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Introduction
Introduction

The IPP effect

(1) ...dat ik hem \textcolor{red}{heb}_1 \textcolor{blue}{gezien}_2.
...that I him have seen.PTPC
‘...that I’ve seen him.

(2) ...dat ik hem \textcolor{red}{heb}_1 \textcolor{blue}{*gezien}_2 \textcolor{green}{/zien}_2 \textcolor{red}{eten}_3.
...that I him have seen.PTPC /seen.IPP eat
‘...that I’ve seen him eat.’
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West-Germanic picture

- The IPP exists in Dutch, Afrikaans and German (or is assumed to exist) (Schmid 2005)
- It does not exist in English, Yiddish and Frisian (Hinterholzl 2009:191)
- *My claim today:* it doesn’t exist in Afrikaans either
Starting point

▶ Ponelis (1993:413): Afrikaans has ‘a residue of infinitive assimilation’
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Starting point

- Ponelis (1993:413): Afrikaans has ‘a residue of infinitive assimilation’

- Cf. De Schutter (2001:205): ‘De schets van IPP in het Afrikaans lijkt er sterk op te wijzen dat dat verschijnsel in die taal een heel eigen leven is gaan leiden, en dus niet zomaar als een residu beschouwd mag worden.’
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Schmid’s (2005) typology

- Based on grammars and some native speaker judgments:
- Afrikaans IPP is optional in all verb classes that can occur in temporal 3-verb clusters (causatives, modals, perception verbs, benefactives, duratives, inchoatives, control verbs), with the exception of raising verbs
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- Augustinus & Dirix (2013): small corpus study into IPP in Afrikaans based on Schmid’s verb classes
- Taalkommissiecorpus (58 million tokens)
## Empirical background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Werkwoord</th>
<th>IPP</th>
<th>'te' IPP</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>% IPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>modaal</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>blyk</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42,86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aspectueel</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kom</em></td>
<td>645</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>97,43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>begin</em></td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99,93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>aanhou</em></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>88,24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ophou</em></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72,73 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gaan</em></td>
<td>853</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bly</em></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>onderwerpcontrole</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>leer</em> (studeren)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>durf</em></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97,22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wil</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>weet</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>probeer</em></td>
<td>575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99,82 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>causatief</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>doen</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>laat</em></td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99,87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>maak</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>perceptiewerkwoorden</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hoor</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,00 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sien</em></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94,89 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>benefactieve</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>leer</em> (onderrichten)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>werkwoorden</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>help</em></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93,22 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5679</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98,85 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** Table from Augustinus & Dirix (2013)

- ‘IPP’ is not that optional
Empirical background

Figure 2: Table from Augustinus & Dirix (2013)

- ‘IPP’ seems more optional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Werkwoord</th>
<th>IPP</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>% IPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aspectueel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staan</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lê</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.67%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Empirical background

- Modals, which according to Schmid (2005) also show optional IPP, only occur in ‘past tense’ form (*preterite assimilation*), and seem not to have an infinitival form anymore

(3)  
a. ...dat Eva hard kan\textsubscript{2} werk\textsubscript{3} het\textsubscript{1}.
  ...that Eva hard can.IPP work have
  ‘...that Eva could have worked hard.’

b. ...dat Eva hard kon\textsubscript{2} (ge-)werk\textsubscript{3} het\textsubscript{1}.
  ...that Eva hard can.PRT GE-work have
  ‘...that Eva could have worked hard.’

- (3b) is ambiguous between Dutch *kan hebben gewerkt* and *heeft kunnen werken*

- Ge- on V3 is reported as optional (Robbers 1997)
Empirical background

- Dirix, Augustinus & Van Eynde (2017): small corpus study
Empirical background

- Dirix, Augustinus & Van Eynde (2017): small corpus study
- They found many hits for the *preterite assimilation* type of cluster with modals, and hardly any hits with the modals occurring in ‘IPP’ form
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The data

- Corpus search in Korpusportaal (150 million tokens at time of search)
- Investigation into IPP/past participle form of:
  - indirect linking verbs (motion verb loop ‘walk’ and the posture verbs)
  - a subgroup of direct linking verbs
  - preterite form of modals
The data: indirect linking verbs

<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>

Table 1: Morphological form of indirect linking verbs

- Higher frequencies for IPP form with *loop*; IPP seems truly optional with the posture verbs
The data: direct linking verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>IPP-form</th>
<th>Past participle</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maak ‘make’</td>
<td>10 (71,4%)</td>
<td>4 (28,6%)</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoor ‘hear’</td>
<td>545 (93,8%)</td>
<td>26 (6,2%)</td>
<td>581 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help ‘help’</td>
<td>539 (91,5%)</td>
<td>50 (8,5%)</td>
<td>589 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bly ‘stay’</td>
<td>2134 (99,7%)</td>
<td>6 (0,3%)</td>
<td>2140 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophou ‘stop’</td>
<td>498 (61,6%)</td>
<td>310 (38,4%)</td>
<td>808 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Morphological form of indirect linking verbs

- Past participle form is much more frequent with *ophou* ‘stop’ and *maak* ‘make’ compared to the other direct linking verbs
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The data: modals

- A first search showed no hits for 3-verb clusters in which the modal has an IPP-form
- The modals *wou* ‘want’, *kon* ‘can’, *sou* ‘shall’, *moes* ‘must’ occur very frequently as V2 in 3-verb clusters
- Their interpretation is often ambiguous between being V1 or 2 (cf. Dutch *heeft willen maken* vs. *wil hebben gemaakt*)
- In almost all of these 3-verb clusters with V2 being a modal, V3 has *ge*-, except for with *wou* ‘want’, where there are also many occurrences of a *ge*-less V3 (cf Dutch oddness of *wil hebben gemaakt*)
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The corpus search into 3-verb clusters embedded under a temporal auxiliary show that:

1. ‘IPP’ is optional with the innovative group of indirect linking verbs (motion and posture verbs)
2. ‘IPP’ occurs almost across the board with direct linking verbs, least so with the innovative direct linking verbs ophou and maak ‘make’
3. Modals are no longer a verb class in which ‘IPP’ shows up; these verbs always occur in preterite form, and are semantically ambiguous between V1 and V2
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The corpus search into 3-verb clusters embedded under a temporal auxiliary show that:

1. ‘IPP’ is optional with the innovative group of indirect linking verbs (motion and posture verbs)
2. ‘IPP’ occurs almost across the board with direct linking verbs, least so with the innovative direct linking verbs *ophou* ‘stop’ and *maak* ‘make’
The corpus search into 3-verb clusters embedded under a temporal auxiliary show that:

1. ‘IPP’ is optional with the innovative group of indirect linking verbs (motion and posture verbs)
2. ‘IPP’ occurs almost across the board with direct linking verbs, least so with the innovative direct linking verbs ophou ‘stop’ and maak ‘make’
3. Modals are no longer a verb class in which ‘IPP’ shows up; these verbs always occur in preterite form, and are semantically ambiguous between V1 and V2
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Theoretical prerequisites

In order to develop the argument, I have three theoretical prerequisites:

1. IPP is a side-effect;
2. Afrikaans *het* and *ge-* are both past tense markers
3. Afrikaans *ge-* is phrasal
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Development of West Germanic ge-

▶ The West Germanic past participle marker ge- developed from a proclitic marker of telicity (Gaeta 2007:92, Zwart 2007:84)
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Development of West Germanic ge-

- The West Germanic past participle marker ge- developed from a proclitic marker of telicity (Gaeta 2007:92, Zwart 2007:84)
- It was productively used to make an nontelic verb describe a completed event (Gothic lisan ‘reap’ vs. galisan ‘collect’ (Van Swaay 1899:46–47))
- From here, it could develop into a marker of perfective aspect, and then further to a prefix of the past participle (Zwart 2007:84)
- Its telic value was not directly lost
- E.g. in Old High German, the prefix was not compatible with intrinsically telic verbs bringan ‘bring’ (past participle: brungan), findan ‘find’ (past participle: fundan), et cetera (Gaeta 2007:93)
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- According to Gaeta (2007:96) and Zwart (2007), IPP in 3-verb clusters is in fact a side-effect of the grammaticalisation of the past participle marker *ge-*.
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IPP emerges after the grammaticalisation of ge-

- According to Gaeta (2007:96) and Zwart (2007), IPP in 3-verb clusters is in fact a side-effect of the grammaticalisation of the past participle marker ge-
- An empirical argument: IPP is first attested in the 13th century, two centuries after the grammaticalisation of the perfect periphrasis (Gaeta 2007: 97)
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- A second argument: those West Germanic languages that do not have the past participle marker *ge*-, also do not show IPP (Gaeta 2007, Zwart 2007, Hoeksema 1980, Lange 1981)
- One counterexample has been mentioned: West Frisian dialects (no *ge*-, but IPP) (Gaeta 2007: 100)
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...that he it has can.IPP do
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West Frisian dialect

▶ Past participles are *ge*-less, e.g. *kind* vs Dutch *gekund*
TP I: IPP is a side-effect

No ge-, no IPP

(4) ...dat er it hat₁ kinne₂ dwaan₃.
   ...that he it has can.IPP do
   ‘...that he could do it.’ West Frisian dialect

- Past participles are ge-less, e.g. kind vs Dutch gekund
- However, for West Frisian we know it is in strong language
  contact with Dutch (which shows high frequency of IPP)
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▶ As mentioned above, ge- developed from a proclitic telicity marker
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A clash between atelic V2+V3 and telic ge-

- As mentioned above, ge- developed from a proclitic telicity marker
- A part of the initial meaning of an element is often retained in the grammaticalised form (Hopper & Traugott)
- Zwart (2007) proposes that this retained telic meaning of ge-clashes with the atelicity of V2+V3 of the 3-verb cluster
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(5)  

a. Ik heb het boek gelezen.
   ‘I read the book.’

b. Ik heb het boek laten lezen.
   ‘I let (sc. them) read the book.’
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Zwart (2007:87): an auxiliary-participle combination denotes an accomplishment/completed event, while the same combination of verbs with an added infinitive does not

(5) a. Ik heb₁ het boek gelezen₂.
   I have the book read. PTPC
   ‘I read the book.’

   b. Ik heb₁ het boek laten₂ lezen₃.
   I have the book let. IPP read. INF
   ‘I let (sc. them) read the book.’

▶ In (6a) the reading is finished, in (6b) it does not have to be
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- Similarly: (Zwart 2007: 87)

(6) 

a. Ik heb\textsubscript{1} de film gezien\textsubscript{2}.
   I have the movie seen.PTPC
   ‘I saw the movie.’

b. Ik heb\textsubscript{1} de film zien\textsubscript{2} opnemen\textsubscript{3}.
   I have the movie seen.IPP shot.INF
   ‘I’ve seen (sc. them) shoot the movie.’
TP I: IPP is a side-effect
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- Similarly: (Zwart 2007: 87)

(6)  

a. Ik heb₁ de film gezien₂.
I have the movie seen.PTCP
‘I saw the movie.’

b. Ik heb₁ de film zien₂ opnemen₃.
I have the movie seen.IPP shot.INF
‘I’ve seen (sc. them) shoot the movie.’

- In (7a) the movie-watching is completed, in (7b) the shooting is not necessarily complete
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A clash between atelic V2+V3 and telic ge-

- Zwart (2007:91) concludes: ‘3-verb clusters headed by a temporal auxiliary are atelic, hence would not have qualified for modification by telic preverb ge-’
- It follows that the IPP-effect did not come about by elimination of the ge- prefix on V2, but through analogical pressure to assimilate original ge-less participles with infinitives
- Standardisation has played a big role in this
- I.e. in many non-standard varieties, the form of V2 in these clusters in not an infinitive, but a different non-finite form without ge-, e.g. a supine
TP II: Afrikaans *ge*- and *het* are past tense markers

Afrikaans *ge*- is past tense inflection

- Conradie (2009): the loss of the synthetic preterite has caused the periphrastic perfect in Afrikaans to broaden into a past tense
TP II: Afrikaans *ge-* and *het* are past tense markers
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Afrikaans ge- is past tense inflection

- Conradie (2009): the loss of the synthetic preterite has caused the periphrastic perfect in Afrikaans to broaden into a past tense
- The periphrastic perfect is nowadays the only explicit past tense marker available

(7) Ik het\textsubscript{1} die boek \textit{gelees}\textsubscript{2}.
I have the book read.\text{PTPC}
Dutch: ‘Ik heb het boek gelezen (telic)./Ik las het boek (atelic).’
TP II: Afrikaans *ge-* and *het* are past tense markers

Afrikaans *ge-* is past tense inflection

- Conradie (2009): the loss of the synthetic preterite has caused the periphrastic perfect in Afrikaans to broaden into a past tense
- The periphrastic perfect is nowadays the only explicit past tense marker available

(7) \[ \text{Ik } \textit{het}_1 \text{ die boek } \textit{gelees}_2. \]
    I have the book read.\textsc{ptpc}
    Dutch: ‘Ik heb het boek gelezen (telic)./Ik las het boek (atelic).’

- As such, Afrikaans *ge-* seems to have completely lost its telic flavour, still present in Dutch
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Afrikaans *het*- is past tense inflection

- Both Conradie (2006; 2018) and Zwart (2017) argue that the Afrikaans temporal auxiliary *het* is a past tense inflection
- *Het* has replaced *is/wees* in the course of the 19th century (*is > het gegaan*)
- Its usage has increased drastically after the loss of the preterite (e.g. *zong > het gesing*)
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Afrikaans het- is past tense inflection

- An argument for het being past tense inflection is the fact that it cannot be separated from the past participle:
  - I.e. *hoef te gesien het* vs. Dutch *hoeft gezien te hebben*
  - *Het* also always follows the past participle:
    - I.e. *gewerk het* vs. Dutch *heb gewerkt/gewerkt heb*
TP II: Afrikaans *ge* - and *het* are past tense markers

Afrikaans *het* - is past tense inflection

- An argument for *het* being past tense inflection is the fact that it cannot be separated from the past participle:
- I.e. *hoef te gesien het* vs. Dutch *hoeft gezien te hebben*
- *Het* also always follows the past participle:
- I.e. *gewerk het* vs. Dutch *heb gewerkt/gewerkt heb’*
- Furthermore, *het* is very frequently reduced to unstressed ’*t*
Taken together, we can conclude that both ge- and het are past tense markers
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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
TP III: Afrikaans ge- is phrasal

Dutch ge- is a regular verbal affix

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

af\textunderscore ge\textunderscore haald, *ge\textunderscore af\textunderscore haald
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)
Afrikaans *ge-* is a phrasal affix

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

\[ \text{af-}ge\text{-haar, } ge\text{-af-haal} \]

(Prinsloo 2009:78)
Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix

Conradie (2012:12): **Afrikaans ge- is a phrasal affix**, with much more syntactic independence than Dutch ge-
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Summary of the theoretical prerequisites

- IPP in 3-verb clusters is a side-effect of the telic origin of West Germanic *ge*-
- Afrikaans *ge-* has lost its telic flavour: it is now a past tense marker
- Afrikaans *het* is a past tense marker as well
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- Afrikaans \textit{ge-} has lost its telic flavour, while temporal auxiliary \textit{het} has become a real past tense marker

- I.e. the past tense interpretation in a temporal 3-verb cluster comes from \textit{het}

- This makes the presence of \textit{ge-} on V2 redundant, itself also being a past tense marker
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- The use of *ge-* in temporal 3-verb clusters is mostly informal and regional (Ponelis 1993)

- We know from many other dialectal studies, that the double spell out of a feature is a characteristic of regional and dialectal language

- and is in fact common in Standard Afrikaans morphosyntax as well (e.g. negative concord)
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- Recall: the highest frequencies of ge- on V2 are the innovative indirect and direct linking verbs: loop, the posture verbs, ophou and maak
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Recall: the highest frequencies of ge- on V2 are the innovative indirect and direct linking verbs: loop, the posture verbs, ophou and maak

These verbs did not come in a ‘IPP-package’ from Middle and Early Modern Dutch

It is therefore not unexpected that they show the least resistance for the attachment of the now only past tense marking ge-
A further enforcing factor in the disappearance of real IPP in Afrikaans:
The analysis of Afrikaans optional ‘IPP’

- A further enforcing factor in the disappearance of real IPP in Afrikaans:
- The most strict IPP group in Dutch and German - the modal group - has lost its infinitival use altogether
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- We furthermore know that Afrikaans ge- is phrasal; it has more syntactic freedom than Dutch ge-
- We therefore see it also appearing on V3 in 3-verb clusters, an innovation that is not attested in any Dutch variety

(8) ...dat hij die huis laat₂ gebou₃ het¹. 
...that he the house let GE-built has ‘...that he let the house be build.’
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▶ We furthermore know that Afrikaans ge- is phrasal; it has more syntactic freedom than Dutch ge-
▶ We therefore see it also appearing on V3 in 3-verb clusters, an innovation that is not attested in any Dutch variety

(8) ...dat hij die huis \textit{laat}_2 \textit{gebou}_3 \textit{het}_1.
...that he the house let \textit{GE}-built has
‘...that he let the house be build.’

▶ Another factor that has ‘helped’ this innovation is of course the loss of the circumfix of Afrikaans past participles
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Interestingly, this verb class is the one that has the strongest use of so-called ‘quirky verb second’

(9) a. Ik bly die boek lees.
    I continue the book read

b. Ik bly lees die boek.
    I continue read the book
    ‘I continue reading the book.’
Recall: the group of direct linking verbs was the group that has a very low percentage of ge- occurrence on V2 (bly ‘continue’, begin ‘begin’, help ‘help’ et cetera

Interestingly, this verb class is the one that has the strongest use of so-called ‘quirky verb second’

(9) 

a. Ik bly die boek lees.  
   I continue the book read
b. Ik bly lees die boek.  
   I continue read the book
   ‘I continue reading the book.’

The ’residu IPP’ from Dutch, which causes the verbs to have the same form, has thus worked in favour of another innovation in Afrikaans
Quirky verb second is crucially ungrammatical with modals:

(10)  
  a. Ik \textit{wou} die boek \textit{lees}.  
       I want the book read
  b. *Ik \textit{wou lees} die boek.  
       I want read the book
     ‘I want to read the book.’
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- Quirky verb second is crucially ungrammatical with modals:

  (10)  
  a. Ik **wou** die boek **lees**.  
       I want the book read  
  
  b. *Ik **wou** **lees** die boek.  
      I want read the book  
      ‘I want to read the book.’

- Modals never occur in the same form as V3 in temporal 3-verb clusters (*recall: V3 is either a bare form or past participle*).

- I.e. the modal group - the core IPP group in West Germanic - shows different behaviour from the ‘residu IPP’ group of verbs in this respect as well.
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Conclusion and outlook

- Taken together, optional ‘IPP’ in Afrikaans temporal 3-verb clusters can be analysed as optional double spell out of the past tense feature of the cluster.
- In the future, I aim at investigating the dialectal dimension, i.e. variation in frequencies of IPP/non-IPP across the Afrikaans language area.
Baie dankie!