

**How progressives progress:  
The case of Dutch and Afrikaans**  
Cora Pots (KU Leuven)

This talk compares Dutch (1) and Afrikaans (2) periphrastic progressives in which motion verb *lopen/loop* ‘walk’ or a posture verb (*zitten/sit* ‘sit’, *staan/staan* ‘stand’ or *liggen/lê* ‘lie’) is used to indicate progressive aspect of the lexical verb.

- (1) Ik heb **lopen/ zitten/ staan/ liggen** (*te*) werken.  
I have walk/ sit/ stand/ lie to work.
- (2) Ek het (**ge-)**loop/ (**ge-)**sit/ (**ge-)**staan/ (**ge-)**lê (*en*) werk.  
I have GE-walk/ GE-sit/ GE-stand/ GE-lie and work.  
‘I’ve been working.’

These periphrastic progressives show a high degree of morphosyntactic variation, both within and across the two languages. In the literature it has been noted that in both languages, the progressives with *lopen/loop* show different morphosyntactic behaviour compared to their posture verb counterparts. That is, they show *te/en*-drop—phenomena that are less frequent/ungrammatical with posture verbs (Haeseryn et al. 1997; Biberauer 2017). Another factor in which variation has been observed is the form of the motion/posture verb when embedded under temporal auxiliary *hebben/het* ‘have’. In Afrikaans, the motion/posture verb can optionally appear as past participle or in bare form (i.e. without *ge-*) (cf. (2)), whereas in Dutch, the progressive verb always has to appear in bare form (Schmid 2005). In this talk, I test these observations by means of a comparative corpus study, using *SoNaR+* for Dutch and *Korpusportaal* for Afrikaans. The data show that in Dutch all motion verb progressives show *te*-drop, whereas *te* is sometimes present with posture verbs. Both the motion and posture verb progressives always appear in bare form. For Afrikaans, we see that only the motion verb progressive shows *en*-drop, and that this in fact the most frequent option for this progressive verb. We furthermore see that these motion verb progressives have much higher frequencies of bare form compared to the posture verb progressives. I propose that the variation in these periphrastic progressives both within and between the languages can be analysed if we assume that the progressive verbs are in different stages of a grammaticalisation process from being actual verbs to becoming genuine progressive markers. A clue for this is the fact that in both languages the motion verb progressives are much more semantically bleached (no longer entailing a physical motion through space) than the posture verb counterparts (no longer entailing a seated/standing/lying position), with all Dutch progressive verbs being more bleached than the Afrikaans ones. I argue that the progressive verbs are semi-lexical and on their way of becoming even more functional. The attested variation follows from different underlying syntactic structures that these periphrastic progressives have at different stages of their grammaticalisation process.

**REFERENCES** Biberauer (2017). Pseudo-coordination in a hybrid system: (parametric) insights from afrikaans. Paper presented at the Workshop on Pseudo-Coordination (Venice). • Cinque (2001). “Restructuring” and the order of aspectual and root modal heads. In Cinque & Salvi (eds.) *Current studies in Italian syntax*, 137–155. Elsevier. • De Vos (2005). *The syntax of pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans*. Utrecht: Igitur/LOT. • Haeseryn et al. (1997). *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*. Second edition. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff. • Schmid (2005). *Infinitival Syntax: Infinitivus Pro Participio as a repair strategy*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.