



**HAL**  
open science

## A diachronic approach to variation and change in the typology of motion event expression.

Claudio Iacobini, Benjamin Fagard

► **To cite this version:**

Claudio Iacobini, Benjamin Fagard. A diachronic approach to variation and change in the typology of motion event expression.: A case study: From Latin to Romance.. Cahiers de Faits de langue, 2011, 3, pp.151-172. halshs-00665331

**HAL Id: halshs-00665331**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00665331>**

Submitted on 1 Feb 2012

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# **A diachronic approach to variation and change in the typology of motion event expression**

## **A case study: From Latin to Romance**

**Claudio Iacobini\* & Benjamin Fagard\*\***

### 0. ABSTRACT

Most studies dealing with variation and change between Verb-Framed and Satellite-Framed strategies adopt a synchronic approach. In this paper, adopting a diachronic point of view, we will see whether it is possible to account for changes driving languages from one prevalent type to the other. We will begin with an overview of the main proposals about the typology of motion event encoding from a variationist perspective, the theoretical premises of our approach to the analysis of (diachronic) change, and their relevance for a “Working Typology”, arguing in favour of applying typological classification to the matching between individual event types and linguistic patterns instead of to languages as a whole.

In the second part of this paper, taking Romance languages as a case study of typological change, we argue that variation and change cannot be explained in the framework of a holistic typology. Changes affecting motion event expression may result from phenomena which are independent from motion encoding. Besides, variations in the encoding of motion events should not necessarily be considered as changes introducing inconsistent features with respect to one of the two main framing structure (i.e. SF and VF).

The final part of the paper lists a series of phenomena related to the encoding of path in Romance languages which rather than exceptions to the VF type may be considered more or less significant indicators of the emergence of SF patterns, hence to be interpreted from a methodological point of view as possible relevant signals of ongoing typological change in the preferred way of expressing motion.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

---

\* Università di Salerno, [ciacobini@unisa.it](mailto:ciacobini@unisa.it)

\*\* Lattice, ENS & CNRS, [benjamin.fagard@ens.fr](mailto:benjamin.fagard@ens.fr)

The way languages express motion has been studied for quite some time, at least since Tesnière's remarks on motion in French and German (1959), but it has been the focus of much research in recent years. General typologies have been proposed to account for the different strategies adopted by individual languages, Talmy and Slobin are perhaps the two most influential authors on the subject (see a.o. Talmy 1985, 2000; Slobin 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008). Both classify languages according to two main types: Verb-Framed vs. Satellite-Framed in talmian terminology or Path-In-Verb vs. Path-In-Non-verb according to Slobin (2008). Among the many proposals of refinements and integrations of such bipartite taxonomy (cf. Beavers et al. 2010 for a recent overview), the account of the reasons driving a language to change from one prevalent type to another is one of the least investigated issues.

This paper, framed in the research line "diachrony, dynamic and variations" of the Trajectoire project, aims to fill this gap, since it deals with changes in the encoding of motion events in a diachronic perspective. One might ask why a research project on the typology of motion event should bother with diachrony. The most obvious answer comes from the recognition that "most languages straddle more than one of the previously proposed typological categories" (Beavers, Levin & Tham 2010: 331) and that a possible explanation is the way in which languages change from one type to the other, as noted by Hickmann & Robert (2006: 5):

Changes in the expression of motion event are not abrupt, but **unfolded in several stages over centuries**, moreover the hybridization within languages at given points in time shows that language-internal variability corresponds to more general variability that can be observed across languages. That is, **during the course of its history, a given language evolves from one type of system into a different type that is found in other languages.** (our emphasis)

As noted here, these typological classifications really apply to linguistic patterns or even to "individual complex event types within a language, not to languages as a whole" (Croft et al. 2010: 202). We believe that, by studying diachronic trends in the encoding of motion events, we can better assess tendencies which may emerge from synchronic variations observed in languages. This approach may allow us to identify turning points in the synchronic interaction between different encoding patterns. Besides, by studying changes in the preferred strategies of motion event encoding, we may identify implicational scales or possible stages in recurring paths of evolution. Of course, the ultimate goal of such diachronic studies is to find *explanations* for typological changes, i.e. in this case for why languages (i.e. speakers) change from one motion-encoding strategy to the other. However, such accomplishments lie far ahead, we fear.

## 2. THEORETICAL PREMISES OF OUR APPROACH

### 2.1 Typologies of motion event encoding – a brief account

Typologies of motion event encoding have evolved quite considerably since Talmy (1985) (cf. Matsumoto 2003). In this work, Talmy distinguishes between three types of lexicalization of motion events: at this stage of his theory, each language has one pattern as a dominant type, and dominance can be judged by frequency and colloquiality of expression; this typological classification is applied only to motion verb constructions, and defined in terms of which of the four basic semantic components (Figure, Ground, Path, Manner) is expressed, or “incorporated”, in the main verb together with motion. Talmy (1985) thereby defines three types of languages: manner-incorporating, path-incorporating, and ground-incorporating.

Talmy (2000) broadens the scope of his previous classification: constructions denoting events with resulting states of all types are included. Motion events describing motion on a path to a destination are thus put in relation with other kinds of delimited events implying resulting states (e.g. *he ran into the cave / he painted the fence red*). The focus is on which constituent encodes Path. Depending on whether the Path is expressed in the verb root or outside it, Talmy (2000) distinguishes two main types, respectively path-incorporating and manner-incorporating.

A scalar approach, instead of a discrete one, is adopted in Berman & Slobin (1994) and Slobin (2004, 2005), who take into account intra- and cross-linguistic variation: “Typological characterizations often reflect tendencies rather than absolute differences between languages” (Berman & Slobin 1994:118, fn 4). They include interactions between linguistic expression, discursive strategies, rhetorical style, and cognitive salience, and focus on the emergence of correlations between preferred strategies and linguistic features (e.g. higher number of manner verbs and higher articulation of Path expression in SF languages than in VF ones).

Croft et alii (2010) insist on the importance of proposing a typology of constructions rather than of languages as a whole; they advocate a search for cross-linguistic universals by examining the intralinguistic variation in the encoding of complex events.

We can conclude from this brief account that recent trends in research on motion-event encoding show at the same time the emergence of a consensus on a two-way scalar typology (Verb- vs Satellite-Framed in talmian terminology), and a growing attention to phenomena of variation<sup>1</sup>. In particular, the study of contexts which promote or inhibit the use of a given pattern has relativized the talmian claim that a language has one pattern as its dominant type, and it has opened the way for investigations on how different synchronic patterns interact,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Poplack (2001: 405), following mainly Labov and Sankoff (Labov 1969, Sankoff 1988): “The working hypothesis of Variation Theory is that within a given locus of variability, or *variable context*, each of two or more competing variants will occur at greater or lesser rates depending on the features that constitute the context. The expected proportion of each variant is the resultant of the combined contributions of the independent features defining its context.”

more precisely on how a new framing strategy can emerge and, with time, gain the upper hand. Starting at least with Aske (1989), there has been a growing attention on the extra-linguistic contexts which favour a given pattern, i.e. on the interaction between extra-linguistic and linguistic features (e.g. the presence or absence of dedicated goal particles or case markers).

## 2.2 Theoretical framework

Both intra- and cross-linguistic studies on variation in motion event encoding mainly deal with synchronic variation, while diachronic studies are few in number. Besides, both synchronic and diachronic studies mainly describe deviations from the canonical Talmian types (e.g. presence of SF patterns in purported VF languages or vice versa), but they do not bring to light the critical factors that allow or cause the change from one predominant type to the other (e.g. the emergence in a VF language of SF patterns and the gradual strengthening of these patterns, with the possible outcome of a typological shift brought about by the prevalence of SF strategies).

However, we can identify various lines of research which may have significant consequences for the investigation of diachronic change in the typology of motion events, and which we will consider as sources of data, analysis and suggestions for our diachronic approach to the typology of motion encoding.

One is the research on causes of change, with explanations based on cognitive weight (i.e. ease of processing) due to the ease of encoding a given strategy in relation to linguistic features provided by languages (cf. Slobin 2008), as well as explanations based on typological or structural adequacy (i.e. the argued tendency of language structures to conform to ideal abstract structures or typological models, cf. Mateu & Rigau 2002; Herslund 2005) or on language contact (see Schøsler 2008). Another interesting line of research is that on the different resources languages make available for the encoding of motion events, and their possible variation in time; in works such as Filipović (2007), Skopeteas (2008), Stolova (2008), Xu (2008), Iacobini (2009), Kopecka (2009a, in press) we may find studies on specific (groups of) languages about the typological shift in either direction. A quite different research line deals with linguistic phenomena other than the encoding of motion events, which may be related to or may favour one or the other main framing strategy (e.g. expression of resulting state, nominal compounding, cf. Snyder 2001, Folli & Ramchand 2005, Son 2007). A further research line foregrounds the matching between different event types and the linguistic patterns preferentially used for their encoding, as well as the role of linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts in the licensing of directional interpretation, even in the lack of overt linguistic path encoding (Aske 1989; Gehrke 2007; Nikitina 2008; Kopecka 2009b; Iacobini 2010; Iacobini & Vergaro in press). The search for implication scales concerning constructional types encoding different complex events types (cf. Croft et alii 2010) has some points in common with the last two research lines.

The theoretical tenets of our research are summarized in the following points:

- a) The way in which the Path is expressed is the most important component for the encoding of motion events.
- b) The encoding of Path is in close correlation with (depends on?) the characteristics of the main predicate (usually a verb). If a sentence has only one verb, we can distinguish two main types: a) one in which the Path is expressed in the verbal root (*Verb-Framed* Talmy 2000, *Path-In-Verb* Slobin 2008, *Head-Language* Matsumoto 2003, *Head-Framed* Fortis & Vittrant, this issue); b) one in which the Path is expressed outside the verb root (*Satellite-Framed* Talmy, *Path-In-Non-verb* Slobin, *Nonhead-Language* Matsumoto), that is in some other element related to it (“extended version” of satellite, which also includes PPs and spatial morphological cases, cf. the paper on satellites by Imbert, Grinevald & Sores in this issue). Besides their lexical meaning (the most important distinction is between path and manner verbs<sup>2</sup>), the argumental structure of the verb is also very relevant for the strategies of motion event encoding (i.e. some verbs can either select directional or locative particles; verbs having three arguments - typically Agent, Theme and Goal – easily accommodate with motion expression).
- c) The encoding (and decoding) of Path is the result of the interaction of the distribution of information across linguistic elements (e.g. verb root, temporal and aspectual markers, particles and adpositions), and co-textual informations and pragmatic inferences.
- d) Typological classification primarily refers to the patterns used to encode individual event types. As a consequence, typologies of languages as a whole are coarse generalizations which can be useful at a very broad level of classification. Intralinguistic variation should not be considered as deviation from an holistic type, rather possible clue leading to crosslinguistic universals about constructions.
- e) Since the encoding of motion events largely relies on “motion-independent morphological, lexical, and syntactic resources languages make available for encoding manner and path of motion” (Beavers, Levin & Tham 2010), changes affecting motion event encoding may happen outside the realm of motion expression.
- f) Different strategies of path encoding in a given language for a given event may have different (cognitive) costs, depending on

---

<sup>2</sup> Different theoretical views – cf. Zubizarreta & Oh (2007), Rappaport & Levin (2010) – agree on the incompatibility of manner and path in the same verb; however, this assumption is not uncontroversial, cf. Goldberg (2010) for a theoretical appraisal, and Zlatev & Yangklang (2004), Iacobini (2010) for data respectively on Thai and Italian.

the relative ease of managing linguistic resources this particular language makes available.

- g) The frequency of use of a given strategy is related to what is considered as the normal information to be linguistically expressed in the representation of a motion event, and for the lexical stock of verbs. As a consequence, extra-grammatical factors may yield preferences for a strategy over another (Beavers, Levin & Tham 2010).

### 2.3 Relevance of our approach for Grinevald's "Working Typology"

Our diachronic approach aims to provide methodological and practical tools for describing language change in the preferred expression of motion (i.e. typological shift from SF to VF or vice versa). At the same time, the analysis of diachronic change and its dynamics may help us find out which factors in synchronic variation are the most reliable indicators of ongoing diachronic change.

No satisfactory analysis of this sort has yet been made, not only on account of the prevalence of a holistic approach that has contained deviations observed in relation to two main framing patterns to the rank of (unexplained) exceptions, but also on account of the difficulties, in terms of both conceptual grid and time, required by an in-depth description of the encoding of motion events. These difficulties are considerable, since the interpretation of reasons for diachronic changes must be based on a detailed description of the encoding patterns and their mutual relations at a given point in time.

The need to optimize the tools for the investigation of language change and restrict or focus the scope of analysis is crucial for the investigation of oral and less described languages, for which in most cases we do not have large corpora, detailed grammatical descriptions, or data concerning previous stages of the language.

In oral languages without prior documentation is more difficult to identify conservative vs innovative trends, but even for languages with a long written tradition, we do not have in-depth analyses of the reasons for typological changes in motion event encoding. We have a fairly detailed documentation, but no pertinent in-depth analysis identifying possible causes of typological change of at least two cases, one in each direction; from SF to VF in the transition from Latin to Romance, and in the reverse direction in the transition from Old to Contemporary Chinese (Xu 2006, 2008; Figure 1 below):




Figure 1: Transitions from VF to SF and vice-versa.

In the next part of this talk we will focus on linguistic phenomena used in the encoding of motion events in the transition from Latin to Romance languages.

### 3. FROM SATELLITE-FRAMED LATIN TO VERB-FRAMED ROMANCE?

The goal of this section is to recall what has been described as a typological shift in motion-event encoding, from SF to VF expression of motion: the evolution from Satellite-framed Latin to Verb-framed Romance. We will show that there is an important variation between Romance languages, which rules out a “simple” SF-to-VF shift. We further argue that a holistic typological classification in SF vs VF does not allow a proper approach to variation and change. In order to study the changes from Latin to Romance, we think it is necessary, rather than simply single out exceptions to “consistent” linguistic systems, to relate the different patterns of motion encoding to different kinds of events each of them is more likely to express. The question here is whether it is possible more precisely to understand how a language’s strategy of motion-event encoding can change.

#### 3.1 Latin vs Romance motion-event encoding

Latin is traditionally described as a Satellite-Framed language, in which Path is typically expressed by a preverb and / or a prepositional phrase, while the verb root often expresses manner of motion. This is the case in (2a) for *tranatat*, and the French translations (2b-d) illustrate the fact that Romance languages do not generally adopt the same strategy.

(2a) Lat.	Iuli-a Julie-N.SG	flumen river.A.SG	tra-nat-at across-swim-PRES.3SG				
(2b) Fr.	<i>Julie</i> Julie	<i>traverse</i> cross. PRES.3SG	<i>le</i> the	<i>fleuve</i> river	<i>en</i> by	<i>nageant</i> swimm. PRES.PARTP	
(2c) Fr.	<i>Julie</i> Julie	<i>traverse</i> cross. PRES.3SG	<i>le</i> the	<i>fleuve</i> river	<i>à</i> at	<i>la</i> the	<i>nage</i> swimming
(2d) Fr.	<i>Julie</i> Julie	<i>traverse</i> cross. PRES.3SG	<i>le</i> the	<i>fleuve</i> river			

“Julie swims across the river”<sup>3</sup>

During the shift from Latin to Romance, there were of course many changes. One notable change is the progressive lexicalization of preverbs (Haverling 2003), with an obvious impact on the encoding of motion events. These lexicalizations brought about different possible changes. Once a “preverb+verb” construct is lexicalized, its semantics changes (i.e. the “Path + Manner” semantics are progressively lost), and most important, the paradigmatic nature of the “preverb+verb” constructs disappears. The examples in Table 1 illustrate a possible result of this evolution: in Modern French, of the two preverbations of two different Latin verbs (*eo* “to go” and *nato* “to swim”), only one combination is attested; and it does not have a spatial meaning anymore, but only kept the figurative meaning (already attested in Latin). The situation is quite similar for other Romance languages, as shown below for Spanish and Italian<sup>4</sup>.

<i>Latin verb</i>	<i>subeo</i> “go under”	<i>adeo</i> “go towards”	<i>subnato</i> “swim under (water)”	<i>adnato</i> “swim towards”
<i>Outcomes in Romance</i>	Fr. <i>subir</i> , It. <i>subire</i> “suffer”, Sp. <i>subir</i> “go up”	No lexical outcome		
<i>Romance (semantic) equivalents:</i>				
<i>French</i>	<i>descendre</i>	<i>aller vers qch.</i>	<i>nager sous qqch.</i>	<i>nager vers qqch.</i>
<i>Italian</i>	<i>scendere (giù)</i>	<i>andare verso qc.</i>	<i>nuotare sotto qc.</i>	<i>nuotare verso qc.</i>
<i>Spanish</i>	<i>bajar</i>	<i>ir hacia alg.</i>	<i>nadar por debajo de alg.</i>	<i>nadar hacia alg.</i>

Table 1: Latin prefixed verbs expressing direction and manner of motion and some outcomes in Romance

Many such constructs (preverb+verb) expressing direction have been lost in the transition from Latin to Romance. From a semasiological point of view, the equivalents in Modern French (see Table 1) illustrate quite well the typological shift. The Latin preverb+verb constructs were partially replaced by lexemes which conflate the Path component in the verb root. As illustrated in (3) and (4), this replacement was a complex process, achieved in a number of ways, with differences across Romance languages. Thus, some Romance verbs meaning “to

<sup>3</sup> Sentence (2d) is certainly the most natural way to say ‘Julie swims across the river’ in French, but this is not necessarily its default interpretation. The translation holds in certain contexts only.

<sup>4</sup> The verb *adire* in Italian is only used in legal register with a specialized meaning “to take legal steps”.

exit” arose through lexicalization of Latin prefixed verbs meaning “to come or go out” (3), others through the loss of the manner component of Latin *salire* “to jump” (4).

- (3) Lat. *ex-ire* “to exit” > Cat. *eixir*, It. *uscire*, Sard. *bessiri*, *bessire*, Rum. *a ieși*
- (4) Lat. *salire* “to jump” > Port. *sair*, Sp. *salir* “to exit”; It. *salire* “to go or come up”

Other evolutions have taken place, such as the emergence of specific directional verbs: whereas Latin uses various manner verbs with a directional preverb meaning “up” / “down” / “towards”, Romance languages tend to use specific verbs meaning “to climb up”, “to climb down”, “to go forward” (without satellite). These verbs are typically Late Latin or Romance innovations, as illustrated in (5a-b) (cf. Stolova 2008).

- (5) a. Fr. *monter*, It. *montare*, Cat. *muntar*, Occ. *montar*, Rhaeto-R. *muntar* “to mount, to ascend”, from Lat. *\*montare* from *mons*, *montis* “mountain, mount”; Fr. *hausser*, It. *alzare*, Sard. *artziai*, *arziare* “to lift, to raise”, from Lat. *\*altiare* from *altus* “high”
- b. Port., Cat. *avançar*, Sp. *avanzar*, Fr. *avancer*, It. *avanzare* “to advance, to go forward”, from Lat. *\*abantiare* from *abante* “forward, ahead”

The fact that such innovations arose sometimes as early as Late Latin is an important point: as has been shown in recent research, the SF > VF transition has been anything but abrupt. Multiple clues indicate that this transition was rather gradual: for one thing, Late Latin already shows signs of reinforced VF strategies, with verbs expressing Path in the root (cf. examples in 5) and verb-particle constructions (cf. examples in (6a-e), from Iacobini 2009); for another, Medieval Romance languages seem less clearly VF than Modern Romance (see for French, a.o., Kopecka 2009a, Dufresne, Dupuis & Tremblay 2003, 2008).

- (6) a. *quisquis servus sine dominico iussu foras exierit*  
“any slave going abroad without the master’s permission” (Petron., Satyr. 28, 7)
- b. *et quod sursum est, deorsum faciunt*  
(lit.) what is up they put down  
“they turn everything upside down” (Ibid., 63, 10)
- c. *iusserunt autem eos foras extra concilium secedere*  
“they had commanded them to go aside out of the council” (Act. apost. 4, 15)
- d. *Cecidit de tertio cenaculo deorsum*  
“and fell down from the third loft” (Ibid., 20, 9)
- e. *Noli foras ire, in te ipsum redi*  
“do not wish to go outside, return into yourself” (Aug., De vera relig. 39, 72)

Besides, even some Modern Romance varieties are rather SF than VF, as shown for North-Eastern Italian and Rhaeto-Romance varieties by Gsell (1982) and Berthele (2006) a.o., and even major Romance languages are not equally VF:

Italian displays more SF characteristics than either French or Spanish (for instance the frequent use of directional post-verbal particles (satellites) associated with manner of motion verbs; cf. Iacobini & Masini 2006, Cini ed. 2008, Iacobini 2009).

### 3.2. Motion event encoding and global linguistic changes

A major innovation in the transition from Latin to Romance – as far as motion expression is concerned – is the unavailability of “simple” constructions expressing manner in the main verb in the representation of boundary-crossing events. The use of manner of motion verbs in Romance is generally restricted to goal-oriented events, as in (7). Since Romance languages have lost most satellites (e.g. directional preverbs) or other morphosyntactic devices clearly expressing boundary-crossing events, they tend to express Path in the main verb for the encoding of boundary-crossing events. As a consequence, if manner cannot be omitted, it is typically expressed in an adjunct, as in (8).

**Commentaire [BF1]** : non avresti un esempio da mettere qui?

(7) Sp. *corrieron a los botes*, It. *corsero alle navi* “they ran to the boats”

(8) Sp. *entrar corriendo*, Fr. *entrer en courant*, It. *entrare di corsa* “enter running”

The latter (in (8)) are “heavy” constructions, compared with Latin *accurro* “to run to”, *incurro* “to run into” and similar constructions frequent in Satellite-Framed languages, for instance Eng. *to run into*. We may hypothesize (following Slobin 2008) that changes affecting the expression of boundary-crossing events are very likely to be the most important among processes leading to the restructuring of motion event expression in Romance languages. The necessity of expressing boundary-crossing motion events with path verbs might have favoured the emergence of such verbs, and the success of the VF strategy. Of course, this kind of impact is very difficult to measure, and at the moment remains a working hypothesis, but there is some evidence to support it, such as the semantic downgrading of Classical Latin manner verbs to generic motion verbs in Romance (cf. Schøsler 2008: Latin *ambulare* “to walk” > Fr. *aller*, Friulan *lâ* “to go”). Other language internal phenomena, not necessarily related to the expression of path, which plausibly played a role in the change of preferred ways of expressing motion events in the transition from Classical to Late Latin are the crisis in the system of spatial preverbs (García Hernández 1980, Haverling 2003), and the loss of distinction between stative and directional meanings both for prepositions and cases, linked to the gradual collapse of the case system (Fagard 2010: 199-224, cf. *in* + Ablative “location” and *in* + Accusative “direction, goal”, *foris* “on the outside” / *foras* “to the outside”, *intus* “on the inside” / *intro* “to the inside”).

While the consequences of these phenomena are quite well known in relation to the grammatical system of Latin, we do not yet have a clear picture of the processes leading to the restructuring of motion event expression in Romance. We know that these changes were gradual, and we can surmise that they were

brought on partly by phenomena which were completely independent from the expression of motion.

Some explanations about the causes of change are clearly ruled out, such as typological (in)consistency, because changes introducing inconsistent features (with respect to a framing typology) do not make a language functionally deficient (cf. Lehmann 1985, Wischer 2006). How, then, are we to find out which linguistic phenomena played a major role in these changes, and which contexts may provide us with the most interesting hints about the dynamic of change? We think investigating the changes affecting the expression of boundary-crossing events might be a good starting point, because we believe that these changes may have triggered other processes leading to the restructuring of motion event expression in Romance languages, Path being an essential component in the expression of motion. Besides, we believe that the dynamics of change can be understood only through a careful investigation of the different strategies adopted for the encoding of motion and their relationships with different kinds of events. We think indeed that the “macroscopic” changes resulting in a different typology of motion expression could be the result of “microscopic” changes due to individual behaviors, along the lines of Keller’s (1994) “Invisible-hand theory”, and the constructionist step-wise dynamics of change (cf. Goldberg 2006, Traugott & Trousdale 2010), according to which micro-changes may give rise to systematic shifts with similar or more relevant effect than “cataclysmic” macro-changes. We argue that the interplay between lexical and morphosyntactic changes (even independent from motion expression) and specific linguistic means for motion event encoding may influence language users, leading them in some cases to gradually abandon the usual constructions and thus causing the gradual emergence of structures characterizing a different typology of motion event descriptions. It is therefore no surprise to find SF features in (overall) VF languages (and vice versa). More interesting is the question of which unpredicted features are better clues of possible ongoing changes. We do not yet have a theoretical framework of the possible paths of change from one type to the other, nor do we have detailed analyses on specific cases which could be used as generic methodological indications<sup>5</sup>. The goal of the next section is to give a few indications in this direction.

#### 4. EXCEPTIONS TO TYPOLOGICAL EXPECTATIONS

A dichotomic approach to the classification of languages is not very helpful in explaining change. A great number of languages are not easily classifiable into one type or another in the verbalization of motion events, especially if we move from a broad typological overview to a more fine-grained level of representation. Neither the acknowledgement of the existence of split or

---

<sup>5</sup> Some hints on intratypological variation may be found in Filipovič (2007).

conflating types allow a better understanding of the dynamics of change.<sup>6</sup> A proper approach to the understanding of typological change in motion event encoding should therefore investigate the relationships between specific event types and preferred linguistic constructions, try to identify the characteristics which best contribute to define a type (cf. the list of factors which best contribute to degree of path description provided by Ibarretxe Antuñano 2009), and find out which phenomena best indicate the emergence of variation.

In this last section, we will briefly discuss four cases concerning Romance languages in which it is shown that variations with respect to the canonical frame types are not equally significant: some exceptions are more important than others. We believe that the focus on the variation on the matching between types of events and different patterns used to encode them will allow us to identify which signals are to be taken into account in order to recognize trends of linguistic change.

#### 4.1 Manner in boundary-crossing events

As far as major Romance languages are concerned, dating at least from Aske (1989), scholars agree on the fact that the set of motion events which requires path conflation in the verb root does not concern all motion events but is restricted to bounded events. In (9) are reported examples of colloquial sentences where Romance languages use a manner of motion verb complemented by a path phrase expressing direction toward a goal.

- (9) a. Sp. *Juan bailó hacia la puerta*. “John danced towards the door” (from Aske 1989).  
 b. Fr. *Il courut / marcha vers moi*. “He ran / walked towards me” (from Cummins 1996).

Scholars show agreement around the marginal use of manner verb in constructions expressing attainment of goal in the majority of Romance languages, although some exceptions to this restriction have been found in Spanish and French (cf. ex. 10).

- (10) Sp. *y nadó hasta la otra orilla, donde comió* “and s/he swam up to the other bank, where s/he ate” (from Martínez Vázquez 2001).  
 Fr. *Max sauta sur la table* “Max jumped onto the table” (from Cummins 1996).

---

<sup>6</sup> We share the position of Croft et al. (2010: 210), according to which “It would be much more interesting if we could find cross-linguistic universals by examining the intralinguistic variation in the encoding of complex events, instead of treating them as exceptions that reduce a ‘universal’ to a ‘tendency’.”

Italian is more liberal with respect to this restriction: a fair proportion of manner verbs may license a cross-boundary reading, given the appropriate context (11).

- (11) a. It. *Un orangotango salta fuori dal recinto*. “An orangutan jumps out / bursts out of the pen”.  
 b. It. *Lei è scappata via da una porta laterale*. “She ran away through a side door”.  
 c. It. *Invece di stare fuori sulla neve, corre dentro casa a guardare la televisione*. “Instead of staying outside in the snow, s/he runs inside to watch TV” (from Iacobini 2010).

A possible explanation for such examples is provided by Slobin (2004: 225-226): according to him, though manner verbs are used in VF languages only if manner is foregrounded, and seem excluded when boundary-crossing is involved, the examples in (11) illustrate an important exception to this rule, i.e. “verbs that encode particular force dynamics – high energy motor patterns that are more like punctual acts than activities, such as equivalents of “throw oneself” and “plunge”.” This would entail that

The only manner verbs that can occur in boundary-crossing situations are those that are not readily conceived of as activities, but, rather, as “instantaneous” acts. Thus one can “throw oneself into a room” but one generally can’t “crawl into a room” in V-languages. (Ibid.: 226)

However, as exemplified by (12), the preference shown in Italian for constructions involving a manner verb for the representation of punctual high force dynamics, does not rule out the use of the same construction for describing slow, quiet and careful movement.

- (12) It. *L'esofago scompare, scompare anche il fastidio forte e tenace per quel tubo che mi scivola dentro e si muove e striscia*. “The esophagus disappears, as well as the strong and persistent discomfort caused by that tube sliding inside and moving and slithering” (from Iacobini 2010).

Keeping these considerations in mind, we can now reconsider the following implicational universal, proposed by Croft et alii (2010: 211): “If a telic path of motion is encoded by a satellite framing construction, then an atelic path of motion is also encoded by a satellite framing construction”. Indeed, it might be better viewed in terms of prevalent patterns used in a language. We can say that, in a prevalent Verb-Framed language, the encoding of an atelic path of motion by a satellite construction is less significant than the encoding of a telic path. Conversely, if a construction involving a manner of motion verb (without high force dynamics) allows a boundary-crossing reading, it constitutes a very relevant “exception”, i.e. a more significant manifestation of SF strategies.

In the lack of inherently directional satellites, the boundary-crossing reading is made possible through the interaction of linguistic features, co-textual informations and pragmatic inferences (cf. Nikitina 2008, Kopecka 2009, Levin

et al. 2009). Besides the semantic and aspectual features of the verb (cf. § 4.2), the two characteristics playing a major role for directional reading and attainment of goal are the physical characteristics of locations designated by the noun of the prepositional phrase expressing the Ground and the the meaning of prepositions. Manner verbs are more suitable to receive a directional reading when the locations are objects or fixed spaces, while substances with ill-defined boundaries favour a locative reading. The explanation for this lies in the fact that well-defined locations allow the inference of punctual transition perceived as a change of state. Prepositions favouring the attainment of goal reading are the one that express the final part of a spatial orientation (e.g. It. *su* “on, onto, up”, *giù* “down”), or the inside or outside of a location with well-defined boundaries (e.g. It. *fuori* “out(side), away, off”, *dentro* “in(side), in(to)”). The use of complex prepositions is another factor enhancing goal reading (cf. Folli 2008 and examples (13a-b)).

- (13) a. It. *Gianni corse dentro il parco.* [locative / directional].  
Gianni ran inside the park  
b. It. *Gianni corse dentro al parco.* [directional / (locative)].  
(lit.) Gianni ran inside to.the park (adapted from Folli 2008)

The appropriate combination of physical characteristics of the Ground and prepositions may induce a cross-boundary interpretation even with manner verbs whose semantics are not very compatible with a goal construction, cf. the Italian example in (14a-b).

- (14) a. It. «*Potremmo andare a fare colazione*». *Le disse mentre arrancava fuori dalla stanza.* “«We could go to breakfast». S/he said as s/he trudged out of the room”.  
b. It. *Per paura del leone, il re era già strisciato dentro il vaso di bronzo.* “For fear of the lion, the king had already crawled into the bronze vase”

Of course, these are gradual phenomena, which depend on the fact that the distribution and frequency of given constructions determine their entrenchment and possible diffusion. Table 2 below provides a hierarchy for the degree of relevance of constructions with manner verbs in languages which do not have inherently directional particles.

1	2	3	4	5
Giovanni corre sul prato “John runs on the lawn”	Giovanni corre verso casa “John runs towards home”	Giovanni è corso a casa (a preparare la cena) “John ran home (to cook dinner)” (lit. “John is run	Giovanni irrompe in casa “John bursts into the house” (lit. “John burst in home”)	Giovanni striscia a letto “John crawls onto his bed” (lit. “John crawls at bed”)

		at home (to cook the dinner”)		
motion location	at	motion toward a goal (no attainment of a goal)	attainment of a goal	boundary-crossing + high force dyn. verb
				boundary-crossing - high force dyn. verb

Table 2: Manner verbs and boundary-crossing in a Verb-Framed language

In a VF language, the use of manner verbs is expected in (1); even cases such as (2), in which the non attainment of a goal is the default reading, are rather frequent. The difficulty of expressing the attainment of a goal with manner verbs (as main verb) in the absence of dedicated particles or prepositions is made obvious by the necessity of a resultative reading of the sentence, as in (3), in the presence of other elements which frame the event (in this case the auxiliary *be* characterizing the unaccusative construction, and a dependent clause from which we may infer that John arrived home). In (4) and (5), the encoding of a boundary-crossing event is done without the help of inherently directional satellites or prepositions: the Italian prepositions *a* and *in* do not make it possible to distinguish between location and direction. They both constitute valid examples of exceptions to the VF type, especially (5), given the semantic characteristics of the verb. For a VF language, the presence and use of constructions such as those in (4) and (5) should be seen as stronger exceptions than the use of manner verbs for the codification of displacement events.

**Commentaire [BF2]** : qui non sono sicuro che si capisce bene.

#### 4.2 Verb-Particle constructions

Another type of unexpected constructions in VF languages are Verb-Particle Constructions, i.e. complex verbs expressing direction with post-verbal particles. It is not unusual even for VF languages like the Romance ones to display Verb-Particle constructions both in Early Romance (12a; for Old French, namely, see Buridant 2000, Dufresne et al. 2001, Marchello-Nizia 2002) and in modern languages (12b-c; see Iacobini & Masini 2006, Iacobini 2009).

- (12) a. Old French *aler en avant* “to go forward” (Marchello-Nizia 2002:214), *descendre aval* “to go down (downwards)”, *issir fors* “to exit (outside)”<sup>7</sup>  
 b. Modern French (colloquial) *descendre en bas* “to go down (downwards)”, *monter en haut* “to go up (upwards)”, *sortir dehors* “to go out (outside)”

<sup>7</sup> A good example in a medieval text is the following, where the contrast between the boundary-crossing verb (with particle but without manner) and the manner verb (without directional particle) is quite obvious: *Des que cil furent fort issu, Tuit cil de l’ost sunt la curu* “As soon as these people had come out (lit. had exited outside), all the soldiers ran towards them (lit. ran there)” (*Brut*, Wace, 12<sup>th</sup> century).

- c. Modern Italian *scendere giù* “to go down (downwards)”, *uscire fuori* “to go out” (lit. “to exit out”), *mettere giù* “to put down”, *rotolare giù* “to roll down”, *strisciare via* “to crawl away”.

According to Slobin (2008), it is very plausible that verb-particle constructions are first used – in a VF language – to reinforce or emphasize path verbs (such as Italian *uscire fuori*, French *sortir dehors/entrer dedans*), and then possibly develop, extending to high-frequency caused-motion verbs such as “to throw” (Italian *buttare fuori*, French *jeter bas*) and later on to basic manner of locomotion verbs such as “to run” and “to jump”.<sup>8</sup>

In this case, too, we could attempt to define an implicational scale mainly based on criteria such as frequency and acceptability, but also on semantic and pragmatic features (see Table 3). Starting from left to right, this scale orders the types of Verb-particle constructions which can be used in a VF language to express “displacement”, i.e. a type of motion where the trajector moves completely from one point to another. The first three cells show respectively path verbs, deictic verbs and verbs expressing caused motion, while cells 4-7 show various types of manner verbs.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>uscire fuori</i> “exit out”	<i>andare fuori</i> “go out”	<i>spingere fuori</i> “push out”	<i>precipitarsi fuori</i> “bolt out”	<i>correre fuori</i> “run out”	? <i>camminare fuori</i> “walk out”	* <i>danzare fuori</i> “dance out”
Path	Deixis	Caused Motion	Manner + Orientation + Force Dynamics	Manner + Force Dyn.	Manner ± Force Dyn. - Specific	Manner - Force Dyn. + Specific

Table 3: Implication scale of Verb-Particle expressions expressing displacement

Manner verbs differ in their availability to be used in constructions which express displacement events. Some are more prone to licensing a directional reading, for instance the ones which express not only an orientation, i.e. removal from a reference point (It. *battersela* “to scam”, *sbucare* “to come out suddenly, to pop out”), or movement toward a goal (It. *avventarsi* “to hurl oneself”, *scagliarsi* “to lunge”) but also a rapid, often sudden, movement; in some of these verbs, attainment of the goal is even implicit (*irrompere* “to burst into”). Verbs which express motion on a vertical axis such as *arrampicarsi* “to climb up” or *tuffarsi* “to dive” are more compatible with a path reading from a source to a goal than those indicating a movement of a rather aimless sort, that is, a series of

<sup>8</sup> It is also very common for SF languages to develop a post-verbal particle pattern starting with so-called double-framing constructions (‘double marking’ in the terminology of Bohnemeyer et al. 2007: 512, 514). In such constructions, the path is expressed twice, once as a detached satellite and once as part of the verb (cf. Latin *exit foras*, lit. “he out-goes outside”).



The degree of diffusion of Verb-Particle Constructions expressing actional values can therefore be considered as a strong clue of the emergence of SF patterns.

#### 4.4 Pragmatics

Danish, a Satellite-Framed language, uses different verbs to encode a motion event that takes place through transportation means, whereas French shows a tendency to omit such an indication or to encode it using a noun phrase (when it is considered pragmatically relevant).

- (15) a. Dan. *De sejlede ind i Havanabugten.* “They sailed into Havana Bay”.  
*De kørte ind i Santa Clara.* “They drove into Santa Clara”.  
 b. Fr. *Ils entrèrent dans la baie de La Havane (en bateau).* (id)  
*Ils entrèrent dans Santa Clara (en voiture)* (id; from Herslund 2005).

Romance languages tend to avoid adding manner information in an adjunct phrase when that information is implicitly provided, or presupposed, by the context. This explains the awkwardness of sentences (16a-b), which are perfectly grammatical but seem unnatural. However, a sentence like (16c) is perfectly acceptable because a hopping type of manner does not constitute the default, or habitual, manner of motion for birds.

- (16) a. Fr. *Le bateau est arrivé au port en navigant.*  
 the boat arrived at the harbour sailing  
 “The boat sailed into the harbour”.  
 b. Fr. *L’oiseau est sorti de la cage en volant.*  
 the bird is exited from the cage flying  
 “The bird flew out of its cage”.  
 c. Fr. *L’oiseau est sorti du nid en sautillant.*  
 the bird is exited from the nest in hopping  
 “The bird hopped out of the nest”. (from Pourcel and Kopecka 2006)

Besides, even if hopping is the default manner of motion for rabbits, Italian allows the expression of boundary-crossing events in sentences like (17).

- (17) It. *Appena gli lascio la gabbietta aperta il mio coniglio saltella fuori e viene a curiosare.* “As soon as I leave the small cage open my rabbit hops out and comes to look around”.

Here again, we may consider examples like the one in (17) as stronger, that is, more significant exceptions of manner verb usage in VF languages. A tentative ordering of the possible ways of expressing boundary-crossing events is

proposed in table 4. The left end of the scale illustrates a typical VF pattern, the right end a typical SF pattern, and cells 2, 3 and 4 illustrate intermediate stages.

1	2	3	4	5
<i>l'uccello esce dal nido</i> (lit.) "the bird exits from the nest"	<i>l'uccello esce dal nido saltellando</i> (lit.) "the bird exits from the nest hopping"	<i>l'uccello saltella uscendo dal nido</i> (lit.) "the bird hops exiting from the nest"	<i>l'uccello saltella fuori dal nido</i> (lit.) "the bird hops out of the nest"	<i>l'uccello vola fuori dal nido</i> (lit.) "the bird flies out of the nest"
Path Verb No Manner	Path Verb + No default Manner V	No default Manner V + Path Verb	No default Manner V + Path Satellite	Default Manner V + Path Satellite

Table 4: Different possible expressions of boundary-crossing events in VF and SF languages

## 5. CONCLUSION

It is only through a careful investigation of the balance of all the factors playing a role in encoding path that we may assess which is the expected way and which are the possible variations for the encoding of a given event type. We believe that it is only within this perspective that we may fruitfully approach the issue of diachronic change in the typology of motion events.

cf Schoesler, che dice di stare attenti alla differenza tra sistema e uso