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

The only downside with Ziggo Digitaal is live football, the entire neighbourhood

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 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]

• 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)

(2) {Colleagues are organising a suprise going-away party for Claire:}

While having drinks last night, Joe went and told Claire about the party.

[after Stefanowitsch (1999): 124]

• 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\(^2\), and if so, is it compositional in nature?

  – tonight: Dutch and English; more generally: Germanic

• Our approach: qualitative corpus study + multidimensional semantics

---

1 Ziggo Digitaal is a type of TV contract in the Netherlands.
2 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

- A posture verb + te + V_2 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/lie/stands to read
‘He is reading.’

- The progressive can also be constructed with the motion verb lopen⁴; 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 aanbieding die looth 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

---

³See Kuteva (1999) for an overview of progressive posture verb constructions in both European and non-European languages.
⁴Note 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*

  - *go* and the lexical verb are not truly coordinated, but together form a **single event**
  - no overt subject for lexical V; no intervening constituents\(^5\); 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

\(^5\)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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SoNaR</td>
<td>STEVIN Nederlandstalig Referentiecorpus&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 million words</td>
<td>Oostdijk et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Dutch in NE and BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>written and online text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;STEVIN Dutch Reference Corpus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methodology: Extraction and Annotation

Table 2: Search terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• [lopen] + te + [v*]</td>
<td>• [go] + and + [v*]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ loop/loopt/open/liep/liepen te Verb</td>
<td>→ goes/went/gone/going and Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• [Aux]/[Mod] + lopen + [v*]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ AUX/MOD lopen (te) Verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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\(^6\); criteria\(^7\) in Table 3

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Lexical V</th>
<th>Entire clause</th>
<th>Emotive component?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animacy</td>
<td>negative?</td>
<td>'adverb present?'</td>
<td>'positive? negative?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phi features</td>
<td>Levin (1993) class</td>
<td>'tense'</td>
<td>'what category?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantifier?</td>
<td></td>
<td>'embedded clause?'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'obligatory te?'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Emotive categories\(^8\) 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]

---

\(^6\) Annotation was done individually, according to native language.

\(^7\) Grey cells indicate annotations not discussed here.

\(^8\) 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesired</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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 V₂

→ *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
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British English</th>
<th>American English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>37 67%</td>
<td>56 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>16 26%</td>
<td>15 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>9 15%</td>
<td>12 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British English</th>
<th>American English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undesired</td>
<td>17 27%</td>
<td>44 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td>45 73%</td>
<td>36 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>– –</td>
<td>3  4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• 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

7
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
  - Positive: 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 open 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

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?

9The 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\(^{10}\)
  - supported by tests above
- go/open 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Meaning</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>descriptive/at-issue</td>
<td>V2: lexical verb</td>
<td>predicated event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive/not-at-issue</td>
<td>V1: motion verb</td>
<td>evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) \([\text{gawk}]^t = [\text{look}]^t\)
   (ii) \([J \text{ is gawking at the people}]^t = \{w: \text{Jonathan is looking at people in } w\}\)

b. use content
   (i) \([\text{gawk}]^u = [\text{speaker has a derogatory attitude towards the manner of looking}]^u\)
   (ii) \([J \text{ is gawking at people}]^u = \{c: \text{speaker has a derogatory attitude towards J’s manner of looking in } c_w\}\)

4.3 Our proposal

- Expressive meaning in NoMove contributed by underspecified motion verb
  - this desemanticised verb takes lexical verb’s verb phrase (V\(_2\)P) and its event as argument

(23) \([\text{Verb}_{\text{motion}} \text{ (and) } V_2 P] = (\{w: \text{V}_2 \text{P’s event in } w\}, \{c: \text{V}_2 \text{P’s event is unexpected or undesired in } c_w\})\)

\(^{10}\)Stefanowitsch (1999) presents a similar idea, but within an Image-Schema Framework.
Jonathan Franzen went and wrote two Great American Novels.

- \[ \text{went and wrote two G.A. Novels}^{'} = \text{[wrote two G.A. Novels]}^{'} \]
- \[ \text{Jonathan Franzen went and wrote two Great American Novels}^{''} = \{w: \text{Jonathan Franzen wrote two G. A. Novels in } w\} \]

(25) Jonathan Franzen went and wrote two Great American Novels.

- \[ \text{went and wrote two G.A. Novels}^{''} = \text{[writing-two-GA-Novels event is unexpected]}^{''} \]
- \[ \text{Jonathan Franzen went and wrote two Great American Novels}^{''} = \{c: \text{writing-two-GA-Novels event is unexpected in } c_{w}\} \]

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 \( \text{boul}^{11} \)
  - bouletic, to account for expectations and desires in relevant context
  - \( \text{boul} \) 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

- \( \text{boul}: \langle (s, t), u \rangle \)
- \( \mathcal{B} \) is a set of use-conditional bouletic evaluator-predicates =
  \{λp.\( C_E \) did not expect \( p \) to be true, \( λp.\( C_E \) does not want \( p \) to be true, \( λp.\( C_E \) wants \( C_A \) to change \( p \), ... \)

- \( \text{BOUL} = λP.\{w: \text{boul}(p)(w) \text{ in } w\} = λP.\{c: \text{there is a } b ∈ \mathcal{B} \text{ such that } b \text{ is suitable for } p \text{ in } c \text{ and } b \text{ holds for } p \text{ in } c_{w}\} \)

(27) The entry for expressive go/opend

\[ \lambda P.∃e.[\text{boul}[P(e)]] \]

(28) Put together:
Jonathon Franzen went and wrote two GA Novels

- The truth-conditional domain: Deriving the \( V_2P \)
  \[ \text{[write]} = λx.λy.\text{write}(x)(y) \]
  \[ \text{[J wrote two novels]} = \text{write}(j)(n) \]
- The use-conditional domain: with the motion verb
  \[ \text{[go]} = \lambda P.∃e.[\text{boul}[P(e)]] \]
  \[ \text{[J went and wrote two novels]} = ∃e.\text{boul}[\text{write}(j)(n), (e)] \]

---

\(^{11}\)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.\(^{12}\)

→ 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 ou’aaas 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 word.**

David Maynier says that the party cannot just sit and 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!

\(^{12}\) Afrikaans does have the infinitival marker *te* in it’s grammar, but unlike Dutch, it is not used in progressive posture/motion verb constructions.
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