MEANING AND USE OF THE DUTCH PERFECT

Sies de Haan

Abstract

In this paper, I am concerned with the perfect as a language-specific category in the grammar of Dutch. In the view of Van Es the meaning of this syntactic construction, consisting of a form of the auxiliaries hebben or zijn and a past participle, boils down to the fact that it presents an event retrospectively, summarized and detached from its background. These semantic properties relate to the compound nature, c.q. the syntactic structure of the perfect construction. These semantic and syntactic characteristics of the Dutch perfect have their roots in the historical development of the construction.*

1. The Dutch perfect

In traditional Dutch grammar the term perfect is used to refer to syntactic constructions consisting of a form of the auxiliaries hebben or zijn and a past participle. Comrie, in his book on aspect (Comrie 1985), views the perfect as a language-universal semantic category. He warns us that not everything referred to as a perfect in grammar-books, really is a perfect, in his sense of that notion, that is.

My approach starts from the opposite direction: I am concerned with the perfect as a language-specific category in the grammar of Dutch. There are a host of questions to answer regarding this category. For example, how do we have to analyse the distribution of the two auxiliaries hebben and zijn? These are in many cases in complementary distribution, though not in all. Or what distinguishes the hebben-perfect from constructions with hebben as a full verb and the past participle as a predicative complement to the direct object, or the zijn-perfect from a copular construction of zijn + a past participle? And what is the relation between the two elements of the perfect construction, the auxiliary and the past participle?

And last but not least, what is the meaning of the perfect-construction? According to the Dutch grammatical tradition this can be glossed as "the event is presented as completed before or at the present moment". This kind of formulation is inapt: there are uses of the perfect in which the event may be ended without being in the more strict sense completed; and there are uses of the perfect in which the event has to come about in the future.

My aim here will be primarily to look into the meaning and use of the Dutch perfect. More specifically, I want to explore a theory about this meaning, put forward by the Dutch grammarian Van Es, in relation to the historical development of the construction.
2. Semantic analysis of the Dutch perfect

2.1. The meaning of the Dutch perfect

According to Waugh in her article on the French passé composé (Waugh 1987), like the other tense forms the perfect has as its basic function the location of the verbal event in time, the time moment being delimited deictically as past, present, or future with respect to some deictic reference point. She maintains that time, as linguistically conceptualized, is the integrating factor for the different uses of the passé composé. The relation between the passé composé and location in time is the organizing principle in her discussion.

Here my analysis of the Dutch perfect diverges from her theory of the French perfect. Following the ANS we have to point out with regard to the Dutch perfect that in agreement with the finite verb form it behaves with respect to the category tense like the present tense: the perfect as such, like the present, does not express any temporal location in terms of past, present and future. The choice between the existing possibilities, being past, present, future, or no historical time period at all, depends on context and/or situation. Parallel to the present, there is a historical perfect, and a perfect referring to the future (as in (1)), and a perfect which expresses a 'timeless' state of affairs (as in (2)),...

(1) Morgen hebben we om deze tijd Parijs al bereikt.  
   Tomorrow we will have reached Paris already by this time.

(2) Als hij te laat komt, dan heeft hij zich verstapen.  
   If he comes too late, then he has overslept.

Location of the verbal event with respect to past, present or future is no function of the perfect, nor of any other so called verbal tense in Dutch. However, as we shall see, due to the past participle at least the perfect involves some other temporal meaning element in that it expresses anteriority c.q. retrospection.

2.1.1. Van Es on the meaning of the perfect

The approach of the perfect of the Dutch grammarian Van Es is the most interesting and promising that I know of (cf. Van Es 1971 and Van Es and Van Caspel 1974). Van Es provides us with a characterization of its general meaning and with a detailed application of it to different types of uses. At the background of this meaning-characterization, there is a general theory of verbal aspect. The perfect has to do with the category of what Van Es calls the absoluting aspects. These aspects represent the verbal event abstracted from the flow of time and the continuing succession of events.

Van Es refers to the perfectic aspect, typically exemplified by the perfect, as the most important absoluting aspect. According to Van Es the perfectic aspect lifts the event out of the course of time, isolates it as a fact, finishes it off temporally.
2.1.2. The perfect and the notion completion

According to Van Es the perfectic representation of an event is not so much a representation of "being completed", but rather that of "finishing off" and "isolating temporally". This links up with a remark of Comrie (Comrie 1985: 46; cf. also Waugh 1987: 7) on the interaction of the perfective/imperfective-distinction and the distinction between telic and atelic events: a perfectic form referring to a telic event implies attainment of the terminal point of that event:

(3) Hij heeft een stoel gemaakt.
   "He has a chair made"
   He has made a chair.

(3) implies that the chair has been completed. Following Comrie we may assume that "such examples may have given rise to the widespread view that perfectivity\(^1\) indicates completedness"(o.c. 46, n.2).

This view, however, is mistaken, as we can see in (4):

(4) Hij heeft met een paar vrienden gespeeld.
   "He has with some friends played"
   He has played with some friends.

where no completion of the playing is implied.\(^2\)

Van Es's semantic description of the Dutch perfect is very similar to the definition of perfectivity in Comrie (1985: 3). Re-phrasing the formulations of Comrie we could say that in (5) the reading-event is represented as an undivided whole; it is presented without any reference to the individual phases that make up the event. In (6) the same reading-event is presented with explicit reference to (some part of) its temporal course.

(5) Jan heeft gisteren dit boek gelezen.
   "Jan has yesterday this book read"
   John read this book yesterday.
(6) Toen hij het las, belde de postbode aan.
   "While he it read, rang the postman"
   While he was reading it, the postman rang.

Comrie explains the difference between this perfective and imperfective meaning element as the difference between an external and an internal point of view (o.c. 4). In the case of the imperfective aspect he speaks of a crucial involvement in the internal structure of the event. This perfective/imperfective distinction is an important element in the difference between the Dutch perfect and preterit, and is, as such, of great stylistic value. Whereas the perfect isolates an event, the preterit presents it as a part of the succession of events in the flow of time.
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In the view of Van Es the meaning of the Dutch perfect boils down to the fact that it summarizes an event. It presents an event retrospectively and detached from its background. These semantic properties relate to the compound nature, e.g. the syntactic structure of the perfect construction. They are concerned with the effects of the historical process of bringing together the two parts in one construction. This means that the semantic structure of the Dutch perfect has its roots in its historical development. I will now look into this relation between linguistic history and meaning.

2.2. Historical development of the Dutch perfect

The historical development of the Dutch perfect has much in common with the development of the perfect in other Germanic languages and also in the Romance languages. However in the case of each language there are language-specific variations on the general pattern. As De Voors remarks in his Nederlandse Spraakkunst the facts regarding the perfect indicate that in this area of Dutch grammar a historical approach is necessary for the understanding of the present language-situation. In my opinion a historical approach is rewarding in the case of the perfect, because the linguistic history that led up to this construction can provide us with some clues about its grammatical identity. The classical work on this subject is Kern (1912).3

2.2.1. The past participle

The invariant element in the two types of perfect-constructions is the past participle. This linguistic element developed from an Old Germanic verbal adjective4 which, in itself, had nothing to do with the system of the verb. It still shows the traces of this origin. Past participles of transitives and mutative intransitives can still be used as adjectives. In many cases of adjectival use they display a verbal value; other cases are transitional to the status of pure adjectives; ultimately in many cases only the form of the element corresponds to that of a past participle.

Originally this verbal adjective could only be derived from a transitive verb; later on derivation of a mutative intransitive verb also became possible. According to Kern, in the case of mutative verbs, this verbal adjective expressed that someone or something is in a certain state, and got into that state through an event from without (in the case of a transitive verb stem), or through an event within the person or thing in question (in the case of a intransitive verb stem). The event indicated by the verbal stem of the adjective is present in the background of what is represented by the verbal adjective, as the cause of the present state of the person or thing.

With regard to the immutative verbs, only the transitives could form the verbal adjective, indicating that a person or thing experiences an event of the kind in-
dictated by the verbal stem. This imperfective verbal adjective could not be used predicatively. For the immutative intransitives the meaning of the verb stem clashed with the meaning of the verbal adjective form. The kind of event expressed by these verb stems doesn’t involve a person or thing that experiences the event or the state resulting from it. This fact even prevented the derivation of the verbal adjective in their case. When the perfect category was taking shape, these verbs developed the possibility of forming a past participle. In Modern Dutch, these participles still can’t be used in an adjectival function, or at best they can in some peripheral cases.

2.2.2. The development of the Dutch perfect

The verbal adjective became the centre of syntactic restructuring processes in the Germanic languages from which the perfect-constructions arose. For Dutch Kern distinguishes the following developments.

First there is the verbal adjective of mutative intransitives. In Old Germanic this could be used in the copular construction with zijnn, in an agreement-relation with the subject. This construction had two uses, one emphasizing the existence of the state resultant from the event, and the other emphasizing the getting into that state. These two uses did not constitute two discrete, differentiated categories, but blended together. The latter use led to the development of a perfect meaning.

As to the copular construction of zijnn + the passive verbal adjective (i.e. the adjective derived from a transitive verb stem, expressing a representation oriented towards the experiencer), this construction developed a passive perfect use for the perfective transitives in Middle Dutch. This use is based on a semantic shift in which the event indicated by the verbal stem became more prominent and the state resultant from the event is pushed into the background. Initially the verbal adjective of imperfective transitives could not be used in a predicative function. The emergence of the perfect category made it possible for this forms to occur in a construction with zijnn. For this no meaning-shift was necessary, because in the case of the imperfective transitives the meaning of the verbal adjective already implied a verbal value, namely the experiencing of an event of the kind concerned.

A construction with the verbal adjective, more recent than the copular construction, is the construction with hebben. In this construction the verbal adjective functioned originally as a predicative modifier of the direct object, which is still possible in a restricted set of cases, as in (7):

(7) Hij heeft zijn haar achterover gekamd.
"He has his hair backwards combed"
He has his hair combed backwards.

In Old Germanic, we already find cases in which the verbal adjective doesn’t agree in gender and number with the direct object. In these cases the latent verbal meaning-aspect is activated and dominates the adjectival meaning, indicating a restructuring of the syntactic relations: the verbal adjective became primarily involved with the verb hebben and became the major verb of the sentence.
The development of this new syntactic interpretation of constructions like (7) was a slow one. In Middle Dutch we still find both uses. Originally imperfective transitive verbal adjectives could not be used as a predicative modifier of the direct object in hebben-constructions. After a while they could be used in these constructions. Eventually the hebben + past participle-construction could occur without a direct object if the verb allowed it. Initially immutative intransitive verbs could not form the verbal adjective. Therefore these verbs could not develop a perfect on their own, but when the perfect of the other verbs settled down, they joined the hebben-perfect. To that end they developed a past participle. These past participles can still hardly ever be used in adjective positions.

The emergence of the Dutch perfect has its roots in the Old Germanic languagesituation, but mainly came about in the Middle Dutch language-phase. In Old Germanic there was no perfect-form, and the meaning of the perfect was covered by the preterit-form. When the verbal adjective developed perfect uses in predicative functions, the preterit initially kept its perfect-function. But when these new perfect-constructions were used more and more, the preterit became restricted to the presentation of events as viewed from within and as coming about in a reality which is disconnected with the frame of reference. So the emergence of the perfect not only involved an adaptation of existing constructions to new functions, but also a restriction of the use of the Old Germanic preterite.

2.3. The meaning of the Dutch perfect

As I have already mentioned, the meaning of the Dutch perfect comes down to the fact that it represents a retrospective viewpoint, that it summarizes an event, and detaches it from its background. All these properties have to do with the compositional characteristics of the perfect construction, that is, with the effects of the two parts brought together in one construction in the historical development leading up to the perfect. I will now turn to this iconic character of the perfect-construction, and take a look at its predecessors.

The past participle, the invariant element in the various perfect-constructions, is the result of a re-formation of the verbal adjective. This re-formation contained a semantic shift in which the expression of the verbal event took precedence over the expression of the state which resulted from it.

In the meaning of the verbal adjective the event only existed as the cause of the expressed state. This means that it was present retrospectively, anterior to the existence of this state. Furthermore, this means that the event was present, not in its course of time, but as an integrated whole, in the formulation of Waugh (1987:4), "as a dimensionalized or global whole". These semantic elements of retrospection and integrated whole were carried over from the verbal adjective to the past participle, and became central elements in the meaning of the perfect-construction in its different forms.

The past participle could easily arise from the verbal adjective in the copular
construction with *zijn*, for example under influence of temporal expressions. This applies to verbs with a perfective Aktionsart. Imperfective transitive verbs had to develop the possibility of a predicative use for the form concerned. In this case the change was mainly syntactic. The required meaning shift was not so drastic, because the imperfective transitive verbal adjective indicated duratively that a person or thing experiences an event of the kind expressed by the verbal stem. The expression of the event had to take the shape of a retrospective viewpoint which presents it as a global whole.

The copular construction *zijn* + verbal adjective had a stative verbal value. It characterized the referent of the subject as being in or reaching the state indicated by the verbal adjective. With the semantic shift to the indication of an event presented from a retrospective point of view, the role of the *verb* *zijn* was reduced. It only expresses a deictic indication of the point of orientation for the retrospection. As the verbal adjective became a past participle, the copular verb became an auxiliary.6

As a consequence of this development the perfect is characterized with regard to its copular predecessor by a splitting up of the deictic reference to time into two time-periods. It refers to the moment from which the retrospection takes place, and through that moment it refers to the time at which the retrospection is directed, i.e. the time at which the event happened. This twofold time-structure corresponds to the binary structure of the form of the perfect (cf. Janssen 1987 and Waugh 1987: 24), and leads to the temporal meaning element of the perfect, the expression of anteriority.

The development of a perfect use of the structure *hebben* + verbal adjective involved a number of changes besides the transformation of the verbal adjective into the past participle. At the beginning of this development the construction was restricted to perfective transitives.

The verbal adjective, a predicative complement of the direct object, lost its direct connection with that object and became attached to the verb *hebben*. In the *hebben*-perfect the direct object no longer functions as the subject of the past participle, leaving only one subject/predicate structure.

In this new syntactic structure, *hebben* came to function as an auxiliary of the past participle. This means that the independent lexical function of this verb altered into a dependent one. Like *zijn*, *hebben* came to indicate deictically the point of orientation for retrospection.

In addition *hebben* then related its subject as the agent participant to the past participle. The reverse of this is that the past participle lost its passive meaning in the construction with *hebben*. Just like the verbal adjective the past participle normally has a passive meaning in the sense that in the representation it expresses, the point of orientation (its 'subject') is the person or thing experiencing the event involved. But in the *hebben*-perfect the subject of *hebben* became an agentive point of orientation in the representation expressed by the *hebben* + past participle construction as a whole.

In this connection Overdiep (1949: 336) points out that *hebben* has dynamic/perfective uses, in which its subject must be interpreted as an agent; cf. (8-10):
Duinhoven (1988: 22-5) elaborates this fact and connects it with the etymology of hebben, in form and meaning related to the Latin verb capere and with clear perfective/resultative uses, as in (8-10). In (11) hebben and the past participle geverfd implicate in a non-perfect interpretation an action with the subject of hebben as the agent:

(11) Hij heeft zijn hek groen geverfd.
"He has his fence green painted"
He has his fence painted green.

According to Duinhoven hebben indicates an action of a nondescript kind; geverfd specifies what kind of action is involved.

When the structure hebben + direct object + verbal adjective had assumed a perfect interpretation with perfective transitives, it became possible for the imperfective transitives to appear in this construction. As I have pointed out before, their verbal adjective indicated duratively that a person or thing experiences the event expressed by the verbal stem. So, for the transformation to a past participle the representation of the event had to take a retrospective approach in which it is seen as a complete, global whole. This was also needed for their use in the passive perfect with zijn.

A final step in the emergence of the Dutch perfect regarded the imperfective intransitives. Initially a verbal adjective could not be derived from these verbs. But when the perfect category had taken shape, these verbs developed a past participle that could be used in the hebben-perfect construction.

As a result of these developments we have a constant paradigmatic relation between the following (a) and (b) sentences, respectively of a present to a perfect, with an unmarked present and the perfect marked for retrospection:

(12a) Mijn buurman sterft.
My neighbour dies.
(12b) Mijn buurman is gestorven.
My neighbour has died.
(13a) Het geweer wordt geladen.
The rifle is being loaded.
(13b) Het geweer is geladen.
The rifle has been loaded.
(14a) Hij laadt het geweer.
He is loading the rifle.
(14b) Hij heeft het geweer geladen.
He has loaded the rifle.
(15a) Zij slaapt.
She is sleeping.
(15b) Zij heeft geslapen.
She has slept.

The distribution of hebben and zijn in the perfect construction is regularly connected with semantic properties of the two constructions that led up to the perfect construction. The zijn-perfect developed from the copular construction with zijn and the verbal adjective of a mutative intransitive or that of a transitive, with an experiencer in the subject function; i.e. in the case of transitive verbal adjective with a passive meaning. The hebben-perfect developed from a construction with a transitive verbal adjective as a predicative modifier of the direct object of hebben, with an agentive subject. In this construction hebben expresses the coming about of an action of an unspecified kind. This explains why immutative intransitive verbs joined the hebben-perfect: these verbs indicate an action performed by the subject of the verb. This fits in with the characteristics of the hebben-perfect.

In the perfect construction the meaning of the verbs hebben and zijn has strongly weakened, but their agentive respectively nonagentive character still asserts its influence. For the present day language users however the distinction seems to become less firm (De Voogs 1967: 140/1), as is shown by the fact that some verbs have moved from the hebben-perfect to the zijn-perfect or the other way around. Besides the weakened meaning of the auxiliaries this development arises perhaps from the fact that many verbs can occur with both auxiliaries, though with slightly distinct meanings.

3. The use of the Dutch perfect

We have seen that the semantic properties which Van Es attributes to the Dutch perfect, namely the presentation of the event retrospectively as a complete whole, can be carried back to the semantic structure of the Old Germanic verbal adjective that was transformed to the past participle of the perfect-construction. Now I will touch on how these semantic properties function in the use of the perfect.

In most cases the perfect deals with past events. But the perfect does not just report or bring to mind a past event, as the preterit does. The perfect creates a point of view in time posterior, and therefore exterior to the event. From that external point of view the event is presented retrospectively as an unstructured whole. An important effect of this mode of presentation is the highlighting of the event: by isolating it as a complete whole the event is detached from its background.

Language-users can have many reasons for removing an event from its background. In conversations the perfect is an appropriate form to broach a subject. The perfect-form lends itself pre-eminently to bring up an event from a recent,
but also from a more remote past, to talk about it, to react to it, or to have it reacted to, to report upon it, ... and so on.

Van Es points out that the perfect need not indicate one isolated event. It can summarize a whole course of events or a series of similar events as one unit. The contrary is maintained by the ANS. In demarking the perfect from the preterit, the ANS states that the perfect indicates an occasional, isolated event, and the preterit an event of unlimited duration, a habit etc. (o.c. 460), and illustrates this vision with (16) and (17).

(16) Vorig jaar heeft opa nog gefietst.
   "Last year has grandpa still cycled"
   Last year grandpa still cycled.

(17) Vorig jaar fietste opa nog.
   "Last year cycled grandpa still"
   Last year grandpa still cycled.

(16) implies that grandpa cycled only occasionally, and (17) that he cycled regularly. Up to this point we can agree with the ANS.

But when we add a time-frequency adjunct or an adjunct of duration to (16), we can also express a habit with the perfect:

(16a) Vorig jaar heeft opa nog dagelijks gefietst.
   Last year grandpa still cycled daily.

(16b) Vorig jaar heeft opa nog het hele jaar gefietst.
   Last year grandpa still cycled the whole year.

Here we have what Van Es calls the summarizing perfect; a perfect which isolates as one whole a course of events that takes a longer period, as in (18), or which presents an indefinite quantity of similar events in one fell swoop, as in (16a) and (16b) and in (19).

(18) Mijn werk is langzamerhand te veel voor mij geworden.
   "My job has gradually too much for me become"
   My job has gradually become too much for me.

(19) We hebben thuis altijd honden gehad.
   "We have at home always dogs had"
   We have always had dogs at home.

Sentences like (18) can be used in situations in which a state of affairs, similar to the summarized state of affairs, exists at the time indicated by the auxiliary. (19) can be used when we still have dogs. Regarding this kind of perfect use the ANS maintains that it does not represent the event as completed, on the assumption that the perfect usually does represent an event as completed.

As I said before, the perfect never expresses completion as such. The ANS points out that sentences like (19) can also be used when the kind of situation, summarized by the perfect, does not hold at the point of time indicated by the auxiliary. If a sentence with a perfect construction expresses completion in a strong
sense, then there is another element responsible, be it the lexical meaning of the participle or an element in the context or situation.

If a sentence with a summarizing perfect is used with regard to a situation in which a state of affairs exists similar to the summarized states of affairs, then the perfect still represents the summarized states of affairs from an external point of view, retrospectively and as a complete whole. This does not exclude the reappearance of this kind of state of affairs in the extralinguistic reality, now and in the future. The perfect form however does not provide us with the information whether this is the case or not. The perfect form expresses a representation of a sequence of states of affairs that abstracts from a possible continuation up to and past the reference moment. In such cases the perfect is very apt in order to bring up the summarized sequence for reflexion or reaction, or to question it, as in (20) and (21):

(20) Waar blijf je? We hebben je in geen weken gezien.
    What keeps you? We haven't seen you for weeks.

(21) Hoe lang woon je hier? Ik heb hier altijd gewoond.
    How long do you live here? I have always lived here.

Van Es points out that the perfect is used very characteristically in discursive and reportorial prose. The perfect is appropriate in such prose for the presentation of the facts in a demonstration, the themes one treats, the assumptions one makes, the evidence one cites, the conclusions one draws, ... and so on.

The perfect is particularly suited to journalistic writing. It is used to emphasise the essentials, to lift out the main points, to underline a conclusion. In newspaper reports the perfect is often used in alternation with the preterit. At the beginning of an article, the perfect is used to introduce a subject in outline; then the preterit is used to elaborate on it, to give substance to the outline. Meanwhile, switches are possible to the perfect in order to highlight important facts. Finally the perfect can be used with effect for a conclusion. Van Es calls this a "classical" structure of a newspaper report.

4. Conclusion

I have touched upon some applications of the perfect to show the possibilities it offers by its presentation of an event as a complete, independent whole. They are just some of the countless possibilities open to a creative language user. I have tried to make clear that the perfect can be an important instrument in structuring a text by way of its meaning. This structuring involves the indication of prominence and the presentation of events in some perspective. Now I conclude with some summarizing remarks.

To my mind the meaning of the Dutch perfect comes down to the fact that it represents a retrospective viewpoint, that it summarizes an event, and detaches it from its background. I have tried to show that all these properties have to do with the compositional characteristics of the perfect construction on one side, and on
the other side with the effects of the two parts brought together in one construction in the historical development leading up to the perfect.

We have seen that the semantic properties we can attribute to the Dutch perfect, namely the presentation of the event retrospectively as a complete whole, can be carried back to the semantic structure of the Old Germanic verbal adjective that was transformed to the past participle of the perfect-construction.

The semantic elements of retrospection and complete whole were carried over from the verbal adjective to the past participle, and became central elements in the meaning of the perfect-construction in its different forms.

Location of the verbal event with respect to past, present or future is no function of the perfect, nor of any other so-called verbal tense in Dutch. Location in time is determined by a variety of contextual factors. In the case of the perfect this bears upon the point of reference that serves as a point of retrospection. Different from the other so-called verbal tenses the perfect does involve however, some temporal meaning element: by expressing retrospection it expresses anteriority.

Notes

1. I wish to thank Sally Miedema for her helpful assistance in diminishing my misuse of the English language, and Jadranka Gvozdanović and Theo Janssen for their stimulating critical remarks.

2. Note that there is a terminological problem here: Comrie uses the term perfectivity where Van Es uses the term perfectic; and Van Es uses the term perfective in a way related to Comrie’s use of the term telic, namely to indicate a phase aspect, expressing "being directed at the reaching of a terminal point".

3. The same point is made in Balk (1963: 128), where we can read that the opposition onvoltooid (not completed) - voltooid (completed) naturally bears upon being or being no more in progress, and not upon being or being not brought to an intended end.


5. According to Duinhoven (1985: 121-6) this verbal adjective in its turn developed from an adverbial compound.

6. According to Van der Wal (1986: 56 and 70) these change processes represented innovating mutations in the Germanic languages, whereas the corresponding developments in the Romance languages represented conservative mutations. This makes the assumption plausible that the changes in the Germanic languages are a case of borrowing.


8. Recent research on these changes is reported in De Rooij (1988).

9. I strongly disagree with the conclusion of Duinhoven (1988: 267) who views the Dutch perfect as a past tense. He even uses the term preteritum in this connection. This can only hold in a very superficial way. Duinhoven completely disregards the semantic opposition between the perfect and the preterite.
And he neglects the possibility to use the Dutch perfect with regard to the
future as in (5) Morgen hebben we om deze tijd Parijs al bereikt (Tomorrow
we will have reached Paris already by this time).
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