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Constructionalization and post-constructionalization:
The constructional semantics of the Dutch *krijgen*-passive from a diachronic perspective

Timothy Colleman
Ghent University, Belgium

Abstract

The grammatical literature on Dutch generally distinguishes two “passive” alternatives to the active double object construction, one of which, the so-called *krijgen*-passive is a fairly recent addition to the grammar, the earliest reported examples dating from around 1900. The present paper addresses the early and subsequent history of this construction from a diachronic constructionist perspective. The first part of the paper uses data from the 1900-1935 volumes of the Dutch periodical *De Gids* to reconstruct the lexical and semantic range of the *krijgen*-passive in its very first decades of life, in order to investigate which (semantic and/or morphological) subclasses of ditransitive verbs played a pathbreaking role in the development of this new construction from other *krijgen* + participle constructions, i.e. in the constructionalization of the *krijgen*-passive. The second part of the paper looks into post-constructionalization semantic change, i.e. into the subsequent expansion of the newly emerged construction towards more sub-classes of ditransitive verbs, on the basis of data from the diachronic CONDIV-corpus (1950s to 1990s). Contra recent non-constructionist proposals, it will be argued that the *krijgen*-passive is an argument structure
construction in its own right, with a semantic dynamics of its own, and that the apparently random constraints on its present-day distribution are less puzzling when viewed against the background of the construction’s genesis and subsequent semantic expansion.

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with (i) the constructionalization of and (ii) post-constructionalization semantic change in the Dutch construction [Subj [[krijgen 'get' V.PSTP] Obj (van/door NP)]] exemplified in (1). In addition, it looks into the position of this construction in the Dutch network of three-argument constructions vis-à-vis the active double object construction illustrated in (2).

(1) *Ik kreeg de boeken overhandigd (van/door de hoogleraar).*
    I got the books handed from/by the professor
    “I was handed the books (by the professor).”

(2) *De hoogleraar overhandigde mij de boeken.*
    the professor handed me the books
    ‘The professor handed me the books.’

The construction in (1) is a fairly recent innovation in Dutch grammar, the earliest attested examples dating from the late 19th or early 20th century (cf. section 2). In the grammatical literature on Dutch, it is known as the *semi-passive*, or alternatively as the *pseudo-*/indirect passive, *krijgen-passive* or receptive
construction. This construction is generally discussed in relation to the passive construction with the default passive auxiliary *worden* (3), as an alternative means for the perspectivization of ditransitive scenes—see, e.g., the brief discussion in the standard reference grammar by Haeseryn et al. (1997, section 22.4.2).

(3) *De boeken werden mij overhandigd (door de hoogleraar).*
the books were me handed by the professor
“The books were handed to me (by the professor).”

Indeed, in contrast to the active double object construction exemplified in (2), which includes an agent subject and theme and recipient objects, both the construction with *krijgen* in (1) and the *worden*-passive in (3) accord subject status to a non-agentive argument while encoding the agent of the ditransitive scene as an optional prepositional phrase headed either by *door* ‘by,’ or, in case of the *krijgen*-passive, *van* ‘from’. The crucial difference between (1) and (3) is that, in the construction with *krijgen*, it is the recipient argument that is linked to the grammatical subject function, whereas it is the theme argument that fulfils this function in the “regular” passive construction with *worden*—as is evident from the different forms of the 1st person singular pronoun (the subject form *ik* vs. the object form *mij*) and by the singular vs. plural agreement on the verb.³

Opinions differ on the grammatical status of the construction with *krijgen*, the question being whether or not it presents a genuine passive construction on a par with the *worden*-construction. Key issues in this debate are the nature and extent of the lexical and semantic constraints on the *krijgen*-construction; it is
well-known that several ditransitive verbs cannot be combined with *krijgen*,
including the prototypical ‘transfer of possession’ verb *geven* ‘give’ — see (4),
which is straightforwardly ungrammatical. Note that this is not because *geven* is
incompatible with a passive meaning as such; the *worden*-passive in (5) is fine.

(4)  *Ik kreeg de boeken gegeven (van/door de hoogleraar).*
     I got the books given (from/by the professor)

(5)  *De boeken werden mij gegeven (door de hoogleraar).*
     the books were me given (by the professor).
     “I was given the books (by the professor).”

In the past, several authors have emphasized the randomness of these lexical
constraints—often concluding that the *krijgen*-construction is too idiosyncratic
and unproductive to count as a “real” passive (De Schutter, 1989; Schermer-
Vermeer, 1991). Conversely, the recent generative account by Broekhuis &
Cornips (2012) claims that many of these earlier observations were at least
overstated and that the large majority of ditransitive verbs do in fact allow for
inclusion in the *krijgen*-construction, concluding that *krijgen*-passivization is a
productive syntactic rule on a par with *worden*-passivization (see Broekhuis &
Cornips, 1994, for an earlier version of the argument).

This paper addresses the matter of the (un)productivity of the *krijgen-
passive from a diachronic construction grammar perspective. In construction
grammar, it is explicitly acknowledged that multiword patterns may be stored as
(partially) schematic constructions and entrenched in the grammar while at the
same time displaying a certain degree of lexical, syntactic, and/or semantic
idiosyncrasy—see Goldberg’s (1995, pp. 120-140) account of partial productivity in argument structure constructions, for instance. One way of accounting for such idiosyncrasies is through the postulation of constraints at various levels in the lexicality-schematicity hierarchy — for instance, there may be formal or semantic constraints which operate only on particular verb-specific or verb-class-specific sub-constructions of a schematic argument structure construction, rather than on the construction as a whole (cf. Croft, 2003; Barddal, 2008; Barddal, Kristoffersen & Sveen, 2011). The present paper investigates the nature and extent of the lexical and semantic constraints on the krijgen-passive through an analysis of its presence in a number of corpora representing various sub-stages of 20th- and early 21st-century Dutch. First, I will examine the type and token frequencies in three early 20th-century five-year snapshots from the De Gids corpus (1900-04, 1910-14, 1920-24), i.e. at a time when the construction had in all probability only just recently been introduced. I then will document the use of the construction in newspaper language from the 1950s and 1970s and in the present-day language, based on data from the CONDIV and Twente News corpora, complemented with the results from Google queries.

While the early 20th-century corpus data will shed additional light on the genesis of the krijgen-passive, the focus of the present paper rests as much on the subsequent developments of the krijgen-passive after its emergence as a construction. Colleman & De Clerck (2012) argue for a diachronic semasiological approach to constructional semantics, in which diachronic shifts and instabilities in the semantic range of argument structure constructions or other schematic
patterns are analyzed in order to investigate patterns of semantic constructional change (see also Colleman, 2011; Colleman & Noël, 2012). In line with this semasiological approach, I will investigate whether — and, if so, to what extent — the *krijgen*-passive has become less constrained/more productive in the course of the 20th century. To put it in terms of Traugott & Trousdale (2013), we will not only be concerned with the *krijgen*-passive’s constructionalization, but also with post-constructionalization constructional change (also see Traugott, this volume, and, for slightly different models of constructionalization, Fried, this volume and especially Smirnova, this volume).

The paper is structured as follows. First, Section 2 presents an outline of what is known about the history of the *krijgen*-passive from previous studies, most notably from the existing construction-based account by Landsbergen (2009). Then follows the data section: Sub-section 3.1 presents and discusses the early 20th-century data from *De Gids*, and Sub-section 3.2 looks into developments in the language from the latter half of the century. Each of these sub-sections ends with an interim conclusion which summarizes the most important points to be gleaned from the investigation of the constructional semantics of the *krijgen*-passive during the period in question. Section 4 is a general discussion section which addresses the relation between the *krijgen*-passive and the active double object construction and revisits the apparent randomness of the semantic constraints operating on the *krijgen*-passive from a construction-based perspective, arguing for a combination of semantic persistence effects and
morphological constraints operating at lower levels in the lexicality-schematicity hierarchy rather than a single general semantic constraint.

Section 5 summarizes the major conclusions of the paper.

Two more comments are in order before we move on. First, note that I will be using the label *krijgen-passive* throughout the paper to refer to the construction exemplified in (1). This is simply a convenient label to set the construction apart from other constructions with *krijgen*, most notably the *krijgen-resultative*, to be introduced in the next section. The construction in (1) has a “passive” meaning in that it allows for the presentation of a ditransitive scene from the perspective of a non-agentive participant. However, there is no claim whatsoever that the *krijgen*-passive is related to the active double object construction via some kind of general passivization rule; on the contrary, the data will furnish abundant proof that the *krijgen*-passive is an argument structure in its own right. Second, it should be pointed out that present-day German has a construction which closely resembles the Dutch *krijgen*-passive, both structurally and functionally, viz. the so-called *bekommen-passive* (also known as the *recipient passive* or the *dative passive*) illustrated in (6) (also see Siewierska, 1984, pp. 132-33; Leirbukt, 1997; Smirnova, this volume, among many others).

(6)  *Die Frau bekam/kriegte (von ihrem Mann) einen schönen Ring geschenkt.*
the woman got/got (from her husband) a nice ring presented
“The woman was given a nice ring (by her husband).”
In the sections to follow, it will prove helpful to occasionally refer to existing hypotheses about the grammaticalization of this German construction and/or to briefly point out differences in semantic range between the Dutch and German constructions. The present paper does not aim at a comprehensive contrastive analysis, however.

2. Existing accounts of the history of the *krijgen*-passive

The first linguistic discussion of the *krijgen*-passive is a brief article by Royen (1952), in which the author comments on a convenient new passive-like use of *krijgen* that he observed in the language of his contemporaries, especially in combination with the participle of the verb *toewijzen* ‘assign, allot,’ but also with other verbs. Royen quotes several attested instances from newspapers and fictional prose, most of which date from the 1940s and early 1950s, with a small number of instances from the preceding decades. The oldest example he was able to find is from a 1907 novella by the Flemish author Louisa Duykers (1869-1952), see (7).

(7)  *Ze moest nog lessen betaald krijgen, Godfried ook.*

  she must still lessons paid get Godfried too

  “She still had to be paid (for) some lessons, and so did Godfried.”

The corpus investigations by Landsbergen (2009) and Van Leeuwen (2006) corroborate that the *krijgen*-passive is a recent, possibly even 20th-century
innovation. Landsbergen (2006, 2009) provides diachronic studies of the syntax and semantics of *krijgen* based on a sample of 1276 instances of *krijgen* distributed more or less evenly over the period 1300-1979, culled from the Middle Dutch corpus on CD-ROM and the citation database of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* [Dictionary of the Dutch language], which covers the period 1500 to 1979. The earliest example of the *krijgen*-passive in this small sample dates from 1920 (cf. Landsbergen, 2009, p. 104). Van Leeuwen (2006) investigated the use of *krijgen* in a diachronic corpus of 20th-century literary prose consisting of about 250,000 words of running text per decade. In all, this corpus was found to contain some 30 instances of the *krijgen*-passive only, and very few instances were retrieved from the earliest decades: a single example from 1900-09, none at all from 1910-1919 and 1920-29, and two examples from 1930-39 (see Van Leeuwen, 2006, pp. 61-63, for details).

If it is correct that the Dutch *krijgen*-passive dates back to around the previous turn of the century, this would mean that it is quite a bit younger than the German *bekommen*-passive, instances of which have been quoted from 16th- and 17th-century texts (see e.g. Glaser, 2005). The accepted view on the grammaticalization of the *bekommen*-passive is that it has developed from a co-predicative construction in which the lexical *kriegen* or *bekomen* ‘get, receive’ verb is combined with a direct object and a predicative participle that modifies the action or process expressed in the sentence or denotes the condition of the direct object referent, as in *Sie bekommt den Katalog geschickt* ‘She receives the catalogue through sending, i.e. by post,’ or *Sie bekommt/kriegt die Bretter schon*
passend zugeschnitten ‘She receives the boards already cut up suitably’ (see Diewald, 1997, pp. 30-40; Leirbukt, 1997, pp. 204-214; Diedrichsen, 2012; Lenz, 2012; Smirnova, this volume; inter alia, for discussion). In such expressions, the participle could easily be reanalyzed as a main verb combined with an auxiliary kriegen/bekommen, especially since co-predicative elements tend to occur in the same position as non-finite verbs in the German declarative main clause, viz. in the right bracket of the clause (see, e.g., Diedrichsen, 2012, pp. 1171-1176, for details).

For the Dutch krijgen-passive, it is natural to assume a similar grammaticalization path. As illustrated in (8), Dutch also allows for the combination of lexical krijgen with a co-predicative participle — obviously, both of the examples below denote events of receiving, rather than events of damaging or packing, respectively.

(8) a. *Ik kreeg het boek beschadigd.*
    I got the book damaged
    “I received the book in a damaged condition.”

b. *Hij kreeg de computer in een stevige doos verpakt.*
    he got the computer in a firm box packed
    “He received the computer packed in a firm box.”

According to Schermer-Vermeer (1991) and Askedal (2009, pp. 15-16), among others, the krijgen-passive has developed from such co-predicative uses through reanalysis of the co-predicative participle as the main verb of the construction. Landsbergen (2006, pp. 158-159, 2009, pp. 100-105), however, suggests a different development, which crucially refers to another auxiliarized use of Dutch
krijgen. From the 14th century onwards, transitive krijgen, which at that time had a stronger agentive meaning than today (‘obtain by effort, grasp’), could be combined with a locative PP, meaning ‘to make someone or something move to a particular location’ (e.g. een spijker uit de muur krijgen ‘to get a nail out of the wall’). The next step is the addition of an adjective denoting a state (e.g. iets open krijgen ‘to get something open’); such examples occur from the 16th century onwards. If the adjective takes the form of an adjectival participle, this combination of krijgen as a main verb with a participle denoting a state can easily be reanalyzed as the combination of an auxiliary and a participial main verb: from ‘to get a person/object in a V-ed state’ to ‘to manage to V a person/object’. Thus, krijgen developed a resultative use, as in (9) and (10).

(9) Sij […] konden haar drank niet als met een gemeen Herbergs vuur ontdoid krijgen. (example from 1684 quoted in Landsbergen, 2009, p. 101)⁵
they could their drink not as with a common inn fire defrosted get
“They could only get their drink defrosted on a common fire at the inn.”

(10) {Mijnheer Pardoes zat als verwezen en durfde waarlijk niet zeggen}dat zijn éénige bijdrage ‘t half geld was waarvoor hij de advertentie had geplaatst gekregen. (example from 1859 quoted in Landsbergen, 2009, p. 104) that his only contribution the half money was wherefore he the advertisement had placed got
“(Mr. Pardoes was dismayed and truly did not dare to say} that his only contribution was that he got the advertisement placed for half the price.”
The difference between (9) and (10) is that, in the former case, it is the subject who acts to produce the result who is also the agent of the participle (i.e., the one who does the defrosting), while it is *someone else* who carries out the action denoted by the participle in the latter case. In (10), the subject of *krijgen* is of course still actively involved in the denoted event, being the one who persuades someone else into publishing an advertisement in their newspaper. However, from the constructions exemplified in such examples, Landsbergen argues that it is a relatively small step to the *krijgen*-passive, in which the subject has lost all agentivity and simply encodes a recipient, i.e., from the interpretation ‘He succeeded in having the advertisement placed (by someone)’ to ‘Someone placed the advertisement (for him).’ This development was facilitated by a change of meaning in the lexical verb *krijgen*, which, by the beginning of the 20th century, had virtually completely lost the agentive meaning ‘obtain by effort’ in its simple transitive uses and only retained its non-agentive meaning ‘receive.’ In this way, Landsbergen stresses, the development of the *krijgen*-passive “cannot be attributed to one ‘parent’ construction, but rather to two [i.e., the simple transitive construction and the resultative construction]” (Landsbergen, 2009, p. 105). Van Leeuwen (2006, pp. 60-61) notes that while Landsbergen’s general hypothesis about the relation between *krijgen*-passive and *krijgen*-resultative uses is plausible enough, he does not address the crucial question of the specific contexts in which the possibility of an alternative, passive-like interpretation first emerged (i.e., the critical contexts in terms of Diewald, 2006 and Smirnova, this volume). That is, while the *krijgen*-resultative occurs with a wide array of
participles, it is at least probable that the *krijgen*-passive originated in a specific subset of resultative *krijgen* + participle constructions. Van Leeuwen suggests that the combination of resultative *krijgen* with ditransitive ‘transfer’ verbs provided the critical context, as such verbs come with an array of semantic roles (agent – theme – recipient) that is virtually identical to that of lexical *krijgen* (recipient – theme – source), so that the subject of the *krijgen* + participle combination could easily be aligned with the recipient role of the participle verb. The next section will examine whether the range of instances of the *krijgen*-passive attested in early 20th-century data corroborates this hypothesized path-breaking role of ‘possessional transfer’ verbs.

3. Data analysis: the presence of the *krijgen*-passive in 20th-century corpora

3.1 De Gids

3.1.1 Overview

From the handful of early 20th-century examples quoted in the literature, it is impossible to reconstruct the semantic range of the *krijgen*-passive in the first decades of the century. To get a more elaborate picture of this, I selected three five-year samples from the corpus *De Gids* (“The Guide”), which consists of the full text of the first 100 volumes (1837-1936) of the Dutch literary and cultural periodical of the same name, viz. the volumes 1900-1904, 1910-1914 and 1920-
24. These samples range in size from 3.4 to 3.9 million words of running text.

Since the *De Gids* corpus is not lemmatized and not POS-tagged, the three samples were queried for all forms of the verb *krijgen* and the thousands of resulting instances were manually skimmed in order to identify all instances of the *

\textit{krijgen}\textsuperscript{-}passive and the resultative *krijgen* + participle construction.

(11) and (12) list a number of resultative and passive instances observed in the data.

\begin{quote}
(11) a. \textit{Verhinderen kan hij niet, dat Wisby Lydia nareist en met haar trouwt} maar hij zorgt er voor, het paar weer gescheiden te krijgen. (\textit{De Gids}, 1901)

but he provides there for, the couple again separated to get

“\{He cannot prevent Wisby from following after Lydia and marrying her\}, but he sees to it to get the couple separated again.”

b. \textit{De moeite waar-mee wij onzen wil gedaan hebben gekregen,\textsuperscript{ }}{\textit{terwijl de regeering 't wou ontlopen, had veel van een vossenjacht.}} (\textit{De Gids}, 1904)

the effort where-with we our will done have got

“The effort it took to get our will done, {while the government wanted to avoid it, was much like a fox hunt}.”

c. \textit{Ik acht dan ook niet onmogelijk dat vanwege de Sarekat Islam een actie zal uitgaan om artikel 111 gewijzigd te krijgen in den zin van art. 9 der Grondwet.} (\textit{De Gids}, 1914)

I deem then also not impossible that from the Sarekat Islam an action will out-go to article 111 changed to get in the sense of art. 9 of the Constitution

“I do not consider it impossible that there will be an action going out from the Sarekat Islam to get article 111 revised along the lines of article 9 of the constitution.”
\end{quote}

(12) a. \textit{\ldots maar de Turksche soldaat wordt beter gevoed dan}
bij voorbeeld de Pruisische. Het eten, dat hij krijgt, is
eenvoudig voortreffelijk.) Hij dient vijf jaar, maar krijgt
slechts een kwart van zijn soldij uit-betaald. (De Gids,
1903)
he serves five year but gets only a quarter of his pay out-
paid
“[…] but the Turkish soldier is fed better than, for instance,
the Prussian one. The food he gets is simply excellent.) He
serves for five years but is only paid a quarter of his
soldier’s wages.”

b. {Laten wij er dus niet meer van zeggen} dan dat mevrouw
Julia Cuypers eene rol had toebedeeld gekregen,{zóó
ongeschikt voor haar talent en haar persoon als denkbaar
is}. (De Gids,1913)
than that Mrs. Julia Cuypers a role had assigned got
“[So let us not say more of it] than that Mrs. Julia Cuypers
had been assigned a role {as unfit for her talent and
character as conceivably possible}.”

As there are no straightforward formal criteria to distinguish between the krijgen-
passive and the krijgen-resultative, identifying a difference is a matter of semantic
interpretation. In the large majority of cases, it is clear from other elements in the
linguistic context whether the subject is involved as someone actively trying to get
something done (possibly by someone else) or as a mere recipient (cf. the matrix
verb zorgen voor ‘take care to’ in 11a, the nouns moeite ‘effort’ and actie ‘action’
in 11b and 11c). There are a couple of examples which are open to both
interpretations—these will be discussed below.

Table 1 presents the type and token frequencies of the krijgen-passive
and krijgen-resultative constructions in the three sub-periods. The few ambiguous
instances to be discussed below were counted as krijgen-passive tokens, as a
passive interpretation is at least possible.
The frequencies in Table 1 corroborate Landsbergen’s position that the use of *krijgen* as a resultative auxiliary was already well-established at the time that the *krijgen*-passive started to emerge. In the oldest sample, the *krijgen*-passive is still very infrequent, with a mere 4 tokens, while the resultative construction is ten times as frequent; this corroborates the claim that the *krijgen*-passive cannot date back much further than the turn of the 20th century. In the 1910-14 and 1920-24 samples, the construction rises to a frequency of about 5 instances per million words, which is still less frequent than the resultative construction.

As for the type-frequency of the *krijgen*-passive, it is striking that, even in these early decades, the type-to-token ratio is quite high. As was noted in the previous section, Royen (1952) accords a special status to the verb *toewijzen* ‘assign, allot,’ which, according to him, accounts for the majority of instances of the newly emerging *krijgen* usage in the 1940s and 1950s. The data from *De Gids* do not corroborate this hypothesized “path-breaking” role; *toewijzen* is present in the data alright, and it is even one of the relatively few verbs with several attested *krijgen*-passive tokens, but it still accounts for only 3 out of 41 observed examples.

In all, the 41 tokens represent 31 different verb types (see the overview in Table 2).
The attested types can be seen to cluster into a number of semantic and/or morphological classes. There are four clusters with a token frequency of five or more, which will be discussed in turn in sub-sections 3.1.2 through 3.1.5. Sub-section 3.1.6 then offers a brief look at a number of more isolated cases, and sub-section 3.1.7 presents an intermediary conclusion.

3.1.2 Verbs of paying

Verbs of paying account for two of the four *krijgen*-passive types attested in the earliest sub-period, viz. *betalen* ‘pay’ and the near-synonymous particle verb *uitbetalen* ‘pay out’ (see 12a above). The semantically closely related verbs *vergoeden* ‘compensate, remunerate’ and *uitkeren* ‘pay out, remit’ are attested in the latter two sub-periods; together, these four verbs account for 7 out of the 41 *krijgen*-passive tokens in the data from *De Gids*. The presence of several verbs of paying among the earliest attested instances of the *krijgen*-passive is in line with Landsbergen’s (2006, 2009) hypothesis of the development of the construction, as such verbs are also attested with resultative *krijgen* in the data (see e.g. 13).

(13) *Hoe krijg ik wel dezen schuldbrief betaald?* *(De Gids, 1903)*
how get I PRT this debt.letter paid
“How can I ever manage to pay this letter of debt?”

While (13) is a case in which the subject of *krijgen* is also the agent of *betalen*, it is easy to find instances in 19th-century or early 20th-century texts in which the subject of *krijgen* acts to get someone else to pay something. In such cases, there
is a pragmatic implicature that the agent of *krijgen* is also the intended recipient of the financial transaction. While it is not inconceivable that someone makes an effort to get somebody else to pay a third party — (14a) is a case in point — the more usual case is represented by (14b), where the agent acts (or rather, in this specific example, does not act) in order to get paid.

(14)  

a. {Later, he also saw} that the gentlemen {of the board} were not able to get the Department to pay the assistant teachers *{Later zag hij ook} dat de heeren niet bij machte waren door het Departement behoorlijk betaald te krijgen de hulponderwijzeressen {ervaren in de Fröbelmethode}. (Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde, 1896)

b. {The financial profit that Witkamp gained from such publications was not at all commensurate with the effort gone into the compilation.} He didn’t even think of getting himself paid for his time. *(Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde, 1896)*

From cases such as (14b), it is a small step to instances in which the subject has lost all agentivity and is a mere recipient. (15a) is an ambiguous example open to both a resultative and a passive interpretation, as shown in the English glosses. In fact, the *betalen* example from sub-period I of *De Gids* (15b) is a similar example.
in which the subject may either be an agent/recipient or a mere recipient.

Compare to the uitbetalen example from the same sub-period in (12a), where the passive is the only available interpretation.

\[(15)\]

\[a. \quad \{\text{Men had namelijk het gerucht verspreid, dat} \]
\[\text{Beaumarchais 60.000 geweren}, \text{die hij vooruit van 't} \]
\[\text{Fransche gouvernement betaald zou hebben gekregen,} \]
\[\text{aan den vijand had uitgeleverd}. \text{(De Gids, 1887)} \]
\[\text{which he in advance of the French government paid would have got} \]
\[\text{“(For the rumor had been spread that B. had handed over} \]
\[\text{60,000 rifles to the enemy), which he had gotten the} \]
\[\text{French government to pay for in advance / for which he} \]
\[\text{had been paid in advance by the French government.”} \]

\[b. \quad \{\text{… en als ge 't later openbaar moest onder den hamer} \]
\[\text{brengen}, \text{t ware jammer, g’en zoudt maar den helft van} \]
\[\text{de weerde betaald krijgen!} \text{(De Gids, 1902)} \]
\[\text{it would be shameful you not would only the half of the} \]
\[\text{worth paid get} \]
\[\text{“(… and if you were to decide to sell it [i.e., the farm] by} \]
\[\text{public auction later), it would be a shame if you would} \]
\[\text{only manage to get paid half of its worth / if you would} \]
\[\text{only be paid half of its worth.”} \]

In the absence of more systematic data on the range of krijgen + participle constructions attested in (late) 19th-century language, it is too soon to draw firm conclusions, but I would hazard the position that the reinterpretation of the subject as a mere recipient—i.e., the emergence of the krijgen-passive—may well have originated with verbs of paying. Indications for this are that half of the (potential) instances of krijgen-passive in the 1900-1904 sub-period of De Gids feature verbs of paying and that, through specialized queries in the earlier
volumes of the *De Gids* corpus, it is possible to find a number of potentially ambiguous examples from the latter half of the 19th century, such as (15a).

### 3.1.3 Complex particle verbs with toe ‘to(wards)’

A remarkable fact about the distribution of the *krijgen*-passive in the early 20th-century data is the strong presence of tokens in which the participle slot is filled by a separable complex verb with a particle as its first element (16 of the 31 attested types belong to this morphological category). The most well-represented subclass is that of particle verbs with toe ‘to(wards)’. There are six such verbs in the database — *toewijzen* ‘assign, allot,’ *toebedelen* ‘assign, allocate,’ *toestoppen* ‘slip, give,’ *toevoeren* ‘provide, bring towards,’ *toemeten* ‘allot,’ and *toezenden* ‘send towards’ — which together account for 9 *krijgen*-passive tokens; see (16) for some representative examples (see also the example with *toebedelen* in 12b).

(16) a. *… alleen Sjimmie had in stilte een brok van de heerlijkheid toegestopt gekregen.* (*De Gids*, 1912)
   “… only Sjimmie had been silently slipped a morsel of the exquisiteness [i.e., of the cake].”

b. *Eerstgenoemde krijgt 1 zetel op 110 kiezers toegewezen.*
   (*De Gids*, 1914)
   “The former is allotted 1 seat per 110 voters.”

These *toe*-verbs all denote fairly prototypical events of actual possessional transfer: the subject referent receives the direct object referent in his domain of possession or control as the beneficiary in an act of giving. Note, however, that
there are no non-particle verbs of giving among the 31 verb types attested. That is, there is not a single krijgen-passive instance with highly frequent ditransitive verbs, such as geven ‘give,’ schenken ‘give (as a present),’ verschaffen ‘provide,’ bieden ‘offer, provide,’ verlenen ‘grant,’ etc. This means that there must be something special about particle verbs (with toe) that makes them eligible for use in the krijgen-passive.

The general difference between particle verbs and related simplex verbs of possessional transfer in terms of the acceptability of the krijgen-passive has been observed before. For instance, Broekhuis & Cornips (2012, p. 1223) note the difference between plain sturen ‘send’ and its particle variant toesturen ‘towards-send’ in (17) (also see De Schutter, 1989; and Colleman, 2006, p. 264, for similar observations). They attribute this to the fact that gestuurd ‘sent’ does not in itself add much to the meaning of krijgen ‘get,’ while toe-gestuurd ‘sent towards’ does. More specifically, they claim that “the particle adds sufficient information about the mode of transmission to license the krijgen-passivization” (2012, p. 1222). The authors’ overall hypothesis is thus that krijgen-passivization is fully productive with verbs of transmission (and communication), provided that these verbs specify the mode of transmission (see Section 4 for further discussion).

(17) Marie kreeg een mooie brief *(toe)gestuurd.
M. got a nice letter towards-sent
“Marie was sent a nice letter.”
I would like to propose a somewhat different explanation for the strong presence of particle verbs with *toe* among the verb types (first) attested in the *krijgen*-passive, which builds on Blom (2005). In an extensive chapter on the semantics of several subtypes of separable complex verbs in Dutch, Blom (2005, pp. 192-194) briefly discusses a somewhat atypical class of particle verbs, viz. those with a particle that licenses both a Figure and a Ground. This concerns ditransitive verbs with particles such as *aan* ‘at,’ *om* ‘around,’ or *toe* ‘towards’. (18a), for instance, denotes an action, the intended result of which is that the ball (the Figure) goes to the keeper (the Ground) (see the Lexical-Conceptual structure and paraphrase in 18b).

(18)  

a.  
\[
\text{de keeper de bal toe-spelen} \\
\text{the keeper the ball towards-play} \\
\text{‘to play the ball to the goalkeeper’}
\]

b.  
\[
[\text{CAUSE (x), BECOME \{TO (de keeper)\) (de bal)}], \\
\text{BY\{spelen (x)\}} \\
\text{‘to cause the ball to become to the goalkeeper by playing’}
\]

(Blom, 2005, pp. 192, 193)

Such verbs can hardly occur without a specified Ground — ?? Hij speelde de bal *toe* ‘He played the ball towards’ is at least odd. To return to the *krijgen*-passive, in clauses such as (19) below, it is of course the subject of *krijgen* which fills the Ground slot licensed by the particle *toe*, while the direct object fills the Figure slot.

(19)  
\[
\text{De keeper krijgt de bal toe-gespeeld.} \\
\text{the keeper gets the ball towards-played} \\
\text{‘The keeper is passed the ball.’}
\]
In this way, I would argue that the presence of the double-participant particle *toe* in the participle slot of a *krijgen* + participle combination provides an extra clue for the interpretation of the subject referent as the intended end location of the direct object referent, hence as the recipient of the denoted ‘transfer’ scene, and that this can help explain why such particle verbs are so well-represented among the verbs (first) attested in the *krijgen*-passive. The same holds for particle verbs with other double participant particles; in *iets opgezet krijgen* (lit. ‘to get something upon-placed’), the subject is the entity *upon* which the direct object is put, in *iets omgehangen krijgen* (lit. ‘to get something around-hung’), it is the entity around which the direct object is hung, etc. In addition, some of these particles occur as predicative particles in clauses with lexical *krijgen*, too, as in (20). Such uses may also have functioned as a source for *krijgen*-passives with particle verbs. In (20a), for instance, all that is needed to arrive at the *krijgen*-passive is the addition of the participle *gezet* ‘placed’: *hij krijgt een hoed op-gezet*.

(20) a. *Hij krijgt een hoed op.*  
he gets a hat upon  
“He gets a hat on.”

b. *Hij krijgt een sjaal om.*  
he gets a scarf around  
“He gets a scarf around (his neck).”

3.1.4 Verbs of delivering – esp. with the adverb *thuis* ‘(at) home’

A third cluster of early instances of *krijgen*-passive is formed by uses with the verbs of sending or delivering *bezorgen* ‘deliver,’ *bestellen* ‘deliver,’ *brengen* ‘bring,’ *leveren* ‘deliver,’ and *sturen* ‘send,’ which are more often than not
combined with the adverbs *thuis* or *aan huis* ‘(at) home’. Together, these verbs account for 11 *krijgen*-passive tokens in the *De Gids* data — 8 of which feature *thuis* or *aan huis* ‘at home.’ Some examples are listed in (21).\textsuperscript{11}

\begin{enumerate}[leftmargin=*]
\item \emph{Er is een tijd geweest in ons land dat de menschen zoo gelukkig waren} om hun rantsoen poëeterij \textit{thuis bezorgd te krijgen}. (De Gids, 1903) for their ration poetry home delivered to get “{There was a time in our country when the people were so happy} to get their ration of poetry home-delivered.”
\item \emph{Wij plegen lange correspondentiën te lezen,} \textit{krijgen ze althans thuisgestuurd, {over de quaestie der bevestiging van Kopenhagen}.} (De Gids, 1910) get them at least home-sent “{We are in the habit of reading long correspondences}, at least they are sent home to us, {about the matter of the confirmation of Copenhagen}.”
\end{enumerate}

Landsbergen (2006, 2009), who, as we have seen in Section 2, was the first to argue that the *krijgen*-passive developed from the *krijgen*-resultative, does not give any thought to the alternative hypothesis that the *krijgen*-passive is the result of the reanalysis of a participial co-predicate as the main verb of the construction, i.e. along the lines of the grammaticalization path usually assumed for the German *bekommen*-passive. However, one hypothesized development need not completely rule out the other. It is perfectly well possible that the *krijgen*-passive resulted from the coalescence of several “threads,” some of which — e.g. the cluster of uses involving *krijgen* + verbs of paying — originated from *krijgen*-resultative uses, while others originated from a co-predicative source.
There are several observations to be made in support of the hypothesis that the cluster of *krijgen*-passive uses under discussion in this sub-section may well have developed from a co-predicative source. First, *resultative* *krijgen*-uses with these verbs do not seem to have been very well-entrenched in 19th-century language. A query for all combinations of the participle forms *gebracht*, *bezorgd*, *geleverd*, *besteld*, and *gestuurd* with *krijgen* within a ten-word span in the 1837 to 1899 volumes of *De Gids* did not produce a single instance. Second, even in the present-day language, *geleverd*, etc. can easily be used as co-predicative participles, especially in combination with adverbials such as *thuis/aan huis* ‘at home,’ *gratis* ‘for free,’ *in onderdelen* ‘unassembled,’ and so on (see 22). Such examples resemble Diedrichsen’s (2012, p. 1172) example *Sie bekommt den Katalog geschickt* in its co-predicative interpretation, i.e. with *geschickt* functioning as an adverbial modifying the receiving event rather than as a main verb (‘She receives the catalogue sent, i.e. by post’).

(22)  *Ik kreeg de boeken-kast voor een aantrekkelijke prijs en gratis aan huis geleverd.*  
I got the book-case for an attractive price and freely at home delivered  
“I got the bookcase for an attractive price and with free home-delivery.”  

Some of the examples from *De Gids* are actually ambiguous between a *krijgen*-passive and a co-predicative meaning. (21a) above, for instance, could be paraphrased in English as either ‘They were so happy that their ration of poetry was delivered to them at home’ (*krijgen*-passive) or ‘They were so happy to
receive their ration of poetry via home delivery’ (co-predicative construction). In fact, the difference in meaning is not even particularly striking; it is just that in the co-predicative reading there is a bit more emphasis on the mode of delivery (cf. also Diedrichsen, 2012, p. 1173).

Still, subtle as it is, the semantic difference does have formal consequences. As pointed out by De Schutter (1989), in the "krijgen"-passive, "krijgen" displays the relative word-order flexibility typical of auxiliaries, in that, when both "krijgen" and the participle are in the right bracket of the clause, they may occur in both orders. In the co-predicative construction, by contrast, "krijgen", as a main verb, has to follow the participle (see the contrast between 23 and 24).

(23) ... dat ik de boeken overhandigd kreeg / kreeg overhandigd. 
that I the books handed got / got handed
“... that I was handed the books.”

(24) ... dat ik de boeken beschadigd kreeg / * kreeg beschadigd. 
that I the books damaged got / got damaged
“... that I received the books in a damaged condition.”

(25) demonstrates that the "krijgen" + ‘deliver’ verb combinations already occurred in the auxiliarized word order in the data from De Gids.

(25) ... {terwijl [Vincent] niet alleen geen model kon betalen}, 
maar het eten kreeg thuisgebracht van zijn model. (De Gids, 1914) 
but the food got home-brought from his model
“{while it was not just that Vincent could not afford to pay a model}, he was even brought his food at home by his model.”

3.1.5 (Separable complex) verbs of communication
The dataset also includes a number of *krijgen*-passive examples with verbs of telling, teaching, or showing, viz. *voorstellen* ‘depict,’ *samenvatten* ‘summarize,’ *aangeven* ‘indicate, show,’ *onderwijzen* ‘teach,’ *tegenwerpen* ‘remonstrate,’ and *voorspelen* ‘show how to play,’ each of which are attested in the construction only once; (26) lists some examples.

(26) a. *{We zien ook nu ’t verlaten, simpele Anneke nog eens spreken met haar toenmaligen afgod, den ontrouwen Max,} en ook *krijgen* we haar nu *voorgesteld in hernieuwde vrijage met den gezwollen schoolmeester-rijmelaar.* (De Gids, 1904)
   ... and also get we her now depicted in renewed courtship with the pompous schoolteacher-poetaster
   “{We now witness the deserted, simple Annie speaking with her former idol, the unfaithful Max,} and she is also presented to us in renewed courtship with the pompous schoolteacher and poetaster.”

b. *Hun houding en persoonlijke habitus *krijgt* men in enkele gemeenzame trekken *aangegeven.* (De Gids, 1920)
   their attitude and personal habit gets one in some colloquial strokes indicated
   “One gets an indication of their attitude and habits in a few colloquial strokes.”

These examples show that, in the data from *De Gids,* it is by no means the case that the *krijgen*-passive is only used to encode events in which the subject is the recipient in a prototypical receiving event involving a more or less concrete object. From the earliest investigated sub-period on, the *krijgen*-passive also combines with verbs denoting more abstract events of communicative transfer. However, it should also be pointed out that, again, these uses seem to be mostly
restricted to separable complex verbs; the only exception in the data is
*onderwijzen* 'teach,' which is a prefixed rather than a separable complex verb.

More prototypical (simplex) ditransitive verbs of communicated message, such as
*zeggen* 'say,' *vertellen* 'tell,' *tonen* 'show,' *vragen* 'ask,' etc., are not attested in
the *krijgen*-passive in the early 20th-century data.

3.1.6 Other cases
Together, the four clusters discussed above account for over three quarters of the
observed *krijgen*-passive tokens (33 out of 41). In addition, there are a number of
more isolated cases which are worth pointing out. First, Dutch has a fairly
productive system of indirect objects of external possession, i.e. in which the
indirect object referent is the possessor of an item — often a body part or item of
clothing — named in a PP (see the examples in 27 from Broekhuis & Cornips,
2012, pp. 1214, 1225). As shown in (28), the subject of the *krijgen*-passive could
already encode such an external possessor in the early 20th century, too.

(27) a. *Jan stopt Peter een euro in de hand.*
Jan puts Peter a euro in the hand
"Jan puts a euro coin in Peter’s hand." / “Jan gives Peter a
euro coin.”

b. *Ze zetten hem het kind op de knie.*
they put him the child on the knee
“They sat the child on his knee.”

(28) *(En als onmiskenbaar teeken van zijn afstamming van een antieke
soldatenfiguur) kreeg de Amsteramsche straatjongen bij
Rembrandt een helm op het hoofd gezet.* (De Gids, 1914)
got the Amsterdam streetkid with Rembrandt a helmet on the head put

“[And as an unmistakable sign of his descent from an ancient soldier], the Amsterdam street kid got a helmet on his head (lit. got put a helmet on the head) in Rembrandt’s painting.”

Second, consider the examples in (29a) and (30a), which are worth pointing out because the verbs in question cannot occur in the active double object construction, as shown in the (b)-clauses.

(29)  a. {Hoe vreemd dit ook moge schijnen bij een schrijver},
      die het zegel der strenge afbeeldings-objectiviteit op zich
gedrukt heeft gekregen {van zijnen aanvang af aan}. (De
      Gids, 1913)
      who the seal of:the strict portrayal-objectivity upon REFL
      pressed has got
      “No matter how strange this may appear from a writer
      who has gotten the mark of strict objectivity of portrayal
      put on him right from the beginning.”

        one pressed him the mark upon REFL / upon him

(30) a. Als ge bedenkt, dat Zwerver … nog slaapdronken,
      bijkans zijn hoed beschadigd kreeg {door het
      onvoorzichtig paffen van een gaucho, die met zijn
      monsterpistool de onschuldige, stomme yacaré’s aan den
      oever te lijf ging…} (De Gids, 1923)
      if you consider that Zwerver still drowsy almost his hat
      damaged got
      “If you consider that Zwerver, while still drowsy, had
      almost gotten his hat damaged (by the uncareful shooting
      of a gaucho who had attacked the innocent, stupid yacare
      caimans on the shore with his monstrous pistol…)"

b. * Men beschadigde hem zijn hoed.
   one damaged him his hat
This shows that, from the early 20th century on, the *krijgen*-passive was not restricted to verbs which are eligible for use in the active double object construction — which, evidently, constitutes a huge problem for any account which would like to derive the *krijgen*-passive from the double object construction through some kind of syntactic rule. (29a) is an early example of a type we will encounter more of in Sub-section 3.2.2, with a goal rather than a recipient subject. (30a) is a one-off, though it is related to some of the present-day examples to be discussed below in that the *krijgen*-passive seems to function as a kind of adversative passive here.

3.1.7 Interim conclusion

The most important conclusion to be drawn from the first part of the corpus investigation is that, even at the beginning of the 20th century, the *krijgen*-passive was already quite productive, as shown by the high type-token ratio (the 41 observed tokens represent 31 different types). Still, the majority of these belong to one of four semantic clusters, which can be considered well-entrenched verb-class-specific sub-constructions of the schematic *krijgen*-passive construction. Figure 1 offers a simplified graphic representation.

The four major sub-constructions distinguished in Figure 1 all involve ‘transfer’ verbs; the subject of the *krijgen*-passive encodes the recipient of a possessional
transfer in the first three clusters, and the addressee in an event of
communicative transfer in the fourth sub-construction. In this way, the results
corroborate Van Leeuwen’s (2006) suggestion that the *krijgen*-passive probably
originated in resultative *krijgen*-uses with ditransitive ‘transfer’ verbs. We can
even narrow it down to a specific subclass of transfer verbs, albeit tentatively;
there is some textual evidence suggesting that the combination of resultative
*krijgen* with verbs of paying such as *betalen* ‘pay,’ *uitbetalen* ‘pay out,’ *vergoeden*
‘compensate,’ etc. was the very first cluster of *krijgen*-resultative uses in which
this reinterpretation of the subject as a mere recipient occurred. This is an
interesting working hypothesis for more systematic research in (late) 19th-century
texts.

However, it has also been argued that the different verb-class-specific
sub-constructions may have developed from different sources. In the case of the
‘sending/delivering’ cluster of uses, it seems more likely that these have
developed out of co-predicative uses with a participle specifying the mode of
delivery, i.e. in the way that the German *bekommen*-passive is often assumed to
have emerged. In this way, the *krijgen*-passive seems to have resulted from the
coalescence of several “threads,” some of which originated from *krijgen-
resultative uses, others from a co-predicative source. If we rephrase this in terms
of Smirnova’s (this volume) alternative model of constructionalization, it seems
that the constructionalization of the *krijgen*-passive involved not one but several
critical constructions: a critical construction [Subj [[*krijgen* V_paying] Obj (van/door
NP)]] which sprang from the *krijgen*-resultative through reinterpretation of the
subject referent as a mere recipient, a second critical construction [Subj [[*krijgen*
\(V_{\text{delivering/sending}}\) (thuis) Obj (\(\text{van}/\text{door}\) NP)]] which developed from the transitive *krijgen*-construction with a co-predicative past participle through the reanalysis of this past participle as the construction's main verb and *krijgen* as an auxiliary, a third critical construction involving particle verbs with *toe* (for which, in fact, it is not yet clear whether this has developed from a co-predicative or a resultative source), and, possibly, a fourth critical construction involving particle verbs of communication.

There are other examples of constructions which have developed from multiple sources in this way (see, e.g., the accounts of the development of the English *way*-construction by Israel, 1996, and Traugott & Trousdale, in press, both of which assume the confluence of multiple threads, although the details of their analyses differ); also see Torrent (this volume) for an account which traces back the origin of a construction to several historically unrelated constructions, though in a somewhat different vein).

Another remarkable fact about the distribution of the *krijgen*-passive in the early 20\(^{th}\)-century data is the strong presence of tokens with a particle verb in the participle slot. Half of the attested types belong to this morphological subclass, verbs with the particle *toe* ‘towards’ being especially well-represented. I have offered an explanation for the strong degree of attraction between the *krijgen*-passive and these verbs, which builds on Blom’s (2005) analysis of particles such as *toe* as double-participant particles. Particle verbs with a double-participant particle denote a situation in which the intended result of the activity
denoted by the base verb is that a given entity (the Figure) ends up in a specific spatial relation to another entity (the Ground); e.g. in active double object clauses with, say, *toespelen* ‘play towards,’ the subject causes the direct-object referent to move towards the indirect-object referent by playing it. In the *krijgen*-passive, the presence of such a double-participant particle in the participle slot signals that there has to be a Ground somewhere in the clause and thus provides an extra clue for the interpretation of the subject referent as the intended end location of the direct-object referent, hence as the recipient of the denoted ‘transfer’ scene.

Finally, it should be kept in mind that, though the large majority of observed *krijgen*-passive tokens belong in one of the four sub-constructions in Figure 1, the semantic range of the construction in early 20th-century Dutch is broader than that — the dataset includes occasional examples of goal and even maleficiary uses, too.


As was stressed in the introduction, this article is as concerned with post-constructionalization semantic change in the *krijgen*-passive as it is with its actual genesis. The second part of the data investigation looks into the construction’s presence in a number of data sources from the second half of the 20th century, in order to identify possible semasiological shifts.

3.2.1 Overview: type and token frequencies
Two corpora were used to examine the use of the *krijgen*-passive in the latter half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, viz. the diachronic CONDIV corpus, which is made up of Dutch and Belgian newspaper texts from 1958 and 1978, and the newspaper component of the present-day CONDIV corpus, which consists of articles from the late 1990s, mostly from the year 1998. I selected material from the broadsheet *NRC Handelsblad* only, as this is the only Dutch newspaper for which data were available for all three subperiods, and I followed the same procedure as outlined in the previous sub-section to retrieve all instances of the *krijgen*-passive and *krijgen*-resultative constructions from the data.\textsuperscript{12} The results are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

A comparison of the figures in Tables 1 and 3 reveals a consistent increase in token frequency. For example, by 1958, the *krijgen*-passive had risen to a normalized frequency of about 20 instances per one million words, which is considerably more than in the early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century data. The *krijgen*-passive’s frequency further increased to 41 instances per million words in the 1978 data and 76 instances per million words in the 1998 data. The difference in token frequency between the three sub-periods in Table 3 is highly significant, as shown by a chi-square goodness-of-fit test (chi-sq. = 42.78, df = 2, p < .0001). Also note that the *krijgen*-passive has clearly overtaken the *krijgen*-resultative in frequency by the latter half of the century; in the youngest sub-period, the *krijgen*-passive
construction is more than ten times as frequent as the resultative *krijgen* + participle construction. The type frequency follows suit: in the 1998 data, 47 different verbs have one or more *krijgen*-passive occurrences. The set of *krijgen*-passive verb types attested in the NRC data is somewhat more heterogeneous than the set of verbs attested in the older data (see the overview in Table 4).

The remainder of this sub-section will first give an overview of the most important semantic extensions and will then proceed to the discussion of a number of verb classes which are notably absent — or virtually absent — from the data. Now and again, additional web data will be brought in, and I will also refer to the observations on the semantic range of the *krijgen*-passive in the existing studies mentioned in section 2.

3.2.2 Semantic extensions

The first thing to observe is that there are quite a lot of instances with the particle verb of future transfer *aanbieden* ‘offer’ in the NRC data (31a). With 21 tokens across all three sub-periods, *aanbieden* is even the most frequently attested *krijgen*-passive verb in the data; in addition, the simplex near-synonym *bieden* ‘offer’ has two *krijgen*-passive instances, e.g. (31b).\(^{13}\) In terms of Goldberg’s (1995, 2002) seminal analysis of the English double object construction as a polysemous argument structure construction built around a central ‘Agent successfully causes Recipient to receive Patient’ sense, these verbs instantiate the
constructional subsense ‘Conditions of satisfaction imply: Agent causes Recipient to receive Patient.’ In double object clauses with aanbieden etc., the projected ‘transfer of possession’ event does not necessarily take place — the direct-object referent will only end up in the indirect-object referent’s domain of possession if the latter one accepts the offer. The examples in (31) illustrate that the krijgen-passive can be used to encode the same kind of projected (rather than actual) transfer events. In (31a), for instance, it is clear from the following context that the direct object did not end up in the subject’s possession (hence, the subject did not literally “get” the direct object, though he did receive something, viz. an offer).

(31)  

a.  

{Een procuratiehouder die al twee directeuren had meegemaakt} en eindelijk zelf de hoogste post aangeboden kreeg, {sloeg het aanbod af: hij wilde ook graag de derde overleven}. (NRC, 1958)  

and finally self the highest post offered got “{A deputy manager who had already served under two directors} and was finally offered the highest office himself {declined the offer: he wanted to survive the third one as well.}”

b.  

{Van der Hart: „Mijn hart bloedde toen ik op mijn 22ste bij Ajax weging.” Maar ik kreeg in Frankrijk in Lille 25.000 gulden handgeld geboden, plus een enorm salaris.”} (NRC, 1998)

but I got in France in Lille 25,000 guilders earnest.money plus a enormous salary “{Van der Hart: ‘My heart bled when I left Ajax at the age of 22). But in France, in Lille, I was offered an earnest 25,000 Dutch guilders and a vast salary.’}”
Secondly, the data contain a small number of *krijgen*-passive instances with non-particle verbs of communication, including *tonen* ‘show’ and *mailen* ‘e-mail,’ as in (32) — the other examples in the dataset are *bevestigen* ‘confirm’ and *openbaren* ‘reveal’.

(32) a. *(Eén enkel goochelnummertje is leuk), anderhalf uur trucs en voetvlugheid *getoond krijgen*, *(leidt tot overvoering).* (NRC, 1978)
   an hour and a half tricks and foot-fastness shown get
   “(A single act of magic is nice, but) being shown an hour and a half of tricks and quick feet [is too much.]”

b. *De bewoners van Smulweb *krijgen* geregeld de Smulkrant *gemaild*, inclusief product-aanbiedingen van pasta tot wok.* (NRC, 1998)
   the inhabitants of Smulweb get regularly the Smulpaper mailed inclusive product-offers from pasta to wok
   “The inhabitants of Smulweb [i.e., the registered users of a particular website dedicated to food] are regularly e-mailed the Smulpaper, including product offers from pasta to wok meals.”

Thirdly, and perhaps most interestingly, the *krijgen*-passive occurs with two types of predicates that do not enter into the active double object construction. The first of these was already mentioned in Sub-section 3.1. (33a) and (34a), both from the most recent sub-period, are two more examples similar to the example with *drukken* in (29a) above. What we are dealing with here are combinations of a verb with a PP consisting of a locative or directional preposition (or, as in 33a, a circumposition) plus a reflexive pronoun. The active counterparts of these clauses are the clauses in (c), which appear without an indirect object but with a locative/directional PP, as opposed to the double object clauses in (b).
(33) a. *Nauwelijks benoemd op de post van Economische Zaken kreeg minister Jorritsma de afgelopen zomer deze vraag op zich afgevuurd door fractievoorzitter Paul Rosenmöller.* (NRC, 1998)

hardly appointed at the post of economic affairs got minister J. the past summer this question at REFL off-fired by fraction leader P.R.

“Last summer, when he was hardly in office as Minister of economic affairs, Jorritsma had this question fired at him by fraction leader Paul Rosenmöller.”

b. *Ze vuurden hem deze vraag op zich af.*
they fired him this question at him off

c. *Ze vuurden deze vraag op hem af.*
they fired this question at him off

“They fired this question at him.”

(34) a. *Wat ik in die periode aan gal over me heen-gespuwd kreeg […], dat wil je niet weten.* (NRC, 1998)

what I in that period of bile over REFL over-spit got that want you not know

“You don’t want to know how much bile I had spat at me in that period.”

b. *Ze spuwden mij gal over me heen.*
they spat me bile over me over

c. *Ze spuwden gal over mij heen.*
they spitted bile over me over

“They spat bile at me.”

It is not difficult to find additional instances of this kind in larger corpora of present-day Dutch. The web examples in (35) testify to the productivity of this cluster of uses.

(35) a. *Een tweetal leerlingen krijgt een glas melk voor zich gezet.*
a twosome students gets a glass milk before REFL placed
“A glass of milk is placed before two students.”

b. Het is nodig dat iedereen een nieuwe natuur in zich geplant krijgt.
   it is necessary that everyone a new nature in REFL planted gets
   “It is necessary for everyone that a new nature is planted in them.”

<http://laatzienwiejebent.hyves.nl/blog/16919410/Ingrijp_ende_verhalen_etc/Yr8t/>
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Semantically, these uses belong to two sub-classes. In (35a-c), like in (33) and (34) (and in the older example in 29a above), the preposition is used in its basic spatial sense and the subject encodes the locative goal of a spatial transfer. These uses most probably developed from krijgen-passive uses with ditransitive particle verbs — for example, it is a small step from iets voorgezet krijgen to iets voor zich gezet krijgen (lit. ‘to get something before-put’ > ‘to get something put before oneself’), or from iets ingeplant krijgen to iets in zich geplant krijgen (lit. ‘to get something in-planted’ > ‘to get something planted in oneself’). Note, however, that there is a semantic difference. In (35c), for instance, in contrast to, say, De keeper kreeg een aansteker toegegooid ‘The keeper was thrown a lighter,’ there is no suggestion at all that the keeper is meant to catch the lighter. The subject in (35a-c) is a mere goal, not an intended recipient. Such goal uses occur with a variety of spatial prepositions and circumpositions. The examples in (35d-g) represent a further extension; here, the preposition is not used in its spatial sense anymore, but in an abstract sense. The referent that occupies the subject position here would appear in a prepositional object or prepositional adverbial in the active counterparts to these clauses. (35d-e) denote scenes which are beneficial to the subject referent, while in (35f-g) the subject encodes the maleficiary of the action denoted by the main verb. In such uses, the krijgen-passive comes close to the English beneficial or adversative get-passive, as is also shown by the use of the get-passive in some of the English glosses.
Another related cluster of *krijgen*-passive uses that does not correspond to one of the sub-senses of the active double object construction is represented by the examples in (36) below. (36a), with *indienen* ‘submit,’ is the only example of this kind in the NRC data, but additional examples can easily be found on the Internet. In these cases, we are dealing with particle verbs which do not select a recipient but rather, again, a kind of spatial goal participant. (37) illustrates that such verbs do not enter into the active double object construction.

(36) a. *Berlijn kreeg meer dubieuze declaraties ingediend.*
(NRC, 1998)
Berlin got more dubious declarations submitted
“More dubious declarations were submitted to Berlin [i.e., to the campaign team for the Berlin 2000 Olympics].”
b. *Bijkomend effect was dat Sinfonia uit 1971 een nummer kreeg toegevoegd.*
<http://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Symfonie_nr._2_%28Salline n%29>, last accessed 28/04/2012
additional effect was that Sinfonia from 1971 a number got added
“An additional effect was that a number was added to Sinfonia from 1971.”
c. *Het CML heeft sinds 2005 in overleg met de betrokken ondernemers het potje voor Leiden Centraal ondergebracht gekregen.*
<www.onderneemersfonds.nl/.../Notulen_adviesraad_16_ maart_2009-3.doc.>, last accessed 28/04/2012
the CML has since 2005 in consultation with the concerned contractors the funds for Leiden Centraal placed got
“Since 2005, the funds for Leiden Centraal have been housed at the CML, in agreement with the contractors concerned.”

(37) a. *Ze hebben *(bij) Berlijn meer dubieuze declaraties*
3.2.3 Verbs and verb classes not attested in the NRC data

As we have just seen, the krijgen-passive data from the second half of the 20th century include two subtypes of verbs that do not occur in the active double object construction. On the other hand, several of the ditransitive verb classes that have been associated with the double object argument structure construction in previous corpus-based studies (e.g. Colleman, 2009a, b) are not attested in the krijgen-passive at all in the data from NRC Handelsblad:

- Verbs of prevention of possession, such as weigeren ‘refuse’ and ontzeggen ‘deny.’ The double object uses of these verbs encode events of negated or blocked transfer, i.e., those which represent a constructional subsense that, in terms of Colleman’s (2009a) multidimensional analysis of double object semantics, differs from the central ‘successfully caused reception’ sense along the ‘polarity’ dimension.

- Verbs of dispossession such as ontnemen ‘take away,’ ontfutselen ‘filch from,’ onstelen ‘steal away,’ afnemen ‘take away,’ afdwingen ‘force from,’ etc., which denote a subsense that differs from the central sense in terms of the
direction of the denoted transfer, i.e., ‘away from’ rather than ‘towards’ the indirect-object referent (cf. Colleman, 2009a).

- Verbs such as gunnen ‘not begrudge,’ benijden ‘envy,’ misgunnen ‘begrudge,’ verwijten ‘blame,’ kwalijk nemen ‘take ill of,’ and aanrekenen ‘hold against,’ which denote static events in which the subject referent has a certain attitude towards the indirect object referent: e.g. Piet gunde/benijdde zijn buurvrouw haar succes ‘Piet did not begrudge/envy his neighbor her success’ (cf. Colleman, 2009a, pp. 210-214).

In addition, the NRC data suggest important differences between verbs along morphological lines in terms of the degree of entrenchment of the krijgen-passive. It is striking that non-particle verbs of giving are still virtually absent from the data. This does not only pertain to geven ‘give,’. Some other examples of frequent verbs of giving which are not represented in the set of 179 krijgen-passive tokens culled from the three NRC sub-periods are schenken ‘give, present,’ verschaffen ‘provide,’ lenen ‘lend,’ verlenen ‘grant,’ and verstrekken ‘supply.’ There are only two (apparent) exceptions: overhandigen ‘hand (over)’ and presenteren ‘present.’ The first of these is not strictly speaking a particle verb—over is a prefix here—but bears a close formal similarity to particle verbs such as overmaken ‘transfer, make over’ and overdragen ‘hand over, transfer.’ The latter verb is only attested in the krijgen-passive in the semi-idiomatic expressions de rekening (voor iets) gepresenteerd krijgen ‘to be punished (for something), to be demanded satisfaction of (for something)’ (lit. ‘to get presented
the bill for something’) and een koekje van eigen deeg gepresenteerd krijgen ‘to get a taste of one’s own medicine’ (lit. ‘to get presented a cookie of one’s own dough’). Non-particle verbs of communication fare only slightly better; while we have seen that tonen ‘show’ and mailen ‘e-mail’ both have a single krijgen-passive occurrence in the NRC data, there is still no sign of verbs such as vertellen ‘tell,’ vragen ‘ask,’ zeggen ‘say,’ schrijven ‘write,’ leren ‘teach,’ melden ‘report,’ and so on. In the class of future/conditional giving verbs, aanbieden ‘offer’ is far more frequently attested in the krijgen-passive than its simplex variant bieden ‘offer, give,’ and beloven ‘promise’ is noticeably absent from the data.

In general, it can be observed that the predominance of particle verb uses already present in the early 20th-century data continues in the latter half of the century. In all, particle verbs account for 141 of the 179 krijgen-passive tokens in the NRC data (= 78.8%). These belong to several subtypes; particle verbs with toe are still well-represented (11 types), but aan (e.g. aanbieden ‘offer,’ aanreiken ‘reach, pass,’ aansmeren ‘palm off on’), op (e.g. opleggen ‘impose,’ opspelden ‘pin on,’ opdrukken ‘press on’), voor (e.g. voorschotelen ‘dish up, serve,’ voorzetten ‘serve, put in front of,’ voorhouden ‘hold out to’) and in (inblazen ‘breathe into,’ inpompen ‘pump into,’ inhameren ‘hammer into’) also account for five or more types. Note that all of these, like toe, are double-participant particles. This is not to say that verbs with other particles are categorically ruled out, for the dataset contains a couple of instances with non-double participant particle verbs as well. A case in point is (38), with doorsturen ‘send through,’ in which door is, in Blom’s (2005) terminology, a simple result particle that only licenses a Figure, not a
Ground (i.e., it is not that the direct object ends up ‘through’ the subject in this case).

Such instances are relatively rare, however. Hence, the correct generalization is not that the *krijgen*-passive prefers particle verbs, but rather that it has a particular fondness for a particular kind of particle verbs, viz. those with a double-participant particle.

Before we move on, it should be stressed that the above observations about the absence of *krijgen*-passive examples involving verbs of refusal, simplex verbs of giving, etc. in the NRC data should not be read as claims that such uses are actually *ungrammatical* in present-day Dutch. For instance, as was already observed by Broekhuis & Cornips (2012, pp. 1224), *krijgen*-passive instances with *weigeren* ‘refuse’ and *ontzeggen* ‘deny’ can be found on the Internet, which shows that these verbs do occasionally occur in the *krijgen*-passive. The same applies to several other of the above-mentioned verbs, though not, it would seem, the dispossession and attitudinal verbs.¹⁴ I only quote web examples for *weigeren* ‘refuse,’ *schenken* ‘give, present,’ and *vertellen* ‘tell’ here.
(39)  *Dan zou er grote kans zijn dat ik tijdens dat gesprek een visum geweigerd kreeg.*  
*then would there big chance be that I during that conversation a visa refused got*  
“Then there would be a good chance that I would be refused a visa during that conversation.”  
<http://margotdeegree.waarbenjij.nu/Reisverslag/?margotdeegree/ha%EFti/Wordt+vervolgd/&subdomain=margotdeegree&module=site&page=message&id=3954290>, last accessed 24/04/2012)

(40)  *{De naam van de club was oorspronkelijk Rotterdamsche Cricketclub "Sparta"}, maar toen de vereniging in juli 1888 een voetbal *kreeg geschenken*, {werd de naam direct veranderd in de Rotterdamsche Cricket & Football Club "Sparta".}*  
*but when the association in July 1888 a football got presented ‘{The name of the club was originally Rotterdam Cricket Club ‘Sparta’}, but when the association was given a football in 1888, the name was immediately changed to Rotterdam Cricket & Football Club ‘Sparta’.”*  

(41)  *{Tijdens mijn opleiding vond ik een vriend uit het ‘andere verband’)}, die in zijn familie nagenoeg dezelfde verhalen *verteld kreeg over de mens uit mijn kerk.*  
*who in his family almost the same stories told got about the people from my church*  
“{During my studies, I met a friend from the ‘other denomination’}, who was told almost exactly the same stories about people from my Church in his family.”  
<http://www.lezen.nu/boeken/het-hondje-van-sollie.html, last accessed 28/04/2012>

However, there are frequency issues to consider. What the examples in (39) to (41) show is that the verbs in question are not categorically ruled out from the *krijgen*-passive in Dutch; there are at least some speakers who spontaneously produce *krijgen*-passives with, say, *weigeren ‘refuse’ or schenken ‘give, present.’
In this respect, it is a relevant observation of the semantic range of the *krijgen*-passive in present-day Dutch that web examples can be found for verbs of prevention of possession but not — or hardly not, see footnote 14 — for verbs of dispossession, for instance. On the other hand, the complete absence of *krijgen*-passives in the NRC data with the verbs in question suggests that such uses are quite infrequent. This is corroborated by additional queries in a larger corpus. In a 200 million word sample consisting of the material in the Twente News corpus from 1998 to 2002, I searched for all instances of the participle forms of the verbs *weigeren* ‘refuse,’ *ontzeggen* ‘deny,’ *beletten* ‘block, prevent’ and *besparen* ‘spare’ (= the four verbs of prevention of possession most frequently attested in the active double object construction according to Colleman, 2006) combined with any form of the verb *krijgen* within a seven-word span. The manual analysis of the results from these queries produced a single instance of the *krijgen*-passive, featuring the verb *ontzeggen* ‘deny.’ The same procedure produced a mere 11, 4, and 5 *krijgen*-passive occurrences for *schenken* ‘give, present,’ *vertellen* ‘tell’ and *beloven* ‘promise,’ respectively. By comparison, queries for combinations of *aanbieden* ‘offer’ and *toewijzen* ‘assign’ with *krijgen* in a much smaller corpus, viz. the 9 million word newspaper corpus used for Colleman (2009b), produced 92 and 90 *krijgen*-passive instances, respectively (i.e., about 10 instances per one million words). In other words, whereas [SUBJ *krijgen NP aangeboden*] ‘<Subject> is offered <NP>’ and [SUBJ *krijgen NP toegewezen*] ‘<Subj> is assigned <NP>’ can be considered well-entrenched verb-specific sub-constructions of the *krijgen*-passive,
the same cannot be said of \[\text{SUBJ krijgen NP geweigerd} \] ‘<Subj> is refused <NP>’ etc.

3.2.4 Interim conclusion

Compared to the data from De Gids, the krijgen-passive is found with a somewhat more heterogeneous set of verbs in the latter half of the 20th century. This can be seen as the kind of semantic expansion that typically happens after constructionalization, as the newly emerged construction starts attracting an increasingly diverse set of lexical fillers (in this case, is extended to a larger variety of three-participant verbs), or -- in terms of Smirnova (this volume), displays a gradual loss of contextual constraints. More specifically, I have identified three post-constructionalization semantic shifts:

- the *krijgen*-passive has been extended to encode events of projected rather than actual transfer (most notably with *aanbieden* ‘offer’);
- in the class of communication verbs, the constraint against non-particle verbs seems to have relaxed a bit;
- the construction has been extended to encode two sub-types of ‘goal’ events and a cluster of beneficial/adversative uses (though it should be added that the first of these was already marginally present in the early 20th-century data, too, cf. example 29a).
The latter development is probably the most interesting one, as it shows that post-constructionalization semantic change in the *krij gen*-passive is not simply a matter of the construction progressively being extended to more sub-types of ‘caused reception,’ causing the *krij gen*-passive’s semantic range of application to cover an ever larger sub-region of the semantic range of the active double object construction. On the contrary, the *krij gen*-passive can be seen to be moving in a direction of its own, i.e. extending towards sub-regions of semantic space that are outside the range of application of the double object construction.

The second part of this sub-section has given an overview of the major sub-classes of ditransitive verbs that are absent from the NRC data, while stressing that this absence does not necessarily mean that the verbs in question are categorically banned from the *krij gen*-passive. Apart from the observation that a number of semantic classes are (virtually) absent from the data (verbs of prevention of possession, verbs of dispossession and verbs of attitude), the most important observation is that, in the present-day data, as well, there is still a predominance of particle verbs with double-participant particles.

4. Additional discussion

This section provides additional discussion of what can be gleaned from the diachronic corpus data with regard to two central questions about the Dutch *krij gen*-passive: (i) how exactly does the construction relate to the active double
object construction and (ii) what is the nature of the constraints on the *krijgen-*
passive?

4.1 The *krijgen*-passive vs. the active double object construction

Both the *krijgen*-passive and the active double object construction are three-
argument constructions which can be used to encode ditransitive scenes involving
an agent, theme and recipient. However, while the double object construction has
the default linking of the agent role to the grammatical subject function, the
*krijgen*-passive presents the scene from the perspective of the recipient
argument—which is why it deserves the label “passive.” The fact that it provides
speakers with a convenient alternative to the double object construction for
portraying ditransitive scenes has undoubtedly been an important factor in the
success of this “new” construction with *krijgen*. In her account of the German
*bekommen*-passive, Diedrichsen (2012) argues that the use of this construction is
functionally motivated by the fact that recipient arguments are often highly
accessible and topical, and hence ideal candidates for subjecthood. However, to
say that the *krijgen*-passive is functionally motivated by the desire to present a
ditranstive scene from the perspective of the recipient rather than the agent
argument is not the same as saying that the *krijgen*-passive is derived from the
active double object construction through some kind of syntactic passivization
mechanism. From the overview in the previous section, it is clear that the
semantic range of the *krijgen*-passive differs from that of the active double object
construction in important respects. On the one hand, the *krijgen*-passive cannot encode the full array of ‘(projected) possessional transfer’ scenes expressed by the double object construction; it is not an option for the portrayal of events of dispossession, for instance. Conversely, the *krijgen*-passive can encode certain kinds of three-participant events that cannot be expressed by means of the double object construction. The post-constructionalization extension towards spatial transfers with a goal rather than a recipient (e.g. *iets naar zich gegooid krijgen* ‘to get something thrown at oneself,’ *iets toegevoegd krijgen* ‘lit. to get added something’) and the further extension towards non-transfer events involving a beneficiary or maleficiary, such as *een straat naar zich genoemd krijgen* ‘to get a street named after oneself’ or *een penalty tegen zich gefloten krijgen* ‘to have a penalty whistled against oneself,’ show that the *krijgen*-passive is moving in a direction of its own, acquiring new semantic functions that are not shared with the double object construction. In sum, the *krijgen*-passive is an argument structure construction in its own right, with its own semantic dynamics, that cannot be reduced to the combination of the double object argument structure construction with a general passivization rule. As such, it is part of a family of ‘transfer’ constructions with overlapping, but by no means identical, semantic ranges. Next to the double object and *krijgen*-passive constructions, this family also includes the regular passive-ditransitive construction with *worden*, the *aan*-dative (*Jan geeft het boek aan Peter* ‘Jan gives the book to Peter’), as well as its passive equivalent (*Het boek wordt door Jan aan Peter gegeven* ‘The book is given to Peter by Jan’), and the plain transitive construction with lexical *krijgen*
(Peter krijgt het boek van Jan ‘Peter gets the book from John’). While all of these constructions can be used to encode several sub-types of ‘caused reception’ events, most of them also display a number of additional semantic functions, some of which are shared with one or several of the other constructions, while others are not. Note that this means that, from an onomasiological point of view, the traditional dative alternation is actually better thought of as an (at least) five-way alternation. When faced with the linguistic task of encoding a ‘caused reception’ event, speakers do not just make a binary choice between either the double object construction or the prepositional-dative, they also have several passive-ditransitive constructions at their disposal, including the krijgen-passive.

4.2 The constraints on the krijgen-passive

This sub-section returns to the “randomness” of the constraints on the krijgen-passive observed by several authors (but questioned by Broekhuis & Cornips, 2012). Why is it that certain (subclasses of) ditransitive verbs are excluded from — or at least not particularly welcomed by — the krijgen-passive, while they are perfectly eligible for use in the other ditransitive constructions mentioned in the previous sub-section? First of all, it should be observed that, since the krijgen-passive is an argument structure construction in its own right, it is only natural that it does not accommodate the very same array of ditransitive verbs and verb classes as, say, the active double object construction — but this does not exempt us from seeking an explanation for the observed contrasts. In what follows, a
distinction is made between two types of constraints which restrict the *krijgen*-passive’s range of application: semantic constraints related to persistence effects and morphological constraints.

### 4.2.1 Semantic persistence

The resistance of verbs of dispossession and verbs of attitude to the *krijgen*-passive can be seen as persistence effects in terms of Hopper (1991). The Principle of Persistence is defined as follows:

> When a form undergoes grammaticization from a lexical to a grammatical function, so long as it is grammatically viable some traces of its original lexical meanings tend to adhere to it, and details of its lexical history may be reflected in constraints on its grammatical distribution.

(Hopper, 1991, p. 22)

This straightforwardly applies to the above-mentioned verb classes, i.e. the ungrammaticality of the *krijgen*-passive can be related to the semantic incompatibility between participles of the verbs in question and the meaning of the lexical verb *krijgen* ‘get, receive.’ After all, in combinations such as *iets ontnomen krijgen* (lit. ‘to get something away-taken’) or *iets benijd krijgen* (lit. ‘to get something envied’), the subject referent does not actually “receive” anything, even in a metaphorical sense. I would argue that the virtual absence of verbs of refusal from the *krijgen*-passive is a persistence effect as well. The
position of Broekhuis & Cornips (2012) seems to be that the occurrence of *krijgen*-examples with *weigeren* ‘refuse’ and *ontzeggen* ‘deny’ on the Internet shows that there is no constraint against such verbs. This is one of the findings which leads them to conclude that *krijgen*-passivization is a far more general process than is often assumed. However, from a usage-based perspective, the fact that the combinations of *weigeren* ‘refuse’ and related verbs with the *krijgen* -passive are very rare is a relevant fact about the distribution of this construction, too; even if there may not be an absolute constraint against such uses, there surely is a statistical constraint (see also Stefanowitsch, 2006). Note that it is not at odds with an analysis in terms of semantic persistence that the use of the *krijgen*-passive with verbs of refusal is thus shown to be slightly less awkward than its use with verbs of dispossession. The indirect object referent in active clauses with *weigeren* ‘refuse’ etc. is a recipient, after all, though it is only the projected recipient of a blocked transfer, while the indirect object referent in active clauses with *ontnemen* ‘take away’ etc. is a possessional source.

In passing, it should be noted that the German *bekommen*-passive does accommodate verbs of dispossession (see the examples in 42), at least in the most tolerant idiolects (as pointed out by Lenz, 2012, among others, there is a lot of regional and idiolectal variation in the productivity of the *bekommen*-passive in German). This shows that the construction with *bekommen/kriegen* is less constrained, i.e. has a wider semantic range of application than the Dutch *krijgen*-passive — verbs of attitude such as *gönnen* ‘not begrudge, grant’ and *neiden*
‘envy,’ however, are ruled out in German, too (see, e.g., Leirbukt, 1997, p. 154: *

_Sie bekommt das Glück gegönnt_ ‘She gets her happiness granted’).

(42) a.  “_Ich finde es besser, Diamanten gestohlen zu bekommen, als keine zu besitzen._”
        I find it better diamonds stolen to get then none to possess
        “I find it better to have one’s diamonds stolen than to possess none.”

b.  _Er bekam den Führerschein entzogen._
        he got the driver’s license away-drawn
        “He was deprived of his driver’s license.”

(examples quoted in Leirbukt, 1997, pp. 74, 209)

In her brief discussion of the German _bekommen_-passive, Smirnova (this volume, note 7) suggests that the idea of semantic persistence is not readily compatible with a constructionist perspective on language change, which crucially shifts the focus from change in individual lexical items to contexts and constructions. I do not see why this should be a problem for the present analysis, however, so long as we do not frame these "persistence" effects as contextual restrictions on the use of the _krijgen_ verb as such, but as constraints on the lexical filling of a specific slot in a specific construction, i.e. the past participle slot in the [Subj [[_krijgen_ 'get' V.PSTP] Obj _van/door NP_]] construction.

4.2.2 Morphological constraints

As for the restrictions on the use of the _krijgen_-passive with verbs of transfer of possession and verbs of communication, Broekhuis & Cornips (2012), as was mentioned above, propose a single, general semantic constraint: such verbs are
only eligible for use in the *krijgen*-passive provided they specify the mode of transmission. It is this constraint that, in their view, rules out verbs such as *geven* ‘give,’ *schenken* ‘give, present,’ *verschaffen* ‘provide,’ *sturen* ‘send,’ *vertellen* ‘tell,’ *zeggen* ‘say’ and *schrijven* ‘write’ whereas verbs such as *aanbieden* ‘offer,’ *overhandigen* ‘hand,’ *vergoeden* ‘compensate,’ *toewijzen* ‘assign,’ *meedelen* ‘tell, communicate,’ *uitleggen* ‘explain,’ etc., pass the semantic filter (cf. Broekhuis & Cornips, 2012, pp. 1221-22). Instead of this rather vague and hardly operationalizable semantic constraint\(^1\), I would like to propose that the apparent randomness in the range of application of the *krijgen*-passive is the result of verb-class-specific morphological constraints. This alternative hypothesis crucially relies on the idea of the lexicality-schematicity hierarchy. In terms of Barðdal, Kristoffersen & Sveen (2011, p. 100), “lexicality–schematicity hierarchies […] make it possible to capture higher-level generalizations, while preserving verb-specific idiosyncratic behavior at the same time.” They present a model of the West-Scandinavian ditransitive construction in which the fully schematic [Sbj [Verb IO DO]] is located at the top of the hierarchy, with higher-level semantic categories, such as *ACTUAL TRANSFER, INTENTION, ENABLING,* etc., at the level below that, and verb-class-specific and verb-specific sub-constructions occupying the lower levels of the hierarchy. Some of these lower-level sub-constructions have idiosyncratic formal or semantic properties; for instance, in some verb-class-specific sub-constructions the indirect object has to be reflexive, while in others there is no such restriction. Sometimes the reflexivity constraint can even be seen operating at the lowest, verb-specific level — e.g. the Icelandic verb *kaupa* ‘buy’ can only get
a reflexive indirect object, whereas útvega ‘get,’ though also a verb of obtaining, can get non-reflexive indirect objects, too (Barðdal, Kristoffersen & Sveen, 2011, pp. 80-81).

A similar situation of lower-level constraints obtains in the Dutch krijgen-passive. Although the large majority of krijgen-passive tokens in the NRC data feature separable complex particle verbs, usually with a double-participant particle, it cannot be claimed that, at the level of the schematic construction, there is a constraint against other morphological classes of verbs — there are simply too many simplex and prefixed verbs in Table 4 for such a claim to have any validity. However, a good deal of these can be seen as belonging to two specific subclasses, viz. verbs of paying (betalen ‘pay,’ vergoeden ‘compensate,’ compenseren ‘compensate’) and verbs of sending or delivering (leveren ‘deliver, furnish,’ (thuis) zenden ‘send home’). In other words, in these particular subclasses, there is definitely no constraint against non-particle verbs. What is more, there never seems to have been such a constraint. In the ‘paying’ class, betalen ‘pay’ appears as early as its particle variant uitbetalen ‘pay out,’ and the simplex sending/delivering verbs are already present in the data from De Gids, too — though, in the latter case, there is another (non-categorical) constraint, namely that these verbs are usually combined with the adverbial thuis ‘at home.’ In subclasses of ‘possessional transfer’ verbs other than ‘paying’ and ‘delivering,’ however, as well as in the class of communication verbs, there is a constraint on krijgen-passives with non-particle verbs. In the communication class, this constraint seems to have relaxed a bit over time; as we have seen in Sub-section
3.2, the NRC data contain a number of instances with simplex verbs such as *tonen* ‘show’ and *mailen* ‘e-mail,’ though these are not particularly frequent. For verbs of giving, however, the constraint is still very strong; as we have noted above, there are only two (apparent) exceptions: *iets overhandigd krijgen* is licensed by the close formal similarity of *overhandigen* ‘hand over’ to particle verbs such as *overmaken* ‘make over, transfer,’ and the two semi-idiomatic expressions with *gepresenteerd krijgen* are best treated as separately stored verb-specific constructions. In this way, several verb-class-specific sub-constructions of the *krijgen*-passive are subject to a morphological constraint against non-particle verbs, albeit to varying degrees, whereas other sub-constructions are not subject to such a constraint at all. This situation is reminiscent of the so-called “Latinate restriction” on the English double object construction, which, as discussed in Goldberg (1995, pp. 125-129), is only operative on certain sub-constructions, too.¹⁷

For a final brief note, there are other contrasts between the different sub-constructions of the schematic *krijgen*-passive construction, as well. Another characteristic of the ‘paying’ and ‘delivering’ clusters of uses, for instance, is that these are the only verb-class-specific constructions which allow for the direct object to be null-instantiated, as in the corpus instances in (43). This is not possible with any of the other verb classes (e.g. *Hij kreeg toegewezen/opgespeld/uitgelegd/op het hoofd gezet/…* ‘He got assigned/pinned on/explained/put on the head/…’). This is another indication of the fact that
certain properties of the construction are best represented at lower levels in the lexicality-schematicity continuum.

(43) a. *Nee, na éénen kon je niet meer aan huis besteld krijgen.* *(De Gids, 1921)*
no after one could you not anymore at home delivered get
“No, you couldn’t get home delivery anymore after one o’ clock.”

b. *Pas wanneer het veiling-huis het bewijs van verzending heeft, krijgt de verkoper uitbetaald.* *(NRC, 1996)*
only when the auction-house the proof of has gets the seller out-paid
“Only when the auction house receives proof that the item has been sent, does the seller get paid.”

5. Conclusion

On the basis of data from *De Gids* and NRC *Handelsblad*, I have shown that, contra Broekhuis & Cornips (2012) and others, the Dutch *krijgen*-passive cannot be reduced to the combination of the active double object construction and some kind of general passivization rule, but rather is a full-fledged argument structure construction in its own right, with a semantic range that only partially overlaps with the semantic range of the active double object construction. The emergence of the construction seems to have been a coalescence of several threads; one of the major conclusions from the first part of the corpus investigation is that the *krijgen*-passive already covered a fairly broad semantic range in the first quarter of the 20th century, though the majority of observed tokens fall into one of four
semantic clusters, which make up four low-level subschemas, i.e. verb-class-specific constructions. The data from the latter half of the century have shown a number of semantic evolutions (i.e. instances of post-constructionalization semantic change): the construction’s semantic range has extended to include events of future/conditional possessional transfer, as well as certain events with a spatial goal rather than a recipient and even some beneficial/maleficial uses, and the constraint against non-particle verbs of communication has relaxed a bit. Other constraints have stayed in place — the construction is still resistant to *geven* ‘give’ and many of its non-particle hyponyms, for instance — though in a number of other, closely related semantic classes, simplex verbs seem to have occurred in the *krijgen*-passive right from the start (e.g. *betalen* ‘pay’). In this way, diachronic construction grammar presents a solution to the long-standing puzzle of the apparent randomness in the range of application of the *krijgen*-passive construction. This apparent randomness can be explained as resulting from a combination of semantic persistence effects and morphological constraints operating at lower levels in the lexicality-schematicity hierarchy, some of which have, in addition, become somewhat less strict over time.
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Tracing the history of deontic NCI patterns in Dutch: A case of polysemy copying

Timothy Colleman (Ghent University) & Dirk Noël (The University of Hong Kong)

Abstract

While the so-called “nominative-and-infinitive” (NCI) is no longer a productive construction in Dutch, the grammar of Present-day Dutch still contains a small set of lexically substantive NCI patterns, most notably geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te. Like their English formal equivalent be supposed to, these Dutch patterns can instantiate both evidential and deontic constructions, the latter being the most frequent one in Dutch. This paper focuses on the history of these deontic uses. We show that, with both patterns, the deontic use did not really take off until well into the second half of the 20th century and argue against an analysis in terms of grammaticalization along an (unlikely) ‘evidential to deontic’ path. Instead we present a language-contact hypothesis which attributes the development of the deontic uses of Dutch geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te to polysemy copying or distributional assimilation, English be supposed to providing the model. Additional evidence for the influence of English on this domain of Dutch grammar comes from the newly emerging lexically substantive NCI pattern verwacht worden te ‘be expected to’.

1. Introduction

As is well documented in a number of diachronic contrastive studies, the so-called “accusative-and-infinitive” (ACI) and “nominative-and-infinitive” (NCI) patterns have met with a dramatically different fate in Dutch compared to English (cf. Fischer 1994; Noël & Colleman 2009, 2010; Colleman & Noël 2012). Whereas both patterns were shared by the grammars of both languages a couple of centuries ago, they have remained productive only in English. In Dutch, the ACI has virtually disappeared from the grammar, and the NCI is no longer productive but is limited to a handful of verbs, most notably achten ‘consider, suppose’ and veronderstellen ‘suppose’. Examples of these verb-specific NCI patterns are given in (1) and (2).

(1) Chefs van afdelingen worden geacht excessief of nutteloos surfen te voorkomen. (ConDiv-NRC)
   ‘Heads of departments are supposed to prevent excessive and useless surfing.’
(2) Een abt wordt verondersteld in zijn abdij te vertoeven. (ConDiv-GVA)
   ‘An abbot is supposed to reside in his abbey.’

Note that the NCI patterns in these examples express a deontic meaning, just as the formally cognate English pattern be supposed to can do (cf. the English glosses), a pattern which is sometimes called a “semi-modal”, “quasi-modal” or “periphrastic modal” in the English grammatical literature (e.g. Depraetere & Reed 2006; Huddleston & Pullum 2002). Recently,
the development of the deontic use of be supposed to has drawn a fair amount of attention, also for reason that it has been taken to present a counterexample to the purportedly (quasi-)universal grammaticalization path from deontic to epistemic meanings (cf. Ziegeler 2003; Mair 2004; Visconti 2004; Berkenfield 2006; Moore 2007; Noël & van der Auwera 2009). The questions addressed in the present paper are when and how the Dutch patterns illustrated in (1) and (2) developed their deontic functions, and whether, and if so how, this development is related to the history of the English deontic NCI construction, which subsumes not only be supposed to but also be expected to.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents a more elaborate introduction to the form and function of the ACI and NCI constructions, and their history in English and Dutch. Next, as a preliminary to the analysis of the Dutch patterns geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te, section 3 briefly reviews two alternative hypotheses on the development of English deontic be supposed to that were (re-)examined in the recent literature referred to in the previous paragraph. Section 4 charts the presence of deontic NCIs in a number of diachronic and present-day Dutch corpora, and section 5 presents our hypothesis on the origin of the Dutch deontic patterns, which crucially refers to the views on grammatical replication developed in Heine & Kuteva (2003, 2005) and Gast & van der Auwera (2012). Section 6 briefly comments on another emerging lexical NCI pattern in Dutch, viz. verwacht worden te ‘be expected to’ and section 7 presents our conclusions.

2. The ACI and NCI constructions of English and Dutch: form, function, and diachrony

The accusative-and-infinitive, or “accusativus cum infinitivo” (whence the abbreviation “ACI”), is a pattern that consists of an active perception, cognition or utterance verb (which Givón 1990 has grouped as “P-C-U verbs”) complemented by a to/te-infinitive that has its own explicit subject, as illustrated by the underlined bits in (3) and (4). Both in Chomskyan and post-Chomskyan linguistics this pattern is usually referred to as “raising to object”, also outside formalist paradigms (see, e.g., Givón 1993). However, we have used the term borrowed from Latin grammar in previous work (Noël 2003, 2008; Noël & Colleman 2009, 2010) and will continue to do so here for reasons that will become clear below, having to do with the origin of the pattern.

(3) The former Lord Chancellor, Lord Hailsham, said he believed the scientific community to be a responsible one. (BNC A96 259)

(4) Elk meent zijn uil een valk te zijn. (Dutch proverb)
‘Everyone considers his owl to be a falcon.’

Our description, and the two examples, should make clear that what we are referring to is the pattern which is sometimes called the “genuine”, “learned” or “Latin-type” ACI (e.g., see

---

2 This section incorporates parts of Noël & Colleman (2010).

3 Another term used in work that links up with formalist linguistics is the Government and Binding expression “Exceptional Case Marking”, or its abbreviation, “ECM”.

The term “ACI” has also been used to refer to perception verbs and causative verbs (*make*, *let*) followed by “accusatives” and bare infinitives, and mandative verbs (e.g. *order*) followed by accusatives and *to*-infinitives, but these patterns fall out of the scope of this paper.

The nominative-and-infinitive, or “nominativus cum infinitivo” (whence “NCI”), consists of a passive P-C-U verb complemented by a to/te-infinitive, as in (5) and (6), and is often referred to as “raising to subject”.

(5) *BOMB DISPOSAL specialists were yesterday called out to beaches on the southwest coast of Scotland after Second World War phosphorus canisters believed to be from an undersea dump were washed ashore.* (BNC K5D 9706)

(6) *De boten worden geacht over een dag of vier Kaap Hoorn te ronden.* (ConDiv-Telegraaf)

‘The boats are predicted to round Cape Horn in about four days.’

The functionality of the ACI has received a considerable amount of attention in the linguistics of English, where it is usually contrasted with that of a matrix + *that*-clause construction, both in a synchronic (see Noël 1997, 2003; and the references there) and a diachronic perspective (see Fischer 1989, 1992; Los 2005; and the references there). However, while the terms “accusative and infinitive” and “ACI” are not unusual, especially in historical English linguistics, “nominative and infinitive” and “NCI” are not commonly used in Anglophone linguistics, since the NCI pattern is usually perceived as merely the passive counterpart of the ACI and consequently is not given independent attention. Largely the same is true of Dutch linguistics, where the ACI has mainly been treated in historical accounts (e.g. Duinhoven 1991; Fischer 1994), Zajicek (1970) being the only dedicated study of the ACI in Present-day Dutch. Since our focus is on the NCI, we will not elaborate on the functionality of the ACI here. As to the functionality of the NCI, we have proposed in Noël (2008) and Noël and Colleman (2009, 2010) that, both in English and in Dutch, NCI patterns usually have a symbolic value which is quite different from that of the passive and that therefore the NCI cannot in most cases be reduced to a combination of an ACI construction and the general passive construction. In construction grammar terms, the NCI is not merely the passive version of the ACI, but qualifies as a construction—or rather, a cluster of constructions—in its own right.

In English, both the ACI and the NCI patterns are productive morphosyntactic configurations that allow a great variety of P-C-U verbs. However, not only is the variety greater in the case of the NCI, the NCI is also generally more frequent than the ACI. In the 100-million-word British National Corpus (BNC), the overall ratio is almost three to one, but for some representatives of the P-C-U class figures are much more dramatic, to the point that some verbs do not display the active pattern at all (e.g. *say*, *rumour*, *repute*; see Noël 2001 for details). This is the observation that led us to suspect that the NCI is not just a passive, because passives are not normally more frequent than actives (see, e.g., Biber et al. 1999). We have proposed in Noël (2008) that most NCI patterns have at least three uses and that a distinction should be made between a plain passive NCI (as in 7), an evidential NCI (8) and a descriptive NCI (9). Only the first of these constitutes a mere combination of an ACI...
construction and the general passive construction. The other two are constructions in their own right, with specific semantic properties. The discussion of the examples will help to make clear this distinction.

(7) In this book authorities are said to be limited also by the kinds of reasons on which they may or may not rely in making decisions and issuing directives, and by the kind of reasons their decisions can pre-empt. (BNC ANH 148)

(8) AMERICAN ring doughnuts from The Delicious Donut Co are made from a flour which is said to give them a light, fluffy, and non-greasy consistency. (BNC A0C 1141)

(9) A market can be said to be a place where buyers and sellers meet to make an exchange of goods (or services). (BNC K8W 508)

We call the NCI in (7) a “plain passive” (even though no active “equivalent”, i.e. an ACI, with say is possible in Present-day English) because the meaning of the matrix verb (said) is very much part of the propositional meaning of the sentence, which refers to a spatiotemporally locatable utterance act: a statement made “in this book”. In this example the meaning of are said to is very much “on-stage” (cf. Langacker 1987): if you remove it, the sentence becomes nonsensical, or at the very least conveys an altogether different meaning (?In this book authorities are limited also by...). The NCI is used here for the same information packaging reasons that motivate the use of the passive generally (compare: The authors of this book say that authorities...). In (8) and (9), on the other hand, the meaning of the be said to pattern is “qualificational” (cf. Aijmer 1972: 39; Nuyts 2001: 113). These sentences do not report on a specific utterance act. The meaning of be said to is “off-stage” here and you can safely remove the pattern, so that said can be argued to no longer be a matrix verb, but to be part of an auxiliary-like construction that modifies the meaning of the infinitive. (8) and (9) have in common that the NCI is not used for information structural reasons (since it can be left out: ....a flour which gives them..., A market is a place...), but they differ in that they illustrate two different form-meaning pairings. In (8) the modifying construction has an evidential function, i.e. its writer uses the pattern to indicate that s/he has a source for the information s/he is conveying, so that s/he is not the (sole) judge of the factuality of the statement that American ring doughnuts are light, fluffy, and non-greasy (see Noël 2008 for further elaboration). In (9) the modifying construction connects a description with a descriptum (see Goossens 1991).

Other frequent instantiations of the “evidential NCI construction” in Present-day English are be alleged to, be assumed to, be believed to, be claimed to, be considered to, be deemed to, be estimated to, be expected to, be felt to, be found to, be held to, be known to, be reported to, be seen to, be shown to, be supposed to, be taken to, be thought to and be understood to (Noël 2008). Whether these can all realize the “descriptive NCI construction” as well remains to be seen. Highly relevant to our present purpose, however, is that two of these patterns can carry the additional meaning illustrated in (10) and (11).

(10) Pupils are expected to use their Maths to solve problems. (BNC K9X 434)

(11) You were supposed to do six and you only did four! (BNC KST 788)
In these examples *be expected to* and *be supposed to* instantiate a “deontic NCI construction”. They can be paraphrased with “Pupils should use their Maths to solve problems” and “You should have done six and you only did four” (see Collins 2009: 80 on the semantic affinity between *be supposed to* and the modal *should*, as well as the much less frequent modal *ought to*). The following examples illustrate that the same patterns can also be the realization of a plain passive (12-13) and the evidential NCI construction (14-15).

(12) *Standards for exposure to benzene are expected by the UK government to be set in 1993: a level of 3 ppb is under consideration, although according to the World Health Organization there is “no known safe threshold dose”.* (BNC JC3 608)

(13) *The mechanism supposed by Miller (1948) to underlie acquired equivalence is that introduced by Hull (1939) with his notion of secondary generalization.* (BNC APH 1337)

(14) *The Japanese economy is expected to grow by only 3.8% during fiscal 1991 compared with this year’s 5.2%.* (BNC ABD 953)

(15) *Napoleon is supposed to have said “An army marches on its stomach.”* (BNC A77 422)

*Be supposed to* has yet another use, illustrated in (16) and (17).

(16) *The race was supposed to be taking place in blazing sunshine, but the sun refused to come out and there was even some rain.* (BNC HRF 1117)

(17) *I didn’t think much of the first time really. It wasn’t how I imagined it. I thought you were supposed to enjoy it, and it was half and half really.* (BNC FU1 147)

Visconti (2004: 185) terms this the “epistemic” use of *be supposed to*, because it “evokes a possible world, a state of affairs which would be expected to occur but does not”, often in contexts containing “counterfactual signals” like *but, in fact, in reality, …* To our mind, however, “counterfactual” is the operative word here, rather than “epistemic”, because no judgement of the (un)certainty or probability of a proposition (cf. van der Auwera & Plungian 1998: 81) is involved.

In Dutch the ACI and NCI are much less “part of the grammar” than in English. To illustrate the ACI construction in Present-day Dutch we resorted to presenting an archaism in (4), obviously a relic from a time when the pattern was more common in Dutch than it is now, because modern examples of the pattern are very hard to come by. In historical accounts the ACI is said to have had two usage peaks (see, e.g., Duinhoven 1991). It occurred more than sporadically at the start of the Middle Dutch period (generally taken to span the time from 1200 to 1500), but rapidly grew out of fashion again during that period. Later it enjoyed a brief moment of popularity in the early stages of Modern Dutch (late 16th and 17th century), mainly in the formal writings of authors who had had a classical training (Van Leuvensteijn 1997). Subsequently it disappeared from the language, barring a few relics (e.g., Duinhoven 1991; Fischer 1994). Zajicek (1970: 203) claims that the ACI still occurs with a limited set of P-C-U verbs in very formal administrative and didactic texts, but Duinhoven (1991: 425) questions the grammaticality of most of the examples he offers, though he recognizes that the
ACI is not altogether impossible in relative clauses. The Dutch NCI, on the other hand, has survived better than the ACI, but it is a far less prolific pattern there than in Present-day English. Corpus research of our own (Noël & Colleman 2009) revealed that the only patterns occurring today with any frequency are *geacht worden te* (‘be considered/supposed to’), *verondersteld worden te* (‘be supposed to’) and, to a lesser extent, *verwacht worden te* (‘be expected to’). While the 20 most frequent NCI patterns in Present-day English occur with a frequency of 340.47 tokens per million words in the entire BNC, and with a frequency of 433.45 and 710.53 tokens per million words respectively in a newspaper and a natural sciences sub-corpus of it, these three Dutch patterns together only occur with a frequency of 4.4 tokens per million words in a fragment of about 12.5 million words of the newspaper component of the Dutch ConDiv corpus. This is just about the frequency the Dutch NCI had overall in the second half of the 17th century (4.21 tokens per million words). What happened in between then and the end of the 20th century was first a relatively steep overall frequency rise till some point in the 18th century (to 17.8 tokens per million words), followed by a more gentle overall drop in frequency. The currently most frequent NCI pattern, *geacht worden te*, did not follow this pattern, however, and has seen a steady but very mild increase in its frequency since the 17th century, while *(ver)ondersteld worden te* was first in line with the overall drop after an 18th-century high, but then picked up again (for details, see Noël & Colleman 2009). As we will discuss further below, *verwacht worden te* is a later introduction.

Like the English NCI, the Dutch NCI is not simply a passive. Arguably, the examples in (18-19) are plain passives relevantly similar to the English plain passive NCI in (7) above, in that the meanings of *achten* and *veronderstellen* are on-stage: these instances report on someone—the organisers of the election in (18), the 19th century practitioners of phrenology in (19)—considering or supposing something to be the case. However, like in English, such examples account for a small minority of NCI examples only. Nowadays, Dutch NCI examples most often instantiate a deontic NCI construction (20-21), less often an evidential NCI construction (22-23) and occasionally also a descriptive NCI construction (24-25). We are exemplifying all of these uses here for *geacht worden te* and *verondersteld worden te* only (for examples of *verwacht worden te*, see section 5).

(18)  
*En dus werd er een truc bedacht. Iedereen die grond had in een te verkavelen gebied, mocht meestemmen over het doorgaan van de verkaveling ... Kwamen ze niet dan werden ze geacht voor te zijn.* (ConDiv-De Limburger)  
‘So a trick was thought up. Everyone who possessed land in an area designated for allocation was allowed to participate in a vote on whether the scheme should go ahead. If they did not show up, they were considered to be in favour of it.’

(19)  
*Zijn hoofdstukje over de frenologie - een ... negentiende-eeuwse tak van de medische wetenschap, waarbij uitwendige schedelkenmerken verondersteld werden hoedanigheden van de hersenen te weerspiegelen - is zelfs rondt hilarisch.* (INL-De Standaard)  
‘His chapter on phrenology – a 19th-century branch of medical science according to which the shape of the skull was supposed to reflect properties of the brain – is positively hilarious even.’
(20) *Chefs van afdelingen worden geacht excessief of nutteloos surfen te voorkomen.* (ConDiv-NRC)

‘Heads of departments are supposed to prevent excessive and useless surfing.’

(21) *Iedereen wordt dan verondersteld met het Klein Gevaarlijk Afval naar de containerparken te gaan.* (ConDiv-Laatste Nieuws)

‘Everyone is then supposed to take the Small Toxic Waste to the recycling centre.’

(22) *Ze werden populair bij atleten en wielrenners omdat meer rode bloedlichaampjes worden geacht een “zuurstofvoorsprong” te geven.* (ConDiv-NRC)

‘They [EPO hormones] became popular with athletes and cyclists because more red blood cells are thought to give an “oxygen advantage”.’

(23) *De belangen van personages blijken uit hun handelingen en die roepen bij het publiek bepaalde affectieve disposities op jegens hen: positief (met empathie als gevolg) of negatief (onverschilligheid of anti-empathy als reactie). Ook het uiterlijk van personages wordt verondersteld een rol te spelen in die dispositie, hetgeen nadrukkelijk bevestigd is in experimenteel onderzoek.* (web example: www.ethesis.net/dramafilms/dramafilms_inhoud.htm; last accessed on 17 March 2012)

‘The interests of characters are obvious from their actions, which evoke certain affective dispositions towards them in the audience: positive ones (resulting in empathy) or negative ones (indifference or anti-empathy as a reaction). Also the outward appearance of characters is assumed to play a part in this disposition, which has been confirmed by experimental research.’

(24) *Kan de rechterlijke macht, nu in ons constitutioneel staatsbestel alle machten van de natie uitgaan, geacht worden de natie te vertegenwoordigen?* (ConDiv-Standaard)

‘Since in our constitutional system all powers are vested in the nation, can the judicial power be supposed to represent the nation?’

(25) *[…] ook de programmering van de radio- en televisieprogramma’s mag verondersteld worden een breed publiek aan te spreken.* (ConDiv-NRC)

‘… also the scheduling of the radio and television broadcasts may be supposed to appeal to a large audience.’

*Geacht worden te* and *verondersteld worden te* can be used counterfactually as well, as in (26) and (27).

(26) *[Het tv-programma bestaat uit] studiogesprekken met ‘Prominenten’ van het vierde garnituur op de bank, die geacht worden interessante dingen over hun seksleven te vertellen aan een zekere Verona Feldbusch.* (ConDiv-Telegraaf)

‘The television show consists of studio talks with fourth-class ‘celebrities’, who are supposed to tell interesting things about their sex lives to one Verona Feldbusch.’ (but it is clear from the context that the writer finds these sex live stories uninteresting)
De aanklager werd verondersteld de kinderen te verdedigen. (ConDiv-Standaard)
‘The prosecutor was supposed to defend the children.’ (but it is clear from the context that he did not)

Though there is no complete consensus on the origin of the ACI and the NCI in English and Dutch, the two late-20th-century authorities on these structures in English historical linguistics, Warner (1982) and Fischer (1989, 1992, 1994), agree that these patterns are calques from Latin which became thoroughly entrenched in the grammar of English in the 15th century. In Dutch historical linguistics the debate on whether they are native or of Latin origin seems not to have been settled yet (for a summary and references, see Noël & Colleman 2009: 166), but there is agreement at least that when these patterns (again) acquired a certain popularity in Early Modern Dutch (between 1500 and 1650) this was due to the influence of Latin. We have established in previous work (Noël 2008; Noël & Colleman 2009) that what was calqued was not just a plain passive NCI, but that an evidential NCI already existed in Latin, though the evidential function of the Dutch NCI surfaced later than that of the English NCI and was never exploited to the same extent (Noël & Colleman 2010; Colleman & Noël 2012). Latin did not have a deontic NCI, however, so that the origin of both the English and the Dutch NCI constructions needs to be sought elsewhere.

3. The development of the deontic NCI in English

The majority view in the recent work on English be supposed to referred to in section 1 is that its deontic use only gained momentum towards the end of the 19th century, to become firmly entrenched in the course of the 20th century, and that it is a continued grammaticalization of its evidential use (Ziegeler 2003, Visconti 2004, Moore 2007). Much earlier, however, Traugott (1989: 46, n. 11) had suggested, in a footnote to a paper on the rise of epistemic meanings in English, that what she termed “epistemic” (while intending “evidential”) be supposed to and the deontic use of the pattern were the results of two separate developments, positing that when the verb suppose entered the English language as a borrowing from Middle French, it had two meanings, ‘expect [to happen]’ and ‘hypothesize [that something is the case]’. Suppose ‘expect’ first “developed a deontic of intention” and “ultimately […] a stronger deontic of obligation” meaning, while suppose ‘hypothesize’ led to the evidential pattern. Noël & van der Auwera (2009) went looking for, and found, evidence for this in the online Middle English Dictionary and the online Oxford English Dictionary, connecting data on suppose with data on expect. They established that suppose and expect covered a shared meaning spectrum for at least two centuries (the 17th and the 18th), from ‘to believe that something will happen’ over ‘to intend to do something’ to ‘to want somebody to do something/obligation’. Active suppose lost these meanings, maybe because expect, which entered the English language much later than suppose, had taken over this semantic niche.

4 The Latin origin of the ACI/NCI does not constitute the crux of either Warner’s (1982) or Fischer’s (1989, 1992, 1994) contributions to the history of these patterns in English (and Dutch in the case of Fischer 1994), but it is the bit that is relevant to our general point in this paper about the importance of language contact in this grammatical area.
while deontic be supposed to, which started to appear in the 17th century, had probably got sufficiently entrenched to survive next to deontic be expected to.

Important for the argumentation we will present below (in section 5) on the origin of the Dutch deontic NCI are the two main reasons offered by Noël & van der Auwera (2009: 616-617) for the unlikeliness of evidential be supposed to having developed into the deontic pattern. The first reason is that the evidential NCI has a qualificational, off-stage, meaning, whereas the meaning of the deontic NCI is propositional, on-stage—note that leaving out be supposed to from example (11) above would result in a description of an entirely different state of affairs. What happens in grammaticalization, however, is that propositional patterns “turn into” qualificational constructions, not the other way round (cf. Sweetser 1990, Chapter 3, on the historical relation between content and non-content modals). The second reason is the empirical fact that be supposed to and be expected to are the only two deontic NCI patterns in English. The evidential NCI, on the other hand, is a highly productive construction and towards the end of the Early Modern English period (late 17th century) be thought to was a pattern with a frequency of occurrence very close to that of be supposed to (Noël 2008; Noël & Colleman 2009). The difference in meaning between evidential be thought to and evidential be supposed to is minimal, however, so that if the evidential were the source construction for the deontic construction in the case of be supposed to, one would expect there also to be a deontic be thought to construction. If there is a difference in meaning between evidential be supposed to and evidential be thought to, it should be one that predisposes be supposed to to develop into a deontic construction, but it is difficult to see what this could be. The absence of deontic be thought to therefore makes evidential be supposed to a doubtful source of the deontic construction.

4. Deontic NCIs in Dutch corpora

We can now turn to the Dutch deontic NCI and its history. In order to plot the presence, past and present, of deontic examples of geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te in Dutch, we queried the corpora listed below, representing several substages of Modern Dutch, from the mid-17th century onwards, for all occurrences of the past participle forms geacht and verondersteld combined with the infinitival particle te within a 10-word span:

- a self-compiled corpus of literary Dutch which consists of extracts from texts available online from the Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren (Digital Library of Dutch Literature) and the Project Gutenberg (mainly prose) and which spans the period 1640-1920; the corpus is divided into four seventy-year subperiods, with a size ranging from 1.2 to 3.5 million words of running text;
- four five-year snapshots from the corpus De Gids, which contains the first 100 volumes of the Dutch literary and cultural periodical De Gids (‘The Guide’), viz. 1850-54 (3 million words), 1870-74 (4.3 million words), 1900-04 (4 million words) and 1930-34 (2.9 million words);

For veronderstellen, we also included the past participle of the now-obsolete morphological variant onderstellen in the queries, i.e. ondersteld.
• the diachronic part of the ConDiv corpus, which contains material from Dutch and Belgian newspapers dating from the years 1958 and 1978, adding up to about 3 million words of running text for both years;
• the newspaper component of the present-day ConDiv-corpus, with material from Dutch and Belgian newspapers dating from 1998 and immediately surrounding volumes, which adds up to 17 million words of running text (Grondelaers et al. 2000);
• the 38-million-word corpus of written Dutch compiled at the Institute for Dutch Lexicology, which is a bit more heterogeneous in terms of register, including news reporting articles as well as fictional and non-fictional prose, popular magazines, academic prose, etc., the large majority of texts dating from the early 1990s (Kruyt & Dutilh 1997).

Across all the above corpora, we found 378 NCI instances for *achten* and 74 NCI instances for *veronderstellen*. The distribution of these instances over the semantic categories distinguished in section 2 is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

@@ Insert Table 1 about here

@@ Insert Table 2 about here

The general picture emerging from these tables is that, with both verbs, pre-1978 deontic instances are rare—even though for *veronderstellen*, we have to be cautious, given the overall infrequency of the NCI pattern. Moreover, the sporadic pre-1978 deontic instances we detected might just be the result of our present-day cognitive perspective, i.e. the earlier instances may have been open to alternative interpretations, even though interpretations other than a deontic one are less obvious to present-day Dutch speakers. The figures presented in Tables 1 and 2 are based on functional analyses of the attested NCI patterns that were first done independently by both authors and then compared to determine inter-analyst agreement, but, as everyone with research experience in diachronic semantics and/or pragmatics will be painfully aware, the functional interpretation of instances from older language stages is a tricky task, especially when fine-grained distinctions of modality are concerned, since it is almost impossible for the researcher to avoid bringing to bear present-day functional categories in the analysis of older data. We classified instances as deontic as soon as a deontic interpretation appeared to be the most likely one to us, fully aware, however, that, in case of the earliest examples, at a time when the deontic construction was much less entrenched as it is now, this may not have been the intended interpretation. A pertinent illustration is provided by the example in (28), from the 1930 volume of *De Gids*.


‘Soeur Padua draws open the curtains, making a jingling sound. You are supposed to be out of bed and wearing your stockings. You’re in a nervous hurry now: it would be shameful if the open curtain were to reveal you still lying in bed.’
We counted this as an early example of deontic *geacht worden te*, since a deontic interpretation appeared to us to be the most likely one (i.e., ‘By convent rule, you have to be out of bed and wearing your stockings before a given hour’). However, a plain passive interpretation may at the time have been more likely (i.e., ‘It is assumed by the sisters that everyone will be out of bed and wearing their stockings by a given hour’, which is why Soeur Padua thinks nothing wrong of drawing open the curtains without prior warning). Similarly, (29) is the earliest example in the database of *verondersteld worden te* classified as deontic, but an evidential interpretation cannot be ruled out either (i.e., ‘it is imperative for a serious researcher to be aware of the major laws of language’ vs. ‘serious researchers are thought to be aware of the major laws of language’).

(29) *Zulk spelen met woorden is den ernstigen onderzoeker, die verondersteld wordt de opperste wetten te kennen, die in eene taal heersen, onwaardig.* (De Gids, 1853)

‘This kind of word play is unworthy of a serious researcher, who is supposed to be aware of the supreme laws operating in a language.’

However, given that we only discerned a few isolated pre-1978 deontic instances, we thought there was little point in working with mixed (‘either… or…’) categories, or with a single ‘undecided’ category. We can indeed be more confident about our identification of deontic instances appearing in later stages, like the ones in the present-day examples in (30) and (31), in which the infinitival clause clearly denotes some kind of external obligation resting upon the subject referent, other interpretations being extremely unlikely. In the present-day data, deontic uses constitute by far the largest category, accounting for about half of all attested NCI instances with both verbs.

(30) *De Indiaanse, Afrikaanse, Latijns-Amerikaanse en Creoolse invloeden klinken volop door op deze eilanden, waar de mannen geacht worden volop macho te zijn.* (ConDiv-NRC)

‘The Indian, African, Latin American and Creole influences are evident on these islands, where men are supposed to be firmly macho.’

(31) *Jullie mannen in het bezit van een voorhuid moeten weten dat JA!, jullie worden verondersteld om hem ‘daaronder’ ook te wassen.* (INL38-Playboy)

‘You men in the possession of a foreskin need to know that YES!, you are supposed to wash it “underneath” as well.’

All in all, therefore, the results from the corpus investigation suggest that the deontic use of the NCI in Dutch did not become prevalent until well into the second half of the 20th century.

---

6 Also note the addition of *om* ‘for’ before the to-infinitive in (31), a recent phenomenon that appears to be limited to deontic (and perhaps counterfactual) uses, as the addition of *om* to evidential and descriptive uses of the kind illustrated in (22) to (25) is impossible, at least in our idiolects. Both authors are native speakers of Belgian Dutch, but the intuition is shared by Olga Fischer (p.c.), a speaker of Netherlandic Dutch. We leave it to future research to look into the semantic relation between NCIs with and without *om* in more detail.
5. The source of the Dutch deontic NCI

Consequently, the firm establishment (or conventionalization) of geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te as deontic constructions seems to postdate the entrenchment of the corresponding English pattern be supposed to. As for the source of the deontic use of the Dutch patterns, the first explanation that might come to mind is that they have undergone the same ‘volitive to deontic’ grammaticalization path first hypothesized by Traugott (1989) for be supposed to, and extended to be expected to by Noël & van der Auwera (2009) (see section 3). However, there is no support for this hypothesis to be gleaned from the semantic history of the active verbs achten and veronderstellen. First, the lengthy lexical descriptions of these verbs in the diachronic Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal (WNT) [Dictionary of the Dutch Language] do not contain any sense or sub-sense that is even remotely like the ‘intend to do’ senses of suppose (now-obsolete) and expect, explicitly identified for the former verb in the Oxford English Dictionary, but also found to exist in the case of the latter by Noël & van der Auwera (2009). Second, we conducted an extra check on the compatibility of such a sense with the Dutch verbs by manually inspecting the results of queries for all forms of achten and veronderstellen—so not just the past participle form this time—combined with the infinitival particle te within a 10-word span in the entire 10-million-word diachronic corpus of literary modern Dutch (1640-1920). The results of this test are unequivocal. Achten does not combine with an infinitival equi-clause at all; (ver)onderstellen does, but only in a ‘suppose, imagine, hypothesize’ sense, as in (32). This makes it very unlikely that either of the two verbs has ever displayed a ‘deontic of intention’ sense.

(32) Wanneer de jongeling ten slotte te bed lag, schrikte hij meer dan eens op en veronderstelde de doodsklok gehoord te hebben. (Stijns, Hard Labeur, 1904)
‘When the young man was finally in bed, he startled more than once and supposed to have heard the death bell.’

An alternative hypothesis is that, unlike in English, the deontic NCI did develop from the evidential NCI in Dutch. This, however, is most unlikely, too, for the very same reasons as the ones adduced by Noël & van der Auwera (2009) against the ‘evidential to deontic’ path for be supposed to (see section 3). In Dutch deontic constructions are no less propositional, and evidential constructions no less qualificational, than they are in English. Plus, supposing for the sake of argument that deontic geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te could have developed out of the respective evidential constructions, it remains unexplained why these were the only two substantive NCI patterns to evolve in this way. There used to be several other substantive NCI patterns in the grammar of Dutch, with verbs of cognition which encoded evidential meanings very similar to geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te, including gerekend worden te ‘be reckoned to’, geloofd worden te ‘be believed to’, beschouwd worden te ‘be considered to’: the corpus frequencies reported in Noël & Colleman (2010) show that such patterns were part of Dutch grammar for three centuries or longer, from the earliest stages of Modern Dutch until well into the 19th century, and in some cases even the 20th century. If there were such a thing as a natural ‘evidential to deontic’
grammaticalization path, it would have been very strange indeed for only two of the many potential source patterns to have evolved in this way.

Instead, the explanation we would like to put forward is that the development of the deontic function in *geacht worden te* and *verondersteld worden te* in Dutch is a contact-induced phenomenon, viz. a specific sub-type of grammatical replication. A particular contact phenomenon discussed at some length by Heine & Kuteva (2003: 555-561, 2005: 100-103) is “polysemy copying”, which roughly proceeds along the following steps:

1. in a first stage, a marker of one language and a marker of some contact language have overlapping functions, or one of the markers is more specific than the other;
2. as a consequence of language contact, the functional range of the two markers may be aligned, so that the marker of the target language comes to express more or less the same range of meanings/functions as the marker of the model language.

Gast & van der Auwera (2012) speak of “semantic map assimilation” in this respect: typically, the model language marker is the more polysemous one of the pair, and the target language marker extends its territory so that it comes to cover largely the same region in functional-semantic space. An important prerequisite for this kind of assimilation to take place is of course that the target language speakers identify the markers from the two languages as relevantly similar in one way or another.\(^7\)

The development of the deontic functions of the substantive NCI patterns *verondersteld worden te* and *geacht worden te* could very well be due to this kind of assimilation. To begin with, if the results of the corpus investigation reported on in the previous section are anything to go by, this development took place in (the second half of) the 20th century, a period of unprecedented potential for contact influence of English on Dutch because of the enormous increase in the “consumption” of English by speakers of Dutch. And second, the interlingual identification of Dutch *geacht worden te* and *verondersteld worden te* with English *be supposed to* is unproblematic: not only did these patterns match syntactically and did they share a number of specialized semantic functions (viz. the evidential and the descriptive functions), the active Dutch verbs *achten/veronderstellen* and English *suppose* also display an important overlap in lexical meaning. However, the English NCI pattern was more polyvalent in that, in addition to the evidential and descriptive functions, it was also associated with a deontic function. Hence, the development of this particular function in the corresponding Dutch pattern has all the hallmarks of a case of polysemy copying, or, in Gast and van der Auwera’s terminology, of semantic map assimilation.

---

\(^7\) Olga Fischer (p.c.) has suggested that there might be little difference between polysemy copying/semantic map assimilation and the much older concept of “semantic loans”, which is referred to by Weinreich (1968 [1953]: 48) and Haugen (1950: 220). To Weinreich (1968 [1953]: 48) this is a kind of “interference” between languages which “involves the extension of the use of an indigenous word of the influenced language in conformity with a foreign model”. More specifically, “[i]f two languages have semantemes, or units of content, which are partly similar, the interference consists in the identification and adjustment of the semantemes to fuller congruence.” For Haugen (1950: 215), semantic loans are a kind of “loanshift”, which, unlike “loanwords”, “appear in the borrowing language only as functional shifts of native morphemes”. In our opinion, both Heine & Kuteva (2003, 2005) and Gast & van der Auwera (2012) have added precision to the characterization of the phenomenon. We judge the former’s term “polysemy copying” to be the most graphic one available to refer to it.
It is interesting to dwell on this concept of polysemy copying a bit longer. Heine & Kuteva (2003, 2005) contrast polysemy copying with a much more common kind of grammatical convergence, viz. “contact-induced grammaticalization” (CIG), in which case, in order to replicate a grammatical category of the model language, the target language speakers grammaticalize an existing target language category, drawing on universal strategies of grammaticalization. This is not what we claim to have taken place with the Dutch NCI patterns geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te, however, for such a view in terms of CIG would, again, imply the unlikely existence of an ‘evidential to deontic’ grammaticalization path. Hence, while we do not wish to dispute Heine & Kuteva’s argument that many cases that are seemingly instances of polysemy copying are in fact better thought of as CIG, the development of deontic meanings in the Dutch NCI patterns does seem to represent a straightforward case of polysemy copying without grammaticalization. According to Heine & Kuteva (2005: 102), what distinguishes such sporadic cases of plain polysemy copying from grammaticalization “is that the former does not appear to involve intermediate stages of evolution”, but this does not mean of course that polysemy copying happens overnight. Gast & van der Auwera’s (2012: 392-93) discussion of semantic map assimilation makes a useful distinction between “uses” and “routines”. As speakers interlingually identify a more polysemous model language marker with a target language marker, they will start using the target language marker in functions outside of its initial semantic range (but inside of the model language marker’s range). At this early stage, such uses are creative and ad hoc, but as they spread across the community, they conventionalize into new routines. In this view, the pre-1978 instances of deontic geacht/verondersteld worden te found sporadically in the diachronic corpora qualify as novel uses, while the relatively large frequencies in the INL and ConDiv data testify to the existence of a new conventionalized routine in present-day Dutch.

It is hard, if not impossible, to find solid empirical proof for such a polysemy copying hypothesis: we will never be able to tell with any certainty whether the Dutch speakers who first, innovatively, extended the use of geacht/verondersteld worden te into the deontic domain did so under the influence of English be supposed to or not. However, the story is plausible enough, and there is some circumstantial evidence in the form of other recent evolutions in the syntax and productivity of the Dutch NCI which point towards English influence. First, consider the example from the Dutch broadsheet NRC Handelsblad in (33), from an article which reports on the sentiments of members of an audience after a film premiere.

(33) Er klonken kwalificaties als ‘tragi-komisch’ en het veelgehoorde: „Wat ben ik verondersteld hiervan te denken?”. (ConDiv-NRC)

‘There were labellings like “tragicomical” and the often-heard “What am I supposed to think of this?”’

According to the “normal” rules of Dutch grammar, the auxiliary should be _word_ here (the 1st-person singular form of the verb _worden_ ‘become’), not _ben_ (the 1st-person singular form of _zijn_ ‘be’), since the Dutch passive uses the auxiliary _worden_ in imperfect tenses and _zijn_ in perfect tenses (see, e.g., Zwart 2011: 14). Probably, _wat ben ik verondersteld te Vinf_ is a direct calque of English _what am I supposed to Vinf_. The example in (33) is direct speech, but
similar examples from written registers are easily found on the Internet: (34) is from a document from the website of the Dutch national government.

(34) De lessen (voor zover die er zijn) worden gegeven aan het eind van de dag, en je bent geacht om om 09.00 uur op school te zijn. <www.rijksoverheid.nl/bestanden/documenten-en.../22144e.pdf> (last accessed on 14 March 2012)

‘Classes (as far as there are any) are taught at the end of the day, and you are supposed to be in school at 9 p.m.’

Another innovation that is most probably due to English influence, is the introduction of the substantive NCI pattern verwacht worden te ‘be expected to’. This is the topic of the next section.

6. Verwacht worden te: further evidence of English influence

In Noël & Colleman (2009), we pointed out that there are three substantive NCI patterns which occur with any frequency in corpora representing (non-casual registers of) present-day written Dutch: in addition to geacht worden te and verondersteld worden te, there is also verwacht worden te ‘be expected to’. This latter pattern is substantially less frequent than the other two, and is probably not universally accepted, but it does occur now and then. (35) and (36) present a deontic and an evidential example, respectively; both are from newspaper articles.

(35) Het steekt bij ons dat we worden verwacht om dingen te doen waarvoor we gewoon geen tijd hebben. Vooral de individuele aandacht voor kinderen die moeite hebben de lessen bij te houden, gaat al snel verloren. (INL38-Meppeler Courant)

‘It galls us that we are expected to do things for which we simply have not got the time. Giving individual attention to kids who are experiencing difficulties in keeping up is something which is often left over.’

(36) De labresultaten worden verwacht klaar te zijn eind oktober. (ConDiv-Laatste Nieuws)

‘The lab results are expected to be ready by the end of October.’

Interestingly, verwachten ‘expect’—though it is of course a P-C-U verb—seems not to have occurred in the ACI or NCI constructions in earlier stages of Dutch: queries for all forms of the verb followed by te within a span of 10 words in our 10-million-word diachronic corpus of literary Dutch (1640-1920) did not produce a single instance. Hence, verwacht worden te is a new pattern, and one that cannot be attributed to a general increase in the productivity of the Dutch NCI, given that we have observed exactly the opposite development to have been taking place for over two centuries (Noël & Colleman 2009, 2010). Considering the level of contact between English and Dutch speakers in the post-World War II era and the position of be expected to in the frequency ranking of English NCI patterns (Noël 2008), it becomes highly plausible that Dutch verwacht worden te is a grammatical calque of the cognate
English pattern. Note that this is a different development from the one we have documented in the previous section: whereas *geacht worden te* and *verondersteld worden te* were existing lexical NCI patterns which extended their functional-semantic range, the *verwacht worden te* pattern is a *formal* extension of the Dutch NCI. However, as a different-natured development, it reinforces the evidence for the influence of English in this domain of Dutch grammar.

7. Conclusion

Noël & van der Auwera (2009) have argued against a view of the deontic “quasi-modal” *be supposed to* in English as a grammaticalization of the evidential pattern *be supposed to*, one of the many specific instantiations of the schematic evidential NCI construction. Instead, they adduced evidence that the deontic use has developed from a now-obsolete ‘volitive’ use of the active verb *suppose*. Similarly, deontic *be expected to* has its roots in the volitive sense of active *expect*, not in the homomorphic evidential pattern. This explains why the grammar of English contains two lexically substantive deontic NCI patterns only, next to a very productive, schematic, evidential NCI construction. In Dutch, the deontic uses of *geacht worden te* and *verondersteld worden te* cannot be traced back to volitive senses of the corresponding active verbs, as it is very unlikely that *achten* and *veronderstellen* ever conveyed such a meaning. This does not entail that the Dutch deontic patterns did develop from their evidential equivalents. Instead, we have proposed an analysis in terms of polysemy copying which attributes the deontic function of the Dutch NCI patterns to an extension in their functional-semantic range resulting from interlingual identification with the more polysemous English pattern *be supposed to*. The recent emergence of (deontic and evidential) *verwacht worden te* as a grammatical calque of *be expected to* is further proof of the influence of English on this domain of Dutch grammar.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>evident.</th>
<th>descript.</th>
<th>deontic</th>
<th>counterf.</th>
<th>unclass.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corpus of literary Dutch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640-1710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710-1780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780-1850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Gids</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1854</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1874</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1904</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1934</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diachronic ConDiv</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present-day corpora</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1  Distribution of NCI *achten* instances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>passive</th>
<th>evident.</th>
<th>descript.</th>
<th>deontic</th>
<th>counterf.</th>
<th>unclass.</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corpus of literary Dutch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1640-1710</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1710-1780</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780-1850</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Gids</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-1854</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-1874</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1904</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diachronic ConDiv</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present-day corpora</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2  Distribution of NCI *(ver)onderstellen* instances
The argumentation in Broekhuis & Cornips (2012) does not hinge on this particular example, however.

I queried the 1850-1899 volumes for combinations in which the participle forms of the four verbs of paying observed in the early 20th-century krijgen-passive data are combined with a form of krijgen, within a distance of 10 words to the right or to the left. This produced four instances of krijgen + betaald, three instances of krijgen + uitbetaald and five instances of krijgen + vergoed. At least half of these would, like (15a), allow for a passive interpretation.

I queried the 1850-1899 volumes for combinations in which the participle forms of the four verbs of paying observed in the early 20th-century krijgen-passive data are combined with a form of krijgen, within a distance of 10 words to the right or to the left. This produced four instances of krijgen + betaald, three instances of krijgen + uitbetaald and five instances of krijgen + vergoed. At least half of these would, like (15a), allow for a passive interpretation.

As shown by the spelling thuisgestuurd in (21b), combinations with the adverbial thuis are sometimes treated as complex verbs.

I disagree with Blom (2005) on this point, as, according to her, Hij speelde de bal toe is grammatical. A Google query for the exact string speelde de bal toe on 28/02/2013 generated a single fairly dubious example.

As shown by the spelling thuisgestuurd in (21b), combinations with the adverbial thuis are sometimes treated as complex verbs.

I disagree with Blom (2005) on this point, as, according to her, Hij speelde de bal toe is grammatical. A Google query for the exact string speelde de bal toe on 28/02/2013 generated a single fairly dubious example.

As shown by the spelling thuisgestuurd in (21b), combinations with the adverbial thuis are sometimes treated as complex verbs.
‘For a couple of years now, he has been acting like a small child that was robbed of his toy, while he has given it away himself!’
(<www.rodajcfans.nl/>, last accessed 28/04/2012).

For gunnen, the query produced a number of krijgen-passive instances, such as een opdracht gegund krijgen ‘to be granted a commission,’ which involve “dynamic” gunnen. The attitudinal ‘not begrudge’ sense of gunnen is not attested in the krijgen-passive. Similarly, no krijgen-passive instances were found for benijden and kwalijk nemen.

15 Broekhuis & Cornips (2012, pp. 1225-1226) briefly note the first of the above extended uses of the krijgen-passive, too (their example being Hij kreeg de hond op zich afgestuurd ‘The dogs were set on him’), and they acknowledge that an active double object paraphrase is impossible in such cases, but, strangely enough, they do not seem to consider this a problem for their hypothesis that the krijgen-passive is derived from the active double object construction via a syntactic passivization rule.

16 For instance, what exactly would be the crucial difference with regard to the mode of transmission between, say, vertellen ‘tell’ and meedelen ‘tell, communicate’?

17 Note that in German, while geben ‘give’ is ruled out from the bekomen-passive, too, this constraint does not extend to simplex hyponyms of geben such as schenken ‘give (as a present),’ leihen ‘lend,’ mieten ‘hire out,’ etc., nor to verbs of communication such as sagen ‘say,’ schreiben ‘write,’ and so on. Hence, the German construction is not subject to similar morphological constraints.