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Habitual *doen* in Heerlen Dutch

Leonie Cornips

1. Introduction

In this paper I will focus on the *doen*+infinitive construction in a regional Dutch variety, in particular, Heerlen Dutch. Heerlen is a town of 90,000 inhabitants situated in Limburg, a province in the southeast of the Netherlands, near the Belgian and German borders.

With respect to other Dutch dialect areas Heerlen occupies an exceptional position, since at the beginning of this century the expanding mining industry in the area attracted numerous workers from elsewhere in the Netherlands and abroad. This immigration altered the linguistic uniformity of Heerlen to such an extent that the native population who spoke the local dialect of Heerlen became a minority. Subsequently, a new intermediate variety of Dutch emerged, namely Heerlen Dutch. Heerlen Dutch may be considered as the result of a process of language shift with the local dialect as the source and standard Dutch as the target language (see Cornips 1994a for a more extensive discussion). Nowadays, Heerlen is still a bilingual community; its inhabitants speak either the local dialect as their first language and Heerlen Dutch as a second language, or Heerlen Dutch as their first language. The local dialect of Heerlen is situated in the westernmost dialect-geographical transition zone of the Ripuarian dialects, a sub-branch of the Franconian dialect group, and for centuries it was heavily influenced by the German city of Cologne (see Hinskens 1993: 80 for a more extensive discussion). Subsequently, the Heerlen dialect differs from standard Dutch in all its linguistic aspects: lexical, phonological, morphological and syntactic. It is for this reason that syntactic interference in Heerlen Dutch from the local dialect may well result in syntactic constructions that are marginal or even unacceptable in standard Dutch. The declarative construction with the frame NP1 - *doen* - (NP2) - V in (1) is an illustration of this.1 Note that in (1) (i) *doen* "do" is not an auxiliary in the strict sense of the word since it does not select a participle but an infinitive and (ii) that *doen* carries all agreement and tense features (SD=standard Dutch, HD=Heerlen Dutch):

---

1From a syntactic point of view, what distinguishes Heerlen Dutch from standard Dutch is not only the occurrence of the declarative *doen*+infinitive construction but also (i) that dative objects appear in a much wider range of constructions and (ii) that the reflexive *zich* has a wider range of usages in Heerlen Dutch than in standard Dutch (cf. Cornips 1994a).
The marginal status of the constructions in (1) in standard Dutch, but not in Heerlen Dutch, is due to the fact that they belong to a specific domain of discourse. It has often been said that in standard Dutch the *doen* + infinitive construction, such as in (1), does not belong to the grammar of adults (cf. Giesbers 1983–84, Duinhoven 1994:111). Instead, it frequently shows up in child language or in the speech of adults who are talking to children (Tieken-Boon van Oostade 1990). Furthermore, in the literature it is argued that the *doen* construction in standard Dutch child grammar is similar to the *doen* construction that is used by adults in regional colloquial or dialect speech (cf. Giesbers 1983–84, Duinhoven 1994:111). Since it is assumed that children use the *doen* construction in order to avoid the morphological complexity of compound verbs, it is assumed that in regional Dutch varieties adults use the *doen* construction as an “avoidance” strategy, as well. In addition, Nuijten’s (1962:156) claims that dialect speakers who do not have a good command of standard Dutch use *doen* frequently. All these claims may be summarised as in Figure 1 below. In this paper, however, I will argue that the grammatical status of the regional *doen* construction has always been misunderstood due to its absence in standard Dutch. The misunderstandings concerning this regional construction is a consequence of the assumption of linguists that grammars of regional varieties must reflect the grammar of the standard language in some sense. I will argue that this assumption, to quote Harris (1984:303), “presupposes that standard and nonstandard syntactic variants are embedded in structurally identical grammars”. That is to say, this idea “encourages the impression that differences between the standard and a particular vernacular are merely superficial and tend to obscure whatever deep-seated divergences there might exist between the two varieties”.

(1)  \[ \text{SD/HD a. Zij}\ doet \ \text{werken} \ \text{*gewerkt} \\
\text{she}\ \text{does} \ \text{work}_{inf} \ \text{worked}_{past} \\
\text{She is working?} \]

\[ \text{SD/HD b. Zij}\ doet \ \text{haar huishuiswerk} \ \text{maken} \\
\text{she}\ \text{does} \ \text{her} \ \text{homework} \ \text{make}_{inf} \\
\text{She is doing her homework?} \]

Figure 1. The discourse domain of the *doen* + infinitive construction.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{doen} + infinitive (cf. (1))
\item \textit{standard Dutch}
  \begin{itemize}
  \item child grammar
  \item non-standard colloquial speech
  \item imperfect command by adult speakers
  \end{itemize}
\item \textit{regional Dutch varieties, e.g. Heerlen Dutch}
  \begin{itemize}
  \item adult dialect speakers speaking SD as a second language
  \item avoidance strategy morphological compound verbs
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

In this paper, I will demonstrate that in Heerlen Dutch the *doen* construction, such as in (1), serves the purpose of expressing habitual aspect. What is more, on the basis of the expression of habitual aspect by means of adverbial expressions and compound predicates in standard Dutch as well as in Heerlen Dutch I will argue that it is for this reason that *doen* in Heerlen Dutch favours the occurrence of infinitives that are compounded.

\section{1.1. The corpus of Heerlen Dutch}

Throughout this paper, the *doen* examples are drawn from my speech data corpus of Heerlen Dutch which was collected by means of recording 33.5 hours of spontaneous speech. Altogether, 67 male speakers were recorded; it is moreover important to note that the spontaneous speech data consist only of the speech of adult speakers only. The speakers were selected at random. Three speaker variables were taken into account in order to investigate the social distribution of the varieties of Dutch spoken in Heerlen, namely language background, education/occupation and age. The specification of these variables makes it possible to investigate whether the speakers will show social stratification, in particular with respect to the variable language background.

The speakers were divided into three language groups according to their language background, namely immigrant, dialect and Heerlen Dutch. It should be noted, however, that with respect to the origin of the speakers’ parents the language group of immigrants is not as homogeneous as the other two language groups:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{IMMIGRANT:} speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as their first language and whose parents were born outside the province of Limburg;
\item \textbf{DIALECT:} speakers who speak the local dialect as their first language and (Heerlen) Dutch as a second language;
\item \textbf{HEERLEN DUTCH:} speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as their first language and whose parents speak the local dialect as a first language.
\end{itemize}

Subsequently, the speakers were further subdivided into smaller groups according to their education/occupation and age. The variable education/occupation is based on a high to low scale, i.e. middle/high level employees and unskilled/skilled labour. With respect to the variable age, a distinction was made between those aged between 20 and 45 and those older than 60. The speaker variables are shown in Table 1. In

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{table1.png}
\caption{Speaker variables in Heerlen Dutch}
\end{figure}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Speaker group & Education/occupation & Age
\hline
Immigrant & Low-middle, high & 20-45, 60
\hline
Dialect & Low-middle, high & 20-45, 60
\hline
Heerlen Dutch & Low-middle, high & 20-45, 60
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Speaker variables in Heerlen Dutch}
\end{table}

\footnotetext{In the original survey (Cornips 1994a) upon which this paper is based, the sex of the speakers was held constant for practical purposes such as the limited means and time available at the time.}
each case two speakers with the same language background, education and age variable talked for one hour without interruption of any kind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>language</th>
<th>low level of education</th>
<th>high level of education</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>young</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRANT DIALECT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEERLEN DUTCH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Number of speakers in each cell divided according to speaker variables.

This paper is organised as follows. In the second section I will focus on the *doen*+infinitive construction in standard Dutch and in various Dutch dialects. In the third section I will examine the social stratification of the regional *doen*+infinitive construction in Heerlen Dutch. Furthermore, I will discuss whether regional *doen* combines with infinitives that are compounded. In the fourth section, I will discuss habitual aspect in standard/Heerlen Dutch which can be expressed by adverbial expressions of time and compound verbs. Finally, I will show that the *doen*+infinitive construction in Heerlen Dutch expresses habitual aspect. Moreover, I will demonstrate that it is for this reason that *doen* in Heerlen Dutch favours the occurrence of compound infinitives.

2. The *doen*+infinitive construction in standard Dutch

In standard Dutch there are three types of *doen* constructions, all of which are grammatical in Heerlen Dutch (cf. ANS 1984). First, the construction in (2) involves causative *doen*. This example is taken from Verhagen (1994:260). Note that the second NP is the subject of the infinitive, as illustrated in (3):

HD/SD:
(2) De zon *doet* de temperatuur *oplopen*  
the sun *does* the temperature *rise*ref  
"The sun causes the temperature to rise"  

HD/SD:
(3) De temperatuur *loopt op*  
the temperature *rises*  
"The temperature is rising".

Secondly, in Heerlen Dutch, as in standard Dutch, *doen* can be used as part of an anaphoric *doen* construction, as in (4). Note that the infinitival clause is used as an adjunct.³

HD/SD:
(4) die *doen* niks anders als koeltorens tekenen (24: Ris)  
they *did* nothing else than cooling towers *drawinf*  
"they did nothing but draw cooling towers".

Finally, in example (5) *doen* is used emphatically. Compared to causative and anaphoric *doen*, (5) shows an inverted pattern or topicalisation, namely, the infinitive *kaarten* "play cards" precedes the auxiliary *hebben* "have". What is more, *doen* appears as a past participle in (5):

HD/SD:
(5) jawel *kaarten* hebben we altijd veel *gedaan* (35: Berk)  
yes play-cardsref have we always a lot doneperc  
"yes, we used to play cards a lot".

All the data discussed in this section relate to both standard Dutch and Heerlen Dutch; however, there is also a regional *doen*+infinitive construction that, unlike the *doen*+infinitive construction in standard Dutch, cannot be analyzed as either a causative, anaphoric or emphatic use of *doen*. It is this construction, illustrated by (1), which is the focus of the present article.

2.1. Various kinds of *doen*+infinitive constructions in Dutch dialects

Since the use of the *doen*+infinitive construction illustrated by (1) is widely spread in regional Dutch varieties, namely in the provinces of Groningen, Drente, Twente and Zeeland as well as in southern Dutch generally, it is impossible to claim a clear-cut geographical distribution for its occurrence (cf. Giesbers 1983–4). What is more, it is not certain which kind of *doen*+infinitive is involved since various dialects realise this construction differently.⁴ Consider, for example, the following examples of the *doen*+infinitive construction in the dialect of Groningen that is spoken in the northeast of the Netherlands. Both examples in (6) indicate that in Groningen *doen*...
functions as a past participle that occurs together with the auxiliary hebben “have” and an infinitive (cf. ter Laan 1953:156):

dialect of Groningen:

(6) a. Zai het heur öl mouter 'n bult ploagen doen she has her old mother many teaseRef doneParc.
“She often teased her old mother”

b. Hai het in zien levent wat zoopen doen
he has in his life some drunkRef doneParc.
“He drank a lot during his life”.

However, for another Dutch northern area, i.e. Twente, I have been unable to find constructions in which doen functions as a past participle. (7) indicates that if an infinitive is involved, doen only appears as the auxiliary (cf. Bezoen 1948:61, Nuijten 1962). Note, that the doen constructions in (7) are similar to the Heerlen Dutch doen constructions in (1):

dialect of Twente:

(7) a. dee deuden Kloopen verkopen
they did wooden shoes sellRef
“they sold wooden shoes”

b. daar deuden ze bomziede maken
there did they vinegar makeRef
“they produced vinegar there”

c. ze deuden em aait plagen
they did him always teaseRef
“they always teased him”.

3. The Heerlen Dutch spontaneous speech data

Since several kinds of doen+infinitive appear in the Dutch dialects, let us begin by considering the speech data corpus of Heerlen Dutch (cf. Cornips 1994a and 1994b). First of all, I will look at the level of group speech: that is, the specification of the social variables of the speakers of Heerlen Dutch in my survey makes it possible to investigate whether the speakers will show social stratification, in particular with respect to the variable language background (see Table 1 and Labov 1966, 1972a). Hence, according to the claims summarised in Figure 1, we would expect to find that speakers who speak the local dialect as their first language and standard Dutch as their second language would use the doen+infinitive construction more often than the other groups of speakers.

Furthermore, I will focus on possible linguistic constraints of the doen+infinitive construction in Heerlen Dutch. In doing so it becomes possible to examine the claim that the regional doen+infinitive construction is used as a strategy in order to avoid morphologically complex verbs (see Figure 1).

3.1. Social stratification of regional usage of doen

The number of speakers that produce the construction under investigation in spontaneous speech is eighteen. This is shown in Table 2. Table 2 also shows the proportions of speakers who used doen. In order to assess social stratification on the use or non-use of the doen construction, I analyzed these proportions by means of a $\chi^2$ test. Table 2 reveals only significant results for the occupation/education variable. More specifically, it shows that the group of speakers with a low level of education/occupation use doen significantly more often than the other groups of speakers. Thus, the expectation put forward that the dialect speakers would use the regional doen+infinitive construction more often than monolingual speakers is not confirmed. Hence, Table 2 displays that there is no significant correlation between the use or non-use of the doen+infinitive construction and the variable language background. For completeness sake it should be observed that with respect to this variable the speakers who speak a variety of Heerlen Dutch as their first language, unlike speakers of the local dialect, use the doen+infinitive construction most often, namely a proportion of .31:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>low level of education</th>
<th>high level of education</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>young</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRANT</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>0/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIALECT</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEERLEN DUTCH</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>3/21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$ (level of education) = 10.62 df = 1 p < .005.

Table 2. Proportions of speakers in each cell using regional doen (spontaneous speech).
3.2. The thematic role of the subject and the kind of infinitive in the Heerlen Dutch doen construction

The eighteen speakers discussed above produced 33 tokens of the regional construction (cf. Cornips 1994b). In all instances, the regional doen+infinitive construction combines with human subjects performing the action expressed by the predicate, that is to say, the subjects are construed as agents: doen co-occurs with infinitives which belong either to the class of the so-called intransitive, active (or unergative) verbs or transitive verbs, as illustrated in (8) and (9), respectively. It should be noted that doen in (8) and (9) cannot be considered as causative doen (cf. (2)):

**Heerlen Dutch:**

(8) a. ... die *doet* ook nou in de tuinen werken ... (2: Wybe) ... he does also now in the gardens work\textsubscript{inf} “he is also working in the gardens now”

b. ... *doen* veel hobbyen hier boven ... (14: Gijs) ... they do a lot pursue-hobbies\textsubscript{inf} here upstairs “they engage in their hobbies upstairs a lot here”

**Heerlen Dutch:**

(9) a. ... *doe* nou die mensen terughalen in het werk ... (13: Michiel) ... *doen* ADV those people back-fetch\textsubscript{inf} in the job ... “get those people back on the job”

b. ... dan *doen* ze dat daar op dat doek projecteren ... (35: Mr Arends) ... then do they it there on that screen project\textsubscript{inf} ... “then they project it onto that screen”.

Since the subject has the thematic role of agents, doen expectedly does not occur with infinitives which belong to the intransitive, unaccusative class, as demonstrated in (10). Generally, it is assumed that the grammatical subjects of unaccusative verbs, such as in (10), are themes (see Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995 for a more extensive discussion of unaccusative verbs):

(10) **HD**

a. *Jan *doet* sterven

Jan does die\textsubscript{inf}

“Jan is dying”

b. *Marie *doet* arriveren

Marie does arrive\textsubscript{inf}

“Marie is arriving”.

Nor did my corpus contain any instances in which doen combines with subjects that have the thematic role of experiencer:

(11) **HD**

a. *Jan *doet* het antwoord weten

Jan does the answer know\textsubscript{inf}

“Jan knows the answer”

b. *Marie *doet* het gebouw herkennen

Marie does the building recognise\textsubscript{inf}

“Marie recognises the building”.

3.3. Compound verbs

As mentioned above, it is assumed that the regional doen+infinitive construction is used as an avoidance strategy. Such a function of doen would be stylistic rather than syntactic in that its use would serve to avoid the morphological complexity of compound verbs. The spontaneous speech data, however, show that about two thirds of the 33 tokens contain infinitives that are not compounded at all.

Only 9 out of 33 tokens contain infinitives that to a certain extent belong to the class of morphological complex verbs. This is illustrated for the infinitives *banden opleggen* “fit tires” and *zaalvoetballen* “play indoor football” in (12a) (cf. (9a)) and (12b):

**Heerlen Dutch:**

(12) a. ... *doe* *doen* ... *banden* opleggen dus op die auto’s (12: Anton) ... they do tires put-on\textsubscript{inf} ADV on those cars “they are fitting tires onto those cars”

b. *doen* een keer in de week nog *zaalvoetballen* (30: Rob) ... do one time in the week also hall-football\textsubscript{inf} “[I] also play indoor football once a week”.

The following tokens show that the nine compound infinitives contain (i) verbs with direct objects, (ii) verbs with particles, such as *teng* “back” and *apart* “apart” (see also *op-halen, op-leggen* and *na-kijken* in (13)) and (iii) intransitive verbs in which nouns denoting locations are incorporated, as demonstrated in (13), (14) and (15), respectively:

(13) \( V_{\text{nom}} + NP_{DO} \)

- *zuurstof halen* “get oxygen”
- *auto’s spuiten* “spray cars with paint”
- *melkbussen ophalen* “collect milk cans”
- *auto nakijken* “check a car”
- *banden opleggen* (cf. (12a)) “fit tires”
Table 3 gives an overview of the data discussed so far. Strikingly, five out of seven transitive compound infinitives involve direct objects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heerlen Dutch</th>
<th>subject has thematic role of <em>agens</em></th>
<th>transitive infinitive</th>
<th>intransitive, active infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>doen +</td>
<td>+ compound</td>
<td>N = 7: 5</td>
<td>N = 2: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>- compound</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>N = 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- compound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 → v + part.</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The distribution of *doen* according to the features [±trans] and [±compound] (spontaneous speech).

Summarising my findings, in the Heerlen Dutch speech corpus the use of the *doen* + infinitive construction correlates only significantly with the variable education/occupation of the speakers. Thus the expectation put forward that the dialect speakers would use regional *doen* most often is not confirmed. Secondly, for the larger part *doen* combines with infinitives that are not morphological complex. Furthermore, the data reveal that *doen* requires a subject that is construed as an agents.

The question arises whether the observation that compound verbs select *doen* is correct (see Figure 1). By addressing this question, I will propose that it is not the case that complex verbs select *doen* but that it is the reverse. In fact, I will argue that it is the verb *doen* that favours the occurrence of complex verbs. Since in standard Dutch as well as in Heerlen Dutch habitual aspect may be expressed by compound verbs and since *doen* expresses habitual aspect in Heerlen Dutch (as is the case in some German dialects; see Stein 1992), it is for this reason that *doen* combines easily with compound verbs.

4. Habitual aspect in standard Dutch

4.1. Adverbial phrases of time and aspectual properties of the predicate

Although in standard Dutch habitual aspect cannot be expressed by a verb, there are other ways in which a habitual reading can be put into effect – in which respect Heerlen Dutch is similar to standard Dutch. First, habitual aspect can be expressed by means of adverbial phrases of time such as *altijd* “always” and *een keer in de week* “once a week”, as in (16a) and (16b), respectively:

(16) SD/HD a. Hij zingt *altijd*  
he sings always  
“He always sings”

SD/HD b. Hij *stofzuigt* *een keer in de week*  
he hoovers one time in the week  
“He hoovers once a week”.

Furthermore, with respect to transitive predicates, the aspectual properties of the VP are determined by the object, in the sense that the object “measures out” the event (Mulder 1992:49). To this end, the following examples may be considered, in which the (a) variants indicate incidental events and the (b) variants a habitual reading. This is also demonstrated by means of the different adverbial phrases of time.

First, a habitual reading is obtained by the use of a bare NP, such as *pijp* “pipe” rather than *een pijp* “a pipe” as in (17), and a mass noun, such as *custard* and *spaghetti* as in example (18):

(17) SD/HD a. Ik *rook* *een pijp* (voor de eerste keer)  
I smoke a pipe for the first time  
“I’m smoking a pipe for the first time”

SD/HD b. Ik *rook* *pijp* (??voor de eerste keer)  
I smoke pipe for the first time  
“I usually smoke a pipe”

(18) SD/HD a. Hij *eet* *een appel*  
he eats an apple  
“He is eating an apple”

SD/HD b. Hij *eet* *custard/spaghetti*  
he eats custard/spaghetti  
“He regularly eats custard/spaghetti”.

Note, that the examples in this section are not taken from my Heerlen Dutch speech data corpus but reflect my own intuitions as a native speaker of Heerlen Dutch (cf. Cornips 1994a).
Secondly, in the habitual sentence in (19b) the intransitive verb *rijden* "drive" combines with a bare NP which is a part of a prepositional constituent in (19a):

(19) **SD/HD a.** Hij rijdt *in de auto* naar Heerlen
    he drives in the car to Heerlen
    "He is driving to Heerlen by car"

**SD/HD b.** Hij rijdt *auto* (*naar Heerlen*)
    he drives car to Heerlen
    "He is able to drive a car".

Finally, a habitual reading may be expressed by a bare plural within a prepositional phrase, as in (20b):

(20) **SD/HD a.** Zij zingt vanavond in de opera
    she sings tonight in the opera
    "She is singing in the opera tonight"

**SD/HD b.** Zij zingt (*vanavond*) in opera’s
    she sings tonight in operas
    "She is an opera singer".

Interestingly, in contrast to the habitual atelic predicates in the (b) sentences given above, a combination of telic activity verbs with bare (plural) nouns and mass noun produces ungrammatical sentences. Apparently, bare plurals and mass nouns cannot easily occupy the object position of telic activity verbs, despite the fact that these verbs require an object, as can be seen in (21b) and (21c), respectively:

(21) **SD/HD a.** Jan eet een de appel op
    Jan eats an/the apple "UP"
    "Jan is finishing an/the apple"

**SD/HD b.** Jan eet appels/spaghetti op
    Jan eats apples/spaghetti "UP"
    "Jan eats apples/spaghetti all up"

**SD/HD c.** Jan eet op
    Jan eats "UP".

4.2. **Object incorporation or complex verbs**

Hopper and Thompson (1980:252) regard the notion of transitivity as a scalar phenomenon and claim transitivity to be identifiable by several parameters. Some parameters of high transitivity are, among others, telicity or perfectivity, a totally affected object and an individuated object, that is to say, an object which consists of a noun that is concrete, singular, countable, referential and definite. From the above, it is clear that the (b) sentences involve atelicity, a non-affected and a non-individuated object. It is for this reason that Van Hout (cited in De Hoop 1992) argues that atelic activity verbs, such as the habitual examples in the (b) sentences, require one argument whereas telic verbs, such as in (21a) and (21c), require two arguments. In addition, according to De Hoop (1992 and references cited there) the ungrammaticality of (21b) can be accounted for if we assume that non-individuated nouns like bare NPs do not have the status of real objects but that they must be interpreted as part of the predicate, e.g. as a predicate modifier. More evidence in support of this assumption is the fact that predicate modifiers, in contrast to real objects, can only be found in a position to the right of adverbials, as is illustrated in (22) and (23) (cf. De Hoop 1992):

(22) **SD/HD a.** dat Jan *afweer* spaghetti eet
    that Jan again spaghetti eats
    "that Jan is eating spaghetti again"

**SD/HD b.** *dat Jan* spaghetti *afweer* eet
    "that Jan is eating spaghetti again"

(23) **SD/HD a.** dat Jan *vandaag* een appel eet
    that Jan today an apple eats
    "that Jan is eating an apple today"

**SD/HD b.** dat Jan een appel *vandaag* eet
    "that Jan is eating an apple today".

Interestingly, De Hoop (1992) argues that if object NPs of atelic activity verbs have to be interpreted as part of a one-place predicate, the phenomenon of object incorporation can be conceived as the ultimate morphological realisation of this interpretation. And, indeed, we see that two of the habitual predicates given above, allow for object incorporation, as is illustrated in the so-called *aan het v- or "v-ing"* construction in (24):

(24) **SD/HD a.** Hij is *aan het pijproken* (cf. (17b))
    he is at the pipe-smoke
    "He is smoking a pipe"

**SD/HD b.** Hij is *aan het autorijden* (cf. (19b))
    he is at the car-drive
    "He is driving a car".

Strikingly, in the dialect of Groningen the phenomenon of incorporation is more free and productive than in standard Dutch or Heerlen Dutch. Consider the following examples of object and prepositional noun incorporation in (25) and (26), respectively, taken from Schuurman (1987:185, 188):
5. Habitual *doen* in Heerlen Dutch

5.1. Analysis

In this section I will argue that the *doen*+infinitive construction in Heerlen Dutch expresses activities of the agents that have a regular pattern and, by contrast, do not have an incidental reading. I will therefore argue that *doen* determines the aspectual properties of the entire sentence, that is to say, the use of *doen* brings about an event structure in which an event is depicted as habitual (presentational aspect). This can be accounted for if we assume that *doen* indicates a functional projection AspPhrase which must be outside the VP. More specifically, I will assume the base structure in (28b):

(28)  HD  a. IkNPI *doe* werken\_  
    I do work \*Hij heeft *doen* gedaan (cf. (6))  
    He has done

    *Hij *gaat *doen werken/werken *doen  
    He goes do\_inf work\_inf do\_inf
    “He is going to work”

An argument for *doen* being the aspectual head derives from the fact that in the corpus *doen* always appears as an auxiliary and, hence, never shows up as a past participle. As noted above, in contrast to the dialect of Groningen, a similar pattern is found in the dialects of Twente (cf. (7)). Consequently, *doen* has to carry, in addition to agreement and tense, aspectual features as well. In Heerlen Dutch, therefore, a sentence is ungrammatical if, instead of *doen*, auxiliaries such as *hebben* “have” in (29a) and *gaan* “go” in (29b) determine the way the event is depicted and, hence, are related to presentational aspect:

(29)  HD  a. *Hij heeft *doen gedaan \(\text{cf. (6)}\)  
    he has do\_inf done\_part
    “He worked”

    *Hij *gaat *doen werken/werken *doen  
    He goes do\_inf work\_inf do\_inf
    “He is going to work”.

More evidence in support of this assumption can be found in the minimal pairs with and without *doen* in (30) and (31). It thus appears that it is interesting to have a closer look at the kind of verbs that combine with and without *do*. These minimal pairs were uttered by two speakers (“Cor” and “Mr Arends”, respectively) on the same occasion. Strikingly, it appears that the same verbs show up with and without *doen* even while one speaker is maintaining the same level of speech style. It can be argued that the (a) sentences indicate a plurality of events whereas the (b) sentences without *doen* express an incidental activity:

In the following section, I will argue that since in Heerlen Dutch *doen* expresses habitual aspect, it easily combines with the same kind of adverbal phrases of time and, furthermore, favours the occurrence of compound verbs.
5.2. Adverbials phrases of time in Heerlen Dutch

So far, I have argued that *doen* in Heerlen Dutch is not a meaningless element but that it has a syntactic function, i.e. *doen* expresses habitual aspect. If this is really the case, we would expect the *doen*+infinitive construction to combine only with a certain class of time adverbials, i.e. adverbs indicating a plurality of events, as is the case in standard Dutch. Furthermore, we would expect *doen* to combine easily with objects that can be interpreted as predicate modifiers.

First, let us consider the question of the presence of adverbial phrases of time, and suppose that *doen* is a meaningless element. If this assumption is correct, we would expect the *doen*+infinitive construction to have the same syntactic properties as its counterpart without *doen*. To be more precise, we would expect that combining both types of constructions with the same kinds of adverbial phrases of time produces grammatical sentences as a result. However, as illustrated in (31), this expectation is not borne out. The *doen* construction in (31a) may combine with a temporal quantifier such as *altijd* “always”, whereas (31b) contains an adverb that expresses an incidentally reading, such as *nog eens* “once more”. Apparently, the adverbial phrases of time can intensify the habitual reading that is already expressed by the predicate.

If the assumption mentioned earlier is correct, we would expect the Heerlen Dutch corpus to contain instances in which the *doen*+infinitive construction combines only with adverbial phrases that suggest a plurality event reading. And, indeed, in the corpus, we only find adverbial phrases that intensify the habitual reading of the action already expressed by the predicate. Consider, for example, the *doen* constructions in (32) with adverbials such as *zaterdags en vaak ‘s zondags* “on Saturday and often on Sunday”, *alleen maar* “only” and *altijd* “always”. 7 out of 33 tokens in the corpus combine with such an adverbial phrase:

Heerlen Dutch:

(32) a. … deed ik *‘s zaterdags en vaak ‘s zondags* m’n huiswerk
   … did I on Saturday and often on Sunday my homework
   maken … (15: Jan)
   make<inf>
   “I often did my homework on Saturday and on Sunday”
   b. … ik *deed alleen maar sporten* … (20: Jeroen)
   I did only just do-sport<inf>
   “doing sport is all I did”
   c. … ik *do dan altijd kijken* (26: Mr Bon)
   I do then always look<inf>
   “I am always watching then”.

For this reason restriction has to be formulated with respect to the kind of adverbial phrases of time cooccurring with the *doen*+infinitive construction. In contrast to (33), the adverbial phrases in (34) are grammatical:

(33) *één/erste keer* “once/for the first time”
   *wel eens* “once in a while”
   *alleen vandaag* “only today”

(34) *alleen maar* “just”
   *altijd/nooit* “always”/”never”
   *vaak/veel* “often”/”a lot”
   *elke week/keer* “every week/time”.

Interestingly, in the dialect of Twente we find a lot of instances of the *doen*+infinitive constructions with the same adverbial phrases as in Heerlen Dutch (cf. Nuijtens 1962:154):

dialect of Twente:

(35) a. Hj *doet alleen maar luieren*
   he does only just idle-away<inf>
   “He is just idling away”
   b. In school *doe ik niet meer praten*
   in school do I no more talk<inf>
   “I am not talking in school anymore”.

5.3. Aspectual properties of the *doen* predicates

On the basis of the occurrence of habitual aspect in standard Dutch, we would also expect *doen* to combine easily with objects that can be interpreted as predicate modifiers – as is, indeed, the case. The constructions in (36) involve bare plural nouns and, hence, the infinitives can be considered as complex verbs (cf. Table 3):
Heerlen Dutch:
(36) a. ... die ... _doen_ (...)_bonden opleggen..._ dus op die auto’s... (12: Anton)
... they do _tires put-on_{inf} ADV on those cars
“they are fitting tires onto those cars”
b. ... _doe_ je ook _auto’s spuiten en zo..._ (27: Martijn)
... do you also cars _spray-paint_{inf} and so
“do you also spray cars with paint and so on?”

With respect to the instances of the _doen_+infinitive construction in the Twente dialect as discussed above, it may be assumed that in this kind of dialect the objects function as predicate modifiers, too (cf. (7)). This is demonstrated by the standard Dutch translations provided by Bezoen (1948:61) that already indicate a habitual reading, as illustrated in (38):

dialect of Twente:
(37) a. _deed_ _deed_ kloopen _verkopen_ (cf. (7a))
they did wooden shoes sell_{inf}
b. _daar_ _deed_ _deed_ ze _bomziede maken_ (cf. (7b))
there did they vinegar make_{inf}
(38) a. “Deerplachten ze klommen te verkopen” (cf. Bezoen 1948 (37a))
“They used to sell wooden shoes, there”
b. “Ze fabricereerden azijn daar” (cf. Bezoen 1948 (37b))
“They used to produce vinegar there”

It is also interesting to have a closer look at the aspectual properties of the _doen_+infinitive constructions. So far, I have discussed _doen_+infinitive constructions involving compound verbs that express atelic readings. First, let us consider the infinitives which belong to the intransitive class (N=20, cf. Table 3). It appears that these infinitives, regardless of the question whether they are compounded or not, combine only with adverbial phrases of duration such as _een jaar lang “for a year”_ whereas adverbial phrases that represent the end of the action expressed by the predicate, such as _bijen/in een jaar “within a year”_, are excluded (cf. Jackendoff 1996:305). The examples in (39) show that the intransitive _doen_+infinitive constructions involve atelic activities, that is to say, these intransitives express a length of time during which the event or activity takes place. Moreover, since _doen_ expresses habitual aspect, a plurality of events is described:

Heerlen Dutch:
(39) a. ik _doe_ timmeren en opbouwen ... _een jaar lang* “in a jëfr”: Anton)_
I do _hammer_{inf} and build-up_{inf} ... for a year/within a year
“I have been a carpenter and a builder”

b. ... als je voetballen _doet_ ... _een jaar lang* “in a jëfr” (14: Gijs)
... if you football_{inf} do for a year/within a year
“if you have been playing football”
c. ... _ik deed_ sleutelen ... _een jaar lang* “in a jëfr” (27: Dik)
... I did repair_{inf} for a year/within a year
“I have been doing repairs”.

With respect to transitive predicates that do involve an object, the Heerlen Dutch examples demonstrate that these predicates express both iterative imperfectivity and iterative perfectivity, as demonstrated in (40a) and (40b), respectively. Obviously, transitive predicates, too, indicate a plurality of events. Furthermore, in the telic construction (40b) each event or activity is viewed as self-contained (cf. Harris 1984:306):

(40) a. ... dan _doe_ ik hem fôhnen _een uur lang* “in an hour” (26: Mr Bon)
... then do _I him blow-dry_{inf} for an hour/within an hour
“then I blow-dry his hair”
b. ... _die_ (...) _doe_ ik apart zetten ... _een uur lang* “in an hour”
... those do _I aside put_{inf} for an hour/within an hour
“(25: Mr Menen)
“ I put these aside”.

6. Concluding remarks

On the basis of the above discussion, we may conclude in the first place that in Heerlen Dutch _doen_ does not show any significant correlation with respect to language background of the speakers; or, more specifically, it is not the case that speakers of the local dialect use regional _doen_ more often than native speakers of Heerlen Dutch. In the second place, the assumption that _doen_ is only used as a strategy in order to avoid the inflection of morphological complex verbs cannot be maintained. I have argued that since the _doen_+infinitive construction expresses habitual aspect, it may easily combine with modifiers that already indicate a habitual reading in both in standard Dutch and in Heerlen Dutch. These modifiers are (i) specific adverbial phrases of time, namely the ones that indicate a plurality of events and (ii) compound verbs, i.e. infinitives combining NPs that do not have the status of real objects but, instead, function as predicate modifiers. Furthermore, I have demonstrated that the _doen_+infinitive constructions express both iterative imperfectivity and iterative perfectivity.

From the above, it is clear that it is relevant to involve regional varieties and dialects such as Heerlen Dutch in the discussions and investigations of the _doen_+infinitive constructions.