

Ditransitives in Early Modern Dutch: The Aspects of Word Order Variation

0. Background Information

Linguistic PhD in *Language Dynamics of the Dutch Golden Age*

- Combining Historical Linguistics and Language Change
 - o Paradox of perfect language acquisition and language change
 - o Hybrid Grammars (Aboh 2015)
 - o Intra-speaker (author) variation as link between variation and language change

Authors from the 16th and 17th century

- Different kind of authors: highly and poorly educated, varying over the timespan of the Early Modern Dutch period, from different parts of the language area.
- Extensive body of work
 - o Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert (1522-1590)
 - Holland area
 - Started as etcher & engraver, became the secretary of the mayor of Haarlem and even later a fulltime writer. Rising from humble beginning to wealth.
 - Was involved in the discussion about ‘proper’ Dutch, he wrote the prologue to the grammar *Twe-spraack* by Spiegel.
 - Different texts, both for a general public, such as *Zedekunst*, a book on ethics aimed at people unable to read the Bible, and translated Greek and Latin works, such as the *Odyssey*, aimed at a highly educated audience.
 - o Johan van Beverwijck (1594-1647)
 - Holland area
 - From wealthy beginnings, highly educated, both a doctor and a writer.
 - Most of his works were for the general public; his books were some of the most popular books of the time, after the Bible and the works of Jacob Cats.
 - He wrote books on health, ranging from what kinds of food to eat to (natural) medicine, like his book on healthy living *Schat der Gesontheyt*.

Morphosyntactic problems

- Word order in relation to (overt) case
- Verb clusters
- Pronoun clitics & pro-drop

In this talk I will focus on word order variation in ditransitive constructions with two DPs in the works of Coornhert.

1. Introduction

My research is concerned with the diachrony of scrambling in double object constructions in Dutch. In Modern Dutch, scrambling of the indirect object (IO) and direct object (DO) is restricted to the relative word order IO-DO. The order DO-IO leads to ungrammaticality.

- (1) a. dat Jan <morgen> de meisjes <morgen> het boek <morgen> zal geven
 that Jan <tomorrow> the girls the book shall give
 ‘...that Jan shall give the girls the book tomorrow.’
- b. *dat Jan <morgen> het boek <morgen> de meisjes <morgen> zal geven

This restraint holds, regardless of the position of the objects in respect to the clause adverb. In Middle Dutch the relative word order of DO, IO and V is free (Van der Horst 2008:551/561):

- (2) a. Van dane sende **hi bode den broeder** omme vrede. 1271
 from there sent he message the brother for peace
 ‘From there he sent a message for peace to the brother.’
- b. **Ghi** cont **goede ghichten** gheuen **uwen kindren**. around 1325
 you can good gifts give your children
 ‘You can give your children good gifts.’
- c. So beual hi dat **men Iosephe din lichame** gaue. around 1325
 thus ordered he that one Joseph the body give.indative
 ‘Thus he ordered that one should give Joseph the body.’

The aim of this study is to check the validity of Broekhuis’ (2008) analysis for Modern Germanic for the Early Modern Dutch (EMD) data from the works of Coornhert. First, I will give the new data from Coornhert, followed by Broekhuis’ analysis of object shift the Modern Germanic languages. Finally, the analysis is tested for EMD.

2. Data

243 double object constructions are found in a corpus of 240.000 words, consisting of the following four works of Coornhert:

- *De dolinge van Ulysse* (1561)
- *Ofde siele, dan of de wille zondight, ondersoeck* (1563)
- *Tsamensprekinghe, waar in bewesen wort da thy niet goet en wil worden die quaat blijft* (1568)
- *Zedekunst dat is wellevenskunste* (1585).

This data is compiled by a search for the ditransitive verbs *beloven* ‘promise’, *benemen* ‘steal’, *geven* ‘give’, *togen* ‘show’, *tonen* ‘show’, *verklaren* ‘explain’, *verkopen* ‘sell’ and *zeggen* ‘tell’. The data of this preliminary study shows interesting patterns:

<i>Instances</i>	<i>Form objects</i>	<i>Relative word order</i>
47	DO DP & IO DP	IO-DO & DO-IO order
105	DP DP & IO pronoun	IO-DO order
36	DO pronoun & IO DP	DO-IO order
11	DO pronoun & IO pronoun	IO-DO order
44	varying	fronting of object

Table 1: Word order in the ditransitive constructions of Coornhert

These patterns show that object pronoun shift is mandatory in EMD: IO pronouns always precede DO DPs, and DO pronouns precede IO DPs. Furthermore it has been found that the DO pronoun precedes the IO pronoun. The relative order of DP objects alternates, predominantly the modern order IO-DO is found (42/47), while the order DO-IO is rare (5/47). I will give an analysis for the possible order of two DP objects.

3. Analysis of Modern Germanic languages

Broekhuis (2009: 165-183) analyzes the word order in ditransitive constructions for Modern German, Modern Dutch and the modern Scandinavian languages. In Icelandic and Dutch object shift of both the direct as the indirect object is possible, although the direct object cannot cross the indirect object, contrasting German, in which the DO-IO order is found.

Broekhuis bases his analysis on information structure, in which focus and topic are prominent. The input is checked in a framework of Optimality Theory (OT) with a set of rules, selecting the output. The rules that Broekhuis use are:

- *Move: violated by the first movement of a complement
- EPP(case): violated when the unvalued case feature of the object is not triggered by v
- Align Focus (AF): violated when the topic is not in the rightmost position

As we have seen, in Dutch the relative order between the objects and the adverb is free, while the order between the object DPs always remains IO-DO, illustrated in (4).

- (3) **Jan** geeft <morgen> **de meisjes** <morgen> **het boek** <morgen>
 Jan gives <tomorrow> the girls the book
 'Jan will give the girls the book tomorrow.'

IO & DO $\not\subset$ focus	AF	EPP(case)	*MOVE (t_O only)
a. Subj I+V Adv t_V IO DO		*!*	
b. Subj I+V IO Adv t_V t_{IO} DO		*!	*
c. Subj I+V IO DO Adv t_V t_{IO} t_{DO} \rightarrow			**
d. Subj I+V DO Adv t_V IO t_{DO}		*!	*

Image 1: Non-focused IO and DO in Dutch and Icelandic

IO & DO \subset focus	AF	EPP(case)	*MOVE (t_O only)
a. Subj I+V Adv t_V IO DO \rightarrow	*	**	
b. Subj I+V IO Adv t_V t_{IO} DO	**!	*	*
c. Subj I+V IO DO Adv t_V t_{IO} t_{DO}	**!*		**
d. Subj I+V DO Adv t_V IO t_{DO}	**!	*	*

Image 2: Focused IO and DO in Dutch and Icelandic

IO $\not\subset$ focus; DO \subset focus	AF	EPP(case)	*MOVE (t_O only)
a. Subj I+V Adv t_V IO DO		**!	
b. Subj I+V IO Adv t_V t_{IO} DO \rightarrow		*	*
c. Subj I+V IO DO Adv t_V t_{IO} t_{DO}	*!		**
d. Subj I+V DO Adv t_V IO t_{DO}	*!*	*	*

Image 3: Non-focused IO and focused DO in Dutch and Icelandic

IO \subset focus: DO $\not\subset$ focus	AF	EPP(case)	*MOVE (t_O only)
a. Subj I+V Adv t_V IO DO	*!	**	
b. Subj I+V IO Adv t_V t_{IO} DO	*!*	*	*
c. Subj I+V IO DO Adv t_V t_{IO} t_{DO}	*!*		**
d. Subj I+V DO Adv t_V IO t_{DO} ☹		*	*

Image 4: Focused IO and non-focused DO in Dutch and Icelandic (without RELMIN)

IO \subset focus: DO $\not\subset$ focus	REL MIN	AF	EPP (case)	*MOVE (t_O only)
a. Subj I+V Adv t_V IO DO ☹		*	**	
b. Subj I+V IO Adv t_V t_{IO} DO		**!	*	*
c. Subj I+V IO DO Adv t_V t_{IO} t_{DO}		**!		**
d. Subj I+V DO Adv t_V IO t_{DO}	*!		*	*

Image 5: Focused IO and non-focused DO in Dutch and Icelandic (with RELMIN)

- (4) Relativized Minimality (RELMIN): if the foot of X-chain α c-commands the foot of X-chain β , the head of α c-commands the head of β (X-chain = A-, A'-, or head chain)
- (5) a. Icelandic/Dutch:
 {D-PRONOUN, RELMIN} >> ALIGNFOCUS >> EPP(case) >> *MOVE
 b. German:
 D-PRONOUN >> ALIGNFOCUS >> RELMIN >> EPP(case) >> *MOVE

4. Analysis

In the works of Coornhert both the IO-DO as the DO-IO order is found: 42 IO-DO and 5 DO-IO. Following the analysis for Modern German, in which DO-IO orders are possible as well, I will assume the analysis of Modern German for EMD: DO-IO is (only) expected in constructions in which the IO is focused, while the DO is presupposed. In my analysis I will check Broekhuis' analysis to the 5 clauses with DO-IO order.

- (6) a. De huysvader beveelt **zyn dienstbode dat kleedt met die spyze** **dezen armen** te gheven.
The householder orders his servant that garm. with the food this poor to give
 'The householder orders his servant to give this poor [man] the garment with the food.'
- b. Zal **die bode** oock eenighe zwaricheyd maken om zyn meesters bevel te
Shall that servant also some difficulty make to his master's order to
ghehoorzamen, ende dat kleedt metten spyze den armen te gheven?
obey and that garment with the food the poor to give
 'Shall the servant cause trouble to obey his master's order and to give the garment with the food to the poor [man].'
- c. **Die** ontstalt hem behendelyck om den doodslagh te voorhoeden ende **'tzwaerd zyn ghaest**
That stole-it him skillfully to the slaying to prevent and the-sword his guest
 's anderen daaghs weder te gheven.
the other day again to give

‘That (man) stole it from him skillfully to prevent the manslaughter and to give the sword back to his guest the next day.’

- d. zo **zy** maar na noodurft hadden willen leven ende **die onnoodlycke kosten van huer**
so they but to necessity had want live and that unnecessary costs of their
proncken den naackten ende hongherighen gheven.
flaunting the naked and poor give
‘If only they would have lived simpler and (if only they) would have given the unnecessary costs of their flaunting (lifestyle) to the naked and poor.’
- e. Ist nu dat **die groote factor**, God, **zyn ryckdomme dezen zynen Rentmeester** weder
Is-it now that that big factor God his riches this his steward again
beneemt.
takes
‘Is it so that that big factor, God, takes back his riches from this steward of his...’

The order DO-IO is found in different kinds of clauses: (10a), (b) and (c) are non-finite clauses, (10d) is a (contracted) matrix clause, (10e) a subclause.

The context shows that in all five clauses the IO is presupposed, and in (10d) the DO is a topic. In analysis for Modern German, the DO-IO order is only expected when the IO is a topic, and the DO is presupposed. However, in (10a) and (e) the IO is (possibly) bearing another type of stress, indicating that something is given to or taken from that one person. In (10b) and (c) the word order could be explained by the retention of the preceding word order. In fact, in (10c) both objects are antecedents, preceded by their anaphora *-t* and *hem*, following them in the same DO-IO order. Problematic is (10d), in which no stress or retention is detected.

For a conclusive analysis the information structure of EMD needs to be created. In the Modern Germanic languages topics tend to take the rightmost position in the clause, while EMD’s information structure is not based on topic and presupposition, following the data. The possible base of stress and retention needs to be checked and extended.

5. Literature

Primary

Coornhert, D.V. (1561). *De dolinge van Ulysse. Homerus' Odysseia I-XVIII in Nederlandse verzen*. Amsterdam, Elsevier 1939. Retrieved from http://dbnl.org/tekst/coor001doli01_01/

Coornhert, D.V. (1563). Ofde siele, dan of de wille zondight, ondersoeck. In: J.A. Colom (eds.), *Wercken, Deel I*. Amsterdam 1630. Retrieved from http://dbnl.org/tekst/coor001ofde02_01/

Coornhert, D.V. (1568). Tsamensprekinghe, waar in bewesen wort dat hy niet goet en wil worden die quaat blijft. In: J.A. Colom (eds.), *Wercken, Deel I*. Amsterdam 1630. Retrieved from http://dbnl.org/tekst/coor001tsam04_01/

Coornhert, D.V. (1585). *Zedekunsten dat is wellevenskunste (uitgegeven en van aantekeningen voorzien door B.Becker)*. Leiden: E.J. Brill 1942. Retrieved from http://dbnl.org/tekst/coor001zede01_01/

Secondary

Aboh, E.O. (2015). *The Emergence of Hybrid Grammars: Language Contact and Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Broekhuis, H. (2008). *Derivations and Evaluations: Object Shift in Germanic Languages*. (Studies in Generative Grammar). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Broekhuis, H., & Dikken, M. den (2012). *Syntax of Dutch: Nouns and Noun Phrases*. (H. van Riemsdijk & I. Kenesei, Eds.) (Vol. 2). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Broekhuis, H., Corver, N., & Vos, R. (2015). *Syntax of Dutch: Verbs and Verb Phrases*. (H. van Riemsdijk & I. Kenesei, Eds.) (Vol. 1). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Dikken, M. den (2012). Ditransitieven en het nut van hiërarchische structuur en derivatie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 17(3), 362–379.

Hendriks, J. (2012). Case marking (accounts) in collapse: evidence from Early Modern Dutch egodocuments (1572-1573). In M. Ponsonnet, L. Dao, & M. Bowler (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 42nd Australian Linguistic Society Conference* (pp. 123–151). Canberra: ACT: Australian Linguistic Society. Retrieved from <https://digitalcollections.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/9399>

Van der Horst, J.M. (2008). *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse Syntaxis* (2 volumes) Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.

Jorik van Engeland
UiL OTS, J.vanEngeland@uu.nl

Heule, C. van (1625/1633). *De Nederduytsche Grammatica ofte Spraec-konst* (W.J.H. Caron, Ed.). Groningen / Djakarta: J.B. Wolters 1953. Retrieved from http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/heul001nede01_01/index.php

Spiegel, H.L. (1584). *Twe-spraack. Ruygh-bewerp. Kort begrip. Rederijck-kunst* (W.J.H. Caron, Ed.). Groningen: J.B. Wolters 1962. Retrieved from http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/spie001wjhc01_01/index.php

Appendix: Context of ditransitives with DO-IO order

(10a) and (b)

23. Men neme dat eenigh huysvader zyn dienstbode **een nieu kleedt** heeft ghegheven om te draghen **met spyze** om t'eten. Daar komt **een naackt, hongherigh mensehe** bidden. *De huysvader beveelt zyn dienstbode dat kleedt met die spyze **dezen armen te gheven. Zal die bode oock eenighe zwaricheyd maken om zyn meesters bevel te ghehoorzamen, ende dat kleedt metten spyze den armen te gheven?*** Zal hyt laten te gheven uyt vrezzen van zelf spys of kleedt ghebreck te hebben? Men weet wel neen. Waarom dat? Hy betrouwt zynen heere ontwyfelyck toe dat hy hem terstont weder een ander kleedt met spyzen ghenoech zal gheven, ende dit noch of zyn heere hem zulx oock met een eenigh woord niet en beloofde.

(10c)

De ghaest was droncken ende toornigh; **hy** wilde een ander dood steken ende quam ghelopen om **zyn zwaerd**. Dit merckte deze waerd. **Die ontstalt hem behendelyck om den doodslagh te voorhoeden ende 'tzwaerd zyn ghaest 's anderen daaghs weder te gheven.** Die was vroegh verreyt zonder 'tzwaerd, meynende dat het verloren was.

(10d)

8. Wat doen die hovaardighe pronckers ende pronxters doch anders? **Zo menigh arm mensch** verderft ende sterft van koude, hongher ende ander ghebreck, die zy hadden moghen int leven behouden, **zo zy maar na noodurft hadden willen leven ende die onnoodlycke kosten van huer proncken den naackten ende hongherighen gheven.**

(10e).

49. Zo doet oock **de verstandighe mensehe**. **Die**, van Gode voorzien zynde met **ryckdommen** tot **een Rentmeester**, leeft na noodurft, deelt met overvloet ende besteedt **zyns heeren ghoe**d op wissel anden rechten behoefighen. **Ist nu dat die groote factor, God, zyn ryckdomme **dezen zynen Rentmeester** weder beneemt** ende hem met wyf ende kinderen in armoede doet vallen, hy doet zyn best om eerlyck ghewin; maar dan noch te kort komende en schaamt hy zich zynder onschuldigher armoeden niet, maar draaght zich zo redelyck ende ghelyckmoedelyck in zyn armoede als voor in zyn ryckdommen, ende is dan zo rechtschapen bedelaar als hy eerst een bescheyden ghever was.