

**Word Order in Double Object Constructions: A Diachronic Study of Dutch**

**INTRODUCTION** This paper is concerned with the diachrony of scrambling in double object constructions in Dutch. In Modern Dutch, scrambling of the indirect object (IO) and direct object (DO) is restricted to the relative word order IO-DO. The order DO-IO leads to ungrammaticality.

- (1) a. dat Jan <morgen> de meisjes <morgen> het boek <morgen> zal geven  
 that Jan <tomorrow> the girls the book shall give  
 ‘...that Jan shall give the girls the book tomorrow.’  
 b. \*dat Jan <morgen> het boek <morgen> de meisjes <morgen> zal geven

This restraint holds, regardless of the position of the objects in respect to the clause adverb. In Middle Dutch the relative word order of DO, IO and V is free (Van der Horst 2008:551/561):

- (2) a. Van dane sende hi bode den broeder omme vrede. 1271  
 from there sent he message the brother for peace  
 ‘From there he sent a message for peace to the brother.’  
 b. Ghi cont goede ghichten gheuen uwen kindren. around 1325  
 you can good gifts give your children  
 ‘You can give your children good gifts.’  
 c. So beual hi dat men Iosephe din lichame gaue. around 1325  
 thus ordered he that one Joseph the body give.indative  
 ‘Thus he ordered that one should give Joseph the body.’

The aim of this study is to check the validity of Modern Dutch analyses for Early Modern Dutch (EMD), working towards an adequate analysis. I will focus on northern EMD: Hollandic texts from the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century. In this period great language innovations occurred in Holland, partly driven by migration and multilectalism. First the analyses for Modern Dutch are given, followed by new EMD data. Finally, the Modern Dutch analyses are tested for EMD.

**BACKGROUND** For Modern Dutch, Broekhuis (2008) argues that the objects undergo movement: *v* probes for objects, because of its unvalued case features. Scrambling can be canceled because of alignment issues: focused arguments do not move, respecting the Dutch information structure.

In Den Dikken’s (2012) analysis, the objects form a Small Clause (SC) with a DO subject and an IO predicate. Furthermore, he assumes that the IO is a PP and that the P of the IO can be null (a ‘bare’ PP): [<sub>SC</sub> [DP]<sub>DO</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> P DP]<sub>IO</sub>]. A bare PP must be licensed in one of the following ways:

- i. Movement within the SC (predicate inversion), see (3a)
- ii. Movement out of the SC (scrambling), see (3b)
- iii. A particle verb, see (4)

- (3) a. [<sub>CP</sub> dat Jan dan zeker [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> ∅ [<sub>DP</sub> Marie]]<sub>IO-1</sub> [<sub>het boek</sub>]<sub>DO</sub> t<sub>1</sub>] zal aanbieden]]  
 that Jan then certainly Marie the book shall offer  
 ‘...that Jan will certainly offer Marie the book.’  
 b. [<sub>CP</sub> dat Jan [<sub>PP</sub> ∅ [<sub>DP</sub> Marie]]<sub>IO-1</sub> dan zeker [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> t<sub>1</sub> [<sub>het boek</sub>]<sub>DO</sub> t<sub>1</sub>] zal aanbieden]]  
 c. \*[<sub>CP</sub> dat Jan [<sub>het boek</sub>]<sub>DO-2</sub> dan zeker [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>SC</sub> [<sub>PP</sub> ∅ [<sub>DP</sub> Marie]]<sub>IO-1</sub> t<sub>2</sub> t<sub>1</sub>] zal aanbieden]]

- (4) a. Jan zal het boeket de Koningin aanbieden/\*geven  
 Jan shall the bouquet the Queen offer/give ‘Jan shall offer the Queen the bouquet.’

- (5) a. Ik geef dat/’t de man morgen d. Ik geef de man ?dat/’t morgen  
 I give that/it the man tomorrow ‘I will give it/that to the man tomorrow’  
 b. \*Ik geef dat/’t morgen de man e. Ik geef de man morgen \*’t/dat  
 c. \*Ik geef morgen dat/’t de man f. Ik geef morgen de man ?’t/?dat

In (3c) the restraint on DO-IO order is schematically visualized. Den Dikken claims that predicate inversion blocks the scrambling of the DO. Broekhuis (2008) inserts an order preservation constraint in his analysis that blocks DO scrambling over the IO. Movement of a DO pronoun, on the other hand, is possible, see (5a). Broekhuis (2008) shows that pronouns and other pro-forms undergo A-movement and A'-movement, while DPs can only undergo A-movement.

Furthermore, morphological case is often assumed to be a factor in scrambling and word order. Hendriks (2012) has shown that northern EMD has an active nominal case system, albeit restricted to determiners. The word order is unclear: Van der Horst (2008:1051-1055) generalizes for 16<sup>th</sup> century Dutch that the relative word order is free, although the modern order IO-DO is more common. In Modern Dutch morphological case is only found in the pronominal system, while the relative order of the object DPs and V is strict, see (1). In Middle Dutch, nominals have a morphological case system, while the relative order of IO, DO and V is free, as shown in (2). For morphological case, Den Dikken states that it licenses the bare IO, and therefore cancels its mandatory movement. This results in the optional movement of both the DO and the IO out of the SC. Broekhuis, on the contrary, claims that scrambling of DO over IO is blocked by the constraint of order preservation, not by the absence of morphological case. Furthermore, he claims that structural case is responsible for the possibility of object scrambling.

**DATA** 243 double object constructions are found in a corpus of 240.000 words of 16<sup>th</sup> century texts. This data is compiled by a search for the ditransitive verbs *beloven* 'promise', *benemen* 'steal', *geven* 'give', *togen* 'show', *tonen* 'show', *verklaren* 'explain', *verkopen* 'sell' and *zeggen* 'tell'. The data of this preliminary study shows interesting patterns:

Instances	Form objects	Relative word order
47	DO DP & IO DP	IO-DO & DO-IO order
105	DP DP & IO pronoun	IO-DO order
36	DO pronoun & IO DP	DO-IO order
11	DO pronoun & IO pronoun	IO-DO order

**ANALYSIS** These patterns show that object pronoun shift is mandatory in EMD: IO pronouns always precede DO DPs, and DO pronouns precede IO DPs. Furthermore it has been found that the DO pronoun precedes the IO pronoun. The relative order of DP objects alternates, predominantly the modern order IO-DO is found (42/47), while the order DO-IO is rare (5/47).

For these texts, I have confirmed the nominal case system, following Hendriks (2012). The relation between word order and morphological case therefore doesn't hold for EMD. The data can be explained neither by Den Dikken (2012), nor by Broekhuis (2008). The data is counterdata for Den Dikken, according to whom a free relative order of object DPs is expected, since morphological case is active. For Broekhuis' analysis, the data poses a problem: movement of an IO DP over a DO DP is blocked due to his constraint of order preservation. This study therefore shows that current analyses of double objects structures in Modern Dutch are not sufficient to explain EMD data and that a new approach is needed.

**REFERENCES** Broekhuis, H. (2008). *Derivations and Evaluations: Object Shift in Germanic Languages*. (Studies in Generative Grammar). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Den Dikken, M. (2012). Ditransitieven en het nut van hiërarchische structuur en derivatie. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 17(3), 362–379. Hendriks, J. (2012). Case marking (accounts) in collapse: evidence from Early Modern Dutch egodocuments (1572-1573). In M. Ponsonnet, L. Dao, & M. Bowler (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 42nd Australian Linguistic Society Conference*. Canberra: ACT: Australian Linguistic Society. Pp. 123-151. Van der Horst, J.M. (2008). *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse Syntaxis* (2 volumes) Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven.