

Morpheme order constraints upside down: Vertical Orientation vs. Directionality

This talk addresses ordering constraints in the expression of vertical Orientation and Directionality, in languages exhibiting multiple affixation or complex predication. A sample of three languages is given in (1)-(2): Jakaltek Popti' after Craig (1993) and Grinevald (2003), Tetun Dili after Son & Svenonius (2009) and Homeric Greek after AUTHOR (2010). To be noticed is how the Path morphemes¹ exhibit similar ordering constraints, whereby Directionality is systematically encoded 'outside' Orientation, with respect to the verb stem or left-most verb (henceforth "V"):

(1)

	-3	-2	-1	V	+1	+2	+3
Jakaltek				motion, manner, perception	aspect	Orientation, median	Directionality
Tetun Dili				manner, Orientation	Directionality		
H. Greek	Directionality	configu- ration	Orientation, median	motion, manner			

- (2) a. *x-ø-y-il-ay-tij* *ix* *naj* Jakaltek Popti'
ASP-him-she-V/see-**down-toward** CL/she CL/him
'She saw him (down toward)'
- b. *ami* *sa'e* *bá* *to'o* *foho* *leten* Tetun Dili
we **V/ascend** **go** until mountain top
'We climbed up to the summit (away from here)'
- c. *toi* *homòn* *lékhos* *eis-ana-báinoi* Homeric Greek
2SG:DAT same:ACC bed:ACC **to-up-V/walk:OPT.PRES.3SG**
'(She) shall go up into thy bed'

In cases of ordering constraints in multiple affixation to a verb stem, Bybee (1985) argued that the closest an affix is to the verb stem, the more semantically relevant, and the more morphologically fused it is to the verb stem. While the cases she considered involved Tense, Aspect and Person-marking, this talk focuses specifically on the functional domain of Space and more generally on different kinds of morpho-syntactic constructions (multiple affixation, complex predication, and other multiple-Path expressions). It proposes to explain the ordering constraints illustrated in (1)-(2) by relying on Bybee's proposal, but turning it upside down: the question is not where the Path element is with respect to V, but where the Path element is with respect to the argument that encodes the Ground. A crosslinguistic analysis shows that the more relevant the semantics of the Path element is to the Ground ([+Ground] bias), the farthest that element is from V. More crucially, the most [+Ground] Path element of the construction tends to morpho-syntactically relate to the Ground, e.g. to develop an adpositional function. Two arguments in support of this proposal are examined:

- (a) Semantically, Directionality tends to involve a stronger [+Ground] bias.
- (b) Morphosyntactically, Directionality-encoding elements show a stronger tendency to function as adpositions (when allowed).

Both arguments are defended by AUTHOR (2010) for Homeric Greek. Lin's (2011) paper on Mandarin Chinese confirms (a); Muansuwan (2001) and Son & Svenonius (2009) show how (b) is more particularly observed in the expression of Deixis, respectively in Thai and Tetun Dili.

Therefore, this talk places the general issue of morpheme order within the functional domain of Space and aims to explore the competing motivations underlying ordering constraints in Path expression, based on crosslinguistic and typological accounts.

¹ "Path" as in Talmy's (2000, 2009) terminology. For the sake of brevity here, "Orientation" refers to vertical (*up, down*) Orientation, while "Directionality" refers to both Direction (which includes boundary-crossing: *to/into, from/out of*) and Deixis.

References

Author. 2010.

Bybee, J. L. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Typological Studies in Language 9. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Craig, C. 1993. Jakaltek directionals: their meaning and discourse function. In *Languages of the World* 7:2. 23-36.

Grinevald, C. 2003. The expression of static location in a typological perspective. *Conference "L'espace dans les langues : systèmes linguistiques et catégories cognitives"*. Paris, 7-8 February 2003.

Lin, J. 2011. The Order of Mandarin Chinese Motion Morphemes and the 'Scalar Specificity Constraint'. In H. Hong Gao and M. Dong (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*. Institute for Digital Enhancement of Cognitive Development, Waseda University. 525–532.

Muansuwan, N. 2001. Directional Serial Verb Constructions in Thai. In D. Flickinger & A. Kathol (eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th International HPSG Conference*. CSLI Publications.

Son, M. & P. Svenonius. 2009. Directed Manner of Motion in Verb Serialization: A Comparative Study of Indonesian/Malay and Tetun Dili. *13th International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics*. Senggigi, Lombok (Indonesia), 6-7 June 2009.

Talmy L. 2000. *Toward a cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Talmy L. 2009. Main verb properties and equipollent framing. In J. Guo et al. (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Psychology of Language: Research in the Tradition of Dan Isaac Slobin*. Psychology Press. 389-402.