



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

Habitual doen in Heerlen Dutch

Cornips, L.

published in

DO in English, Dutch and German. History and present-day variation
1998

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

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

citation for published version (APA)

Cornips, L. (1998). Habitual doen in Heerlen Dutch. In I. Tieken-Boon van Ostade, M. van der Wal, & A. van Leeuwensteijn (Eds.), *DO in English, Dutch and German. History and present-day variation* (pp. 83-101). Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Nodus Publikationen.

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@knaw.nl

DO in English, Dutch and German

History and present-day variation

edited by

Ingrid Tieken-Boon van Ostade,
Marijke van der Wal
and
Arjan van Leuvensteijn

**Meertens Instituut
KNAW**

Joan Muyskenweg 25
1096 CJ AMSTERDAM
Tel. +31 (0)20-4628 500

Stichting Neerlandistiek VU Amsterdam
Nodus Publikationen Münster
1998

Die Deutsche Bibliothek — CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

DO in English, Dutch and German: history and present-day variation / Ingrid Tiekens-Boon van Ostade ... (eds.). — Münster: Nodus-Publ., 1998

(Uitgaven Stichting Neerlandistiek VU; 24)

ISBN 90-72365-56-9

ISBN 3-89323-428-4

Table of contents:

Abbreviations

Ingrid Tiekens-Boon van Ostade, Marijke van der Wal and Arjan van Leuwensteijn

DO in English, Dutch and German: An introduction 1

Patricia Poussa

DO and dialect death 7

Juhani Klemola

Semantics of DO in southwestern dialects of English English 25

J.M. van der Horst

Doen in Old and Early Middle Dutch: A comparative approach 53

H. Ryckeboer

Substituting *doen* in tag questions and short replies in southern Dutch dialects 65

Leonie Cornips

Habitual *doen* in Heerlen Dutch 83

Arie Verhagen

Changes in the use of Dutch *doen* and the nature of semantic knowledge 103

Annette Fischer

TUN periphrasis in Early New High German 121

Hans-Werner Eroms

Periphrastic *tun* in present-day Bavarian and other German dialects 139

References 159

Authors' addresses 169

© 1998 The authors

All rights reserved. Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN 90-72365-56-9

ISBN 3-89323-428-4

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 Riparian 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 $NP_1 - \textit{doen} - (NP_2) - V$ 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).

- (1) ?SD/HD a. Zij *doet* werken /*gewerkt
 she does work_{inf} /worked_{partc}
 "She is working"
- ?SD/HD b. Zij *doet* haar huiswerk maken
 she does her homework make_{inf}
 "She is doing her homework".

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 Ostade 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, Nuijstens (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".

doen+infinitive (cf. (1))

standard Dutch

- child grammar
- non-standard colloquial speech
- imperfect command by adult speakers

regional Dutch varieties,
 e.g. Heerlen Dutch

- adult dialect speakers speaking SD as a second language
- avoidance strategy morphological compound verbs

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

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.

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.² 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:

- IMMIGRANT: speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as their first language and whose parents were born outside the province of Limburg;
- DIALECT: speakers who speak the local dialect as their first language and (Heerlen) Dutch as a second language;
- HEERLEN DUTCH: speakers who speak (Heerlen) Dutch as their first language and whose parents speak the local dialect as a first language.

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

²In 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.

language	low level of education		high level of education		total
	young	old	young	old	
IMMIGRANT	3	6	5	5	19
DIALECT	5	6	8	10	29
HEERLEN DUTCH	8	—	8	3	19
total	16	12	21	18	67

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_{inf}
 "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 *deden* niks anders als koeltorens tekenen (24: Ris)
 they did_{pl-past} nothing else than cooling towers draw_{inf}
 "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-cards_{inf} have we always a lot done_{partc}
 "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, Drenthe, 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*

³In the transcripts presented throughout the paper, the figure appearing before the speaker's pseudonym refers to the number of the tape-recording.

⁴For lack of space, I will consider the *doen*+infinitive construction in some dialects only by way of example here.

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 òl mouder 'n bult ploagen *doen*
 she has her old mother many tease_{inf} done_{partc}
 "She often teased her old mother"
 b. Hai het in zien levent wat zoepen *doen*
 he has in his life some drunk_{inf} done_{partc}
 "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, Nuijstens 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* kloompen verkoopen
 they did wooden shoes sell_{inf}
 "they sold wooden shoes"
 b. daor *deuden* ze bomziede maken
 there did they vinegar make_{inf}
 "they produced vinegar there"
 c. ze *deuden* em aait plaogen
 they did him always tease_{inf}
 "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 χ^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:

language	low level of education		high level of education		total
	young	old	young	old	
IMMIGRANT	2/3	2/6	0/5	0/5	4/19 .21
DIALECT	2/5	1/6	2/8	3/10	8/29 .27
HEERLEN DUTCH	5/8	—	1/8	0/3	6/19 .31
<i>total</i>	9/16	3/12	3/21	3/18	18/67

χ^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_{inf}
 "he is also working in the gardens now"
 b. ... die *doen* veel hobbyen hier boven ... (14: Gijs)
 ... they do a lot pursue-hobbies_{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)
 ... do_{imp} ADV those people back-fetch_{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_{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_{inf}
 "Jan is dying"
 HD b. *Marie *doet* arriveren
 Marie does arrive_{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_{inf}
 "Jan knows the answer"
 HD b. ?*Marie *doet* het gebouw herkennen
 Marie does the building recognise_{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. ... die *doen* ... *banden 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* een keer in de week nog *zaalvoetballen* (30: Rob)
 ... do one time in the week also hall-football_{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 *terug* "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) $V_{trans} + NP_{DO}$
 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"

- (14) *V* + *particle*
 terughalen (cf. (9a)) “fetch back”
 apart zetten “set aside”
- (15) *V*_{intr.} + “location”
 voetballen “play football”
 zaalvoetballen (cf. 12b)) “play indoor football”.

Table 3 gives an overview of the data discussed so far. Strikingly, five out of seven transitive compound infinitives involve direct objects:

Heerlen Dutch	subject has thematic role of <i>agens</i>			
	transitive infinitive		intransitive, active infinitive	
<i>doen</i> + infinitive	+ <i>compound</i> N = 7:	- <i>compound</i> N = 6	+ <i>compound</i> N = 2:	- <i>compound</i> N = 18
	5 → V + NP _{D.O.} 2 → V + <i>part.</i>		2 → V + <i>location</i>	
N=33	N = 13		N=20	

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 *agens*.

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.⁵ 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”.

⁵Note, 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 a/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 *alweer* spaghetti eet
 that Jan again spaghetti eats
 SD/HD b. *dat Jan spaghetti *alweer* eet
 "that Jan is eating spaghetti again"
 (23) SD/HD a. dat Jan *vandaag* een appel eet
 that Jan today an apple eats
 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_{inf}
 "He is smoking a pipe"
 b. Hij is aan het autorijden (cf. (19b))
 he is at the car-drive_{inf}
 "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):

dialect of Groningen:

- (25) *SD/*HD a. dat e zat te *eerabbels schillen*
 that he sat to potatoes peel
 "that he was peeling potatoes"
 *SD/*HD b. dat e *keziene vaarfd* het
 that he window-frames painted has
 "that he painted window-frames"
- (26) *SD/*HD Hai ston te (*op) *slootje kaauwen*
 he stood to (on) tobacco chew
 "He was chewing tobacco".

Given the discussion above, we would expect that the constructions in (25) and (26) express a habitual reading since the objects and the noun in the prepositional phrases in (25) and (26), respectively, are not real objects but predicate modifiers. And, indeed, in Schuurman (cf. 1987:192) it is argued that these constructions express both a generic/habitual reading. Further evidence is provided by the fact that incorporation in the Groningen dialect is only grammatical if the verbs belong to the aspectual class of activities (Schuurman 1987:189). In such cases, habitual aspect may be expressed by the verb. Consider the contrast in (27):

- (27) Groningen a. *te hoezen bezitten "to own houses"
 b. *te senten hebben "to have money"
 c. te hoezen verkopen "to sell houses"
 d. te peerden fokken "to breed horses".

To summarise, so far I have discussed that, although habitual aspect in standard Dutch is not a verbal phenomenon, it may be achieved by means of specific adverbial phrase of time that indicate a plurality of events. What is more, I have demonstrated that the aspectual properties of the predicate are determined by the nature of the object. If the object is non-affected and non-individuated (Hopper and Thompson 1980), that is to say, if the object is a bare (plural) NP or a mass noun, a reading emerges in which the object acts as a predicate modifier. In such cases, habitual aspect may be expressed. Finally, a process of incorporation or the formation of complex verbs becomes possible. Furthermore, I have discussed that the non-verbal ways by which habitual aspect can be expressed in standard Dutch are also acceptable in Heerlen Dutch.

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

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. Ik_{NP1} doe werken_V
 I do work
 "I work"
 b. [_{IP} [_{I'} [_{ASPP} [_{ASP'} doen [_{VP} NP1 [_{V'} V]]]]].

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 werken *gedaan* (cf. (6))
 he has work_{inf} done_{partic}
 "He worked"
 HD b. *Hij gaat *doen* werken/werken *doen*
 he goes do_{inf} work_{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:

- (30) HD a. ... een jongen (...) *doet* ook vissen ... (19: Cor)
 ... a boy does also fish_{inf}...
 "... a boy (...) is also fishing ..."
- HD b. ... hij vist ook wel eens ... (19: Cor)
 ... he fishes too well once ...
 "he occasionally goes fishing, too"
- (31) HD a. ... die *doet* me die auto altijd nakijken ... (35: Mr Arends)
 ... he does me this car always check_{inf}
 "he always checks the car for me"
- HD b. ... ik heb vandaag nog eens alles nagekeken ... (35: Mr Arends)
 ... I have today once-more everything checked
 "I checked everything once more today".

5.2. Adverbial 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 incidental 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 *'s 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 *doe* 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/eerste 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. Nuijten 1962:154):

dialect of Twente:

- (35) a. Hij *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* (...) *banden 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. *dee deuden kloompen verkoopen* (cf. (7a))
 they did wooden shoes sell_{inf}
- b. *daor deuden ze bomziede maken* (cf. (7b))
 there did they vinegar make_{inf}
- (38) a. "Daar plachten ze klompen te verkopen" (cf. Bezoen 1948 (37a))
 "They used to sell wooden shoes, there"
- b. "Ze fabriceerden 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 *binnen/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 een jaar (12: 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 een jaar (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 een jaar (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 föhnen* *een uur lang*/*in een uur (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 een uur
 (25: Mr Menen)
 ... those do I aside put_{inf} for an hour/within an hour
 "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.