DGfS 2021, AG5: Hanna Fischer, Melitta Gillmann, Mirjam Schmuck

Encoding aspectuality in Germanic languages – empirical and theoretical approaches
Workshop at the 43rd Annual Conference of the DGfS 2021
(February 24–26, 2021, online)

Workshop description: In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in exploring aspectuality from a diachronic, diatopic, or typological perspective (e. g. Breed et al. 2017, Weber 2017, Kinn et al. 2018). The workshop aims at bringing together researchers with different theoretical backgrounds focusing on aspectuality in Germanic languages. While other Indo-European languages inherited a whole set of grammatical aspect forms, the verbal systems of the early Germanic languages were poorly stocked. With the passage of time, the Germanic languages developed different means to express aspectual functions (e. g. *ing*-progressive in English, *aan-het-* and *zitten-te*-progressive in Dutch, *sitter-och-* and *håller-på-att*-progressive in Swedish as well as double perfect constructions in German substandard varieties).

The broad objective of this workshop is to perform an inventory of aspectual forms in Germanic languages and dialects. The workshop is intended as a forum to compare and discuss the emergence, development, and the areal distribution of aspectual forms on the basis of empirical research. Questions to be discussed include – but are not limited to – the following:

- How is aspectuality encoded in Germanic languages and dialects, e. g. by means of derivational, inflectional, or syntactic forms?
- How did forms that may indicate aspectuality emerge and develop diachronically?
- Which aspectual meanings are differentiated in individual Germanic languages and which aspectual oppositions can be identified (e. g. habitual, continuous, progressive, or perfective meanings)?
- How are the aspectual meanings intertwined with temporal, modal, or evidential meanings?
- Do the aspectual forms show specific areal distributions? Are there languages or varieties that are more prone to encode aspectuality than others?
- Which empirical methods are suitable to study aspectuality? Which criteria serve to identify particular aspectual functions?

Keynote speakers:
Frank Brisard (University of Antwerp, Belgium)
Torodd Kinn (University of Bergen, Norway)

References: Breed, Adri, Frank Brisard & Ben Verhoeven. 2017. Periphrastic Progressive Constructions in Dutch and Afrikaans: A Contrastive Analysis. Journal of Germanic Linguistics 29(4). 305–378. | Kinn, Torodd, Kristian Blensenius & Peter Andersson. 2018. Posture, location, and activity in Mainland Scandinavian pseudocoordinations. CogniTextes 18. 1–38. | Weber, Thilo. 2017. Die TUN-Periphrase im Niederdeutschen. Funktionale und formale Aspekte. Tübingen.

The conference will be held **online**.

Conference website: https://www.linguistik.uni-freiburg.de/43rd-annual-conference-of-the-german-linguistic-society-dgfs?set_language=en

Registration: https://www.linguistik.uni-freiburg.de/43rd-annual-conference-of-the-german-linguistic-society-dgfs/registration-1

Contact: Hanna Fischer fischer@uni-potsdam.de
Melitta Gillmann melitta.gillmann@uni-hamburg.de
Mirjam Schmuck schmuck@linglit.tu-darmstadt.de

Program AG 5

Wed 24.02.2021 13.45–15.45	60min	Frank Brisard (invited speaker)	The modal basis of progressive marking
	30min	Maarten Bogaards	Beyond progressive aspectuality: Aspectual *aan*-constructions in Dutch
	30min	Jianan Li	Diatopic and diachronic variations of the German *am*-progressive: A corpus-based investigation
16.30–18.00	30min	Adam Tomas	Grammaticalization in speech-islands. Possibilities and neglects.
	30min	Anna Saller	Periphrastic *tun* in Australian German: A past tense habitual marker?
	30min	Nadine Proske	Pseudo-coordinated *sitzen* ('sit') and *stehen* ('stand') in spoken German – a case of emergent progressive aspect?

Thu 25.02.2021 9.00–10.30	60min	Torodd Kinn (invited speaker)	Is pseudocoordination an aspectual construction?
	30min	Ermenegildo Bidese, Maria Rita Manzini	Progressive and Prospective in German dialects of Italy
11.15–12.45	30min	Jens Fleischhauer	The syntactic expression of prospective aspect in German
	30min	Katharina Paul	Go for ingressivity
	30min	Sarah Ihden	Aspectual Meanings of the Present Participle in Middle Low German
13.45–14.45	30min	Sophie Ellsäßer	Temporal adverbs as aspectuality markers? On the grammaticalization of *als* and *viel* in German substandard varieties
	30min	Lena Schmidtkunz	"Wi wir am leben in alle plantation": The aspect system in Unserdeutsch (Rabaul Creole German)

Fri 26.02.2021 11.45–14.15	30min	Fabian Fleißner	Non-encoding aspectuality in Old High German, or: Why are we failing?
	30min	Stephanie Hackert, Robert Mailhammer, Elena Smirnova	Perfect constructions in English and German: typologies and diachronic implications
	30min	Kathrin Weber	Auxiliary variation in the aspect-tense system of Low German speakers
	30min	Katharina Zaychenko	The influence of grammatical and non-linguistic factors on motion event descriptions: A cross-linguistic study
	30min	Hanna Fischer, Melitta Gillmann, Mirjam Schmuck	Final discussion: Exploring new perspectives on aspectuality in Germanic languages

The modal basis of progressive marking

Frank **Brisard**, University of Antwerp
frank.brisard@uantwerpen.be

My work on modal uses of markers of progressive aspect starts from an analysis of the simple vs progressive alternation in the English present-tense paradigm (Brisard 2002, De Wit & Brisard 2014). I contend that this alternation reflects not only a temporal contrast (roughly, perfective vs imperfective construals of a state of affairs coinciding with the time of speaking), but also, and arguably primarily, an epistemic one, corresponding to the basic cognitive distinction between "structural" vs "phenomenal" knowledge. This is in line with the claim in Cognitive Grammar that so-called grounding predications (e.g., tense and modals) convey epistemic meanings at the most schematic level, but it extends that claim to what I regard as periphrastic tense-aspect units, i.e., conventional collocations of aspect markers with certain tenses. One important implication of this analysis is that *all* central tense markers, including simple ones, have an aspectual value, even if that value is semantically underspecified (as in Germanic languages other than English for the present). In fact, the aspectually (non-)specific nature of a language's present tense turns out to be a good basis for predicting the more temporal (or, conversely, more modal) orientation of that language's progressive construction(s). I distinguish between languages, like English, in which progressive marking (at least in the present-tense paradigm), is grammatically obligatory to express ongoingness with certain types of verbs (i.e., dynamic ones), and those where it is optional and its use is, at least initially, more often than not motivated by non-temporal concerns, typically of an expressive/subjective nature (De Wit et al. 2020). This will be illustrated on the basis of existing case studies of Dutch, German, and Afrikaans (Anthonissen et al. 2016, 2019, Breed et al. 2017).

References
Anthonissen, Lynn, Astrid De Wit and Tanja Mortelmans. 2016. "Aspect meets modality: A semantic analysis of the German *am*-progressive." *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 28: 1-30.
Anthonissen, Lynn, Astrid De Wit and Tanja Mortelmans. 2019. "(Inter)subjective uses of the Dutch progressive constructions." *Linguistics* 57: 1111-1159.
Breed, Adri, Frank Brisard and Ben Verhoeven. 2017. "Periphrastic progressive constructions in Dutch and Afrikaans: A contrastive analysis." *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 29: 305-378.
Brisard, Frank. 2002. "The English present." In Frank Brisard, ed. *Grounding: The Epistemic Footing of Deixis and Reference*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 251-297.
De Wit, Astrid and Frank Brisard. 2014. "A Cognitive Grammar account of the semantics of the English progressive." *Journal of Linguistics* 50: 49-90.
De Wit, Peter Petré and Frank Brisard. 2020. "Standing out with the progressive." *Journal of Linguistics* 56: 479-514.

Beyond progressive aspectuality:
Aspectual *aan*-constructions in Dutch

Maarten **Bogaards**, Leiden University
m.p.m.bogaards@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Research into how Germanic languages encode aspectuality often proceeds in a top-down fashion. First a conceptual crosslinguistic category is taken as a point of departure, for instance 'progressivity'. Then that conceptual category is used to analyze and compare specific aspectual forms in language(s), for example the English '*ing*-progressive' (Boogaart 1999), the '*am*-Progressiv' in certain German varieties (Van Pottelberge 2004) and the Dutch '*aan het*-progressief' (Lemmens 2015).

This talk argues that a bottom-up, form-driven approach adds an important empirical dimension to this type of analysis. Specifically, it shows that the pattern widely analyzed as 'the Dutch progressive' — i.e. '*aan het* + infinitive' paired with *zijn* 'to be', cf. (1) — shares crucial formal and semantic properties with certain other phrases headed by the preposition *aan* 'on'. Instead of an infinitive, these may feature a verb stem, cf. (2), or a noun, cf. (3). Like (1), (2)-(3) appear to encode aspectual meaning.

(1)	Jan	is	aan	het	lezen.
	John	is on	the		read.INF
	'John	is reading.'			
(2)	Jan	is	aan	de	wandel.
	John	is on	the		stroll.STEM
	'John	is taking a stroll.'			
(3)	Jan	is	aan	het	bier.
	John	is on	the		beer
	'John	is drinking beer.'			

Recognizing the formal and semantic connections between the aan-patterns in (1)-(3) complicates the idea of a 'standalone' Dutch progressive. Instead, a fine-grained analysis of their (semi-)aspectual similarities and differences contributes to a more empirically founded understanding of the Dutch aspectual inventory as such, and the place of conceptual categories like 'progressive aspectuality' within language-specific aspectual inventories.

References

Boogaart, Ronny. 1999. *Aspect and temporal ordering. A contrastive analysis of Dutch and English.* Ph.D. thesis. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

Lemmens, Maarten. 2015. "Zit je te denken of ben je aan het piekeren? Persistentie in het synchrone gebruik van de PREP- en POS-progressiefconstructies in het Nederlands." *Nederlandse taalkunde* 20: 5-36.

Van Pottelberge, Jeroen. 2004. *Der am-Progressiv. Struktur und parallelle Entwicklung in den kontinental-westgermanischen Sprachen.* Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Diatopic and diachronic variations of the German
***am*-progressive: A corpus-based investigation**

Jianan **Li**, University of Göttingen
jianan.li01@stud.uni-goettingen.de

This talk concentrates on the *am*-progressive construction in German, such as *Ich bin am arbeiten* 'I am working'. The *am*-progressive has been regarded as typical of dialects in the Rhine region. However, it has evolved rapidly over the past 20 years and has been increasingly used nationwide. The *Atlas zur deutschen Alltagsprache* (Elspaß & Mölle 2003ff.) delivers a livelier image of the *am*-progressive in spoken German in the Rhine region as in other regions. While previous studies (e.g. Krause 2002; Flick & Kuhmichel 2013; Gárgyán 2014; Flick 2016) have explored mostly overall synchronic usage, my corpus-based investigation focuses on the latest diachronic development of the *am*-progressive considering its geographical spread. Using the Mannheim German Reference Corpus, eight local newspapers from eight dialect areas in Germany are selected to test the frequency and flexibility of the *am*-progressive in written German.

I will show that the frequency of use of the *am*-progressive increased overall from 2005 to 2015, with regional differences; that is, it increased in the West Central, West Upper and East Upper German regions but dropped significantly in the East Low German regions. Furthermore, I will argue that in 2015, the *am*-progressive displays very large flexibility in use and less restrictions, without a clearly regional limit. It can be combined with most verb forms except passive and imperative. In conclusion, I will argue that the further advancement of the *am*-progressive from 2005 to 2015 endorses the view that this construction strongly contributes to the establishment of aspectuality in German.

References

Elspaß, S. und R. Möller. 2003ff. *Atlas zur deutschen Alltagssprache (AdA)*. http://www.atlas-alltagssprache.de.

Flick, J. 2016. "Der am-Progressiv und parallel am V-en sein-Konstruktionen: Kompositionalität, Viabilität und Netzwerkbildung." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 138(2): 163-196.

Flick, J. und K. Kuhmichel (2013). "Der am-Progressiv in Dialekt und Standardsprache." *Jahrbuch für germanistische Sprachgeschichte* 4 (2013): 52-76.

Gárgyán, G. 2014. *Der am-Progressiv im heutigen Deutsch: Neue Erkenntnisse mit besonderer Hinsicht auf die Sprachgeschichte, die Aspektualität und den kontrastiven Vergleich mit dem Ungarischen*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.

IDS Mannheim, *Das Deutsche Referenzkorpus DeReKo*. https://www.ids-mannheim.de/kl/projekte/korpora/.

Krause, O. 2002. *Progressiv im Deutschen: Eine empirische Untersuchung im Kontrast mit Niederländisch und Englisch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Grammaticalization in speech-islands. Possibilities and neglects.

Adam **Tomas**, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
adam.tomas@campus.lmu.de

The progressive markers of Germanic languages had being given a stepmotherly treatment and they were examined too hesitant for too long. The well-known explanation for this neglect was covered by the fact that the progressive is nowhere grammaticalized to the same extent as in English. There was also suspected a lack of grammatical morphemes in other Germanic languages to encode progressive aspect. Is this really true?

Within the linguistic diversity, however, it should be noted that some modern West Germanic languages have developed similar progressive constructions with structural similarities in the form of a prepositional progressive construction:

(1)   German: *Ich bin am Lesen/lesen.*
(2)   Dutch: *Ik ben aan het lezen.*
(3)   Afrikaans: *Ek is aan die lese.*

It is surprising that the use of the extremely multifaceted German progressive *Verlaufsform* ($sein_{Finitum}+am+V_{Infinitiv}$) is avoided in the German standard written language. A sentence like *Egon ist ein Buch am lesen* opens the area of verbal aspectuality to German. The *am*-constructions are viewed with great scepticism by the general public because they are regarded as linguistic deviations from the norm. Such a view is no longer tenable from the author's point of view. The Pennsylvania German (PeD), the language of the Amish and Mennonite as German descendants in the USA, offers both expedient and surprising references. The PeD has so far not produced any prescriptive normalization, so that a complete morphological paradigm of the progressive markers has been established. The am-progressive paradigm in PeD is a simple proof of a grammatical unit, which does not exist in this form in any West Germanic language, except in English. In PeD in particular, am-progressive constructions represent a very frequent formal characteristic of incompleteness in the representation of a verbal situation. The am-progressive is used very often and with many additions or syntactical extensions, as shown in the data from my field-research 2014:

(4) *D Aenn is die Ebbel am schaela.*   [Ann is pealing the apples.]
(5) *Ich bin sunndaags mei Guckbox am watscha.* [I am watching my TV sunndays.]

However, the progressive constructions in PeD have reached a previously unknown degree of grammaticalization with a functioning passive form ($sein_{Finitum}+am+PartizipII+werden_{Infinitiv}$):

(6) *Viele Haisa sind am gbaut werra do.*   [Many houses are being built over there.]
(7) *Dei Pois sind am eingwrappt werra now.* [Your pies are now being wrapped.]

In my presentation I want to share some of my elicited data and explore these concrete questions about the use, acceptance and morpho-syntactic expandability of these grammatical forms in both PeD and standard German.

References

Ebert, Karin. 2000 . "The progressive markers in Germanic languages." In Dahl, Östen, eds. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin/New York: Morton de Gruyter. 42-74.

Rödel, Michael. 2004. "Grammatikalisierung und die Folgen: Der Infinitiv in der deutschen Verlaufsform." *Muttersprache. Vierteljahresschrift für deutsche Sprache* 2: 138-150.

Pottelberge, Jeroen van. 2004. *Der am-Progressiv. Struktur und parallele Entwicklung in den kontinentalwestgermanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Tomas, Adam. 2018. *Der am-Progressiv im Pennsylvaniadeutschen. Grammatikalisierung in normfernen Varietäten*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.

Periphrastic tun in Australian German: A past tense habitual marker?

Anna **Saller**, University of Regensburg
Anna.Saller@sprachlit.uni-regensburg.de

German varieties in Australia are shortly before language shift, and show many phenomena of language erosion, including analytical constructions such as *tun* + infinitive. In addition to its use (as shown below) in conditional clauses (1), in the subjunctive (2), and for emphasis (3), a habitual or imperfective character (4) is often discussed – or the tun periphrasis is discarded as a semantically empty, syntactic variant.

    (1)   *wenn du sie nicht sprechen tust, vergisst du sie* ('if you do not speak it, you forget it')
    (2)   *ich täte mich beeilen* ('I did (would) hurry up')
    (3)   *sie tut sich ja Mühe geben* ('she does actually make an effort')
    (4)   *wir tun immer montags Kaffee trinken* ('We do have coffee every Monday')

A diachronic study of Australian German based on spontaneous speech produced in interviews shows that periphrastic *tun* occurred in the 1960s/70s both in the present and in the preterite, while between 2009 and 2014, it was used almost exclusively in the preterite. The first data set is taken from the ›Monash Corpus of Australian German‹, by Prof. Dr. M. G. CLYNE, accessible via the database for spoken German (dgd.ids-mannheim.de). The second data set was provided by Prof. Dr. C. M. RIEHL from her project on ›Barossa German as a Relic Variety‹.

Given the fact that imperfective contexts predominate in the *tun* periphrases in both corpora, and that the present tense by nature produces an imperfective reading, it is reasonable to assume that the combination of past tense + imperfective reading is marked and that periphrastic tun is used for this semantic niche (KLEMOLA noted this for the South West English dialect in Somerset), as exemplified in the following sentences:

    (5)   *er tat immer viele Briefe schreiben* ('He used to write a lot of letters')
    (6)   *jeder hier tat Mandeln anbauen* ('Everyone here used to grow almonds')

An analysis of the situational contexts in which the *tun* periphrasis is used, as well as of morphological characteristics of the lexical verbs, helps to clarify whether this analytical construction has actually developed into a habitual or imperfective past tense marker over the course of 50 years, or into an analytical past tense only, and how this structure fits into the developmental course of dwindling varieties.

References

Bybee, J., R. Perkins and W. Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Klemola, J. 1998. "Semantics of do in southwestern dialects of English English." In Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I., M. Van der Wal and A. Van Leuvensteijn, eds. *Do in English, Dutch and German. History and Present-Day Variation*. Münster: Nodus. 25-52.

Riehl, C. M. 2015. "Language attrition, language contact and the concept of a relic variety: the case of Barossa German." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 236: 261-293.

**Pseudo-coordinated *sitzen* ('sit') and *stehen* ('stand') in spoken German –
a case of emergent progressive aspect?**

Nadine **Proske**, Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache Mannheim
proske@ids-mannheim.de

In the Scandinavian languages, pseudo-coordinated posture verbs are in the process of becoming aspectual markers (e.g. Hesse 2009). In German, pseudo-coordination is generally said to be not as widely used, but it has been shown to exhibit possible starting points for the grammaticalization of motion and (change of) posture verbs into different directions (Proske 2017, 2019). Based on data from the Research and Teaching Corpus of Spoken German, FOLK (http://agd.ids-mannheim.de/folk.shtml), my study examines the pseudo-coordinated posture verbs *sitzen* ('sit') and *stehen* ('stand') in spoken German, which have developed subjective and aspectual meaning components and can mark the activity denoted by the verb in the second conjunct as temporally extended or in progress (see example 1 below).

(1)   und myrte STEHT dann da- und FÖHNT sich die hAAre als ich komme. ('And Myrte stands there and blow-dries [= is blow-drying] her hair when I come.')

The analysis shows that the degree of grammaticalization is low (the verbal semantics is not clearly bleached; the progressive reading largely relies on the co-presence of temporal adverbials; constituents may occur between the coordinated verbs and the conjunction; the locational adverbial of the posture verb is almost always realized). Nonetheless, the construction shows signs of fixedness (e.g., a preference for the locational adverbial to be realized by *da* ('there')) and a potential to extend to new contexts (e.g., stative verbs in the second conjunct, despite a preference for activity verbs). Its aspectual potential will be discussed in relation to its subjective meaning components (e.g. passivity, diligence and intentionality) and to the further grammaticalized German *am*-progressive (e.g. Flick 2016).

References
Flick, J. 2016. "Der *am*-Progressiv und parallele *am V-en sein*-Konstruktionen: Kompositionalität, Variabilität und Netzwerkbildung." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (PBB) 138(2): 163-196.
Hesse, A. 2009. *Zur Grammatikalisierung der Pseudokoordination im Norwegischen und in den anderen skandinavischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag.
Proske, N. 2017. "Perspektivierung von Handlungen und Zuschreibung von Intentionalität durch pseudokoordiniertes kommen." In Deppermann, A., Proske, N. und A. Zeschel, eds. *Verben im interaktiven Kontext. Bewegungsverben und mentale Verben im gesprochenen Deutsch*. Tübingen: 177-247.
Proske, N. 2019. "Emergent pseudo-coordination in spoken German. A corpus-based exploration." *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association* (GCLA) 7: 115-136.

Is pseudocoordination an aspectual construction?

Torodd **Kinn**, University of Bergen
Torodd.Kinn@uib.no

Pseudocoordination is a frequent construction type in the Mainland Scandinavian languages (Danish, Norwegian, Swedish), and much research on pseudocoordination has focused on Germanic languages (Ross 2016). Early research typically concentrated on constructions involving posture verbs meaning 'lie', 'sit', and 'stand' as first verbs, e.g. as in *Ho sit og les dikt* [she **sit.PRS** and read. PRS poems] 'She's **(sitting)** reading poems'. Posture verbs are well-known grammaticalization sources of auxiliaries. It was observed that these contribute to the expression of aspectuality, along with a very few other verbs, e.g. 'go'. A number of syntactic and semantic properties distinguishing pseudocoordination from canonical coordination were identified. There developed a belief that constructions with these properties involve a closed class of aspectualizing first verbs.

However, research has gathered mounting evidence that there are number of variants of pseudocoordination which have the distinguishing properties. The paradigm of first verbs is far from small, including verbs of (assuming) posture, of (a)telic motion, of communication channel, and several other meaning types. Only very few of these first verbs express aspect. This has led to the realization that pseudocoordination does not fundamentally have to do with grammaticalization, but some types tend to become grammaticalization sources.

I will look more closely at pseudocoordination with two first-verb groups and one specific first verb:

• the verbs for 'lie', 'sit', and 'stand' in the Mainland Scandinavian languages (Kinn, Blensenius, and Andersson 2018). These constructions are highly conventionalized, but they continue to exhibit close ties between postures and concomitant activities or states, the former facilitating the latter. Still, there are some signs of bleaching and aspectualization.

• verbs of atelic motion (e.g., 'run around') in Norwegian (Kinn 2018). If supplied with an atelicizing adverbial ('around'), virtually any motion verb can be used in pseudocoordination. But absence of an adverbial correlates with bleaching and more prominent aspectuality.

• the verb *drive* 'carry on' (Hesse 2009, Kinn 2019). The Norwegian construction is the result of several reanalyses and involves the development from situational to viewpoint aspect.

References

Hesse, Andrea. 2009. *Zur Grammatikalisierung der Pseudokoordination im Norwegischen und in den anderen skandinavischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Francke.

Kinn, Torodd. 2018. "Pseudocoordination in Norwegian. Degrees of grammaticalization and constructional variants." In Evie Coussé, Peter Andersson and Joel Olofsson, eds. *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 75-106

Kinn, Torodd. 2019. "Framveksten av pseudokoordinasjon med drive." *Norsk Lingvistisk Tidsskrift* 37: 207-236.

Kinn, Torodd, Kristian Blensenius and Peter Andersson. 2018. *Posture, location, and activity in Mainland Scandinavian pseudocoordinations*. CogniTextes.

Ross, Daniel. 2016. "Between coordination and subordination: Typological, structural and diachronic perspectives on pseudocoordination." In Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira and Clara Pinto, eds. *Coordination and subordination*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. 209-243.

Progressive and Prospective in German dialects of Italy

Ermenegildo **Bidese**, University of Trento, Maria Rita **Manzini**, University of Firenze
e.bidese@lett.unitn.it, mariarita.manzini@unifi.it

German-based minority varieties in Italy in some cases seem to borrow constructions that can also be found in the surrounding Italo-romance varieties, such as the construction *nåsoin + inflected infinitive* ('to be after + inflected infinitive') in Cimbrian (cf. Ferraresi 2016):

(1)   I pin *nå   zo lesa*
       I am after to read.INFL
       'I'm reading'

There are other progressive constructions in Cimbrian, i.e. *dråsoin* + II (cf. Middle High German daran[e] 'thereby'), and *soin + drumauz* + inflected infinitive, specialized for inchoative and prospective meaning. We present new data collected in a large study about the progressive and prospective periphrasis with 34 speakers of Cimbrian. We compare the system of progressivity in Cimbrian with those of other German varieties spoken in Italy and other German-based minority languages, e.g. Pennsylvania Dutch (cf. Tomas 2018).

Theoretically, a question much debated within formal models regards the syntax of progressives. In the cartographic model of Cinque (2017), PROGR is a universal functional head in a monophrasal structure – though its overt realizations can stretch to apparently biclausal structures like (1). The alternative is that the meaning of the progressive is built from its component parts, very often biclausal structures with the embedded sentence introduced by a locative periphrasis (1). Recently Manzini et al (2017) argue that such structures are a good match to the Part-whole semantics of progressives proposed by Landman (1992). We argue that only such a constructivist perspective yields the required insights into microvariation, contact and change.

References

Ferraresi, Gisella. 2016. "Wandel im aspektuellen System des Zimbrischen." In Sergio Neri, Roland Schuhmann and Susanne Zeilfelder, eds. "*dat ihdir itnu   bi huldi gibu*": *Linguistische, germanistische und indogermanistische Studien Rosemarie Lühr gewidmet.* Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag. 101-112.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2017. "On the status of functional categories (heads and phrases)." *Language and Linguistics* 18(4): 521-576.

Landman, Fred. 1992. "The Progressive." *Natural Language Semantics* 1: 1-32.

Manzini, M. Rita, Paolo Lorusso and Leonardo M. Savoia. 2017. *a/bare finite complements in Southern Italian varieties: Mono-clausal or bi-clausal syntax?* Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali (QULSO)3.

Tomas, Adam. 2018. *Der am-Progressiv in Pennsylvaniadeutschen*. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.

The syntactic expression of prospective aspect in German

Jens **Fleischhauer**, Heinrich-Heine Universität Düsseldorf
fleischhauer@phil.uni-duesseldorf.de

In his monograph on aspect, Comrie (1976: 64) briefly mentions an aspectual form he calls `prospective aspect´. Prospective aspect relates a state to a subsequent situation and "defines a temporal phase located close before the initial boundary of the situation" (Kuteva 2001: 92). Although German has not grammaticalized prospective aspect, it expresses prospective aspect by means of light verb constructions (LVCs) consisting of the light verb *stehen* and a PP headed by the preposition *vor* `in front of´ (1). The interpretation of the LVC in (1) is that the subject referent is close to the event denoted by the PP-internal NP.

(1)   *Der Kessel steht   vor   der Explosion.*
         the boiler stands in_front_of the explosion
         'The boiler is close to explosion.'

An essential question is which nouns are permitted within this construction? At first glance, it looks as if only eventive nouns denoting a change of state are permitted. However, actual language data show that other types of nouns are possible as well.

(2)   *das geht jedem so, der   vor   seinem ersten Wettkampf   steht.*
         this goes everyone so, REL.PRON in_front_of his first competition stands
         'everyone is like this facing his first competition.'

In the talk, I present the results of a corpus study (based on the German reference corpus DeReKo) on the types of NPs admissible within the German prospective-LVCs. The talk presents the first corpus study on the expression of prospective aspect in German supplementing the compositional analysis presented in previous work (e.g. Fleischhauer & Gamerschlag 2019).

References
Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fleischhauer, J. and T. Gamerschlag. 2019. "Deriving the meaning of light verb constructions - a frame account of German stehen 'stand'." In C. Juchem-Grundmann, M. Pleyer and M. Pleyer, eds. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association*, Vol. 7. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter. 137-156.
Kuteva, T. 2001. *Auxiliation. An Inquiry into the Nature of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Go for ingressivity

Katharina **Paul**, University of Göttingen
Katharina.paul@uni-goettingen.de

Unlike many other languages, German does not have a grammaticalized morphological aspect system. Nonetheless, several strategies and periphrastic constructions (e.g. *am*-progressive) have recently developed to encode aspectual readings.

This presentation deals with the *gehen*+infinitive construction, which has hardly been discussed in terms of aspectuality yet. As illustrated in (1), this construction consists of an inflected form of *gehen* ('go') combined with the infinitive of another main verb:

> (1)　　Max　　geht　　schlafen.
> 　　　　Max　　goes　　sleep
> 　　　　'Max goes to sleep.'

Based on an empirical investigation, Paul et al. (forthcoming) argue that this construction undergoes a currently observable grammaticalization process. Its output seems to encode aspectuality, more precisely ingressivity.

The aim of this talk is to show that the *gehen*+infinitive construction already underlies restrictions due to its obligatoriness in ingressive contexts and cannot be substituted by an aspectually underspecified or different expression. To test this, I employed a Likert-style questionnaire and tasked 24 participants to gauge the acceptability of items varying with regard to their aspectual interpretation (*gehen*+infinitive, *am*-progressive, underspecified) in ingressive contexts. In order to ensure a balanced distribution of the treatments, a Latin square design with three different lists was employed so that each of the 24 ingressive contexts were combined with only one of the three aspectual interpretations per list.

The results of the ANOVA and a priori t-tests show statistically significant preferences for the *gehen*+infinitive construction in ingressive contexts. In my analysis, I will discuss these results 1) in terms of grammaticalization parameters (cf. Lehmann 2015; *paradigmaticity*), and 2) in a broader context of emerging strategies of encoding aspectuality in Modern German.

References
Lehmann, C. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
Paul, K. et al. (forthcoming). "*gehen* as a new auxiliary in German." In N. Catasso, M. Coniglio and C. De Bastiani, eds. *Language Change at the Interfaces. Intrasentential and intersentential Phenomena*.

Aspectual Meanings of the Present Participle in Middle Low German

Sarah **Ihden**, University of Hamburg
sarah.ihden@uni-hamburg.de

In Middle Low German the combination of a finite auxiliary verb and a verb in the form of the present participle can be used for different aspectual meanings. According to Lasch (1974: 222, § 412, note 3) it can express an inchoative action as in *alse de sondach tôkomende was*, a durative action as in *se wêren sîner dar bêdende* or the simultaneity of two actions as in *He quam slîkende*. Sarauw (1924: 226–227) and Lübben (1882: 92–93) distinguish between the different types of auxiliary verbs used in this construction: While '*wēsen* + pres. part.' marks durative actions, '*wērden* + pres. part.' is used for inchoative actions. Furthermore, Lübben (1882: 92–93) states the special function of a past tense form of wērden combined with the present participle, namely expressing the beginning as well as the duration of an action as in *he wart wenende* ('he began to cry and went on crying').

Besides the rather short descriptions of the phenomenon given by Lasch (1974), Sarauw (1924) and Lübben (1882) there is no further information on its development within the Middle Low German language period or on its use in different times, language areas or texts. The data of the recently published digital *Reference Corpus Middle Low German / Low Rhenish (1200–1650)* enables analyses on the construction '*wēsen/wērden* + pres. part.', its aspectual meanings and its use depending on various external factors. Within the presentation some of the first results on these issues will be shown.

References

Lasch, A. 1914 / 1974. *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik*. Tübingen (Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte. A. Hauptreihe, 9).

Lübben, A. 1882. *Mittelniederdeutsche Grammatik*. Nebst Chrestomathie und Glossar. Leipzig.

Sarauw, C.1924. *Niederdeutsche Forschungen*. Vol. 2: Die Flexionen der mittelniederdeutschen Sprache. Kopenhagen (Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser, 10.1).

Temporal adverbs as aspecutality markers?
On the grammaticalization of *als* and *viel* in German substandard varieties

Sophie, **Ellsäßer**, University of Mainz/University of Münster
sophie.ellsaesser@uni-muenster.de

Research on German (and its dialects) has concentrated primarily on the verbal expression of aspectuality so far (Kuhmichel & Flick 2013, Weber 2017, Fischer 2018). Temporal adverbs are often classified as temporal rather than aspectual phenomena in German (Ebert 1996, Kuhmichel & Flick 2013). The corresponding works, however, primarily refer to the standard German temporal adverbs *gerade* 'just' and *jetzt* 'now'. Though, especially German substandard varieties have developed further temporal adverbs, which have an iterative or habitual meaning and thus could be classified as imperfective markers. Examples are *viel* and *als*, which can be traced back to the mass pronouns *viel* 'much' and *alles* 'everything' and mark temporal quantification in certain recent substandard varieties (see e.g. Grimm et al. 2008 and the following examples).

(1)   *Wir gehen viel in den Wald.*
         'We often go into the forest.'
(2)   *Wir gehen als in den Wald.*
         'We sometimes/often go into the forest.'

Though, the diachronic development, the diatopic distribution and the precise functional spectrum of these temporal quantification adverbs are still relatively unexplored.
With reference to an initial analysis of different data types (historical dictionaries, dialectal corpus data from Zwirner-corpus), the talk will address the following questions:

- Can a grammaticalization path be reconstructed from the data?
- Are levels of this process reflected in different functions of the adverbs in geographical space?
- To what extent can this be defined as an extension of aspectuality?

References
Ebert, K. 1996. "Progressive aspect in German and Dutch." *Interdisciplinary journal for Germanic linguistics and semiotic analysis* 1(1): 41-62.
Fischer, H. 2018. *Präteritumschwund im Deutschen. Dokumentation und Erklärung eines Verdrängungsprozesses*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.
Grimm, J.; W. Grimm und H.-W. Bartz. [6]2008. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Elektronische Ausgabe der Erstbearbeitung. Frankfurt am Main: Zweitausendeins.
Kuhmichel, K. und J. Flick. 2013. "Der am-Progressiv in Dialekt und Standardsprache." In P. Vogel, ed. *Sprachwandel im Neuhochdeutschen*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 52-76.
Weber, T. 2017. *Die TUN-Periphrase im Niederdeutschen. Funktionale und Formale Aspekte*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

"Wi wir am leben in alle plantation":
The aspect system in Unserdeutsch (Rabaul Creole German)

Lena **Schmidtkunz**, Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nuremberg
lena.schmidtkunz@fau.de

The aim of this paper is to describe the central verbal category of aspect in the German-based Creole language Unserdeutsch. The verbal categories in Unserdeutsch are—like in other languages—closely intertwined, so that it is hardly possible to consider them as isolated entities. The focus of the article is on the aspect category, which will be described and interpreted in relation to other verbal categories and in the context of Creolistic universal research.

Based on language data from semi-guided sociolinguistic interviews with basilectal speakers, it is first discussed which aspects Unserdeutsch possesses and to what extent they are grammaticalised or obligatory. It will be shown that Unserdeutsch has both a progressive and a habitual aspect, the two being realised through different verbal periphrases. In a further step, the grammatical means of aspect marking are shown, with two constructions in focus: (1) the <u>am</u>-Progressiv [copula + am + verb], which is similar to the German form but has a significantly higher grammaticalization level in Unserdeutsch and can express both progressive and habitual meaning, and (2) <u>the constructions with *wid*</u> [wid +verb], which is similar in use and function to the English *would*. It will be shown that wid is of particular interest insofar as it represents an integration of all central grammatical categories of the verb—constructions with *wid* can express (a) future tense, (b) habitual aspect and (c) irrealis mood:

       a. *wi wid ni charg-im du ein ding (...)*
       1PL FUT NEG charge-TR 2SG ART.INDF thing
       'We won't charge you anything.'
       b. *du wid afsteh-n am morgen vielleich so sechs finf uhr*
       2SG HAB.PST get.up-V at morning maybe around six five o.clock
       'We would get up at five or six o'clock in the morning.'
       c. *du wid geht wo*
       2SG IRR go whereto
       'Where should we have gone to?'

From a comparative perspective, the findings show on the one hand that Unserdeutsch has a relatively elaborate aspect system compared to its lexifier language (German). On the other hand, the data also suggest that, in the context of creole languages (see Michaelis et al. 2013, Holm/Patrick 2007), the aspect system of Unserdeutsch belongs to the typological mainstream and features structural characteristics that are typical for these languages.

References
Holm, John and Patrick, Peter L.,eds. 2007. *Comparative Creole Syntax. Parallel Outlines of 18 Creole Grammars*. London: Battlebridge.
Michaelis, Susanne Maria, Maurer, Philippe, Haspelmath, Martin and Huber, Magnus, eds. 2013. *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (available online at http://apics-online.info/, last accessed on 13.11.2020).

Non-encoding aspectuality in Old High German, or:
Why are we failing?

Fabian **Fleißner**, Austrian Academy of Sciences
fabian.fleissner@unvie.ac.at

General linguistics has developed a variety of methods for the qualitative and quantitative study of aspectuality, which have been well proven in different individual languages. These include the disclosure of correlative patterns of perfectivity and anterior tense, deontic modality and narrative on the one hand, imperfectivity and temporal simultaneity, epistemic modality and non-narrativity on the other (cf. Abraham 1991, Hopper 1979, Smith 1997). So far, however, corresponding patterns could only be traced inadequately for various Old Germanic languages (cf. Heindl 2017). This explains the ongoing dispute about the general existence of a binary aspectual system being constructed via the respective linguistic successor to the *ga-prefix. Nevertheless, with few exceptions, the existence of a verbal aspect category in Old High German is widely accepted in the German scientific literature of recent decades since Leiss (1992) and regarded as axiomatic within the field of German Studies and academic teaching as well. The divergent behaviour of one or the other morphological form that cannot be integrated into this scheme is often blamed on a supposed insufficiency of the Germanic system in the phase of its decline. I will use data from the ohg. *Evangelienbuch* by Otfrid of Weissenburg to show that previous approaches have largely failed to support this assumption. In addition, I will offer an alternative model that explains both a certain affinity of the prefix ohg. *gi-* to some contexts of perfectivity and the divergent behaviour in this respect. The hypothesis is that the functions of the element can be found in the explicit marking of an effect of verbal action on a particular actant, cf. ohg. *sehan/gisehan* ‚see' in (1) and (2):

(1) *Ságetun thaz sie gáhun stérron einan sáhun* (O, I, 17, 19)
    'They said that they recently saw a star' [− change of mental/physical state]
(2) *Sie blídtun sih es gáhun, sár sie nan gisáhun* (O, I, 17, 55)
    'They rejoiced immediately when they saw it' [+ change of mental/physical state]

All other readings of different grammatical categories such as aspect can derive from these functions.

References

Abraham, Werner. 1991. "Aktionsartensemantik und Auxiliarisierung im Deutschen." In Elisabeth Feldbusch, Reiner Pogarell, Cornelia Weiss, eds. *Neue Fragen der Linguistik.* Akten des 25. Linguistischen Kolloquiums, Paderborn 1990, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 125-133.

Heindl, Olga. 2017. *Aspekt und Genitivobjekt. Eine kontrastiv-typologische Untersuchung zweier Phänomene der historischen germanischen Syntax*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Hopper, Paul J. 1979. "Aspect and foregrounding in discourse." In Givon, Talmy,eds. *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press. 213-241.

Leiss, Elisabeth. 1992. *Die Verbalkategorien des Deutschen. Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der sprachlichen Kategorisierung [Studia Linguistica Germanica 31]*. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Smith, Carlota. 1997. *The parameter oft aspect [Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 43]*. Dordrecht / Boston / London: Kluwer.

Perfect constructions in English and German varieties: typologies and diachronic implications

Stephanie **Hackert**, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Robert **Mailhammer**, University of Western Sydney, Elena **Smirnova**, Université de Neuchâtel
Stephanie.Hackert@anglistik.uni-muenchen.de, R.Mailhammer@westernsydney.edu.au, elena.smirnova@unine.ch

This paper examines the expression of perfect meanings in varieties of two Germanic languages, English and German. Whereas the standard varieties of these two languages both possess grammaticalized perfect categories employing HAVE, this is not necessarily the case in non-standard varieties. A number of high-contact varieties of English and especially pidgins and creoles employ a range of forms to express the various meanings commonly associated with the category (cf. Dahl 1985: 132).

We will present data from a number of varieties of English and German and compare their expression of resultative, experiential, "hot news," and persistent perfect situations. We also look at the perfective, as the perfect's "anti-prototype" (Dahl 2014: 273). Our material includes the data on pidgins and creoles first presented in Hackert (2019), the data from a range of Australian Englishes (e.g. Aboriginal English, Mailhammer forthc.) and from varieties of German (Walser German, Amish German, Pennsylvanian German, Barossa German, and Russian-German Dialects).

Specifically, we aim at answering the following research questions:

(1) What is the range of forms covering the semantic space of the perfect in varieties of English and German?
(2) Which varieties possess a grammaticalized perfect?
(3) Do marking patterns distinguish groups of varieties? Do these linguistically determined groups have geographical and/or sociohistorical correlates?
(4) How do the typological findings align with pathways of grammaticalisation (Smirnova et al. 2019) on micro and macro levels?

References

Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dahl, Östen. 2014. "The perfect map: Investigating the crosslinguistic distribution of TAME categories in a parallel corpus." In Benedikt Szmrecsanyi and Bernhard Wälchli, eds. *Aggregating dialectology, typology, and register analysis. Linguistic variation in text and speech*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 268-289.

Hackert, Stephanie. 2019. "The perfect in English-lexifier pidgins and creoles: A comparative study." *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 34: 195-242.

Mailhammer, Robert. forthc. *English on Croker Island: the synchronic and diachronic dynamics of contact and variation*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Smirnova, Elena, Robert Mailhammer and Susanne Flach. 2019. "The role of atypical constellations in the grammaticalization of German and English passives." *Diachronica* 36(3): 384-416.

Auxiliary variation in telic perfect constructions of Low German speakers

Kathrin **Weber**, University of Jena
weber.kathrin@uni-jena.de

Lexical aspect and telicity are major determinants of auxiliary selection in German (Sorace 2000; Keller and Sorace 2003; Gillmann 2011). Telic verbs are predominantly constructed with the auxiliary *sein* 'be', atelic verbs with the auxiliary *haben* 'have'. However, there are exceptions of the telicity principle in the German standard system as verbs like *anfangen* 'to begin' or *abnehmen* 'to decrease' are constructed with the auxiliary *haben* 'have'. From a regional perspective, telicity and lexical aspect have a stronger influence on auxiliary constructions in the Westphalian Low German area, especially with the verb *angefangen* 'to begin' (Weber 2020). Here, sentences like *ich bin angefangen* 'I be$_{AUX}$ begun$_{PP}$' are highly conventionalized. The main objective of the presentation is to apply a regional approach to the influence of telicity on auxiliary variation in Low German. Besides lexical aspect, the continuum between tense and aspect plays a crucial role in explaining auxiliary variation in the perfect tense with *angefangen* 'to begin'. Theoretically, the presentation follows a usage-based construction grammar approach, where constructions are understood as form-meaning-pairs. Methodologically, the talk pursues a mixed-methods approach by analyzing both authentic spoken interactions of Westphalian speakers (both dialect and regiolect data) and written data from the regional newspaper *Neue Westfälische*. The presentation shows that the auxiliaries *haben* 'have' and *sein* 'be' serve as grammatical markers in the tense-aspect-interface. Auxiliary constructions with *haben* 'have' and *angefangen* 'to begin' are mainly associated with tense meaning, while auxiliary constructions with *sein* 'be' mainly present current relevance meaning.

References

Gillmann, Melitta. 2011. "Die Grammatikalisierung des sein-Perfekts. Eine korpuslinguistische Untersuchung zur Hilfsverbselektion der Bewegungsverben im Deutschen." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 133 (2): 203-234.

Keller, Frank and Sorace, Antonella. 2003. "Gradient Auxiliary Selection and Impersonal Passivization in German: An Experimental Investigation." *Journal of Linguistics* 39 (1): 57-108.

Sorace, Antonella. 2000. "Gradients in Auxiliary Selection with Intransitive Verbs." *Language* 76 (4): 859-890.

Weber, Kathrin. 2020. *Regionale Auxiliarvariation: Interaktion, Schrift, Kognition.* Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.

The influence of grammatical and non-linguistic factors on motion event descriptions: A cross-linguistic study

Katharina **Zaychenko**, University of Kassel
zaychenko@uni-kassel.de

Cross-linguistic differences in the conceptualization of motion events have often been hypothesized to depend on the absence or presence of grammatical aspect in different languages. Empirical studies in this field focus in particular on presenting videoclips showing entities moving towards different endpoints in combination with the task to verbalize the event. Cross-linguistic differences become apparent, for instance, through the varying number of verbalized endpoints. An interesting observation concerns the result that speakers of languages with a grammaticized concept of temporality rather focus on the process of an event, whereas speakers of non-aspect languages have been shown to favor the motion endpoint (Stutterheim et al. 2012; Mertins 2018).

Recent investigations, however, speculate that cognitive factors such as the visual prominence (salience) of certain motion event components might influence motion event conceptualization, too (Bepperling & Härtl 2013; Georgakopoulos et al. 2019). To examine the interplay between non-linguistic and linguistic factors experimentally, an online survey was conducted which implements the non-linguistic factor 'endpoint salience' as an influence on motion event descriptions. Native speakers of German and English participated in two verbalization tasks and one non-linguistic memorization task. The results point at a main effect for 'endpoint salience' such that salient endpoints were verbalized more often than regular endpoints. While German speakers only show a tendency to verbalize more salient endpoints than regular ones, English speakers verbalized significantly more endpoints in the salient endpoint condition. Simultaneously, native speakers of English use significantly fewer progressive forms when they mention the motion endpoint in their descriptions. These results indicate that endpoint salience has a higher influence on speakers of English than German since German speakers focus on the endpoint in any case even if they do not verbalize it. The results will be discussed in the light of an interdependency between linguistic and non-linguistic factors in motion event conceptualization.

References

Bepperling, S. and H. Härtl. 2013. "Ereigniskonzeptualisierung im Zweitspracherwerb - Thinking for Speaking im Vergleich von Muttersprachlern und Lernern." *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 35 (1-2): 159-191.

Georgakopoulos, T., H. Härtl and A. Sioupi. 2019. "Goal realization: An empirically based comparison between English, German, and Greek." *Languages in Contrast* 19.2: 280-309.

Mertins, B. 2018. *Sprache und Kognition: Ereigniskonzeptualisierung im Deutschen und Tschechischen* (Vol. 8). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Stutterheim, C. v., M. Andermann, M. Carroll, M. Flecken and B. Schmiedtova. 2012. "How grammaticized concepts shape event conceptualization in language production: Insights from linguistic analysis, eye tracking data, and memory performance." *Linguistics* 50(4): 833-867.