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What is an idiom?

• An idiom = an expression with a non-compositional interpretation
  — its meaning as a whole is not simply predictable/derivable from (the combination of) the literal meanings of its parts:

(1) *Ned Stark bit the dust.* = Ned Stark died.

(2) *Deze Stellenbosche wijn spant de kroon.*
   = this wine from Stellenbosch surpasses all, is the very best (idiom can also be used negatively)
What is an idiom?

• None of the lexical items that comprise the idioms in (1) and (2) correspond to their idiomatic meaning:

(1) *Ned stark bit the dust.*
- *bite* = use your teeth to cut into something
- *the* = definite article
- *dust* = fine, dry powder consisting of tiny particles of earth or waste matter

(2) *Deze Stellenbosche wijn spant de kroon.*
- *de* = definite article
- *kroon* = crown, i.e. a circular ornamental headdress worn by a monarch as a symbol of authority, usually made of or decorated with precious metals and jewels
- *spannen* = span, stretch, i.e. extend from side to side
Non-compositionality

• The Fregean principle of compositionality: the meaning of a complex expression is determined by the meanings of its parts and the rules used to combine them.

• Given their non-compositionality, idioms appear to directly violate this principle (cf. i.a. Katz & Postal 1963; Fraser 1970; Katz 1973; Chomsky 1980; Machonitis 1985; Schenk 1994; Grégoire 2009).

• Question: How can idioms be reconciled with this principle?
Non-compositionality

• One possible answer: idioms are stored in our mental lexicon as single, atomic items (see i.a. Gibbs & Gonzales 1985; McClone et al. 1994; compare Jackendoff 1997)

• 2 other possible arguments for this position…
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Lexical inflexibility

• If any of the lexical items that make up the idioms in (1) and (2) are replaced, even by synonyms, the figurative interpretation is lost (# = loss of idiomatic interpretation):

(3) a.  # bite the dirt  
     b.  # bite some dust  
     c.  # chew the dust  

(4) a.  # de tiara spannen  
     b.  # zijn kroon spannen  
     c.  # de kroon uitrekken
Syntactic inflexibility

- Many idioms: syntactically inflexible [English]
  (cf. i.a. Newmeyer 1974; Nunberg et al. 1994)

(5) *bite the dust = die*

  a. # The dust was bitten by Ned.  *passivisation*
  b. # The dust, Ned has bitten.  *topicalisation*

(6) *shoot the breeze = chat*

  a. # The breeze was shot by them.  *passivisation*
  b. # The breeze, we shot yesterday.  *topicalisation*
Syntactic inflexibility

• Many idioms: syntactically inflexible [Dutch]
  (cf. i.a. Grégoire 2009)

(7) de geest geven = die, break down (lit. ‘give the ghost’)

a. # Toen werd de geest gegeven door Jo.     *passivisation
b. # De geest heeft mijn auto gegeven.       *topicalisation

(8) de benen nemen = run off, take off (lit. ‘take the legs’)

a. # Ten slotte werden de benen genomen door de dief.  *passivisation
b. # De benen heeft hij snel genomen.            *topicalisation
What is an idiom?

Lack of

• a compositional interpretation
• lexical flexibility
• syntactic transformations

follows automatically if an idiom is syntactically atomic

i.e. if an idiom = a multiword expression that …

… functions as a single word in syntax
… is stored wholesale as a unit in the lexicon

(see i.a. Gibbs & Gonzales 1985; McClone et al. 1994; compare Jackendoff 1997)
What is an idiom?

However:

in general, idiomatic VPS - such as *bite the dust* in (1) and *de geest geven* in (9) - are formed in a manner which obeys the **regular syntactic rules of the language**, like any other **fully regular VP**.

(cf. i.a. Fellbaum 1993; Nunberg et al. 1994; Ifill 2002; McGinnis 2002; Svenonius 2005; Everaert 2010; Stone 2013)

(1) *Ned Stark bit the dust.*  =  *Ned Stark died.*

(9) *Mijn camera gaf de geest.* = *My camera broke down.*
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Syntactic regularity

- idioms conform with regular phrase structure rules

(10) a. *Ned Stark bit the dust.*
    b. *Ned Stark bit the bread.*
    c. *Ned Stark swept the dust.*

    b. *Mijn camera gaf de foutcode 01.*
    c. *Mijn camera zag de geest.*
Syntactic regularity

• idioms exhibit normal word order

(12)  a.  *Ned Stark bit the dust.* [SVO]
     b.  *I think that Ned Stark bit the dust.* [SVO]

(13)  a.  *Mijn camera gaf de geest.* [SVO, V2]
     b.  *Ik denk dat mijn camera de geest gaf.* [SOV]
• idioms behave as expected regarding their aspectual properties (telicity)

(1) *Ned Stark bit the dust.*
    =   Ned Stark died.

(9) *Mijn camera gaf de geest.*
    =   My camera broke down.
Syntactic regularity

• idioms interact with productive syntax
  ‣ raising/control
  ‣ clause-type shifting
  ‣ embedding in subordinate clauses
  ‣ other syntactic operations, e.g. relativisation

(14) a. Another promising company *seems to* bite the dust.
    b. *Who* will bite the dust?
    c. They want you to think *that* a big character bit the dust.
    d. He is the first major character *who* bites the dust in this episode.
Syntactic regularity

- idioms interact with productive syntax
  - raising/control
  - clause-type shifting
  - embedding in subordinate clauses
  - other syntactic operations, e.g. relativisation

(15) a. *Mijn auto lijkt de geest te geven.*
    b. *Welk personage heeft de geest gegeven?*
    c. *Weet iemand of hij de geest heeft gegeven?*
    d. *De eerste die de geest gaf, was de Yamaha.*
Morpho-syntactic regularity

- idioms show the normal range of inflexional affixes
  - temporal, aspectual, agreement specifications vary freely
  - finite and non-finite forms

(16) a. *My iMac* bit the dust today.
    b. *Another one* bites the dust.
    c. *Littlefinger* will surely bite the dust.
    d. *So many Starks* have bitten the dust over the course of six seasons.
Morpho-syntactic regularity

• idioms show the normal range of inflexional affixes
  ‣ temporal, aspectual, agreement specifications vary freely
  ‣ finite and non-finite forms

(17) a. *De oude machine* gaf gisteren de geest.
    b. *De assistent* geeft de geest in dit verhaal.
    c. *Ook een nieuwe laptop* kan de geest geven.
    d. *Zijn vriendin* had plotseling de geest gegeven.
What is an idiom?

• these data suggest that the idioms are not stored as single, atomic units (cf. i.a. Stone 2013, 2015)

• idioms seem to be built up by the same normal, regular (morpho-)syntactic structure-building mechanisms that create non-idiomatic structures
Ongoing debate

- **inflexibility ~ lexicon**
  - idiom = stored wholesale as a single unit in the mental lexicon
  - idiom = syntactically atomic, a multiword expression functioning as a single word in syntax

- **regularity ~ syntax**
  - idiom = has structure, has a regular (morpho-)syntax, is built up by the normal (morpho-)syntactic structure-building mechanisms of the language
  - idiom = not stored as a single, atomic unit
Inflexibility vs. regularity? Lexicon vs. syntax?

• **this talk: contribution to this debate**

  further demonstration that idioms are built up by the same regular structure-building mechanisms that create non-idiomatic syntactic structures

• **empirical basis:**

  new data from idioms in non-standard varieties of Dutch
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Findings

If the syntax of idioms is completely regular...

- **Prediction:**
  - **if:** a language (variety) exhibits a syntactic phenomenon that is ‘peculiar’/uncommon (i.e. that seems to be a cross-linguistic or cross-dialectal ‘rarity’)
  - **then:** this same syntactic phenomenon will also be found in the idioms of that language (variety)

- This is exactly what we found in our research on Dutch dialects.
  - we discuss 3 cases in 3 different Dutch dialects
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Determiner drop

- many dialects spoken in the Dutch province of Groningen, e.g. Hogelandsters

- **definite/specific nouns** occur without an overt article in contexts where other varieties of Dutch require a definite determiner

  (cf. i.a. Schuringa 1923; Ter Laan 1929, 1953; Apotheker 1980; Reker 2005; Oosterhof 2008; Van der Kooi et al. 2008)
Determiner drop

(18) dropping of non-neuter definite determiners (Ter Laan 1953:35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groningen</th>
<th>Standard Dutch &amp; other dialects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a. Man het geliek.  
*man has right*  
'The man is right.' | De man heeft gelijk.  
*the man has right*  
'The man is right.' |
| b. Jong het bok verkøft.  
*boy has goat sold*  
'The boy has sold the goat.' | De jongen heeft de bok verkocht.  
*the boy has the goat sold*  
'The boy has sold the goat.' |
| c. Kou staat in sloot.  
*cow stands in ditch*  
'The cow is standing in the ditch.' | De koe staat in de sloot.  
*the cow stands in the ditch*  
'The cow is standing in the ditch.' |
| d. Dou deur dicht.  
*do door closed*  
'Close the door.' | Dou de deur dicht.  
*do the door closed*  
'Close the door.' |
Determiner drop

Careful: in Standard Dutch (and dialects in other regions than Groningen)

- singular countable nouns in argument position
don't occur without article, cf. (18)
- uncountable and plural nouns do occur without article, cf. (19)
  - but: these constituents have an indefinite/generic reading
  - they do NOT have a definite/specific reading, unlike the Groningen ex's in (18)

(19) (Oosterhof 2008:75)
  a. De jongen heeft water gedronken.     ('The boy has drunk water.' )
     the boy has water drunk
  b. Slootwater ruikt een beetje zuur.    ('Ditch water smells a bit sour.' )
     ditch-water smells a bit sour
  c. De jongen heeft bokken verkocht.     ('The boy has sold goats.' )
     the boy has goats sold
  d. Koeien eten graag gras.               ('Cows like to eat grass.' )
     cows eat gladly grass
Determiner drop

Some more details:

the **definite/specific non-neuter** determiner (de 'the.NON-NEUT') is dropped

- obligatorily in certain Groningen dialects (+)
- optionally in others (⚫)
- never in others (—)

map *Reeks Nederlandse Dialectatlassen* for dropping of *de*
Determiner drop

what about the **definite/specific neuter** determiner *(het or ‘t ‘the.NEUT’)*?

→ **standard assumption**: it is never dropped

(20) (Ter Laan 1953:35)

*(‘t) Peerd löpt in *(‘t) laand. the.NEUT horse runs in the.NEUT land

*(‘t) Vool is bie hom. the.NEUT foal is with him

'The horse is running on the meadow. The foal is with him.'
Determiner drop

what about the **definite/specific neuter** determiner *(het or ’t 'the.NEUT')*?

→ **more recent observation** (Apotheke 1980; SAND; Oosterhof 2008):
  it is dropped

  • obligatorily in certain Groningen dialects (+)

  • optionally in others (⚫)

  • never in others (—)

map *Syntactische Atlas Nederlandse Dialecten* for dropping of *het*
Determiner drop - idioms

- data from our fieldwork discussed here:
  idioms in the Hogelandsters dialects
  (dialects spoken in Hogeland)
Determiner drop - idioms

- fieldwork: places of birth of our informants

1. Uithuizermeeden
2. Uithuizen
3. Stedum
4. Oosterwijdwert
5. Zuidbroek
Determiner drop - idioms

- our observations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dropping of non-neuter determiner</th>
<th>dropping of neuter determiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in non-idiomatic contexts</td>
<td>in idioms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uithuizermeeden, Uithuizen</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stedum, Zuidbroek, Oosterwijdwert</td>
<td>optional</td>
<td>optional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determiner drop - idioms

Non-neuter determiner dropping: obligatory or optional

(21) Hai veegde mie (*de) / (de) mantel oet.
    he swept me the the coat out
    'He punished me severely.'

(22) Hai het et an (*de) / (de) loop.
    he has it on the the run
    'It's going smoothly for him.'

(23) Hai draaide mie (*de) / (de) rogge toe.
    he turned me the the back to
    'He turned his back on me.'
Determiner drop - idioms

Neuter determiner dropping: impossible

(24) Hai bindt *(t) vour an.
    he binds the.NEUT forage on
    'He's launching something.'

(25) Hai ken *(t) gras heuren wassen.
    he can the.NEUT grass hear grow
    'He's very conceited, cocky.'
Determiner drop

• **Observation**
  ‣ dialects in the province of Groningen (more specifically, in Hogeland) exhibit determiner drop

  ‣ this same syntactic phenomenon is also found in the idioms of these dialects

  ‣ the patterns of determiner drop in idioms are perfectly in line with the dialects’ regular syntax
    ➡ non-neuter definite determiner drop
    ➡ obligatory vs. optional determiner dropping

• **Conclusion**
  ‣ the idioms are built up by the regular structure-building mechanisms of the dialects under scrutiny
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Possessive alternation

• many Dutch dialects, e.g. Leuvens (province of Flemish Brabant, Belgium)

• inalienable possession can be marked with different syntactic alternations
  ‣ the possessor can also appear outside of the possessum DP
Possessive alternation

- **Internal possession:** $[_{TP} \ldots [_{DP} \text{possessor} \text{ possessum}] \ldots]$  
  
  - possession is expressed internally in the possessive DP, e.g. with a possessive pronoun or a genitive nominal
  
  - the possessor nominals are encoded syntactically as dependents of the possessum nouns

(26) a. Hij sloeg op $[_{DP} \text{Marie’s} / \text{haar} \text{ arm}]$.
    
    \text{he} \ \text{hit} \ \text{on} \ \text{Mary’s} \ \text{her} \ \text{arm}

b. Ik gooi een krant naar $[_{DP} \text{Jefs} / \text{zijn} \text{ hoofd}]$.
    
    \text{l} \ \text{throw} \ \text{a} \ \text{newspaper} \ \text{to} \ \text{Jeff’s} \ \text{his} \ \text{head}
Possessive alternation

- **External possession:** $[\text{TP} \ldots [\text{DP possessor}] \ldots [\text{DP Ddef possessum}] \ldots]$

  a nominal is
  
  - syntactically encoded as a verbal dependent
  - but semantically understood as the possessor of an inalienable noun (preceded by a definite article) in one of its co-arguments

(27) a. Hij sloeg $[\text{DP haar}]$ op $[\text{DP de arm}]$.
    *he hit her on the arm*

  b. Ik gooi $[\text{DP Jef}]$ een krant naar $[\text{DP het hoofd}]$.
    *I throw Jeff a newspaper to the head*

  c. $[\text{DP Hij}]$ sluit $[\text{DP de ogen}]$.
    *he closes the eyes*
Possessive alternation

• "Doubly marked" possession:

[$TP \ldots [DP \text{possessor}i] \ldots [DP \text{poss.pron.}i \text{possessum}] \ldots$

(cf. Lee-Schoenfeld 2006)

\begin{itemize}
  \item with both external and internal possession
    (coreferential possessors)
\end{itemize}

(28) a. Hij sloeg [DP Marie$_i$] op [DP haar$_i$ arm].
    he hit Mary on her arm

b. Ik gooi [DP hem$_i$] een krant naar [DP zijn$_i$ hoofd].
    I throw him a newspaper to his head

c. [DP Jon$_i$] sluit [DP zijn$_i$ ogen].
    Jon closes his eyes
Possessive alternation - idioms

- **Data from our fieldwork discussed here:**
  idioms in the Leuvens dialect
  (dialect spoken in Leuven)
Possessive alternation - idioms

- the possessive alternation with inalienable nouns

Our observations in the Leuven dialect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal possession</th>
<th>External possession</th>
<th>'Doubly-marked' possession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in non-idiomatic contexts</td>
<td>in idioms</td>
<td>in non-idiomatic contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possessive alternation - idioms

(29) **External possession (subject)**

\[\text{Ik zat met de dood op het lijf.} \]
\[I sat with the dead on the body = 'I was terrified.'\]

(30) **"Doubly-marked" possession (subject)**

\[\text{Ik zat met de dood op mijn lijf.} \]
\[I sat with the dead on my body = 'I was terrified.'\]

(31) **External possession (subject)**

\[\text{Ik keer hem de rug toe.} \]
\[I turn him the back to = 'I don't want anything to do with him.'\]

(32) **"Doubly-marked" possession (subject)**

\[\text{Ik zat met de dood op mijn lijf.} \]
\[I sat with the dead on my body = 'I was terrified.'\]
Possessive alternation - idioms

(33) **External possession (indirect object)**
Ik ga hem zand in de ogen strooien.
*I go him sand in the eyes strew* = 'I am going to fool him.'

(34) "Doubly-marked" possession (indirect object)
Ik ga hem zand in zijn ogen strooien.
*I go him sand in his eyes strew* = 'I am going to fool him.'

(35) **Internal possession**
Ik ga zand in zijn ogen strooien.
*I go sand in his eyes strew* = 'I am going to fool him.'
Possessive alternation - idioms

(36) **External possession (indirect object)**
    \[
    \text{Ik ga } \text{hem} \text{ de prang op } \text{de keel} \text{ zetten.} \\
    \text{I go him the clip on the throat put} = 'I am going to pressure him.'
    \]

(37) **"Doubly-marked" possession (indirect object)**
    \[
    \text{Ik ga } \text{hem} \text{ i de prang op } \text{zijn i keel} \text{ zetten.} \\
    \text{I go him the clip on his throat put} = 'I am going to pressure him.'
    \]

(38) **Internal possession**
    \[
    \text{Ik ga } \text{de prang op } \text{zijn keel} \text{ zetten.} \\
    \text{I go the clip on his throat put} = 'I am going to pressure him.'
    \]
Possessive alternation

- **Observation**
  - in the dialect of Leuven, inalienable possession can be marked with different syntactic alternations
  - this same syntactic phenomenon is also found in the idioms of the dialect
  - the pattern of the possessive alternation in idioms is perfectly in line with the dialect’s regular syntax *(pace Fox 1981; Fellbaum 1993; Sailer 2015 on English and German)*!
    - internal possession
    - external possession
    - "doubly-marked" possession

- **Conclusion**
  - the idioms are built up by the regular structure-building mechanisms of the dialect under scrutiny
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Perfect doubling

- South-eastern dialects of Dutch, e.g. Loois (Tessenderlo, province of Limburg, Belgium)
- compound tenses featuring an additional, participial have (or be)
  (cf. i.a. Barbiers et al. 2009; Koeneman et al. 2011; Cornips & Broekhuis 2015)
Perfect doubling

- South-eastern dialects
  - (a) simple past
  - (b) simple (present/past) perfect
    - $have/be$
      + past participle
  - (c) perfect doubling
    - $have/be$
      + past participle
      + past participle of $have/be$
Perfect doubling

(39) a. Ik beet in de boterham.
    I bit in the sandwich
= 'I bit the sandwich.'
b. Ik heb in de boterham gebeten.
    I have in the sandwich bitten
= 'I have bitten the sandwich.'
c. Ik heb in de boterham gebeten gehad.
    I have in the sandwich bitten had
= 'I have bitten the sandwich.'

(40) a. Ik waste de handen.
    I washed the hands
= 'I washed my hands.'
b. Ik heb de handen gewassen.
    I have the hands washed
= 'I have washed my hands.'
c. Ik heb de handen gewassen gehad.
    I have the hands washed had
= 'I have washed my hands.'

(41) a. Ik viel twee keer.
    I fell two time
= 'I fell twice.'
b. Ik ben twee keer gevallen.
    I am two time fallen
= 'I have fallen twice.'
c. Ik ben twee keer gevallen geweest.
    I am two time fallen been
= 'I have fallen twice.'
Perfect doubling

- the double perfect appears in similar contexts as its non-doubling counterpart
- the double perfect is not sensitive to the semantic properties of the main verb
- the double perfect has the so-called ‘superperfect use’ (Carruthers 1994)
  ‣ i.e. marking an action/state which is definitely complete and unlikely to recur
- the double perfect can involve a ‘reversal’ interpretation
  ‣ e.g. in *Ik heb de fiets gestolen gehad* (‘I have the bike stolen had’), the implication can be that it is no longer missing

(Barbiers et al. 2009; Koeneman et al. 2011 (and confirmed in our fieldwork))
Perfect doubling - idioms

- our observations in the Loois dialect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>regular perfect</th>
<th>perfect doubling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in non-idiomatic contexts</td>
<td>in idioms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (age +60)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (age -60)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perfect doubling - idioms

• idioms not dependent on perfect aspect

(42) a. Hij heeft zijn kap over de haag gesmeten (gehad).  [Group 1]
    Hij heeft zijn kap over de haag gesmeten (*gehad).  [Group 2]
  he has his hood over the hedge thrown had
  'He quit his (religious) job.'

  b. Hij smeet zijn kap over de haag.
  he threw his hood over the hedge = 'He quit his (religious) job.'

(43) a. Hij is niet op zijn bek gevallen (geweest).  [Group 1]
    Hij is niet op zijn bek gevallen (*geweest).  [Group 2]
  he is not on his beak fallen been
  'He is very assertive.'

  b. Hij viel niet op zijn bek
  he fell not on his beak = 'He is very assertive.'
Perfect doubling - idioms

- **idioms dependent on perfect aspect**
  (cf. Harwood & Temmerman 2015; Harwood et al. 2016)

(44) a. Ze hebben in zijn gat gebeten (**gehad**).
    they have in his ass bitten had
    'He is angry.'

b. # Ze beten in zijn gat.
    they bit in his ass ≠ 'He is angry.'

(45) a. Het is van het camion gevallen (**geweest**).
    it is from the truck fallen been
    'It was stolen.'

b. # Het viel van het camion.
    it fell from the truck ≠ 'It was stolen.'
Perfect doubling

• **Observation**
  ‣ the dialect of Tessenderlo exhibits perfect doubling
    ➤ optional for speakers aged 60+
    ➤ disallowed for speakers aged 60-

  ‣ this same syntactic phenomenon is also found in the idioms of the dialect

  ‣ the pattern of perfect doubling in idioms is perfectly in line with the dialect’s regular syntax
    ➤ optional (60+) vs. disallowed (60-)

• **Conclusion**
  ‣ the idioms are built up by the regular structure-building mechanisms of the dialect under scrutiny
Extra: *worden*-construction

- Loois
  (Tessenderlo, province of Limburg, Belgium)

- we came across a peculiar idiom…
Extra: *worden*-construction

- the idiom

(46) Ze zulle hunne kak *wennen* óphève.  [Loois]
ze zullen hun kak *worden* ophouden  [Dutch glosses]
they will their poop become up-keep
'They will not proceed rashly; they will be careful (especially with money).'}
Extra: worden-construction

• the idiom

(46) Ze zulle hunne kak wennen óphèève.INF.
    ze zulle hun kak worden ophouden.INF
    they will their poop become up-keep.INF
    'They will not proceed rashly; they will be careful (especially with money).'

• worden + infinitive = ?
  vs. Standard Dutch:

  › worden (+ past participle) = passive auxiliary

    (47) Trump zal worden afgezet.
        Trump will become.PASS deposed.PART

  › worden (+ noun/adjective) = copula

    (48) De wereld zal een paradijs / beter worden.
        the world will a paradise.N / better.A become.COP
Extra: *worden*-construction

- **Loois:** *worden* as a future auxiliary (Van Thienen 2016a,b)
  (compare German *Es wird regnen* 'It will rain')
  (impossible in Standard Dutch)

(49) *worden* + INF = future auxiliary

'*t Went* morge reegene.
*it becomes tomorrow rain INF*
'It will rain tomorrow.'

(50) *gaan/zullen* + (optional) *worden* + INF = 'double' future marking
(no difference in interpretation!)

'*t Gao/Zal* morge *(wenne)* reegene.
*it goes/will tomorrow become rain INF*
'It will rain tomorrow.'
Extra: *worden*-construction

- back to the idiom:

(51) *gaan/zullen* + (optional) *worden* + INF

Ze *gaan/zulle* hunne kak *(wennen)* óphèève.
ze *gaan/zullen* hun kak *worden* ophouden.INF
they go/will their poop become up-keep.INF

(52) *worden* + INF

Ze *wenne* hunne kak óphèève.
ze *worden* hun kak *ophouden*
they become their poop *up-keep.INF*
Extra: \textit{worden}-construction

- speakers who do not allow \textit{worden} as a future auxiliary
  - only allow the idiom without \textit{worden}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{(53) future: gaan/zullen - *worden}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Ze \textbf{gaan/zulle} hunne kak (*wennen) óphèève. \\
ze \textbf{gaan/zullen} hun kak \textbf{worden} ophouden \\
they \textbf{go/will} \textbf{their} poop \textbf{become} up-keep.INF
\end{tabular}
\end{quote}
Extra: *worden*-construction

- our observations in the Loois dialect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>worden</em> future</th>
<th>'double' future = <em>gaan/zullen</em> + <em>(worden)</em></th>
<th><em>gaan/zullen</em> future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in non-idiomatic contexts</td>
<td>in idiom</td>
<td>in non-idiomatic contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 1</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(60+, ♂)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group 2</strong></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(others)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Extra: *worden*-construction

- **Observation**
  - the dialect of Tessenderlo exhibits *worden* as a future auxiliary (+ a 'double' future *gaan/zullen* + (optional) *worden*)
  
  - this same syntactic phenomenon is also found in an idiom of the dialect
  
  - the pattern of future *worden* in the idiom is perfectly in line with the dialect’s regular syntax
    - optional (60+ & male) vs. disallowed (others)

- **Conclusion**
  - the idioms are built up by the regular structure-building mechanisms of the dialect under scrutiny
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Why inflexibility?

• discussed in this talk: several cases of idioms (in dialects of Dutch) built up by the regular structure-building mechanisms of the dialect

• this suggests: these idioms are
  — completely regular in their morpho-syntax
  — not stored wholesale in the lexicon as single, atomic units

• remaining puzzle: if idioms are not syntactic atoms, why do “stock and standard" syntactic manipulations (topicalisation, passivisation) sometimes destroy idioms?
Why inflexibility?

- also the case for some of the idioms discussed earlier

(25) Hai ken *(t) gras heuren wassen. [Hogelandsters]

he can the.NEUT grass hear grow

'He’s very conceited, cocky.'

(54) No passivisation

# 't Gras ken (deur hom) wassen heurd worden.

the grass can by him grow heard become

≠ 'He's very conceited, cocky.'

(55) No topicalisation

# Ja, 't Gras kon hai wis heuren wassen!

yes the grass could he certainly hear grow

≠ 'He's very conceited, cocky.'
Why inflexibility?

- also the case for some of the idioms discussed earlier

(29) Ik zat met de dood op het lijf.  
     *I sat with the dead on the body*  
     'I was terrified.'  

(56) No topicalisation  
     # Amai, met de dood <op het lijf> zat ik zeker <op het lijf>.  
     *gosh with the death on the body sat I certainly on the body*  
     ≠ 'I was terrified.'
Why inflexibility?

- also the case for some of the idioms discussed earlier

(44) Ze hebben in zijn gat gebeten.  
they have in his ass bitten  
'He is angry.'

(57) No passivisation  
Er werd in zijn gat gebeten.  
there became in his ass bitten  
≠ 'He is angry.'

(58) No topicalisation  
Amai, in zijn gat hebben ze zeker gebeten!  
gosh in his ass have they certainly bitten  
≠ 'He is angry.'
Why inflexibility?

- the most well-known account: **Semantic Mapping**
  (Newmeyer 1974; Nunberg 1978; Wasow et al. 1984; Gazdar et al. 1985; Fillmore et al. 1988; Nunberg et al. 1994; Everaert et al. 1995; Gibbs 1996; Stone 2016; *inter multi alia*)

- 2 types of idioms
  - **idiomatically combining expressions (ICEs):**
    individual elements of the literal expression can be mapped onto individual elements of the figurative meaning
    (the sub-parts of the idiom have (some degree of) semantic autonomy)
    e.g. *spill the beans*

  - **idiomatic phrases (IdPs):**
    the expression as a whole is mapped onto the figurative meaning
    (the sub-parts of the idiom exhibit no autonomy whatsoever)
    e.g. *kick the bucket*

```
spill the beans
↓
divulge the secret
```

```
kick the bucket
↓
die
```
Why inflexibility?

• **ICEs = lexically flexible**, can undergo lexical substitutions to some degree
  > because an ICE is decomposable
  > its component parts are referential

  (59)  a.  *Come on, spill the details!*
        b.  *Come on, spill the news!*
        c.  *Come on, spill the gossip!*

• **IdPs = lexically inflexible**, cannot undergo lexical substitution
  > because an IdP is not decomposable
  > its component parts are not referential

  (60)  a.  # *He kicked the tub.*
        b.  # *He kicked the tin.*
        c.  # *He struck the bucket*
        d.  # *He booted the bucket.*
Why inflexibility?

• **ICEs = syntactically flexible**, can undergo topicalisation and passivisation
  > because an ICE is decomposable
  > its component parts are referential

  (61)  a. *The beans, Bob has most certainly spilled.*
  b. *The beans were spilled (by Bob).*

• **IdPs = syntactically inflexible**, cannot undergo topicalisation and passivisation
  > because an IdP is not decomposable
  > its component parts are not referential

  (62)  a. # *The bucket, Bob has gone and kicked.*
  b. # *The bucket was kicked (by Bob).*
Why inflexibility?

• an interesting extra hypothesis (Trotzke 2015)
  ★ morpho-syntactic manipulations are licit
  ★ information-structural modifications sometimes aren’t

➡ constraints on word order variation (topicalisation, passivisation)
  ‣ are not only due to the ICE-IdP divide
  ‣ are also due to syntax-external factors at the level of pragmatics
Why inflexibility?

- Trotzke (2015:225) observes the following tendency ('accessibility' vs. 'bizarreness'):
  
  ‣ "when the literal reading is not accessible/plausible to the hearer (when it is 'bizarre'), the hearer infers, due to a relevance implicature, that the idiomatic reading should be chosen"

  ‣ these syntax-external pragmatic factors may overwrite ordering constraints, and hence play a role in idiom flexibility

  ‣ according to Trotzke, this is why IdPs with a bizarre literal reading can still show up in e.g. topicalisation constructions, while IdPs with a plausible literal reading cannot
Why inflexibility?

• an idiom such as *pop the clogs* ('die' = IdP) has a bizarre literal reading, a non-idiomatic reading is not easily available

  ▷ passivisation/topicalisation is possible

  (63) a. … advise the coroner of the district where the clogs were popped.
    (cf. also Fellbaum 2015)
  b. *He owned little more than the clogs he had just popped.*

• an idiom such as *kick the bucket* ('die' = IdP) has an accessible plausible literal, non-idiomatic meaning

  ▷ topicalisation/passivisation is impossible, cf. (63)
Why inflexibility?

- the data discussed today are in line with the idea that

  ‣ **morpho-syntactic** manipulations in idioms are **allowed**
    (cf. interaction with productive syntax (e.g. embedding), cf. free variation of temporal-aspectual-agreement specifications)

  ‣ modifications that have **information-structural** impact (topicalisation, passivisation) are sometimes **not allowed**

  ➤ it seems that **determiner drop** (Oosterhof 2008), **possessive alternations** (Deal 2013) and **perfect doubling** (Koeneman et al. 2011) do not have an information-structural impact (at least, in the dialects under scrutiny), and can be classified as run-of-the-mill morpho-syntactic manipulations
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Summary

- **ongoing debate: inflexibility vs. regularity ~ lexicon vs. syntax**
  - are idioms stored wholesale as single, atomic units in the mental lexicon?  
    cf. idiom inflexibility
  - are idioms built up by the regular structure-building mechanisms of the language?  
    cf. idioms with regular (morpho-)syntax

- **this talk:** idioms are built up by the same normal (morpho-)syntactic structure-building mechanisms that create non-idiomatic structures

- **evidence:** new data from idioms in dialectal Dutch
  - determiner drop in Hogelandsters
  - possessive alternation in Leuvens
  - perfect doubling (+ **worden**-construction) in Loois

- **(in)flexibility?**
  in general, morpho-syntactic manipulations in idioms are allowed, while modifications with information-structural impact sometimes are not
Thank You!
Questions?

FOOD FOR THOUGHT
Possessive alternation in Standard Dutch

How come in Standard Dutch, there are idioms with external possession, even though Standard Dutch does not seem to have this in non-idiomatic sentences?

•  *iemand de ogen uitsteken*
•  *iemand op de hielen zitten, iemand op het hart trappen*
•  *iemand de oren wassen, iemand de mond snoeren*

➢ so far, lack of external possession in Standard Dutch is merely an assumption, should be tested systematically (cf. Scholten fc.)
➢ external possession seems to be allowed with particle verbs or with a PP argument in Standard Dutch:

•  *iemand de arm afhakken, iemand de rug insmeren, …*
•  *iemand diep in de ogen kijken, iemand een krant naar het hoofd gooien, zich in de vingers snijden, iemand op het been slaan, …*
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