

## Motion verbs in progress: A cross-linguistic study of expressive meaning

### 1 Introduction

This talk's focus is on semi-lexical motion verbs combined with a second verb— the main predicate

- *lopen (te) V* in Dutch periphrastic progressive (1) • *go and V* in English pseudocoordination (2)

- (1) *Het enige nadeel met ziggo digitaal is live voetbal, de hele buurt loopt te juichen en hier valt de goal 30 seconde later walks to cheer* and here falls the goal 30 seconds later  
'The only downside about Ziggo Digitaal<sup>1</sup> is watching live football; the entire neighbourhood **is cheering**, only at home the goal is made 30 seconds later.'  
(lit. 'the entire neighbourhood *walks* to cheer')

[twitter.com]

- (2) {Colleagues are organising a surprise going-away party for Claire;}  
While having drinks last night, Joe **went and told** Claire about the party.  
[after Stefanowitsch (1999): 124]

- In both (1) and (2-a), the motion verb does not entail motion
- there is an additional emotive component to the examples, not present in, e.g., (3)

- (3) Joe told Claire about the party.

- Here, these non-motion-entailed constructions will be called 'NoMove'

#### *Our goal*

- Address gap in literature concerning the emotional reading of NoMove
  - does NoMove have expressive meaning<sup>2</sup>, and if so, is it compositional in nature?
  - *tonight*: Dutch and English; *more generally*: Germanic
- Our approach: qualitative corpus study + multidimensional semantics

---

<sup>1</sup>Ziggo Digitaal is a type of TV contract in the Netherlands.

<sup>2</sup>Note on terminology: here, *expressive* refers the meaning beyond the descriptive, only valid at time/place/utterance (Cruse, 1986; Kaplan, 1999, a.o.). Most often, this is a negative emotion, but can also be positive or somewhat neutral.

## 2 Background: Motion verb constructions

### 2.1 Dutch *lopen te V*

*The construction in Dutch*<sup>3</sup>

- A posture verb + *te* + V<sub>2</sub> infinitive → progressive reading (4)
- Posture verb is semantically bleached • lexical verb is an infinitive
  - eligible posture verbs: *zitten* 'to sit', *liggen* 'to lie', and *staan* 'to stand'
- event occurring in the progressive aspect is as indicated by lexical V

(4) *Hij zit/ligt/staat te lezen.*  
He sits/lies/stands to read  
'He is reading.'

- The progressive can also be constructed with the motion verb *lopen*<sup>4</sup>; cf. (5)

(5) *Hij loopt te lezen.*  
He walks to read  
'He is reading.'

*The motion verb does not contribute 'directed motion' meaning*

If *lopen* still carried the meaning of 'directed motion', stative (6) would be infelicitous

- in (6): *lopen* can felicitously combine with *verstoffen* 'to collect dust'
  - an object cannot collect dust when in motion → NoMove *lopen* can combine with statives

(6) *Iemand een Wii in de aanbidding die loopt te verstoffen?*  
Somebody a Wii in the selling that walks to collect.dust  
'Does anyone have a Wii for sale that is now gathering dust?'

[twitter.com]

*Literature on the periphrastic progressive construction*

- Syntax-semantics: has received little formal attention; cf. Leys (1985); Van Pottelberge (2002)
- Empirical: Lemmens (2005) did corpus work on the progressive posture verb construction (4)
  - no formal syntactic and/or semantic analysis—and only briefly mentions the *lopen* variant
- Semantics-pragmatics: Lemmens (2005) and Haeseryn et al. (1997) report a negative evaluation

→ As far as we are aware, no formal analysis of the *lopen te V*'s emotive component exists

<sup>3</sup>See Kuteva (1999) for an overview of progressive posture verb constructions in both European and non-European languages.

<sup>4</sup>Note that this construction is not possible in all varieties of Dutch - especially in some Flemish varieties it is not accepted. This may be due to the fact that *lopen* in these varieties means 'to run' rather than 'to walk'; see also Lemmens (2005).

## 2.2 English *go and V*

### *The construction in English*

- an instance of pseudocoordination (Carden and Pesetsky, 1977; de Vos, 2004, 2005, 2007)
    - *go* and the lexical verb are not truly coordinated, but together form a single event
    - no overt subject for lexical V; no intervening constituents<sup>5</sup>; cf. (a) and (b)
    - can combine with any type of Aktionsart—except states
- (7) There are all these girls out there saying they want a nice guy with a steady job who'll treat them right. That's ME, for god's sake! **Then my girlfriend goes and leave [sic] me for a guy who treats her like crap.** Are women insane or what?
- [getagirl.co.uk, BritEng]
- a. My girlfriend *goes* (#to London) and *leaves* me for a guy who treats her like crap.  
b. My girlfriend *goes* and (#she) *leaves* me for a guy who treats her like crap.

### *The motion verb does not contribute 'directed motion' meaning*

- In (8), there is clearly no directed motion; example after de Vos (2007, 56)

(8) **It went and rained.**

### *Literature on pseudocoordination*

- Syntax (and semantics): has received much attention from, e.g., Carden and Pesetsky (1977); de Vos (2005, 2007); Wulff (2006); Bjorkman (2016)
- 'Unexpectedness' reading: Stefanowitsch (1999); Ross (2016)
  - But, these works are descriptive and do not formally account for the emotive component

## 2.3 Cross-linguistic overview of emotive component in NoMove constructions

Ross (2016): Verbs or morphemes indicating movement away from deictic center → 'unexpected event'

- "without necessarily indicating motion in space"
  - Discussed for English (Ross, 2016; Stefanowitsch, 1999, 2000) and Swedish (Josefsson, 93)
  - Observed for, e.g., Czech, Finnish, Armenian, French, Masaik, Tucano, Abkhaz, and Kera

### *Explaining the emotional meaning*

- Proposals—but **no formalisations of emotional meaning**
  - Ross (2016, 11) claims "unexpected" *go* is a modal, "expressing unlikelihood"
  - de Vos (2007, 58) discusses "prospective" meaning of *go*, based on futurate function
  - Stefanowitsch (2000, 129): "undesired"/"unexpected" readings are "divergent" from path

---

<sup>5</sup>Although appositives may be possible ... for future investigation.

### 3 Empirical study

#### Research questions

- Q1** What is the distribution of emotional meaning for NoMove constructions?
- animacy • frequency of emotive component • positive vs. negative
- Q2** Are there contextual factors influencing the presence of emotional meaning?
- presence of an (evaluative) adverb • negativity of the lexical verb (e.g., ‘fuck’, ‘ruin’)
- Q3** Are there cross-linguistic differences between Dutch and English in NoMove constructions?

#### 3.1 Corpus search and annotation

Table 1: (Sub-)Corpora used in data collection

Dutch		English	
<i>SoNaR</i>	STEVIN Nederlandstalig Referentiecorpus <sup>a</sup> 500 million words Oostdijk et al. (2013)	<i>GloWbE</i>	Corpus of Global Web-Based English 1,9 billion words Davies (2013)
	Standard Dutch in NE and BE written and online text		British and American English online: news, magazines, blogs

<sup>a</sup>STEVIN Dutch Reference Corpus

#### Methodology: Extraction and Annotation

Table 2: Search terms

Dutch	English
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [lopen] + te + [v*] → <i>loop/loopt/lopen/liep/liepen te</i> Verb</li> <li>• [Aux]/[Mod] + lopen + [v*] → <i>AUX/MOD lopen (te)</i> Verb</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [go] + and + [v*] → <i>go/goes/went/gone/going and</i> Verb</li> </ul>
0-5 intervening words	no intervening words

- random sample/total hits: Dutch: **69/899** – BritEng: **63/11611**– AmerEng: **84/6303**
  - for Dutch, number of hits is total within corpus
  - for English, number of hits is dependant on criteria “750 words or phrases”
- omitted clear cases of events entailing directed motion, judgement based on context

- annotated both sets manually<sup>6</sup>; criteria<sup>7</sup> in Table 3

Table 3: Annotations sorted according to target; used for both languages

Subject	Lexical V	Entire clause	Emotive component?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• animacy</li> <li>• phi features</li> <li>• quantifier?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• negative?</li> <li>• Levin (1993) class</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adverb present?</li> <li>• tense</li> <li>• embedded clause?</li> <li>• obligatory <i>te</i>?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• positive? negative?</li> <li>• what category?</li> </ul>

- Emotive categories<sup>8</sup> were one of two—based on our intuition that NoMove can have both
  - “Undesired”: an attitude displaying irritation, inappropriateness, etc.
  - “Unexpected”: an evaluation displaying surprise, wrt to specific situation or deviant from norm

### 3.1.1 Dutch sample

*Dutch data: Inanimate subjects possible (9)*

- N=6 instances in all sentences of sample
  - subjects were technical things like a smoke alarm or Windows
  - if *lopen* were lexical, inanimate subjects should be infelicitous

(9) *En dan word je gebeld dat je rookmelder loopt te piepen*  
 and then are you called that your smoke.alarm walks to beep  
 ‘And then they call you (to say) that your **smoke alarm** is beeping’

[twitter.com]

<sup>6</sup>Annotation was done individually, according to native language.

<sup>7</sup>Grey cells indicate annotations not discussed here.

<sup>8</sup>Sometimes the category was unclear, like in (i), where, without more context, this could be construed as either positive or negative. Such examples were rare, however.

(i) *ik loop te typen als een malle*  
 I walk te type like a madman  
 ‘I’m typing away like a madman’

[twitter.com]

Dutch data: Distribution of emotional meaning

Total expressive within sample size: N=64, 93%

Table 4: Dutch data: Distribution of emotional meaning per 64 emotive sentences

Emotion			Category		
<i>Negative</i>	58	91%	<i>Undesired</i>	46	72%
<i>Positive</i>	2	3%	<i>Unexpected</i>	16	25%
<i>Unclear</i>	4	6%	<i>Unclear</i>	2	3%
<b>Total</b>	64			64	

- the most common emotion is NEGATIVE • the most common category is “Undesired”

→ the Dutch sample exhibits a strong tendency towards negative attitudes

(10) *ja ik merk net dat ik de herhaling heb lopen kijken, verdikkeme*  
yes I noticed just.now that I the rerun have walk watch, damn  
'yes I just notice that I've been watching the rerun, dammit'

[twitter.com]

Dutch data: Adverbs

Adverbs are present in N=35 (55%) sentences judged to have emotive content

- different types: temporal, spatial, evaluative
- ! no real patterns to be seen wrt emotional—adverb

Dutch Data: Negativity of lexical verb

Lexical verb is negative in N=20 (29%) of sentences judged to have emotive content

- Majority of emotional sentence in sample do not have a negative V<sub>2</sub>

→ *lopen* is able to contribute emotional meaning independently of adverb or lexical V

### 3.1.2 English sample

English data: Inanimates possible, though rare (11)

- N=3 in all sentences of sample
  - if *go* were a lexical verb, inanimate subjects should be infelicitous

- (11) I expect it was a chain reaction, **one bottle went and blew the bollox out of the others** so all that beer was wasted. I blame Hugh Fury Whitingthing’s recipe for not bothering to tell me not to put them next to a radiator. I was upstairs at the time and thought it was a gas explosion . . .  
[tottenhamhotspurs.tv, BritEng]

*English data: Distribution of emotional meaning*

**Total sentences judged to have emotive component within sample size: N=145, 99%**

BritEng: N=62, 98% • AmerEng: N=83, 99%

Table 5: English distribution of emotional meaning: Degree of emotion per 62 and 83 emotive sentences

	British English		American English	
<i>Negative</i>	37	67%	56	67%
<i>Positive</i>	16	26%	15	18%
<i>Unclear</i>	9	15%	12	14%
<b>Total</b>	62		83	

- the most common emotion is NEGATIVE—although NEG/POS discrepancy is not as large as with Dutch

Table 6: English distribution of emotional meaning: Category per 62 and 83 emotive sentences

	British English		American English	
<i>Undesired</i>	17	27%	44	53%
<i>Unexpected</i>	45	73%	36	43%
<i>Unclear</i>	–	–	3	4%
<b>Total</b>	62		83	

- the most common category for AmerEng is “Undesired” (53%); for BritEng is “Unexpected” (73%)
    - generally more “Unexpected” in the English sample than in the Dutch
- the English sample exhibits a weaker tendency for NEGATIVE than Dutch

*English data: Adverbs*

Adverbs are present in N=76 sentences (47%) judged to have emotive content

- BritEng N=31, 44%; AmerEng N=45, 49% • no conclusive patterns to be seen wrt emotional—adverb

*English Data: Negativity of lexical verb in sentences judged to have emotive content*

Lexical verb was negative in Brit Eng: N=16, 26% • AmerEng: N=21, 25%

- like in Dutch, not majority of emotive sentences
- *go* is able to contribute emotional meaning independently of adverb and lexical verb

**Summary: Answering the research questions**

**Q1** What is the distribution of emotional meaning for this construction?

- Inanimate subjects possible in both languages, although rare
- Dutch: 93% of sample
  - NEGATIVE (91% of emotional) and “Undesired” (72% of emotional)
- English: 98% of sample
  - NEG also majority, like in Dutch, but POS has higher frequency in both varieties
  - BritEng has higher frequency of “Unexpected” (73% of emotional) than AmerEng

**Q2** Influence of linguistic factors on distribution?

- doesn’t seem like it:
    - adverbs present in ca. 50% of samples, but different kinds
      - no conclusive patterning wrt adverb presence and emotional meaning
    - 20-29% of lexical verbs in both languages were negative
      - the majority of emotional sentences were without a negative lexical verb
- emotional meaning need not come from adverb or lexical verb

**Q3** Comparing Dutch and English

- Dutch’s emotional distribution more NEGATIVE than English:
  - clearly high frequency of NEGATIVE (91%) and “Undesired” (72%) in Dutch
  - English has overall 63% NEGATIVE; 43% “Undesired” and 57% “Unexpected”

## 4 Analysis

### 4.1 Prerequisites

#### 4.1.1 The emotional meaning of NoMove

The emotional meaning of NoMove: “divergent” events (Stefanowitsch, 2000)

- divergent from norm or desires/expectations of an EVALUATOR
  - Negative: undesired, unexpected
  - Postive: unexpected
- to account for more NEG in Dutch: we think it is because *lopen* is more specific than *go*
  - but the how and why is left for future working-out

Negative: “Undesired” and/or “Unexpected”

- (12) *ja ik merk net dat ik de herhaling heb lopen kijken, verdikkeme*  
yes I noticed just.now that I the rerun have walk watch, damn  
'yes I just noticed that I've been watching the rerun, dammit'  
→ speaker was watching a rerun → speaker was in motion  
~> **this is undesired**
- (13) I had a very interesting article almost completed today, but **WordPress went and made it disappear** somehow. So I apologize for not having a new article posted on this site today. :(  
[...theamericandream.com, AmerEng]  
→ the article disappeared → the article-disappearing event involved motion  
~> **this is undesired**

Positive: “Unexpected”

- (14) Yet while modern publishing sometimes seems to prize whimsy over scope – and nobody much expects a Great American Novel to materialise – **Jonathan Franzen has gone and written two**. The first of them, *The Corrections*, was published a week before 9/11, and widely praised as the finest fiction of the new millennium, though what it captured so astutely were the last days of the previous one. [independent.co.uk, BritEng]  
→ Franzen wrote two Great American novels  
→ Franzen moved with directed motion to perform writing-event  
~> **this is unexpected**

Omitting motion verb changes felicity

- The emotional meaning is only present in (b)

- (15) CONTRIBUTION OF MOTION VERB: DUTCH<sup>9</sup>
- a. *Ik ben de herhaling aan het kijken, zoals ik wilde*  
I are the rerun at the watching, like I wanted  
'I'm watching the rerun, as I wanted'
- b. *Ik loop de herhaling te kijken, zoals ik wilde*  
I walk the rerun to watch, like I wanted  
'I've been watching the rerun, # as I wanted'
- (16) CONTRIBUTION OF MOTION VERB: ENGLISH
- a. As expected, Jonathan Franzen wrote two Great American Novels.  
b. #As expected, Jonathan Franzen **went and wrote** two Great American Novels.

→ motion verb has an emotive component . . . not from context

—**is this emotive component expressive?**

---

<sup>9</sup>The progressive in (a) is a neutral variant. We chose this one, as Lemmens (2005) mentioned a possible expressive meaning in the similar posture progressive construction—this would be an unwanted influence.

#### 4.1.2 Expressive Tests (Potts, 2005)

Tests (A)/(B) show independence from at-issue, a distinguishing property of expressives (Horn, 2007)

- (C) has been included to ensure that we are not talking about a presupposition

(A) *Expressive meaning cannot be denied (cf. also Tonhauser 2012):*

- Can deny at-issue material: (a) is okay • Cannot deny not-at-issue material: (b) is bad

(17) DENIAL: DUTCH

S1: *Ik merk net dat ik de herhaling heb lopen kijken* S2: No, that's not true ...

I notice just.now that I the rerun have walked watch

- a. You haven't watched the rerun, it was a new episode AT-ISSUE
- b. #This is not undesired. NOT-AT-ISSUE

(18) DENIAL: ENGLISH

S1: Jonathan Franzen has gone and written two Great American Novels. S2: No, that's not true ...

- a. He didn't write two: he has only written one Great American Novel. AT-ISSUE
- b. #This is not unexpected. NOT-AT-ISSUE

(B) *Scopelessness under logical operators*

- At-issue material cannot project • Expressive meaning, being not-at-issue, can project

(19) PROJECTION: DUTCH

a. *Ik merk net dat ik **niet** de herhaling heb gekeken*

I notice just.now that I not the rerun have watched

→ It is **not** the case that speaker watched the rerun

b. *Ik merk net dat ik **niet** de herhaling heb lopen kijken*

I notice just.now that I not the rerun have walk watch

→ It is **not** the case that speaker watched the rerun

not negated: attitude that the watching of the rerun would be undesired

(20) PROJECTION: ENGLISH

a. Jonathan Franzen has **not** written two {Great American Novels}.

→ It is **not** the case that JF has written two G.A. Novels

b. Jonathan Franzen has **not** gone and written two {Great American Novels}.

→ It is **not** the case that JF has written two G.A. Novels

not negated: attitude that writing-2-G.A.Novels would be unexpected

(C) *Expressive meaning is not a presupposition*

- Presuppositions are old • Expressives are new (Potts, 2005; Horn, 2007)

(21) a. Sam has a dog, and her dog is sick. [Potts (2015, 178)]

- b. It was unexpected that Franzen would write a GA Novel and #he went and wrote two GA Novels

*Our proposal*

- We propose that NoMove constructions have two dimensions of meaning<sup>10</sup>
  - supported by tests above
- go/lopen contribute no semantics on motion, but expressive meaning
- The presence of *te/and* might be our key to resolving underspecification . . .
  - according to, e.g., Wulff (2006); Ross (2016), *go* V’s expressive reading is unavailable
  - possibly, a similar requirement of *te* presence/omission exists for Dutch’s NoMove expressive meaning
  - . . . but more empirical work needs to be completed!

Table 7: Layers of meaning in NoMove constructions

Type of Meaning	Source	Meaning
<i>descriptive/at-issue</i>	V2: lexical verb	predicated event
<i>expressive/not-at-issue</i>	V1: motion verb	evaluation

**4.2 Multidimensional Semantics (Potts, 2005; McCready, 2010; Gutzmann, 2015)**

The two dimensions are: descriptive/at-issue and expressive/not-at-issue

- in terms of Gutzmann (2015): *truth content* and *use content*

- (22) Jonathan **is gawking** at people.
- a. *truth content*
    - (i)  $\llbracket \text{gawk} \rrbracket^t = \llbracket \text{look} \rrbracket^t$
    - (ii)  $\llbracket \text{J is gawking at the people} \rrbracket^t = \{w: \text{Jonathan is looking at people in } w\}$
  - b. *use content*
    - (i)  $\llbracket \text{gawk} \rrbracket^u = \llbracket \text{speaker has a derogatory attitude towards the manner of looking} \rrbracket^u$
    - (ii)  $\llbracket \text{J is gawking at people} \rrbracket^u = \{c: \text{speaker has a derogatory attitude towards J's manner of looking in } c_w\}$

**4.3 Our proposal**

- Expressive meaning in NoMove contributed by underspecified motion verb
  - this desemanticised verb takes lexical verb’s verb phrase (V<sub>2</sub>P) and its event as argument

(23)  $\llbracket \text{Verb}_{\text{motion}} \text{ (and) } V_2P \rrbracket = \underbrace{\langle \{w: V_2P\text{'s event in } w\} \rangle}_{t\text{-content}}, \underbrace{\langle \{c: V_2P\text{'s event is unexpected or undesired in } c_w\} \rangle}_{u\text{-content}}$

<sup>10</sup>Stefanowitsch (1999) presents a similar idea, but within an Image-Schema Framework.

- (24) Jonathan Franzen **went and wrote** two Great American Novels.
- $\llbracket \text{went and wrote two G.A. Novels} \rrbracket^t = \llbracket \text{wrote two G.A. Novels} \rrbracket^t$
  - $\llbracket \text{Jonathan Franzen went and wrote two Great American Novels} \rrbracket^t = \{w: \text{Jonathan Franzen wrote two G. A. Novels in } w\}$
- (25) Jonathan Franzen **went and wrote** two Great American Novels.
- $\llbracket \text{went and wrote two G.A. Novels} \rrbracket^u = \llbracket \text{writing-two-GA-Novels event is unexpected} \rrbracket^u$
  - $\llbracket \text{Jonathan Franzen went and wrote two Great American Novels} \rrbracket^u = \{c: \text{writing-two-GA-Novels event is unexpected in } c_w\}$

In order to account for the use content:

- Gutzmann defines a modal function to map propositions onto emotional predicates
  - after McCready (2009) in his work on English *man*
  - Fraser (2016) applied this in an analysis of *sitting*, using a bouletic function
- here also: a bouletic function BOUL<sup>11</sup>
  - bouletic, to account for expectations and desires in relevant context
  - BOUL takes t-content,  $V_2$  as its argument
- EVALUATOR,  $C_E$ , is usually the speaker, but can be somebody else in context

- (26) *The modal function*
- BOUL:  $\langle \langle s, t \rangle, u \rangle$
  - $\mathcal{B}$  is a set of use-conditional bouletic evaluator-predicates =  $\{\lambda p.c_E \text{ did not expect } p \text{ to be true, } \lambda p.c_E \text{ does not want } p \text{ to be true, } \lambda p.c_E \text{ wants } c_A \text{ to change } p, \dots\}$
  - $\llbracket \text{BOUL} \rrbracket = \lambda p. \{w: \text{BOUL}(p)(w) \text{ in } w\} = \lambda p. \{c: \text{there is a } b \in \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } b \text{ is suitable for } p \text{ in } c \text{ and } b \text{ holds for } p \text{ in } c_w\}$

- (27) *The entry for expressive go/loopen*  
 $\lambda P. \exists e. [\text{BOUL} [P(e)]]$

- (28) Put together:  
 Jonathan Franzen went and wrote two GA Novels
- The truth-conditional domain: Deriving the  $V_2P$*   
 $\llbracket \text{write} \rrbracket = \lambda x. \lambda y. \text{write}(x)(y)$   
 $\llbracket \text{J wrote two novels} \rrbracket = \text{write}(j)(n)$
  - The use-conditional domain: with the motion verb*  
 $\llbracket \text{go} \rrbracket = \lambda P. \exists e. [\text{BOUL} [P(e)]]$   
 $\llbracket \text{J went and wrote two novels} \rrbracket = \exists e. \text{BOUL}[\text{write}(j)(n), (e)]$

<sup>11</sup>If the only reading was a mirative one, it would have been possible to stick to an epistemic modal function.

## 5 Conclusion

- This talk presented NoMove in Dutch and two varieties of English
  - a construction containing a semi-lexical motion verb and a second lexical verb
  - directed motion is not entailed → but there is a secondary emotive meaning
- We presented the beginning analysis of a cross-linguistic corpus sample
  - this sample demonstrated that an emotional component is possible independent of adverbs or an already negative V2
  - and that this meaning comprises “Undesired” and “Unexpected”, in both positive and negative senses
- We also proposed, based on the suggestion of established semantic tests, that NoMove is 2D
  - the descriptive meaning is lexical event, from the lexical verb
  - the expressive meaning is the evaluation, from the motion verb
- We work within a multi-dimensional framework to formalise the meaning
  - using a modal BOULETIC function to account for the “Undesired” and “Unexpected” evaluations
  - this function takes lexical event as argument—evaluates lexical event

## A Afrikaans data

This analysis could be expanded to also include Afrikaans

- Afrikaans has verb clusters, like Dutch
  - but it’s periphrastic progressive construction is formed with posture verbs (a)
  - ... or the motion verb *loop* ‘to walk’ in a pseudo-coordination (b)
    - here, *en* ‘and’ can be dropped— not possible in the construction with a posture verb as V1

- (29) a. *dat ek sit en werk het.*  
that I sit and work have  
‘that I’ve been working.’  
b. *dat ek loop (en) werk het.*  
that I walk and work have  
‘that I’ve been working.’

- syntactic properties of the Afrikaans periphrastic progressive construction:
  - V1 is a posture verb or motion verb *loop* ‘to walk’, as in Dutch
  - The *posture verb en V* and *loop en V* construction have a progressive reading, as in Dutch

– V1 and V2 linked with *en* ‘and’, as in English pseudo-coordination<sup>12</sup>

→ Afrikaans, in this construction, behaves syntactically ‘in-between’ Dutch and English

- The Afrikaans construction *loop en V* also often expresses a form of irritation, undesirability or unexpectedness; Biberauer (2016), who calls this expressive meaning ‘speaker perspective’
  - The *loop en V* can, as a whole, move to Verb Second position (30), so-called ‘quirky Verb Second’ (de Vos, 2005). According to Biberauer (2016), all constructions with quirky Verb Second have expressive meaning.

(30) *Toe vat hy ons geld, en loop (en) koop vir hom ’n bees en ’n bakkie.*  
Then takes he our money, and walks and buy for him a cow and a pickup  
‘Then he takes our money, and goes and buys himself a cow and a pickup.’

[Korpusportaal corpus]

(31) *Enigste graf van ammal bo op Grootfontein wat geloop insak het, daai een van*  
Only grave of all above on Grootfontein what walk collapse have, is that one  
*ou’aas Hermanus*  
of’our.old.man Hermanus

‘The only grave that has been collapsing, is the one of our old man Hermanus’

[Taalkommissie-korpus.Fiksie.Prosa.Romans]

Unlike Dutch, in which the progressive posture verb construction seems to be mostly neutral/lacking expressive meaning, Afrikaans the progressive posture verb construction can sometimes also convey expressive meaning (32).

(32) *David Maynier sê die party kan nie net sit (\*en) toelaat dat Suid-Afrika ’n wapenstoor*  
David Maynier says the party can not just sit and allow that South-Africa a storage.for.wapons  
*word.*  
becomes

‘David Maynier says that the party cannot just allow South-Africa to become a place to store weapons.’

[Korpusportaal corpus]

→ More research on the expressive meaning in Afrikaans needed, to understand the cross-linguistic similarities/differences between languages and between the progressive posture verb construction and the progressive motion verb construction.

In addition, the Afrikaans *loop en V* construction shows peculiar syntactic behaviour as opposed to the Afrikaans progressive posture verb construction.

→ In Afrikaans, we see a clear interaction between the syntax and the semantics of these constructions.

Taken together, a cross-linguistic comparison of both the syntax and the semantics of the posture and motion verb constructions in Dutch, English and Afrikaans looks promising → future work!

---

<sup>12</sup>Afrikaans does have the infinitival marker *te* in its grammar, but unlike Dutch, it is not used in progressive posture/motion verb constructions.

## References

- Biberauer, T. (2016). Three factors and modern generative diachronic syntax: Extensions and innovations ii: 'going beyond the input'. Handout as part of LOT summer school course. July 11-15 2016. Utrecht University, The Netherlands.
- Bjorkman, B. M. (2016). Go get, come see: Motion verbs, morphological restrictions, and syncretism. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 34:53–91.
- Carden, G. and Pesetsky, D. (1977). Double-verb constructions markedness, and a fake coordination. In *Chicago Linguistics Society (CLS) 13*, pages 82–92, Chicago. CLS.
- Cruse, D. A. (1986). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, M. (2013). Corpus of global web-based english: 1.9 billion words from speakers in 20 countries (glowbe). Available online at <http://corpus.byu.edu/glowbe/>.
- de Vos, M. (2004). Pseudocoordination is not subordination. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 21(1):181–192.
- de Vos, M. (2005). *The syntax of pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans*. Igitur/LOT: Netherlands graduate school of linguistics.
- de Vos, M. (2007). And as an aspectual connective in the event structure of pseudo-coordinative constructions. In Celle, A. and Huart, R., editors, *Connectives as Discourse Landmarks*, Band 161 von Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, pages 49–70. Benjamins.
- Fraser, K. (2016). *Sitting and waiting: An idle meaning of an english posture verb*. Master's thesis, Universität Stuttgart.
- Gutzmann, D. (2015). *Use-Conditional Meaning. Studies in Multidimensional Semantics*. Oxford Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics 6. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Haeseryn, W., Romijn, K., Geerts, G., Rooij, J. d., and Toorn, M. v. d. (1997). *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst. Second edition*. Martinus Nijhoffuitgevers/Wolters Plantyn, Groningen and Deurne.
- Horn, L. R. (2007). Towards a fregean pragmatics: Voraussetzung, nebengedanke, andeutung. In Kecskes, I. and Horn, L. R., editors, *Explorations in Pragmatics: Linguistic, Cognitive and Intercultural Aspects*, pages 39–69. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Josefsson, G. (93). Pseudocoordination in swedish with gå "go" and the "surprise effect.". *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, pages 26–50.
- Kaplan, D. (1999). The meaning of *ouch* and *oops*. explorations in the theory of meaning as use. ms. University of California at Los Angeles.
- Kuteva, T. (1999). On 'sit'/'stand'/'lie' auxiliiation. *Linguistics*, 37(2):191–213.
- Lemmens, M. (2005). Aspectual posture verb constructions in Dutch. *Journal of German Linguistics*, 17(3):183–217.
- Levin, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Leyes, O. (1985). De konstruktie staat te+ infi nitief en verwante konstrukties. *Verslagen en Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*, 13(3):265–277.
- McCready, E. (2009). What man does. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 31:671–724.
- McCready, E. (2010). Varieties of conventional implicatures. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 3(8):1–57.
- Oostdijk, N., Reynaert, M., Hoste, V., and Schuurman, I. (2013). The construction of a 500-million-word reference corpus of contemporary written dutch. In Spyns, P. and Odijk, J., editors, *Essential Speech and Language Technology for Dutch: Results by the STEVIN-programme*. Springer.
- Potts, C. (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. OUP.
- Potts, C. (2015). Presupposition and implicature. In Lappin, S. and Fox, C., editors, *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, pages 168–202. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ross, D. (2016). Going to surprise: the grammaticalization of itive as mirative. Online proceedings of Cognitive Linguistics in Wroclaw Web Conference 2016. <https://sites.google.com/site/coglingwroc2/>.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (1999). The go-and-verb construction in a cross-linguistic perspective: Image- schema blending and the construal of events\*. In Nordquist, D. and Berkenfield, C., editors, *Proceedings of the Second Annual High Desert Linguistics Society Conference*. High Desert Linguistics Society.
- Stefanowitsch, A. (2000). The english go-(prt)-and-verb construction. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 26(1):259–270.
- Tonhauser, J. (2012). Diagnosing (not-)at-issue content. In *Proceedings of Semantics of Under-represented Languages of America (SULA)*, volume 6, pages 239–254, UMass, Amherst. GLSA.

- Van Pottelberge, J. (2002). Nederlandse progressiefconstructies met werkwoorden van lichaamshouding: specificiteit en geschiedenis. *NEDERLANDSE TAALKUNDE (GRONINGEN)*, 7(2):142–174.
- Wulff, S. (2006). Go-v vs. go-and-v in English: a case of constructional synonymy. In *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics: Corpus-based approaches to syntax and lexis*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.