Grammaticalising microvariation
What we can learn from Dutch and Afrikaans periphrastic progressives

Cora Pots
KU Leuven
cora.pots@kuleuven.be

Oberseminar English Linguistics
Göttingen, 26 June

\(^1\)Part of this work is embedded in a project with Katherine Fraser (Univ. of the Basque country (UPV/EHU)).
Outline

Introduction

Background: periphrastic progressives in Germanic

The data
Corpora
Dataset #1: morphosyntax
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching
Dataset #2: evaluative content

The analysis
Grammaticalisation path for periphrastic progressives
Additional pragmatisation
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

Conclusion
Introduction

Background: periphrastic progressives in Germanic

The data

Corpora
Dataset #1: morphosyntax
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching
Dataset #2: evaluative content

The analysis

Grammaticalisation path for periphrastic progressives
Additional pragmaticalisation
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

Conclusion
Empirical focus

Dutch and Afrikaans periphrastic progressives with a motion/posture verb as aspectual marker

(1) Ik **loop/zit/sta/lig** te werken.
I walk/sit/stand/lie to work
‘I’m working.’

(2) Ek **loop/sit/staan/lê** en werk.
I walk/sit/stand/lie and work
‘I’m working.’
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Empirical focus

- Dutch and Afrikaans periphrastic progressives with a motion/posture verb as aspectual marker
  
  →Henceforth MPPs (Motion/Posture Progressive)

(1) Ik loop/zit/sta/lig te werken.
I walk/sit/stand/lie to work
‘I’m working.’ 

(Dutch)

(2) Ek loop/sit/staan/lê en werk.
I walk/sit/stand/lie and work
‘I’m working.’

(Afrikaans)

→In Dutch: ‘motion/posture verb te V’
Introduction

Empirical focus

- Dutch and Afrikaans periphrastic progressives with a motion/posture verb as aspectual marker
  → Henceforth MPPs (Motion/Posture Progressive)

(1)  Ik **loop/zit/sta/lig** te werken.
    I walk/sit/stand/lie to work
    ‘I’m working.’ (Dutch)

(2)  Ek **loop/sit/staan/lê** en werk.
    I walk/sit/stand/lie and work
    ‘I’m working.’ (Afrikaans)

→ In Dutch: ‘motion/posture verb te V’
→ In Afrikaans: pseudocoordination, i.e. ‘motion/posture verb and V’
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Peculiar morphosyntax and semantics

► MPPs show morphosyntactic variation both within and across the two languages (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Biberauer 2017; Breed 2017)
Peculiar morphosyntax and semantics

- The semantics of the motion/posture verbs are bleached to different degrees within and across the two languages (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Donaldson 1993; De Vos 2005; Biberauer 2017; Breed 2017a)
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Peculiar morphosyntax and semantics

- MMPs are often accompanied by secondary, evaluative content (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Biberauer 2017; Biberauer & Vikner 2017; Breed et al. 2017; Breed 2017a,b)
- They signal the speaker’s evaluation or attitude concerning the eventuality described by the sentence
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Main aims of this talk

Presenting data of a systematic comparative study of Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs, investigating:

▶ Morphosyntactic variation
▶ Morphological form of the motion/posture verb
▶ Presence/absence of te/en
▶ Semantic bleaching of the motion/posture verbs

Presenting an analysis how these two factors interact with each other

Illustrating additional pragmaticalisation of these MPPs

Showing how this fits in a theory which places speaker perspective phenomena at the phase edge
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Main aims of this talk

- Presenting data of a systematic comparative study of Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs, investigating:
  - Morphosyntactic variation
    - Morphological form of the motion/posture verb
    - Presence/absence of *te/en*
  - Semantic bleaching of the motion/posture verbs
- Presenting an analysis how these two factors interact with each other
  - Illustrating additional pragmatisational of these MPPs
  - Showing how this fits in a theory which places *speaker perspective* phenomena at the phase edge
Introduction

Background: periphrastic progressives in Germanic

The data

Corpora
Dataset #1: morphosyntax
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching
Dataset #2: evaluative content

The analysis

Grammaticalisation path for periphrastic progressives
Additional pragmatisicalisation
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

Conclusion
Background: periphrastic progressives in Germanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>posture verbs</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘walk’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pseudocoordination</strong></td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to’-coordination</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗/?</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>real progressive</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: MPP-like structures in Germanic
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posture verbs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘walk’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudocoordination</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to’-coordination</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗/?</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real progressive</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** MPP-like structures in Germanic

- In English, pseudocoordination is lexically restricted to ‘try’, ‘come’ and ‘go’ (Carden & Pesetsky 1978)
Background: periphrastic progressives in Germanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posture verbs</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
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<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘walk’</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pseudocoordination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to’-coordination</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X/?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real progressive</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: MPP-like structures in Germanic

- In English, pseudocoordination is lexically restricted to ‘try’, ‘come’ and ‘go’ (Carden & Pesetsky 1978)
- In varieties of Danish and Norwegian, the coordinator in MMP-like constructions is ambiguous between ‘to’ and ‘and’ (Wiklund 2007)
Dutch and Afrikaans are special in their MMP periphrastic progressives from a cross-Germanic perspective.
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Dutch and Afrikaans are special in their MMP periphrastic progressives from a cross-Germanic perspective

- The only two Germanic languages in which motion verb ‘walk’ is used in MPPs
- The only two Germanic languages in which these structures have real progressive interpretations
- Dutch is the only language that combines the two verbs in the MPPs with te ‘to’ (instead of pseudocoordination)

So far, a unified formal analysis of the structure of Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs has not been proposed yet
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Corpora

- Corpus based research: SoNaR+
- Two subcorpora: SoNaR-500 (500 mil. words) & Corpus Gesproken Nederlands (9 mil. words)
- Standard Dutch and Flemish
- Printed and electronic text; spoken Dutch/Flemish
- Various registers and genres

Dutch periphrastic progressives with motion verb 'lopen' and the posture verbs 'zitten', 'staan', 'liegen'

Embedded under the temporal auxiliary 'hebben' to investigate the presence/absence of IPP-form of the progressive verb.
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- Corpus based research: *Korpusportaal*
  - 85 million words
  - Standard and regional Afrikaans
  - Written and electronic text, incl. text written to be spoken (broadcast)
  - Various registers and genres

Afrikaans pseudocoordination progressives with motion verb *loop* 'walk', and the posture verbs *sit*, *staan* 'stand' and *lê* 'lie', embedded under the temporal auxiliary *het* 'have', to investigate the presence/absence of IPP-form of the progressive verb.
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- Afrikaans pseudocoordination progressives with motion verb *loop* ‘walk’, and the posture verbs *sit* ‘sit’, *staan* ‘stand’ and *lê* ‘lie’, embedded under the temporal auxiliary *het* ‘have’
  - Embedded under the temporal auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’, to investigate the presence/absence of IPP-form of the progressive verb
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Two datasets

Two datasets were used in this study

1. A dataset containing all hits for Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs, to investigate morphosyntactic variation
2. Smaller, randomly selected datasets for all Dutch and Afrikaans MPP-types, to annotate for semantic bleaching and evaluative content
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In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always has to appear as an infinitive (=IPP form), and can never appear as past participle (Schmid 2005).

In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion/posture verb can either appear in IPP form or as past participle (De Vos 2005; Schmid 2005; Augustinus & Dirix 2013).
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Focus 1: morphological form of the motion/posture verb in MPPs when embedded under temporal auxiliary hebben/het ‘have’

Temporal auxiliary hebben/het ‘have’ normally selects a past participle

In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always has to appear as an infinitive (=IPP form), and can never appear as past participle (Schmid 2005)

In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion/posture verb can either appear in IPP form or as past participle (De Vos 2005; Schmid 2005; Augustinus & Dirix 2013)
In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always has to appear in IPP form, and can never appear as past participle.

(3) a. Ik heb *(gelopen)/ lopen te werken.
    I have walk.PPC/ walk.INF to work

b. Ik heb *(gezeten)/ zitten te werken.
    I have sit.PPC/ sit.INF to work

c. Ik heb *(gestaan)/ staan te werken.
    I have stand.PPC/ stand.INF to work

d. Ik heb *(gelegen)/ liggen te werken.
    I have lie.PPC/ lie.INF to work

‘I’ve been working.’ (Dutch)
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion/posture verb can either appear in IPP form or as past participle

(4) a. Ek het **geloop**/loop en werk.
    I have walk.PPC/walk.INF to work
b. Ek het **gesit**/sit en werk.
    I have sit.PPC/sit.INF to work
c. Ek het **gestaan**/staan en werk.
    I have stand.PPC/stand.INF to work
d. Ek het **gelê**/lê en werk.
    I have lie.PPC/lie.INF to work
‘I’ve been working.’

(Afrikaans)
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

- IPP/no-IPP form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>+IPP</th>
<th>-IPP</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lopen ‘walk’</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zitten ‘sit’</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staan ‘stand’</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liggen ‘lie’</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Morphological form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs
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- IPP/no-IPP form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>+IPP</th>
<th>-IPP</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lopen ‘walk’</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zitten ‘sit’</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staan ‘stand’</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liggen ‘lie’</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Morphological form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs

- All Dutch MPPs, the progressive verb occurs in IPP form
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

- IPP/no-IPP form of the progressive verb in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>+IPP</th>
<th>-IPP</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>loop</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>83 (74.8%)</td>
<td>28 (25.2%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sit</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>220 (48.4%)</td>
<td>235 (51.6%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>staan</em> ‘stand’</td>
<td>155 (44.8%)</td>
<td>191 (55.2%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lê</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>113 (45.4%)</td>
<td>136 (54.6%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Morphological form of the progressive verb in Afrikaans MPPs
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

- IPP/no-IPP form of the progressive verb in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>+IPP</th>
<th>-IPP</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>loop</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>83 (74.8%)</td>
<td>28 (25.2%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sit</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>220 (48.4%)</td>
<td>235 (51.6%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>staan</em> ‘stand’</td>
<td>155 (44.8%)</td>
<td>191 (55.2%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lê</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>113 (45.4%)</td>
<td>136 (54.6%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Morphological form of the progressive verb in Afrikaans MPPs

- IPP is much more common with motion verb *loop* than with the posture verbs (for which IPP seems truly optional)
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

Focus 2: the presence/absence of ‘te’ for Dutch and ‘en’ for Afrikaans

Motion verb MPPs in Dutch and Afrikaans have been reported to show high frequencies of ‘te/en’-drop, which has been said to be less frequent/ungrammatical in the posture verb counterparts (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Biberauer 2017)
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- **Focus 2**: the presence/absence of *te* ‘to’ for Dutch and *en* ‘and’ for Afrikaans
- **Motion** verb MPPs in Dutch and Afrikaans have been reported to show high frequencies of *te/en*-drop, which has been said to be less frequent/ungrammatical in the posture verb counterparts (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Biberauer 2017)
(5) Ik heb in de schaduw lopen (te) wachten.
I have in the shade walk to wait
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’

(6) Ik heb in de schaduw staan (te) wachten.
I have in the shade stand to wait
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’

(Dutch)
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

(7) Ek het in die schaduw loop (en) wag.
I have in the shade walk and wait
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’

(8) Ek het in die schaduw staan *(en)* wag.
I have in the shade stand and wait
‘I’ve been waiting in the shade.’ (Afrikaans)
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

- Presence/absence of *te* in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>+te</th>
<th>-te</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>lopen</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zitten</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>8 (0,8%)</td>
<td>920 (99,2%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>staan</em> ‘stand’</td>
<td>13 (10,7%)</td>
<td>110 (89,4%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>liggen</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>2 (0,9%)</td>
<td>212 (99,1%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Presence/absence of *te* ‘to’ in Dutch MPPs
Presence/absence of *te* in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>+<em>te</em></th>
<th>-<em>te</em></th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>lopen</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
<td>89 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zitten</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>8 (0,8%)</td>
<td>920 (99,2%)</td>
<td>928 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>staan</em> ‘stand’</td>
<td>13 (10,7%)</td>
<td>110 (89,4%)</td>
<td>123 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>liggen</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>2 (0,9%)</td>
<td>212 (99,1%)</td>
<td>214 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Presence/absence of *te* ‘to’ in Dutch MPPs

No occurrences of *te* in *lopen* MPPs, few instances with posture verb MPPs
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

Presence/absence of *en* in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressive verb</th>
<th>+<em>En</em></th>
<th>-<em>En</em></th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>loop</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>24 (21.6%)</td>
<td>85 (78.4%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sit</em> ‘sit’</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>staan</em> ‘stand’</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lê</em> ‘lie’</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Presence/absence of *en* ‘and’ in Afrikaans MPPs
Dataset #1: morphosyntax

- Presence/absence of *en* in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progressive verb</th>
<th>+En</th>
<th>-En</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>loop ‘walk’</td>
<td>24 (21.6%)</td>
<td>85 (78.4%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit ‘sit’</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staan ‘stand’</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lê ‘lie’</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Presence/absence of *en* ‘and’ in Afrikaans MPPs

- We only find occurrences of *en*-drop with motion verb *loop*
Summary of dataset #1

- Morphological form of the progressive verb:
  - In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always appears in IPP form.
  - In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion verb appears in IPP form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the posture verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently.

- Presence/absence of te/en:
  - In Dutch, all motion MPPs hits show te-drop, while there are some occurrences of te in posture MPPs.
  - In Afrikaans, there are high occurrences of en-drop in motion MPPs, and no hits with posture MPPs.
Summary of dataset #1

- Morphological form of the progressive verb:
Summary of dataset #1

- **Morphological form of the progressive verb:**
  - In Dutch MPPs, the *motion/posture* verb always appears in IPP form
  - In Afrikaans MPPs, the *motion* verb appears in IPP form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the *posture* verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently
- Presence/absence of *te/en*:
  - In Dutch, all *motion* MPPs hits show *te*-drop, while there are some occurrences of *te* in posture MPPs
  - In Afrikaans, there are high occurrences of *en*-drop in motion MPPs, and no hits with posture MPPs
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- **Morphological form of the progressive verb:**
  - In Dutch MPPs, the **motion/posture** verb always appears in IPP form
  - In Afrikaans MPPs, the **motion** verb appears in IPP form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the **posture** verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently
Summary of dataset #1

★ Morphological form of the progressive verb:
  ▶ In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always appears in IPP form
  ▶ In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion verb appears in IPP form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the posture verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently

★ Presence/absence of te/en:
Summary of dataset #1

- **Morphological form of the progressive verb:**
  - In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always appears in IPP form.
  - In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion verb appears in IPP form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the posture verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently.

- **Presence/absence of te/en:**
  - In Dutch, all motion MPPs hits show te-drop, while there are some occurrences of te in posture MPPs.
Summary of dataset #1

- **Morphological form of the progressive verb:**
  - In Dutch MPPs, the motion/posture verb always appears in IPP form
  - In Afrikaans MPPs, the motion verb appears in IPP form in roughly 75% of the cases and in past participle form in 25%; for the posture verbs, IPP/past participle form occur equally frequently

- **Presence/absence of te/en:**
  - In Dutch, all motion MPPs hits show te-drop, while there are some occurrences of te in posture MPPs
  - In Afrikaans, there are high occurrences of en-drop in motion MPPs, and no hits with posture MMPs
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching

Different extents of semantic bleaching

A physical motion through space, or seated, standing, lying position is not always entailed by the motion/posture verb in MPPs (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Donaldson 1993; De Vos 2005; Biberauer 2017; Breed 2017a)
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching

Different extents of semantic bleaching

- A physical motion through space, or seated, standing, lying position is not always entailed by the motion/posture verb in MPPs (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Donaldson 1993; De Vos 2005; Biberauer 2017; Breed 2017a)
Example motion entailed:

(9) Onderweg naar het restaurant hebben ze aan een stuk door open praten.

‘They’ve been talking the entire time on their way to the restaurant.’
Example no motion entailed:

(10) Jammer dat ze in de show hadden open knippen, Pity that they in the show had walk.INF cut, miste een aantal leuke stukken. missed a couple fun parts. ‘[It is] a pity that they’ve been cutting in the show, a couple of fun parts were missing.’ (Dutch, SoNaR+)
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching

- Physical motion through space/posture position entailed per motion/posture verb MPP for Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion/posture entailed</th>
<th>lopen ( n=94 )</th>
<th>zitten ( n=93 )</th>
<th>staan ( n=94 )</th>
<th>liggen ( n=94 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 (18,1%)</td>
<td>35 (37,7%)</td>
<td>82 (87,0%)</td>
<td>69 (73,4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67 (71,3%)</td>
<td>6 (6,4%)</td>
<td>15 (16,0%)</td>
<td>20 (21,4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>10 (10,6%)</td>
<td>39 (41,9%)</td>
<td>6 (6,4%)</td>
<td>5 (5,2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Semantic bleaching per motion/posture verb in Dutch
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching

- Physical motion through space/posture position entailed per motion/posture verb MPP for Dutch

| Motion/posture entailed | lopen  
| n=94 | zitten  
| n=93 | staan  
| n=94 | liggen  
| n=94 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 17 (18,1%) | 35 (37,7%) | 82 (87,0%) | 69 (73,4%) |
| No | 67 (71,3%) | 6 (6,4%) | 15 (16,0%) | 20 (21,4%) |
| Unclear | 10 (10,6%) | 39 (41,9%) | 6 (6,4%) | 5 (5,2%) |

Table 7: Semantic bleaching per motion/posture verb in Dutch

- Dutch *lopen* is semantically bleached to the highest extent
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching

- Physical motion through space/posture position entailed per motion/posture verb MPP for Afrikaans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion/posture entailed</th>
<th>loop $n=109$</th>
<th>sit $n=109$</th>
<th>staan $n=109$</th>
<th>lê $n=109$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (11,0%)</td>
<td>98 (89,9%)</td>
<td>94 (86,2%)</td>
<td>94 (87,2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43 (39,4%)</td>
<td>2 (01,8%)</td>
<td>4 (03,7%)</td>
<td>13 (11,9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>54 (49,6%)</td>
<td>9 (08,3%)</td>
<td>11 (10,1%)</td>
<td>1 (00,9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Semantic bleaching per motion/posture verb in Afrikaans
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching

- Physical motion through space/posture position entailed per motion/posture verb MPP for Afrikaans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion/posture entailed</th>
<th>loop $n=109$</th>
<th>sit $n=109$</th>
<th>staan $n=109$</th>
<th>lê $n=109$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (11,0%)</td>
<td>98 (89,9%)</td>
<td>94 (86,2%)</td>
<td>94 (87,2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43 (39,4%)</td>
<td>2 (01,8%)</td>
<td>4 (03,7%)</td>
<td>13 (11,9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>54 (49,6%)</td>
<td>9 (08,3%)</td>
<td>11 (10,1%)</td>
<td>1 (00,9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Semantic bleaching per motion/posture verb in Afrikaans

- Afrikaans *loop* is semantically bleached to the highest extent
Dataset #2: semantic bleaching

- Physical motion through space/posture position entailed per motion/posture verb MPP for Afrikaans

| Motion/posture entailed | loop  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 (11,0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43 (39,4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>54 (49,6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         | sit   
|                         | n=109 |
| Yes                    | 98 (89,9%) |
| No                     | 2 (01,8%) |
| Unclear                | 9 (08,3%) |
|                         | staan |
|                         | n=109 |
| Yes                    | 94 (86,2%) |
| No                     | 4 (03,7%) |
| Unclear                | 11 (10,1%) |
|                         | lê    
|                         | n=109 |
| Yes                    | 94 (87,2%) |
| No                     | 13 (11,9%) |
| Unclear                | 1 (00,9%) |

Table 8: Semantic bleaching per motion/posture verb in Afrikaans

- Afrikaans *loop* is semantically bleached to the highest extent
- The *posture* verbs are hardly semantically bleached
Dataset #2: evaluative content

On top of the morphosyntactic variation and the semantic bleaching, motion verbs have been said to often carry secondary, evaluative content (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Biberauer 2017; Biberauer & Vikner 2017; Breed 2017). They signal the speaker's evaluation or attitude concerning the eventuality described by the sentence.

In dataset #2, we wanted to see to what extent pragmaticalisation may be occurring (see Pots & Fraser, in prep).
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- On top of the morphosyntactic variation and the semantic bleaching, motion verbs have been said to often carry secondary, evaluative content (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Biberauer 2017; Biberauer & Vikner 2017; Breed 2017).
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- On top of the morphosyntactic variation and the semantic bleaching, **motion** verbs have been said to often carry secondary, evaluative content (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Biberauer 2017; Biberauer & Vikner 2017; Breed 2017)
  - They signal the speaker’s evaluation or attitude concerning the eventuality described by the sentence.
On top of the morphosyntactic variation and the semantic bleaching, motion verbs have been said to often carry secondary, evaluative content (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Lemmens 2005; Biberauer 2017; Biberauer & Vikner 2017; Breed 2017).

- They signal the speaker’s evaluation or attitude concerning the eventuality described by the sentence.

In dataset #2, we wanted to see to what extent pragmatalisation may be occurring (see Pots & Fraser, in prep).
Secondary, evaluative component

(11) Ja ik merk net dat ik de herhaling heb open
    yes I noticed just now that I the rerun have walk
    kijken, verdikkeme.
    watch, dammit
    ‘Yes I just notice that I’ve been watching the rerun,
    dammit.’ (Dutch, OpenSoNaR+)
Secondary, evaluative component

(11) Ja ik merk net dat ik de herhaling heb open
yes I noticed just now that I the rerun have walk
kijken, verdikkeme.
watch, dammit
‘Yes I just notice that I’ve been watching the rerun, dammit.’ (Dutch, OpenSoNaR+)

▶ The speaker evaluates the eventuality of watching the re-run as undesired
Secondary, evaluative component

(12) Stel jou voor, dat elkeen vir hom een donkie loop vang het.
Imagine you for, that everyone for himself a donkey walk catch have
‘Imagine, that anyone would go and catch a donkey of his own.’
(Afrikaans, Korpusportaal)
Dataset #2: evaluative content

Secondary, evaluative component

(12) Stel jou voor, dat elkeen vir hom een donkie loop vang het. Imagine you for, that everyone for himself a donkey walk catch have ‘Imagine, that anyone would go and catch a donkey of his own.’ (Afrikaans, Korpusportaal)

▷ The speaker evaluates the eventuality of everyone catching a donkey of his own as undesired
Dataset #2: evaluative content

Annotations

- The sentences of dataset #2 were annotated for evaluative content by two native speakers per language
Dataset #2: evaluative content

Annotations

- The sentences of dataset #2 were annotated for evaluative content by two native speakers per language
- They were first familiarised with the concept of evaluative content
Annotations

- The sentences of dataset #2 were annotated for evaluative content by two native speakers per language.
- They were first familiarised with the concept of evaluative content.
- Then they were asked to answer a set of questions for each sentence.
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- Presence/absence of evaluative content in sentences with MPPs in Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>lopen $n=94$</th>
<th>zitten $n=93$</th>
<th>staan $n=94$</th>
<th>lopen $n=94$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>75 (79.8%)</td>
<td>41 (44.1%)</td>
<td>42 (44.7%)</td>
<td>68 (72.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>13 (13.8%)</td>
<td>29 (31.2%)</td>
<td>35 (37.3%)</td>
<td>4 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>6 (6.4%)</td>
<td>23 (24.7%)</td>
<td>17 (18.6%)</td>
<td>22 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Evaluative content in Dutch MPP sentences
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- Presence/absence of evaluative content in sentences with MPPs in Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>lopen</th>
<th>zitten</th>
<th>staan</th>
<th>liggen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n=94 )</td>
<td>( n=93 )</td>
<td>( n=94 )</td>
<td>( n=94 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>75 (79,8%)</td>
<td>41 (44,1%)</td>
<td>42 (44,7%)</td>
<td>68 (72,3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>13 (13,8%)</td>
<td>29 (31,2%)</td>
<td>35 (37,3%)</td>
<td>4 (4,3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>6 (6,4%)</td>
<td>23 (24,7%)</td>
<td>17 (18,6%)</td>
<td>22 (23,4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Evaluative content in Dutch MPP sentences

- Highest percentage of present evaluative content for *lopen* (79,8\%), followed by *liggen* (72,3\%)
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- Presence/absence of evaluative content in sentences with MPPs in Afrikaans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>loop n=109</th>
<th>sit n=109</th>
<th>staan n=109</th>
<th>Lê n=109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>75 (68.8%)</td>
<td>11 (10.1%)</td>
<td>24 (22.0%)</td>
<td>28 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>20 (18.3%)</td>
<td>94 (77.1%)</td>
<td>79 (72.5%)</td>
<td>88 (77.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>24 (12.9%)</td>
<td>14 (12.9%)</td>
<td>6 (05.5%)</td>
<td>1 (00.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Evaluative content in Afrikaans MPP sentences
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- Presence/absence of evaluative content in sentences with MPPs in Afrikaans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>loop $n=109$</th>
<th>sit $n=109$</th>
<th>staan $n=109$</th>
<th>lê $n=109$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>75 (68.8%)</td>
<td>11 (10.1%)</td>
<td>24 (22.0%)</td>
<td>28 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>20 (18.3%)</td>
<td>94 (77.1%)</td>
<td>79 (72.5%)</td>
<td>88 (77.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>24 (12.9%)</td>
<td>14 (12.9%)</td>
<td>6 (05.5%)</td>
<td>1 (00.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Evaluative content in Afrikaans MPP sentences

- Highest percentage of present evaluative content for *loop* (68.8%)
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- Presence/absence of evaluative content in sentences with MPPs in Afrikaans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>loop (n=109)</th>
<th>sit (n=109)</th>
<th>staan (n=109)</th>
<th>lê (n=109)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>75 (68.8%)</td>
<td>11 (10.1%)</td>
<td>24 (22.0%)</td>
<td>28 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>20 (18.3%)</td>
<td>94 (77.1%)</td>
<td>79 (72.5%)</td>
<td>88 (77.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>24 (12.9%)</td>
<td>14 (12.9%)</td>
<td>6 (05.5%)</td>
<td>1 (00.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Evaluative content in Afrikaans MPP sentences

- Highest percentage of present evaluative content for *loop* (68.8%)
- In the sentences with *posture* verb MPPs, evaluative content is most frequently absent in Afrikaans
Dataset #2: evaluative content

- Presence/absence of evaluative content in sentences with MPPs in Afrikaans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>loop $n=109$</th>
<th>sit $n=109$</th>
<th>staan $n=109$</th>
<th>lê $n=109$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>75 (68,8%)</td>
<td>11 (10,1%)</td>
<td>24 (22,0%)</td>
<td>28 (10,0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>20 (18,3%)</td>
<td>94 (77,1%)</td>
<td>79 (72,5%)</td>
<td>88 (77,1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>24 (12,9%)</td>
<td>14 (12,9%)</td>
<td>6 (05,5%)</td>
<td>1 (00,9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10: Evaluative content in Afrikaans MPP sentences**

- Highest percentage of present evaluative content for *loop* (68,8%)
- In the sentences with *posture* verb MPPs, evaluative content is most frequently absent in Afrikaans
- Evaluative content is much less frequent in Afrikaans as compared to Dutch, except for with *loop*
Summary of dataset #2

- Extent of semantic bleaching

  - In Dutch, *lopen* is semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by *zitten*; *staan/liggen* much less

  - In Afrikaans, only *loop* is semantically bleached to a fairly high extent, the posture verbs almost always retain their postural semantics

  - Evaluative content

    - In Dutch, we find the highest frequency of evaluative content in sentences with *lopen* MPPs, followed by sentences with *liggen* MPPs

    - In Afrikaans, only in the sentences with *loop* MPPs we find a high frequency of evaluative content
Summary of dataset #2

- **Extent of semantic bleaching**
  - In Dutch, *lopen* is semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by *zitten; staan/liggen* much less

  

  In Afrikaans, only *loop* is semantically bleached to a fairly high extent, the posture verbs almost always retain their postural semantics

  

  Evaluative content
  - In Dutch, we find the highest frequency of evaluative content in sentences with *lopen* MPPs, followed by sentences with *liggen* MPPs

  

  In Afrikaans, only in the sentences with *loop* MPPs we find a high frequency of evaluative content
Extent of semantic bleaching

- In Dutch, *lopen* is semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by *zitten; staan/liggen* much less.
- In Afrikaans, only *loop* is semantically bleached to a fairly high extent, the *posture* verbs almost always retain their postural semantics.
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- **Extent of semantic bleaching**
  - In Dutch, *lopen* is semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by *zitten; staan/liggen* much less
  - In Afrikaans, only *loop* is semantically bleached to a fairly high extent, the posture verbs almost always retain their postural semantics

- **Evaluative content**
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- **Extent of semantic bleaching**
  - In Dutch, *lopen* is semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by *zitten; staan/liggen* much less
  - In Afrikaans, only *loop* is semantically bleached to a fairly high extent, the posture verbs almost always retain their postural semantics

- **Evaluative content**
  - In Dutch, we find the highest frequency of evaluative content in sentences with *lopen* MPPs, followed by sentences with *liggen* MPPs
Summary of dataset #2

- **Extent of semantic bleaching**
  - In Dutch, *lopen* is semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by *zitten; staan/liggen* much less
  - In Afrikaans, only *loop* is semantically bleached to a fairly high extent, the posture verbs almost always retain their postural semantics

- **Evalitative content**
  - In Dutch, we find the highest frequency of evalitative content in sentences with *lopen* MPPs, followed by sentences with *liggen* MPPs
  - In Afrikaans, only in the sentences with *loop* MPPs we find a high frequency of evalitative content
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Three main claims:

1. Afrikaans MPPs are on a grammaticalisation path from a syntactically ‘wider’ structure in which the motion/posture verb behaves as a light verb, to a structure in which *en* functions as a categoriser, attaches to the root of the motion/posture verb, and head-adjoins as a whole to *Prog*.

2. Dutch MPPs always have the latter structure.

3. The attested morphosyntactic variation in MPPs follows from the extent to which the progressive verbs are grammaticalised.
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Two structures for Afrikaans MPPs

- A ‘wider’ syntactic structure of PseudoCoordination (‘PC-structure’) and a structure in which *en* is a categoriser, which attaches to the root of the progressive verb (‘Prog-structure’)
  - In the PC-structure, the progressive verb still behaves as a light verb and can therefore carry inflection
  - In the Prog-structure, *en* is a categoriser, which makes it possible for the motion/posture verb to function as a progressive verb (e.g. head-adjoin as a whole to Prog)
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Two structures for Afrikaans MPPs

- A ‘wider’ syntactic structure (PC-structure) and a Prog-structure in which *en* is a categoriser, which attaches to the root of the progressive verb

(13)

```
VP
  \V
geloop & VP
  \en \V
  lexical verb
```

(14)

```
ProgP
  \Prog
  c
  en \V
  root of loop
  root lex. verb
```
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Grammaticalisation path of Afrikaans MPPs

▶ From the PC-structure to the Prog-structure
  ▶ Assumption: this grammaticalisation mirrors the semantic bleaching of the motion/posture verb
  ▶ The lexical semantic features of the motion/posture verb are gradually replaced by functional ones (e.g. [prog]-feature)
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Grammaticalisation path of Afrikaans MPPs

(15)

```
(15)  
  VP   
  |    |  
 V    V'  
 |     |    
 geloop & VP 
     |     |  
 en   V    
      |    
 lexical verb
```

Stage 1 (15): progressive verb still has its semantics and can occur as a past participle → becomes more semantically bleached →

Stage 2 (16): expresses progressive aspect together with *en* (only IPP form)

```
(16)  
  ProgP  
  |     |  
 Prog  c  
 |     |   
 en   V  
 |     |    
 root of loop    
 |     |  
 ... V  
 root lex. verb
```
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Two components of the reanalysis in Afrikaans

1. The motion/posture verb becomes a verb that can be directly combined with *en* and then merged in a higher functional head.

2. *En* becomes more grammaticalised, i.e. loses its c-selection requirement to combine two items of the same category, leaving the requirement to combine two items (Biberauer, to appear).
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- The reanalysis of the motion/posture verbs is caused by the frequent coordination of these verbs with another verb, leading to bleaching of the semantics of these verbs (cf. Jespersen’s Cycle-type developments).

- The bleaching of these motion/posture verbs has a knock-on effect for *en*, losing the requirement to combine two items of the same category (*COMBINATION-OF-LIKES* specification $\rightarrow$ *COMBINATION* specification) (Biberauer, to appear).
The analysis: grammaticalisation path for periphrastic progressives

Interaction of semantic bleaching and morphological form

- The assumption that the semantics of the progressive verb are still very salient when the progressive verb occurs in past participle form is reflected in the data:

  - The occurrences of *loop* as past participle in Afrikaans MPPs entail physical motion through space much more often (in 80.8% of the past participle occurrences) than the IPP-form occurrences (54.2%).
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- They also show higher frequencies of past participle form/IPP form (around 50%/50%), while *loop* has much higher frequencies of IPP-form (around 75%)
The analysis: grammaticalisation path for periphrastic progressives

Interaction of semantic bleaching and morphological form

- **Recall**: the *posture* verbs in Afrikaans MPPs are semantically bleached to a lesser extent than *loop*.
- They also show higher frequencies of past participle form/IPP form (around 50%/50%), while *loop* has much higher frequencies of IPP-form (around 75%).
- *Loop* is more semantically bleached, thus further along the grammaticalisation path to a Prog-structure, in which it appears in bare, IPP form.
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Interaction of semantic bleaching and morphological form

- Dutch *motion/posture* verbs are semantically bleached to a higher extent than the Afrikaans ones, always occur in IPP form: always have the Prog-structure

- In earlier stages of Dutch, MPPs were also cases of pseudocoordination (‘*motion/posture* verb en V’)

- *Prediction*: Dutch *motion/posture* verbs were less semantically bleached in that construction and could also occur in past participle form, which is indeed the case (Van Pottelberge 2002)
The analysis: grammaticalisation path for periphrastic progressives

Further grammaticalisation and presence/absence of te/en

- Afrikaans *loop* and Dutch *lopen* are grammaticalising even further

In the hits with *en*-drop, a physical motion through space is never entailed (e.g. *en*-less loop is very highly semantically bleached)

*En*-drop almost exclusively happens when *loop* appears in IPP-form
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Difference between the extent of grammaticalisation in Dutch and Afrikaans

- Why are Dutch MPPs more grammaticalised?
- Both languages have three periphrastic progressive constructions (‘busy with V’, ‘at the V’ and the MPPs)
- A comparative study by Breed et al. (2017) has shown that in Dutch the MPP construction is used much more frequently than in Afrikaans
- More frequent use is beneficial for grammaticalisation, e.g. Dutch MPPs are more grammaticalised because it is a more common option compared to Afrikaans MPPs
The analysis: additional pragmaticalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lopen</td>
<td>75/94 (79.8%)</td>
<td>75/109 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zitten</td>
<td>28/93 (30.0%)</td>
<td>11/109 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staan</td>
<td>33/94 (35.1%)</td>
<td>24/109 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liggen</td>
<td>65/94 (69.1%)</td>
<td>28/109 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Lopen/loop has a high percentage of evaluative sentences in both languages.
- These motion verbs are also semantically bleached to the highest extent in the respective languages.
- Dutch liggen also has a high percentage of evaluative sentences; often associated with death, illness, laziness (Lemmens 2005).
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- **loop**: 75/109 (68.8%)
- **sit**: 11/109 (10.0%)
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Dutch
lopent: 75/94 (79,8%)
zitten: 28/93 (30,0%)
staan: 33/94 (35,1%)
liggen: 65/94 (69,1%)

Afrikaans
loop: 75/109 (68,8%)
sit: 11/109 (10,0%)
staan: 24/109 (22,0%)
lê: 28/109 (10,0%)

▶ lopen/loop has a high percentage of evaluative sentences in both languages
▶ These motion verbs are also semantically bleached to the highest extent in the respective languages
### Recap: Evaluative content in dataset #2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Afrikaans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lopen</td>
<td>75/94 (79.8%)</td>
<td>loop: 75/109 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zitten</td>
<td>28/93 (30.0%)</td>
<td>sit: 11/109 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staan</td>
<td>33/94 (35.1%)</td>
<td>staan: 24/109 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liggen</td>
<td>65/94 (69.1%)</td>
<td>lê: 28/109 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *lopen/loop* has a high percentage of evaluative sentences in both languages
- These *motion* verbs are also semantically bleached to the highest extent in the respective languages
- Dutch *liggen* also has a high percentage of evaluative sentences; often associated with death, illness, laziness (Lemmens 2005)
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- Recall: Dutch *lopen* is more semantically bleached than Afrikaans *loop*, and shows a higher percentage of evaluative content.
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  - This accounts for the frequency differences in evaluative content between the two languages, and between the motion/posture verbs
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- Recall: Dutch *lopen* is more semantically bleached than Afrikaans *loop*, and shows a higher percentage of evaluative content.
- i.e., a more grammaticalised verb as the progressive marker is more likely to have evaluative content.
- *Our proposal:* grammaticalisation is a trigger for pragmatisationalisation (evaluative content) (following Diewald 2011)
  - This accounts for the frequency differences in evaluative content between the two languages, and between the motion/posture verbs.
- Especially Dutch *lopen* is even so far grammaticalised that this evaluative meaning has almost conventionalised (=high extent of pragmatisationalisation).
The analysis: additional pragmaticalisation

Source of evaluative content with motion verbs

- Ross (2016): Verbs or morphemes indicating movement away from deictic center → ‘unexpected event’
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- Ross (2016): Verbs or morphemes indicating movement away from deictic center → ‘unexpected event’
- Stefanowitsch (2000, 129): “undesired”/“unexpected” readings are “divergent” from path
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Source of evaluative content with motion verbs

- Ross (2016): Verbs or morphemes indicating movement away from deictic center → ‘unexpected event’
- Stefanowitsch (2000, 129): “undesired”/“unexpected” readings are “divergent” from path
- Verbs like ‘walk’ indicate a certain iteration, continuousness, which can be a metaphorical representation of irritation
The analysis: additional pragmaticallyisation

Difference between Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs

- As with the semantic bleaching, we see higher extents of pragmaticallyisation with Dutch MPPs than with Afrikaans MPPs
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Difference between Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs

- As with the semantic bleaching, we see higher extents of pragmaticalisation with Dutch MPPs than with Afrikaans MPPs
- This can again be accounted for by a devision of labour between different constructions
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Difference between Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs

- As with the semantic bleaching, we see higher extents of pragmaticalisation with Dutch MPPs than with Afrikaans MPPs
- This can again be accounted for by a deviation of labour between different constructions
- That is, in Afrikaans, the *gaan staan en V ‘go stand and V’* pseudocoordination seems to be used to express evaluation more often than the *loop* MPP
The analysis: additional pragmaticalisation

Difference between Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs

- In Afrikaans, the *gaan staan en V* ‘go stand and V’ pseudocoordination seems to be used to express evaluation more frequently than the *loop* MPP

(17) Dit het *gaan staan en reën* op haar troudag!
it has gone stand and rain on her wedding-day
‘It went and rained on her wedding day!
  (Biberauer & Vikner 2017)
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

We have seen that Dutch *lopen* and Afrikaans *loop* are grammaticalised to a higher extent than the posture verbs. I follow Biberauer (2017) in assuming that these verbs are merged in a higher Prog-head than their posture verb counterparts. These motion verbs are thus at the edge of the Aspectual-progressive domain in the functional sequence.
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- We have seen that Dutch *lopen* and Afrikaans *loop* are grammaticalised to a higher extent than the posture verbs.
- I follow Biberauer (2017) in assuming that these verbs are merged in a higher Prog-head than their posture verb counterparts.
- These motion verbs are thus at the edge of the Aspectual-progressive domain in the functional sequence.
Progressive motion verbs at the edge of the phase

- We have seen that Dutch *lopen* and Afrikaans *loop* are grammaticalised to a higher extent than the posture verbs.
- I follow Biberauer (2017) in assuming that these verbs are merged in a higher Prog-head than their posture verb counterparts.
- These motion verbs are thus at the edge of the Aspectual-progressive domain in the functional sequence.
- Harwood (2013): the progressive is the maximal phase boundary of vP.
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

Phase boundaries as loci for speaker perspective

- Recent work has shown that not only the edge of the CP, but edges of phases in general are locations where speaker’s perspective can be signalled (Poletto 2012; Wiltschko 2014, 2017; Heim & Wiltschko 2017; Biberauer & Vikner 2017; Biberauer 2018, a.o.)
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

**The Peripheral Speaker-Hearer Hypothesis**
Speaker-hearer perspective is formally encoded at the edges of phasal domains, where phasal domains are independently signalled, realizationally (PF) and interpretively (LF) privileged structural domains, the precise identity of which differs from language to language (Biberauer 2018: 3)
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The Peripheral Speaker-Hearer Hypothesis
Speaker-hearer perspective is formally encoded at the edges of phasal domains, where phasal domains are independently signalled, realizationally (PF) and interpretively (LF) privileged structural domains, the precise identity of which differs from language to language (Biberauer 2018: 3)

▶ ‘Phase edges constitute points of particular significance in language change, contact, and acquisition by providing a “way in” for elements that have not been (fully) formally integrated into the projecting structure.’ (Biberauer 2018: 3)
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

Example of speaker perspective at the vP phase edge

- Clause-medial modal particles (Biberauer 2018: 8) and expressives (Potts 2007)

(18) They’re all *mos/sommer/maar* taking a chance.  
    (South African English)

(19) They’re all *bloody/flippin’* (well) taking a chance.  
    (British/American English)
At the morphosyntax-semantics interface

The motion verbs as contributors to evaluative content

- Since Dutch and Afrikaans motion verbs are at the edge of a phase, they often carry evaluative content
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The motion verbs as contributors to evaluative content

- Since Dutch and Afrikaans motion verbs are at the edge of a phase, they often carry evaluative content.
- They can also more often be the sole contributor of this meaning, i.e. Dutch *lopen* vs *liggen* → the latter almost always combines with a negative lexical verb and/or subjective/iterative adverbs)
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- **Analysis**: Morphosyntactic behaviour and extent of semantic bleaching of Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs show:
  - the extent to which they are grammaticalised
> **New data:** Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs show:
>  ▶ different morphosyntactic behaviour (IPP/no-IPP, presence/absence of *te/en*)
>  ▶ different degrees of semantic bleaching of the progressive verbs
>  ▶ different extents of additional pragmaticalisation

> **Analysis:** Morphosyntactic behaviour and extent of semantic bleaching of Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs show:
>  ▶ the extent to which they are grammaticalised
>  ▶ e.g. what type of underlying syntactic structure they have
Conclusion

- **New data**: Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs show:
  - different morphosyntactic behaviour (IPP/no-IPP, presence/absence of te/en)
  - different degrees of semantic bleaching of the progressive verbs
  - different extents of additional pragmatization

- **Analysis**: Morphosyntactic behaviour and extent of semantic bleaching of Dutch and Afrikaans MPPs show:
  - the extent to which they are grammaticalised
  - e.g. what type of underlying syntactic structure they have
  - an interaction with additional pragmatization (e.g. *speaker perspective*), which comes about at the vP phase edge (Poletto 2012; Wiltschko 2014, 2017; Biberauer 2018)
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