

The pragmatic and rhetorical function of perfect doubling in the work of D.V. Coornhert

Cora van de Poppe¹ and Joanna Wall^{1,2,3}

¹ Utrecht University | ² Leiden University | ³ Meertens Institute

The Early Modern Dutch writer D.V. Coornhert (1522–1590) was an influential figure in the key religious and linguistic developments of his times. Bringing together these two facets and combining both a linguistic (pragmatics/discourse studies and semantics) and a literary studies (rhetoric) approach, this intra-author variation study examines Coornhert's use of *have*-doubling constructions (e.g., *have had written*) alongside simple perfects (e.g., *have written*). At the macro-level, we show that *have*-doubling was restricted to Coornhert's argumentative and predominantly moral – theological prose. At the micro-level, we then firstly link Coornhert's *have*-doubling to the well-studied double perfect of modern German which has been proposed to signal the absence of current relevance and have emphasis functions. Secondly, connecting these observations with the pragmatics of verb – tense variation, this article proposes that *have*-doubling parallels the historical present in functioning as a stance marker/evaluative device in Coornhert's moral – theological prose.

Keywords: double perfects, D.V. Coornhert, Early Modern Dutch, *have*-doubling, intra-author variation, stance marker/evaluative device

1. Introduction

The Early Modern period witnessed far-reaching developments across diverse domains. No less was this the case than in the Early Modern Low Countries, which underwent a period of important religious and linguistic developments. In particular, in the fledgling Dutch Republic, Reformed Protestantism or Calvinism grew steadily, but was strongly resisted by some. There was also increasing fascination in and exaltation of the vernacular tongue, prompting the first attempts to

standardise (Van de Haar 2019), even though this would only be realised in the eighteenth century (Rutten 2016a, b).

A central actor in both these domains was the Amsterdam-born writer D.V. Coornhert (1522–1590). The majority of Coornhert's writing concerned religious and related moral issues: Coornhert was an active opponent of Reformed Protestantism and heavily criticised it by expounding his own contrasting views on moral – theological matters in a number of publications. Moreover, Coornhert was an active promoter of the vernacular. He was a key member of *De Egelantier* (van der Aa 1858: 700), an Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric (*rederijkerskamer*), which, in 1584, published H.L. Spiegel's *Twe-spraack van de Nederduitsche Letterkunst* ('*Dialogue on Dutch Literature*'), which has been described as "the most important grammar from the sixteenth century"¹ (Van der Sijs and Willemyns 2009: 216). Coornhert wrote its preface. His broader work also testifies to this linguistic vocation: in humanist fashion, he translated several texts into the vernacular from Latin (see, for example, Bonger [1941: 29] and Veenman [2009: 69–70]), and was a rare sixteenth-century moralist in it (van der Aa 1858: 699). In so doing, he both acquainted his contemporaries with the classics in their own language, and elevated that language by applying rhetorical characteristics from Latin to his own vernacular writings (Gelderblom 1989).

Whilst Coornhert's use of such characteristics has long been studied, only recently has attention been given to variation in his use of morphosyntactic structures. Firstly, from an intra-author variationist perspective, van de Poppe (2018) examines Coornhert's variation in genitive constructions, showing that it was part of the rhetorical repertoire in his plays. Secondly, adopting a formal syntactic perspective, Wall (2018a) examines Coornhert's use of the constructions that will be the focus of this paper: *have*-doubling constructions, as shown in Examples (1) and (2b). These constructions occur alongside run-of-the-mill present perfect in Example (1a), and (irrealis) past perfect constructions in Example (2a), which are formed of a finite present/past form of *have* like *heeft* ('has') and *hadde* ('had'), and a participial form of a main verb like *belooft* ('promised') or *ontfanghen* ('received'). *Have*-doubling constructions differ formally from these simple present and past perfects in containing an additional participial form of *have* (i.e., *ghehadt* ['had']) in (Examples [1] and [2b]).

- (1) a. Maar wie **heeft** henluyden d'alderbeste voorspoet **belooft**?
 But who has them.people the.best prosperity promised.PTCP
 ['But who promised those people the best prosperity?'] (CO.ZDIW.361)²

1. Original Dutch: "De belangrijkste grammatica uit de zestiende eeuw".

2. For abbreviations of primary texts, see the relevant entry in the References section.

- b. Dit heeft God Israel beloofte ghehadt.
 This has God Israel promised.PTCP had.PTCP
 [Approx.: 'God promised this to Israel.'] (CO.SDS.ccc.liir)
- (2) a. ... meer dan hy hadde ontfanghen.
 ... more than he had received.PTCP
 ['...more than he had received.'] (CO.ZDIW.267)
- b. ... maar de zelve.... ontfanghen hebben ghehadt,
 ... but the same received.PTCP have had.PTCP
 [Approx.: '...but received the same,'] (CO.ZDIW.201)

Both of these constructions and Coornhert's use of them are conspicuous for a number of reasons. Firstly, whilst found in certain modern Dutch dialects (Barbiers et al. 2008: 40; Koenen et al. 2011) and other modern varieties like German, *have*-doubling constructions like Example (1) and (2b) are entirely absent from modern Standard Dutch, in contrast to run-of-the-mill present/past perfects which remain frequent. Investigating a range of Coornhert's texts available from the *Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren* (DBNL) ('*Digital Library for Dutch Literature*'),³ Wall (2018a: 159–160) finds 120 such constructions in a text collection of 1.6 million words, equating to a frequency of approximately 76.3 instances per million words. Given the construction's complete absence from modern Standard Dutch, their frequency in Coornhert's writing stands out. As Wall (2018b, Under revision) shows, whilst Coornhert was certainly not the only user of *have*-doubling in the Early Modern Dutch period, he also exceeds most of his contemporaries in his frequency of use of the construction. This raises the question: "Which factors determined Coornhert's apparently exceptional use of *have*-doubling constructions?"

In this paper, we provide an answer to this question by examining how semantic, pragmatic and literary factors determine the use of *have*-doubling, or perfect doubling, as we will opt to focus on (see Section 3). As we will show, previous analyses of double perfects have proposed pragmatic reasons for the alternation between these forms and simple perfects (e.g., van der Wal [1988: 393], Squartini [1999: 57, 65–67], Brandner et al. [2016: 27] and Haß [2016: 197–213, 215–282]). Building on these studies, we show that double perfects are akin to evaluative devices or stance markers described in the pragmatic/discourse studies literature and, more specifically, parallel the well-studied historical present (see, for example, Schifffrin [1981: 59] and Brinton [2015: 227]). Adopting a literary perspective on how Early Modern literary authors like Coornhert used their texts as rhetorically refined instruments of persuasion (Hermans 2018: 292; i.e., the

3. See: <https://www.dbnl.org/>.

study of rhetoric; see, for example, Gelderblom [1989] and van de Poppe [2018]), we then use this as a basis for examining how Coornhert used the construction to express individual themes in his moral – theological prose. In so doing, we connect both construction-specific and broader research in semantics and pragmatics/discourses studies (linguistics) to research rhetoric (literary studies), arguing that Coornhert could use double perfects to emphasise and thus arouse the reader's attention to core elements of his ethical stance. As such, this paper also adds to the predominantly (historical) sociolinguistic research on intra-writer or -speaker variation, recently extended to include variation within a single author's literary texts (i.e., intra-author variation; see, for example, Van Koppen and Dietz [2016] and van de Poppe [2018]), including that specifically on Coornhert's work (van de Poppe 2018).⁴

The paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2, we investigate the use of perfect doubling at the macro-level in Coornhert's work, namely in relation to cultural styles and genre. Turning to the micro-level, we then provide an overview of previous studies on the semantic and pragmatic properties of perfect doubling in both Early Modern Dutch and modern German varieties and Dutch dialects (Section 3). In Section 4, we detail our proposal that, based on analyses of double perfects in these previous studies, this construction can be assimilated into the stance markers/evaluative devices identified in the pragmatics/discourse studies tradition and, more specifically, parallels the historical present. Moreover, we argue here that both this and construction-specific linguistic research can be connected to research in literary studies on rhetoric (i.e., the persuasive use of language to influence and manage the reader; see, for example, van de Poppe [2020]). On this basis, in Section 5, we then provide a qualitative analysis of how the construction is used in two case studies on Coornhert's moral – theological texts, showing how this relates to their thematic and wider sociohistorical context, as well as rhetorical structure. Section 6 concludes the paper.

4. In comparison with inter-individual variation, intra-individual variation has hitherto received considerably less attention in (historical) sociolinguistics (Hernández-Campoy 2016: 29–30). Recently, however, the attention given to variation within individual language users has been growing (see, for example, Rutten [2016b] for a recent Early Modern Dutch example in this line of research).

2. Marco properties of Coornhert's *have*-doubling: Cultural styles and genre

In this section, taking a macro-level approach to intra-author variation, we will show that Coornhert's use of *have*-doubling was not a humanistic-shaped borrowing from classical texts, nor was it informed by the writing tradition of sixteenth-century rhetoricians. Rather, the literary-communicative context seems to have triggered the use of the construction: Coornhert employed *have*-doublings overwhelmingly in his argumentative prose.

As already noted, Gelderblom (1989) and van de Poppe (2018) have both made relevant proposals about specific elements of Coornhert's language. Firstly, Gelderblom (1989) has shown that, as well as translating texts from Latin, Coornhert, in humanist fashion, borrowed and adapted some elements of his style from classical literature (e.g., rhythm, rhyme and rhetorical questions). This raises the question as to whether Coornhert might have also borrowed *have*-doublings as stylistic devices from Latin. However, such a notion can be quickly dispensed with: whilst *have*-doubling is found in certain modern (Latin descendant) Romance languages like French (see, for example, Haß [2016]), to the best of our knowledge, it is not documented in Latin itself (see also Wall [Under revision]).

Secondly, in her research on genitive variation, van de Poppe (2018) has argued that genre is a determiner of Coornhert's linguistic variation. Van de Poppe (2018: 284–285) shows that, in his plays, Coornhert uses the more archaic pregenitive variant more frequently than the post-genitive variant, but that this is reversed in his prose. Building on Damsteegt (1978), Jansen ([ed.] 2011) and Jansen (2017) link this to the fact that Coornhert's plays were more faithful to the *rederijkerstraditie* (i.e., the rhetorical style in the tradition of the chamber of rhetoric) than his prose was. Moreover, van de Poppe (2018: 294–296) shows that variation between both types of genitives “often takes place in and contributes to the functioning of style figures”⁵ (van de Poppe 2018: 296), especially those typical of lyric rather than prose (e.g., chiasms, alliteration, rhythm and rhyme).

In order to ascertain which factors determined Coornhert's use of *have*-doubling here and throughout this investigation, we examined Wall's (2018b) set of 120 *have*-doubling constructions collected from his non-translated texts available on DBNL (see Section 1). Like variation in the use of the genitive, we find a clear genre dichotomy in Coornhert's use of *have*-doubling, but one that points in a different direction to the dichotomy found in genitive variation. Consider firstly Table 1, which shows the number of *have*-doubling constructions

5. Original Dutch: “vindt vaak plaats in en draagt bij aan het functioneren van stijlfiguren”.

found in the corpus for each genre, based on the classification of (main) genre in DBNL.⁶

Table 1. *Have-doubling constructions in Coornhert's work by genre*

Genre	No. of texts	No. of words	Percentage of total words	No. of instances of <i>have-doubling</i>	No. of instances of <i>have-doubling</i> per million words
Drama	10	150,221	10	1	6.7
Poetry	4	49,682	3	0	0.0
Prose	48	1,372,673	87	119	86.7
Total	62	1,572,576	n/a	120	76.3

The first observation concerning Table 1 is that, whilst the corpus size is small ($n=49,682$ words; 3 percent), *have-doubling* is entirely absent from Poetry. Similarly, only one instance is attested in Drama, equating to just 6.7 instances per million words, despite Drama accounting for 10 percent of the total words in the corpus. Indeed, *have-doubling* overwhelmingly predominates in Prose (86.7 instances per million words; see also Wall [Under revision]). Notice that, since *have-doubling* is, essentially, completely absent from Coornhert's plays, its use cannot be directly linked to the *rederijkerstraditie*, as was the case in his use of the pregenitive (see above). Instead, this broadly matches construction-specific literature on the role of genre: both van der Wal (1988:393) on Early Modern Dutch *be-* and *have-doubling* constructions (see Footnote 15) and Litvinov and Radčenko (1998:15) on German find a low frequency of *have-doubling* in poetry. Further, van der Wal's (1988:393) intuition is "that argumentative prose forms a favourable context"⁷ (van der Wal 1988:393; cf., however, Litvinov and Radčenko [1998:12–15]).⁸ We are able to provide support for her observation: all of the Prose texts in the corpus, regardless of the presence of doubling, fall into at least one of the following sub-genre categories: Treatises, Dialogues, Pamphlet-Brochures, Philosophy-Ethics and Theology. Indeed, the four texts with the highest raw frequency of *have-doubling* are all clear examples of argumentative prose on philosophical, ethical and/or theological content, and together account for 45

6. This distinguishes Drama, Poetry, Prose and Non-Fiction. In Table 1, the last two are combined as Prose.

7. Original Dutch: "dat betogend proza een begunstigende kontekst vormt".

8. Note that ultimately, whilst van der Wal does not provide her statistics, the main evidence for this conclusion might be the argumentative prose of Coornhert's *Zedekunst*, which is included in her study (see Footnote 14).

percent of the *have*-doubling constructions in the corpus.⁹ These are: *Van de vreemde sonde* ('On Strange Sin') (1584; $n=24$, 20 percent); the first vernacular companion to ethics for common people, *Zedekunst* ('Ethics') (1586; $n=13$, 11 percent); *Vande predestinatie, verkiesinghe en de verwerpinghe Godes* ('On Predes-tination and God's Preferences and Rejections') (1589; $n=10$, 8 percent); and *Van de toelatinge ende decreete Godts* ('On God's Allowances and Decrees') (1572; $n=7$, 6 percent). In Section 5, we will examine individual examples from the two texts in which *have*-doubling occurs with the highest raw frequencies, *Van de vreemde sonde* and the *Zedekunst*, in this central context of theological prose, in order to analyse the micro-discourse properties of *have*-doubling.

Furthermore, we can also assimilate the one apparently exceptional *have*-doubling found in Drama, shown in Example (3), to this picture.

- (3) [...] [Het Evangelie] seydt dat het leven der oprechten hier wel een rasernye schijnt inden ooghen der gheenre die self rasen, maer dat zy namaels met te spade berou sullen bevinden dat sy gheraest hebben ende dat het kinderen Godes zijn **die sy bespot hebben ghehadt**.
 ['(...) (The Gospel) says that the life of the righteous here does seem a mad one in the eyes of those who rage themselves, but that they subsequently realise with too late repentance that they raged and that it was children of God who they **mocked**.'] (CO.DMSC.327)

Example (3) is from Coornhert's *Maeghdekens schole* ('School for Maidens') (c. 1570–1575), one of only two of Coornhert's plays which were non-rhyming, his eight others were all rhyming (van de Poppe 2018: 283). It is spoken by the pupil Iohanna, the drama's principle protagonist. In it, she defends to the teacher, Curiositas, the supremacy of the Gospel, the latter having misled Iohanna's fellow pupil, Galilea, to exchange it for a book that gives more pleasure. Instead, Iohanna points out to Curiositas that the Gospel teaches her that God's judgment and that of man are distinct. Hence, this example in fact satisfies all three characteristics highlighted above: it is prose, theological and argumentative – indeed, it is placed into the mouth of the principle protagonist.

Given that all Prose texts in the corpus can be broadly characterised as argumentative prose, what obviously cannot be straightforwardly established on the basis of this corpus is how frequent *have*-doubling was in Coornhert's non-argumentative prose. Consideration of some of Coornhert's texts not included in

9. Note that, although Coornhert's plays were also vehicles for moral and theological instruction, his texts were first and foremost intended to provide entertainment and thereby educate the audience (Fleurkens 1989: 80). The primary purpose of the texts distinguished in Table 1 thus differed (entertainment and teaching in plays, *versus* education and persuasion in prose). The form (prose *versus* poetry) and style are adjusted accordingly.

the corpus provides evidence, albeit limited, that the construction occurs in other forms of prose less frequently. In point of fact, we find the instance shown in Example (4) in a letter from Coornhert to Spiegel, his friend and fellow member of the chamber of rhetoric *De Egelantier*; the content, relating an important life event – the death of his wife – to his friend, implies that this is non-argumentative prose.¹⁰

- (4) Amice, ick groet U vriendelyck met U lieve Huysvrouwe; de mijne is bij haer Heere: diese my lange **gheleent heeft ghehadt**.
 [Approx.: ‘Dear friend, I send my cordial greetings to you with your dear wife; my own is with her Lord who **had long lent** her to me.’]
 (repeated from Bongers [1941: 37])

A future investigation should be conducted to establish whether *have*-doublings are also less frequent in Coornhert’s letters compared with his argumentative prose. Another text not included in the corpus which already points to the conclusion that *have*-doubling is indeed infrequent in Coornhert’s non-argumentative prose is his *Vijftigh lustighe historien oft nieuwicheden Joannis Boccattij* (‘Fifty Funny Stories or Curiosities from Giovanni Boccaccio’) (1564), a translation of selected parts of Boccaccio’s prose narrative work *Decamerone*, excluded from the original corpus as it is a translation. It contains four *have*-doublings, equating to a frequency of 24.3 instances per million words, significantly lower than the 86.7 instances per million words for the (argumentative) prose works in the corpus. This suggests that, whilst not absent from other types of prose, *have*-doubling is indeed particularly frequent in Coornhert’s argumentative prose relative to other types of prose.¹¹

3. Semantics and pragmatics of perfect doubling

In this section, we introduce previous research on the semantics and pragmatics of *have*-doubling in both Early Modern Dutch and modern Dutch dialectal and German varieties.

10. Even certain instances in letters could, however, be assimilated into Coornhert’s argumentative and persuasive prose (Bongers and Gelderblom 1985: 126).

11. There are few other available instances of non-argumentative prose from Coornhert: his other translations include those of Cicero’s treatise *De Officiis* (Cicero 1561) (one double perfect), Boethius’ philosophical work *De consolatione philosophiae* (Coornhert 1945 [1585]) (one double perfect in the main text and one in the foreword) and selected parts of the *Odyssey* (Coornhert 1939 [1561]) (no double perfects), a verse text.

Whilst multiple different types of *have*-doubling have been proposed to exist in both these and other related varieties (see, for example, Wall [2018b] for an overview), we will concentrate on one particular type of *have*-doubling: perfect doubling.¹² Like simple perfects, these are active constructions in which the interpretation of the syntactic subject is determined by the external argument of the embedded participle. For instance, Example (5) is an active construction, in which the subject is interpreted as a *sinner* in line with the embedded participle *gezondight* ('sinned').

- (5) [...] souden sy int niet aannemen vanden Heere oock **gezondight**
 should they in.the not accept.INF of.the Lord also sinned.PTCP
hebben ghehadt?
 have.INF had.PTCP
 [Approx.: '...would they have also sinned in not accepting from the Lord?']
 (CO.TDWL.67r)

A previous Early Modern Dutch study which touches upon the factors of interest is that of van der Wal (1988) who investigates these "active three-part forms"¹³ (van der Wal 1988: 391) in a multi-author corpus study of eighteen Dutch texts from the sixteenth until the eighteenth century.^{14,15} Van der Wal finds that there is "no

12. Wall (2018b: 162–163), for instance, argues that in addition to double perfects there are passive *have*-doubling constructions, in which, following Broekhuis (2021: 276) and Duinhoven (1997: 347), the syntactic subject is "a metaphorical recipient, namely an individual who is causally but not actively implicated in the denoted event" (Wall 2018b: 162), akin to causative *have*-doubling constructions found in modern English (Wall 2018b: 162–163, Footnote 8). Here, we assume that the specific instances of Coornhert's *have*-doubling discussed in Section 5 are double perfects, although it should be noted that most examples do not allow the reading of the subject to be ascertained unambiguously. More research is required to try to determine the distribution of these distinct types of *have*-doubling more accurately.

13. Original Dutch: "aktieve drieledige vormen".

14. One of the sixteenth-century texts is Coornhert's *Zedekunst*, which is also included in this study, but these are otherwise from authors other than Coornhert (van der Wal 1988: 391, Footnote 8).

15. Note that these "active three-part forms" are in fact of secondary interest to the main focus of van der Wal's (1988) study – the apparently related three-part passive constructions like (a), a further construction found in Early Modern Dutch but absent from modern Standard Dutch.

a. Het boek is verkocht geworden / gewesen
 The book is sold.PTCP become.PTCP / been.PTCP
 [Approx.: 'The book has been/was sold.']

This means, aside from her discussion of Hooft's remarks which specifically concern *have*-doubling, van der Wal's (1988) comments on the function of doubling refer to both sets of constructions, if not predominately those like (a), not just the ones of interest here.

particular rule [of usage]”¹⁶ of doubling constructions, but nevertheless highlights two factors related to their semantics and pragmatics. Firstly, she cites an extract from the seventeenth-century writer P.C. Hooft’s (1581–1647) grammar *Waernehmenen op de Hollandsche Tael* (*Observations on the Dutch Language*) (in Zwaan [1939]) where he describes the potential ambiguity of run-of-the-mill perfects as a potential motivation for the use of perfect doubling in Early Modern Dutch: the use of a present perfect like *hy heeft de stadt beleghert* (‘he has besieged the town’) “...may obscure matters, because it might be understood that he still had the town under siege, at our time of speaking: so to be very clear, it would in fact be necessary to say *HY HEEFT BELEGHERT GEHADT* [i.e., the doubling variant]...” (Zwaan 1939: 249; see van der Wal [1988: 397]).¹⁷ This implies that a double perfect may only be used when something is no longer valid at the time of speaking. Secondly, van der Wal (1988: 393) also expresses an intuition regarding a pragmatic role for these constructions: “Since one variant is more marked and thus draws more attention than the usual form, one might assume that the use of the three-part forms corresponds to the need for clarification or placing of emphasis”.¹⁸

In contrast to their Early Modern Dutch counterparts, perfect doubling constructions in modern Dutch dialectal and, more so, German varieties have been subject to a vast amount of research (e.g., Litvinov and Radčenko [1998], Squartini [1999], Ammann [2007], Rödel [2007, 2011], Koeneman et al. [2011], Brandner et al. [2016], Haß [2016] and Zybatow and Weskott [2018]). This research distinguishes two different types of double perfects, whose availability is determined by the variety in question’s wider tense/aspect paradigm. As we now show, Early Modern Dutch probably lacked a purely temporal double perfect, such as that restricted to southern German varieties, but instead had a double perfect like those found in Dutch dialects and other German varieties, with both a temporal/aspectual semantics akin to that described by P.C. Hooft, but also a clear pragmatic motivation comparable to that suggested by van der Wal.

The first, purely temporal double perfect, the so-called “anterior” (e.g., Koeneman et al. [2011: 72–74, and references therein], Brandner et al. [2016], Larsson and Brandner [2014], cf. Squartini [1999: 62ff.] and Haß [2016: 117–133]), which is found in southern German dialects, signals “an event in the past as completed/

16. Original Dutch: “geen bepaalde regel”.

17. Original Dutch: “kan diijsterheijt vallen, want het mochte verstaen worden, dat hij de Stadt nog beleghert held, op den tijd als wij spreken: zulx om heel klaer te spreken, wel noodigh waere te zeggen *HY HEEFT BELEGHERT GEHADT*”.

18. Original Dutch: “Omdat een variant gemarkeerder is en dus meer aandacht trekt dan de gebruikelijke vorm, zou men kunnen veronderstellen dat het gebruik van de driedledige vormen samenhangt met de behoefte tot verduidelijking of met het leggen van een accent”.

anterior to a reference point in the past”¹⁹ (Brandner et al. 2016: 4). This is illustrated in Example (6).

- (6) Wo s Anni der éerscht Walzer **gmacht** **ghaa** **hed**, **isch** em
 When the Anni the first waltz done.PTCP had.PTCP Has is him.DAT
 schlächt **wòorde**.
 bad become.PTCP
 [‘After Anni had danced the first waltz, she started to feel sick.’]
 (cf. Bossard [1962] in Brandner et al. [2016: 16])

In Example (6), as signposted by the conjunction *wo* (‘when, after’), the anterior double perfect *hed ghaa gmacht* (‘has... had done’) expresses that Anni’s having completed the waltz is anterior to the point when he starts to feel bad – expressed by a run-of-the-mill simple perfect – *isch...wòorde* (‘has become’). In modern Standard German and other varieties, the same meaning is instead expressed by a morphological past perfect, like *hatte...getanzt* (‘had...danced’), as in Example (7).

- (7) Nachdem Anni den ersten Walzer **getanzt** **hatte**, **wurde** ihr
 [‘After Anni the first waltz danced.PTCP had became him.DAT
 schlecht.
 bad.’]
 (Brandner et al. 2016: 16)

Importantly, the availability of double perfects with this purely temporal meaning is determined by the wider tense/aspect paradigm: these double perfects are generally restricted to varieties which have undergone the *Präteritumsschwund* (‘preterit disappearance’) (Larsson and Brandner 2014; cf. Squartini [1999: 60–61] and Koenen et al. [2011: 40–41, 73–74]) – that is, they have lost morphologically simple past tenses like *wurde* (‘became’) in Example (7). More specifically, given the absence of simple past forms of the auxiliary (e.g., *sie hatte* [‘she had’] and *sie war* [‘she was’]) in these varieties, past perfects cannot be formed from a combination of a simple past form of the auxiliary like *hatte* (‘had’) and a lexical past participle like *getanzt* (‘danced’), as in other German varieties and modern Dutch varieties (see Footnote 22). As such, in southern varieties, double perfects express this temporal meaning, thus filling a genuine gap in the tense/aspect system.

Like non-southern German varieties and modern Dutch varieties, there appears to have been no such gap in the tense/aspect system in Coornhert’s

19. Original German: “beschreibt ein Ereignis in der Vergangenheit als abgeschlossen/ vorzeitig zu einem Referenzzeitpunkt in der Vergangenheit”.

Dutch: he retained morphological simple pasts and was hence able to express the temporal meaning associated with anterior double perfects with a morphological past perfect. Both of these forms are shown in the narrative extract in Example (8) (see also Hooft's contemporary description of the past perfect in his *Waernemingen* in Zwaan [1939: 248]).

- (8) Endelijck bevindende dat hy hem niet en **beweechde** na dat sy hem
 Finally finding that he him not NEG moved after she him
 al dicmael weder **aenghestoten hadde, vermerckte** sy dat hy doot
 already many.times again nudged.PTCP had noticed she that he dead
 was
 was
 ['Finally finding that he was not moving after she had nudged him again and
 again, she realised that he was dead...'] (CO.VLHO. N4V)

In Example (8), the morphological past perfect *hadde...aenghestoten* ('had...nudged') appears to express the anterior's meaning: as signposted by the conjunction *na dat* ('after') (cf. *nachdem* ['after'] in Example [7]), the repeated nudging of the body is anterior to the establishment of the individual's death indicated by the simple pasts *beweechde* ('moved') and *vermerckte* ('noticed'). As such, given the presence of both morphological simple pasts and past perfects in Coornhert's Dutch, and assuming that we can generally only expect double perfects in varieties without these, we seem to be able to rule out this purely temporal, anterior double perfect.

Instead, Coornhert's double perfects appear to correspond to a second type of double perfect, which has both a temporal/aspectual and pragmatic meaning, and is found alongside anterior double perfects in southern German dialects (e.g., Squartini [1999: 65ff.] and Brandner et al. [2016]), as well as in other German varieties: for example, Haß [2016]) and modern Dutch dialects (Koeneman et al. 2011: 72–74) which lack the anterior.^{20,21} In what follows, focussing on the better-studied instances of this construction in German varieties, we introduce the

20. As Wall (2018b) shows based on the same dataset, Coornhert's *have*-doubling constructions also parallel their Dutch dialectal counterparts in terms of an important syntactic property, namely their word order (see Koeneman et al. [2011] and also Brandner et al. [2016: 35ff.] on southern German varieties).

21. This corresponds to what Haß (2016) refers to as the "absoluter Gebrauch" ('absolute use') of double perfects, and broadly speaking to the various non-anterior uses distinguished by Squartini (1999) and Brandner et al. (2016). Note that unlike these other authors, who for instance notably treat double perfects with positional past-tense adverbs as a separate class (Squartini 1999: 66ff.; Brandner et al. 2016: 17–18, 27–28), whilst, following Haß (2016), we assume they are part of a unified class of non-anterior uses.

temporal/aspectual meaning of these double perfects, by first describing relevant forms in the wider tense/aspect paradigm of these varieties with which they are partially interchangeable, and then look at their pragmatic function.

In non-southern varieties of German, in addition to past perfects like those in Example (7), the wider tense/aspect paradigm features morphologically simple pasts like *traf* ('met') as well as simple perfects like *habe...getroffen* ('have...met') (see, for example, Squartini [1999: 61]).²² Both of these are at least to some extent exchangeable (see, for example, Haß [2016: 48–49, 55–63]), being able to combine with positional past adverbs like *gestern* ('yesterday') (e.g., Haß [2016: 48–49]), as illustrated in Examples (9a) and (9b), respectively.

- (9) a. *Gestern traf ich Hans.*
 Yesterday met I Hans
 b. *Gestern habe ich Hans getroffen.*
 Yesterday have I Hans met.PTCP
 ['Yesterday, I met Hans.'] (Haß 2016: 48–49)

In addition, simple perfects in German are possible in "current relevance"-type contexts – namely, approximately when what is expressed relates to or holds into the present. One such instance is Example (10), a universal perfect (see, for example, Comrie [1976: 60]), in which the durative adverb *seit einer Stunde* ('for an hour') indicates that a state began in the past and the present tense adverb *jetzt* ('now') shows that it still holds in the present.

- (10) *Ich habe den Rucksack jetzt schon seit einer Stunde [sic] getragen.*
 I have the rucksack now already since a hour carried.PTCP
 ['I have now carried the rucksack for an hour.'] (Haß 2016: 217)

In their temporal meaning, double perfects in (non-southern) German varieties parallel Examples (9a) and (9b), rather than Example (10): like morphologically simple pasts and perfects of the Example (9b)-type, they can also express simple past tense (e.g., Haß [2016s: 249–258]) and combine with positional past tense adverbs like *gestern* ('yesterday') in Example (11a) (e.g., Haß [2016: 145], see also Footnote 21]), but are ungrammatical in current relevance contexts (Haß 2016: 216–217), as in Example (11b).

22. Whilst there is less descriptive material available on the wider tense/aspect systems of Dutch dialects with double perfects, they appear to parallel non-southern German varieties, given that they also feature both simple pasts and past perfects, and that both simple and double perfects are possible in viable doubling contexts (Koenenman et al. 2011: 40, 74).

- (11) a. Gestern **hat** er es mir **gesagt** **gehabt**.
Yesterday has he it me.DAT said.PTCP had.PTCP
[Approx.: ‘He said it to me yesterday.’] (Haß 2016: 135)
- b. *Ich **habe** den Rucksack **jetzt schon** **seit** **einer Stunde** **getragen**
I have the rucksack now already since an hour carried.PTCP
gehabt.
had.PTCP
(Haß 2016: 217)

As such, perfect doubling can be seen to express the absence of current relevance, or to “cancel [...] the implication that a certain status still holds at the moment of speech” (Ammann 2007: 197; for similar descriptions, see, for example, Brandner et al. [2016] and Rödel [2007, 2011]).

According to the aforementioned comments by Hooft in his *Waernemingen*, including and beyond those cited above, a broadly identical situation seems to have held of both the wider tense/aspect system and double perfects in Early Modern Dutch. First, both Early Modern Dutch morphological simple past forms like *hy belegherde* (‘he besieged’) and simple perfects like *hy heeft de stadt beleghert* (‘he has besieged the town’) (in Zwaan [1939: 249]), can express “a matter which is over at the point of time when one speaks thereof”²³ (in Zwaan [1939: 248]). Further, the latter, just like their German counterparts, seem to be found in current relevance contexts given that from the simple perfect *hy heeft de stadt beleghert*, “it might be understood that he still had the town under siege”²⁴. Finally, as noted above, it is likewise double perfects which are ruled out in this latter context and appear thus to be only able to express something which is no longer valid at the time of speaking, as in German.

Secondly, supporting van der Wal’s (1988: 393) second observation, previous analyses of double perfects in German and Dutch varieties have proposed pragmatic reasons for the alternation between these forms and simple perfects (e.g., Squartini [1999: 57, 65–67], Koenen et al. [2011: 69, 73], Brandner et al. [2016: 27–28] and Haß [2016: 197–213, 215–282]). Notably, directly parallel to van der Wal, Haß (2016) argues that double perfects are an *expressive Kommunikationsstrategie* (‘expressive communication strategy’) compared with double perfect due to their status as a “[...] more complex, heavier and phonetically marked verbal form [...]” (Haß 2016: 199).²⁵ According to Haß, examples which exhibit this expressive function can be linked to the *Hervorhebung eines Verbalgeschehens* (‘emphasis of an event’) (Haß 2016: 206, 208) or *eine besonders*

23. Original Dutch: “een zaek die verbij is op den tijdt als men daer af spreekt”.

24. Original Dutch: “het mochte verstaen worden, dat hij de Stadt nog beleghert hield”.

25. Original German: “[...] komplexere, schwerere und phonetisch markierte Verbalform [...]”.

wichtige Information ('a particularly important piece of information') (Haß 2016: 205). One context in which such expressive functions are frequent is the repetition of an event that has already been expressed with a non-double form, be it a simple perfect or simple past in conjunction with a double perfect, or a simple past perfect with either a double perfect or double past perfect (Haß 2016: 203–207, 210–212; see also Rödel's [2011: 136] Example [21]).²⁶

Further, describing Example (12) and directly related to their temporal/aspectual meaning, Rödel (2011: 136) links double perfects to an emphasis specifically on the "temporal distance" of the proposition expressed, stating: "Obviously the speaker chooses a double perfect to emphasise the temporal distance of the situation. It is a subjective classification of the speaker to distance himself from the topic of this sentence [...]" (see also Rödel [2007] and Brandner et al. [2016: 27–28]).

- (12) **Speaker 1:** Bei den Filmaufnahmen damals haben Sie sehr sportlich gewirkt. Treiben Sie Sport?

Speaker 2: Ja, ich spiele leidenschaftlich Fußball (.) und **habe** es auch damals schon **gespielt gehabt**.

[**Speaker 1:** Back then when shooting the film you seemed to be very sporty. Do you regularly do sports?

Speaker 2: Yes, I love playing football and I already played then too.]

(Bayern2Radio, 05/10/2005 in Rödel [2011: 136])

Thus, as well as expressing a temporal meaning associated with the absence of current relevance, double perfects can be linked to pragmatic motivations for emphasis.

In this section, we have shown, with reference to the wider tense/aspect paradigms, that Early Modern Dutch probably lacked the purely temporal, anterior double perfect found in southern German varieties, but instead had a double perfect with both a temporal/aspectual and pragmatic meaning as also found in modern Dutch dialects and other German varieties. Temporally, such double perfects can be broadly seen to express the absence of current relevance (Haß 2016) and, pragmatically, these constructions have been associated with emphasis functions, specifically in relation to stressing a situation's temporal distance (Rödel 2007, 2011). In the next section, we present a proposal for Coornhert's

26. In addition, Haß (2016: 197–213) relates this expressive function to "eine[r] Art Betonung, dass ein vergangenes Ereignis tatsächlich in der beschriebenen Form stattgefunden hat" ('a sort of emphasis, that a past event actually took place in the described form') (Haß 2016: 212–213). However, as this is not obviously the case with the Early Modern Dutch instances in this paper, we will not discuss it further here.

use of perfect doubling based on this previous literature in relation to research in pragmatics and discourse studies on verb tense variation.

4. Proposal: Perfect doubling parallels the historical present

In this section, we propose that, due to their semantics and emphasis function, double perfects can be considered to parallel the historical present. We show that they form part of a wider class of evaluative devices/stance markers documented in the pragmatics/discourse studies literature on tense-switching phenomena (e.g., Fleischman [1986]). Further, as a bridge to the case studies on Coornhert's use of *have*-doubling, we argue that these can be linked to rhetorical devices, as discussed in literary studies research.

The historical present is the use of the present tense in the narration of past events. It is a marked form, in opposition to the usual unmarked past tense found in narratives (see, for a discussion on tense and markedness, Fleischman [1990:52ff]). Now widely acknowledged is the fact that the historical present serves pragmatic roles (see, for a short overview, Brinton [2015:227]), which fall under the category of evaluation devices/stance marking. Generally, scholars assume that the speaker/writer is present in an utterance with his or her attitude and belief through linguistic means, thus giving personal emphasis and conveying, for example, levels of certainty and importance (see Baratta [2009:1407] for a short overview on stance's rhetorical effect). Over the recent decades, scholars have increasingly studied the evaluative function and meaning of various linguistic items (particularly that of value-marked vocabulary, but see, for example, Fleischman [1985, 1986] on the historical present and Baratta [2009] on the passive) in different languages and contexts. In particular, the first decades of the twenty-first century witnessed an upsurge of interest in the linguistic mechanisms of evaluation under different labels, including evaluation, subjectivity and stance – with stance probably being the most commonly used nowadays (see, for example, Hunston and Thompson [(eds) 2003], Martin and White [2005], Englebretson [2007], Jaffe [(ed.) 2009] and Thompson and Alba-Juez [(eds) 2014]).

Although the historical present has no intrinsic evaluative force itself – in contrast to intensifiers or other value-marked vocabulary – it can function as an evaluative device/stance marker in two ways. Firstly, on a more general level, the historical present as a marked tense can highlight the relative importance of a certain event within the larger discourse (e.g., Brinton [1992:227–228]) – that is, it foregrounds certain information (Fleischman 1985). Secondly, following from its tense/aspect morphology, the historical present has an evaluative function related

to the degree of distance between the event and the moment of narration/reading. More specifically, as a form of “internal evaluation” the historical present renders events “as if they were occurring at that moment” (Schiffrin 1981: 59).²⁷ Thus, it can serve both the narrator and the audience, in the representation and interpretation of the narrative.²⁸

Building on the literature discussed on verb–tense variation between the past and the historical present and combining it with the literature discussed on the semantics and pragmatics of perfect doubling (Section 3), perfect doubling and the historical present can be treated as parallel phenomena. Firstly, perfect doubling and the historical present have in common that they are both marked tenses, as they are used as deviation from other tense forms: run-of-the-mill present/past perfects as well as simple pasts in the case of perfect doubling (see also van der Wal [1988: 393] and Haß [2016: 198, Section 3]) and simple pasts in the case of the historical perfect. Hence, they are both a potential means for the author’s personal emphasis (stance) – for example, emphasising *eine besonders wichtige Information* (‘a particularly piece of important information’) (Haß 2016: 205). Secondly, both tenses reveal the level of distance to the content of the utterance. Whereas the historical present situates narrated events in the here-and-now, perfect doubling, in contrast, locates events in the completed past (e.g., Rödel [2007, 2011]). Perfect doubling, in other words, offers the writer/speaker the most distanced stance, thus allowing “[...] the speaker to distance himself from the topic of this sentence [...]” (Rödel 2011: 136). To the best of our knowledge, this link between perfect doubling and the historical present/stance marking is a novel one which does not feature in the previous literature on either.

In the following section, we present a qualitative analysis of *have*-doubling in two case studies on themes in Coornhert’s moral–theological texts. We will argue there that, parallel to the historical present, perfect doubling is a vehicle

27. The notion of internal evaluation refers to Labov’s (1972) seminal sociolinguistic work on the structure of narratives, where he distinguishes between external (i.e., explicit) and internal (i.e., linguistic items expressing evaluative force) evaluation. However, as highlighted above, recent research has greatly extended these notions beyond Labov’s initial conception of them as alerting the audience to the story’s point, and it is to these more recent interpretations which we relate perfect doubling in this paper.

28. There is some debate whether the historical present is an evaluation device for the narrator, revealing his or her stance towards events, or for the audience, to “develop their own view of events” (for a short overview on both aspects, see Brinton [1992: 228]). Below, we interpret the use of perfect doubling from an interactional perspective: perfect doubling first and foremost allows Coornhert, as author, to distance himself from the uttered content. When presenting his own way of thinking, however, he is likely also to be guided by the interpretation of the audience.

for the author to insert his viewpoint into a text (see Brinton [1992:228]). In contrast with the former's conveyance of temporal closeness, however, the evaluative force of perfect doubling lies in dissociation. In that sense, perfect doubling could be argued to be another of the stylistic devices used for rhetorical functions as discerned in literary studies. Like the deployment of stylistic devices (e.g., Gelderblom [1989]) and the effective arrangement of a text's argument structure (e.g., Fleurkens [1994]), Coornhert could use morphosyntactic items, and perfect doubling specifically (but see also van de Poppe [2018] on Coornhert's use of the genitive), rhetorically – that is, to attract the reader's attention and to structure the argumentation line by situating the utterance's content in the completed past.

5. Perfect doubling in Coornhert's theological prose: Two case studies on (original) sin

The majority of Coornhert's writing concerned religious and related moral issues: Coornhert was an active opponent of Reformed Protestantism and heavily criticised it and the Reformed Church by expounding his own contrasting views on moral-theological matters in a number of publications. The works in which perfect doubling occurs most frequently are all related to these theological matters (see Section 2).

In this section, we will consider potential pragmatic-rhetorical functions of the construction in relation to a key context in his writing in which perfect doubling occurs frequently: the notion of sin from bygone times (Berkvens-Stevelinck 1989:22–23). Contrary to Calvinist theology, Coornhert argues that Adam's sin (i.e., original sin) has not doomed all mankind to sinfulness, and therefore mankind can take destiny into their own hands and pursue salvation (Berkvens-Stevelinck 1989:22–25). Coornhert's denial of original sin results in his theory of "perfectism" (*perfectisme*): through God's grace, a believer is capable of leaving his or her sinful past behind and fulfilling the divine law completely (see, for example, Buys [2011:7] and van Veen and Spohnholz [2014:88]).

When discussing these notions of sin and perfectism, Coornhert varies between double perfects and simple present/past perfects. In what follows, we aim to provide possible interpretations of this variation by studying a sample of *have*-doubling constructions in two contexts (see also, however, Footnote 30): Coornhert's polemical debate with his Calvinist opponents (see Section 5.1), and the exploration of Coornhert's own theology (see Section 5.2). We will propose that Coornhert used perfect doubling in both contexts as an evaluative device/stance marker (see Section 4): Coornhert employed perfect doubling to signal the significance of certain information and the point of the debate, as well as to guide

his audience through the line of argument by dissociating himself, and potentially his readers, from the sins of bygone times. In the specific context of polemical debates (see Section 5.1), furthermore, this use of perfect doubling contributed to critiquing his opponents' theology, whereas, in the context of presenting his own ethics (see Section 5.2), perfect doubling served to linguistically confirm the theology of perfectism, by putting additional emphasis on the completeness of past sins, resulting in a state of perfection.

5.1 Case study 1: Coornhert in debate

In *Van de vreemde sonde* ('On Strange Sin') (VDVS, 1584), Coornhert argues against two Calvinist ministers, Arent Cornelisz and Reynier Donteclock, who view man's corrupt nature as arising through the fall of Adam. Coornhert, to the contrary, argues that man acquires sin or virtue through his own belief or disbelief.

Through this first case study of perfect doubling, we aim to illustrate that, in this context of a controversy, Coornhert used perfect doubling for restating and evaluating the opponent's point, linked to one of the main structures found in Early Modern controversy texts more broadly. We will do so by analysing seven examples from one chapter (Book 1, Chapter 5).

Considering the polemical context and argumentative content of VDVS, the pragmatics of Coornhert's language in this treatise should be analysed from the perspective of historical controversies and polemical communication. This topic has recently received much attention in the field of pragmatics (see Fritz et al. [2018]), thus providing a framework for the analysis of communicative patterns in polemical texts. Specifically, previous studies on controversy dialogues help us to see how perfect doubling functioned in one specific communicative section. As pointed out by Fritz (2003), Early Modern controversy texts follow certain organisational principles of dialogue structures. The main structure used is the restatement of the opponent's point, and then the author's response to that particular point (see also Brownlees [2017:236]). This was a means to provide some background knowledge, since in many cases "the authors could not assume their readers to have available the texts of which the controversy consisted or to remember previous contributions. So they had to take measures in their own text to provide readers with the appropriate knowledge" (Fritz 2003: 203). Coornhert applied this technique in VDVS.

In both the chapter's title, Example (13), and its introductory section, Example (14), Coornhert introduces the main subject – that is, whether Adam received virtues for himself or for mankind, using the past perfect (*ontfangen hadde* ['received had']). Following the observation on controversy dialogues

above, the introductory section, Example (14), marks the first part of the dialogue structure, since it introduces the opponent's point: the Calvinist ministers argue that Adam indeed received virtues for himself and his descendants.

- (13) Of Adam alle die gaven in hem gheweest zijnde, voor die gantsche menschelijke nature, dat is voor alle sijne afcomste, dan of hy eenighe voor hem self **ontfangen hadde**.
 ['Whether Adam received all the gifts which were in him, for all mankind, that is, for all his descendants, or whether he **had received** some of them for himself.']
 (CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)
- (14) GHyluyden bouwet dese uwe leere vande vreemde sonde op u segghen, dat Adam alle sijne gaven **ontfanghen hadde**, niet voor sich self alleen, maer voor alle sijne afcomste.
 ['You build this doctrine of yours on your argument that Adam **had received** all his gifts not only for himself, but for all his descendants.']
 (CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

After this introduction, Coornhert starts his response in this polemical dialogue; the conjunction *maer* ('but') at the start of Example (15) marks the beginning of Coornhert's rhetorically composed criticism of the Calvinist theology. His main thesis in Example (15) is that their theology of receiving and losing virtues through Adam is not based on scripture. Contrary to the title, Example (13), and introduction section, Example (14), however, Coornhert uses perfect doubling here to restate his opponent's viewpoint. Following the observation on the pragmatics of double perfects made in Section 3, Coornhert may be using the double perfect here to put additional emphasis on the temporal distance of the fall, according to the emphasis function attributed to the construction by Rödel (2007, 2011).

- (15) Maer dit bewijsdy even soo weynigh metter heylicher Schrifturen, als ghy bewijst dat hy die altsamen oock voor alle sijne Nacomelinghen **verloren soude hebben ghehad** [...].
 ['However, you prove this (viewpoint) no more with the Holy Scripture than you prove that he (Adam) also **would have lost** these (virtues) for all his descendants (...).']
 (CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

In fact, throughout the argumentative dialogue in this chapter (i.e., the reiteration of the opponent's viewpoint, and Coornhert's response), Coornhert seems to supplement overt forms of criticism, such as the reproach of being unscriptural (see Example [15]), with more covert forms of evaluation through linguistic structures (e.g., perfect doubling), thus representing his own way of thinking (or

stance towards the subject matter). Consider as an illustration the case of Example (16).

- (16) Want ick niet en meyne u luyder meyninghe te zijn, dat [...] wyluyden altsamen oock mede, waren sy [Adam ende Eva] niet ghevallen, alle sulckx van henluyden oock **aengheerft** ende **ontfanghen soudē hebben ghehadt**, ghemerckt sulck segghen met gheen Godtlijcke Schrifture eenen waarschijnlijk-jcken verwe en mach ghegheven worden [...].
 [Approx.: ‘Since I do not think your opinion is that...had they (Adam and Eve) not fallen, all of us **would have also inherited** and **received** all such gifts from them, given that such words cannot be made probable by any piece of divine scripture (...).’]
 (CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)

In Example (16), Coornhert summarises the same Calvinist viewpoint which he had summarised in the title, Example (13), and introduction, Example (14), but contrary to the latter two, in Example (16) he intertwines his own view (“ick niet en meyne” [‘I do not think’]) with that of the Calvinist ministers (“u luyder meyninghe” [‘your opinion’]). In fact, freely translated, Coornhert argues that it cannot be the case that these ministers are so ignorant to fathom that, if mankind had not fallen, we could have inherited virtues through Adam, since no citation from scripture can evidence such. In this way, Coornhert criticises the Calvinist foolishness by allegedly doubting his own interpretation of their argument. Coornhert supplements this overt form of critique and irony with linguistic argumentation through perfect doubling (“aengheerft ende ontfanghen soudē hebben ghehadt”) which presents the fall as situated in the completed past, and, hence, without consequences for the present.

A similar analysis can be made of the subsequent instances of doubling in the chapter, shown in Examples (17) and (18), in which Coornhert again addresses his opponents and summarises their dispute using double perfects.

- (17) Aengaende dit beelde Godes mette voorschreven deuchden (nu hier ons gheschille zijnde) seght ghyluyden dat Adam voor ons allen **ontfanghen heeft ghehadt** [...].
 [‘With respect to this image of God and the discussed virtues (being our dispute), you argue that Adam **received** them for all of us (...).’]
 (CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.v)
- (18) Want dit niet bewijssende ist u onmoghelijck te bewijssen dat [...] Adam sulcke gaven oft deuchden voor ons allen **verloren soude hebben ghehadt**.
 [‘Not proving this, it is impossible for you to prove that (...) Adam **would have lost** such gifts or virtues for us all.’]
 (CO.VDVS.cccclxxxvij.r)

Interestingly, as in the title and introduction section (i.e., Examples [13] and [14]), in the conclusion (Example [19]), Coornhert does not use perfect doubling. Instead, here he switches to the present perfect (“heeft ontvangen” [‘has received’]).²⁹

- (19) Soo en **heeft** dan oock Adam sijne gaven voor ons niet **ontfanghen** om by hem ons aengeerft te worden indien hy staende bleef.
[‘Thus, Adam **did** not **receive** his gifts for us, to be inherited by us through him if he had not fallen.’]

This difference between the chapter’s introductory and conclusion sections (without perfect doubling) on the one hand, and its main body on the other (with perfect doubling), suggests that perfect doubling might have an evaluative function in the polemical dialogue specifically. Whereas the introduction and conclusion with the present/past perfects are a more general rendering of the chapter’s subject with present/past perfects, in the polemical dialogue, Coornhert’s aim may be to guide his reader through his own line of thought, and thus to convince his reader with the help of rhetorical-linguistic elements, including that of perfect doubling. The function of this perfect doubling, firstly, seems to be that of revealing the personal emphasis of the writer on the event’s significance within the larger argumentative discourse: Adam’s sin is crucial to the theological matter at stake (i.e., original sin). More importantly, considering the fact that Coornhert alternates between simple past/present perfects in the introduction/conclusion section and double perfects in its main body – also paralleling alternations found more broadly between double and non-double forms in modern German (Haß 2016) (see Section 3) – perfect doubling seems to be a vehicle of argumentative commentary, thus revealing Coornhert’s way of thinking and his stance towards the event. Contrary to the evaluative function of perfect doubling’s counterpart (i.e., the historical present signalling temporal closeness; see Section 3 and 4), perfect doubling as a marked tense then reveals the personal emphasis of the writer on temporal distance and thus creates dissociation from the present (we have borrowed the term “dissociation” from Steele [1975]): Coornhert presents the fall as situated in the completed past, and hence, shows it to be without conse-

29. Interestingly, though, in the title and introduction Coornhert uses the past perfect, whereas in the conclusion he uses the present perfect. Further, in this section of Coornhert’s work and elsewhere, indicative double perfects (e.g., Example [15]) alternate with irrealis ones (e.g. Example [14]) (see, for example, Kern [1912: 290]). Further research is necessary to illuminate our understanding of both instances of variation.

quences and/or relevance for the present, contrary to what Calvinist theology claims.³⁰

5.2 Case study 2: Coornhert highlights key elements of his theology

The preceding section described the function of perfect doubling in the context of theological controversy, where we have attempted to show that it was used by Coornhert to summarise his opponent's viewpoints on Adam's sin and simultaneously express his own stance towards this. Furthermore, as we now show, Coornhert uses perfect doubling when highlighting the basic principles on sin in his own theology.

An important aspect related to sin is Coornhert's belief in the process of spiritual rebirth, with corresponding degrees of faith, ultimately resulting in perfection. As explained above, according to Coornhert, man is able to reject sin and to grow in his faith, ultimately leading towards the maintenance of all God's commandments: the final stage of perfection. The following cases, presented in Examples (20), (21) and (22), illustrate that Coornhert, when addressing the readers of his own theology to teach them on moral development, uses perfect doubling to show that a level of spiritual rebirth is or should be fully completed. The construction, then, again may be seen as a means of dissociation, but, rather than providing a means to dissociate himself and thereby his readers from Adam's fall and its consequences, Coornhert might have used it to make it possible for his readers to dissociate themselves from their own past sins.

The first two examples, Examples (20) and (21), contain an order concerning the pursuit of perfection, expressed by an imperative (*begheeft* ['forsake'] and *dient* ['serve']). There is, however, a linguistic difference between the two. In Example (20), Coornhert describes a level of faith that is not completed yet, using the present perfect (*hebt ghedient* ['served']). In this example, inequity (*ongerechtigheid*) is still present, because the person serves its opposite (i.e., righteousness only "voor een deelken ende onvolcomelijck" ['partially and incompletely']). To the contrary, in Example (21), Coornhert uses perfect doubling when expressing a completed process of striving for perfection. Here, Coornhert stresses the contrast between the "old man" ("Ghelijck als" ['just as']), the sinner who had followed impurity and inequity, and the "new man" ("alsoo...nu..." ['thus...now...']), who, as a result of spiritual rebirth, serves righteousness ("dienst

30. A potential further example of similar variation between the doubling and non-doubling forms is in Book 2, Chapter 1 of *Van de vreemde sonde*, where instances of simple present/past perfects with the verbs *bederven/verderven* ('corrupt') are found alongside have-doubling constructions with those same verbs.

der gherechtigheydt” [‘service of righteousness’]). Hence, whereas in Example (20) man’s imperfections are still present, in Example (21) man has overcome these imperfections. Coornhert seems to use variation between the present perfect tense, Example (20), and perfect doubling, Example (21), to emphasise this difference: the double perfect in Example (21) may stress the temporal distance, and thereby express the dissociation, between the righteous reader and his sins that are situated in the completed past.

- (20) Ghelijck ghy voormaels in’t gheheel ende volcomelijck die ongherechtigheydt **hebt ghedient**: alsoo dient nu voor een deelken ende onvolcomelijck die gherechtigheydt [...].
[‘Just as you previously **served** inequity wholly and completely, thus now serve righteousness partially and incompletely (...).’] (CO.VDVS. cccccij.r)
- (21) Ghelijck als ghy uwe leden **hebt begheven ghehad**t tot dienste der onreynigheyt ende ongherechtigheydt: alsoo begheeft nu mede uwe leden tot dienst der gherechtigheydt, tot heylighmakinghe.
[Approx.: ‘Just as your limbs used to follow the service of impurity and iniquity, now turn your limbs in the service of righteousness and sanctification.’] (CO.VDVS. cccccij.r)

Taken together, Examples (20) and (21) thus provide evidence that Coornhert uses grammatical items, such as forms of address (*ghy* [‘you’]) and instructions (imperatives), to directly address the reader and guide them in their moral development, which fits into the broader picture of Coornhert treatises as rhetorically refined instruments of persuasion (Hermans 2018: 292). Likewise, alternation between the present perfect and perfect doubling may be applied by Coornhert, not only to reveal his personal stance towards the sin of bygone times, but also to convey the reader’s appropriate stance towards their sin; whereas the “ghy” of Example (20) is still subject to sin, the “ghy” of Example (21) is dissociated from sin.

However, giving orders to the readers of his own theology, as in Examples (20) and (21), is not the only rhetorical context in which perfect doubling is used by Coornhert. In his famous vernacular companion to ethics, the *Zedekunst* (ZDIW, 1586), for example, Coornhert also uses perfect doubling when communicating the core tenets of his theology, thereby addressing a more general audience (*men* [‘one’]) instead of the “ghy” in Examples (20) and (21). One instance is presented in Example (22); again, contrasting the behaviour of the “old” and “new” man, Coornhert warns that it will not be easy to exchange the bad for the good (in this particular case in the context of judging persons and events).

- (22) [...] maar niet zo licht en vallet een valsch oordeel, datmen langhe **bezeten** ende met ghoeddunckenheyd **omhelst heeft ghehadt**, te verlaten om een warachtigh oordeel te anvaten.
 ['(...) but it is not so easy to leave a false judgement, which one long **possessed** and **embraced** with self-assurance, in order to accept a true judgement.']
 (CO.ZDIW.120)

As in Example (20), in Example (22), the bad, characterising the “old man”, is expressed through perfect doubling (“bezeten ende omhelst heeft ghehadt”). Again, in line with the emphasis functions attributed to double perfects by Rödel, Coornhert may use the construction here to locate this situation of false judgment (“een valsch oordeel”) in the completed past, in order to contrast it with the present true judgement (“warachtigh oordeel”). Indeed, a true judgment is only possible when the false judgment has been completely cast aside. In brief, Examples (20) and (22) suggest that Coornhert uses perfect doubling instead of the perfect tense to dissociate perfect readers from their past sins. To the contrary, based on Example (21), when parts of the “old man” are still present, Coornhert does not dissociate the reader through perfect doubling, but instead uses a present perfect. Generally speaking, furthermore, this investigation into Coornhert’s use of perfect doubling through Case Studies 1 and 2 suggests that, concerning the subject of human sin, Coornhert’s use of perfect doubling dissociates his readers from Adam’s sin, and their own sin from past times, in order to justify his ethics of perfectibility, in which human beings are capable of becoming perfect.

6. Conclusion

Previous research has shown how the sixteenth-century Dutch writer D.V. Coornhert applied classical rhetorical strategies in his works in order to persuade his audiences. This article elaborated on a more recent strand of research which investigates the pragmatic function of morphosyntactic structures within individual authors (intra-author variation), by examining Coornhert’s exceptional use of a structure found in his times but unknown to modern Standard Dutch: *have*-doubling. Firstly, taking a macro-approach, this article has shown that the use of this structure depended on the literary-communicative context, and thus revealed both parallels, but also important differences, with Coornhert’s wider use of rhetorical strategies: Coornhert mainly used *have*-doubling in his argumentative prose on philosophical and/or theological content. Secondly, focussing on previous accounts of perfect doubling’s semantics and pragmatics, this article suggested that Early Modern Dutch double perfects parallel the aspectual/temporal meaning of absence of current relevance and the emphasis functions

of those in modern German varieties (cf. also Dutch dialectal varieties). Relating these more formal observations to research in pragmatics/discourse studies on verb-tense variation and literary studies on persuasive language use, we have, moreover, proposed that perfect doubling could be regarded as an evaluative device/stance marker. This hypothesis is supported by our two case studies on Coornhert's argumentative prose, in which he uses the construction specifically when responding to his opponent's viewpoint and discussing past sins in his own theology which defends perfectibility. In particular, our analysis suggests that double perfects create the evaluative effect of dissociation through which Coornhert could both express his distanced stance towards Adam's fall as well as empower his readers to leave behind their own sins of bygone times.



Funding



This paper is based on the authors' work in the research project "Language Dynamics in the Dutch Golden Age", financed by the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek ('Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research') (Grant 360-78-02).

Acknowledgements










The authors would also like to thank deeply Feike Dietz and Marjo van Koppen for their detailed feedback, which considerably helped to improve earlier drafts of this paper. Finally, many thanks to two anonymous reviewers, the editors of the *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, and Matthew P. Davies for all their help.











References

- van der Aa, Abraham Jacob. 1858. *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden. Deel 3* ['*Biographical Dictionary of Dutch. Part 3*']. Haarlem: Van Brederode. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aa__001biog04_01/
-  Ammann, Andreas. 2007. "The Fate of 'Redundant' Verbal Forms: Double Perfect Constructions in the Languages of Europe". In Thomas Stolz (ed.), *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* ['*Language Typology and Universals*'], 186–204. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
-  Baratta, Alexander M. 2009. "Revealing Stance through Passive Voice". *Journal of Pragmatics* 41 (7): 1406–1421.
- Barbiers, Sjef, Johan van der Auwera, Hans Bennis, Eefje Boef, Gunther de Vogelaer and Margreet van der Ham. 2008. *Syntactic Atlas of the Dutch Dialects*. (Volume 2.) Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.


- Berkvens-Stevelinck, Christiane. 1989. "Coornhert, een eigenzinnig theoloog" ['Coornhert, A Self-Willed Theologian']. In Henk Bongers, J. R. H. Hoogervorst, Nicolette Mout, Ivo Schöffers and Jan Juliaan Woltjer (eds), *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert. Dwars maar recht* ['*Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert: Unruly but Correct*'], 18–31. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers.
- Bongers, Hendrik. 1941. *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert. Studie over een nuchter en vroom Nederlander* ['*Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert: Study of a Sober and Pious Dutchman*']. Lochem: De Tijdstroom. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/bongoo4dirco1_01/colofon.php
- Bongers, Hendrik and Arie-Jan Gelderblom (eds). 1985. *Weet of rust. Proza van Coornhert* ['*Know or Let Go: Prose from Coornhert*']. Amsterdam: Em. Querido's Uitgeverij.
- Bossard, Hans. 1962. *Zuger Mundartbuch: Grammatik und Wörterverzeichnis* ['*Dialect Book of Zug: Grammar and Vocabulary*']. Zürich: Schweizer Spiegel-Verlag.
- Brandner, Ellen, Martin Salzmann and Gerhard Schaden. 2016. "Zur Syntax und Semantik des doppelten Perfekts aus alemannischer Sicht" ['On the Syntax and Semantics of the Double Perfect from an Alemannic Viewpoint']. In Alexandra N. Lenz and Franz Patocka (eds), *Syntaktische Variation: Areallinguistische Perspektiven* ['*Syntactic Variation: Areal Linguistic Perspectives*'], 13–46. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Vienna University Press.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 1992. "The Historical Present in Charlotte Brontë's Novels: Some Discourse Functions". *Style* 26 (2): 221–244.
-  Brinton, Laurel J. 2015. "Historical Discourse Analysis". In Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton and Deborah Schiffrin (eds), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 222–243. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
-  Broekhuis, Hans. 2021. "The Rise of the Periphrastic Perfect Tense in the Continental West Germanic Languages". In Kristin Melum Eide and Marc Fryd (eds), *The Perfect Volume: Papers on the Perfect*, 262–289. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
-  Brownlee, Nicholas. 2017. "He Tells Us That: Strategies of Reporting Adversarial News in the English Civil War". *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 18 (2): 235–251.
- Buys, Ruben. 2011. *Coornhert in het klein. Korte teksten over deugd, onwetendheid en Volmaakbaarheid* ['*Coornhert in Miniature: Short Texts about Virtue, Ignorance, and Perfectibility*']. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. 1561. *Officia Ciceronis, leerende wat yeghelijck in allen staten behoort te doen, bescreuen int Latijn* ['*Cicero's De Officiis, Teaching What Every One in All States Should Do, Described in Latin*']. (Translation by Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert.) Haarlem: Jan van Zuren. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/ciceo01offio1_01/
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An Introduction to Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. *Schijndeugd der secten (SDS)* ['*Delusional Virtue of Sects*']. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz Colom. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coorooischio2_01/index.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. *Vande predestinatie, verkiesinghe en de verwerpinghe Godes* ['*On Predestination and God's Preferences and Rejections*']. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom. Available online at: https://dbnl.org/tekst/cooroo1vanpo2_01/index.php

- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. "Van de toelatinge ende decrete Godts" ['On God's Allowances and Decrees']. In Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert, *Wercken. Deel II* ['Works. Part II']. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coorooivando5_01/colofon.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1630. "Van de vreemde sonde, schulde, straffe nasporinghe" (VDVS) ['Inquiries On Strange Sin, Guilt, Punishment']. In Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert, *Wercken. Deel II* ['Works. Part II']. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coorooivree01_01/
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1631. "Toetzsteen der ware leeraren" (TDWL) ['Touchstone of True Teachers']. In Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert, *Wercken. Deel I* ['Works. Part I']. Amsterdam: Jacob Aertsz. Colom. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/coorooitoeto2_01/
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. c. 1644. *Vijftigh lustighe historien oft nieuwigheden Joannis Boccattij (VLHO)* ['Fifty Funny Stories or Curiosities from Giovanni Boccaccio']. Amsterdam: Broer Jansz. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/cooroorvijfo1_01/index.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1939 (1561). *De dolinge van Ulysse. Homerus' Odysseia I–XVIII in Nederlandse verzen* ['The Wanderings of Ulysses: Homer's Odyssey I–XVIII in Dutch Verse']. Amsterdam: Elsevier. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/cooroo1dolio1_01/cooroo1dolio1_01_0001.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1942 (1586). *Zedekunst, dat is wellevenskunste (ZDIW)* ['Ethics: The Art of Living Well']. (Edited by Bruno B. Becker.) Leiden: E.J. Brill. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/cooroo1zedeo1_01/
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1945 (1585). *Boëthius: Van de vertróosting der wysheyd* ['Boethius: On the Consolation of Wisdom']. Amsterdam: A.A. Balkema. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/cooroor1vanvo1_01/index.php
- Coornhert, Dirk Volkertsz. 1955 (c. 1570–1575). "Der Maeghdekens Schole, comedia" (DMSC) ['School for Maidens']. In Dirk Volkertsz Coornhert, *Het roerspel en de comedies van Coornhert* ['The Turbulent Play and the Comedies of Coornhert'], 318–401. (Edited by Paul van der Meulen.) Leiden: E.J. Brill. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/cooroor1pvano1_01/
- Damsteegt, B. C. 1978. "t'Samenvoeghing in de Hertspiegel" ['Composition in the Heart-Mirror']. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 94: 1–24. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_tijoo31978o1_01/_tijoo31978o1_01_0001.php
- Duinhoven, Antonius Maria. 1997. *Middel-Nederlandse syntaxis: Synchroon en diachroon 2. De werkwoordgroep* ['Middle Dutch Syntax: Synchronic and Diachronic 2. The Verb Phrase']. Groningen: Martinus Nijhoff.
-  Englebreton, Robert. 2007. *Stancetaking in Discourse: Subjectivity, Evaluation, Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
-  Fleischman, Suzanne. 1985. "Discourse Functions of Tense-Aspect Oppositions in Narrative: Toward a Theory of Grounding". *Linguistics* 23 (6): 851–882.
-  Fleischman, Suzanne. 1986. "Evaluation in Narrative: The Present Tense in Medieval 'Performed Stories'". *Yale French Studies* 70: 199–251.
-  Fleischman, Suzanne. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity: From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Fleurkens, Anneke C. G. 1989. 'Leren met lust. Coornherts toneelspelen' ['Learning with Pleasure: Coornhert's Plays']. In Henk Bongers, J. R. H. Hoogervorst, Nicolette Mout, Ivo Schoffer and Jan Juliaan Woltjer (eds), *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert. Dwars maar recht* ['Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert: Unruly but Correct'], 80–97. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers.
- Fleurkens, Anneke C. G. 1994. *Stichtelijke lust. De toneelspelen van D. V. Coornhert (1522–1590) als middelen tot het geven van morele instructie* ['Edifying Lust: The Plays of D. V. Coornhert (1522–1590) as a Means of Giving Moral Instruction']. Hilversum: Verloren.
-  Fritz, Gerd. 2003. "Dialogical Structures in 17th Century Controversies". In Marina Bondi and Sorin Stati (eds), *Dialogue Analysis 2000*, 199–208. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag GmbH.
-  Fritz, Gerd, Thomas Gloning and Juliane Glüer. 2018. *Historical Pragmatics of Controversies: Case Studies from 1600 to 1800*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gelderblom, Arie-Jan. 1989. "'Nieuwe stof in Neerlandsch'. Een karakteristiek van Coornherts proza" ["'New Material in Dutch': A Characteristic of Coornhert's Prose"]. In Henk Bongers, J. R. H. Hoogervorst, Nicolette Mout, Ivo Schöffer and Jan Juliaan Woltjer (eds), *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert. Dwars maar recht* ['Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert: Unruly but Correct'], 98–114. Zutphen: De Walburg Pers. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/geldoo8nieuo1_01/geldoo8nieuo1_01_0001.php
-  van de Haar, Alisa. 2019. *The Golden Mean of Languages: Forging Dutch and French in the Early Modern Low Countries (1540–1620)*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
-  Haß, Norman. 2016. *Doppelte Zeitformen im Deutschen und im Französischen* ['Doubled Tenses in German and in French']. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
-  Hernández-Campoy, Juan Manuel. 2016. *Sociolinguistic Styles*. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
-  Hermans, Theo. 2018. "The World of Literature". In Helmer J. Helmers and Geert H. Janssen (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to the Dutch Golden Age*, 289–307. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hunston, Susan and Geoff Thompson (eds). 2003. *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-  Jaffe, Alexandra (ed.). 2009. *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jansen, Jeroen (ed.). 2011. *G.A. Bredero. Proza*. Hilversum: Verloren.
-  Jansen, Jeroen. 2017. "'Sincere Simplicity': Gerbrand Bredero's Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel". *Dutch Crossing* 41 (1): 4–20.
- Kern, Johan Hendrik. 1912. *De met het participium praeteriti omschrevenwerkwordsvormen in 't Nederlands* ['Verb Forms with the Past Participle in Dutch']. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller.
-  Koeneman, Olaf, Marika Lekakou and Sjef Barbiers. 2011. "Perfect Doubling". *Linguistic Variation* 11 (1): 35–75.
- van Koppen, Marjo and Feike M. Dietz. 2016. "Language Dynamics in the Dutch Golden Age". (Research project description.) Accessed 27 June 2020 at: https://languagedynamics.wp.hum.uu.nl/wp-content/uploads/sites/251/2016/05/project-proposal_website.pdf
- Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Larsson, Ida and Ellen Brandner. 2014. *Perfect Doubling and the Grammaticalization of Auxiliaries*. Paper presented at DiGS16. 3–5 July 2014. Budapest.
- Litvinov, Viktor P. and Vladimir L. Radčenko. 1998. *Doppelte Perfektbildungen in der deutschen Literatursprache* ['Double Perfects in the German Literary Language']. Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verlag.
-  Martin, James R. and Peter R. R. White. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van de Poppe, Cora. 2018. "Genitiefvariatie als instrument in Coornherts didactische programma: Semantische en stilistische functies van intra-auteur-variatie" ['Genitive Variation as an Instrument in Coornhert's Didactic Program: Semantic and Stylistic Functions of Intra-Author Variation']. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal-en Letterkunde* 134 (4): 277–299.
-  van de Poppe, Cora. 2020 (early view). "Early Modern Reader Management: *Begin*+Infinitive as a Discourse Marker in P.C. Hooft's Dutch Prose". *Renaissance Studies*.
- Rödel, Michael. 2007. *Doppelte Perfektbildungen und die Organisation von Tempus im Deutschen* ['Double Perfects and the Organisation of Tense in German']. Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verlag.
-  Rödel, Michael. 2011. "New Perspectives on Double Perfect Constructions in German". In Monika Rathert and Renate Musan (eds), *Tense Across Languages*, 127–146. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
-  Rutten, Gijsbert. 2016a. "Standardization and the Myth of Neutrality in Language History". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 242: 25–57.
-  Rutten, Gijsbert. 2016b. "Diaglossia, Individual Variation and the Limits of Standardization: Evidence from Dutch". In Cinzia Russi (ed.), *Current Trends in Historical Sociolinguistics*, 194–218. Warsaw and Berlin: De Gruyter Open Ltd.
-  Schiffrin, Deborah. 1981. "Tense Variation in Narrative". *Language* 57 (1): 45–62.
- Sijs, Nicoline van der and Roland Willemyns. 2009. *Het verhaal van het Nederlands: Een geschiedenis van twaalf eeuwen* ['The Story of Dutch: A History of Twelve Centuries']. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
-  Squartini, Mario. 1999. "On the Semantics of the Pluperfect: Evidence from Germanic and Romance". *Linguistic Typology* 3 (1): 51–89.
-  Steele, Susan. 1975. "Past and Irrealis: Just What Does it All Mean?" *International Journal of American Linguistics* 41 (3): 200–217. Available online at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1264541>.
-  Thompson, Geoff and Laura Alba-Juez (eds). 2014. *Evaluation in Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
-  van Veen, Mirjam G. K. and Jesse Spohnholz. 2014. "Calvinists vs. Libertines: A New Look at Religious Exile and the Origins of 'Dutch' Tolerance". In Gijsbert van den Brink and Harro M. Höpfl (eds), *Calvinism and the Making of the European Mind*, 76–99. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Veenman, René. 2009. *De klassieke traditie in de Lage Landen* ['The Classical Tradition in the Low Countries']. Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Vantilt.
- van der Wal, Marijke J. 1988. "De driedledige vormen in taal en taalbeschouwing" ['The Tripartite Forms in Language and Linguistic Thought']. *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 81: 383–400.

Wall, Joanna Helen. 2018a. Seeing Double: The HAVE Puzzle. (Master's thesis.) Utrecht University.

 Wall, Joanna Helen. 2018b. "Have-Doubling Constructions in Historical and Modern Dutch". *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 35 (1): 155–172.

Wall, Joanna Helen. Under revision. *Extra-Linguistic Properties of Have-Doubling in Historical Varieties of Dutch*. (Manuscript.) Utrecht University.

Zwaan, Frederik Lodewijk. 1939. *Uit de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche spraakkunst* ['From the History of Dutch Grammar']. Groningen: Batavia. Available online at: https://www.dbnl.org/tekst/zwaa004quitdo1_01/

 Zybatow, Tatjana and Thomas Weskott. 2018. "Das Doppelperfekt: Theorie und Empirie" ['The Double Perfect: Theory and Empirical Evidence']. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 37 (1): 83–124.

Address for correspondence

Joanna Wall
Utrecht University
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
Netherlands
j.h.wall@uu.nl

Co-author information

Cora van de Poppe
Utrecht University
c.j.vandepoppe@gmail.com

Publication history

Date received: 8 July 2020
Date accepted: 20 October 2020
Published online: 11 September 2023