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Introduction

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.’ (Dutch)

(2) Ek loop/sit/staan/lê en werk.
    I walk/sit/stand/lie and work
    ‘I’m working.’ (Afrikaans)
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→ In Dutch: ‘motion/posture verb te V’
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  ▶ Presence/absence of te/en
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Corpora

Dutch

- 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 'walk', and the posture verbs zitten 'sit', staan 'stand' and liggen 'lie'

- Embedded under the temporal auxiliary hebben 'have', to investigate the morphological form of the progressive verb
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  - 85 million words
  - Standard and regional Afrikaans
  - Written and electronic text, incl. text written to be spoken (broadcast)
  - Various registers and genres
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The data: morphological form of the progressive verb

Focus 1: morphological form of the motion/posture verb in MPPs when embedded under temporal auxiliary hebben/het

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)
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(3)  

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

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

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

d. Ik heb *(gelegen)/ liggen te werken.  
    I have lie.PTCP/ lie.INF to work  
    ‘I’ve been working.’ (Dutch)
The data: morphological form of the progressive verb

- 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.PTCP/ walk.INF to  work
b. Ek het **gesit/** sit en werk.  
   I  have sit.PTCP/ sit.INF to  work
c. Ek het **gestaan/** staan en werk.  
   I  have stand.PTCP/ stand.INF to  work
d. Ek het **gelê/** lê en werk.  
   I  have lie.PTCP/ lie.INF to  work

‘I’ve been working.’ (Afrikaans)
The data: morphological form of the progressive verb

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>IPP-form</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lopen ‘walk’</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>94 (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>
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Table 1: Morphological form of the progressive verb in Dutch MPPs

In all Dutch MPPs, the progressive verb occurs in IPP-form
The data: morphological form of the progressive verb

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>IPP-form</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loop ‘walk’</td>
<td>83 (74.8%)</td>
<td>28 (25.2%)</td>
<td>109 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit ‘sit’</td>
<td>220 (48.4%)</td>
<td>235 (51.6%)</td>
<td>455 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staan ‘staan’</td>
<td>155 (44.8%)</td>
<td>191 (55.2%)</td>
<td>346 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lê ‘lie’</td>
<td>113 (45.4%)</td>
<td>136 (54.6%)</td>
<td>249 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IPP is much more common with motion verb loop than with the posture verbs (p<0.001).
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- **Focus 2**: the presence/absence of *te* ‘to’ for Dutch and *en* ‘and’ for Afrikaans
Focus 2: the presence/absence of \textit{te} ‘to’ for Dutch and \textit{en} ‘and’ for Afrikaans

Motion verb MPPs in Dutch and Afrikaans have been reported to show high frequencies of \textit{te/en}-drop, which has been said to be less frequent/ungrammatical in the posture verb counterparts (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Biberauer 2017)
The data: presence/absence of *te/en*

(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)
The data: presence/absence of *te/en*

(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)
The data: presence/absence of *te/en*

- Presence/absence of *te* in Dutch MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Te present</th>
<th>Te absent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Lopen</em> ‘walk’</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>94 (100%)</td>
<td>94 (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>
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Table 3: Presence/absence of *te* in Dutch MPPs

- No occurrences of *te* in *lopen* MPPs, few instances with posture verb MPPs
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- Presence/absence of *en* in Afrikaans MPPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th><em>En</em> present</th>
<th><em>En</em> absent</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>
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Table 4: Presence/absence of *en* ‘and’ in Afrikaans PeriProgs
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Table 4: Presence/absence of en ‘and’ in Afrikaans PeriProgs

- We only find occurrences of en-drop with motion verb loop
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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.
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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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The morphological status of ge-

Dutch *ge-* is a regular verbal affix

- It is in complementary distribution with other verbal prefixes
  
  *ge-*daan, *ver-*teld, *ge-*ver-*teld, *ver-*ge-*teld
The morphological status of ge-

Dutch ge- is a regular verbal affix

- The sequence ge-V cannot be interrupted by a particle

  af-ge-haald, *ge-af-haald
The morphological status of ge-

Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix

- It is not in complementary distribution with other verbal prefixes; but can only appear to the left of the verbal prefix

  ge-doen, ver-tel, ge-ver-tel, *ver-ge-tel

  (Conradie 2012:12)
The morphological status of ge-

Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix

- The sequence ge-V can be interrupted by a particle

  af-*ge*-haal, *ge*-af-haal

  (Prinsloo 2009:78)
The morphological status of ge-

Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix

- Conradie (2012:12): Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix, with much more syntactic independence than Dutch ge-
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs
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The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- Dutch and Afrikaans progressive verbs can still retain their lexical semantics, but their semantics seem also to be bleached (Haeseryn et al. (1997, Biberauer 2017, Breed 2017)
- The motion/posture verbs in MPPs do not always entail a physical motion/seated/standing/lying position in MPPs
- They can sometimes even combine with a lexical verb incompatible with motion/postural position (Pots & Fraser, to appear)
- Semantic bleaching is an indication of a shift from being lexical to being functional (Sweetser 1988)
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

Example physical motion entailed

(9) Het was een kudde herten die had *lopen grazen* in het struikgewas aan de overkant.
    It was a herd deer that had walk graze in the bushes on the other side.
    ‘It was a herd of deer that had been grazing in the bushes on the other side.’
    (Dutch, SoNaR+)
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

**Example lexical verb incompatible with physical motion**

(10)  

```
Jammer dat ze in de show hadden *lopen* knippen,  
Pity that they in the show had walk 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.’
```
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- When a vocabulary item is semi-lexical, its functional use is often syntactically more restricted than its lexical use (De Belder 2011:102)
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- When a vocabulary item is semi-lexical, its functional use is often syntactically more restricted than its lexical use (De Belder 2011:102)
- For example, Dutch *stuk* ‘piece’ can be functional and lexical, but when it is used functionally, it cannot take a diminutive suffix
Lexical use of Dutch *stuk*:

(11) a. *Ik heb twee stukken van deze banaan gegeten.*
   I have two pieces of this banana eaten
   ‘I’ve eaten two pieces of this banana.’

b. *Ik heb twee stuk-*je-*s* van deze banaan gegeten.
   I have two pieces.DIM.PL of this banana eaten
   ‘I’ve eaten two small pieces of this banana.’
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

Functional use of Dutch *stuk*:

(12) Hoeveel bananen heb je gekocht?
    How.many bananas have you bought
    ‘How many bananas did you buy?’

(13) a. Ik heb twee *stuks* gekocht.
    I have two specimens bought
    ‘I’ve bought two specimens.’

b. *Ik heb twee *stuk-je-s* gekocht.
   I have two specimens.DIM.PL bought
   Intended meaning: ‘I’ve bought two small specimens of banana.’
Similarly to restricted syntactic behaviour of functional *stuk* in Dutch, Dutch *lopen* shows restricted behaviour when used as a progressive verb rather than a lexical verb.
Similarly to restricted syntactic behaviour of functional *stuk* in Dutch, Dutch *lopen* shows restricted behaviour when used as a progressive verb rather than a lexical verb.

Lexical *lopen* can be either embedded under temporal auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’, or under temporal auxiliary *zijn* ‘be’ when a endpoint/goal of the motion is indicated.
Similarly to restricted syntactic behaviour of functional *stuk* in Dutch, Dutch *lopen* shows restricted behaviour when used as a progressive verb rather than a lexical verb.

Lexical *lopen* can be either embedded under temporal auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’, or under temporal auxiliary *zijn* ‘be’ when a endpoint/goal of the motion is indicated.

Functional (progressive) *lopen* can only be embedded under temporal auxiliary *hebben* ‘have’.
Lexical use of Dutch *lopen*

(14)  

a. *Ik heb dit weekend veel gelopen.*  
    I have this weekend a.lot walk.PTCP  
    ‘I’ve walked a lot this weekend.’

b. *Ik ben dit weekend naar mijn oude huis gelopen.*  
    I am this weekend to my old house  
    walk.PTCP  
    ‘I’ve walked to my previous house this weekend.’
Functional use of Dutch *lopen*

(15)  

a. *Ik heb dit weekend veel *lopen* bellen.*  
I have this weekend a lot walk.IPP call  
‘I’ve been calling a lot this weekend.’

b. *Ik ben dit weekend veel *lopen* bellen.*  
I am this weekend a lot walk.IPP call  
Intended meaning: ‘I’ve been calling a lot this weekend.’
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- Taken together, the semantic bleaching and the restricted syntactic behaviour of these items shows that Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are used functionally when they appear in MPPs.
The semi-lexicality of Dutch/Afrikaans progressive verbs

- Taken together, the semantic bleaching and the restricted syntactic behaviour of these items shows that Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are used functionally when they appear in MPPs.
- They can still retain their lexical semantics, making Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs semi-lexical.
What it means to be semi-lexical

- I follow Klockmann (2017)’s approach to semi-lexicality, in which a semi-lexical item is defined as a root that is lexically specified for a syntactic feature
What it means to be semi-lexical

Defining semi-lexicality (Klockmann 2018:6)
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Defining semi-lexicality (Klockmann 2018:6)

- Being lexical implies the presence of a root
- Being functional implies the presence of a syntactic feature
- Semi-lexicality is often cited as the combination of lexical and functional properties in a single lexical item
- Semi-lexicality is what occurs when a root is specified for a syntactic feature
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- Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are semi-lexical
- I.e. they are roots that are specified for a syntactic feature
Grammaticalisation path for MPPs

- Dutch and Afrikaans motion and posture verbs are semi-lexical
  - I.e. they are roots that are specified for a syntactic feature
  - Since they indicate progressive aspect of the lexical verb in MPPs, I propose this feature is a [Prog] feature
Grammaticalisation path for MPPS

- 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, Biberauer p.c.)
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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, Biberauer p.c.)

▶ The semantic bleaching goes from the motion/posture verbs’ lexical meaning to a more schematic, abstract meaning of iteration/duration, eventually leading to a progressive interpretation (cf. Sweetser 1988, Kuteva 1999)
Grammaticalisation path for MPPS

- When a lexical item develops a functional use, it is becoming more grammaticalised
Grammaticalisation path for MPPS

- When a lexical item develops a functional use, it is becoming more grammaticalised

- *My proposal:* grammaticalisation from a lexical item to a functional item can mean acquiring an uninterpretable syntactic feature, which becomes interpretable when the item is further along the grammaticalisation path
Grammaticalisation path for MPPS

Proposed possible grammaticalisation path:

$$\text{root} \to \text{root} + [uF] \to [iF]$$

For Dutch/Afrikaans motion/posture verbs:

$$\text{root} \to \text{root} + [u\text{Prog}] \to [i\text{Prog}]$$
Grammaticalisation path for MPPS

- The motion and posture verbs in Dutch and Afrikaans are semantically bleached to different extents (Biberauer 2017, Breed 2017, Lemmens 2005, Pots & Fraser to appear)
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- In both languages, the motion verbs are semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by the Dutch posture verbs; the Afrikaans ones being hardly bleached at all
Grammaticalisation path for MPPS

The motion and posture verbs in Dutch and Afrikaans are semantically bleached to different extents (Biberauer 2017, Breed 2017, Lemmens 2005, Pots & Fraser to appear).

In both languages, the motion verbs are semantically bleached to the highest extent, followed by the Dutch posture verbs; the Afrikaans ones being hardly bleached at all.

I.e. the motion verbs are further along on the grammaticalisation path compared to the posture verbs, of which the Afrikaans ones are the least far along this path.
My proposal: there are two different structures for MPPs, with the grammaticalisation path of the progressive verbs going from the structure in (16) to the structure in (17).
Grammaticalisation path for MPPS

- In the first structure, the motion/posture verb is a root specified for a \([uProg]\) feature: its semantics are still salient.
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- In the first structure, the motion/posture verb is a root specified for a [uProg] feature: its semantics are still salient
- We thus have to merge the motion/posture root with the root of the lexical verb
- This intervening functional head does not add any meaning that is not already added by merge; it is conjunctive (De Belder 2011: 248)
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- In the first structure, the motion/posture verb is a root specified for a [uProg] feature: its semantics are still salient
- We thus have to merge the motion/posture root with the root of the lexical verb
- This intervening functional head does not add any meaning that is not already added by merge; it is conjunctive (De Belder 2011: 248)
- In Afrikaans, this position is filled by *en*, in Dutch by *te*, which semantics are close to vacuous (Broekhuis & Corver 2015)
Afrikaans MPPs

The two structures for Afrikaans MPPs:

\[(18)\]

\[
\ldots \quad \quad \text{ProgP} \quad \quad \ldots
\]

\[
\text{Prog} \quad \quad \text{[iProg]} \quad \quad \sqrt{V_1} \quad \quad \text{[uProg]} \quad \quad \text{F'} \quad \quad \sqrt{V_2} \quad \quad \text{en}
\]

\[(19)\]

\[
\ldots \quad \quad \text{ProgP} \quad \quad \ldots
\]

\[
\text{Prog} \quad \quad \text{[iProg]} \quad \quad \sqrt{V_2} \quad \quad \text{[uProg]} \quad \quad \text{F'} \quad \quad \sqrt{V_2}
\]

The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics.

Recall: Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal verbal affix.

Assumption: ge- can only attach to lexical material.

In the first structure, it can attach to the combined roots complex, in the second structure it cannot attach.
The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics.
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The two structures for Afrikaans MPPs:

(18) 

\[ \text{...} \]

\[ \text{...} \]

\[ \text{ProgP} \]

\[ \text{Prog} \]

\[ [\text{iProg}] \]

\[ \sqrt{V_1} \]

\[ [u\text{Prog}] \]

\[ F \]

\[ \sqrt{V_2} \]

\[ \text{en} \]

(19) 

\[ \text{...} \]

\[ \text{...} \]

\[ \text{ProgP} \]

\[ \text{Prog} \]

\[ [\text{iProg}] \]

\[ \sqrt{V_2} \]

\[ \text{motion/posture} \]

The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics

Recall: Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal verbal affix
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- *Recall*: Afrikaans *ge*- is a phrasal verbal affix
- *Assumption*: *ge*- can only attach to lexical material
Afrikaans MPPs

The two structures for Afrikaans MPPs:

(18)

(19)

The root insertion of the **motion/posture** verb brings about its lexical semantics

*Recall*: Afrikaans *ge*- is a phrasal verbal affix

*Assumption*: *ge*- can only attach to lexical material

In the first structure, it can attach to the combined roots complex, in the second structure it cannot attach
Recall: Afrikaans *loop* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs
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Afrikaans *loop* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs
Afrikaans MPPs

- *Recall*: Afrikaans *loop* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs
- Afrikaans *loop* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs
- The fact that it shows much higher frequencies of *en*-drop and bare, IPP-form follows from it being close to only being able to have the latter structure, in which there is not F head (so no *en*), and in which *ge-* cannot attach to anything
Dutch MPPs

The two structures for Dutch MPPs:

(20)

(21)
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The two structures for Dutch MPPs:

(20)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{...} \\
\text{...} \\
\text{ProgP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Prog} \\
\text{[iProg]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{V_1} \\
\text{[uProg]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
F' \\
F \\
te \\
\sqrt{V_2}
\end{array}
\]

(21)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{...} \\
\text{ProgP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Prog} \\
\text{[iProg]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{V_2}
\end{array}
\]

▶ The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics
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- The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics
- Recall: Dutch ge- is a regular verbal affix, not phrasal
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The two structures for Dutch MPPs:

(20)

(21)

The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics

Recall: Dutch ge- is a regular verbal affix, not phrasal

Assumption: ge- can only attach to lexical material
The root insertion of the motion/posture verb brings about its lexical semantics

- **Recall**: Dutch *ge-* is a regular verbal affix, not phrasal
- **Assumption**: *ge-* can only attach to lexical material
- Dutch *ge-* thus cannot attach to either one of the structures (cf. Zwart (2016), Dros-Hendriks (2018))
Dutch MPPs

- *Recall:* Dutch *lopen* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs, but the *posture* verbs are also more semantically bleached than the Afrikaans ones.
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- Dutch *lopen* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs, but these latter are also quite far on this path.

- The fact that we see no occurrences of *te* with Dutch *lopen* follows from it being so grammaticalised that it only has the latter structure.

- The low occurrences of *te* with the Dutch *posture* verbs follows from them also being highly grammaticalised, i.e. often having the second structure.
Dutch MPPs

- **Recall**: Dutch *lopen* is much more semantically bleached than the *posture* verbs, but the *posture* verbs are also more semantically bleached than the Afrikaans ones.

- Dutch *lopen* is further along the grammaticalisation path from the first to the second structure compared to the *posture* verbs, but these latter are also quite far on this path.

- The fact that we see no occurrences of *te* with Dutch *lopen* follows from it being so grammaticalised that it only has the latter structure.

- The low occurrences of *te* with the Dutch *posture* verbs follows from them also being highly grammaticalised, i.e. often having the second structure.

- Dutch *ge-* is not a phrasal affix, meaning it can never attach to any of the two structures: we find the bare, IPP-form across the board.
A similar case: English quantificational nouns

- A lot/ton/bunch of books.
- Many books.
- A hundred books.

English quantificational nouns (Q-nouns) indicate quantity, like quantifiers and numerals. Klockmann (2018) analyses these Q-nouns as semi-lexical roots.
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(22) A lot/ton/bunch of books.
(23) Many books.
(24) A hundred books.

- English quantificational nouns (Q-nouns) indicate quantity, like quantifiers and numerals
A similar case: English quantificational nouns

(22) A lot/ton/bunch of books.
(23) Many books.
(24) A hundred books.

- English quantificational nouns (Q-nouns) indicate quantity, like quantifiers and numerals
- Klockmann (2018) analyses these Q-nouns as semi-lexical roots
A similar case: English quantificational nouns

(25) A ton/tons of students *was/weren’t studying.
(26) A ton of herring was standing at the shore.

- Q-nouns cannot function as agreement targets, despite appearing to be singular nouns; they can in their lexical use
A similar case: English quantificational nouns

(25) A ton/tons of students *was/weren’t studying.

(26) A ton of herring was standing at the shore.

- Q-nouns cannot function as agreement targets, despite appearing to be singular nouns; they can in their lexical use.
- This shows that these Q-nouns are semi-lexical items (i.e. a root with a syntactic feature).
A similar case: English quantificational nouns

(25) A ton/tons of students *was/weren’t studying.
(26) A ton of herring was standing at the shore.

- Q-nouns cannot function as agreement targets, despite appearing to be singular nouns; they can in their lexical use.
- This shows that these Q-nouns are semi-lexical items (i.e. a root with a syntactic feature).
- The presence or absence of *of* indicates the level of grammaticalisation of these elements, *of* being required to combine the Q-noun root and the root of the noun (Klockmann 2018:22).
The different degree of grammaticalisation in Dutch and Afrikaans
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- This study shows that Dutch MPPs more grammaticalised than Afrikaans MPPs
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- This study shows that Dutch MPPs are more grammaticalised than Afrikaans MPPs.
- Both languages have three periphrastic progressive constructions ('busy with V', 'at the V' and the MPPs).
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- This study shows that Dutch MPPs more grammaticalised than Afrikaans MPPs
- 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
The different degree of grammaticalisation in Dutch and Afrikaners

- This study shows that Dutch MPPs more grammaticalised than Afrikaners MPPs
- 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 Afrikaners
- More frequent use is beneficial for grammaticalisation, e.g. Dutch MPPs are more grammaticalised because it is a more common option compared to Afrikaners MPPs
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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

- **Analysis**: Dutch and Afrikaans progressive verbs are on a grammaticalisation path
  - They are semi-lexical items in the process of becoming more functional (i.e. real progressive markers)
  - The proposed grammaticalisation path goes from being a root with a [uProg] feature to being a [iProg] feature
  - The presence/absence of *te/en* and *ge-* (for Afrikaans) are indications of where the progressive verbs are on the grammaticalisation path
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