



Jeffrey Pheiff, Philipps-Universität Marburg
Lea Schäfer, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf

komt ingefietst/fietsen – On the Diachronic and Diatopic Dimension of Dutch *komen* ‘come’ + Motion Verb

The Dutch motion verb *komen* ‘come’ can combine with either a past participle or infinitive to specify simultaneous aspects of a single motion event as in (1):

(1) *De agent kwam de straat ingefietst.PTCP/fietsen.INF*
‘The police officer came cycling into the street’.

It has been claimed that the past participle variant is losing ground in Dutch (e.g. Dal 1954; Vogel 2005); however, the corpus data in Beliën (2016) suggests that it still has a strong footing in contemporary Dutch. Speakers can make use of either the past participle or the infinitive variant; however, there are slight regional, country-specific preferences for Standard Dutch (Haeseryn et al. 1997) and idiolectal variation (Cornips 2002). Given that speakers can use both variants in parallel and that there is a difference in the morpho-syntactic form of the variants, this raises the question as to a semantic differentiation between the two (e.g. Beliën 2016; Schäfer forthcoming). For example, Beliën (2016: 30; italics in original) suggests that while “both variants describe an unfolding, unidirectional motion event towards a contextually con-struable vantage point, the variant with the past participle highlights the *end* of a process, while the infinitive variant does not”. This distinction remains to be systematically tested. In this contribution, 1) the results of an analysis of ca. 90 dialect dictionaries and dialect grammars will be presented. The poster will 2) also show the results of an analysis of three survey questions from the 1978 survey of Dutch dialects concerning the acceptability and function of the variants under investigation. Finally, it will 3) present the design and some initial results of a sentence completion with subsequent rating task that will be distributed in early 2018. In addition, other variables, which may explain the variation in the speech community, will be collected (e.g. age, gender, education, mobility). The data from the survey will be compared to the data from the Meertens Instituut and the dictionary/grammar analysis.

References:

Beliën, Maaike (2016): Exploring Semantic Differences in Syntactic Variation: Dutch *komen* ‘come’ with a Past Participle or an Infinitive. In: Bannink, Anne / Wim Honselaar (eds.). *From Variation to Iconicity: Festschrift for Olga Fischer on the Occasion of her 65th Birthday*. Amsterdam: Pegasus, 17–32.

Cornips, Leonie (2002): Een vreemde eend in het rijtje. Over het aspectueel hulpwerkwoord ‘komen’. In: *In verband met Jan Luif: 29 Variaties op een thema door vrienden en collega’s bij het afscheid van Jan*

Luif. URL: http://cf.hum.uva.nl/poldernederlands/backup_luif/luif/cor-nips.html [last accessed: 25.01.2018].

Dal, Ingerid (1954): Indifferenzformen in der deutschen Syntax. Betrachtungen zur Fügung *ich kam gegangen*. In: Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap, Bind XVII, 489–497.

Haeseryn, Walter et al. (ed.) (1997): Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff. (=ANS).

Schäfer, Lea (forthcoming): “kommen” und Bewegungsverb in westgermanischen Varietäten. In: Speyer, Augustin / Julia Hertel (eds.). Syntax aus Saarbrücker Sicht 3. Beiträge der SaRDIS-Tagung zur Dialektsyntax. Stuttgart: Steiner. (=Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik Beihefte).

Vogel, Petra (2005): Neue Überlegungen zu den Fügungen des Tyüs *sie kamen gelaufen*. In: Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik 33(1), 57–77.