

ON PUTATIVE MARKERS OF ASSOCIATED MOTION IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN*

0. INTRODUCTION

Associated motion (henceforth AM) has recently been the topic of an important collection of papers. The editors propose the following definition:

AM is “a verbal grammatical category, separate from tense, aspect, mood and direction, whose function is to associate, in different ways, different kinds of translational motion (spatial displacement / change of location) to a (generally non-motion) verb event” (Guillaume & Koch 2021a, p. 3).

By “grammatical” are meant “verbal affixes...clitics, particles or auxiliaries” (ibid., p. 4). Guillaume & Koch (ibid., p. 16) further observe that “AM has been found to occur in languages of all inhabited continents *except Europe*” (my emphasis, Ph. B.) – a claim which is essentially confirmed by the crosslinguistic survey carried out by Ross (2021).¹ The goal of the present paper is to test the validity of this claim against two very different types of construction, attested in two different Germanic languages.

Section 1. explores the *come/go V* construction. If we accept the formal boundaries set on associated motion by Guillaume & Koch (2021a) and before them by Guillaume (2016), *come* and *go* cannot qualify as genuine AM markers unless they can be shown to behave like “grammaticalized” elements, rather than like lexical verbs in a multiverbal construction. I propose to show that given the morphosyntactic behaviour of *come* and *go* in the *come/go V* construction, there are grounds for locating them closer to the grammatical pole of the lexical-grammatical gradient, though certainly at some distance from it, than to the lexical pole.

Section 2. deals with the German deictic directionals *her* and *hin* as well as derived compound directionals such as *heraus/hinaus*, *herein/hinein*, etc. It offers a counterpoint to section 1. because there is no question that *her*, *hin* and the compound directionals qualify as *bona fide* closed-class items: as such, they could, in theory, function as unproblematic AM markers. We will see, however, that there is one good reason for denying them that status. It is grounded in the recognition, usually left tacit in the literature, that associated motion requires the motion event to be ancillary, textually and/or syntactically, to the non-motion event.

* An initial version of this paper was presented at the workshop Event & Space: Associated Motion & Posture (ESAMP 2), Université Paris-Diderot, Dec. 5, 2018. The abbreviations are based on the Leipzig Glossing Rules, except for ITV: itive and VEN: ventive. I wish to express my sincere thanks to Tom Güldemann for his assistance in analysing the German data in section 2. and making important comments. All remaining errors and shortcomings are mine and mine alone.

¹ Ross (ibid., p. 37) points out that the Caucasus is an exception; he also notes that itive *va* in dialects spoken in Southern Italy fits the definition of an AM marker.

English *come* and *go* and German *her* and *hin* have one crucial property in common: they are exponents of directional deixis (DD), a “comparative concept” (Haspelmath 2010) which is closely tied to associated motion, itself categorized as a comparative concept by Guillaume (2016, p. 92). While it is by no means the case that all markers of AM are deictic directionals, the morphemes that specify exclusively ventive or itive direction when attached to verbs of motion are in many languages tasked in addition with implementing AM when attached to verbs not referring to motion (Dryer 2021a). Belkadi (2021, p. 191) goes further, in advancing the hypothesis that “deictic directionality is a type of associated motion,” on the basis of a reconceptualization of both phenomena.

1. ON THE ENGLISH *COME/GO V* CONSTRUCTION: *COME* AND *GO* AS PUTATIVE MARKERS OF AM

1.1. *Come/go V* vs. *go and (then) V*

Guillaume & Koch (2021a, p. 16)’s claim that AM is unattested in languages spoken in Europe hinges, not trivially, on the exclusion of lexical verbs as potential exponents of AM. Lovestrand & Ross (2021) view this exclusion as unwarranted in the case of serial constructions and proceed to categorize motion verbs in such constructions as potentially *bona fide* AM makers. They claim, as a result, that AM is indeed attested in such languages as Russian and English, which possess constructions satisfying their definition of serialization (ibid., p. 117). With regard to English, what they have in mind is *go and (then) V*, namely the construction known as “pseudo-coordination” (Pullum 1990, p. 221–222; Ross 2016) or “asymmetric coordination” (Bjorkman 2016): *go* here, according to Lovestrand & Ross (2021, p. 88; 99), is an AM marker encoding prior motion.

I have chosen instead to discuss the *come/go V* construction, for two reasons. First, the inflection condition to which, as will be seen presently, the *come/go V* construction is subject, does not apply to the *go and (then) V* construction. This extra morphological constraint suggests that *come* and *go* are more grammaticalized in *come/go V* than is *go* in *go and (then) V*. Secondly, in *come/go V*, *come* invariably refers straightforwardly to motion in space and *go* tends to do so as well, though not always.² This is far less true of *go* in *go and (then) V*: when, as is frequent, the construction encodes “surprise”, “suddenness” and/or “undesirability” (see Ross 2016, among others), motion is at best residual in the semantics of *go*.

1.2. On *come* and *go* as grammaticalized items

While explicitly excluding lexical items from the set of potential AM markers, Guillaume (2016, p. 82; 90) does allow for AM to be implemented by

² *Go V* can on occasion carry “negative” implications and express “counter-normativity” (Matsumoto 2020, p. 242), in which case reference to actual physical motion fades away.

“affixes or other grammaticalized elements.” The expression “grammaticalized elements” may offer some wiggle room when it comes to assessing *come* and *go* as putative candidates to the status of AM markers. In many languages, indeed, verbs of coming and going behave in ways that single them out as special. As pointed out by Bourdin (2014, p. 105–106), they tend to be among the verbs exhibiting the highest frequency and the highest degree of morphological irregularity, and their presence in sentences referring to motion in space is not infrequently obligatory. These features, among others, point to a “latent grammatical status” (Bourdin *ibid.*, p. 106), which status goes a long way towards accounting for their crosslinguistically ubiquitous ability to undergo grammaticalization. As Bourdin (*ibid.*, p. 106) argues, this covert status preps them in effect for what may be seen as second-stage grammaticalization, in the sense of Kuriłowicz (1965).

The claim that the *come/go V* construction implements associated motion would draw much strength if it could be shown that *come* and *go* here exhibit even more than just “latent” grammatical status. There is some evidence that they do.

The construction has received a good deal of attention from linguists working within successive versions of the generative framework, such as Pullum (1990), Jaeggli & Hyams (1993), Cardinaletti & Giusti (2001) and Bjorkman (2016), but also from more descriptively oriented linguists such as Shopen (1971) and Wulff (2006). The following examples are from Bjorkman (2016, p. 55):

- (1) a. ***Come** visit us next week.*
- b. *I want to **go take** a nap.*

The morphosyntactic idiosyncrasy of the construction is remarkable.

First, neither *come/go* nor *V* can support overt inflection, which Pullum (1990, p. 219) calls the “inflection condition”; secondly, *V* must carry the same covert inflection as *come/go*, which Bjorkman (2016, p. 55) calls the “identity condition”. Violation of either of these conditions results in ungrammaticality:

- (2) a. **Our neighbour **came leave** a note on our door.*
 - b. **Our neighbour **come left** a note on our door.*
 - c. **Our neighbour **came left** a note on our door.*
- (Bjorkman 2016, p. 55)

- (3) a. *The coach told the lacrosse player to **go be** examined by a doctor.*
 - b. **Lacrosse players **go be** examined by a doctor after every head injury.*
- (Bjorkman 2016, p. 56–57)

The inability of *come* or *go* to carry any inflection is a tell-tale sign of reduced “verbianness” and it calls to mind, according to Shopen, the behaviour of modal auxiliaries. However, as both Pullum and Jaeggli & Hyams have noted, *come* and *go* here exhibit none of the other properties of modals. For this reason, Jaeggli & Hyams (*ibid.*, p. 323) propose treating them as “aspectual heads” of what they call an “Aspect Phrase”. This is not the place to discuss the technicalities of their proposal, but clearly, from a generative perspective, it does amount to categorizing *come* and *go* here as functional elements rather than lexical items.

³ NBC *Today Show*, Jan. 5, 2015. (From COCA v. comes [**vv0*]).

- c. *I'm on my school's archery team so my parents **came watch** me compete.*⁵
 d. *Teachers who have been at the school...**came say** it has transformed Poinciana.*⁶
- (7) a. *He **goes sit**, cross-legged, near the Dervish's tomb...*⁷
 b. *and he **goes feel** how hot it is.*⁸
 c. *But then, when I **went visit** him...*⁹
 d. *"She said the rufus-sided towhee **went drink** your tea-ea-ea, drink your tea".*¹⁰

While the idiosyncrasies instantiated by such examples are subject to much dialectal and idiolectal variation (Pullum 1990, p. 231ff), they cannot simply be dismissed as devoid of significance, as Bjorkman (2016, fn.3, p. 55) seems to suggest.

Secondly, the examples under (8) suggest that adjacency of *come/go* and *V* is not as absolute a requirement as might be thought:

- (8) a. *While helping a monolingual Nahuatl speaker who had **come to New York look** for her family...*¹¹
 b. *"If you are about to **go to the store buy** things as you normally would...."*¹²
 c. *... when my friend asked me to **go with him visit** his friends in Portugal, I couldn't and wouldn't say no.*¹³

Come in (8a) and *go* in (8b) display an argument structure of their own, which runs counter to the idea that they are bereft of predicative force and therefore not "real" verbs.

The third counter-argument is equally telling. As has been noted in the literature, in particular by Shopen (1971), Pullum (1990), Jaeggli & Hyams (1993) and Bjorkman (2016), there is a small number of verbs, whose lexical status is hardly in doubt, that can substitute for *come* and *go* in *come/go V*. Two of these are the manner of motion verbs *run* and *hurry*:

⁴ CNN *DrDrew*, June 15, 2011. (From COCA v. *comes* [*vv0]).

⁵ *Fagbug Nation* (IMDB) (Open subtitles), 2014. (From COCA, v. *came* V[*vv0]).

⁶ Denver Post, March 22, 1998. (From COCA, v. *came* [*vv0]).

⁷ Anonymous. 2007. *The Dark Year* (L'Année Noire). (From COCA, v. *goes* [*vv0]).

⁸ CBS *This Morning*, April 10, 2004. (From COCA, v. *goes* [*vv0]).

⁹ CNN *Larry King Weekend*, June 28, 1997. (From COCA, v. *went* V [*vv0]).

¹⁰ Frances Stokes Hoekstra. 1996 (Spring). *Perilous Lives*. *The Virginia Quarterly Review*, 72. (From COCA, v. *went* [*vv0]).

¹¹ <https://www.gothamcenter.org/babel-in-reverse-indigenous-metropolis> (accessed on April 29, 2023).

¹² <https://abc7chicago.com/coronavirus-price-gouging-hoarding-toilet-paper/6062845/> (accessed on April 29, 2023)

¹³ <https://www.charlie-bruzzese.com/portugal-an-architectural-pilgrimage/> (accessed on April 29, 2023)

- (9) a. ... when I have to **run get** coffee, I feel like I'm falling down the rungs of the occupational ladder.¹⁴
 b. Stella looks at him, looks back at Miss Taylor motioning Stella to **hurry get** on the bus...¹⁵

There are also instances involving *stay*, *sit* and *stand*, which obviously are anything but motion verbs:

- (10) Ms. Suber said, "You **stay fight** here, Mendal".¹⁶
 (11) Every other day he met with his brothers up on the hill to **sit discuss** the matters of the day.¹⁷
 (12) Divers in red dry suits **stand discuss** the next step in the investigation...¹⁸

The verb *try*, a non-motion verb but one that involves purpose, is also attested:

- (13) Let's **try make** it simpler.¹⁹

The ability of these verbs to combine with *V*, infrequently though they do, puts somewhat in perspective the exceptionality of *come* and *go*; this cannot be dismissed out of hand.

What these facts tell us is that while *come* in *come V* and *go* in *go V* are to a significant extent "grammaticalized", thereby coming close to behaving like AM markers by Guillaume (2016)'s standards, it cannot be said that they have entirely let go of their lexical moorings. It is tempting to conjecture that the diachronic trend has been towards an increasingly grammatical status; however, a search in the *Oxford English Dictionary* tells quite another story: both *come V* and *go V* are attested as far back as Old English and unless more focused research should prove otherwise, the construction does not seem to be any more rigidly constrained now than it was at earlier historical stages, contrary to what would be expected if *come* and *go* had been advancing with time towards the grammatical pole of the continuum.²⁰

¹⁴ R. Gutteridge & C. McKay, *Never the Bride: A Novel*, Colorado Springs, WaterBrook Press, 2009. (From COCA, v. *run* [*vv0]).

¹⁵ P. Christopher, *That Heavy Rider*, in „Antioch Review“, 50:3, 1992. (From COCA v. *hurry* [*vv0]).

¹⁶ G. Singleton, *Show-and-tell*, in „Atlantic Monthly“, 288:1, 2001. (From COCA v. *stay* [*vv0]).

¹⁷ <https://www.vocfh.com/obituary/4327965> (accessed on April 29, 2023).

¹⁸ Anon, *Police Unveil Sketch of Suspect in Indiana Teens' Slayings*, in „USA Today“, July 18, 2017. (From COCA v. *stand* [*vv0]).

¹⁹ *Piers Morgan Live*, Jan. 27, 2014. (From COCA v. *try* [*vv0]).

²⁰ On diachronic (and dialectal) aspects of the *come/go V* construction, see Pullum (1990, p. 218–219).

2. ON GERMAN *HER* AND *HIN*, AND DERIVED COMPOUND DIRECTIONALS, AS PUTATIVE AM MARKERS

2.1. The data

The German markers *her* and *hin* fundamentally encode directional deixis, though this basic characterization is far from exhausting their semantics. They are known, among other labels, as “Direktions-Adverbien” or “Verb-Partikeln” and they can combine with prepositional elements (*aus*, *unter*, etc.) to form such compound directionals as *heraus/hinaus*, *herunter/hinunter*, etc., with frequent neutralization of the deictic contrast between ventive *her* and itive *hin*. Another pair of compound directionals is formed by *her* or *hin* attaching to the locative adverb *da*, which produces *daher* and *dahin*.²¹ Syntactically, *her*, *hin* and the compound directionals are adjacent to the verb, i.e. preverbed,²² unless the verb is syntactically “attracted” to the V2 position, in which case the preverb remains stranded in final position in the clause: this happens in finite non-subordinate clauses. Because the preverbal position is basic (and treated as such in dictionaries), the label most commonly used in descriptive and didactic grammars is “separable prefixes”. However, it has gained neither universal nor systematic acceptance²³ and I follow Zeller (2003, p. 181–182), who uses the term “preverb”, while reserving the term “prefix” for what didactic grammars call “inseparable prefixes” such as *be-*, *ent-*, *er-*, etc.

The German deictic directionals typically impart direction to a *motion* verb:

- (14) a. *herlaufen* ‘to come (here) running’
 b. *hinlaufen* ‘to go (there) running’

To the best of my knowledge, they are not documented, in the literature on AM, as being able to link a *translational motion* event with a *non-motion* event. This would explain why Ross (2021) implicitly denies them the status of AM markers, as German is not listed among languages encoding AM.

The following sentence counts as a first potential counterexample:

- (15) ...und das frische Schneewasser über die
 ...and DEF.SG.NOM fresh.SG.NOM snow_water.SG.NOM over DEF.PL.ACC
 reinlichen Kiesbänke hin-spiel-te
 clear.PL.ACC gravel_bank.PL.ACC ITV-play-PST.SG

²¹ I am grateful to Tom Guldemann for bringing *daher* and *dahin* to my attention.

²² This is normally, though not always, sanctioned by orthographic attachment.

²³ Revealingly, Curme (1922) uses the label “separable prefixes” on p. 326, only to talk, on p. 341, of “adverbs” (*her* and *hin*) and “adverbial compounds” (*heraus/hinaus*, etc.).

‘[Here now, in these already rugged enough mountains, where the Reuss flowed from precipitous cliffs...] and the fresh snowmelt **glided playfully** over the clear gravel banks...’²⁴

For *hinspielen* (lit. ‘to play thither’) in (15), the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (DWB) specifically proposes the gloss *spielend hingleiten*, (lit.) ‘to glide thither playing’. This means *hin-* is interpreted as the abbreviation of a verb, *hingleiten*, specifying jointly direction (*hin-*) and manner of motion (*gleiten*). Other implicit manner of motion verbs could be invoked, but the point is that absent *hin-*, there would simply be no co-event of motion. More precisely, what *hin-* here does is link a non-motion event (*spielen*) with a concurrent *translational*, or *path*, motion event whose exact manner (gliding, gushing, cascading, etc.) is left implicit. Crucially, *hin-* thereby licenses *über die reinlichen Kiesbänke* as a *superservice-cum-prolative*²⁵ complement rather than a *locative* one: the water did not just “play over” the banks, it overflowed them, thus flowing *over* them and *past* them. Interestingly, the compound directional *dahin* would trigger the same effect.²⁶

Example (15) features an intransitive construction and thereby differs from those to be discussed now.

The DWB specifically lists the verb *herseufzen*, (lit.) ‘to sigh hither’, for which it adduces the following constructed example:

- | | | | | | | | |
|------|------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| (16) | <i>den</i> | <i>Abgeschiedenen</i> | <i>seufz-en</i> | <i>wir</i> | <i>nicht</i> | <i>wieder</i> | <i>her</i> |
| | DEF.SG.ACC | departed.SG.ACC | sigh -PRS.PL | 1PL | NEG | back | VEN |

‘We do not **sigh** the departed person back **to us**.’²⁷

The gloss proposed in the DWB is *durch seufzen herholen*, ‘to fetch (s.o.) through sighing’. This suggests that *her* licenses the direct object *den Abgeschiedenen*. It is well known that among other functions, prefixes, i.e. such so-called “inseparable” morphemes as *be-*, *ent-*, *er-*, etc., can act on intransitive verbs as transitivityizers. However, they are not alone in possessing this ability: the preverbs *her* and *hin* can also function as transitivityizers, and so can compound preverbs containing them.²⁸ Indeed, the transitivityizing function performed in (16) by the preverb *her* could have been fulfilled by the prefix *er-*, minus the deictic force intrinsic to *her*.²⁹ To be more precise, (16) may be glossed ‘We do not make, through sighing, the departed person $V_{[MOTION]}$ back to us’, where $V_{[MOTION]}$ stands for a generic path or manner of motion verb. How the actual syntax of this covertly causative construction is to be

²⁴ Goethe, *Dichtung und Wahrheit: Aus meinem Leben*, 1775. (From DWB, v. *hinspielen*). My translation, Ph. B.

²⁵ Hagège (2010) defines “superservice” as denoting “[motion] to a position above” a given location (ibid., p. 286) and “prolative” as denoting motion past it (ibid., p. 291).

²⁶ I am thankful to Tom Güldemann for bringing this point to my attention.

²⁷ My translation, Ph. B. (*Abgeschiedenen* is not capitalized in the DWB).

²⁸ See in particular Zimmer-Poreaux (2007), who provides many examples of compound preverbs (*herbei*, *hinauf*, *herunter*, etc.) acting as transitivityizers.

²⁹ I owe to Tom Güldemann this important observation.

accounted for is very much theory-bound. For instance, [*den Abgeschiedenen her*] may arguably be analysed as a small clause in which the predicate is *her* and the subject *den Abgeschiedenen*.³⁰

Example (16) features a non-compound deictic directional (*her*) as well as a marker of path (*wieder*)³¹ which is an adverb rather than a prepositional phrase. On both counts, (16) differs from the examples to be discussed now.

In (17), the verb *spielen* combines with the compound directional *herein*, which operates in tandem with the prepositional phrase *zu sich*:

- (17) ...und sie mit lieblicher Musik zu sich **her-ein**
 ...and 3PL.ACC with seductive.SG.DAT music.SG.DAT to 3REFL VEN-INTO
ge-spiel-t
 PST.PTCP-**play**-PST.PTCP

‘[Hell then opened wide her gates to the poor human beings...] and enticed them in with seductive music’³².

(lit.) ‘and [has] with seductive music **played** them **in** towards itself’.

Key to the semantics of *herein* is reference to a motion event: *herein* stands for *herein-V_[BEWEGUNG]* (where *V_[BEWEGUNG]* is the translation of *V_[MOTION]*). The figure that moves is denoted by *sie*, i.e. the ‘poor mortals’. The enclosed space which is the goal of motion is hell, it is personified and grammatically encoded by a reflexive pronoun (*sich*); further, *her-* in *herein* does not refer to the deictic centre, i.e. the speaker’s location, but to an endophoric reference point, as hell is the referent of the grammatical subject. Syntactically, the construction is, as in (16), covertly causative: ‘Hell made the poor mortals *V_[MOTION]* to herself by playing seductive music’. *Sie*, which is in the accusative, is assigned, no less covertly, the role Causee, which means it concurrently bears the role Patient in relation to the implicit verbal support of causation and the role Agent in relation to the implicit generic motion verb. These are not semantic roles that can be assigned by *gespielt*, as *spielen* is normally expected, rather, to govern *liebliche Musik* as direct object. The role assignment, therefore, necessarily involves *herein-V_[BEWEGUNG]* – or more precisely, as will be seen below, *herein-V_[BEWEGUNG]* in tandem with *zu sich*.

As it links the non-motion event denoted by *gespielt* with a concurrent translational motion event, *herein* fits the definition of AM markers as worded by Guillaume & Koch (2021a, p. 3). Importantly, the linking requires *sie* to be licensed as direct object.

The same analysis is applicable to (18):

³⁰ For a discussion of this type of analysis as it applies to “particle verbs” in English, see McIntyre (2007, p. 361-364).

³¹ *Wieder* is to be interpreted here as synonymous with *zurück*, ‘back(ward)’, rather than with *noch einmal*, ‘once again’.

³² L. Tieck, *Der getreue Eckart und der Tannenhäuser*, Zweiter Abschnitt, 1799. (From DWDS Historische Korpora 1465–1998, v. *herein spielen*). Translation by Th. Carlyle, 1827: https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Trusty_Eckart_and_Tannenhäuser (accessed on April 16, 2023).

- (18) ...*daß* *ich* *die* *neuen* *Pädagogen* ... *gern*
 ...that 1SG.NOM DEF.PL.ACC new.PL.ACC pedagogue PL.ACC ... gladly
als *Verdammte* *in* *einen* *eigenen* *Kreis*
 as damned.PL.ACC into INDF.SG.ACC own.SG.ACC circle.SG.ACC
der *Danteschen* *Hölle* *hin-ein*
 DEF.SG.GEN Dantesque.SG.GEN Hell.SG.GEN ITV-INTO
ge-dichte-t *hätte...*
 PST.PTCP-write-PST.PTCP have.SBJV.PST.1SG
 ‘...and the new pedagogues..., damned souls that they are, I would have liked to
write straight **into** a circle of Dante’s Hell all their own...’³³
 ‘I would have liked to make the new pedagogues, through my writing, V_[motion]
 straight into a circle...’.

As a non-motion verb, *dichten* (‘to write’, esp. in verse) is normally unable to govern an illative complement like *in einen eignen Kreis der Danteschen Hölle*; only a verb of motion, here covert, can do so. Neither can *dichten* govern an animate direct object bearing the role Causee, as *die neuen Pädagogen* does, which refers to the moving figure. *Hinein* therefore stands for *hinein-V_[BEWEGUNG]* and as such serves, in tandem with *in einen eignen Kreis der Danteschen Hölle*, a crucial licensing purpose.

Hinauspredigen and *hinausreden* in (19) instantiate the same pattern:

- (19) ...*daß* *sie* *die* *aus* *der*
 ...that 3PL.NOM DEF.PL.ACC out_of DEF.SG.DAT
Kirche *hin-aus-predig-en...*
 church.SG.DAT ITV-OUT-preach-PRS.PL
 ‘[Just as it is said of certain preachers...] that they **preach** the people **out** of the church,’
 ...*die* *ihre* *Kollegen* *aus* *dem*
 ...REL.PL.NOM their.PL.ACC colleague.PL.ACC out_of DEF.SG.DAT
Reichstage *hin-aus-red-en*
 Reichstag.SG.DAT ITV-OUT-talk-PRS.PL
 ‘[likewise there is a no small number of members of Parliament...] who **talk** their colleagues **out** of the Reichstag’³⁴.
 ‘They make the people, through preaching, V_[motion] out of the church...they make their colleagues, through talking, V_[motion] out of the Reichstag.’

In tandem with the elative complements *aus der Kirche* and *aus dem Reichstage*, *hinaus-V_[BEWEGUNG]* here licenses the direct objects *die Leute* and *ihre*

³³ L. Tieck, *Einleitung*, in „Phantasmus“, Erster Theil, 1811. (From DWDS Historische Korpora 1465–1998, v. *hinein dichten*). My translation, Ph. B.

³⁴ *Die Grenzboten*, 64, 1905. (From DWDS Historische Korpora 1465–1998, v. *hinausreden*). My translation, Ph. B.

Kollegen, respectively; neither *predigen* nor *reden* are compatible with this argument structure.

2.2. Discussion

The following examples, which feature two verbs instantiated in examples above, suggest that the licensing role that can be played by *her*, *hin*, *heraus*, etc., needs to be reassessed or at least put in perspective:

- (20) ...*wer* *sich* *von* *diesem* *Triumvirat* *in*
 ...who.SG.NOM 3REFL from DEM.SG.DAT triumvirate.SG.DAT into
den *Vordergrund* *spiel-en* *kann*
 DEF.SG.ACC foreground.SG.ACC play-INF can.PRS.SG
 ‘[In the absence of the President, Russia’s fate will essentially be determined by...] which member of this triumvirate can manipulate his way to the fore’³⁵.
 ‘who of this triumvirate can make himself, through playing, V_[MOTION] to the fore.’
- (21) ...*nachdem* *er* *ein* *halbes* *Jahr* *lang*
 ...after 3MSG.NOM one.SG.ACC half.SG.ACC year.SG.ACC long
die *Leute* *aus* *der* *Kirche*
 DEF.PL.ACC people.PL.ACC out_of DEF.SG.DAT church.SG.DAT
ge-predig-t *hatte...*
 PST.PTCP-preach-PST.PTCP have.PST.3SG
 ‘...after he had **preached**, for half a year, the people out of the church...’³⁶.
 ‘after he had, for half a year, made the people, through preaching, V_[MOTION] out of the church.’

Spielen in (20) seemingly, and unexpectedly, governs the reflexive direct object *sich* and the illative/allative complement *in den Vordergrund*. It is equally remarkable that *gepredigt* in (21) would seemingly govern the direct object *die Leute* and the elative complement *aus der Kirche*. In reality, the syntax is unproblematic as long as a covert causative diathesis and an equally covert *V_[BEWEGUNG/MOTION]* are invoked: clearly, it is only *in den Vordergrund* in (20) and *aus der Kirche* in (21) that can open up the syntactic space which renders this permissible. In point of fact, the English translation of (21) shows *out of the church* performing exactly the same licensing function.

This analysis is borne out by the fact that in examples such as (17), modified as (22) below, there are actually three options that are equally acceptable syntactically³⁷:

³⁵ „Berliner Zeitung”, Sept. 7, 1996. (From DWDS Berliner Zeitung 1994–2005, v. in *den Vordergrund spielen*). My translation, Ph. B.

³⁶ J. Ch. Heer, *Nick Tappoli*, 1922. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/58848/58848-h/58848-h.htm> (accessed on May 5, 2023).

³⁷ I am grateful to Tom Güldemann for this crucial observation.

- (22) a. ...und sie **her-ein** ge-spiel-t
 ...and 3PL.ACC VEN-INTO PST.PTCP-**play**-PST.PTCP
- b. ...und sie **zu sich** ge-spiel-t
 ...and 3PL.ACC **to 3REFL** PST.PTCP-**play**-PST.PTCP
- c. ...und sie **zu sich her-ein** ge-spiel-t
 ...and 3PL.ACC **to 3REFL VEN-INTO** PST.PTCP-**play**-PST.PTCP
- (lit.) ‘and **played** them **in towards** itself’.

Licensing of the direct object *sie* is conditional on a causative interpretation of all three clauses, which in turn requires the covert presence of $V_{[BEWEGUNG]}$. Such presence can be sanctioned by *herein* alone, as in (22a), by *zu sich* alone, as in (22b), or by *zu sich* and *herein* concurrently, as in (22c). In other words, the linking of the covert $V_{[BEWEGUNG]}$ event to the non-motion event that *gespielt* refers to *can* indeed be achieved by a compound directional such as *herein*, but it can just as well be achieved by an allative prepositional phrase such as *zu sich*, or indeed by a combination of both.

This, by itself, does not invalidate the analysis of *her*, *hin*, and the derived compound directionals as potential markers of AM. The real problem with this analysis lies elsewhere.

In his seminal 1984 paper, Koch characterizes the motion event in AM constructions as “subordinate” to the non-motion event (p. 26), a characterization he reiterates 37 years later: “In AM systems the motion is presented as a co-event with the main action or state denoted by the verb” (Koch 2021, p. 232). In practice, the primacy of the non-motion event is understood in the existing literature, albeit usually tacitly or semi-explicitly,³⁸ to be an integral feature of AM.

Koch’s reasoning in 1984 was based on two arguments. In terms of textual dynamics, it is typically the non-motion event that moves the narrative flow forward, not the motion event. Syntactically, the argument structure is determined solely by the non-motion verb.

The textual dynamics argument advanced by Koch is formulated by Wilkins (1991, p. 251) in terms of narrative saliency: in Mparntwe Arrernte (Australian), the motion events encoded by AM provide “background” information relative to the “prominence” of the non-motion events. Wilkins (ibid, p. 236), however, tempers this generalization by showing how sometimes, in Mparntwe Arrernte, “the ‘prior motion’ [AM] form helps to both introduce a new focal participant... as well as indicating the shift of scene.”

³⁸ A case in point is Belkadi (2021, p. 169)’s observation that “the motion event ...always occurs *in addition to* another event,” namely the non-motion event (my emphasis, Ph. B.). To talk about the non-motion event as the “main event”, as is frequent in the literature, is another semi-explicit recognition of the ancillary status of the motion event. Explicit recognition, as in Kawachi (2021, p. 774), is, rather surprisingly, quite infrequent.

With respect to Koch (1984)'s second argument, a systematic examination of the data in each of the papers in Guillaume & Koch (2021b) confirms that the argument structure, when overtly encoded, is usually controlled, across languages that implement AM, by the non-motion verb alone. There are exceptions, though, and it is not trivial that they are attested in a range of languages that is genealogically and geographically diverse. Thus, in Kaytetye (Koch 2021, p. 253) and Mudburra (Osgarby 2021, p. 326, 328-329, 336, 339), which are both Australian languages, AM morphemes have the ability to license a goal or source complement. The same type of phenomenon is attested in Ende, a Papuan language of Papua New Guinea (Reed & Lindsey 2021, p. 370), and in Creek, a Muskogean language spoken in the Southeastern United States (Dryer *ibid.*, p. 517), while in Southeastern Tepehuan, a Uto-Aztecan language spoken in Mexico, the prior motion AM suffix licenses a ventive particle which is normally compatible only with motion verbs (Dryer 2021b, p. 508). The issue is specifically addressed by Pakendorf & Stojnova (2021), who offer a detailed account based on authentic data drawn from five Tungusic languages, spoken in Siberia and the Russian Far East. Besides licensing goal and source complements, the AM affix in those languages can enable adjuncts referring to the trajectory or the means of transportation. The authors raise the possibility that in some, though not all, of those configurations it may well be the motion event that is foregrounded in terms of textual dynamics, at the expense of the non-motion event. If so, we would be dealing, as the authors point out, with an instance of associated motion that is definitely an outlier crosslinguistically.

While "exceptions" such as those listed above clearly deserve further research, it is difficult to imagine that their cumulative effect would not have some impact on our current state of knowledge about AM. What this means is that Koch's requirement as originally formulated in 1984 was likely too strong. But it does not invalidate the insight behind it, an insight which is important enough that incorporating it into the definition of AM proposed by Guillaume & Koch (2021a, p. 3) would, I believe, constrain AM as a comparative concept in a way that had empirical merit. The following wording is a tentative proposal:

"No marker can qualify as an AM marker unless the requirements of textual and syntactic primacy of the non-motion event are both satisfied or unless at least one of them is."

In the English *come/go V* construction, the coming or going is pragmatically ancillary to the process denoted by V: *Go buy me drink!* is a request that is not much different from *Buy me a drink!* In addition, it is relatively uncommon, though as we have seen not quite impossible, for *come* or *go* to license a complement of its own. This means the *come/go V* construction satisfies at least one of the requirements, if not quite both, in the augmented definition of AM proposed above.

The German examples (15) to (19) feature likewise the linking of a translational motion event with a non-motion event, but the differences with *come/go V* could hardly be more stark. In terms of textual saliency, it is unequivocally the motion event encoded by the directional – potentially acting in tandem with a prepositional phrase, as in (17) to (19) – that exerts primacy over the non-motion event denoted by the verbal root. In the case of (15), for instance, the gloss proposed by the DWB is eloquent enough: in *spielend hergleiten*, *spielend* plays no more than a modifying function. In addition, in each of the examples the primacy of the motion event is sanctioned syntactically. This is because rather than being controlled by the non-motion verb, the argument structure is the outcome of the licensing function fulfilled by the deictic directional, either alone or in tandem with a path-encoding prepositional phrase. What plays out here is reminiscent of the “balance of forces” in auxiliatation structures: in examples (15) to (19), the non-motion verb exerts no more control on the argument structure than the auxiliary *has* does in *John has given flowers to Mary*. In short, while the constructions in examples (15) to (19) do implement the linking of a motion event and a non-motion event, there is just no way they could possibly fit a definition of AM that incorporated the reformulation of Koch (1984)’s requirement proposed above.

3. CONCLUSION

In the English *come/go V* construction, *come* and *go* refer to prior motion and fit the definition of AM markers as long as we are prepared to stretch the customary boundaries of “grammatical marker” to include the verbs in question. This is contingent on recognizing that they have lost some of the attributes of fully lexical verbs and while there are solid grounds for arguing that they have, it is also undeniable that they do not qualify as *fully* grammatical items.

The notion that the German deictic directionals *her* and *hin* and the compound directionals containing them might qualify as AM markers raises an objection that has to do with another aspect of associated motion. The decisive point here is that in the relevant German constructions, the non-motion event is systematically ancillary, *both* textually and syntactically, to the motion event. This is in defiance of a feature of associated motion that is largely left implicit in the literature, even though, in the present state of our knowledge, it would seem to have the force of a defining feature.

In short, it is open to debate whether Guillaume & Koch (2021a: 16)’s claim that AM is unattested in languages spoken in Europe is disconfirmed or not by the English *come/go V* construction. On the other hand, their claim is clearly not falsified by the behaviour of German *her* and *hin* as well as the compound directionals of which they may be part.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

a) Dictionary and corpora

COCA = *Corpus of Contemporary American English* <https://corpus.byu.edu/coca/>
 DWDS = *Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, <https://www.dwds.de>
 DWB = Jacob Grimm and Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 1854-1960, in DWDS, <https://www.dwds.de>

b) References

- Belkadi 2021 = A. Belkadi, *Deictic directionality as associated motion: motion, complex events and event integration in African languages*, in Guillaume & Koch, 2021b, p. 163–200.
- Bjorkman 2016 = B. M. Bjorkman, *Go get, come see: motion verbs, morphological constructions, and syncretism*, in „Natural Language and Linguistic Theory”, 34, 2016, 1, p. 53–91.
- Bourdin 2014 = Ph. Bourdin, *When come and go go necessary*, in M. Devos & J. van der Wal, eds., *‘Come’ and ‘Go’ Off the Beaten Grammaticalization Path*, Berlin & New York, De Gruyter, 2014, p. 103–164.
- Cardinaletti & Giusti 2001 = A. Cardinaletti & G. Giusti, *“Semi-lexical” motion verbs in Romance and Germanic*, in N. Corver & H. C. van Riemsdijk (eds), *Semi-lexical Categories: the Function of Content Words and the Content of Function Words*, Berlin & New York, De Gruyter, 2001, p. 317–414.
- Curme 1922 = G. O. Curme, *A Grammar of the German Language (revised and enlarged)*, New York & London, Macmillan, 1922.
- Dryer 2021a = M. S. Dryer, *Associated motion and directionals: where they overlap*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 129–162.
- Dryer 2021b = M. S. Dryer, *Associated motion in North America (including Mexico and Central America)*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 485–525.
- Guillaume 2016 = A. Guillaume, *Associated motion in South America: typological and areal perspectives*, in „Linguistic Typology”, 20, 2016, p. 81–177.
- Guillaume & Koch 2021a = A. Guillaume & H. Koch, *Introduction: associated motion as a grammatical category in linguistic typology*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 3–30.
- Guillaume & Koch 2021b = A. Guillaume & H. Koch (eds), *Associated Motion*, Berlin & Boston, De Gruyter, 2021.
- Hagège 2010 = Cl. Hagège, *Adpositions*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Haspelmath 2010 = M. Haspelmath, *Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies*, in „Language”, 86, 2010, 3, p. 663–687.
- Jaeggli & Hyams 1993 = O. Jaeggli & N. M. Hyams, *On the independence and interdependence of syntactic and morphological properties: English aspectual come and go*, in „Natural Language and Linguistic Theory”, 11, 1993, 2, p. 313–346.
- Kawachi 2021 = K. Kawachi, *The ‘along’-deictic-directional verb suffix complex in Kupsapiny*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 747–777.
- Koch 1984 = H. Koch, *The category of ‘associated motion’ in Kaytej*, in „Language in Central Australia”, 1, 1984, p. 23–34.
- Koch 2021 = H. Koch, *Associated motion in the Pama-Nyungan languages of Australia*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 231–324.
- Kurilowicz 1965 = J. Kurilowicz, *The evolution of grammatical categories*, in „Diogenes”, 51, 1965, p. 55–71.
- Lovestrand & Ross 2021 = J. Lovestrand & D. Ross, *Serial verb constructions and motion semantics*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 87–128.
- Matsumoto 2020 = N. Matsumoto, *A genre-based analysis of evaluative modality in multi-verb sequences in English*, in P. Hohaus & R. Schulze (eds), *Re-Assessing Modalising Expressions: Categories, Co-text and Context*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2020, p. 225–252.

- McIntyre 2007 = A. McIntyre, *Particle verbs and argument structure*, in „Language and Linguistics Compass”, 1, 2007, 4, p. 350–367.
- Osgarby 2021 = D. Osgarby, *Mudburra associated motion in an areal perspective*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 325–356.
- Pakendorf & Stoynova 2021 = B. Pakendorf & N. Stoynova, *Associated motion in Tungusic languages: a case of mixed argument structure*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 855–897.
- Pullum 1990 = G. K. Pullum, *Constraints on intransitive quasi-serial verb constructions in modern colloquial English*, in „Ohio State Working Papers in Linguistics”, 39, 1990, p. 218–239.
- Reed & Lindsey 2021 = L. W. Reed & K. L. Lindsey, *“Now the story’s turning around”: associated motion and directionality in Ende, a language of Papua New Guinea*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 357–383.
- Ross 2016 = D. Ross, *Going to surprise: the grammaticalization of itive as mirative*, in J. Woźny (ed), *Online Proceedings of Cognitive Linguistics in Wrocław Web Conference 2016*. Wrocław, Polish Cognitive Linguistics Association and University of Wrocław. <http://hdl.handle.net/2142/108897>.
- Ross 2021 = D. Ross, *A cross-linguistic survey of Associated Motion and Directionals*, in Guillaume & Koch 2021b, p. 31–86.
- Shopen 1971 = T. Shopen, *Caught in the act*, in „Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society”, University of Chicago, Department of linguistics, 1971, p. 254–263.
- Wilkins 1991 = D. P. Wilkins, *The semantics, pragmatics, and diachronic development of ‘Associated Motion’ in Mparntwe Arrernte*, in „Buffalo Papers in Linguistics”, 1, 1991, p. 207–257.
- Wulff 2006 = S. Wulff, *Go-V vs. go-and-V in English: a case of constructional synonymy*, in S. T. Gries & A. Stefanowitsch, eds., *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics. Corpus-based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*, Berlin & New York, De Gruyter, 2006, p. 101–126.
- Zeller 2003 = J. Zeller, *Moved preverbs in German: displaced or misplaced?*, in G. Booij & J. van Marle (eds), *Yearbook of Morphology 2003*, New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London & Moscow, Kluwer, 2003, p. 179–212.
- Zimmer-Poreaux 2007 = A. Zimmer-Poreaux, *Essai sur les préverbes composés de l’allemand. Le cas des préverbes en hin- et en her-*, Bern, Peter Lang, 2007.

ON PUTATIVE MARKERS OF ASSOCIATED MOTION IN ENGLISH AND GERMAN (Abstract)

Many languages use specific markers, typically affixes, to link a non-motion event E1 with a prior, concurrent, or subsequent motion event E2. In so doing, they encode a verbal category known as “associated motion” (AM). Most scholars espouse a restrictive definition of AM, which stipulates that it cannot be encoded by lexical items. It follows from this definition that AM is thought to be unattested among languages spoken in Europe. Two constructions are examined in this paper that might at first sight challenge this assumption; they share the property of encoding directional deixis, which happens to have close ties with AM. The English verbs *come* and *go* in the *come/go V* construction display morphosyntactic idiosyncrasies that can plausibly be regarded as typical of grammaticalized items, but whether this is enough to warrant analysing them as genuine AM markers of prior motion is shown to be open to debate. The German preverbs *her* and *hin*, and compound preverbs derived from *her* and *hin*, are unquestionably closed-class items and they have the ability to “create” a concurrent motion event when attached to certain non-motion verbs. However, analysing them as implementing AM would run afoul of a principle that is tacitly, and on occasion explicitly, assumed to be a feature of AM constructions, namely the primacy, textual and/or syntactic, of the non-motion event over the motion event. It is suggested that pending more focused research, this feature should be elevated to the status of a requirement when defining AM. This would preclude analysing *her*, *hin* and derived preverbs as AM markers.

À PROPOS DE MARQUEURS PUTATIFS DU MOUVEMENT ASSOCIÉ EN
ANGLAIS ET EN ALLEMAND
(Résumé)

De nombreuses langues confient à des marqueurs spécifiques, en général affixaux, le soin de lier deux événements É1 et É2 tels que É1 n'est pas un déplacement spatial et que É2 est un déplacement antérieur à É1, concomitant, ou postérieur. La catégorie verbale en cause est dénommée « mouvement associé » (MA). La plupart des linguistes souscrivent à une définition restrictive, qui stipule que le MA ne peut être codé par des items lexicaux. En conséquence, il est considéré comme une catégorie inconnue des langues parlées en Europe. Il est procédé dans cet article à l'examen de deux constructions susceptibles, de prime abord, de réfuter cette proposition ; elles ont pour propriété commune de servir de supports à la deixis directionnelle, qui se trouve entretenir un lien étroit avec le MA. Les verbes anglais *come* et *go* dans la construction *come/go* V présentent des singularités morphosyntaxiques qui peuvent raisonnablement être considérées comme typiques d'items grammaticalisés, mais la question reste ouverte de savoir si elles suffisent à faire de *come* et *go* d'authentiques marqueurs du MA antérieur. Les préverbes allemands *her* et *hin*, et les préverbes composés dérivés de *her* et *hin*, appartiennent sans conteste à une classe fermée et ils sont capables de « créer » un événement concomitant de type É2 quand ils sont affixés à certains verbes référant à un événement de type É1. Cependant, les analyser comme instanciant le MA contreviendrait à un principe qui est tacitement, et parfois explicitement, tenu pour caractériser celui-ci, à savoir la primauté, textuelle et/ou syntaxique, de É1 sur É2. Il est proposé que sous réserve de recherches complémentaires, ce principe soit érigé en condition devant être satisfaite par tout candidat au statut de marqueur du MA. Ceci interdirait de conférer un tel statut à *her* et *hin* ainsi qu'aux préverbes dérivés.

Keywords: *associated motion, directional deixis, grammatical/lexical, come V and go V, her and hin, covert causativity.*

Mots-clés : *mouvement associé, deixis directionnelle, grammatical/lexical, come V et go V, her et hin, causativité furtive.*

Cuvinte-cheie: *mişcare asociată, deixis direcțional, grammatical/lexical, come V și go V, her și hin, cauzativitate ascunsă.*

York University, Glendon College
2275 Bayview Avenue
Toronto, Canada, M4N 3M6
pbourdin@yorku.ca