic role of <i>agens</i>			
	transitive inf.		intransitive, active inf.	
<i>doen+infinitiv</i>	+	-	+ <i>compound</i>	- <i>compound</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>compound</i>	<i>compoun</i>	N = 2:	N = 18
	N = 7:	<i>d</i>		
	5 -> V+NP	N = 6	2->V+prep.	
	<i>D.O.</i>		NP	
	2 ->			
	V+part.			
N=33		N = 13		N = 20

Summarizing my findings, in the Heerlen Dutch speech corpus the use of the *doen+infinitive* construction correlates only significantly with the variable education/occupation of the speakers. Thus the expectation put forward that that the dialect speakers would use regional *doen* most often is not confirmed. Secondly, for the larger part *doen* combines with

infinitives that are not morphological complex. Furthermore, the data reveal that *doen* requires a subject that is construed as an agent.

The following question arises: is the observation that compound verbs select *doen* correct (see fig. 1)? By addressing this question, I will propose that it is not the case that complex verbs select *doen* but it is the other way around. In fact, I will argue that it is the verb *doen* that actually favours the occurrence of complex verbs. Since in Standard Dutch as well as in Heerlen Dutch, habitual aspect may be expressed by compound verbs and, since *doen* expresses habitual aspect in Heerlen Dutch (as is the case in some German dialects; see Stein 1992), it is for this reason that *doen* combines easily with compound verbs.

#### 4. Habitual aspect in Standard Dutch

##### 4.1 Adverbial phrases of time and aspectual properties of the predicate

Although in Standard Dutch, habitual aspect cannot be expressed by any verb, there are other ways in which a habitual reading can be obtained. With respect to these non-verbal ways, it is important to keep in mind that Heerlen Dutch is similar to Standard Dutch.<sup>5</sup> First, habitual aspect can be expressed by means of adverbial phrases of time such as *altijd* 'always' and *een keer in de week* 'once a week', as presented in (16a) and (16b), respectively:

- (16) SD/HD a. Hij zingt *altijd*  
                   he sings always  
               SD/HD b. Hij stofzuigt *een keer in de week*  
   'He hovers once a week'

Furthermore, with respect to transitive predicates, the aspectual properties of the VP are determined by the object, in the sense that the object 'measures out' the event (Mulder 1992: 49). To this end, consider the following examples in which the (a)-variants indicate incidental events, whereas the (b)-variants bring about a habitual reading. This is also demonstrated by means of the different adverbial phrases of time.

First, a habitual reading is obtained by the use of a bare NP, such as *pijp* 'pipe' rather than *een pijp* 'a pipe' and a mass noun, such as *custard* and *spaghetti* in (17) and (18), respectively:

- (17) SD/HD a. Ik rook *een pijp* (voor de eerste keer)  
                   I smoke a pipe for the first time  
                   'I smoke a pipe for the first time'  
               SD/HD b. Ik rook *pijp* (??voor de eerste keer)  
                   I smoke pipe for the first time  
                   'I usually am smoking a pipe'
- (18) SD/HD a. Hij eet *een appel*  
                   he eats an apple  
                   'He is eating an apple'  
               SD/HD b. Hij eet *custard/spaghetti*  
                   he eats custard/spaghetti

<sup>5</sup> Note, that the examples in this section are not taken from my Heerlen Dutch speech data corpus but

'He regularly is eating soup/spaghetti'

Secondly, in the habitual sentence in (19b) the intransitive verb *rijden* 'drive' combines with a bare NP which is a part of a prepositional constituent in (19a):

- (19) SD/HD a. Hij rijdt *in de auto* naar Heerlen  
 he drives in the car to Heerlen  
 'He is driving to Heerlen by car'  
 SD/HD b. Hij rijdt *auto* (\*naar Heerlen)  
 he drives car to Heerlen  
 'He is able to drive a car'

Finally, a habitual reading may be expressed by a bare plural within a prepositional phrase, as is demonstrated in (20b):

- (20) SD/HD a. Zij zingt vanavond *in de opera*  
 she sings tonight in the opera  
 'She is singing in the opera tonight'  
 SD/HD b. Zij zingt (\*vanavond) *in opera's*  
 she sings tonight in opera's  
 'She is an opera singer'

Interestingly, in contrast to the habitual atelic predicates in the (b) sentences given above, it leads to an ungrammatical result if telic activity verbs combine with bare (plural) nouns and mass nouns. Apparently, bare plurals and mass nouns have difficulty in occupying the object position of telic activity verbs, despite the fact that these verbs require an object, as can be seen in (21b) and (21c), respectively:

- (21) SD/HD a. Jan eet een/de appel *op*  
 Jan eats a/the apple 'UP'  
 'Jan is eating (up) a/the apple up'  
 SD/HD b. \*Jan eet appels/spaghetti *op*  
 Jan eats apples/spaghetti 'UP'  
 'Jan is eating apples/spaghetti completely'  
 SD/HD c. \*Jan eet *op*  
 Jan eats 'UP'

#### 4.2 Incorporation or complex verbs

Hopper and Thompson (1980: 252) regard the notion of transitivity as a scalar phenomenon and claim transitivity to be identifiable by several parameters. Some parameters of high transitivity are, among others, telicity or perfectivity, a totally affected object and an individuated object, that is to say, an object which consists of a noun that is concrete, singular, countable, referential and definite. From the above, it is clear that the (b) sentences involve atelicity, a non-affected and a non-individuated object. It is for this reason that Van Hout (cited in De Hoop 1992) argues that atelic activity verbs, such as the habitual examples in the (b) sentences, require one argument whereas telic verbs, such as in (21a) and (21c).

require two arguments. In addition, according to De Hoop (1992 and references cited there) the ungrammaticality of (21b) can be accounted for if we assume that non-individuated nouns like bare NP's do not have the status of real objects but that they must be interpreted as part of the predicate, e.g. as a predicate modifier. More evidence in support of this assumption is the fact that predicate modifiers, in contrast to real objects, can only be found in a position to the right of adverbials, as is illustrated in (22) and (23), respectively (cf. De Hoop 1992):

- (22) SD/HD a. dat Jan *alweer* spaghetti eet  
                   that Jan again spaghetti eats  
               SD/HD b. \*dat Jan spaghetti *alweer* eet  
                           'that Jan is eating spaghetti again'
- (23) SD/HD a. dat Jan *vandaag* een appel eet  
                   that Jan today an apple eats  
               SD/HD b. dat Jan een appel *vandaag* eet  
                           'that Jan is eating an apple today'

Interestingly, De Hoop (1992) argues that if object NP's of atelic activity verbs have to be interpreted as part of a one-place predicate, the phenomenon of object incorporation can be conceived as the ultimate morphological realization of this interpretation. And, indeed, we see that two of the habitual predicates given above, allow for object incorporation, as is illustrated in the so-called *aan het V-* 'at the V'-construction' in (24):

- (24) SD/HD a. Hij is aan het pijproken (cf. (17b))  
                   he is at the pipe-smoke  
                   'He is smoking a pipe'  
               SD/HD b. Hij is aan het autorijden (cf. (19b))  
                   he is at the car-drive  
                   'He is driving a car'

Strikingly, in the dialect of Groningen the phenomenon of incorporation is more free and productive than in Standard/Heerlen Dutch. Consider the following examples of object and prepositional noun incorporation in (25) and (26), respectively, taken from Schuurman (1987: 185,188):

*dialect of Groningen:*

- (25) \*SD/\*HD a. dat e zat te *eerabbels schillen*  
                   that he sat to potatoes peel  
                   'that he was peeling potatoes'  
               \*SD/\*HD b. dat e *keziene* *vaarfd* het  
                   that he window-frames painted has  
                   'that he painted window-frames'
- (26) \*SD/\*HD Hai ston te (\*op) *slootje kaauwen*  
                   he stood to (on) tobacco chew  
                   'He was chewing tobacco'

Given the discussion above, we would expect that the constructions in (25) and (26) express a habitual reading since the objects and the noun in the prepositional phrase in (25) and (26), respectively, are not real objects but predicate modifiers. And, indeed, in Schuurman (cf.

1987: 192) it is argued that these constructions express both a generic/habitual reading. Further evidence is provided by the fact that incorporation in the Groningen dialect is only grammatical if the verbs belong to the aspectual class of activities (Schuurman 1987: 189). To this end, consider the contrast in (27):

- (27) *Groningen*
- |    |                     |                   |
|----|---------------------|-------------------|
| a. | *te hoezen bezitten | ‘to own houses’   |
| b. | *te senten hebben   | ‘to have money’   |
| c. | te hoezen verkopen  | ‘to sell houses’  |
| d. | te peerden fokken   | ‘to breed horses’ |

Summarizing, until now I have discussed that, although habitual aspect in Standard Dutch is not a verbal phenomenon, it may be achieved by means of specific adverbial phrase of time that indicate a plurality of events. What is more, I have demonstrated that the aspectual properties of the predicate are determined by the nature of the object. If the object is non-affected and non-individuated (Hopper and Thompson 1980), that is to say, if the object involves a bare (plural) NP or a mass noun, a reading emerges in which the object acts as a predicate modifier. In such cases, habitual aspect may be expressed. Finally, a process of incorporation or the formation of complex verbs becomes possible. Furthermore, I have discussed that the non-verbal ways by which habitual aspect can be expressed in Standard Dutch are also acceptable in Heerlen Dutch.

In the following section, I will discuss that since in Heerlen Dutch *doen* expresses habitual aspect, it easily combines with the same kind of adverbial phrases of time and, furthermore, favours the occurrence of compound verbs.

## 5. Habitual *doen* in Heerlen Dutch

### 5.1 Analysis

In this section I will argue that the *doen+infinitive* construction in Heerlen Dutch expresses activities of the agents that have a regular pattern and, in contrast, do not have an incidental reading. I will therefore argue that *doen* determines the aspectual properties of the entire sentence, that is to say, the use of *doen* brings about an event structure in which an event is depicted as habitual (presentational aspect). This can be accounted for if we assume that *doen* indicates a functional projection AspPhrase which must be outside the VP. More specifically, I will assume the base structure in (28b):

- (28) HD
- |    |  |     |                     |
|----|--|-----|---------------------|
| a. | Ik <sub>NP1</sub>  | doe | werken <sub>v</sub> |
|    | I  | do  | work                |
| b. | [ <sub>IP</sub> [ <sub>I'</sub> [ <sub>ASPP</sub> [ <sub>ASP'</sub> doen [ <sub>VP</sub> NP1 [ <sub>V'</sub> V]]]]]] |     |                     |

An argument for *doen* being the aspectual head derives from the fact that in the corpus *doen* always appears as an auxiliary and, hence, never shows up as a past participle. As noted above, in contrast to the dialect of Groningen, a similar pattern is found in the dialects of Twente (cf. (7)). Consequently, *doen* has to carry, in addition to agreement and tense, aspectual features as well. So, in Heerlen Dutch it leads to an ungrammatical result if, instead of *doen*, auxiliaries, such as *hebben* ‘have’ and *gaan* ‘go in (29a) and (29b), respectively, determine the way the event is depicted and, hence, are related to presentational aspect:

- (29) HD
- |    |  |
|----|--|
| a. | *Hij heeft werken <i>gedaan</i> (cf. (6))          |
|    | he has work <sub>inf</sub> done <sub>partc</sub>   |
| HD | b. *Hii gaat <i>doen</i> werken/werken <i>doen</i> |

He goes  $do_{inf}$   $work_{inf}/work_{inf}$   $do_{inf}$

More evidence in support of this assumption can be found in the minimal pairs with and without *doen* in (30) and (31). It shows that it is interesting to have a closer look at the individual occurrences of verbs that combine with and without *do*. These minimal pairs were uttered by two speakers ('Cor' and 'mr Arends', respectively) on the same occasion. Strikingly, it appears that the same verbs show up with and without *doen* even while one speaker is maintaining the same level of speech style. It can be argued that the (a) sentences indicate a plurality of events whereas the (b) sentences without *doen* express an incidental activity:

HD:

- (30) a. ...een jongen (...) *doet* ook vissen... (19: Cor)  
           a boy                    does also fish<sub>inf</sub>...  
           '...a boy (...) is also fishing...'  
       b. ...hij vist       ook wel eens... (19: Cor)  
           he fishes    too   well once...  
           'he occasionally goes fishing, too'

HD:

- (31) a. ...die       *doet* me       die auto altijd               nakijken... (35: mr  
 Arends)  
           that [man] does me<sub>io</sub> this car    always check<sub>inf</sub>  
           'he is always checking the car for me'  
       b. ...ik heb vandaag nog eens alles               nagekeken... (35: mr Arends)  
           I have today ADV once everything checked  
           'today, I have checked everything once more'

## 5.2 Adverbial phrases of time in Heerlen Dutch

So far, I have argued that *doen* in Heerlen Dutch is not a meaningless element but it has a function in syntax, i.e. *doen* expresses habitual aspect. If the *doen+infinitive* construction really expresses habitual aspect we would expect this construction to combine only with a certain class of time adverbials, i.e. adverbs indicating a plurality of events, as is the case in Standard Dutch. Furthermore, we would expect that *doen* easily combines with objects that can be interpreted as predicate modifiers.

First, let us consider the question of the presence of adverbial phrases of time, and suppose that *doen* is a meaningless element. If this assumption is correct, we would expect the *doen+infinitive* construction to have the same syntactic properties as its counterpart without *doen*. To be more precise, we would expect combining the two kinds of constructions with the same kinds of adverbial phrases of time leads to a grammatical result. However, as illustrated in (31), this expectation is not borne out. The *doen* construction in (31a) may combine with a quantifier over the temporal domain, such as *altijd* ‘always’, whereas in (31b) an adverb that expresses an incidental reading, such as *nog eens* ‘once more’ appears. Apparently, the adverbial phrases of time can intensify the habitual reading that is already expressed by the predicate.

So, if the assumption mentioned earlier is correct, we would expect the Heerlen Dutch corpus to contain instances in which the *doen+infinitive* construction combines only with adverbial phrases that suggest a plurality event reading. And, indeed, in the corpus, we only find adverbial phrases that intensify the habitual reading of the action already expressed by the predicate. Consider, for example, the *doen* constructions in (32) with adverbials, such as ‘*s zaterdags en vaak* ‘*s zondags* ‘on saturday and often on sunday’, *alleen maar* ‘only’ and *altijd* ‘always’ appear. The corpus contains 7 out of 33 tokens which combine with such an adverbial phrase:

HD:

- (32) a. ...*deed* ik ‘*s zaterdags en vaak* ‘*s zondags* (...) m’n huiswerk  
 maken...(15: Jan)  
 did I on saturday and often on sunday my homework make<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘I often did my homework on saturday and on sunday’
- b. ...ik *deed alleen maar* sporten...(20: Jeroen)  
 I did only just do-sport<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘Doing sport, that is all I did’
- c. ...ik *doe* dan *altijd* kijken (26: mr Bon)  
 I do then always look<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘I am always watching then’

So, a restriction has to be formulated with respect to the kind of adverbial phrases of time in the *doen+infinitive* construction. In contrast to (33), the adverbial phrases in (34) are grammatical:

- (33) \**één/eerste keer* ‘once/for the first time’  
 \**wel eens* ‘once in a while’  
 \**alleen vandaag* ‘only today’
- (34) *alleen maar* ‘just’  
*altijd/nooit* ‘always’/‘never’  
*vaak/veel* ‘often’

elke week/keer      ‘every/each week/time’

Interestingly, in the dialect of Twente we find a lot of *doen+infinitive* constructions with the same adverbial phrases as in Heerlen Dutch (cf. Nuijstens 1962: 154):

*dialect of Twente:*

- (35) a. Hij *doet alleen maar* luieren  
 He does only just idle-away<sub>inf</sub>  
 'He is just idling away'
- b. In school *doe ik niet meer* praten  
 in school do I never more talk<sub>inf</sub>  
 'I am not talking at school anymore'

### 5.3 Aspectual properties of the *doen* predicates

Furthermore, as we would expect on the basis of the occurrence of habitual aspect in Standard Dutch and, we would expect that *doen* easily combines with objects that can be interpreted as predicate modifiers. And indeed, this is the case. The constructions in (36) involve bare plural nouns and, hence, the infinitives can be considered as complex verbs (cf. Table 3):

HD:

- (36) a. ...die *doen* (...) *banden opleggen* dus op die auto's...  
 (12: Anton)  
 they do tyres put-on<sub>inf</sub> ADV on those cars  
 'they are fitting tyres onto those cars'
- b. ...*doe* je ook *auto's spuiten* en zo...(27: Martijn)  
 do you also cars spray-paint<sub>inf</sub> and so  
 'do you also spray cars with paint'

With respect to the *doen+infinitive* constructions in the Twente dialect as discussed above, it may be assumed that in this kind of dialect the objects function as predicate modifiers, too (cf. (7)). This is demonstrated by the Standard Dutch translations of Bezoen that already indicate a habitual reading, as illustrated in (38):

*dialect of Twente:*

- (37) a. *dee deuden klompen verkoopen* (cf. (7a))  
 they did wooden shoes sell<sub>inf</sub>
- b. *daor deuden ze bomziede maken* (cf. (7b))  
 there did they vinegar make<sub>inf</sub>
- (38) a. 'Daar plachten ze klompen te verkopen' (cf. Bezoen (37a))  
 'They used to sell wooden shoes, there'
- b. 'Ze fabriceerden azijn daar' (cf. Bezoen (37b))  
 'They used to produce vinegar there'

Moreover, it is interesting to have a closer look at the aspectual properties of the *doen+infinitive* constructions. Until now, I have discussed *doen+infinitive* constructions involving compound verbs that express atelic readings. First, let us consider the infinitives which belong to the intransitive class (N=20, cf. Table 3). It appears that these infinitives, regardless of the question whether they are compounded or not, combine only with adverbial phrases of duration such as *een jaar lang* 'for a year' whereas adverbial phrases that represent the end of the action expressed by the predicate, such as *binnen/in een jaar* 'within a year' are excluded (cf. Jackendoff 1996: 305). The examples in (39) show that the intransitive *doen+infinitive* constructions involve atelic activities. that is to sav. these intransitives

express a length of time during which the event or activity exists or happens. Moreover, since *doen* expresses habitual aspect, a plurality of events is presented:

HD:

- (39) a. ...ik *doe* timmeren en opbouwen..(12: Anton) een jaar lang/\*in een jaar  
 I do hammer<sub>inf</sub> and build-up<sub>inf</sub> for a year/within a  
 year  
 ‘I am a carpenter and a builder’
- b. ...als je voetballen *doet*...(14: Gijs) een jaar lang/\*in  
 een jaar if you football<sub>inf</sub> do for a year/within a  
 year  
 ‘if you are playing football’
- c. ...ik *deed* sleutelen...(27: Dik) een jaar lang/\*in  
 een jaar I did repair<sub>inf</sub> for a year/within a  
 year  
 ‘I did repairs’

With respect to transitive predicates that do involve an object, the Heerlen Dutch examples demonstrate that these predicates express both iterative imperfectivity and iterative perfectivity, as demonstrated in (40a) and (40b), respectively. Obviously, transitive predicates, too, indicate a plurality of events. Furthermore, in the telic construction (40b) each event or activity is viewed as self-contained (cf. Harris 1984: 306):

- (40) a. ...dan *doe* ik hem föhnen...(26: mr Bon) één uur lang/\*in één uur  
 then do I him blow-dry<sub>inf</sub> for one  
 hour/within one hour  
 ‘then I am blow-drying him’
- b. ...die(...) *doe* ik apart zetten...(25: mr Menen) \*één uur lang/in één uur  
 those do I apart put<sub>inf</sub> for one  
 hour/within one hour  
 ‘I am putting these apart’

### Concluding remarks

We may conclude that in Heerlen Dutch *doen* (i) does not show any significant correlation with respect to language background of the speakers, or more specifically, it is not the case that speakers of the local dialect use regional *doen* more often than native speakers of Heerlen Dutch and (ii) the assumption that *doen* is only used as a strategy in order to avoid the inflection of morphological complex verbs cannot be maintained. I have argued that since the *doen+infinitive* construction expresses habitual aspect, it may easily combine with modifiers that already indicate a habitual reading in Standard/Heerlen Dutch. These modifiers are (i) specific adverbial phrases of time, namely the ones that indicate a plurality of events and (ii) compound verbs, e.g. infinitives involving NP’s that do not have the status of real objects but, instead, they function as predicate modifiers. Furthermore, I have demonstrated that the *doen+infinitive* constructions express both iterative imperfectivity and iterative perfectivity.

## References

- Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (ANS) (1984), Geerts, G. e.a. (eds). Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Bezoen, H.L. (1948), *Taal en volk van Twente*. Assen: Van Gorcum
- Cornips, L. (1994)a, *Syntactische variatie in het Algemeen Nederlands van Heerlen*. Diss. University of Amsterdam/IFOTT.
- Cornips, L. (1994)b, De hardnekkige vooroordelen over de regionale *doen+infinitief*-constructie *Forum der Letteren* 35, 4: 282-294.
- De Hoop, H. (1992), *Case configuration and Noun Phrase interpretation*. Diss. University of Groningen.
- Duinhoven, A.M. (1994), Het hulpwerkwoord *doen* heeft afgedaan. *Forum der Letteren* 35, 2: 110-131.
- Giesbers, H. (1983-1984), Doe jij lief spelen? Notities over het perifrastisch *doen*. *Mededelingen van de Nijmeegse Centrale voor Dialect- en Naamkunde* 19, 57-64.
- Harris, J. (1984), Syntactic variation and dialect convergence. *Journal of Linguistics* 20: 303- 327.
- Hinskens, F. (1993), *Dialect levelling in Limburg. Structural and sociolinguistic aspects*. Diss. University of Nijmegen
- Hopper, P.J. and S.A. Thompson (1980), Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56,2: 251-299.
- Jackendoff, R. 1996. Measuring out, Telicity, and Quantification in English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14. 305-354.
- Laan, K. ter (1953), *Proeve van een Groninger spraakkunst*. Winschoten: van der Veen.
- Labov, W. (1966), *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, W. (1972), *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Levin, B.&M. Rappaport Hovav (1995). *Unaccusativity. At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: MIT press.
- Mulder, R. (1992), *The aspectual nature of syntactic complementation*. Diss. University of Leiden/HIL.
- Nuijten, E. (1962), *De tweetalige mens*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp.
- Schuurman, I. (1987), Incorporation in the Groningen dialect. In: F. Beukema and P. Coopmans (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1987*:185-194. Foris Publications, Dordrecht.
- Stein, D. (1992), *Doen* and *tun*: A semantics and varieties based approach to syntactic change. In: M. Gerritsen and D. Stein (eds) *Internal and external factors in syntactic change*. Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 131-156.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (1990), The origin and development of periphrastic auxiliary *do*. A case of destigmatisation. *Nowele* 16, 3-52.
- Verhagen, A. (1994), Taalverandering en cultuurverandering: *doen* en *laten* sinds de 18e eeuw. *Forum der Letteren* 35, 4: 256-271.

Amsterdam, 7 november 1996,

Dag Ingrid,

Bij deze stuur ik je de herziene versie 'habitual doen in Heerlen Dutch' retour. Ik heb bijna alle aanwijzingen en suggesties voor verbeteringen van je overgenomen.

Wat ik niet heb gedaan is:

1. De Nederlandse zinnen zijn eerst geglossed waarna correcte Engelse vertaling gegeven wordt (is gecontroleerd door native speaker) die herkenbaar is omdat deze tussen " haakjes staat. In de glos heb ik natuurlijk nergens een -ing vorm overgenomen, wel in de Engelse vertaling. Ook is het heel ongebruikelijk om in de glos of in de vertalingen asterisken op te nemen.

2. Wat betreft tabel 2. Er is slechts één significante correlatie, andere cijfers kunnen wijzen op tendensen maar zouden net zo goed toevallig kunnen zijn. Het cijfer  $>.005$  heb ik niet veranderd in  $>0.005$  omdat dat echt heel ongebruikelijk is.

3. §2.1. heb ik er toch in laten staan omdat -hoewel inderdaad fragmentarisch- het een goed inzicht geeft in de variatie van *doen* in het Nederlandse taalgebied.

4. De uitdraai heeft een andere lay-out dan die op de flop staat, dat komt omdat de uitdraai Mac-versie en de flop DOS-versie is.

Ingrid, bedankt voor het redactionele commentaar. Mocht de redactie nog vragen hebben dan hoor ik 't natuurlijk graag. Ik ben erg benieuwd hoe de bundel eruit gaat zien.

met vriendelijke groet,

Leonie Cornips

*Do/Tun/Doen* in English, Dutch and German. History and present-day variation symposium, University of Leiden, IFOTT, March 15 1996.

### **Habitual doen in Heerlen Dutch**

Leonie Cornips (P.J. Meertens-Institute/KNAW, email: Leonie.Cornips@let.uva.nl)

SD=Standard Dutch, HD=Heerlen Dutch:

- (1) ?SD/HDa. Zij doet werken /\*gewerkt  
           she does work<sub>inf</sub> /worked<sub>partc</sub>  
           ‘She works’  
       ?SD/HDb. Zij doet haar huiswerk maken  
           she does her homework make<sub>inf</sub>  
           ‘She does her homework’

- (2) “Zij: Goed zo. Is Ventje fijn met baas uit wezen *doene daan*?  
 Hondje: Wrrraf! Waf!  
 Hij: Ja, ja ik weet het. Ventje heeft nog geen brokje kregen *doene daan*.  
 Zij: Hier is vrouw al met brokje. Ventje lekker brokje eten *doene daan*.  
 (... ....)  
 Zij: ...Als er andere mensen bij zijn, moeten we niet *doene daan* zeggen, hoor.”  
 from: W. de Bie ‘*Meneer Foppe en het gedoe*’ 1987:170

“She: Oh lookee here, my baby-waybe is back from his walky-walk!  
 Doggy: Woof, woof!  
 He: Yes. siree. He did a great big doggie-do. and now he wants his dinner-winner.

She: Well here comes mommy with a great big bowl. Doggie-woggie's gonna eat it right up, aren't you boy?

(... ...)

She: I sure hope we can remember to cut out the talkie-walky talk when people are around"

Figure 1: *The discourse domain of the doen + infinitive construction*  
**doen+infinitive** (cf. (1))

*Standard Dutch*

- child grammar
- 'substandard' colloquial speech
- 'unexperienced' adult speakers

*Regional Dutch varieties, e.g.*

Heerlen Dutch

- adult grammar
- dialect speakers who speak SD as a second language
- strategy in order to avoid morphological compound verbs

HD/SD:

- (3) a. De zon doet de temperatuur oplopen  
 the sun does/lets the temperature raise<sub>inf</sub>  
 'The sun raises the temperature'
- b. die opbouwwerker *deed* de heer Y aan mij voorstellen (15: Peter)  
 that social worker did<sub>sg-past</sub> mister Y to me  
 introduce<sub>inf</sub>  
 'that social worker had mister Y introduced to me'

HD/SD:

- (4) a. De temperatuur loopt op  
 the temperature raises
- b. dat Jan zich voorstelde aan mij  
 that Jan REFL introduced to me

HD/SD:

- (5) *diededen* niks anders als koeltorens tekenen (24: Ris)  
 they did<sub>pl-past</sub> nothing else than cooling towers draw<sub>inf</sub>  
 'they did nothing else than drawing cooling towers'

HD/SD:

- (6) jawel kaarten hebben we altijd veel gedaan (35: Berk)  
 yes play-cards<sub>inf</sub> have we always a lot done<sub>partc</sub>  
 'yes, we always played cards a lot'

*dialect of Groningen:*

- (7) a. Zai het heur òl mouder 'n bult ploagen doan  
 she has her old mother many tease<sub>inf</sub> done<sub>partc</sub>  
 'She has often teased her old mother'
- b. Hai het in zien levent wat zoepen doan  
 he has in his life some drunk<sub>inf</sub> done<sub>partc</sub>  
 'He did some drinking in his life'

*dialect of Twente:*

- (8) a. dee deuden kloopen verkoopen  
 they did wooden shoes sell<sub>inf</sub>  
 'they sold wooden shoes'
- b. daor deuden ze homziede maken

there did they vinegar make<sub>inf</sub>  
'they produced vinegar there'

c. ze deuden em aait plaogen  
they did him always tease<sub>inf</sub>  
'they always teased him'

- IMPORT: speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as a first language and whose parents were born outside the province of Limburg;  
 DIALECT: speakers who speak the local dialect as a first language and (Heerlen) Dutch as a second language;  
 HEERLEN DUTCH: speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as a first language and whose parents speak the local dialect as a first language.

Table 1: *Number of speakers in each cell divided according to speaker variables*

	low level of education		high level of education		total
	young	old	young	old	
language	3	6	5	5	19
IMP	5	6	8	10	29
DIA	8	--	8	3	19
HD					
total	16	12	21	18	67

Table 2: *Proportions of speakers in each cell using doen (spontaneous speech)*

DO	low level of education		high level of education		total
	young	old	young	old	
language	2/3	2/6	0/5	0/5	4/19
IMP	2/5	1/6	2/8	3/10	21% 8/29
DIA	5/8	--	1/8	0/3	27%
HD					6/19
total	9/16 56%	3/12 25%	3/21 14%	3/18 17%	18/67 27%

$\chi^2$  (level of education)=10.62 df=1 p<.005

*Heerlen Dutch:*

- (9) a. ...die doet ook nou in de tuinen werken... (2: Wybe)  
 he does also now in the gardens work<sub>inf</sub>  
 'He works in the gardens now'  
 b. ...die doen veel hobbyen hier boven ..(14: Gijs)  
 they do a lot pursue-hobbies<sub>inf</sub> here upstairs  
 'They pursue their hobbies upstairs a lot'

*Heerlen Dutch:*

- (10) a. ...doenou die mensen terughalen in het werk... (13: Michiel)  
 do<sub>imp</sub> ADV those people back-fetch<sub>inf</sub> in the work  
 'Fetch those people back into work'  
 b. ...dandoen ze dat daar opdat doek projecteren...(35: mr Arends)  
 then do they it there onthat screen project<sub>inf</sub>  
 'Then, they project it onto the screen'

- (11) HD a. \*Jan doet sterven

Jan does die<sub>inf</sub>  
HD b. \*Marie doet arriveren  
Marie does arrive<sub>inf</sub>

- (12) HD a. ?\*Jandoet het antwoord weten  
 Jan does the answer know<sub>inf</sub>  
 HD b. ?\*Marie doet het gebouw herkennen  
 Marie does the building recognise<sub>inf</sub>
- (13) a. ...die doen (...) *banden opleggen* dus op die auto's...  
 (12: Anton)  
 they do tyres put-on<sub>inf</sub> ADV on those cars  
 'they fit tyres onto those cars'  
 b. ...doe een keer in de week nog *zaalvoetballen*...(30: Rob)  
 do one time in the week ADV hall-football<sub>inf</sub>  
 '[I] play indoor football once a week'
- (14)  $V_{trans.} + NP_{D.O.}$   
 zuurstof halen 'get oxygen'  
 auto's spuiten 'spray-paint car'  
 melkbussen ophalen 'collect milk cans'  
 auto nakijken 'check car'
- banden opleggen* (cf. (13a)) 'fit tyres'
- (15)  $V + particle$   
 terughalen (cf. (10a)) 'fetch back'  
 apart zetten 'set apart'
- (16)  $V_{intr.} + prep. NP$   
 voetballen 'play-football'  
 zaalvoetballen (cf. 13b)) 'play-indoor-football'

Table 3: *The distribution of doen according to [ $\pm trans$ ] and [ $\pm compound$ ] (spontaneous speech)*

Heerlen Dutch		subject has thematic role of <i>agens</i>			
		transitive inf.		intransitive, active inf.	
<i>doen+infini</i> <i>tive</i>	+ <i>compound</i>	-	+ <i>compound</i>	-	
	N = 7:	<i>compoun</i> <i>d</i>	N = 2:	<i>compoun</i> <i>d</i>	
	5 -> $V+NP$	N = 6	2-> $V+prep.$ $NP$	N = 18	
	<i>D.O.</i> 2 -> $V+part.$	-		-	
N=33	N = 13		N = 20		

- (17) SD/HD a. Hij zingt altijd  
 he sings always  
 SD/HD b. Hij stofzuigt een keer in de week  
 'he hoovers once a week'
- (18) SD/HD a. Ik rook een pijp (voor de eerste keer)  
 I smoke a pipe for the first time  
 SD/HD b. Ik rook pijp (??voor de eerste keer)  
 I smoke pipe for the first time

'Usually, I smoke a pipe'

- (19) SD/HD a. Hij eet een appel  
 he eats an apple  
 SD/HD b. Hij eet soep/spaghetti  
 he eats soup/spaghetti  
 ‘Regularly, he eats soup/spaghetti’
- (20) SD a. Hij rijdt in de auto naar Heerlen  
 he drives in the car to Heerlen  
 SD b. Hij rijdt auto (\*naar Heerlen)  
 he drives car to Heerlen  
 ‘He is able to drive a car’
- (21) SD/HD a. Zij zingt vanavond in het koor  
 she sings tonight in the choir  
 SD/HD b. Zij zingt (\*vanavond) in koren  
 she sings tonight in choirs  
 ‘Usually, she sings in choirs’
- (22) SD/HD a. Jan eet een/de appel op  
 Jan eats an/the apple up  
 SD/HD b. \*Jan eet appels/soep op  
 Jan eats apples/soup up  
 SD/HD c. \*Jan eet op  
 Jan eats up
- (23) SD/HD a. dat Jan alweer soep eet  
 that Jan again soup eats  
 SD/HD b. \*dat Jan soep alweer eet
- (24) SD/HD a. dat Jan vandaag een appel eet  
 that Jan today an apple eats  
 SD/HD b. dat Jan een appel vandaag eet
- (25) SD/HD a. Hij is aan het pijpen (cf. (18b))  
 he is to the pipe-smoke  
 ‘He is smoking a pipe’  
 SD/HD b. Hij is aan het autorijden (cf. (19b))  
 he is to the car-drive  
 ‘he is driving a car’

*dialect of Groningen:*

- (26) \*SD/\*HD a. dat e zat te eerabbels schillen  
 that he sat to potatoes peel  
 \*SD/\*HD b. dat e keziene vaarf het  
 that he window-frames painted has
- (27) \*SD/\*HD Hai ston te (\*op) sloatje kaauwen  
 he stood to (on) tobacco chew  
 ‘He was chewing tobacco’

- (28) *Groningen* a. \*te hoezen bezitten ‘to own houses’  
 b. \*te senten hebben ‘to have money’  
 c. te hoezen verkopen ‘to sell houses’  
 d. te peerden fokken ‘to breed horses’

- (29) HD a. Ik<sub>NP1</sub> doe werken<sub>v</sub>  
 I do work  
 b. DS: [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>I'</sub> [<sub>ASPP</sub> [<sub>ASP'</sub> doen [<sub>VP</sub> NP1 [<sub>V'</sub> V]]]]]]

- (30) HD a. \*Hij heeft werken gedaan (cf. (7))  
 he has work<sub>inf</sub> done<sub>partc</sub>  
 HD b. \*Hij gaat doen werken/werken doen  
 He goes do<sub>inf</sub> work<sub>inf</sub>/work<sub>inf</sub> do<sub>inf</sub>

HD:

- (31) a. ...een jongen (...) doet ook vissen... (19: Cor)  
 a boy does also fish<sub>inf</sub>...  
 ‘A boy fishes also’  
 b. ...hij vist ook wel eens... (19: Cor)  
 he fishes too well once...  
 ‘He fishes once in a while, too’

HD:

- (32) a. ...die doet me die auto altijd nakijken... (35: dhr Arends)  
 that (man) does me<sub>io</sub> this car always check<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘He always check this car for me’  
 b. ...ik heb vandaag nog eens alles nagekeken... (35: dhr Arends)  
 I have today adv once everything checked  
 ‘Today, I have checked everything once more’

HD:

- (33) a. ...deed ik ‘s zaterdags en vaak ‘s zondags (...) m’n huiswerk maken... (15: Jan)  
 did I on saturdays and often on sundays my homework make<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘Often, I did my homework on saturdays and on sundays’  
 b. ...ik deed *alleen* *maar* sporten... (20: Jeroen)  
 I did only just do-sport<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘Doing sport, that is all I did’  
 c. ...ik doe dan *altijd* kijken (26: dhr Bon)  
 I do then always look<sub>inf</sub>  
 ‘then, I always watch’

- (34) \*één/eerste keer ‘one/first time’  
 \*wel eens ‘once in a while’  
 \*alleen vandaag ‘only today’

- (35) alleen maar ‘just only’  
 altijd/nooit ‘always’/‘never’  
 vaak/veel ‘often’  
 elke week/keer ‘everv/each week/time’

*dialect of Twente:*

- (36) a. Hij doet *alleen maar* luieren  
He does only just idle-away<sub>inf</sub>  
He is just only idling away'
- b. In school doe ik *niet meer* praten  
in school do I never more talk<sub>inf</sub>  
'I am not talking at school anymore'

HD:

- (37) a. ...die doen (...) *banden opleggen* dus op die auto's...  
 (12: Anton)  
 they do tyres put-on<sub>inf</sub> ADV on those cars  
 'they fit tyres onto those cars'  
 b. ...doe je ook *auto's spuiten* en zo...(27: Martijn)  
 do you also cars spray-paint<sub>inf</sub> and so

*dialect of Twente:*

- (38) a. dee deuden *kloompen verkoopen* (cf. (8a))  
 they did wooden shoes sell<sub>inf</sub>  
 b. daor deuden ze *bomziede maken* (cf. (8b))  
 there did they vinegar make<sub>inf</sub>
- (39) a. 'Daar plachten ze klompen te verkopen' (cf. Bezoen (38a))  
 'They used to sell wooden shoes'  
 b. 'Ze fabriceerden azijn daar' (cf. Bezoen (38b))  
 'They used to produce vinegar there'

HD:

- (40) a. ...ik doe timmeren en opbouwen..(12: Anton) een jaar lang/\*in een jaar  
 I do hammer<sub>inf</sub> and build-up<sub>inf</sub> for a year/within a  
 year  
 'I am a carpenter and a builder'  
 b. ...als je voetballen doet...(14: Gijs) een jaar lang/\*in  
 een jaar if you football<sub>inf</sub> doen for a year/within a  
 year  
 'If you are playing football'  
 c. ...je doet graag tuinieren...() een jaar lang/\*in  
 een jaar you do gladly cultivate<sub>inf</sub> for a year/within a  
 year  
 'You are gardening with pleasure'  
 d. ...ik deed sleutelen...(27: Dik) een jaar lang/\*in  
 een jaar I did repair<sub>inf</sub> for a year/within a  
 year  
 'I was repairing'
- (41) a. ...dan doe ik hem föhnen...(26: dhr Bon) één uur lang/\*in één uur  
 then do I him blow-dry<sub>inf</sub> for one  
 hour/within one hour  
 'then, I am blow-drying him'  
 b. ...die(...) doe ik apart zetten...(25: dhr Menen) \*één uur lang/in één uur  
 those do I apart put<sub>inf</sub> for one  
 hour/within one hour  
 'I am putting these apart'

**References**

- Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst (ANS)* (1984), Geerts, G. e.a. (eds). Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Bezoen, H.L. (1948), *Taal en volk van Twente*. Assen: Van Gorcum
- Cornips, L. (1994)a, *Syntactische variatie in het Algemeen Nederlands van Heerlen*. University of Amsterdam/IFOTT.
- Cornips, L. (1994)b, De hardnekkige vooroordelen over de regionale *doen+infinitief*-constructie *Forum der Letteren* 35, 4: 282-294.
- De Hoop, H. (1992), Case configuration and Noun Phrase interpretation. University of Groningen.
- Duinhoven, A.M. (1994), Het hulpwerkwoord *doen* heeft afgedaan. *Forum der Letteren* 35, 2: 110-131.
- Giesbers, H. (1983-1984), Doe jij lief spelen? Notities over het perifrastisch *doen*. *Mededelingen van de Nijmeegse Centrale voor Dialect- en Naamkunde* 19, 57-64.
- Harris, J. (1984), Syntactic variation and dialect convergence. *Journal of Linguistics* 20: 303- 327.
- Hopper, P.J. and S.A. Thompson (1980), Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56,2: 251-299.
- Laan, K. ter (1953), *Proeve van een Groninger spraakkunst*. Winschoten: van der Veen.
- Labov, William. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mulder, R. (1992), *The aspectual nature of syntactic complementation*. University of Leiden/HIL.
- Nuijten, E. (1962), *De tweetalige mens*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp.
- Schuurman, I. (1987), Incorporation in the Groningen dialect. In: F. Beukema and P. Coopmans (eds.) *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1987*:185-194. Foris Publications, Dordrecht.
- Stein, D. (1992), *Do and tun: A semantics and varieties based approach to syntactic change*. In: M. Gerritsen and D. Stein (eds) *Internal and external factors in syntactic change*. Berlin New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 131- 156.
- Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (1990), The origin and development of periphrastic auxiliary *do*. A case of destigmatisation. *Nowele* 16, 3-52.
- Verhagen, A. (1994)a, Taalverandering en cultuurverandering: *doen* en *laten* sinds de 18e eeuw. *Forum der Letteren* 35, 4: 256-271.
- Verhagen, A. (1994)b, *Doen* of *laten*: woordbetekenis of (ook) structuur? *Forum der Letteren* 35, 4: 277-281.