Combining *Multilingual Constructicography* and *Diasystematic Construction Grammar* in multilingual language learning scenarios.

Keywords: multilingualism; construction grammar; constructicography; learner corpus research; progressive aspectuality

The practice of *constructiCography* (e.g., Lyngfelt et al. 2018), which involves the identification of recurrent lexicogrammatical patterns in a language by constructions, has seen the emergence of descriptive resources called *constructiCons* for several languages (Lyngfelt et al. 2022). *Multilingual Constructicography*, characterized as a combination of Construction Grammar (CxG) and Lexicography, has been quickly recognized for its potential to create constructiCons by linking constructions in several languages via shared semantic/functional properties (Boas et al. 2019).

Other CxG frameworks argue that constructiCons not only formally describe linguistic expressions, but also represent mental categories that speakers create and acquire through exposure (Hilpert 2021). In multilingual contexts, *Diasystematic Construction Grammar* (DCxG) aims at explaining how speakers form such categories on the basis of several reorganizational processes, motivated not only by the identification of formal/functional similarities across the languages of their repertoires, but also as a result of their communicative practices which are not predictable from abstract representations (Höder 2012: 245).

This study integrates Multilingual Constructicography and DCxG principles to model a multilingual constructiCon on the basis of English learner corpus data (Leonide, Glaznieks et al. 2022) produced by lower-secondary students living in a multilingual environment, in which Italian and German are the official languages to which students are differently exposed, and English is taught as school subject. The phenomenon investigated refers to the semantic-cognitive notion of *progressive aspectuality* (Dessì-Schmid 2019), which is transportable across the three languages—Italian, German, and English—and particularly interesting in the context of German, which lacks an obligatory grammatical category for it, unlike the other two languages.

Analyses reveal how formal and functional correspondences among constructions in English, Italian, and German can be mapped using Multilingual Constructicography. At the same time, DCxG is employed to explain learners' actual production patterns and reorganizational process of constructional formation, in light of not only the formal/functional shared characteristics of the constructions, but also the amount of exposure and use that students make of the languages involved in the study. The results support the propensity of forming language-unspecific constructions ('*dia*constructions') based on the typological distance of languages in the repertoires (cf. for DCxG, Höder 2018; but also Rothman 2015 and Westergaard et al. 2017). Particular attention will be dedicated to discussing examples from the corpus showing the constructional creativity of the students having different language profiles, in order to support the idea that a speaker constructiCon is a system constantly updated, restructured, and reorganized under the influence of language use (Bybee & Beckner 2010).

References

Boas, H. C., Lyngfelt, B. & Torrent, T. (2019). Framing Constructicography. Lexicographica 35, 15–59.

Bybee, J. and Beckner, C. (2010). Usage-based theory. In B. Heine and H. Narrog (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 827–855.

Dessì-Schmid, S. (2019). Aspectuality – An Onomasiological Model Applied to the Romance Languages. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Glaznieks, A., Frey, J-C., Stopfner, M., Zanasi, L. and Nicolas, L. (2022). Leonide. A longitudinal trilingual corpus of young learners of Italian, German and English, International Journal of Learner Corpus Research 8:1, 97–120.

Hilpert, M. (2021). Ten Lectures on Diachronic Construction Grammar. Leiden: Brill.

Höder, S. (2012). Multilingual constructions: a diasystematic approach to common structures. In K. Braunmüller & C. Gabriel (eds), Multilingual individuals and multilingual societies [Hamburg studies on multilingualism 13]. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 241–258.

Höder, S. (2018). Grammar is community-specific: Background and basic concepts of Diasystematic Construction Grammar. In H. C. Boas and S. Höder (eds.), Constructions in Contact. Constructional perspectives on contact phenomena in German Languages. John Benjamins, 37-70.

Lyngfelt, B., Borin, L., Ohara, K., & Torrent T. T., eds. (2018). Constructicography: Constructicon Development across Languages. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lyngfelt, B., Torrent, T.T, da Silva Matos, E. E. & Backstrom, L. (2022). Comparative concepts as a resource for multilingual constructicography. In Kristian Blensenius (ed.), Valency and constructions: Perspectives on combining words. Göteborg: Meijerbergs institut för svensk etymologisk forskning, 101-129.

Rothman, J. (2015). Linguistic and cognitive motivations for the Typological Primacy Model (TPM) of third language (L3) transfer: Timing of acquisition and proficiency considered, Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 18, 179- 190.

Westergaard, M., Mitrofanova, N., and Mykhaylyk, R. (2017). Crosslinguistic influence in the acquisition of a third language: The Linguistic Proximity Model, International Journal of Bilingualism 21, 666–82.