

Katrin Pfadenhauer and Evelyn Wiesinger

Romance motion verbs in language change: New approaches and challenges

Abstract: The introduction to this volume provides an overview on the concept and encoding of motion in language, summarises the current state of research on the Romance languages and identifies existing desiderata. It outlines the broad and innovative perspective on motion-related constructions in Romance as well as the theoretical and methodological approaches pursued in this volume and briefly presents the individual contributions.

Keywords: Romance, motion, verbal periphrases, multi-verb constructions, serial verb constructions, grammaticalization, lexicalization, constructionalization

Motion in space is among the most basic sensorimotor experiences and also represents a central component of human cognition and thinking (cf. Miller/Johnson-Laird 1976). In Cognitive Linguistics, spatial positions and motional relations have been captured in terms of “image schemas” (e.g. *path*, *containment*, *source-path-goal*). These are considered conceptual primitives or embodied, prelinguistic structures of experience that are learned at an early age (cf. Johnson 1987; Lakoff 1987; Hampe 2005), and for which also non-linguistic disciplines such as psychology and neuroscience have provided evidence (cf. Gibbs/Colston 1995; Boroditsky 2000; Rohrer 2005).

The expression of real and fictive motion is also part of our everyday linguistic activity (cf. Filipović/Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2015). Motion verbs play a central role in this process, which is also reflected in language acquisition and use. Motion verbs (at least some) are acquired early, have a high frequency of use in comparison to other verbs and are seen as the basis for the development of abstract, (in)transitive argument structures in the Indo-European languages (e.g. Miller/Johnson-Laird 1976; Tomasello 1992; Goldberg 1995; 2006).

Against this background, it is hardly surprising that verbs of motion are also frequently involved in language change (cf. Schmid 2014; Ströbel 2014). In this vein, motion verbs feature different types of multi-verb constructions such as verbal periphrases, (pseudo-)copula, (pseudo-)coordinated or passive constructions as well as discourse and focus markers, among others, which express a wide range of grammatical, lexical or pragmatic meanings or functions.

Katrin Pfadenhauer, University of Bayreuth
Evelyn Wiesinger, University of Tübingen

<https://doi.org/10.1515/978311248141-001>

The overall goal of this volume is to grasp more completely the typological characteristics and the developmental potential of motion verbs and the constructions in which they occur in the Romance languages. To this effect, the existing findings on already known constructions and (mostly grammaticalization) paths of language change will be expanded by studies that focus on motion verbs and motion-related constructions, functions and diachronic developments in Romance languages that have received less attention so far. In comparison to previous research, the present volume adopts a wider perspective on language change, taking into account not only grammaticalization processes but also discursive, lexical and pragmatic phenomena and thus also the intermediate area between lexicon and grammar.

This introductory chapter to our volume is structured as follows: in Section 1, we provide a general overview on the concept and encoding of motion in language, before we summarise the current state of research on the Romance languages and identify desiderata for future research in Section 2. Section 3 then outlines the innovative perspective taken in the present volume as well as its theoretical and methodological focus. The individual contributions to this volume are briefly presented in Section 4.

1 Motion in language

The concept of motion, or more precisely, of “translational motion” (Talmy 2000b, 25) is commonly defined as “a change of location from a spatial position A to a different position B, whereby the moving figure was located at position A at time T1 and then located at position B at another time T2” (cf. Filipović/Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2015, 528). In his influential typological work on the linguistic expression of motion events, Talmy identifies the *figure*, which corresponds to the moving entity, the *path* (i.e. the course or trajectory over which the motion takes place), and the *ground* (a landmark or reference point with respect to which the figure is moving), as the basic components of a translational motion frame. In the Talmian research tradition, the path represents the conceptual core of motion events. It is deemed to receive preferential attention in language acquisition, linguistic expression and non-linguistic representation, especially if it represents the (intended) goal of the motion event (e.g. Ikegami 1987; Slobin 1996; Lakusta/Landau 2005; Lakusta et al. 2007; Kopecka/Ishibashi 2011 or Ishibashi 2012 for this so-called “goal bias”). The translational motion frame is thus strongly related to the source-path-goal image schema (cf. Johnson 1987, 28; Lakoff 1987, 275), which seems to be among the first ones to be acquired in early infancy (cf. Rohrer 2005; Mandler/Pagán Cánovas 2014). However Talmy (1985; 2000b, 25–26; 2017, 2–3) also believes

that “basic” motion events may be associated with various “co-events”, among which he includes the following:¹

- *Precursion*: The co-event precedes the motion event, but does not cause or enable its occurrence.
- *Enablement*: The co-event directly precedes the motion event and enables an event that causes the motion, but does not itself cause this motion.
- *Onset causation*: The co-event immediately precedes and causes the motion event.
- *Extended causation*: The co-event is concurrent throughout the motion event and maintains it.
- *Manner*: The co-event is concurrent with the motion event; it is an activity or state that the figure of the motion event manifests as a direct aspect of its motion.
- *Concomitance*: The co-event is concurrent with the motion event; it is an activity or state that the figure of the motion event manifests independently of its motion.
- *Concurrent result*: The co-event results from (is caused by) the motion event and occurs during some portion of it.
- *Subsequence*: The co-event takes place directly after the main motion event, and is enabled by, is caused by, or is the purpose of that motion event (cf. Talmy 2017, 2–3).

Still, in accordance with the importance attributed to the path of motion events, most typological research on the linguistic encoding of motion in the Indo-European languages has focused on the expression of the path in or outside the verb, which also forms the basis of Talmy’s (2000a; 2000b) distinction between *verb-* and *satellite-framing*: whereas the Romance languages feature predominantly verb-framed constructions, in which the path of motion is directly encoded in the verb, the Germanic and Slavic languages prefer satellite-framed constructions, in which the path is expressed via a non-verbal (e.g. adverbial or prepositional) satellite and the verb more frequently expresses manner of motion, i.e. the way in or the activity by which motion is performed.

¹ *Deixis* is treated as one of the possible components of the path by Talmy (2000b, 56–57). However, since deixis refers to the viewpoint taken by the speaker and not to the configuration of the path with respect to a ground element, Filipović (2007, 17) does not consider it to be an inherent part of the motion event itself. In typological research, deixis is often referred to as “itive”, i.e. movement away from the deictic center, and “ventive”, i.e. movement towards the deictic center (cf. Ross, this volume).

Whereas this kind of typological research has been strongly focused on constructions that essentially include one motion verb, motion-related constructions may also involve more than one verb. In a very general way and without implying any formal or semantic specificities, we refer to these constructions as “multi-verb constructions” in the following (cf. also Ameika 2005; Haspelmath 2016, 313; Ross 2022). For example, Talmy (2000b, 222) already invokes the role of gerunds for expressing manner-of-motion in the Romance languages (e.g. Spanish *Abrió la puerta empujándola* lit. ‘He opened the door by pushing it’; ‘He pushed the door open’), but these have not received much attention so far (cf. also Fortis/Vittrant 2011).² By contrast, multi-verb constructions have played a prominent role in the investigation of so-called serial verb constructions in non-European languages (cf. Aikhenvald 2006; 2018; Haspelmath 2016 for overviews).³ This construction type has been defined as “a monoclausal construction consisting of multiple independent verbs with no element linking them and with no predicate-argument relation between the verbs” (Haspelmath 2016, 196). Cross-linguistically, serial verb constructions frequently express different types of more or less complex motion (co-)events, including “directional motion”, typically combining a motion verb with a path verb, or “associated motion”, typically combining a motion verb with a (non-)motion verb (cf. Lovestrand/Ross 2021). In associated motion, the motion event may be prior, concurrent or subsequent to the associated event (cf. Guillaume/Koch 2021, 3).

Further, serial verb constructions may show certain transition areas towards coordinated constructions, complement/subordinating (e.g. purposive) constructions and more lexicalized compounds or more grammaticalized (e.g. periphrastic) constructions, in which the first verb may develop into an auxiliary, or the second verb may develop into an adpositional element (cf. Heine/Kuteva 2002; Aikhenvald 2006 or, for language-specific studies, Diller 2006 on Thai and Gramatke 2019 on Seselwa). From a broader typological perspective, Lovestrand/Ross (2021, 88) and Ross (2022) have recently argued that formally different types of multi-verb constructions, e.g. serial verb constructions, verb-verb compounds, pseudo-coordinated constructions or converb complex predicates, may express equivalent or similar motion concepts, both inter- and, in some cases, even intralinguistically.

² For example, Goldschmitt (2014, 166–167) observes in a frog story experiment that gerunds are more frequent in Spanish than in French. In Italian translations of English novels, Iacobini/Vergaro (2014, 222–224) find that English motion constructions with manner (main) verbs are in 11% of all cases translated with a manner gerund, e.g. English *danced down the steps*/Italian *scese le scale danzando* ‘descended the stairs dancing’.

³ Serial verb constructions have also been associated with the typological category of “equipollently-framing”, e.g. in Mandarin Chinese, several West African languages and some creole languages (cf. Slobin 2006, 62–64, or Beavers et al. 2010, 351–357, for overviews).

These observations also point to a potential diachronic relationship between different motion-related constructions, e.g. in terms of an increase of syntactic cohesion and integration and/or of semantic fixity and non-compositionality. It is, for example, well known that verbs and constructions encoding simple or complex motion events have a cross-linguistic developmental potential towards the expression of tense and aspect, e.g. towards immediate past, progressive, continuous, habitual or future meanings (cf. Bybee/Dahl 1989; Bybee et al. 1994; Heine/Kuteva 2002). In the same vein, Stefanowitsch (1999, 127) signals that *go-and-verb* constructions show cross-linguistic similarities in expressing spatial motion, annoyance/disappointment/disapproval, surprise, a lack of hesitation, continuous action or progressive/habitual aspect. Moreover, motion verbs and motion-related constructions have been found to develop into discourse connectors (Ebert 2003; Bourdin 2008), consecutive markers (cf. Heine/Kuteva 2002; Nurse 2003) or focus markers (e.g. Devos/Van der Wal 2010; Bravo 2014). Multi-verb constructions may also become fixed lexical or phraseological units with non-compositional, idiomatic meanings (cf. Aikhenvald 2006; 2018, 227). The potential for developing these grammatical, pragmatic or lexical meanings or functions thus seems to be conceptually related to the initial motion semantics (cf. also Stefanowitsch 1999) and to cut across different formal construction types.

2 Previous research and challenges on motion-related constructions in Romance

In the major Romance languages such as French, Spanish and Italian, motion verbs and the linguistic expression of motion events have been intensively investigated from a typological perspective and numerous studies have confirmed the predominance of so-called “verb-framed” (in)transitive motion constructions in the modern Romance languages (e.g. Talmy 1985; 2000; Slobin 1996; Hijazo-Gascón/Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2013a; 2013b; Fagard et al. 2013). However, so-called “satellite-framed” constructions, in which the path over which the motion event takes place is expressed in a non-verbal satellite, are also attested in all Romance languages (e.g. Martínez Vázquez 2001; Berthele 2006; 2013; Pedersen 2014; Iacobini 2015; Ibarretxe-Antuñano et al. 2017), but they generally show a low degree of frequency and productivity, especially in the Standard varieties. We also dispose of detailed studies and inventories of motion verbs in Romance languages such as French, which go beyond traditional aspectual or manner-path distinctions in the domain of motion verbs (cf. Aurnague 2011; Stosic/Aurnague 2017). By contrast, other Romance languages such as Romanian as well as the non-European varieties

of the Romance languages or Romance-based creole languages have been much less in the focus of typological and/or language-specific studies on the encoding of motion events (cf., for example, Papahagi 2009 for a first overview on Romanian or Wiesinger in press on motion-encoding in Guianese French Creole).

As for phenomena of language change involving motion verbs and motion-related constructions, the most intensely studied domain for the Romance languages is the development of periphrastic constructions that come to express temporality, modality and/or aspectuality (e.g., cf. Gougenheim 1971 [1929]; Dietrich 1973; Olbertz 1998; Squartini 1998; Pusch/Wesch 2003; Bres/Labeau 2018; De Araújo-Adriano 2021). Whereas Classical Latin had only one periphrastic construction based on a motion verb (the future passive infinitive formed as a combination of a supine and *iri*, the present passive infinitive of *ire* ‘to go’, cf. Stolova 2009, 83; Dalbera 2018, 29: *amatum iri* ‘he is going to be loved’), the Romance languages have developed a whole variety of motion-based, more or less grammaticalized multi-verb constructions that can be formally assigned to one of the following types (cf. Stolova 2009, 83; Dessì Schmid 2019, 212; Vincent 2022, 114–115):

1. Motion verb + past participle (e.g., as in Italian)
 - (1) *Questa lampadina va sostituita.*
 ‘This light bulb must be replaced.’ (personal communication)
2. Motion verb + gerund (e.g., as in Portuguese)
 - (2) *Ele anda dizendo* que ela está doente.
 ‘He keeps saying that she’s sick.’ (Rostock 2007, 345)
3. Motion verb + infinitive (e.g., as in Catalan)
 - (3) *Va arribar* el dia que les cames ja no la *van poder aguantar*.
 ‘The day came when his legs could no longer hold him.’ (Puig/Borràs 2019)
4. Motion verb (+ conjunction) + finite verb (e.g., as in Spanish)
 - (4) *Va y ¿qué me dice* el muy listo? Pues nada.
 ‘He goes and what does the wise guy say? Well nothing.’
 (Garachana Camarero 2018, 135)

From a typological point of view, the existence of motion-based periphrastic constructions, which are defined as “grammaticalized constructions that employ a

motion verb as auxiliary” (Stolova 2009, 83), has even been proposed as a classificational criterion in comparison to other languages such as Latin (cf. Stolova 2009).

From a syntactic perspective, particular attention has been paid to the question of the formal criteria for the delimitation of verbal periphrases. Traditionally, and more generally, verbal periphrases are defined as

“[...] eine Verbindung von zwei (oder, in Ausnahmefällen, mehr) Verbformen, die eine einzige und semantisch einheitliche (nicht-kompositionelle) Prädikationseinheit bilden und deren Auxiliarelement bei sehr stark abgeschwächtem semantischen Gehalt als Träger der flexional markierten Verbalkategorien dient, während ein zweites nicht finites Verbalelement, das also (in den romanischen Sprachen) als Infinitiv, Gerund bzw. Partizip vorliegen kann, die semantische Hauptinformation der Prädikationseinheit beisteuert” (Pusch/Wesch 2003, 2–3).⁴

At the same time, the problematic nature of defining periphrasticity has repeatedly been pointed out (cf. Pusch/Wesch 2003, 1–10; Dessì Schmid 2019, 202–230; Rosemeyer/Garachana Camarero, this volume, for discussion). The central difficulties in this context include the degree of grammaticalization of the various constructions as well as their assignment to the lexicon or grammar. The latter loses relevance in recent semantic approaches that deal with verbal periphrases from an onomasiological perspective, such as Dessì Schmid’s (2019 [2014]) model for capturing aspectuality. For aspectual verbal periphrases in particular, she emphasizes that “[t]he common denominator that connects all verbal periphrases is their semantics [...] The question, which is difficult to answer in the traditional semasiological view of aspectual categories, as to which aspectual categories they can be assigned – whether they are aspect or *Aktionsart* – is simply no longer relevant: they are merely aspectuality” (Dessì Schmid 2019, 229–230).

One of the best-known developments in the domain of verbal periphrases is that of a verb meaning ‘to go’ to an auxiliary which, in combination with another verb in the infinitive (and in some cases a preposition as Spanish *a* ‘to’), comes to encode a(n immediate) future meaning, as in Portuguese (ex. 5), Spanish (ex. 6), French (ex. 7), Occitan (ex. 8a, 8b) and Catalan (ex. 9) (cf. Buchi et al. 2016–2020):

- (5) *Vai chover* amanhã. ‘It is going to rain/it will rain tomorrow.’ (Móia 2018, 148)

4 Translation by Dessì Schmid (2019, 210): “[...] a combination of two (or, in exceptional cases, more) verbal forms which form a single and semantically uniform (non-compositional) predicate unit and whose auxiliary element serves as a carrier of the inflectionally marked verbal category with greatly weakened semantic content, while a second non-finite verbal element, which may therefore appear (in the Romance languages) in the infinitive, gerund or participle, carries the main semantic information of the predicate unit”.

- (6) *¿Va usted a expulsar a mi hija del colegio?*
 ‘Are you going to kick my daughter out of school?’ (Fadanelli 2004, 21)
- (7) Elle n’était déjà plus là, ses pieds nus, en s’en allant, ne faisant pas de bruit. Il dit encore: – *Je vais t’espérer*, Anna.
 ‘She was already gone, her naked feet, as she walked away, making no noise. He still said: – I will wait for you, Anna.’ (Roumain 2000 [1944], 81)
- (8) a. Prince, espèra-me. *Vau anar* ligar la pèira verda.
 ‘Prince, wait for me. I’ll go and bind the green stone.’ (Joan Bodon, *Contes*, cited in Bres/Labeau 2012, 146)

But also with the preposition *a* ‘to’ as a result of Occitan-Spanish language contact:

- b. *Te vau a cantar* ua cançon. ‘I’m going to sing you a song.’ (Barceló 2017, 326)
- (9) *Va a ploure*. ‘It’s going to rain.’ (Radatz 2003, 66)

Catalan (as an exceptional case among the Romance languages) has also developed a perfective past of the type *anar* + infinitive as in ex. (10):

- (10) (jo) *vaig cantar* {ahir/la setmana passada/*aquest matí/*aquesta setmana}
 ‘I sang yesterday/last week/*this morning/*this week’
 (Pérez Saldanya/Hualde 2003, 47)

Most of these constructions have been strongly associated with the future reading in the literature, which is also reflected at the level of terminology. In French, for example, it is not at all uncommon to refer to the *aller* + infinitive constructions with the notion *futur périphrastique* ‘periphrastic future’ (Riegel et al. 2011 [1994]).

Moreover, many Romance periphrases containing a motion verb also encode other aspectual values, such as progressivity in Portuguese (ex. 11) or iterativity in Sardinian (ex. 12):

- (11) *Anda lendo*. ‘He is reading.’ (Stolova 2009, 84)
- (12) *Torro a léghere* cussu libru. ‘I read that book again.’ (Stolova 2009, 84)

Moreover, various modal interpretations have been documented in the literature, although the specific readings can usually only be inferred through context, as in the examples from Italian (ex. 13) and Portuguese (ex. 14):

- (13) Ho ceduto non senza apprensione, anche perché la pioggia era sempre più forte. I kart montavano le gomme slick, da asciutto, ma *vai a spiegare* a un ragazzino di otto anni la differenza.
 ‘I gave in not without apprehension, not least because the rain was getting heavier. The karts were on slicks, dry tires, but try explaining the difference to an eight-year-old boy.’ (Silletti 2018, 95)
- (14) *Vamos levá-lo para o carro.* ‘Let’s take him to the car.’ (Stolova 2009, 84)

More recent work has developed differentiated diachronic and semantic analyses, showing that, in addition to parallel developments, there are also language-specific differences, as evidenced by Catalan *anar* + infinitive ‘have done sth.’ vs. *anar a* + infinitive ‘going to do sth.’ (cf. Radatz 2003; Larreya 2005; Haßler 2016; Dessi Schmid 2019 [2014] and the numerous publications by the members of the GRADIA project (*Gramática y Diacronía: Diccionario histórico de las perífrasis verbales del español*) at the University of Barcelona (cf. GRADIA). However, it must also be noted that the focus of most studies on periphrastic constructions with motion verbs is on the European varieties of the Romance languages. With regard to Spanish, the current state of research on verbal periphrases reflects a clear imbalance in the sense that the phenomenon has been studied mainly from a European perspective with a focus on Peninsular Spanish.

Although there are a number of individual studies that investigate periphrastic constructions in a specific American variety (cf. Olbertz 2003 for *venir* + gerund in Ecuadorian Andean Spanish; Nieuwenhuijsen 2019 for a contrastive study of *andar* + gerund in Mexican and Peninsular Spanish; Pfadenhauer 2023 for ‘go’-constructions in Spanish spoken in Cuba and Mexico), there is still an urgent need for up to date and exhaustive descriptions that do not tend to refer to any “different” use as a result of contact with an indigenous language or as a “deviation” from so-called Standard Spanish, the latter usually being understood as Peninsular Spanish (see for example Squartini, 1998, 100–103). A similar picture emerges for French spoken in different African countries, for which studies on (periphrastic) motion constructions are still a desideratum today (cf. Pfadenhauer 2020). From a normative perspective, there is also a tendency to explain constructions perceived as “deviant” in terms of language contact phenomena or “defective L2-acquisition”, although similar constructions can also be found in French spoken in France (cf. Pfadenhauer/Teixeira Kalkhoff/Wiesinger, this volume). Constructions such as those shown in examples (15) and (16) from spoken French in Southern Came-

room are thus described as the result of contact “with African languages” (without further specification!) and immediately placed in the category of serial verb constructions (cf. Manessy 1994, 211):

- (15) je peux alors *partir rester* chez nous ‘then I am going to stay at home’
(Manessy 1994, 211)
- (16) Elle me dit : *va t’asseoir* là-bas, je dis : non, Madame, ça me fait trop mal, il faut que je monte sur la table pour que vous me regardiez. Elle me dit : *va monter, je pars monter* sur la table. . .
‘She said: go and sit over there, I said: no, Madam, it hurts too much, I have to get on the table so that you can look at me. She says to me: go up, I went on the table. . .’ (conversation of a pregnant woman with her midwife) (Manessy 1994, 211)

This widespread practice has also been critically questioned in the past with regard to the description of African languages, as for example by Creissels (2000, 240), who claims that “[u]nfortunately, in many descriptions of African languages, any more or less “exotic” verb sequence (i.e. any sequence of verbs that does not exhibit every characteristic of the sequences of verbs found in European languages) is loosely termed “serial verb””.

Moreover, the state of research on Romance verbal periphrases shows that some constructions, such as the GO and COME-constructions (cf. Flydal 1943; Larreya 2005; Labeau/Bres 2018) have traditionally received far more attention than constructions involving other verbs of motion (e.g. THROW-constructions, cf. Van Hulle/Enghels, this volume). Thus, for the French *aller* + infinitive construction, a whole range of other uses have been identified in addition to the prospective value, such as the directive value, the characterizing value, the narrative value and the so-called *allure extraordinaire* (cf. Larreya 2005). A similar picture emerges for Spanish (cf. Garachana Camarero 2018). Moreover, an increased interest in the pragmatic values of individual periphrases and their discursive functions in specific contexts, text and discourse types is noticeable in recent studies, going beyond the aspectual and temporal values of the constructions in question (cf. Lansari 2010; Bravo 2014; 2017; Pfadenhauer, this volume; Mayr, this volume).

In comparison to the large bulk of research on the emergence of so-called verbal periphrases, Romance motion verbs and motion-related constructions have also received less attention in other processes of language change. These include, for example, the formation of copula verbs, e.g. Romanian *a ajunge* ‘to arrive’ > ‘to become’, *a veni* ‘to come’ > ‘to be’ (cf. Dragomirescu/Nicolae 2014), passive auxiliaries, e.g. Italian *venire* ‘to come’ > ‘to be’, Romanian *a veni* ‘to come’ > ‘to be’

(cf. Giacalone Ramat/Sansò 2014) or discourse and focus markers, e.g. Peninsular Spanish *venga* ‘come on’ (cf. Daniels 2014) and French in Cameroon *j’arrive* as a farewell greeting formula (cf. Mulo Farenkia 2008; Anchimbe 2022 for the equivalent phenomenon *I’m coming* in Cameroon English) (for further examples, cf. the contributions in Devos/Van der Wal 2014).

3 The study of motion-related constructions in Romance in the present volume

The present collective volume adopts a broad perspective on language change based on motion concepts and linguistic means (initially) expressing semantic motion components in various ways.

First, the studies assembled in this volume acknowledge the formal and functional diversity of motion-related constructions in Romance, which may involve more than one verb. In this vein, our volume includes studies on verbal periphrases that are well known in some Romance languages, but have not received much attention in others (such as the periphrastic future in Italian), constructions based on motion verbs other than those meaning ‘to go’ or ‘to come’ (such as ‘throw’ verbs in Spanish inchoative constructions) as well as less-studied construction types such as (pseudo-/semi-)copula and pseudo-coordinated constructions in Spanish.

Second, the contributions in this volume do not only take into account “classical” grammaticalization processes, which involve the increasing auxiliation of the motion verb and an evolution towards the expression of more abstract, e.g. temporal, aspectual or passive meanings, by the analytical construction as a whole. Instead, several of the contributions in this volume also focus on lexical, discursive and pragmatic phenomena, e.g. the development of quotative or mirative functions or the use of constructions for discursive elaboration.

A third focus in this volume is on motion verbs in less studied Romance languages such as Romanian as well as on the anchoring of multi-verb constructions to the initial motion (verb) semantics. Although it is generally recognized in grammaticalization research that lexical meanings may “persist” to a certain extent (cf. Hopper 1991, 22), this aspect has mostly stayed out of sight in previous studies that focused on the more grammaticalized or pragmaticalized functions of the Romance constructions. The persistence of motion semantics in Romance constructions and, in some cases, also its relationship to more formally defined properties such as periphrasticity and auxiliation, will be approached both from a corpus-based, a theoretical cognitive-linguistic as well as from an experimental, psycholinguistic perspective in the present volume.

As for the theoretical frameworks adopted by the authors of the contributions in this volume, they build on functional, usage-based and/or Construction Grammar models of language change (cf. Lehmann 1982; Hopper 1987; Langacker 1988; Bybee 2003; Himmelmann 2005; Traugott/Trousdale 2013; Barðdal/Gildea 2015; Hilpert 2021). These share the assumptions of a continuum between lexicon and syntax, of the gradualness of linguistic change and the emergence of grammar out of language usage and put special emphasis on the interaction between syntagmatic strings and their structural and/or contextual environment.

Functionalist approaches usually distinguish between lexicalization, grammaticalization and, possibly, pragmaticalization (cf. Diwald 2011), which show many overlaps and cannot always be clearly distinguished, at least at the level of individual constructions (e.g. Brinton/Traugott 2005; Trousdale 2008; Dessi Schmid 2021). In diachronic Construction Grammar, Traugott/Trousdale (2013) have made prominent the overarching notions of “constructionalization” and “constructional change”. Although the distinction between the emergence of a “new” form-meaning pairing (as in “constructionalization”) and gradual “constructional changes” in already “existing” constructions have been criticized for various reasons (e.g. Hilpert 2021, 36–59; Enghels/Garachana Camarero 2021, for overviews), a plus of diachronic Construction Grammar is its capacity of zooming in on all types of diachronic micro-changes (or bundles of micro-changes) related to the form, meaning, frequency and/or usage contexts of all types of constructions, which may or may not be classified as “grammaticalization” or “lexicalization” from an *ex-post* perspective. Further, the constructionist perspective allows us to distinguish between (semi-)productive patterns and their lexically specific instantiations (so-called “micro-constructions”) (cf. Traugott 2018), which may be situated at different positions in the lexicon-syntax continuum and show different degrees of (mis)match with the overall pattern (cf., for example, Andersson/Blenselius 2018 on Swedish pseudo-coordinated constructions). Construction Grammar has also shown itself to be particularly useful with regard to constructional changes that have previously been classified as “grammaticalization” and/or “lexicalization”, which is also the case for some syntagmatic multi-word constructions, for which the traditional boundaries between lexicon, morphology, syntax and semantics have to be crossed in order to understand how and why specific changes occur (cf., for example, Wiesinger 2020; 2021 for the study of motion-based verb-particle constructions in Spanish).

Methodologically, most studies presented in this volume rely on corpus-driven empirical approaches. They provide qualitative studies based on different types of synchronic and diachronic linguistic data and corpora, which may be supported by descriptive statistics. Some of the contributions in this volume also explore the potential of elicitation tasks or psycholinguistic priming experiments for the investigation of motion verbs and motion-based constructions.

Further, our volume adopts a pan-Romance perspective that involves all major Romance languages, including French, Italian, Spanish and Romanian, as well as comparative perspectives on multi-verb constructions in French spoken in Gabon and French-based creole languages. Several contributions in this volume will explicitly discuss the persistence of motion semantics in multi-verb constructions and/or pay special attention to Romance languages and varieties that have been less studied so far.

4 The contributions to this volume

In the first paper of our volume, entitled “Motion verbs in Romanian: language contact and language renewal”, Benjamin Fagard (CNRS) and Alexandru Mardale (INALCO) follow the Talmian research tradition and investigate the verbal expression of motion events in one of the least studied Romance languages, combining experimentally collected data from modern spoken Romanian with a diachronic corpus study in an original way. The study shows, on the one hand, that Romanian, like other Romance languages, predominantly features “verb-framed” patterns; on the other hand, it reveals that its motion verb lexicon has been influenced by both verb- and satellite-framed features of various contact languages.

The following two contributions deal with multi-verb constructions in French and French-based Creoles involving the verbs *aller/alé* ‘to go’. In contrast to previous research, which has almost exclusively focused on the more grammaticalized or pragmaticalized functions of *aller* + infinitive in French, Katrin Pfadenhauer (University of Bayreuth), Alexander Teixeira Kalkhoff (University of Heidelberg) and Evelyn Wiesinger (University of Tübingen) start their paper “Where can we go with [*aller/alé* + verb] in hexagonal French, French spoken in Gabon and Guianese French Creole?” with the hypothesis that spatial motion semantics still plays a role in some French *aller* + infinitive (micro-)constructions. The aim of their contribution is to discuss the graduality of semantic motion components in *aller/alé* + verb constructions in hexagonal French, in French spoken in Gabon and in a French-based Creole from a corpus-based, semasiological as well as a theoretical, cognitive linguistic perspective.

In his paper “A diachronic corpus study of the productivity of the French verb-serializing analytic [motion verb + main verb] pattern”, Alexander Teixeira Kalkhoff (University of Heidelberg) relies on quantitative data from the diachronic *Frantext* corpus to investigate motion verb + infinitive constructions from Old to Modern French. The study identifies several patterns belonging to this construction type, of which some members show a high degree of lexical fixation (e.g. *aller chercher*), but also reveals the creative use of some patterns [e.g. *envoyer* + infinitive] up to present-day, and even literary, French.

Katrin Pfadenhauer's contribution entitled "The French *aller* + infinitive construction in instructive discourses: new insights from video cooking shows" is also concerned with the French *aller* + infinitive construction, but focuses on its discourse pragmatic functions. The purpose of her paper is to analyse the use of the French *go* + infinitive construction in the specific discourse type of video cooking shows. The study shows that *aller* + infinitive can also take on a sequentializing function in particular discursive contexts and it is assumed that this value arises not so much from the temporal reading of the periphrasis, but can instead be explained by the semantics of motion inherent in the verb *aller*.

The next two contributions investigate the emergence of the periphrastic future construction *andare a* + infinitive in Modern Italian. In contrast to the grammaticalized future periphrases *aller* + infinitive and *ir a* + infinitive in French and Spanish, the existence of a periphrastic future based on a verb of motion meaning 'to go' has traditionally been refuted in Italian. In their contribution "*Andiamo a utilizzare il futuro analitico: on the use of an unused form*", Sarah Dessì Schmid and Lydia Momma (University of Tübingen) show on the basis of audiovisual material and corpora of spoken Italian that the use of this construction is much more widespread than claimed in recent studies. Besides discussing its degree of grammaticalization in relation to its frequency and contextual/discursive distribution, the authors also argue that speakers systematically prefer the analytic over the synthetic future in specific settings and discuss the underlying cognitive and communicative parameters.

In his contribution "Pragmatic profile of a marginalised verbal periphrasis: functional insights in the use of the Italian verbal periphrasis *andare a* + *infinito* in political discourses", Paul Mayr (University of Innsbruck) contributes to the investigation of the functional, pragmatic and communicative spectrum of the periphrastic construction by analyzing its use in the Italian *linguaggio politico* in speeches given in Italian in the European Parliament (EUROPARL7 corpus) and discusses the variable position of micro-constructions with specific infinitives in the lexicon-syntax continuum.

Turning to Spanish, Malte Rosemeyer (Free University of Berlin) and Mar Garachana Camarero (University of Barcelona) explore in their contribution "Semantic bleaching as an indicator of degrees of periphrasticity: an experimental approach" the potential of a psycholinguistic self-paced reading experiment for measuring the degree of periphrasticity and grammaticalization of Spanish periphrastic constructions and argue for their description in terms of a prototypically organized category. The results of their experiment on the Spanish aspectual periphrases *ir a* + infinitive and *andar* + gerund suggest that blocking the lexical interpretation of the motion verb by semantic antipriming is more likely to cause processing and

interpretation problems for the latter, less grammaticalized construction, than for the former, more grammaticalized periphrasis.

Our volume continues with two studies that contribute to the understanding of the vast and productive domain of motion-based multi-verb constructions in Spanish, focusing on constructions that have been little studied so far: Sven Van Hulle and Renata Enghels (Ghent University) examine “The category of throw verbs as productive source of the Spanish aspectual inchoative construction”. On the basis of diachronic data for Peninsular Spanish, they reconstruct the semantic path from ‘throwing’ to ‘starting’ in the grammaticalization of periphrastic constructions involving verbs like *echarse* ‘to throw (oneself)’, *lanzar* ‘to launch’ or *disparar* ‘to shoot’, which also represent an understudied subcategory of motion verbs. Further, the authors explore the variable degree of frequency, the semantic profiles and the collocational behavior of the near-synonymous inchoative micro-constructions.

In her contribution “(Anti-)Grammaticalization paths for Spanish *venir* (‘to come’) + past participle”, Ana Bravo (University of Murcia) shows that this construction has developed a passive flavor, but may also be analyzed as an impersonal construction in Modern Spanish. On the basis of diachronic data from the *Corpus del Español*, she further argues that a clear process of grammaticalization only starts in the 20th century, although apparently grammaticalized uses can already be found in Old Spanish texts.

The next contributions focus on motion-related analytic constructions whose development cannot be clearly understood in terms of a grammaticalization process and/or which essentially develop discursive or pragmatic functions. Katrin Betz (University of Bamberg) adopts a Construction Grammar approach in her study on “*Venir* + participle in Spanish: semantic bleaching or meaning elaboration?”, which is based on data for Modern Spanish from the web-based newspaper and magazine *Corpus del Español Now*. She discusses the various subclasses and frequency values of semi- and pseudo-copula *venir* + adjective/participle constructions, arguing that they profile different meaning nuances and exhibit different degrees of semantic bleaching of the deictic motion verb *venir* ‘to come’.

The paper “*Va y dice* & Co.: motion verbs as quotatives” by Anke Grutschus (University of Bonn) is dedicated to Spanish V₁-y-V₂ constructions that combine motion verbs like *ir* ‘to go’, *llegar* ‘to arrive’ or *venir* ‘to come’ with communication verbs like *decir* ‘to say’. Analyzing synchronic data for Modern Spanish, she finds a first variant of the construction that seems to emphasize modal and expressive values, whereas the second variant rather functions as a topic marker. The analysis further reveals early signs of constructionalization, although the directional meaning of the motion verbs is still retained to a certain extent.

In the last contribution of this volume, entitled “Going to surprise: the grammaticalization of itive as mirative”, Daniel Ross (University of Illinois) focuses

on the mirative uses of pseudo-coordinated and other verb-based constructions involving “itive” verbs that express the direction away from the deictic center from a cross-linguistic, typological perspective. He relates pseudo-coordination constructions to the expression of “associated motion” and argues that the signaling of unexpectedness may be explained as a metaphorical movement away from an expected outcome.

Previous versions of the majority of the contributions of this volume were presented in our cross-linguistic thematic section “Motion verbs in language change – grammar, lexicon, discourse”, held in digital format from 4–7 October 2021 at the 37th *Deutscher Romanistentag* at the University of Augsburg, and were supplemented with contributions by authors that participated in the sessions’ discussion. We would like to thank all participants of the session for the fruitful discussions and for their contributions to this volume.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., *Serial verb constructions in a typological perspective*, in: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y./Dixon, R.M.W. (edd.), *Serial verb constructions. A cross-linguistic typology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, 1–68.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., *Serial verbs*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Ameke, Felix K., *Multiverb constructions on the West-African littoral. Micro-variation and areal typology*, in: Vulchanova, Mila/Áfarli, Tor A. (edd.), *Grammar and beyond. Essays in honour of Lars Hellan*, Oslo, Novus, 2005, 15–42.
- Anchimbe, Eric A., *Postcolonial linguistics. A perspective from within*, conference held at the University of Basel on October 17, 2022.
- Andersson, Peter/Blensienius, Kristia, *Matches and mismatches in Swedish [“ga och V”] ‘go/walk and V’. An exemplar-based perspective*, *Constructions and frames* 10:2 (2018), 147–177.
- Aurnague, Michel, *How motion verbs are spatial. The spatial foundations of intransitive motion verbs in French*, *Linguisticae investigationes* 34:1 (2011), 1–34.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna/Gildea, Spike, *Diachronic construction grammar. Epistemological context, basic assumptions and historical implications*, in: Barðdal, Jóhanna/Smirnova, Elena/Sommerer, Lotte/Gildea, Spike (edd.), *Diachronic construction grammar*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2015, 1–49.
- Barceló, Gerard Joan, *Le futur en occitan. Un aperçu*, in: Baranzini, Laura (ed.), *Le futur dans les langues romanes*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2017, 323–336.
- Beavers, John/Levin, Beth/Shiao Wei, Tham, *The typology of motion expressions revisited*, *Journal of linguistics* 46:3 (2010), 331–377.
- Berthele, Raphael, *Ort und Weg. Die sprachliche Raumreferenz in Varietäten des Deutschen, Rätoromanischen und Französischen*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 2006.
- Boroditsky, Lera, *Metaphoric structuring. Understanding time through spatial metaphors*, *Cognition* 75:1 (2000), 1–28.

- Bourdin, Philippe, *On the grammaticalization of “come” and “go” into markers of textual connectivity*, in: López-Couso, María José/Seoane, Elena (edd.), *Rethinking grammaticalization. New perspectives*, Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2008, 37–59.
- Bravo, Ana, *The Spanish auxiliary “ir” ‘to go’. From resultative motion verb to focus marker*, in: Devos, Maud/van der Wal, Jenneke (edd.), *COME and GO off the beaten grammaticalization path*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2014, 187–218.
- Bres, Jacques/Labeau, Emmanuelle, *De la grammaticalisation des formes itive (“aller”) et ventive (“venir”). Valeur en langue, emplois en discours*, in: Saussure, Louis de/Rihs, Alain (edd.), *Études de sémantique et pragmatique françaises*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2012, 143–165.
- Bres, Jacques/Labeau, Emmanuelle, *Des constructions de “aller” et de “venir” grammaticalisés en auxiliaires*, in: Labeau, Emmanuelle/Bres, Jacques (edd.), *La grammaticalisation des périphrases en “aller” et “venir” dans les langues romanes*, Caen, Centre de recherches interlangues sur la signification en contexte, 2018, 49–86.
- Brinton, Laurel J./Traugott, Elizabeth C., *Lexicalization and language change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Buchi, Éva/Delabarre, Matthieu/Fister, Marion/Huguet, Maxime/Hütsch, Annalena/Juroszek, Éva/Moisson, Jeanne-Marie/Pausé, Marie-Sophie, **’Bad-e-/ v.intr. ‘se déplacer; s’engager dans une action; accomplir (une action) de façon continue’*, in: Buchi, Éva/Schweickard, Wolfgang (edd.), *Dictionnaire étymologique roman*, Nancy, ATILF, 2016–2020, <http://www.atilf.fr/DERom/entree/Bad-e-> [last access: 3 October 2023].
- Bybee, Joan L., *Mechanisms of change in grammaticalization. The role of frequency*, in: Joseph, Brian D./Janda, Richard D. (edd.), *The handbook of historical linguistics*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2003, 602–623.
- Bybee, Joan/Dahl, Östen, *The creation of tense and aspect systems in the languages of the world*, *Studies in language* 13:1 (1989), 51–103.
- Bybee, Joan/Perkins, Revere/Pagliuca, William, *The evolution of grammar*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Creissels, Denis, *Typology*, in: Heine, Bernd/Nurse, Derek (edd.), *African languages. An introduction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, 231–258.
- Dalbera, Joseph, *La grammaticalisation des formes itives et ventives en latin*, in: Labeau, Emmanuelle/Bres, Jacques, *La grammaticalisation des périphrases en “aller” et “venir” dans les langues romanes*, Caen, Centre de recherches interlangues sur la signification en contexte, 2018, 29–48.
- Daniels, Kelsey, *On the grammaticalization of “venga” ‘come’ as a discourse marker in Peninsular Spanish*, in: Devos, Maud/van der Wal, Jenneke (edd.), *COME and GO off the beaten grammaticalization path*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2014, 219–247.
- De Araújo-Adriano, Paulo Â., *Uma proposta formal para a reanálise do verbo “ir” no português brasileiro. De lexical a funcional*, *Working papers of linguistics* 22:2 (2021), 62–104.
- Dessi Schmid, Sarah, *Aspectuality – an onomasiological model applied to the Romance languages*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2019 [2014].
- Dessi Schmid, Sarah, *Zur Beziehung von progressiven Verbalperiphrasen und states. Ein erster Bericht aus Studien zu romanischen Sprachen*, *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 72:1 (2021), 31–62.
- Devos, Maud/van der Wal, Jenneke, *“Go” on a rare grammaticalisation path to focus*, *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 27:1 (2010), 45–58.
- Devos, Maud/van der Wal, Jenneke (edd.), *COME and GO off the beaten grammaticalization path*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2014.

- Dietrich, Wolf, *Der periphrastische Verbalaspekt in den romanischen Sprachen. Untersuchungen zum heutigen romanischen Verbalssystem und zum Problem der Herkunft des periphrastischen Verbalaspekts*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1973.
- Diewald, Gabriele, *Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions*, *Linguistics* 49:2 (2011), 365–390.
- Diller, Anthony V. N., *Thai serial verbs. Cohesion and culture*, in: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y./Dixon, Robert M.W. (edd.), *Serial verb constructions. A cross-linguistic typology*, Oxford/New York, Oxford University Press, 2006, 160–177.
- Dragomirescu, Adina/Nicolae, Alexandru, *The multiple grammaticalization of Romanian “veni” ‘come’. Focussing on the passive construction*, in: Devos, Maud/van der Wal, Jenneke (edd.), *COME and GO off the beaten grammaticalization path*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2014, 69–100.
- Ebert, Karen H., *“Come” and “go” as discourse connectors in Kera and other Chadic languages*, in: Shay, Erin/Seibert, Uwe (edd.), *Motion, direction and location in languages. In honor of Zygmunt Frajzyngier*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2003, 111–122.
- Engels, Renata/Garachana Camarero, Mar, *Grammaticalization, lexicalization, and constructionalization*, in: Xu, Wen/Taylor, John R. (edd.), *The Routledge handbook of cognitive linguistics*, New York, Routledge, 2021, 314–332.
- Fadanelli, Guillermo, *Comprar un rifle*, Barcelona, Anagrama, 2004.
- Fagard, Benjamin/Zlatev, Jordan/Kopecka, Anetta/Cerruti, Massimo/Blomberg, Johan, *The expression of motion events. A quantitative study of six typologically varied languages*, *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 39:1 (2013), 364–379.
- Filipović, Luna, *Talking about motion. A crosslinguistic investigation of lexicalization patterns*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2007.
- Filipović, Luna/Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide, *Motion*, in: Dąbrowska, Ewa/Divjak, Dagmar (edd.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2015, 527–546.
- Flydal, Leiv, *“Aller” et “venir” de suivis de l’infinitif comme expressions de rapports temporels*, Oslo, I kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1943.
- Fortis, Jean-Michel/Vittrant, Alice, *L’organisation syntaxique de l’expression de la trajectoire. Vers une typologie des constructions*, *Faits de langues* 38:2 (2011), 71–98.
- Garachana Camarero, Mar, *From movement to grammar. Spanish verbal periphrases derived from verbs of movement*, in: Labeau, Emmanuelle/Bres, Jacques (edd.), *La grammaticalisation des périphrases en “aller” et “venir” dans les langues romanes*, Caen, Centre de recherches interlangues sur la signification en contexte, 2018, 115–146.
- Giacalone Ramat, Anna/Sansò, Andrea, *“Venire” (‘come’) as a passive auxiliary in Italian*, in: Devos, Maud/van der Wal, Jenneke (edd.), *COME and GO off the beaten grammaticalization path*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2014, 21–44.
- Gibbs, Raymond W./Colston, Herbert L., *Image schema. The cognitive psychological reality of image schemas and their transformations*, *Cognitive linguistics* 6:4 (1995), 347–378.
- Goldberg, Adele E., *Constructions. A construction grammar approach to argument structure*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Goldberg, Adele E., *Constructions at work. The nature of generalization in language*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Goldschmitt, Stefanie, *Expressivitätsstrategien bei Bewegungsereignissen, Französisch und Spanisch im Vergleich*, in: Pustka, Elissa/Goldschmitt, Stefanie (edd.), *Emotionen, Expressivität, Emphase*, Berlin, Erich Schmidt, 2014, 155–175.
- Gougenheim, Georges, *Étude sur les périphrases verbales de la langue française*, Paris, Nizet, 1971 [1929].

- GRADIA = *Gramática y Diacronía: Diccionario histórico de las perífrasis verbales del español. Gramática, pragmática y discurso*, Barcelona, University of Barcelona, <https://gradiadiacronia.wixsite.com/gradia/services> [last access: 3 October 2023].
- Gramatke, Astrid, *Monte Desann – Serial verb constructions in Kreol Seselwa*, Ph.D. dissertation, Köln, Universität zu Köln, 2009.
- Guillaume, Antoine/Koch, Harold, *Introduction. Associated motion as a grammatical category in linguistic typology*, in: Guillaume, Antoine/Koch, Harald (edd.), *Associated motion*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 2021, 3–30.
- Hampe, Beate, *Image schemas in cognitive linguistics. Introduction*, in: Hampe, Beate (ed.), *From perception to meaning. Image schemas in cognitive linguistics*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter Mouton, 2005, 1–14.
- Haspelmath, Martin, *The serial verb construction. Comparative concept and cross-linguistic generalizations*, *Language and linguistics* 17:3 (2016), 291–319.
- Haßler, Gerda, *Temporalität, Aspektualität und Modalität in romanischen Sprachen*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2016.
- Heine, Bernd/Kuteva, Tania, *World lexicon of grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hijazo-Gascón, Alberto/Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide, *Las lenguas románicas y la tipología de los eventos de movimiento*, *Romanische Forschungen* 125 (2013), 467–494 (= 2013a).
- Hijazo-Gascón, Alberto/Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide, *Same family, different paths. Intratypological differences in three Romance languages*, in: Goschler, Juliana/Stefanowitsch, Anatol (edd.), *Variation and change in the encoding of motion events*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2013, 39–54 (= 2013b).
- Hilpert, Martin, *Ten lectures on diachronic construction grammar*, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2021.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus, *Lexicalization and grammaticization. Opposite or orthogonal?*, in: Bisang, Walter (ed.), *What makes grammaticalization? A look from its fringes and its components*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2004, 21–42.
- Hopper, Paul J., *Emergent grammar*, *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13 (1987), 139–157.
- Hopper, Paul J., *On some principles of grammaticalization*, in: Traugott, Elizabeth C./Heine, Bernd (edd.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 1991, 17–35.
- Iacobini, Claudio, *Particle verbs in Romance*, in: Müller, Peter O./Ohnheiser, Ingeborg/Olsen, Susan/Rainer, Franz (edd.), *Word-formation. An international handbook of the languages of Europe*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 2015, 626–658.
- Iacobini, Claudio/Vergaro, Carla, *The role of inference in motion event encoding/decoding. A cross-linguistic inquiry into English and Italian*, *Lingue e linguaggio* 2 (2014), 211–240.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide/Hijazo-Gascón, Alberto/Moret-Oliver, María-Teresa, *The importance of minority languages in motion event typology*, in: Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide (ed.), *Motion and space across languages. Theory and applications*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2017, 123–150.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko, *“Source” vs. “goal”. A case of linguistic dissymmetry*, in: Dirven, René/Radden, Günter (edd.), *Concepts of case*, Tübingen, Narr, 1987, 122–146.
- Ishibashi, Miyuki, *The expression of ‘putting’ and ‘taking’ events in Japanese. The asymmetry of source and goal revisited*, in: Kopecka, Anetta/Narasimhan, Bhuvana (edd.), *Events of putting and taking. A crosslinguistic perspective*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2012, 253–272.
- Johnson, Mark, *The body in the mind. The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1987.

- Kopecka, Anetta/Ishibashi, Miyuki, *L'(a)-symétrie dans l'expression de la source et du but. Perspective translinguistique*, Les cahiers de faits de langues 3:2 (2011), 131–149.
- Labeau, Emmanuelle/Bres, Jacques (edd.), *La grammaticalisation des périphrases en “aller” et “venir” dans les langues romanes*, Caen, Centre de recherches interlangues sur la signification en contexte, 2018.
- Lakoff, George, *Women, fire, and dangerous things. What categories reveal about the mind*, Chicago/London, University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Lakusta, Laura/Landau, Barbara, *Starting at the end. The importance of goals in spatial language*, Cognition 96 (2005), 1–33.
- Lakusta, Laura/Wagner, Laura/O’Hearn, Kirsten/Landau, Barbara, *Conceptual foundations of spatial language. Evidence for a goal bias in infants*, Language learning and development 3:3 (2007), 179–197.
- Langacker, Ronald W., *A usage-based model*, in: Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida (ed.), *Topics in cognitive linguistics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1988, 127–161.
- Lansari, Laure, *On va dire. Vers un emploi modalisant d’“aller” + infinitif*, in: Moline, Estelle/Vetters, Carl (edd.), *Temps, aspect et modalité en français*, Amsterdam/New York, Rodopi, 2010, 119–139.
- Lansari, Laure, *J’allais dire. De la périphrase au marqueur discursif*, in: Dostie, Gaétane/Lefeuve, Florence (edd.), *Lexique, grammaire, discours. Les marqueurs discursifs*, Paris, Champion, 2017, 433–452.
- Larreja, Paul, *Sur les emplois de la périphrase “aller” + infinitif*, in: Shyldkrot, Hava Bat-Zeev/Le Querler, Nicole (edd.), *Les périphrases verbales*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2005, 337–360.
- Lehmann, Christian, *Thoughts on grammaticalization. A programmatic sketch*, Köln, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, 1982.
- Lovestrand, Joseph/Ross, Daniel, *Serial verb constructions and motion semantics*, in: Guillaume, Antoine/Koch, Harold (edd.), *Associated motion*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 2021, 87–128.
- Mandler, Jean M./Pagán Cánovas, Cristóbal, *On defining image schemas*, Language and cognition 6:4 (2014), 510–532.
- Manessy, Gabriel, *Le français en Afrique noire. Mythes, stratégies, pratiques*, Paris, L’Harmattan, 1994.
- Martínez Vázquez, Montserrat, *Delimited events in English and Spanish*, Estudios ingleses de la Universidad Complutense 9 (2001), 31–59.
- Miller, George A./Johnson-Laird, Philip N., *Language and perception*, Cambridge, MA, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Móia, Telmo, *On the semantics of the temporal auxiliary verb “ir” (“go”) in Portuguese*, in: Labeau, Emmanuelle/Bres, Jacques (edd.), *La grammaticalisation des périphrases en “aller” et “venir” dans les langues romanes*, Caen, Centre de recherches interlangues sur la signification en contexte, 2018, 147–177.
- Mulo Farenkia, Bernard, *“C’est comment, mon frère? – Gars, laisse-moi comme ça!” Des routines de salutations en français camerounais*, Le français en Afrique 23 (2008), 69–88.
- Nieuwenhuijsen, Dorien, *Algo anda ocurriendo. Variación diatópica de “andar” + gerundio*, Boletín de filología 54:2 (2019), 135–170.
- Nurse, Derek, *Aspect and tense in Bantu languages*, in: Nurse, Derek/Philippson, Gérard (edd.), *The Bantu languages*, London/New York, Routledge, 2003, 90–102.
- Olbertz, Hella, *Verbal periphrases in a functional grammar of Spanish*, Berlin/New York, Mouton De Gruyter, 1998.

- Olbertz, Hella, “*Venir + gerundio*” en el español andino ecuatoriano – un producto de contacto lingüístico, in: Pusch, Claus D./Wesch, Andreas (edd.), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero)romanischen Sprachen/Perífrasis verbales en las lenguas (ibero-)románicas*, Hamburg, Buske, 2003, 89–104.
- Papahagi, Cristiana, *La place du roumain dans la typologie motion event. Esquisse de description*, in: Neamțu, Gavril/Gencărașu, Ștefan/Chircu, Adrian (edd.), *Limba română. Abordări tradiționale și moderne*, Cluj-Napoca, Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2009, 397–408.
- Pedersen, Johan, *Variable type framing in Spanish constructions of directed motion*, in: Boas, Hans C./González-García, Francisco (edd.), *Romance perspectives on construction grammar*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2014, 269–304.
- Pérez Saldanya, Manuel/Hualde, José Ignacio, *On the origin and evolution of the Catalan periphrastic preterit*, in: Pusch, Claus D./Wesch, Andreas (edd.), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero)romanischen Sprachen*, Hamburg, Buske, 2003, 47–60.
- Pfadenhauer, Katrin, *Zur Semantik von “aller” + Infinitiv im Kontext des Französischen in Afrika*, *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 26:1 (2020), 27–52.
- Pfadenhauer, Katrin, “*Vamos sazonando poco a poco*”. *Construcciones con “ir” en el español hablado en Cuba y México*, *ISLAS* 65, 204 (2023), <https://islas.uclv.edu.cu/index.php/islas/article/view/1263> [last access: 3 October 2023].
- Puig, Tere/Borràs, Laura, *A flor de pell. Pensant amb el cos*, Barcelona, El Cep i la Nansa, 2019.
- Pusch, Claus D./Wesch, Andreas (edd.), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero-)romanischen Sprachen/Perífrasis verbales en les llengües (ibero-)romàniques/Perífrasis verbales en las lenguas (ibero-)románicas*, Hamburg, Buske, 2003.
- Radatz, Hans-Ingo, *La perífrasis “vado” + infinitivo en castellano, francés y catalán. Por la misma senda – pero a paso distinto*, in: Pusch, Claus D./Wesch, Andreas (edd.), *Verbalperiphrasen in den (ibero)romanischen Sprachen*, Hamburg, Buske, 2003, 61–75.
- Riegel, Martin/Pellat, Jean-Christophe/Rioult, René, *Grammaire méthodique du français*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 2011 [1994].
- Rohrer, Tim, *Image schemata in the brain*, in: Hampe, Beate (ed.), *From perception to meaning. Image schemas in Cognitive Linguistics*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 2005, 165–198.
- Ross, Daniel, *Pseudocoordination and serial verb constructions as multi-verb predicates*, in: Giusti, Giuliana/Di Caro, Vincenzo Nicolò/Ross, Daniel (edd.), *Pseudo-coordination and multiple agreement constructions*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2022, 315–336.
- Rostock, Helmut, *Lehrbuch der portugiesischen Sprache*, Hamburg, Buske, 2007.
- Roumain, Jacques, *Gouverneurs de la Rosée*, Pantin, Le Temps de Cerises, 2000 [1944].
- Schmid, Hans-Jörg, *Semantics and perception. A round-up of key areas of interest and a plea against the separation of linguistic meaning from encyclopedic knowledge*, in: Krefeld, Thomas/Pustka, Elissa (edd.), *Perceptive Linguistik. Phonetik, Semantik, Varietäten*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 2014, 117–131.
- Silletti, Alida M., *Les périphrases en “aller” et “venir” de l’italien contemporain. Grammaticalisation et effets de sens*, in: Labeau, Emmanuelle/Bres, Jacques (edd.), *La grammaticalisation des périphrases en “aller” et “venir” dans les langues romanes*, Caen, Centre de recherches interlangues sur la signification en contexte, 2018, 87–114.
- Slobin, Dan I., *Two ways to travel. Verbs of motion in English and Spanish*, in: Shibatani, Masayoshi/Thompson, Sandra A. (edd.), *Grammatical constructions. Their form and meaning*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996, 195–233.
- Slobin, Dan I., *What makes manner of motion salient? Explorations in linguistic typology, discourse and cognition*, in: Hickmann, Maya/Robert, Stéphane (edd.), *Space in languages. Linguistic systems and cognitive categories*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2006, 59–81.

- Squartini, Mario, *Verbal periphrases in Romance. Aspect, actionality, and grammaticalization*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1998.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol, *The go-and-verb construction in a cross-linguistic perspective. Image-schema blending and the construal of events*, in: Nordquist, Dawn/Berkenfield, Catie (edd.), *Proceedings of the second annual high desert linguistics society conference*, Albuquerque, NM, High Desert Linguistics Society, 1999, 123–134.
- Stolova, Natalya I., *Classification of the Romance languages. Evolution of motion-based periphrases as a new criterion*, *Romance Quarterly* 56:2 (2009), 82–90.
- Stosic, Dejan/Aurnague, Michel, *DinaVmouv. Description, inventaire, analyse des verbes de mouvement. An annotated lexicon of motion verbs in French*, 2017, <http://redac.univ-tlse2.fr/index.html> [last access: 3 October 2023].
- Ströbel, Liliane, *Sensomotorische Strategien und Sprachwandel*, in: Pustka, Elissa/Goldschmitt, Stefanie (edd.), *Emotionen, Expressivität, Emphase*, Berlin, Erich Schmidt, 2014, 139–153.
- Talmy, Leonard, *Lexicalization patterns. Semantic structure in lexical forms*, in: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, vol. 3, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, 57–149.
- Talmy, Leonard, *Past, present, and future of motion research*, in: Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Iraide (ed.), *Motion and space across languages*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2017, 1–12.
- Talmy, Leonard, *Toward a cognitive semantics*, vol. 1: *Concept structuring systems*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2000 (= 2000a).
- Talmy, Leonard, *Toward a cognitive semantics*, vol. 2: *Typology and process in concept structuring*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2000 (= 2000b).
- Traugott, Elizabeth C., *Modeling language change with constructional networks*, in: S. Pons Bordería, Salvador/Loureda Lamas, Oscar (edd.), *Beyond grammaticalization and discourse markers. New issues in the study of language change*, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2018, 17–50.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C./Trousdale, Graeme, *Constructionalization and constructional changes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Tomasello, Michael, *First verbs. A case study of early grammatical development*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Trousdale, Graeme, *A constructional approach to lexicalization processes in the history of English. Evidence from possessive constructions*, *Word structure* 1:2 (2008), 156–177.
- Vincent, Nigel, *Origins of Romance*, in: Ledgeway, Adam/Maiden, Martin (edd.), *The Cambridge handbook of Romance linguistics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2022, 97–122.
- Wiesinger, Evelyn, “¿Esto se echa para atrás?” *Aproximación a los verbos sintagmáticos en el español peninsular a base de un estudio de corpus de [N para atrás]*, *Romanica olomucensia* 32:1 (2020), 201–230.
- Wiesinger, Evelyn, *The Spanish verb-particle construction [N para atrás]. Disentangling constructional contact and change*, in: Boas, Hans/Höder, Steffen (edd.), *Constructions in contact 2: Language change, multilingual practices, and additional language acquisition*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2021, 140–187.
- Wiesinger, Evelyn, *Language contact and creolization. Motion event encoding in Guianese French Creole*, in: Boas, Hans C./Höder, Steffen (edd.), *Argument structure constructions in contact*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, in press.