

The typology of motion events revisited

The crosslinguistic encoding of motion events presents striking regularities, captured in the well-known typology proposed by Leonard Talmy (1975, 1985, 2000), wherein a given language may be either V(erb)-framed or S(atellite)-framed according to whether the verb encodes Path (*Sam entered the house running*) or Manner (*Sam ran into the house*) in expressions conveying both. However, the significant crosslinguistic variety in encodings of motion have lead to various refinements and extensions of Talmy's typology (Aske 1989, Slobin and Hoiting 1994, Slobin 2004, Zlatev and Yangklang 2004). We argue that attested patterns of motion-encoding are determined not by such typologies but instead by two morphosyntactic factors.

First is a restriction regarding Manner and Path encoding in the verb:

- (1) Verb is the only clause obligatory category that can encode either Manner or Path, but a given verb can only encode one of the two.

This generalization, which derives from the more general constraint that verbs tend to encode either Manner or Result but not both (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998), explains Talmy's typology. In a given language, a particular expression could encode either Manner or Path in the verb. The V-framed option is where the verb encodes Path, the S-framed option is where it encodes Manner. The other component must be encoded outside the verb. For some languages one option is preferred for language-dependent reasons, e.g. the V-framed option is preferred in Romance languages (Slobin 2004) since they lack ways of encoding Path in S-framed constructions (e.g. goal-marking adpositions). But (1) also predicts that languages with richer Manner and Path encoding options may display both patterns (e.g. English, Hebrew), and furthermore that in languages where two verbs may occur in a single clause (via compounding or serialization), Path and Manner may be encoded by distinct verbs, as in Japanese V-V compounds and Thai serial verbs (Zlatev and Yangklang 2004).

Second, the significant crosslinguistic variation in motion encoding arises from the variety of morpholexical and morphosyntactic resources found in different languages. Crosslinguistically, Manner is encoded in verbal or adverbial categories, i.e. predicates over events such as verbs, adverbs, and ideophones (Japanese, Thai, Korean; Wienold 1995). Path is encoded in numerous categories, including adpositions (English, German), particles (English), cases (Finnish; Fong 1997), applicative morphemes (Tswana; Schaefer 1985), verb prefixes (Russian), *until*-markers (Japanese, Spanish, French; Yoneyama 1986, Aske 1989, Cummins 1996), and verbs (Talmy 2000). Apparent language-particular restrictions about which categories encode Manner and Path are partly traceable to motion-independent morpholexical properties of individual languages, e.g. what lexical categories, morphological categories, possible category-to-meaning mappings, and combinatorial devices (e.g. applicativization, serialization, compounding) a given language allows. Thus our approach accommodates several phenomena, including Path-encoding by *until*-markers in V-framed languages (Aske 1989, Cummins 1996), motion verbs that encode neither Path nor Manner (e.g. *move*), and the effects of pragmatics in the acceptability of motion expressions, that previous typologies do not easily capture.