



Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN

The pragmatic and rhetorical function of perfect doubling in the work of D. V. Coornhert
Wall, Joanna; van de Poppe, Cora

2023

DOI (link to publisher)
[10.1075/jhp.20007.van](https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.20007.van)

document version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in KNAW Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Wall, J., & van de Poppe, C. (2023). The pragmatic and rhetorical function of perfect doubling in the work of D. V. Coornhert. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 24(2), 245-275. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.20007.van>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the KNAW public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the KNAW public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:
pure@knav.nl

The pragmatic and rhetorical function of perfect doubling in the work of D. V.

Coornhert

1. Introduction

The Early Modern period witnessed far-reaching developments across diverse domains. No less was this the case than in the Early Modern Low Countries, which underwent a period of, amongst others, important religious and linguistic developments. In particular, in the fledgling Dutch Republic, Reformed Protestantism or Calvinism grew steadily, but was strongly resisted by some. There was also increasing fascination for and exaltation of the vernacular tongue, prompting the first attempts to standardise (Van de Haar 2019), even though this would only be realised in the eighteenth century (Rutten 2016a; 2016b).

A central actor in both these domains was the Amsterdam-born writer D. V. Coornhert (1522-1590). The majority of Coornhert's writing concerned religious and related moral issues: Coornhert was an active opponent of Reformed Protestantism and heavily criticised it by expounding his own contrasting views on moral-theological matters in a number of publications. Moreover, Coornhert was an active promoter of the vernacular. He was a key member of *De Egelantier* (van der Aa 1858:700), an Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric (*rederijkerskamer*), which, in 1584, published H. L. Spiegel's *Twe-spraack van de Nederduitsche Letterkunst*, "the most important grammar from the sixteenth century" (Van der Sijs and Willemyns 2009:216).¹ It was Coornhert who penned its preface. His broader work also testifies to this linguistic vocation: in humanist fashion, he translated several texts into the vernacular from Latin (*see e.g.* Bonger 1941:29; Veenman 2009:69-70), and was a rare sixteenth-century moralist in it (Van der Aa 1858:699). In so doing, he both acquainted his

¹ Original Dutch: "De belangrijkste grammatica uit de zestiende eeuw...".

contemporaries with the classics in their own language, and elevated that language by applying rhetorical characteristics from Latin to his own vernacular writings (Gelderblom 1989).

Whilst Coornhert’s use of such characteristics has long been studied, only recently has attention been given to variation in his use of morphosyntactic structures. Firstly, from an intra-author variation perspective, Author A (2018) examines Coornhert’s variation in genitive constructions, showing that it was part of the rhetorical repertoire in his plays. Secondly, adopting a formal syntactic perspective, Author B (2018a) examines Coornhert’s use of the constructions that will be the focus of the current paper: *have*-doubling constructions like (1/2b). These constructions occur alongside run-of-the-mill present perfect, (1a), and (irrealis) past perfect constructions, (2a), which are formed of a finite present/past form of *have* like *heeft* ‘has’ and *hadde* ‘had’, and a participial form of a main verb like *belooft* ‘promised’ or *ontfanghen* ‘received’. *Have*-doubling constructions differ formally from these simple present and past perfects in containing an additional participial form of *have*, i.e. *ghehadt* ‘had’ in (1/2b).

- (1) a. *Maar wie **heeft** henluyden d'alderbeste voorspoet **belooft**?*
 But who has them.people the.best prosperity promised.PTCP
 ‘But who promised those people the best prosperity?’ (CO.ZDIW.361)²
- b. *Dit **heeft** God Israel **belooft** **ghehadt**.*
 This has God Israel promised.PTCP had.PTCP
 Approx.: ‘God promised this to Israel.’ (CO.SDS.ccc liir)
- (2) a. *... meer dan hy **hadde** **ontfanghen**.*
 more than he had received.PTCP
 ‘...more than he had received.’ (CO.ZDIW.267)

² For abbreviations of primary texts, see the relevant reference in the bibliography.

b. ... *maar de zelve*... ontfanghen hebben ghehadt,

but the same received.PTCP have had.PTCP

Approx.: ‘...but received the same.’

(CO.ZDIW.201)

Both these constructions and Coornhert’s use of them are conspicuous for a number of reasons. Firstly, whilst found in certain modern Dutch dialects (Barbiers et al. 2008:40; Koeneman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011) and other modern varieties like German, *have*-doubling constructions like (1/2b) are entirely absent from modern Standard Dutch, in contrast to run-of-the-mill present/past perfects which remain frequent. Investigating a range of Coornhert’s texts available from the *Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren* (DBNL; <https://www.dbnl.org/>), Author B (2018a:159-160) finds 120 such constructions in a text collection totalling 1.6 million words, equating to a frequency of approximately 76.3 instances per 1 million words. Given the construction’s complete absence from modern Standard Dutch, their frequency in Coornhert’s writing stands out. As Author B (2018b, *in prep.*) shows, whilst Coornhert was certainly not the only user of *have*-doubling in the Early Modern Dutch period, he also exceeds most of his contemporaries in his frequency of use of the construction. This raises the question: *Which factors determined Coornhert’s apparently exceptional use of have-doubling constructions?* In this paper, we provide an answer to this question by examining how semantic, pragmatic and literary factors determine the use of *have*-doubling, or perfect doubling, as we will opt to focus on (*see* Section 3). As we will show, previous analyses of double perfects have proposed pragmatic reasons for the alternation between these forms and simple perfects (e.g. Van der Wal 1988:393; Squartini 1999:57, 65-67; Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016:27; Haß 2016:197-213, 215-282). Building on these studies, we show that double perfects are akin to evaluative devices or stance markers described in the pragmatic/discourse studies literature and, more specifically, parallel the well-studied

historical present (*see* e.g. Schiffrin 1981:59; Brinton 2015:227). Adopting a literary perspective on how early modern literary authors like Coornhert used their texts as rhetorically refined instruments of persuasion (Hermans 2018:292; i.e. the study of rhetoric, *see* e.g. Gelderblom 1989, Author A 2018), we then use this as a basis for examining how Coornhert used the construction to express individual themes in his moral-theological prose. In so doing, we connect both construction-specific and broader research in semantics and pragmatics/discourses studies (linguistics) to research on rhetoric (literary studies), arguing that Coornhert could use double perfects to emphasise and thus arouse the reader's attention to core elements of his ethics. As such, this paper also adds to the predominantly (historical) sociolinguistic research on intra-writer or -speaker variation, recently extended to include variation within a single author's literary texts (i.e. intra-author variation, e.g. Van Koppen and Dietz 2016; Author A 2018), including that specifically on Coornhert's work (Author A 2018).³

The paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we investigate the use of perfect doubling at the macro-level in Coornhert's work, namely in relation to cultural styles and genre. Turning to the micro-level, we then provide an overview of previous studies on the semantic and pragmatic properties of perfect doubling in both Early Modern Dutch and modern German varieties and Dutch dialects (Section 3). In Section 4, we detail our proposal that, based on analyses of double perfects in these previous studies, this construction can be assimilated into the stance markers/evaluative devices identified in the pragmatics/discourse studies tradition and, more specifically, parallels the historical present. Moreover, we argue here that both this and construction-specific linguistic research can be connected to research in literary studies on rhetoric, i.e. the persuasive use of language to influence and manage the reader (*see* e.g. Author A *in press*). On this basis, in Section 5, we then provide a qualitative analysis of how the

³ In comparison with inter-individual variation, intra-individual variation has hitherto received considerably less attention in (historical) sociolinguistics (Hernández-Campoy 2016:29-30). Recently, however, attention for variation within individual language users has been growing, *see* e.g. Rutten (2016b) for a recent Early Modern Dutch example in this line of research.

construction is used in two case studies on Coornhert's moral-theological texts, showing how this relates to their thematic and wider sociohistorical context, as well as rhetorical structure. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Marco properties of Coornhert's *have*-doubling: Cultural styles and genre

In this section, taking a macro-level approach to intra-author variation, we will show that Coornhert's use of *have*-doubling was not a humanistic shaped borrowing from classical texts, nor informed by the writing tradition of sixteenth-century rhetoricians. Rather, the literary-communicative context seems to have triggered the use of the construction: Coornhert employed *have*-doublings overwhelmingly in his argumentative prose.

As already noted, Gelderblom (1989) and Author A (2018) have both made relevant proposals about specific elements of Coornhert's language. Firstly, Gelderblom (1989) has shown that, as well as translating texts from Latin, Coornhert, in humanist fashion, borrowed and adapted some elements of his style from classical literature (e.g. rhythm, rhyme and rhetorical questions). This raises the question as to whether Coornhert might have also borrowed *have*-doublings as stylistic devices from Latin. However, such a notion can be quickly disposed of: Whilst *have*-doubling is found in certain modern (Latin descendant) Romance languages like French (*see* e.g. Haß 2016), to the best of our knowledge it is not documented in Latin itself (*see* also Author B *in prep.*).

Secondly, in their research on genitive variation, Author A (2018) has argued that genre is a determiner behind Coornhert's linguistic variation. Author A (2018:284-5) shows that, in his plays, Coornhert uses the more archaic pregenitive variant more frequently than the postgenitive variant, but that this is reversed in his prose. Building on Damsteegt (1978), Jansen (2011) and Jansen (2017), they link this to the fact that Coornhert's plays were more faithful to the *rederijkerstraditie* (i.e. the rhetorical style in the tradition of the chamber of rhetoric)

than his prose was. Moreover, Author A (2018:294-6) shows that variation between both types of genitives “often takes place in and contributes to the functioning of style figures” (Author A 2018:296), especially those typical of lyric rather than prose, e.g. chiasms, alliteration, rhythm and rhyme.⁴

In order to ascertain which factors determined Coornhert’s use of *have*-doubling here and throughout the present investigation, we examined Author B’s (2018b) set of 120 *have*-doubling constructions collected from his non-translated texts available on DBNL (*see* Section 1). Like variation in the use of the genitive, we find a clear genre dichotomy in Coornhert’s (non-)use of *have*-doubling, but one that points in a different direction to the dichotomy found in genitive variation. Consider firstly Table 1, which shows the number of *have*-doubling constructions found in the corpus for each genre, based on the classification of (main) genre in DBNL.⁵

Table 1: *Have*-doubling constructions in Coornhert’s work by genre

Genre	Number of texts	Number of words	Percentage of total words	Number of instances of <i>have</i>-doubling	Number of instances of <i>have</i>-doubling per million words
Drama	10	150,221	10%	1	6.7
Poetry	4	49,682	3%	0	0.0
Prose	48	1,372,673	87%	119	86.7
Total	62	1,572,576	n/a	120	76.3

The first observation concerning Table 1 is that, whilst the corpus size is small ($n=49,682$ words; 3%), *have*-doubling is entirely absent from Poetry. Similarly, only one instance is attested in Drama, equating to just 6.7 instances per million words, despite Drama accounting

⁴ Original Dutch: “...vindt vaak plaats in en draagt bij aan het functioneren van stijlfiguren.”

⁵ This distinguishes Drama, Poetry, Prose and Non-Fiction. In Table 1, the latter two are combined into Prose.

for 10% of the total words in the corpus. Indeed, *have*-doubling overwhelmingly predominates in Prose (86.7 instances per million words; *see also Author B in prep.*). Notice that, since *have*-doubling is essentially completely absent from Coornhert's plays, its use cannot be directly linked to the *rederijkerstraditie*, as was the case in his use of the pregenitive (*see above*). Instead, this broadly matches construction-specific literature on the role of genre: Both Van der Wal (1988:393) on Early Modern Dutch *be*- and *have*-doubling constructions (cf. Footnote 14) and Litvinov and Radčenko (1998:15) on German find a low frequency of *have*-doubling in poetry. Further, Van der Wal's (1988:393) intuition is "that argumentative prose forms a favourable context" (Van der Wal 1988:393; cf. however Litvinov and Radčenko 1998:12-15).^{6 7} We are able to provide support for her observation: All of the Prose texts in the corpus, regardless of the presence of doubling, fall into at least one of the following subgenre categories: Treatises, Dialogues, Pamphlet-Brochures, Philosophy-Ethics and Theology. Indeed, the four texts with the highest raw frequency of *have*-doubling are all clear examples of argumentative prose on philosophical, ethical and/or theological content, and together account for 45% of the *have*-doubling constructions in the corpus.⁸ These are: *Van de vreemde sonde* 'On strange sin' (1584; *n*=24, 20%); the first vernacular companion to ethics for common people, *Zedekunst* (1586; *n*=13, 11%); *Vande predestinatie, verkiesinghe en de verwerpinghe Godes* 'On predestination and God's preferences and rejections' (1589; *n*=10, 8%); and *Van de toelatinge ende decreete Godts* 'On God's allowances and decrees' (1572; *n*=7, 6%). In Section 5, we will examine individual examples from the two texts in which *have*-doubling occurs with the highest raw frequencies, *Van de vreemde sonde* and the *Zedekunst*, in this

⁶ Original Dutch: "...dat betogend proza een begunstigende kontekst vormt...".

⁷ Note that ultimately, whilst Van der Wal does not provide her statistics, the main evidence for this conclusion might be the argumentative prose of Coornhert's *Zedekunst*, which is included in her study (cf. Footnote 13).

⁸ Note that, although Coornhert's plays were also vehicles for moral and theological instruction, his texts were first and foremost intended to provide entertainment and thereby educate the audience (Fleurkens 1989:80). The primary purpose of the texts distinguished in Table 1 thus differed (entertainment and teaching in plays, versus education and persuasion in prose). The form (prose versus poetry) and style is adjusted accordingly.

central context of theological prose, in order to analyse the micro-discourse properties of *have-doubling*.

Furthermore, we can also assimilate the one apparently exceptional *have-doubling* found in Drama, shown in (3), to this picture.

(3) ...[Het Evangelie] seydt dat het leven der oprechten hier wel een rasernye schijnt inden ooghen der gheenre die self rasen, maer dat zy namaels met te spade berou sullen bevinden dat sy gheraest hebben ende dat het kinderen Godes zijn **die sy bespot hebben ghehadt**.

‘[The Gospel] says that the life of the righteous here does seem a mad one in the eyes of those who rage themselves, but that they subsequently realise with too late repentance that they raged and that it was children of God who they **mocked**.’

(CO.DMSC.327)

(3) is from Coornhert’s *Maeghdekens schole* ‘School for Maidens’ (ca. 1570-1575), one of only two of Coornhert’s plays which were non-rhyming, his eight others were all rhyming (Author A 2018:283). It is spoken by the pupil Iohanna, the drama’s principle protagonist. In it, she defends to the teacher, Curiositas, the supremacy of the Gospel, the latter having misled Iohanna’s fellow pupil Galilea to exchange it for a book that gives more pleasure. Instead, Iohanna points out to Curiositas that the Gospel teaches her that God’s judgement and that of man are distinct. Hence, this example in fact satisfies all three characteristics highlighted above: it is prose, theological, and argumentative, indeed placed into the mouth of the principle protagonist.

Given that all Prose texts in the corpus can be broadly characterised as argumentative prose, what obviously cannot be straightforwardly established on the basis of this corpus is

how frequent *have*-doubling was in Coornhert's non-argumentative prose. Consideration of some of Coornhert's texts not included in the corpus provides evidence, albeit limited, that the construction occurs in other forms of prose less frequently. In point of fact, we find the example in (4) in a letter from Coornhert to Spiegel, his friend and fellow member of the chamber of rhetoric *De Egelantier*, whose content, relating an important life event – the death of his wife – to his friend, implies non-argumentative prose.⁹

(4) *Amice, ick groet U vriendelyck met U lieve Huysvrouwe; de mijne is bij haer Heere: diese my lange gheleent heeft ghehad.*

Approx.: 'Dear friend, I send my cordial greetings to you with your dear wife; my own is with her Lord who **had** long **lent** her to me.'

(repeated from Bonger 1941:37)

A future investigation should be conducted to establish whether *have*-doublings are also less frequent in Coornhert's letters compared with his argumentative prose. Another text not included in the corpus which already points to the conclusion that *have*-doubling is indeed infrequent in Coornhert's non-argumentative prose is his *Vijftigh lustighe historien oft nieuwicheden Joannis Boccacij* 'Fifty funny stories or curiosities from Giovanni Boccaccio' (1564), a translation of selected parts of Boccaccio's prose narrative work *Decamerone*, excluded from the original corpus as it is a translation. It contains four *have*-doublings, equating to a frequency of 24.3 instances per 1 million words, significantly lower than the 86.7 instances per 1 million words for the (argumentative) prose works in the corpus. This suggests

⁹ Even certain instances in letters could, however, be assimilated into Coornhert's argumentative and persuasive prose (Bonger and Gelderblom 1985:126).

that, whilst not absent from other types of prose, *have*-doubling is indeed particularly frequent in Coornhert's argumentative prose relative to other types of prose.¹⁰

3. Semantics and pragmatics of perfect doubling

In this section, we introduce previous research on the semantics and pragmatics of *have*-doubling in both Early Modern Dutch and modern Dutch dialectal and German varieties.

Whilst multiple different types of *have*-doubling have been proposed to exist in both these and other related varieties (*see* e.g. Author B 2018b for an overview), we will concentrate on one particular type of *have*-doubling, perfect doubling.¹¹ Like simple perfects, these are active constructions in which the interpretation of the syntactic subject is determined by the external argument of the embedded participle. For example, (5) is an active construction, in which the subject is interpreted as a *sinner* in line with the embedded participle *gezondight* 'sinned'.

(5) ... *souden sy int niet aannemen vanden Heere oock gezondight hebben ghehadt?*

should they in.the not accept.INF of.the Lord also sinned.PTCP have.INF had.PTCP

Approx.: '...would they have also sinned in not accepting from the Lord?'

(CO.TDWL.67r)

A previous Early Modern Dutch study which touches upon the factors of interest is that of Van der Wal (1988) who investigates these "active three-part forms" (Van der Wal 1988:391) in a

¹⁰ There are few other available instances of non-argumentative prose from Coornhert: his other translations include those of Cicero's treatise *De Officiis* (1 double perfect), Boethius' philosophical work *De consolatione philosophiae* (1 double perfect in main text, 1 in foreword) and selected parts of the *Odysee* (0 double perfects), a verse text.

¹¹ Author B (2018b:162-3), for instance, argues that in addition to double perfects there are passive *have*-doubling constructions, in which, following Broekhuis (2019:15) and Duinhoven (1997:347), the syntactic subject is "a metaphorical recipient, namely an individual who is causally but not actively implicated in the denoted event" (Author B 2018b:162), akin to causative *have*-doubling constructions found in modern English (Author B 2018b:162-3, Footnote 8). Here, we assume that the specific instances of Coornhert's *have*-doubling discussed in Section 5 are double perfects, although it should be noted that most examples do not allow the reading of the subject to be ascertained unambiguously. More research is required to try to determine the distribution of these distinct types of *have*-doubling more accurately.

multi-author corpus study of 18 Dutch texts from the sixteenth until the eighteenth century.¹²

¹³ ¹⁴ Van der Wal finds that there is “no particular rule [of usage]” of doubling constructions, but nevertheless highlights two factors related to their semantics and pragmatics.¹⁵ Firstly, she cites an extract from the seventeenth-century writer P. C. Hooft’s (1581-1647) grammar *Waernemingen op de Hollandsche Tael* (‘Observations on the Dutch language’) (in Zwaan 1939) where he describes the potential ambiguity of run-of-the-mill perfects as a potential motivation for the use of perfect doubling in Early Modern Dutch: the use of a present perfect like *hy heeft de stad beleghert* ‘he has besieged the town’ “...may obscure matters, because it might be understood that he still had the town under siege, at our time of speaking: so to be very clear, it would in fact be necessary to say HY HEEFT BELEGHERT GEHADT [i.e. the doubling variant]...” (Zwaan 1939:249; see Van der Wal 1988:397).¹⁶ This implies that a double perfect may only be used when something is no longer valid at the time of speaking. Secondly, Van der Wal (1988:393) also expresses an intuition regarding a pragmatic role of these constructions: “Since one variant is more marked and thus draws more attention than the usual form, one might assume that the use of the three-part forms corresponds to the need for clarification or placing of emphasis”.¹⁷

In contrast to their Early Modern Dutch counterparts, perfect doubling constructions in modern Dutch dialectal and, more so, German varieties have been subject to a vast amount of research (e.g. Litvinov and Radčenko 1998; Squartini 1999; Ammann 2007; Rödel 2007, 2011;

¹² Original Dutch: “aktieve drieledige vormen”.

¹³ One of the sixteenth-century texts is Coornhert’s *Zedekunst*, which is also included in the present study, but these are otherwise from authors other than Coornhert (Van der Wal 1988:391, Footnote 8).

¹⁴ Note that these “active three-part forms” are in fact of secondary interest to the main focus of Van der Wal’s (1988) study – the apparently related three-part passive constructions like (a), a further construction found in Early Modern Dutch but absent from modern Standard Dutch.

(a) *Het boek is verkocht geworden / gewesen*

The book is sold.PTCP become.PTCP / been.PTCP

Approx.: ‘The book has been/was sold.’

This means, aside from her discussion of Hooft’s remarks which specifically concern *have*-doubling, Van der Wal’s (1988) comments on the function of doubling refer to both sets of constructions, if not predominately those like (a), not just the ones of interest here.

¹⁵ Original Dutch: “geen bepaalde regel”.

¹⁶ Original Dutch: “...kan duijsterheijt vallen, want het mochte verstaen worden, dat hij de Stadt nog beleghert hield, op den tijd als wij spreekē: zulx om heel klaer te spreken, wel noodigh waere te zeggen HY HEEFT BELEGHERT GEHADT...”.

¹⁷ Original Dutch: “Omdat een variant gemarkeerder is en dus meer aandacht trekt dan de gebruikelijke vorm, zou men kunnen veronderstellen dat het gebruik van de drieledige vormen samenhangt met de behoefte tot verduidelijking of met het leggen van een accent.”

Koeneman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011; Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016; Haß 2016; Zybatow and Weskott 2018). This research distinguishes two different types of double perfects, whose availability is determined by the variety in question’s wider tense/aspect paradigm. As we now show, Early Modern Dutch likely lacked a purely temporal double perfect such as restricted to southern German varieties, but instead had a double perfect like those found in Dutch dialects and other German varieties, with both a temporal/aspectual semantics akin to that described by P. C. Hooft, but also a clear pragmatic motivation comparable to that suggested by Van der Wal.

The first, purely temporal double perfect, the so-called *anterior* (e.g. Koeneman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011:72-74, *and references therein*; Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016; Larsson and Brandner 2014; cf. Squartini 1999:62ff.; Haß 2016:117-133), which is found in southern German dialects, signals “an event in the past as completed/anterior to a reference point in the past” (Brandner, Salzman, and Schaden 2016:4).¹⁸ This is illustrated in (6).

- (6) *Wo s Anni der äérscht Walzer gmacht ghaa hed, isch em*
 When the Anni the first waltz done.PTCP had.PTCP has is him.DAT
schläch wòorde.
 bad become.PTCP
 ‘After Anni had danced the first waltz, she started to feel sick.’

(cf. Bossard 1962 in Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016:16)

In (6), as signposted by the conjunction *wo* ‘when, after’, the anterior double perfect *hed ghaa gmacht* ‘has... had done’ expresses that Anni’s having completed the waltz is anterior to the

¹⁸ Original German: “...beschreibt ein Ereignis in der Vergangenheit als abgeschlossen/vorzeitig zu einem Referenzzeitpunkt in der Vergangenheit...”.

point when he starts to feel bad – expressed by a run-of-the-mill simple perfect – *isch...wòorde* ‘has become’. In modern Standard German and other varieties, the same meaning is instead expressed by a morphological past perfect, like *hatte...getanzt* ‘had...danced’ in (7).

(7) *Nachdem Anni den ersten Walzer getanzt hatte, wurde ihr schlecht.*
 After Anni the first waltz danced.PTCP had became him.DAT bad

(Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016:16)

Importantly, the availability of double perfects with this purely temporal meaning is determined by the wider tense/aspect paradigm: these double perfects are generally restricted to varieties which have undergone the *Präteritumsschwund* ‘preterit disappearance’ (Larsson and Brandner 2014; cf. Squartini 1999:60-61; Koenenman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011:40-41,73-74), i.e. lost morphologically simple past tenses like *wurde* ‘became’ in (7). More specifically, given the absence of simple past forms of the auxiliary (e.g. *sie hatte* ‘she had’ and *sie war* ‘she was’) in these varieties, past perfects cannot be formed from a combination of a simple past form of the auxiliary like *hatte* ‘had’ and a lexical past participle like *getanzt* ‘danced’, as in other German varieties and modern Dutch varieties (see Footnote 21). As such, in southern varieties, double perfects express this temporal meaning, thus filling a genuine gap in the tense/aspect system.

Like in non-southern German varieties and modern Dutch varieties, there appears to have been no such gap in the tense/aspect system in Coornhert’s Dutch: he retained morphological simple pasts and was hence able to express the temporal meaning associated with anterior double perfects with a morphological past perfect. Both of these forms are

exemplified in the narrative extract in (8) (*see* also Hooft's contemporary description of the past perfect in his *Waernemingen* in Zwaan 1939:248).

- (8) *Endelijck bevindende dat hy hem niet en beweechde na dat sy hem al
Finally finding that he him not NEG moved after she him already
dicmael weder aenghestoten hadde, vermerckte sy dat hy doot was ...
many.times again nudged.PTCP had noticed she that he dead was
'Finally finding that he was not moving after she had nudged him again and again, she realised
that he was dead...'*

(CO.VLHO. N4v)

In (8), the morphological past perfect *hadde...aenghestoten* 'had...nudged' appears to express the anterior's meaning: as signposted by the conjunction *na dat* 'after' (cf. *nachdem* 'after' in (7)), the repeated nudging of the body is anterior to the establishment of the individual's death indicated by the simple pasts *beweechde* 'moved' and *vermerckte* 'noticed'. As such, given the presence of both morphological simple pasts and past perfects in Coornhert's Dutch, and assuming that we can generally only expect double perfects in varieties without these, we seem to be able to rule out this purely temporal, anterior double perfect.

Instead, Coornhert's double perfects appear to correspond to a second type of double perfect, which has both a temporal/aspectual and pragmatic meaning, and is found alongside anterior double perfects in southern German dialects (e.g. Squartini 1999:65ff.; Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016), as well as in other German varieties (e.g. Haß 2016) and modern Dutch dialects (Koeneman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011:72-74) which lack the anterior.^{19 20} In

¹⁹ As Author B (2018) shows based on the same dataset, Coornhert's *have*-doubling constructions also parallel their Dutch dialectal counterparts in terms of an important syntactic property, namely their word order (cf. Koeneman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011; also Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016:35ff. on southern German varieties).

²⁰ This corresponds to what Haß (2016) refers to as the *absoluter Gebrauch* 'absolute use' of double perfects, and broadly speaking to the various non-anterior uses distinguished by Squartini (1999) and Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden (2016). Note that unlike these other authors,

what follows, focusing on the better studied instances of this construction in German varieties, we introduce the temporal/aspectual meaning of these double perfects, by first describing relevant forms in the wider tense/aspect paradigm of these varieties with which they are partially interchangeable, and then look at their pragmatic function.

In non-southern varieties of German, in addition to past perfects like (7), the wider tense/aspect paradigm features morphologically simple pasts like *traf* ‘met’ as well as simple perfects like *habe...getroffen* ‘have...met’ (see e.g. Squartini 1999:61).²¹ Both of these are at least to some extent exchangeable (see e.g. Haß 2016:48-49,55-63), being able to combine with positional past adverbs like *gestern* ‘yesterday’ (e.g. Haß 2016:48-49), as illustrated in (9a/b) respectively.

(9) a. *Gestern traf ich Hans.*

Yesterday met I Hans

b. *Gestern habe ich Hans getroffen.*

Yesterday have I Hans met.PTCP

‘Yesterday, I met Hans.’

(Haß 2016:48-49)

In addition, simple perfects in German are possible in *current relevance*-type contexts, namely approximately when what is expressed relates to or holds into the present. One such instance is (10), a universal perfect (see e.g. Comrie 1976:60), in which the durative adverb *seit einer Stunde* ‘for an hour’ indicates that a state began in the past and the present tense adverb *jetzt* ‘now’ shows that it still holds in the present.

who for instance notably treat double perfects with positional past tense adverbs as a separate class (Squartini 1999:66ff.; Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016:17-18,27-28), whilst, following Haß (2016), we assume they are part of a unified class of non-anterior uses.

²¹ Whilst there is less descriptive material available on the wider tense/aspect systems of Dutch dialects with double perfects, they appear to parallel non-southern German varieties, given that they also feature both simple pasts and past perfects, and that both simple and double perfects are possible in viable doubling contexts (Koeneman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011:40,74).

(10) *Ich habe den Rucksack jetzt schon seit einer Stunde [sic.] getragen.*

I have the rucksack now already since a hour carried.PTCP

‘I have now carried the rucksack for an hour.’

(Haß 2016:217)

In their temporal meaning, double perfects in (non-southern) German varieties parallel (9a/b), rather than (10): Like morphologically simple pasts and perfects of the (9b)-type, they can also express simple past tense (e.g. Haß 2016:249-258) and combine with positional past tense adverbs like *gestern* ‘yesterday’ in (11a) (e.g. Haß 2016:145; cf. Footnote 20), but are ungrammatical in current relevance contexts (Haß 2016:216-7), (11b).

(11) a. *Gestern hat er es mir gesagt gehabt.*

Yesterday has he it me.DAT said.PTCP had.PTCP

Approx.: ‘He said it to me yesterday.’

(Haß 2016:135)

b. **Ich habe den Rucksack jetzt schon seit einer Stunde getragen gehabt.*

I have the rucksack now already since an hour carried.PTCP had.PTCP

(Haß 2016:217)

As such, perfect doubling can be seen to express the absence of current relevance, or to “cancel[...] the implication that a certain status still holds at the moment of speech” (Ammann 2007:197; for similar descriptions see e.g. Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016, and Rödel 2007, 2011).

According to the aforementioned comments by Hooft in his *Waernemingen*, including and beyond those cited above, a broadly identical situation seems to have held of both the wider tense/aspect system and double perfects in Early Modern Dutch. First, both Early Modern Dutch morphological simple past forms like *hy belegherde* ‘he besieged’ and simple perfects

like *hy heeft de stadt beleghert* ‘he has besieged the town’ (in Zwaan 1939:249), can express “a matter which is over at the point of time when one speaks thereof” (in Zwaan 1939:248).²² Further, the latter, just like their German counterparts, seem to be found in current relevance contexts given that from the simple perfect *hy heeft de stadt beleghert*, “it might be understood that he still had the town under siege”.²³ Finally, as noted above, it is likewise double perfects which are ruled out in this latter context and appear thus to be only able to express something which is no longer valid at the time of speaking, like in German.

Secondly, supporting Van der Wal’s (1988:393) second observation, previous analyses of double perfects in German and Dutch varieties have proposed pragmatic reasons for the alternation between these forms and simple perfects (e.g. Squartini 1999:57, 65-67; Koeneman, Lekakou, and Barbiers 2011:69, 73; Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016:27-28; Haß 2016:197-213, 215-282). Notably, directly parallel to Van der Wal, Haß (2016) argues that double perfects are an *expressive Kommunikationsstrategie* ‘expressive communication strategy’ compared with double perfect due to their status as a “...more complex, heavier and phonetically marked verbal form...” (Haß 2016:199).²⁴ According to Haß, examples which exhibit this expressive function can be linked to the *Hervorhebung eines Verbalgeschehens* ‘emphasis of an event’ (Haß 2016:206, 208) or *eine besonders wichtige Information* ‘a particularly important piece of information’ (Haß 2016:205). One context in which such expressive functions are frequent is the repetition of an event that has already been expressed with a non-double form, be it a simple perfect or simple past in conjunction with a double perfect, or a simple past perfect with either a double perfect or double past perfect (Haß 2016:203-207, 210-212; see also Rödel’s 2011:136, ex. (21)).²⁵

²² Original Dutch: “...een zaek die verbij is op den tijdt als men daer af spreckt...”.

²³ Original Dutch: “...het mochte verstaen worden, dat hij de Stadt nog beleghert hield...”.

²⁴ Original German: “...komplexere, schwerere und phonetisch markierte Verbalform...”.

²⁵ In addition, Haß (2016:197-213) relates this expressive function to *eine[r] Art Betonung, dass ein vergangenes Ereignis tatsächlich in der beschriebenen Form stattgefunden hat* ‘a sort of emphasis, that a past event actually took place in the described form’ (Haß 2016:212-3). However, as this is not obviously the case of the Early Modern Dutch instances in this paper, we will not further discuss it here.

Further, describing the example below in (12) and directly related to their temporal/aspectual meaning, Rödel (2011:136) links double perfects to an emphasis specifically on the “temporal distance” of the proposition expressed, stating: “Obviously the speaker chooses a double perfect to emphasise the temporal distance of the situation. It is a subjective classification of the speaker to distance himself from the topic of this sentence...” (see also Rödel 2007; Brandner, Salzmann, and Schaden 2016:27-28).

(12) Speaker 1: *Bei den Filmaufnahmen damals haben Sie sehr sportlich gewirkt. Treiben Sie Sport?*

Speaker 2: *Ja, ich spiele leidenschaftlich Fußball (.) und **habe** es auch damals schon **gespielt gehabt**.*

Speaker 1: ‘Back then when shooting the film you seemed to be very sporty. Do you regularly do sports?’

Speaker 2: ‘Yes, I love playing football and I already played then too.’

(Bayern2Radio, 05/10/2005 in Rödel 2011:136)

Thus, as well as expressing a temporal meaning associated with the absence of current relevance, double perfects can be linked to pragmatic motivations for emphasis.

In this section, we have shown, with reference to the wider tense/aspect paradigms, that Early Modern Dutch likely lacked a purely temporal, anterior double perfect found in southern German varieties, but instead had a double perfect with both a temporal/aspectual and pragmatic meaning as also found in modern Dutch dialects and other German varieties. Temporally, such double perfects can be broadly seen to express the absence of current relevance (Haß 2016) and, pragmatically, these constructions have been associated with emphasis functions, specifically in relation to stressing a situation’s temporal distance (Rödel 2007, 2011). In the next section, we present a proposal for Coornhert’s use of perfect doubling

based on this previous literature in relation to research in pragmatics and discourse studies on verb tense variation.

4. Proposal: Perfect doubling parallels the historical present

In this section, we propose that, due to their semantics and emphasis function, double perfects can be considered to parallel the historical present. As such, we show they form part of a wider class of evaluative devices/stance markers documented in the pragmatics/discourse studies literature on tense switching phenomena (e.g. Fleischman 1986). Further, as a bridge to the case studies on Coornhert's use of *have*-doubling, we argue that these can be linked to rhetorical devices as discussed in literary studies research.

The historical present is the use of the present tense in the narration of past events. It is a marked form, in opposition to the usual unmarked past tense found in narratives (*see* for a discussion on tense and markedness Fleischman 1990:52ff). Now widely acknowledged is the fact that the historical present serves pragmatic roles (*see* for a short overview Brinton 2015:227), which fall under the category of evaluation devices/stance marking. Generally, scholars assume that the speaker/writer is present in an utterance with his/her attitude and belief through linguistic means, thus giving personal emphasis and conveying, for example, levels of certainty and importance (*see* Baratta 2009:1407 for a short overview on stance's rhetorical effect). Over the past decades, scholars have increasingly studied the evaluative function and meaning of various linguistic items (particularly that of value-marked vocabulary, but see e.g. Fleischman 1985, 1986 on the historical present and Baratta 2009 on the passive) in different languages and contexts. In particular, the first decades of the twenty-first century witnessed an upsurge of interest in the linguistic mechanisms of evaluation under different labels, including evaluation, subjectivity, and stance – the latter probably being the most commonly used

nowadays (*see* e.g. Hunston and Thompson 2003, Martin and White 2005, Englebretson 2007, Jaffe 2009, Thompson and Alba-Juez 2014).

Although the historical present has no intrinsic evaluative force itself – in contrast to intensifiers or other value-marked vocabulary –, it can function as an evaluative device/stance marker in two ways. Firstly, on a more general level, the historical present as a marked tense can highlight the relative importance of a certain event within the larger discourse (e.g. Brinton 1992:227-228), i.e. it foregrounds certain information (Fleischman 1985). Secondly, following from its tense/aspect morphology, the historical present has an evaluative function related to the degree of distance between the event and the moment of narration/reading. More specifically, as a form of “internal evaluation” the historical present renders events “as if they were occurring at that moment” (Schiffrin 1981:59).²⁶ As such, it can serve both the narrator and the audience, in the representation and interpretation of the narrative.²⁷

Building on the discussed literature on verb tense variation between the past and the historical present and combining it with the discussed literature on the semantics and pragmatics of perfect doubling (Section 3), perfect doubling and the historical present can be treated as parallel phenomena. Firstly, perfect doubling and the historical present have in common that they are both marked tenses – as they are used as deviation from other tense forms, i.e. run-of-the-mill present/past perfects as well as simple pasts in the case of the former (*see* also Van der Wal 1988:393; Haß 2016:198; Section 3) and simple pasts in the case of the latter – and, hence, they are a potential means for the author’s personal emphasis (stance), e.g. emphasising *eine besonders wichtige Information* ‘a particularly piece of important information’ (Haß 2016:205). Secondly, both tenses reveal the level of distance to the content

²⁶ The notion of internal evaluation refers to Labov’s (1972) seminal sociolinguistic work on the structure of narratives, where he distinguishes between external (i.e. explicit) and internal (i.e. linguistic items expressing evaluative force) evaluation. However, as highlighted above, recent research has greatly extended these notions beyond Labov’s initial conception of them as alerting the audience to the story’s point, and it is to these more recent interpretations which we relate perfect doubling in the current paper.

²⁷ There is some debate whether the historical present is an evaluation device for the narrator, revealing his/her stance towards the events, or for the audience, to “develop their own view of events” (*see* for a short overview on both aspects Brinton 1992:228). Below, we interpret the use of perfect doubling from an interactional perspective: perfect doubling first and foremost allows Coornhert, as author, to distance himself from the uttered content. When presenting his own way of thinking, however, he likely also guided the interpretation of the audience.

of the utterance. Whereas the historical present situates narrated events in the here-and-the-now, perfect doubling, in contrast, locates events in the completed past (e.g. Rödel 2007, 2011). Perfect doubling, in other words, offers the writer/speaker the most distanced stance, thus allowing "...the speaker to distance himself from the topic of this sentence..." (Rödel 2011:136). To the best of our knowledge, this link between perfect doubling and the historical present/stance marking is a novel one which does not feature in the previous literature on either.

In the following section, we present a qualitative analysis of *have*-doubling in two case studies on themes in Coornhert's moral-theological texts. We will argue there that, parallel to the historical present, perfect doubling is a vehicle for the author to insert his viewpoint into a text (cf. Brinton 1992:228). In contrast with the former's conveyance of temporal closeness, however, the evaluative force of perfect doubling lies in dissociation. In that sense, perfect doubling could be argued to be another of the stylistic devices used for rhetorical functions as discerned in literary studies. Like the deployment of stylistic devices (e.g. Gelderblom 1989) and the effective arrangement of the texts' argument structure (e.g. Fleurkens 1994), Coornhert could use morphosyntactic items, and perfect doubling specifically (but see also Author A 2018 on Coornhert's use of the genitive), rhetorically, i.e. to attract the reader's attention and to structure the argumentation line by situating the utterance's content in the completed past.

5. Perfect doubling in Coornhert's theological prose: Two case studies on (original) sin

The majority of Coornhert's writing concerned religious and related moral issues: Coornhert was an active opponent of Reformed Protestantism and heavily criticised it and the Reformed Church by expounding his own contrasting views on moral-theological matters in a number of publications. The works in which perfect doubling occurs most frequently, are all related to these theological matters (*see* Section 2).

In this section, we will consider potential pragmatic-rhetorical functions of the construction in relation to a key context in his writing in which perfect doubling occurs frequently: the notion of sin from bygone times (Berkvens-Stevelinck 1989:22-23). Contrary to Calvinist theology, Coornhert argues that Adam's sin (i.e. original sin) has not doomed all mankind to sinfulness, and therefore mankind can take destiny into their own hands and pursue salvation (Berkvens-Stevelinck 1989:22-25). Coornhert's denial of original sin results in his theory of perfectism (*perfectisme*): through God's grace, a believer is capable of leaving his/her sinful past behind and fulfilling the divine law completely (see for example Buys 2011:7; Van Veen and Spohnholz 2014:88).

When discussing these notions of sin and perfectism, Coornhert varies between double perfects and simple present/past perfects. In what follows, we aim to provide possible interpretations of this variation by studying a sample of *have*-doubling constructions in two contexts (see however also Footnote 29): Coornhert's polemical debate with his Calvinist opponents (Section 5.1), and the exploration of Coornhert's own theology (Section 5.2). We will propose that Coornhert used perfect doubling in both contexts as an evaluative device/stance marker (*see* Section 4): Coornhert employed perfect doubling to signal the significance of certain information and the point of the debate, as well as to guide his audience through the line of argument by dissociating himself, and potentially his readers, from the sins of bygone times. In the specific context of polemical debates (Section 5.1), furthermore, this use of perfect doubling contributed to critiquing his opponents' theology, whereas, in the context of presenting his own ethics (Section 5.2), perfect doubling served to linguistically confirm the theology of perfectism, by putting additional emphasis on the completeness of past sins, resulting in a state of perfection.

5.1 Case study 1: Coornhert in debate

In *Van de vreemde sonde* ‘On strange sin’ (VDVS, 1584), Coornhert argues against two Calvinist ministers Arent Cornelisz and Reynier Donteclock who view man’s corrupt nature as arising through the fall of Adam. Coornhert, to the contrary, argues that man acquires sin or virtue through his own belief or disbelief.

Through this first case study of perfect doubling, we aim to illustrate that in this context of a controversy Coornhert used perfect doubling for restating and evaluating the opponent’s point, linked to one of the main structures found in early modern controversy texts more broadly. We will do so by analysing seven examples from one chapter (Book 1, Chapter 5).

Considering the polemical context and argumentative content of VDVS, the pragmatics of Coornhert’s language in this treatise should be analysed from the perspective of historical controversies and polemical communication. This topic has recently received much attention in the field of pragmatics (*see* Fritz et al. 2018), thus providing a framework for the analysis of communicative patterns in polemical texts. Specifically, previous studies on controversy dialogues help us to see how perfect doubling functioned in one specific communicative section. As pointed out by Fritz (2003), early modern controversy texts follow certain organisational principles of dialogue structures. The main structure used is the restatement of the opponent’s point, and then the author’s response to that particular point (*see* also Brownlees 2017:236). This was a means to provide some background knowledge, since in many cases “the authors could not assume their readers to have available the texts of which the controversy consisted or to remember previous contributions. So they had to take measures in their own text to provide readers with the appropriate knowledge” (Fritz 2003:203). Coornhert applied this technique in VDVS.

In both the chapter’s title, (13), and its introductory section, (14), Coornhert introduces the main subject, i.e. whether Adam received virtues for himself or for mankind, using the past perfect (*ontfangen hadde* ‘received had’). Following the observation on controversy dialogues

above, the introductory section, (14), marks the first part of the dialogue structure, since it introduces the opponent's point: the Calvinist ministers argue that Adam indeed received virtues for himself and his descendants.

(13) *Of Adam alle die gaven in hem gheweest zijnde, voor die gantsche menschelijcke nature, dat is voor alle sijne afcomste, dan of hy eenighe voor hem self **ontfangen hadde**.*

'Whether Adam received all the gifts which were in him, for all mankind, that is, for all his descendants, or whether he **had received** some of them for himself.'

(CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

(14) *GHyluyden bouwet dese uwe leere vande vreemde sonde op u segghen, dat Adam alle sijne gaven **ontfanghen hadde**, niet voor sich self alleen, maer voor alle sijne afcomste*

'You build this doctrine of yours on your argument that Adam **had received** all his gifts not only for himself, but for all his descendants.'

(CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

After this introduction, Coornhert starts his response in this polemical dialogue; the conjunction *maer* 'but' at the start of (15) marks the beginning of Coornhert's rhetorically composed criticism of the Calvinist theology. His main thesis in (15) is that their theology of receiving and losing virtues through Adam is not based on scripture. Contrary to the title (13) and introduction section (14), however, Coornhert uses perfect doubling here to restate his opponent's viewpoint. Following the observation on the pragmatics of double perfects made in Section 3, Coornhert may be using the double perfect here to put additional emphasis on the temporal distance of the fall, according to the emphasis function attributed to the construction, by Rödel (2007, 2011).

(15) *Maer dit bewijsdy even soo weynigh metter heylicher Schrifturen, als ghy bewijst dat hy die altsamen oock voor alle sijne Nacomelinghen **verloren soude hebben ghehad**...*

‘However, you prove this [viewpoint] no more with the Holy Scripture than you prove that he [Adam] also **would have lost** these [virtues] for all his descendants.’

(CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

In fact, throughout the argumentative dialogue in this chapter – i.e. the reiteration of the opponent’s viewpoint, and Coornhert’s response –, Coornhert seems to supplement overt forms of criticism, such as the reproach of being unscriptural (*see* (15)), with more covert forms of evaluation through linguistic structures, e.g. perfect doubling, thus representing his own way of thinking (or stance towards the subject matter). Consider as an illustration the example in (16).

(16) *Want ick niet en meyne u luyder meyninghe te zijn, dat [...] wyluyden altsamen oock mede, waren sy [Adam ende Eva] niet ghevallen, alle sulckx van henluyden oock **aengheerft** ende **ontfanghen souden hebben ghehad**, ghemerckt sulck segghen met gheen Godtlijcke Schrifutreeenen waerschijnlijcken verwe en mach ghegheven worden...*

Approx.: ‘Since I do not think your opinion is that...had they [Adam and Eve] not fallen, all of us **would have also inherited** and **received** all such gifts from them, given that such words cannot be made probable by any piece of divine scripture...’

(CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

In (16), Coornhert summarises the same Calvinist viewpoint which he had summarised in the title, (13), and introduction, (14), but contrary to the latter two, in (16) he intertwines his own view (*ick niet en meyne* ‘I do not think’) with that of the Calvinist ministers (*u luyder meyninghe* ‘your opinion’). In fact, freely translated, Coornhert argues that it cannot be the case

that these ministers are so ignorant to fathom that, if mankind had not fallen, we could have inherited virtues through Adam, since no citation from scripture can evidence such. In this way, Coornhert criticises the Calvinist foolishness by allegedly doubting his own interpretation of their argument. Coornhert supplements this overt form of critique and irony with linguistic argumentation through perfect doubling (*aengheerft ende ontfanghen souden hebben ghehadt*) which presents the fall as situated in the completed past, and, hence, without consequences for the present.

A similar analysis can be made of the subsequent instances of doubling in the chapter, shown in (17) and (18), in which Coornhert again addresses his opponents and summarises their dispute using double perfects.

(17) *Aengaende dit beelde Godes mette voorschreven deuchden (nu hier ons gheschille zijnde) seght ghyluyden dat Adam voor ons allen **ontfanghen heeft ghehadt**...*

‘With respect to this image of God and the discussed virtues (being our dispute), you argue that Adam **received** them for all of us.’

(CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

(18) *Want dit niet bewijsende ist u onmogelijck te bewijzen dat [...] Adam sulcke gaven oft deuchden voor ons allen **verloren soude hebben ghehadt**.*

‘Not proving this, it is impossible for you to prove that [...] Adam **would have lost** such gifts or virtues for us all.’

(CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.r)

Interestingly, like in the title and introduction section (i.e. (13) and (14)), in the conclusion, (19), Coornhert does not use perfect doubling. Instead, here he switches to the present perfect (*heeft ontvangen* ‘has received’).²⁸

(19) *Soo en **heeft** dan oock Adam sijne gaven voor ons niet **ontfanghen** om by hem ons aengeerft te worden indien hy staende bleef.*

‘Thus, Adam **did** not **receive** his gifts for us, to be inherited by us through him if he had not fallen.’

This difference between the chapter’s introductory and conclusion sections (without perfect doubling) on the one hand, and its main body on the other (with perfect doubling), suggests that perfect doubling might have an evaluative function in the polemical dialogue specifically. Whereas the introduction and conclusion with the present/past perfects are a more general rendering of the chapter’s subject with present/past perfects, in the polemical dialogue Coornhert’s aim may be to guide his reader through his own line of thought, and thus to convince his reader with the help of rhetorical-linguistic elements, including that of perfect doubling. The function of this perfect doubling, firstly, seems to be that of revealing the personal emphasis of the writer on the event’s significance within the larger argumentative discourse: Adam’s sin is crucial to the theological matter at stake, i.e. original sin. More importantly, considering the fact that Coornhert alternates between simple past/present perfects in the introduction/conclusion section and double perfects in its main body - also paralleling alternations found more broadly between double and non-double forms in modern German (Haß 2016; *see* Section 3) -, perfect doubling seems to be a vehicle of argumentative commentary, thus revealing Coornhert’s way of thinking and his stance towards the event.

²⁸ Interestingly, though, in the title and introduction Coornhert uses the past perfect, whereas in the conclusion he uses the present perfect. Further, in this section of Coornhert’s work and elsewhere, indicative double perfects (e.g. (15)) alternate with irrealis ones (e.g. (14)) (cf. e.g. Kern 1912:290). Further research is necessary to illuminate our understanding of both instances of variation.

Contrary to the evaluative function of perfect doubling's counterpart, i.e. the historical present signalling temporal closeness (*see* Section 3 and 4), perfect doubling as a marked tense then reveals the personal emphasis of the writer on temporal distance and thus creates dissociation from the present (we have borrowed the term 'dissociation' from Steele (1975)): Coornhert presents the fall as situated in the completed past, and hence, shows it to be without consequences and/or relevance for the present, contrary to what Calvinist theology claims.²⁹

5.2 Case study 2: Coornhert highlights key elements of his theology

The preceding section described the function of perfect doubling in the context of theological controversy, where we have attempted to show that it was used by Coornhert to summarise his opponent's viewpoints on Adam's sin and simultaneously express his own stance towards this. Additionally, as we now show, Coornhert uses perfect doubling when highlighting the basic principles on sin in his own theology.

An important aspect related to sin is Coornhert's belief in the process of spiritual rebirth, with corresponding degrees of faith, ultimately resulting in perfection. As explained above, according to Coornhert, man is able to reject sin and to grow in his faith, ultimately leading towards the maintenance of all God's commandments: the final stage of perfection. The following examples presented in (20), (21) and (22) illustrate that Coornhert, when addressing the readers of his own theology to teach them on moral development, uses perfect doubling to show that a level of spiritual rebirth is or should be fully completed. The construction, then, again may be seen as a means of dissociation, but, rather than providing a means to dissociate himself and thereby his readers from Adam's fall and its consequences, Coornhert might have

²⁹ A potential further example of similar variation between the doubling and non-doubling forms is in Book 2, Chapter 1 of *Van de vreemde sonde*, where instances of simple present/past perfects with the verbs *bederven/verderven* 'corrupt' are found alongside *have*-doubling constructions with those same verbs.

used it to create the possibility for his readers to dissociate themselves from their own sins of bygone times.

The first two examples, (20) and (21), contain an order concerning the pursuit for perfection, expressed by an imperative (*begheeft* ‘forsake’ and *dient* ‘serve’). There is, however, a linguistic difference between the two. In (20), Coornhert describes a level of faith that is not completed yet, using the present perfect (*hebt ghedient* ‘served’). In this example, inequity (*ongerechtigheid*) is still present, because the person serves its opposite, i.e. righteousness only *voor een deelken ende onvolcomelijck* ‘partially and incompletely’. To the contrary, in (21) Coornhert uses perfect doubling when expressing a completed process of striving for perfection. Here, Coornhert stresses the contrast between the “old man” (*Ghelijck als* ‘just as’), the sinner who had followed impurity and inequity, and the “new man” (*alsoo...nu...* ‘thus...now...’), who as a result of spiritual rebirth serves righteousness (*dienst der gherechtigheydt* ‘service of righteousness’). Hence, whereas in (20) man’s imperfections are still present, in (21) man has overcome these imperfections. Coornhert seems to use variation between the present perfect tense, (20), and perfect doubling, (21), to emphasise this difference: the double perfect in (21) may stress the temporal distance, and thereby express the dissociation, between the righteous reader and his sins that are situated in the completed past.

(20) *Ghelijck ghy voormaels in’t gheheel ende volcomelijck die ongherechtigheydt **hebt ghedient**: alsoo dient nu voor een deelken ende onvolcomelijck die gherechtigheydt...*

‘Just as you previously **served** inequity wholly and completely, thus now serve righteousness partially and incompletely.’

(CO.VDVS. cccccij.r)

(21) *Ghelijck als ghy uwe leden **hebt begheven ghehad** tot dienste der onreynigheyt ende ongherechtigheyt: alsoo begheeft nu mede uwe leden tot dienst der gherechtigheyt, tot heylighmakinghe.*

Approx.: ‘Just as your limbs used to follow the service of impurity and iniquity, now turn your limbs in the service of righteousness and sanctification.’

(CO.VDVS. cccccij.r)

Taken together, examples (20) and (21) thus provide evidence that Coornhert uses grammatical items, such as forms of address (*ghy* ‘you’) and instructions (imperatives), to directly address the reader and guide them in their moral development, which fits into the broader picture of Coornhert treatises as rhetorically refined instruments of persuasion (Hermans 2018:292). Likewise, alternation between the present perfect and perfect doubling may be applied by Coornhert, not only to reveal his personal stance towards the sin of bygone times, but also to convey the reader’s appropriate stance towards their sin; whereas the *ghy* of example (20) is still subject to sin, the *ghy* of example (21) is dissociated from sin.

However, giving orders to the readers of his own theology as in (20) and (21) is not the only rhetorical context in which perfect doubling is used by Coornhert. In his famous vernacular companion to ethics, the *Zedekunst* (ZDIW, 1586), for example, Coornhert also uses perfect doubling when communicating the core tenets of his theology, thereby addressing a more general audience (*men* ‘one’) instead of the “*ghy*” in examples (20) and (21). An example is presented in (22); again, contrasting the behaviour of the “old” and “new” man, Coornhert warns that it will not be easy to exchange the bad for the good, in this particular case in the context of judging persons and events:

(22) *...maar niet zo licht en vallet een valsch oordeel, datmen langhe **bezeten** ende met goeddunckenheyd **omhelst heeft ghehad**, te verlaten om een warachtigh oordeel te anvaten.*

‘...but it is not so easy to leave a false judgement, which one long **possessed** and **embraced** with self-assurance, in order to accept a true judgement.’

(CO.ZDIW.120)

Like in (20), in (22), the bad, characterizing the “old man”, is expressed through perfect doubling (*bezeten ende omhelst heeft ghehadt*). Again, in line with the emphasis functions attributed to double perfects by Rödel, Coornhert may use the construction here to locate this situation of false judgement (*een valsch oordeel*) in the completed past, in order to contrast it with the present true judgement (*warachtigh oordeel*). Indeed, a true judgement is only possible when the false judgement has been completely cast aside. In brief, the examples (20) and (22) suggest that Coornhert uses perfect doubling instead of the perfect tense to dissociate perfect readers from their past sins. To the contrary, based on (21), when parts of the “old man” are still present, Coornhert does not dissociate the reader through perfect doubling, but instead uses a present perfect. Generally speaking, furthermore, this investigation into Coornhert’s use of perfect doubling through case studies 1 and 2 suggests that concerning the subject of human sin, Coornhert’s use of perfect doubling dissociates his readers from Adam’s sin, and their own sin from bygone times, in order to justify his ethics of perfectibility, in which human beings are capable of becoming perfect.

6. Conclusion

Previous research has shown how the sixteenth-century Dutch writer D. V. Coornhert applied *classical rhetorical strategies* in his works in order to persuade his audiences. This article elaborated on a more recent strand of research which investigates the pragmatic function of *morphosyntactic structures* within individual authors (intra-author variation), by examining Coornhert’s exceptional use of a structure found in his times but unknown to modern Standard Dutch: *have-doubling*. Firstly, taking a macro-approach, this article showed that the use of this

structure depended on the literary-communicative context, and thus revealed both parallels but also important differences with Coornhert's wider use of rhetorical strategies: Coornhert mainly used *have*-doubling in his argumentative prose on philosophical and/or theological content. Secondly, focusing on previous accounts of perfect doubling's semantics and pragmatics, this article suggested that Early Modern Dutch double perfects parallel the aspectual/temporal meaning of absence of current relevance and the emphasis functions of those in modern German varieties (cf. also Dutch dialectal varieties). Relating these more formal observations to research in pragmatics/discourse studies on verb tense variation and literary studies on persuasive language use, we have, moreover, proposed that perfect doubling could be regarded as an evaluative device/stance marker. This hypothesis is supported by our two case studies on Coornhert's argumentative prose, in which he uses the construction specifically when responding to his opponent's viewpoint and discussing past sins in his own theology which defends perfectibility. In particular, our analysis suggests that double perfects create the evaluative effect of dissociation through which Coornhert could both express his distanced stance towards Adam's fall as well as empower his readers to leave behind their own sins of bygone times.

Bibliography

Van der Aa, Abraham Jacob. 1858. *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden. Deel 3.*

Haarlem: Van Brederode. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa_001biog04_01/

Ammann, Andreas. 2007. "The Fate of 'Redundant' Verbal Forms: Double Perfect

Constructions in the Languages of Europe". In Thomas Stolz (ed.), *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung. Language Typology and Universals*, 186–204. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Baratta, Alexander M. 2009. "Revealing Stance through Passive Voice". *Journal of*

- Pragmatics* 41 (7): 1406-1421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.09.010>
- Barbiers, Sjef, Johan van der Auwera, Hans Bennis, Eefje Boef, Gunther de Vogelaer, and Margreet van der Ham. 2008. *Syntactic atlas of the Dutch dialects. Volume 2*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Berkvens-Stevelinck, Christiane. 1989. "Coornhert, een eigenzinnig theoloog". In H. Bonger et al (eds), *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert. Dwars maar recht*, 18-31. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers.
- Biber, Douglas. 2004. "Historical Patterns for the Grammatical Marking of Stance. A Cross-Register Comparison". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 5 (1): 107-136.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.5.1.06bib>
- Bonger, Hendrik. 1941. *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert. Studie over een nuchter en vroom Nederlander*. Lochem: De Tijdstroom.
https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/bong004dirc01_01/colofon.php
- Bossard, Hans. 1962. *Zuger Mundartbuch: Grammatik und Wörterverzeichnisse*. Zürich: Schweizer Spiegel-Verlag.
- Brandner, Ellen, Martin Salzmann, and Gerhard Schaden. 2016. "Zur Syntax und Semantik des doppelten Perfekts aus alemannischer Sicht". In Alexandra N. Lenz and Franz Patocka (eds), *Syntaktische Variation. Alreallinguistische Perspektiven*, 13-46. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Vienna University Press.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 1992. "The Historical Present in Charlotte Brontë's Novels: Some Discourse Functions". *Style* 26 (2): 221-244. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42945970>
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2015. "Historical Discourse Analysis". In Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, Deborah Schiffrin (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 2, 222-243. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Broekhuis, Hans. 2019. "The Rise of the Periphrastic Perfect Tense in the Continental West

- Germanic Languages”. *LingBuzz*, February 2019. lingbuzz/003206.
- Brownlees, Nicholas. 2017. “ ‘He Tells Us That’ . Strategies of Reporting Adversarial News in the English Civil War”. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 18 (2): 235-251.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.00004.bro>
- Buys, Ruben. 2011. *Coornhert in het klein. Korte teksten over deugd, onwetendheid en Volmaakbaarheid*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. 1561. *Officia Ciceronis, leerende wat yeghelijck in allen staten behoort te doen, bescreuen int Latijn*. Translation by Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert. Haarlem: Jan van Zuren.
https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/cice001offi01_01/
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An Introduction to Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. *Schijndeugd der secten* [SDS]. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz Colom. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001schi02_01/index.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. *Vande predestinatie, verkiesinghe en de verwerpinghe Godes*. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom.
https://dbnl.org/tekst/coor001vanp02_01/index.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. “Van de toelatinge ende decreete Godts”. In D. V. Coornhert, *Wercken. Deel II*. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom.
https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001vand05_01/colofon.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. “Van de vreemde sonde, schulde, straffe nasporinghe”. [VDVS] In D. V. Coornhert, *Wercken. Deel II*. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom.
https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001vree01_01/
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1631. “Toetzsteen der ware leeraren.” [TDWL] In D. V. Coornhert, *Wercken. Deel I*. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom.

https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001toet02_01/

Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. ca. 1644. *Vijftigh lustighe historien oft nieuwigheden Joannis Boccatij* [VLHO]. Amsterdam: Broer Jansz.

https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001vijf01_01/index.php

Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1939 (1561). *De dolinge van Ulysse. Homerus' Odysseia I-XVIII in Nederlandse verzen*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001doli01_01/coor001doli01_01_0001.php

Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1942 (1586). *Zedekunst dat is wellevenskunste* [ZDIW] (ed.

Bruno B. Becker). Leiden: E.J. Brill. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001zede01_01/

Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1945 (1585). *Boëthius: Van de vertróosting der wysheyd*.

Amsterdam: A.A. Balkema.

https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001vanv01_01/index.php

Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1955 (ca. 1570-1575). “Der Maeghdekens Schole, comedia”.

[DMSC] In Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert, *Het roerspel en de comedies van Coornhert*

(ed. Paul van der Meulen), 318-401. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coor001pvan01_01/

Damsteegt, B.C. 1978. “t’Samenvoeghing in de Hertspiegel”. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse*

Taal- en Letterkunde 94: 1-24.

https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/tij003197801_01/tij003197801_01_0001.php

Duinhoven, Antonius Maria. 1997. *Middel-Nederlandse syntaxis: Synchron en diachron 2*.

De werkwoordgroep. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.

Englebretson, Robert. 2007. *Stancetaking in Discourse. Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fleischman, Suzanne. 1985. “Discourse Functions of Tense-Aspect Oppositions in

- Narrative: Toward a Theory of Grounding”. *Linguistics* 23: 851-882.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1985.23.6.851>
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1986. “Evaluation in Narrative: The Present Tense in Medieval ‘Performed Stories’”. *Yale French Studies*, 70: 199-251.
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2929856>
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity. From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Fleurkens, Anneke C.G. 1994. *Stichtelijke lust. De toneelspelen van D.V. Coornhert (1522-1590) als middelen tot het geven van morele instructie*. Hilversum: Verloren.
- Fritz, Gerd. 2003. “Dialogical Structures in 17th Century Controversies”. In Marina Bondi (eds) et al, *Dialogue Analysis 2000*, 199-208. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag GmbH.
- Fritz, Gerd, Thomas Gloning, and Juliane Glüer. 2018. *Historical Pragmatics of Controversies. Case Studies from 1600 to 1800*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gelderblom, Arie-Jan. 1989. “‘Nieuwe stof in Neerlandsch’. Een karakteristiek van Coornherts proza”. In H. Bongers et al (eds), *Dirck Volckerktszoon Coornhert. Dwars maar recht*, 98-114. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers.
https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/geld008nieu01_01/geld008nieu01_01_0001.php
- Haar, Alisa van de. 2019. *The Golden Mean of Languages. Forging Dutch and French in the Early Modern Low Countries (1540-1620)*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Haß, Norman. 2016. *Doppelte Zeitformen im Deutschen und im Französischen*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Hernández-Campoy, Juan Manuel. 2016. *Sociolinguistic Styles*. Hoboken, N. J.: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Hermans, Theo. 2018. "The World of Literature". In Helmer J. Helmers and Geert H. Janssen (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to the Dutch Golden Age*, 289-307. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunston, Susan, and Geoff Thompson (eds). 2003. *Evaluation in Text. Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (ed.). 2009. *Stance. Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jansen, Jeroen (ed.). 2011. *G.A. Bredero. Proza*. Hilversum: Verloren.
- Jansen, Jeroen. 2017. "'Sincere Simplicity'. Gerbrand Bredero's Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel". *Dutch Crossing* 41 (1): 4-20. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1080/03096564.2016.1143286>
- Kern, Johan Hendrik. 1912. *De met het participium praeteriti omschrevenwerkwoordsvormen in 't Nederlands*. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller.
- Koeneman, Olaf, Marika Lekakou, and Sjeff Barbiers. 2011. "Perfect doubling." *Linguistic Variation* 11 (1): 35-75. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lv.11.1.02koe>
- Koppen, Marjo van, and Feike M. Dietz. 2016. "Language Dynamics in the Dutch Golden Age". Research project description. Accessed June 27, 2020. https://languagedynamics.wp.hum.uu.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/251/2016/05/project-proposal_website.pdf
- Larsson, Ida and Ellen Brandner. 2014. *Perfect doubling and the grammaticalization of auxiliaries*. Paper presented at DiGS16, 3–5 July 2014, Budapest.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Litvinov, Viktor P., and Vladimir L. Radčenko. 1998. *Doppelte Perfektbildungen in der deutschen Literatursprache*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verlag.

- Martin, James R., and Peter R. R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Author A. 2018. Title and details removed.
- Author A. *In press*. Title and details removed.
- Rödel, Michael. 2007. *Doppelte Perfektbildungen und die Organisation von Tempus im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verlag.
- Rödel, Michael. 2011. "New Perspectives on Double Perfect Constructions in German." In Monika Rathert and Renate Musan (eds), *Tense Across Languages*, 127-146. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rutten, Gijsbert. 2016a. "Standardization and the Myth of Neutrality in Language History". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 242: 25-57. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1515/ijsl-2016-0032>
- Rutten, Gijsbert. 2016b. "Diaglossia, Individual Variation and the Limits of Standardization: Evidence from Dutch". In Cinzia Russi (ed.), *Current Trends in Historical Sociolinguistics*, 194-218. Warsaw/Berlin: De Gruyter Open Ltd.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1981. "Tense Variation in Narrative". *Language* 57 (1): 45-62.
doi:10.2307/414286
- Sijs, Noline van der, and Roland Willemyns. 2009. *Het verhaal van het Nederlands: Een geschiedenis van twaalf eeuwen*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Squartini, Mario. 1999. "On the Semantics of the Pluperfect: Evidence from Germanic and Romance". In: *Linguistic Typology* 3 (1): 51-89. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.uu.nl/10.1515/lity.1999.3.1.51>
- Steele, Susan. 1975. "Past and Irrealis: Just What Does it All Mean?". *International Journal of American Linguistics* 41 (3): 200-217. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1264541>
- Thompson, Geoff, and Laura Alba-Juez (eds). 2014. *Evaluation in Context*.

Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Veen, Mirjam G.K. van, and Jesse Spohnholz. 2014. "Calvinists vs. Libertines: A New Look at Religious Exile and the Origins of 'Dutch' Tolerance". In Gijsbert van den Brink and Harro M. Höpfl (eds), *Calvinism and the Making of the European Mind*, 76-99. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Veenman, René. 2019. *De klassieke traditie in de Lage Landen*. Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Vantilt.

Wal, Marijke J. van der. 1988. "De drieledige vormen in taal en taalbeschouwing". *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 81: 383-400.

Author B. 2018a. Title and details removed.

Author B. 2018b. Title and details removed.

Author B. *In preparation*. Title and details removed.

Zwaan, Frederik Lodewijk. 1939. *Uit de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche spraakkunst*.

Groningen: Batavia. https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/zwaa004uitd01_01/

Zybatow, Tatjana, and Thomas Weskott. 2018. "Das Doppelperfekt: Theorie und Empirie". *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 37 (1): 83–124.