Typological Context

Periphrastic constructions with COME have been primarily grammaticalized to express tense. In the Germanic language group, COME has not undergone grammaticalization to the same degree that related GO has. Nevertheless, COME has acquired some special functions. One concerns the combination of COME with a motion verb that functions as an expression of aspect and modality, and perhaps even tense. German, Dutch, and Yiddish varieties show considerable morphological variation (Schäfer submitted).

Modern Dutch

Dutch komen ‘come’ can occur with a past participle (1) or an infinitive (2) of a motion verb, or with the present participle (3) if the focus is on the manner of movement:

1. De agent kwam de straat in gefietst/PTCP
2. De agent kwam de straat in fietsen/INF
3. De agent kwam fietsend de straat in/PRR

‘The police officer came cycling into the street’

Diachronically, it has been claimed that the PTCP variant has been losing ground in spoken Standard Dutch (e.g. Dal /one.pnum/nine.pnum/nine.pnum/four.pnum; Vogel /two.pnum/zero.pnum/zero.pnum/five.pnum); the PTCP variant has been losing ground in spoken Standard Dutch (e.g. Dal /one.pnum/nine.pnum/nine.pnum/four.pnum; Vogel /two.pnum/zero.pnum/zero.pnum/five.pnum; Schäfer submitted).

Central Question

According to Beliën (2016:30) “both variants [PTCP and INF] describe an unfolding, unidirectional motion event towards a contextually construable vantage point” but “the variant with the past participle highlights the end of a process, while the infinitive variant does not”. This claims remains to be systematically tested and forms the starting point of our investigation.

Dialects

The dialects show regional preferences for the INF in the north and for PTCP in the southeast (cf. Figure 1, 2 and 3). For Map 1, we searched 62 dialectal dictionaries (van der Sjjs 2015 et seq.) and 23 dialect grammars for attestations of the verb komen with a motion verb (cf. Figure 1). Data from a survey done in 1978 (cf. Figure 2) and in 2000–2003 (cf. Figure 3) show a similar distribution.

Diachrony

Hirao (1965:226) claims the PTCP variant is older. In the 13th century, the use of the INF increased (Hirao 1965:206; Van der Horst 2008:910). According to the Corpus Middelnederlandse, INF and PTCP have existed in parallel since the 14th century. Additionally, a gerund form (4) is also attested and is still attested (cf. DynaSAND testzin 330).

(4) Deze riviëre cont lopende vten aardschien

‘This river comes running out of the ground’

(‘Reis van Jan van Mandevill’ 1462:35)

Online Survey

We created an online survey consisting of 16 puzzle and 16 judgement tasks.

Tested Variables and Constraints

- **Morphological Variation:** PTCP, (le-)INF, gerund
- **Semantic constraints:** PATH (external movement) vs. MANNER (internal movement); inchoative (background/phase) vs. progressive (start or egressively)
- **Morpho-semantic restriction:** MOVE verbs need a particle for expression of PATH-meaning: is it obligatory in Dutch e.g. aan (cf. Talty 1985)
- **Grammaticalization:** Is there a connection to the grammaticalization of the future with gaan (cf. Beheydt 2005, Fehringer 2017)?
- Can komen be used as an increasing raising verb?

Please share this survey. Dank je wel!

Link to the online survey: www.sosciisurvey.de/beweging/
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