

Table of contents

Acknowledgements	XI
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction	1
1.1 Plan of the book	1
1.2 Biographical remarks	2
1.3 How this book came to be	3
1.4 My particular role as an eternal student of Dutch as a foreign language	5
Notes to Chapter 1	5
CHAPTER 2	
The Dutch demonstrative adjectives: Analyses and reactions	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Analyses	9
2.2.1 Kirsner (1979a)	9
2.2.2 Kirsner and van Heuven (1980)	13
2.2.3 Kirsner (1985b)	15
2.2.4 Kirsner (1987)	16
2.2.5 Kirsner, van Heuven, and Vermeulen (1987)	18
2.2.6 Kirsner and van Heuven (1988)	21
2.2.7 Kirsner (1989)	22
2.2.8 Kirsner (1993)	25
2.2.9 Kirsner (1996)	27
2.3 Reactions	28
2.3.1 Maes (1995)	28
2.3.2 Van Everbroeck (1999)	34
2.3.3 Ariel	36
2.3.4 Experimental approaches	38

CHAPTER 3

The Afrikaans demonstratives and instructional meanings

43

- 3.1 Introduction: On instructional meanings 43
- 3.2 The Afrikaans demonstratives: Forms and uses 44
- 3.3 The Deictic system 48
 - 3.3.1 The hypothesis 48
 - 3.3.2 One *dié* or two 50
 - 3.3.3 How *dié* can communicate proximity without explicitly signaling it 52
 - 3.3.4 More on the opposition between *hierdie* and *dié* 55
- 3.4 Quantitative data on the use of the demonstratives in discourse 57
- 3.5 Additional qualitative data 65
- 3.6 Alternative analyses 69
 - 3.6.1 Peeling off prosody but retaining deixis 69
 - 3.6.2 Peeling off prosody and rejecting deixis 70
 - 3.6.3 Keeping prosody but splitting adjective and pronoun 73
- 3.7 Theoretical considerations and conclusions 73
- 3.8 Appendix. Some loose ends 75
 - 3.8.1 On *daai*, the colloquial form of *daardie* 76
 - 3.8.2 A note on proximity and definiteness 77
 - 3.8.3 On sharpness of discrimination 78

Notes to Chapter 3 81

CHAPTER 4

On imperatives and pragmatic particles

85

- 4.1 Introduction 85
- 4.2 The utterance-final pragmatic particles *hoor* and *hè* 86
 - 4.2.1 Observations 86
 - 4.2.2 Analysis of the *hè*–*hoor* opposition 87
 - 4.2.3 Subuses of *hoor* 88
- 4.3 The verb stem imperative (STM) versus the ‘infinitivus pro imperativo’ (IPI) 89
 - 4.3.1 Observations 89
 - 4.3.2 Towards an analysis of the STM–IPI opposition 90
 - 4.3.3 Contrasts in gruffness and suddenness 92
- 4.4 Predicting the interaction of STM and IPI with *hoor* and *hè* 92
- 4.5 The questionnaire experiment 95
 - 4.5.1 Design 95
 - 4.5.2 Initial results 96

4.5.3	Further results: The unpredicted lack of parallelism between <i>hoor</i> and <i>hè</i>	97
4.5.4	Additional discussion	98
4.5.4.1	Imperativity judgements	98
4.5.4.2	Usualness judgments	99
4.5.4.3	Imperativity judgments again: The relative magnitude of effects	101
4.6	Quantitative data from texts	104
4.6.1	The prediction	104
4.6.2	The importance of negation	106
4.6.2.1	The favoring of IPI	108
4.6.2.2	The favoring of <i>hoor</i>	109
4.6.2.3	A note on <i>hè</i>	110
4.7	Some theoretical implications	110
4.7.1	Maximalist (bottom-up) linguistics versus minimalist (top-down) linguistics	111
4.7.2	Degrees of idiomaticity of collocations	112
4.7.3	A brief digression on lexicon	112
4.7.4	Syntax versus semantics versus pragmatics	115
	Notes to Chapter 4	117

CHAPTER 5

	What it takes to understand how one Dutch idiom works	121
5.1	The problem of expressions with final <i>maar</i>	121
5.1.1	The questionnaire	125
5.1.2	Predictions	127
5.1.3	Results	128
5.1.4	The anatomy of a wrong prediction	130
5.1.4.1	Being captivated by a new idiom	131
5.1.4.2	The inadequacy of dictionary statements	131
5.1.4.3	Incomplete data	132
5.1.4.4	The possibility of priming and the role of context	133
5.2	The mechanism underlying the idiomatic interpretation of <i>ho maar</i>	134
5.2.1	How idiomatic <i>ho maar</i> differs from its near paraphrases	134
5.2.2	The relation between the usual and the idiomatic uses of <i>ho maar</i>	137
5.2.3	Why does <i>ho maar</i> contain <i>maar</i> ?	141
5.2.4	Innovations and non-occurrences	145
5.2.4.1	“Exophoric” and “cataphoric” <i>ho maar</i> in <i>ho maar met Y</i>	145
5.2.4.2	“Cataphoric” <i>ho maar</i> in <i>ho maar dat S</i>	148
5.3	What do speakers know?	150

5.4	The problem of units. How many <i>ho maar</i> expressions are there?	152
	Notes to Chapter 5	160

CHAPTER 6

Further explorations	163
-----------------------------	------------

6.1	The “progressive” constructions <i>aan het</i> + Inf <i>zijn</i> and <i> bezig zijn te</i> + Inf	163
6.1.1	Analytical hypothesis	166
6.1.2	Earlier quantitative work	168
6.1.3	Additional text counts	174
6.1.4	Additional questionnaire work	179
6.1.5	Concluding remarks	189
6.2	Bare and prepositional “indirect objects” with <i>aan</i>	191
6.2.1	Introduction	191
6.2.2	Empirical evidence for the grammaticality judgments	192
6.2.3	Inferences of successful transfer	197
6.2.3.1	The first questionnaire on successful transfer	198
6.2.3.2	An additional questionnaire experiment on successful transfer	200
6.2.3.3	Discussion	206

Notes to Chapter 6	208
--------------------	-----

CHAPTER 7

Afterword	213
------------------	------------

7.1	Revisiting the studies	214
7.2	The contribution of quantification	216
7.3	Columbia School and Cognitive Grammar	217

References and corpora	221
-------------------------------	------------

Name index	235
-------------------	------------

Subject index	237
----------------------	------------