Universiteit Leiden
The Netherlands

The historical development of the Dutch posture-verb progressive construction: including a comparison with German

Okabe, A.

Citation
Okabe, A. (2023, February 22). *The historical development of the Dutch posture-verb progressive construction: including a comparison with German*. *LOT dissertation series*. LOT, Amsterdam. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3564457

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3564457

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Appendix A Annotation and possible values per parameter for the Dutch database

This appendix describes the annotation of the Dutch data extracted from the corpora. The data are annotated in the database (cf. Okabe 2022) in terms of the data source (see (1) below), the inflection of the posture verb (2), the form of the connector (3), the syntactic and semantic features of the second verb (4), some features of the subject (5), the placement and some features of the object, if present (6), the presence/absence and the placement of the modifier (8), structural information (9), and other characteristics (10). Note that not all the information coded in the database is systematically discussed in the text, e.g. person and mood specification on the verb.

The specification of the data source includes the following four kinds of information:

(1) a. Name of the corpus: Corpus Gysseling,
Corpus Middelnederlands,
Corpus literair Nieuwnederlands
b. Name of the document: derived from the corpus
c. Publication year (in centuries): 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18
d. Text type: prose, verse, and prose and verse for Middle Dutch;
prose, drama, non-fiction for Early Modern Dutch

Parameter (1a) has three options, as described in Chapter 2: 'Corpus Gysseling', 'Corpus Middelnederlands', and 'Corpus literair Nieuwnederlands'. Parameter (1b) provides the name of the document from which each instance is extracted (this information is derived from the corpora). The publication year is also taken from the corpora and classified per century, i.e. 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th century. This means, for example, that the publication years 1234, 1250, and 1289 would all be annotated as '13' in the database. The text type (1d) also reflects the information given in the corpora. As illustrated in Chapter 2, the two Middle Dutch corpora are principally based on the binary classification of prose vs. verse, although there are two texts in the *Corpus Middelnederlands* which are marked as 'prose and verse'. For the *Corpus literair Nieuwnederlands*, three categories are distinguished: prose, drama, and non-fiction. Hence, for both Middle Dutch and Early Modern Dutch, three values are available for the text type parameter.

The information regarding the posture verb is annotated in the following way:

(2) a. Posture verb: staan, zitten, liggen
b. Person: 1st, 2nd, 3rd, na
c. Number: singular, plural, na
d. Tense/mood/finiteness: present, past, imperative, infinitive, subjunctive

Posture verb type (2a) has three options corresponding to the kind of posture verb in question: 'staan', which covers both the Middle Dutch form *staen* and the (Early) Modern Dutch form *staan*; 'zitten', which covers Middle Dutch *sitten* and (Early) Modern Dutch *zitten*; and 'liggen' for *liggen*. The inflection of the posture verb—that is, its person (2b), number (2c), and tense, mood, and finiteness (2d)—is annotated to enable the assessment of distributional deviations. For cases where person and number are not relevant, for example when the verb is in the infinitive, the instance is marked as 'na' (which stands for 'not applicable') in the database.

The connector type is annotated in terms of the observed form of the connector, as in (3).

(3) Connector: en, ende, te, none

The syntactic and semantic features of the second verb are the most extensively annotated elements in the database, as summarized in (4).

(4) a. Verb number: 2, 3, 4, 5
b. Verb type: dictionary form of the second verb
c. Conjugation: ++, +-, --
d. Dynamic: +, -
e. Atelic: +, -
f. Compatible with the posture: +, -
g. No movement: +, -

First, the sequential number of each verb in the construction is annotated. In most cases, the verb is marked as '2', meaning that the verb in question is the first verb following the posture verb in the construction. In some cases, the instance has three or more verbs in close vicinity, e.g. ?*hij* ***zat*** *en* ***at*** *en* ***drank*** 'he sat and ate and drank'. In this case, two entries are created: one for the verb pair *zitten* and *eten*, where *eten* is annotated as '2', and the other for

zitten and *drinken*, where *drinken* is annotated as '3'. Verb type (4b) provides the dictionary form of the second verb. The dictionaries consulted are the *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* for the instances extracted from the Middle Dutch corpora and the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* for the instances from the Early Modern Dutch corpus. Some of the verbs are additionally marked with '/' (e.g. */wachten*) to exclude them from the analysis of the HTR of the second verb (cf. Appendix B). Conjugation (4c) reflects whether the posture and the second verb are conjugated or not. When a verb is conjugated, it is annotated as '+', otherwise as '-'. Since there are two verbs and two options for each verb, four possibilities exist: '++', '+-', '-+', and '—'. Note, however, that cases where the posture verb is not conjugated while the second verb is conjugated (i.e. '-+') are not included in the database (cf. section 2.2.3.). Features (4d-g) are associated with the semantic features of the second verb (cf. section 3.4.1.); whether each semantic feature is observed or not is marked as '+' or '-', respectively.

The characteristics of the nouns in the construction are annotated as shown in (5) and (6).

(5) Presence of the subject for the second verb: +, -

(6) a. Presence of the object: +, -
b. Position of the object: 1, 2, 3, 4
c. Extracted/preposed object: e, p, or none

The presence/absence of the subject and the object for the second verb is annotated as '+' (present) or '-' (absent) (5 & 6a). The position of the object (6b) is annotated by distinguishing four locations: before the posture verb [1], between the posture verb and the connector [2], between the connector and the second verb [3], and after the second verb [4]. This is shown schematically in (7).

(7) [1] PV [2] C [3] V^2 [4]

As shown in (6c), instances with extracted and preposed objects are annotated as 'e' and 'p', respectively, and those with neither are marked by an empty cell.

The annotations related to the modifiers are summarized in (8).

(8) a. Position of the adverbial before the posture verb [1]: +, none

b. Position of the adverbial between the posture verb and the connector [2]: +, none
c. Position of the adverbial between the connector and the second verb [3]: +, none
d. Position of the adverbial after the second verb [4]: +, none
e. Presence of the locative modifier: +, -
f. Presence of the temporal modifier: +, -
g. Negator for the posture verb: +, none
h. Negator for the second verb: +, none

First, the position of the adverbial is marked (from 8a to 8d) using the same schema as presented in (7). Second, the presence/absence of two types of modifiers, i.e. locative and durative temporal adverbials, is marked (8e & f). Third, the presence/absence of a negator is annotated (8g & h). When the negator is in the position to negate either a posture verb or second verb, it is marked as '+'.

The word order is annotated according to the position of the posture verb, as shown by (9).

(9) Location of the posture verb: nf, f

In this research, I distinguish instances where the posture verb is located in clause-non-final position and where it is located in the clause-final verbal complex (cf. section 3.4.). The former is annotated as 'nf' and the latter as 'f'.

Finally, three types of additional information are annotated in the column named 'Others', where applicable. First, when a sentence shows the IPP effect (see section 1.2.2. for an explanation of the IPP effect), it is marked as 'ipp'. Second, when the posture verb is used with a non-literal meaning (e.g. using *liggen* to mean 'to stay'; cf. section 4.2.1.), the instance is annotated as 'nl'. Lastly, when the posture verb and the second verb can be interpreted as disagreeing in number (cf. section 1.3.3. and 4.2.4.), it is marked as 'nd', which stands for 'number disagreement'.

(10) Others: ipp, nl, nd

Appendix B Dataset for the analysis of the hapax-token ratio

This appendix describes how the datasets were prepared for the analysis of the hapax-token ratio (HTR). In preparing the datasets, recurring Bible translations are first removed. The resulting dataset for the 13th and 14th centuries includes about 4.4 million tokens, that for the 15th and 16th centuries about 5.6 million tokens, and that for the 17th and 18th centuries around 6.5 million tokens. Subsequently, the datasets for the 15th and 16th centuries and the 17th and 18th centuries are reduced in size, so that all the datasets are comparable. The reduction is made by excluding some texts from the dataset. The texts to exclude are randomly chosen from each text genre per century in turn. A total of 39 texts are removed from the dataset for the 15th and 16th centuries and 65 texts from the dataset for the 17th and 18th centuries. The resulting datasets each consist of about 4.4 million tokens, as shown by Table 1.

Table 1. Size (in number of words) of datasets per two centuries

13th & 14th	15th & 16th	17th & 18th
4,413,251	4,419,612	4,428,357

In the database, when the second verb (annotated as in (4b)) derives from the excluded texts, it is marked with '/' (e.g. /eten) so that it can be distinguished and excluded from the HTR analysis.

Appendix C Dataset for the diachronic development of the coordinating conjunction

This appendix describes how the data were prepared for the analysis of the coordinating conjunction. As outlined in 4.2.4., the analysis concerning the replacement of the connector *ende* by *en* (cf. Hypothesis 4) includes an investigation of the alternation of the coordinating conjunction between the forms *ende* and *en*. The development of the coordinating conjunction is examined by extracting data from randomly selected texts, which are evenly distributed across centuries and text genres. The names of the texts used are listed below in (1).

(1) a. *Spiegel historiael (eerste partie/derde partie/vierde partie)* for the early 14th century
b. *Stuttgartse leven van Jezus* for the early 14th century
c. *Roman van Walewein* for 1350 for the late 14th century
d. *Nieuwe Testament (Nndl. vert.)* for the late 14th century
e. B*rabantsche yeesten (boek 6)* for the early 15th century
f. *Historie van den grale* for the early 15th century
g. *Karel ende Elegast* for the late 15th century
h. *Historie van Reynaert die vos, Proza-Reinaert* for the late 15th century
i. *Devoot ende profitelyck boecxken, Liedboek van 1539* for the early 16th century
j. *Historie vanden vier heemskinderen* for the early 16th century
k. *Antwerps liedboek* for the late 16th century
l. *Historie van Malegijs* for the late 16th century
m. *Nederlandsche Historien (boek 1-8)* for the early 17th century
n. *Beschrijvinge der stad Leyden (fragment)* for the early 17th century
o. *Palamedes oft Vermoorde onnooselheyd* for the early 17th century
p. *Het leven van Joost van den Vondel* for the late 17th century
q. *Den vermakelyken avanturier (behalve laatste boek)* for the late 17th century
r. *Haagsche broeder-moord of dolle blydschap* for the late 17th century
s. *Vaderlandsche historie (t.e.m. boek 8 XIX)* for the early 18th century
t. *De Rotterdamsche Hermes* for the early 18th century
u. *Het wederzyds huwelijksbedrog* for the early 18th century
v. *Het onscheidbaar drietal redenwezens verlichting, deugd en tijd* for the late 18th century
w. *De vrouwelijke Cartouche* for the late 18th century
x. *De patriotten* for the late 18th century

The frequencies of the coordinating conjunction in the form of *ende* or *en* extracted from these texts are reported in 4.2.3.

Appendix D Annotation and possible values per parameter for the German database

This appendix describes the annotation of the German data extracted from the corpus (cf. Okabe 2022). The German data are annotated largely in the same manner as the Dutch instances, as described in Appendix A. First, the name of the document and the publication year of the source document are specified in the following way:

(1) a. Name of the document: as given in the corpus
b. Publication year: 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010

For posture verbs, the annotations cover the type of verb, the conjugation of the verb, and its person, number, and tense and mood, as shown in (2).

(2) a. Posture verb: stehen, dastehen, sitzen, dasitzen, liegen, daliegen
b. Conjugation: +, -
c. Person: 1st, 2nd, 3rd, na
d. Number: singular, plural, na
e. Tense/mood/finiteness: present, past, perfective, infinitive, subjunctive

Each instance in the database is marked in terms of what type of posture verb it includes (2a). As shown in Chapter 5, posture verbs with the particle *da-*, i.e. *dastehen*, *dasitzen* and *daliegen*, are analyzed separately from the verbs without the particle. For both the posture verb and the second verb, the presence or absence of conjugation is annotated as '+' or '-' respectively, in (2b). The annotation here is simpler than in Dutch, as inflectional mismatches between the verbs do not occur. Therefore, the '+' or '-' reflects whether or not both the posture verb and second verb are conjugated. The number and the tense/mood/finiteness are annotated in the same way as with the Dutch data (see Appendix A).

The syntactic and semantic features of the second verb are annotated with the parameters shown in (3).

(3) a. Verb number: 2, 3, 4

b. Verb type: dictionary form of the second verb
c. Dynamic: +, -
d. Atelic: +, -
e. Compatible with the posture: +, -
f. No movement: +, -

All the features are annotated in the same way as for the Dutch data (see Appendix A). The form of the connector is not annotated, since German only has one form: *und*.

As for the noun, the annotation covers the presence or absence of the subject for the second verb, the presence or absence of an object, and the presence of an extracted or preposed object.

(4) a. Presence of the subject for the second verb: +,-
b. Presence of the object: +, -
c. Extracted/preposed object: e, p, or none

Parameters (4a-c) are annotated in the same manner as for Dutch (cf. Appendix A).

For the modifier, the annotation covers the position of the adverbials (if any), the presence or absence of certain types of modifiers, and the modification relation of the negator.

(5) a. Position of the adverbial before the posture verb [1]: +, none
b. Position of the adverbial between the posture verb and the connector [2]: +, none
c. Position of the adverbial between the connector and the second verb [3]: +, none
d. Position of the adverbial after the second verb [4]: +, none
e. Presence of the locative modifier: +, ++, -, na
f. Presence of the temporal modifier: +, -
g. Negator for the posture verb: +, none
h. Negator for the second verb: +, none

All the points except for (5e) are annotated in the same way as in Dutch (see Appendix A). With regard to (5e), when an instance has one or more locative modifiers, it is marked as either '+' or '++'. The difference between '+' and '++' is that the latter denotes deictic locative adverbs (e.g. *da* 'there', *hier* 'here') and the former covers the rest (cf. section 5.3.4.). The label 'na' is given when

the instance includes one of the *da*-verbs, i.e. *dastehen*, *dasitzen*, or *daliegen*, and is not further modified for location.

The position of the posture verb is annotated by distinguishing cases where the posture verb is found in clause-non-final position versus clause-final position; these situations are annotated as 'nf' and 'f', respectively.

(6) Location of the posture verb: nf, f

Finally, cases of 'subject lacking in finite clauses' (SLF coordination, cf. 5.2.2.) are marked as 'slf' in the column 'Others'.

(7) Others: slf, none

Bibliography

Corpus

Corpus Gysseling = Corpus Gysseling (Version 1.0) (1990). Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal. Online: https://corpusgysseling.ivdnt.org/corpus-frontend/Gysseling/search/.

Corpus literair Nieuwnederlands = Geleyn & Colleman (2015)

Corpus Middelnederlands. Nederlab. Online: https://www.nederlab.nl/onderzoeksportaal.

DWDS-Kernkorpus 21 (2000-2010). DWDS (Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache). Online: https://www.dwds.de/d/korpora/korpus21.

Dictionary

Duden Wörterbuch = *Duden Onlinewörterbuch*. Bibliographisches Institut. Online: https://www.duden.de/woerterbuch.

MNW = *Het Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek*. Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal. https://gtb.ivdnt.org/search/?owner=mnw.

WNT = *Het Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*. Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal. https://gtb.ivdnt.org/search/?owner=wnt.

Literature

ANS = *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst. Versie 3.1*. Instituut voor de Nederlandse Taal. Online: https://e-ans.ivdnt.org/.

ANDERSEN, HENNING. 2006. Synchrony, Diachrony, and Evolution. *Competing Models of Linguistic Change. Evolution and beyond*, ed. by OLE N. THOMSEN, 59-90. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

ANTHONISSEN, LYNN; ASTRID DE WIT; and TANJA MORTELMANS. 2019. (Inter)subjective uses of the Dutch progressive constructions. *Linguistics* 57 (5). 1111-1159.

ATASEVER BELLI, SERAP. 2017. An Analysis of Stative Verbs Used with the Progressive Aspect in Corpus-informed Textbooks. *English Language Teaching* 11 (1). 120-135.

AUDRING, JENNY, and GEERT BOOIJ. 2016. Cooperation and coercion. *Linguistics* 54 (4). 617-637.

BAAYEN, R. HARALD, and ROCHELLE LIEBER. 1991. Productivity and English Derivation: A Corpus Based Study. *Linguistics* 29 (5). 801-843.

BARBIERS, SJEF; JOHAN VAN DER AUWERA; HANS BENNIS; EEFJE BOEF; GUNTHER DE VOGELAER; and MARGREET VAN DER HAM. 2008. *Syntactische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten Deel II / Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects Volume II.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

BEHRENS, BERGLJOT; MONIQUE FLECKEN; and MARY CARROLL. 2013. Progressive Attraction: On the Use and Grammaticalization of Progressive Aspect in Dutch, Norwegian, and German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 25 (2). 95-136.

BIRKENES, MAGNUS BREDER, and FLORIAN SOMMER. 2015. The agreement of collective nouns in the history of Ancient Greek and German. *Language Change at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, ed. by CHIARA GIANOLLO, AGNES JÄGER, and DORIS PENKA, 183-221. Berlin, Munich, Boston: Walter de Gruyter

BLÜHDORN, HARADARIK. 2008. Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics and discourse. Evidence from the study of connectives. *'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text*, ed. by CATHRINE FABRICIUS-HANSEN and WIEBKE RAMM, 59-85. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

BOGAARDS, MAARTEN. 2019. Sitting stuck and standing scribbled: Productivity, structure, and meaning of posture verbs combined with a complementive past participle in Dutch. Leiden University MA thesis. Online: https://www.maartenbogaards.nl/papers/2019/bogaards_2019_mathesis.pdf>.

BONITZ, PETRA-KRISTIN, and ANKE HOLLER. 2011. Subject gaps in German coordinative structures. Empirical evidence for a gradient phenomenon. *Proceedings of the Fourth ISCA Tutorial and Research Workshop on Experimental Linguistics 2011*, ed. by ANTONIS BOTINIS, 35-38. Athens: ExLing Society.

BOOGAART, RONNY. 1991. 'Progressive Aspect' in Dutch. *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1991*, ed. by FRANK DRIJKONINGEN and ANS M. C. VAN KEMENADE, 1-9. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

BOOGAART, RONNY. 1999. Aspect and temporal ordering. A constrastive analysis of Dutch and English. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam dissertation.

BOUZOUITA, MIRIAM; ANNE BREITBARTH; LIEVEN DANCKAERT; and MELISSA FARASYN. 2019. The determinants of diachronic stability. *The*

Determinants of Diachronic Stability, ed. by ANNE BREITBARTH, MIRIAM BOUZOUITA, LIEVEN DANCKAERT, and MELISSA FARASYN, 1-10. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

BREZINA, VACLAV. 2018. *Statistics in Corpus Linguistics: A Practical Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BROEKHUIS, HANS, and NORBERT CORVER. 2019. *Syntax of Dutch: Coordinations and ellipsis*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

BYBEE, JOAN. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BYBEE, JOAN; REVERE PERKINS; and WILLIAM PAGLIUCA. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

CARLSON, GREGORY N. 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts dissertation.

CATS, JACOB. 1627. *Sinne- en minnebeelden (digital edition)*. Emblem Project Utrecht. Online: https://emblems.hum.uu.nl/c1627.html.

CAVIRANI-POTS, CORA. 2020. Roots in Progress. Sumi-lexicality in the Dutch and Afrikaans verbal domain. KU Leuven dissertation.

COPPEN, PETER-ARNO. 2009. Hoe zit het eigenlijk?. *Onze Taal* 78 (6). 164-165.

CORREIA SAAVEDRA, DAVID. 2019. *Measurements of Grammaticalization: Developing a quantitative index for the study of grammatical change*. Antwerp: University of Antwerp dissertation.

COUSSÉ, EVIE. 2010. Een digitaal compilatiecorpus historisch Nederlands. *Lexikos* 20. 123-142.

DE BO, LEONARD LODEWIJK. 1873. *Westvlaamsch idioticon*. Brugge: E. Gaillard.

DE SCHUTTER, GEORGES. 1994. Dutch. *The Germanic languages*, ed. by EKKEHARD KÖNIG and JOHAN VAN DER AUWERA, 439-477. London, New York: Routledge.

DE SMET, HENDRIK; FRAUKE D'HOEDT; LAUREN FONTEYN; and KRISTEL VAN GOETHEM. 2018. The changing functions of competing forms: Attraction and differentiation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 29 (2). 197-234.

DE VOS, MARK ANDREW. 2005. *The syntax of pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans.* Leiden: Leiden University dissertation.

DE WIT, ASTRID; PETER PETRÉ; and FRANK BRISARD. 2020. Standing out with the progressive. *Journal of Linguistics* 56. 479-514.

Duden (2016) = WÖLLSTEIN, ANGELIKA, and Dudenredaktion (ed.) 2016. *Duden - Die Grammatik: Unentbehrlich für richtiges Deutsch*. Berlin: Dudenverlag.

DUINHOVEN, A. M. 1997. *Middelnederlandse syntaxis: Synchroon en diachroon. 2: De werkwoordgroep*. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.

EBERT, KAREN H. 2008. Progressive markers in Germanic languages. *Eurotyp.*

Volume 6 Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe, ed. by ÖSTEN DAHL, 603-651. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

FLECKEN, MONIQUE. 2011. Event conceptualization by early Dutch - German bilinguals: Insights from linguistic and eye-tracking data. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14 (1). 61-77.

FRIED, MIRJAM. 2009. Construction grammar as a tool for diachronic analysis. *Constructions and Frames* 1 (2). 262-291.

FREUND, NINA. 2016. Recent Change in the Use of Stative Verbs in the Progressive Form in British English: I'm loving it. *Language Studies Working Papers* 206 (7). 50-61.

GAUSE GEORGE FRANCIS. 1934. *The struggle for existence*. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

GELEYN, TIM, and TIMOTHY COLLEMAN. 2015. De aan-constructie in het 17de-eeuwse Nederlands. Een semasiologische studie. *Taal En Tongval* 67 (2). 211-245.

GERRITSEN, MARINEL (ed.) 1991. *Atlas van de Nederlandse dialectsyntaxis (AND)*. Amsterdam: P. J. Meertens-Instituut voor Dialectologie, Volkskunde en Naamkunde.

GISBORNE, NIKOLAS, and AMANDA PATTEN. 2010. Construction grammar and grammaticalization. *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, ed. by BERND HEINE and HEIKO NARROG, 92-104. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GOLDSMITH, JOHN. 1985. A Principled Exception to the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 21. 133-143.

HASLINGER, IRENE, and MARJO VAN KOPPEN. 2003. De verbale hendiadys als pseudocoördinatie. *Taal En Tongval* 15-16. 102-122.

HASPELMATH, MARTIN. 1989. From purposive to infinitive. A universal path of grammaticalization. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10 (1-2). 287-310.

HEINE, BERND. 1993. *Auxiliaries: Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HEINE, BERND. 2003. Grammaticalization. *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, ed. by BRIAN D. JOSEPH, and RICHARD D. JANDA, 575-601. Oxford: Blackwell.

HEINE, BERND; ULRIKE CLAUDI; and FRIEDERIKE HÜNNEMEYER. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HEYCOCK, CAROLINE, and HJALMAR P. PETERSEN. 2012. Pseudo-coordinations in Faroese. *Multilingual Individuals and Multilingual Societies*, ed. by KURT BRAUNMÜLLER, and CHRISTOPH GABRIEL, 259-280. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

HILPERT, MARTIN. 2008. *Germanic Future Constructions. A Usage-Based Approach to Language Change*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

HILPERT, MARTIN, and CHRISTIAN KOOPS. 2008. A quantitative approach to the development of complex predicates: The case of Swedish Pseudo-Coordination with *sitta* "sit". *Diachronica* 25 (2). 242-261.

HINTZ, DANIEL J. 2011. *Crossing Aspectual Frontiers: Emergence, Evolution, and Interwoven Semantic Domains in South Conchucos Quechua Discourse*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

HÖDER, STEFFEN. 2011. Dialect convergence across language boundaries. A challenge for areal linguistics. *Language variation - European perspectives III. Selected papers from the 5th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 5), Copenhagen, June 2009*, ed. by FRANS GREGERSEN; JEFFREY K. PARROTT; and PIA QUIST, 173-184. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

HÖDER, STEFFEN. 2012. Der is wieder bei und malt Karten. Niederdeutsche Syntax aus nordeuropäischer Sicht. *Germanistische Linguistik* 220. 181-201.

HOEKSTRA, ERIC. 1999. De opkomst van het aspektuele hulpwerkwoord *liggen*. *TABU* 29. 43-47.

HOFFMANN, SEBASTIAN. 2004. Are low-frequency complex prepositions grammaticalized?. *Corpus Approaches to Grammaticalization in English*, ed. by HANS LINDQUIST, and CHRISTIAN MAIR, 171-210. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

HÖHLE, TILMAN N. 1983. *Subjektlücken in Koordinationen*. Köln, MS. Online: https://www.ling.uni-potsdam.de/~thiersch/Hoehle83.pdf.

HOPPER, PAUL J. 2008. Emergent Serialization in English: Pragmatics and Typology. *Linguistic universals and language change*, ed. by JEFF GOOD, 253-284. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HOPPER, PAUL J., and ELIZABETH CLOSS TRAUGOTT. 2003. *Grammaticalization (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

IJBEMA, ANIEK. 2003. *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in Dutch aspectual constructions*. Leipzig: University of Leipzig, MS.

JANDA, RICHARD D., AND BRIAN D. JOSEPH. 2003. On language, change, and language — Or, Of history, linguistics, and historical linguistics change. *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, ed. by BRAIN D. JOSEPH, and RICHARD D. JANDA. 3-180. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

JÓHANNSDÓTTIR, KRISTÍN M. 2007. The posture verb progressive in Icelandic. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, ed. by ESTELA PUIG-WALDMÜLLER, 361-374. Barcelona: Pompeu Fabra University.

KINN, TORODD; KRISTIAN BLENSENIUS; and PETER ANDERSSON. 2018. Posture, location, and activity in Mainland Scandinavian pseudocoordinations. *CogniTextes* 18. Online: https://journals.open edition.org/cognitextes/1158.

KRAUSE, OLAF. 2012. *Progressiv im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

KUTEVA, TANIA. 1999. On 'sit'/'stand'/'lie' auxiliation. *Linguistics* 37 (2). 191-213.

KUTEVA, TANIA. 2001. *Auxiliation: An Enquiry Into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KUTSCHER, SILVIA, and EVA SCHULTZE-BERNDT. 2007. Why a folder lies in the basket although it is not lying: The semantics and use of German positional verbs with inanimate Figures. *Linguistics* 45 (5-6). 983-1028.

LAKOFF, GEORGE. 1986. Frame Semantic Control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint. *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory, Chicago Lin- guistic Society 22,* ed. by ANNE FARLEY; PETER FARLEY; and KARL-ERIK MCCULLOUGH, 152-167. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

LARSON, MARTHA ANNE. 2005. *The empty object construction and related phenomena.* Ithaca: Cornell University dissertation.

LEHMANN, CHRISTIAN. 1985. Grammaticalization: Synchronic variation and diachronic change. *Lingua e Stile* 20. 303-318.

LEMMENS, MAARTEN. 2002. The semantic network of Dutch posture verbs. *The Linguistics of Sitting, Standing and Lying*, ed. by JOHN NEWMAN, 103-139. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

LEMMENS, MAARTEN. 2005. Aspectual posture verb constructions in Dutch. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 17 (3). 183-217.

LEMMENS, MAARTEN. 2015. Zit je te denken of ben je aan het piekeren?. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 20 (1). 5-36.

LESUISSE, MÉGANE, and MAARTEN LEMMENS. 2018. Grammaticalisation cut short. *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*, ed. by EVIE COUSSÉ; PETER ANDERSSON; and JOEL OLOFSSON, 43-74. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

LEYS, ODO. 1985. De konstruktie *staan te* + infinitief en verwante konstrukties. *Verslagen en Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde* 13 (3). 265-277.

LØDRUP, HELGE. 2019. Pseudocoordination with posture verbs in Mainland Scandinavian: A grammaticalized progressive construction?. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 42 (1). 87-110.

LÓPEZ-COUSO, MARÍA JOSÉ. 2016. Continuing the dialogue between corpus

linguistics and grammaticalization theory: Three case studies. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 12 (1), 7-29.

MAIR, CHRISTIAN. 2004. Corpus linguistics and grammaticalisation theory. *Corpus Approaches to Grammaticalization in English,* ed. by HANS LINDQUIST and CHRISTIAN MAIR, 121-150. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

MAIR, CHRISTIAN. 2012. Progressive and Continuous Aspect. *The Oxford Handook of Tense and Aspect*, ed. by ROBERT I. BINNICK, 803-827. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MAYR, CLEMENS, and VIOLA SCHMITT. 2017. Asymmetric coordination. *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Second Edition*, ed. by MARTIN EVERAERT and HENK C. VAN RIEMSDIJK, 1-32. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

MICHAELIS, LAURA A. 2004. Type shifting in construction grammar: An integrated approach to aspectual coercion. *Cognitive Linguistics* 15, 1-67.

MÖHLIG-FALKE, RUTH, and BEATRIX BUSSE. 2019. From term to concept and vice versa: Pattern(s) in language and linguistics. *Patterns in Language and Linguistics: New Perspectives on a Ubiquitous Concept*, ed. by BEATRIX BUSSE and RUTH MÖHLIG-FALKE, 11-46. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

NACCARATO, CHIARA. 2016. A corpus-based quantitative approach to the study of morphological productivity in diachrony: The case of samo-compounds in Russian. *A blend of MaLT: Selected contributions from the methods and linguistic theories symposium 2015*, ed. by HANNA CHRIST; DANIEL KLENOVŠAK; LUKAS SÖNNING; and VALENTIN WERNER, 133-152. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press.

NEMOIANU, VIRGIL. 1971. Levels of study in the semantics of rhyme. *Style* 5 (3), 246-264.

New International Version = Bible (New International Version). Biblica. Online: https://www.biblica.com/.

NEWMAN, JOHN. 2002. *The linguistics of sitting, standing and lying*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

NICOLLE, STEVE. 2012. Diachrony and Grammaticalization. *The Oxford Handook of Tense and Aspect*, ed. by ROBERT I. BINNICK, 370-397. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling = De Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling. Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap. Online: https://www.nbv.nl/.

NORDE, MURIEL. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OKABE, AMI. 2022. Posture-verb constructions in Dutch and German.

DataverseNL. doi: https://doi.org/10.34894/BQIQBU.

OVERDIEP, GERRIT SIEBE. 1949. *Stilistische Grammatica van het Moderne Nederlandsch*. Zwolle: Uitgevers-Maatschappij W.E.J. Tjeenk-Willink.

PAARDEKOOPER, P. C. 1993. Een Waterlantsche Trijn zat eens ajuin en schelde. *Leuvense Bijdragen* 82 (1). 145-171.

PATTEN, AMANDA L. 2010. Grammaticalization and the *it*-cleft construction. *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*, ed. by ELIZABETH CLOSS TRAUGOTT and GRAEME TROUSDALE, 221-243. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

PETRÉ, PETER. 2019. How constructions are born. The role of patterns in the constructionalization of *be going to* INF. *Patterns in Language and Linguistics: New Perspectives on a Ubiquitous Concept*, ed. by BEATRIX BUSSE and RUTH MÖHLIG-FALKE, 157-192. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

PIJNENBURG, W. J. J., and TANNEKE H. SCHOONHEIM. 1996. Het Vroegmiddelnederlands Woordenboek (1200-1300). De geschiedenis van een project. *Tijdschrift Voor Nederlandse Taal- En Letterkunde* 112. 152-164.

PROSKE, NADINE. 2017. Perspektivierung von Handlungen und Zuschreibung von Intentionalität durch pseudokoordiniertes *kommen*. *Verben im interaktiven Kontext. Bewegungsverben und mentale Verben im gesprochenen Deutsch,* ed. by ARNULF DEPPERMANN; NADINE PROSKE; and ARNE ZESCHEL, 177-247. Tübingen: Narr.

PROSKE, NADINE. 2019. Emergent pseudo-coordination in spoken German. A corpus-based exploration. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association (GCLA)* 7. 115-136.

QUIRK, RANDOLPH; SIDNEY GREENBAUM; GEOFFREY LEECH; and JAN SVARTVIK. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London, New York: Longman.

R CORE TEAM. 2018. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna. https://www.R-project.org.

REICH, INGO. 2008. From discourse to "odd coordinations". On Asymmetric Coordination and Subject Gaps in German. *'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text. A cross-linguistic perspective*, ed. by CATHRINE FABRICIUS-HANSEN and WIEBKE RAMM, 281-303. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

REICH, INGO. 2009. *„Asymmetrische Koordination" im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

REICH, INGO. 2013. Asymmetrische Koordination. *Satztypen des Deutschen*, ed.

by JÖRG MEIBAUER; MARKUS STEINBACH; and HANS ALTMANN, 356-371. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

ROSEN, ANNA. 2014. *Grammatical Variation and Change in Jersey English*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

ROSS, DANIEL. 2013. Verbal Pseudocoordination in English: A syntactic analysis with reference to diachronic, dialectal and cross-linguistic variation. University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign unpublished qualifying exam paper. Online: http://hdl.handle.net/2142/42581.

ROSS, DANIEL. 2016. Between coordination and subordination: Typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination. *Coordination and Subordination: Form and Meaning—Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*, ed. by FERNADA PRATAS; SANDRA PEREIRA; and CLARA PINTO, 209-243. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

ROSS, JOHN R. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

SOMMERFELDT, KARL-ERNST, and GÜNTER STARKE. 1998. *Einführung in die Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache (3rd ed.)*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

STOETT, F. A. 1889. *Middelnederlandsche spraakkunst. Syntaxis (3rd ed.)*. Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff.

STRENGHOLT, L. 1970. Waterlantsche Trijn heeft nog een appeltje te schillen. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 63. 127-131.

STUTTERHEIM, CHRISTIANE; MARY CARROLL; and WOLDGANG KLEIN. 2009. New perspectives in analyzing aspectual distinctions across languages. *The expression of time*, ed. by WOLFGANG KLEIN and PING LI, 195-216. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

THIERSCH, CRAIG L. 1993. Some remarks on asymmetrical coordination. *Linguistics in the Netherlands 1993*, ed. by FRANK DRIJKONINGEN and KEES HENGEVELD, 141-152. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH CLOSS. 2010. Grammaticalization. *Continuum Companion to Historical Linguistics*, ed. by SILVIA LURAGHI and SILVIA BUBENIK, 269-283. London, New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH CLOSS. 2019. Constructional pattern-development in language change. *Patterns in Language and Linguistics: New Perspectives on a Ubiquitous Concept*, ed. by BEATRIX BUSSE and RUTH MÖHLIG-FALKE, 125-155. Berlin, Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH CLOSS, and GRAEME TROUSDALE. 2013. Constructionalization and Constructional Changes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

VAN DEN HAUWE, JO. 1992. Progressive markers in a Functional Grammar of Dutch. *Working Papers in Functional Grammar* 48. 2-26.

VAN DEN TOORN, M. C. 1975. Het probleem van een syntactische verandering (over enkele werkwoorden van aspect en *te* + infinitief). *Tijdschrift Voor Nederlandse Taal- En Letterkunde* 91. 256-267.

VAN DER HORST, JOOP. 2008. *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse syntaxis*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

VAN POTTELBERGE, JEROEN. 2002. Nederlandse progressiefconstructies met werkwoorden van lichaamshouding: Specificiteit en geschiedenis. *Nederlandse Taalkunde* 7 (2). 142-174.

VAN STADEN, MIRIAM; MELISSA BOWERMAN; and MARIET VERHELST. 2006. Some properties of spatial description in Dutch. *Grammars of space*, ed. by STEPHEN C. LEVINSON and DAVID P. WILKINS, 475-511. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WÄLCHLI, BERNHARD. 2005. *Co-Compounds and Natural Coordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WEIJNEN, A. A. 1971. *Schets van de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse syntaxis*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V.

WIKLUND, ANNA-LENA. 1996. Pseudocoordination is subordination. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 58. 29-54.

ZHANG, NIINA NING. 2010. *Coordination in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ZWART, JAN-WOUTER. 1991. Subject deletion in Dutch: A difference between subjects and topics. *Language and cognition 1: Yearbook 1991 of the Research Group for Linguistic Theory and Knowledge Representation of the University of Groningen*, ed. by MARK KAS; ERIC REULAND; and CO VET, 333-350. Groningen: University of Groningen.

ZWART, JAN-WOUTER. 2011. *The Syntax of Dutch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.