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Abstract
This paper deals with the expression of space in linguistic typology, more specifically with Path encoding. The term “Path” refers to the path followed by an entity with respect to another: for instance, in a scene where a cat runs and a table stands, Path will refer to the cat running past the table, below the table, down from the table, etc. The literature on how Path is encoded in different languages is abundant. This paper is not an exhaustive state-of-the-art review of the literature. It rather intends to guide the reader through major recent landmarks that would help one understand how typological generalizations about Path expression have been attained, what are such generalizations and how part of them still constitute an issue.

Introduction
Human beings have sensory perception of space, movement, non-movement and localization of one entity with respect to another. Human languages constitute one manifestation of how speakers (or signers in the case of signed languages) process and conceptualize these percepts, how they categorize them and how they linguistically encode them into verbal or signed expression. Space is central to human cognition and has been widely studied in linguistics in the last few decades. It is represented in every human language and thus allows for large-scale comparison: linguists studying spatial expression can account for crosslinguistic tendencies, similarities and variation. For these reasons, Space as a conceptual domain has been most prominently addressed in linguistic typology and cognitive linguistics.

This paper deals with the expression of space in linguistic typology, more specifically with Path encoding. The term “Path” refers to the path followed by an entity with respect to another: for instance, in a scene where a cat runs and a table stands, Path will refer to the cat running past the table, below the table, down from the table, etc. The literature on how Path is encoded in different languages is abundant. This paper is not an exhaustive state-of-the-art review of the literature. It rather intends to guide the reader through major recent landmarks that would help one understand how typological generalizations about Path expression have been attained, what are such generalizations and how part of them still constitute an issue.

In the first section of this paper, the notion of Path is defined in terms of Leonard Talmy’s framework – as it is one of the most widespread – and more crucially as it is the starting point of interesting recent developments and controversies. It focuses on Talmy’s “Typology of Motion event”, which attempts to classify languages according to how they express Path, more precisely how they lexicalize this concept into linguistic elements. The second and third sections will show how this typology has evolved to be more complex and also controversial, as it was extended to a larger sample of languages. The second section addresses studies that stemmed from Talmy’s typology and aimed to refine it “from the
inside”, by proposing further concepts and considerations: basically, languages may or may not always fit just one type (to paraphrase Slobin 1996a:214, typologies almost always leak). The third section explores studies that contradict Talmy’s typology to a certain degree, by adding new types of languages and arguing over Talmy’s proposal itself.

1. Path in Motion Event Typology

The term “Path” as used in this paper is to be traced back to Talmy’s cognitive semantics framework (1972, 1985, 1991, 2000, 2009), and to what he called a “Motion event”, i.e. a spatial situation in which one or several entities move or are located with respect to one another and according to a certain posture, position, configuration, direction. Talmy’s Motion event can be seen as organized in two layers: a deep, semantic layer which involves concepts related to spatial situations; and a surface, grammatical layer which involves linguistic elements and expressions that encode those concepts.

1.1. Definition of a Motion Event

A Motion event includes four basic concepts or semantic elements: a Figure (moving or located entity); a Ground (reference entity with respect to which the Figure is moving or is located); locatedness or motion1 (static or dynamic nature of the relation between the Figure and the Ground); and a Path (Path followed or place occupied by the Figure, with respect to the Ground). Path is thus a “relational” concept, in the sense that the spatial relation between the Figure and the Ground, whether static or dynamic, is defined in terms of a Path.2 It is the existence of a Path that defines the conceptualized event as a Motion event, as illustrated in (1): Path is thus criterial to a Motion event (as reminded by Talmy 2009:389–90):

(1) a. The sheep went up the hill
   Figure motion Path Ground
b. The sheep is up the hill
   Figure locatedness Path Ground

Talmy added to these basic semantic elements a “Co-event”, which includes two more elements: Manner and Cause. For instance, the verbs run and kneel do not only encode motion/locatedness, but also Manner, as they specify how the Figure is moving or located; the verb put does not simply refer to motion, as it designates the Figure’s motion or locatedness as being caused. As this paper will show, the Manner element is crucial to understand some controversies over Talmy’s framework.3

1.2. Lexicalization Patterns for Motion Events

Talmy’s interest did not only lie in the semantic level of a Motion event; he focused on the way languages organize and encode the semantic elements into surface elements, namely how grammar deals with a Motion event. Talmy’s approach to this question mainly relied on lexicalization patterns, i.e. “the systematic relations in language between meaning and surface expression” (Talmy 1985:57).

1.2.1. “Conflation Types”

In his 1985 paper, Talmy noted that the relation between semantic elements in a Motion event and their surface expressions is not necessarily one-to-one. Several semantic elements
may be encoded in one surface element; conversely, one semantic element may be encoded in several surface elements. Talmy refers to the former as “conflation” (Talmy 1985:60), which retains most of his attention; as for the latter, it is referred to as “distribution”, after Sinha and Kuteva (1995). Both situations are illustrated in example (2): the semantic elements of motion and Manner are conflated in the verb fly; while the semantic element of Path is distributed in two grammatical elements (away and into) that each encode a different portion of the Path followed by the Figure (respectively the initial portion and the final portion):

(2) The bird flew away into the sky
Figure motion + Manner Path Path Ground
{conflation} {distribution}

Semantic elements tend to be conflated in the main verb or verb root in the encoding of a Motion event, which led Talmy to focus on Motion verbs in his observation of “conflation types” in Path lexicalization. A single language may exhibit instances of several conflation types. This is illustrated for English in (3a–d): in (3a), the verb stride conflates motion and Manner; in (3b), the verb put conflates motion and Cause; in (3c), the verb box acts like the verb put, except that it also encodes the Ground (the box itself); finally in (3d), the verb rain encodes motion and the Figure (rain itself):

(3) Conflation types in one language: English
  a. motion + Manner conflation
     The boy \textit{strode} into the house
     Figure \textit{motion + Manner} Path Ground
  b. motion + Cause conflation
     The boy \textit{put} the ball in a box
     motion + Cause Figure Path Ground
  c. motion + Cause + Ground conflation
     The boy \textit{boxed} the ball
     motion + Cause + Ground Figure
  d. motion + Figure conflation
     It \textit{rained} in the house
     motion + Figure Path Ground

Talmy observed the repartition of these conflation types across languages and aimed to reveal typological tendencies. Therefore, the question he brought up may be formulated as follows: do languages exhibit a “preferred pattern”, do they predominantly or exclusively exhibit one or the other conflation type? The results of this crosslinguistic investigation are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Three conflation types for motion verbs across languages (after Talmy 1985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflation types</th>
<th>Predominant in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion + Path</td>
<td>Romance languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion + Co-event</td>
<td>Semitic languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Co-event = Manner or Cause)</td>
<td>Germanic languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion + Figure</td>
<td>Slavic languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atsugewi, Navajo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples (4)–(6) illustrate those three types in a selection of languages; the main verb or verb root is each time shown in bold face:

(4) [Motion + Path] conflation
   a.  French
       Le garçon **entra** dans la maison en courant
       ‘The boy ran into the house’
   b.  Hebrew (Slobin 2004:224)
       **Yaca** mitox haxor yansuf
       **motion + Path** Path Ground Figure
       ‘An owl goes out of the hole’ (lit. “exits from”)

(5) [Motion + Co-event] conflation
   a.  English
       The boy **ran** out of the school
   b.  Polish (after Kopecka 2004:114)
       Paweł wy-**biegl** ze szkoly
       **motion + Manner** Path Ground
       ‘Paul ran out of the school’

(6) [Motion + Figure] conflation: Atsugewi (simplified, after Talmy 2000-II:59)
   ‘cwa-**staq-icta**
   **Cause + Manner** **motion + Figure** Path + Ground
   ‘The guts moved into the water from the wind blowing on them’

His paper of conflation types across languages led Talmy to adopt a specific angle of observation: because Path is the relational element that is criterial to a Motion event, the way Path is encoded in languages should also be criterial to a Typology of Motion event.

1.2.2. “Framing Types”
Based on his conclusions on conflation types (Table 1), Talmy focused his attention on Path and stressed a dichotomic treatment of Path in languages: either Path is encoded in the main verb or verb root, or it is encoded in another surface element of the clause. Therefore, Talmy elaborated a typology that relies on this dichotomy: languages that predominantly or exclusively encode Path within the main verb or verb root are verb-framed languages (V-framed); languages that predominantly or exclusively encode Path outside the main verb or verb root, generally in a more grammatical element such as a preverb, particle or adposition, are satellite-framed languages (S-framed). This distinction between two framing types in languages is summarized in Table 2.
In his 1991 paper, Talmy extended his typology to other non-spatial constructions via the notion of Macro Event, which refers to a framing event and a Co-event integrated within the same sentence (event integration). Talmy argues that different types of “framing events” (motion, change of state, temporal contouring, action correlating, “realization”) will exhibit a comparable structure: similar surface elements will encode similar semantic elements. Throughout the five types of framing events, surface elements are alike, while semantic elements differ but are still conceptually related, by analogy to Motion events – according to Talmy. Such a construction-based extension inspired later works, for instance Croft et al. (2010) as will be discussed in Section 3.2.

One important clarification about the notion of “satellite” is in order. Readers that are already familiar with Path typologies may express disagreement as to the definition of “satellite-framed” languages given above, because it includes Path encoding in adpositions – while Talmy (1985:102, 1991:486, 2000-II:102) notoriously antagonizes adpositions to satellites. Or does he? Talmy actually used the term “satellite” in two different senses, which led to confusion and arguments over the clarity or even the “usefulness” of the notion. He used the term “satellite” to designate a type of construction (S-framed construction), and also to designate a type of surface element (such as preverbs or particles).

The first use (“S-framing”) covers any construction where Path is not encoded in the verb (thus including constructions where it is encoded in an adposition, e.g. ‘I ran to the school’ in Talmy 2000-II:65).

The second use (“satellite”) covers a category, surface elements such as preverbs and verb particles, and this time explicitly excludes adpositions. This inadequacy led to questions and controversies: are satellites really different from adpositions (as suggested by Cappelle 2005), or are they just intransitive adpositions, namely adpositions that do not introduce a syntactic argument (as suggested by Beavers, Levin, and Wei Tham 2010 and Filipović 2007)?

Talmy (2009:389–90) actually changed his definition while answering one of the controversies over his typology (the “Equipollent-framing” controversy, as developed in Section 3.2). This new version contradicts his own initial statement about opposing satellites and adpositions, both in the (a) constructional and (b) categorial definition of “satellites”:

(a) “If the Path is characteristically represented in the main verb or verb root of a sentence, the language is ‘verb-framed’, but if it is characteristically represented in the satellite and/or preposition, the language is satellite-framed.” [emphasis mine]
(b) “A satellite is a constituent in construction with the main verb (root) and syntactically subordinate to it as a dependent to a head.” [no more mention of an opposition to adpositions]

Table 2. Verb-framed vs. Satellite-framed languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framing type</th>
<th>Conflation type</th>
<th>Examples of languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-framed</td>
<td>Motion + Path</td>
<td>Romance languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-framed</td>
<td>Motion + Co-event (Co-event = Manner or Cause)</td>
<td>Semitic languages, Germanic languages, Slavic languages, Atsugewi, Navajo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motion + Figure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his 1991 paper, Talmy extended his typology to other non-spatial constructions via the notion of Macro Event, which refers to a framing event and a Co-event integrated within the same sentence (event integration). Talmy argues that different types of “framing events” (motion, change of state, temporal contouring, action correlating, “realization”) will exhibit a comparable structure: similar surface elements will encode similar semantic elements. Throughout the five types of framing events, surface elements are alike, while semantic elements differ but are still conceptually related, by analogy to Motion events – according to Talmy. Such a construction-based extension inspired later works, for instance Croft et al. (2010) as will be discussed in Section 3.2.

One important clarification about the notion of “satellite” is in order. Readers that are already familiar with Path typologies may express disagreement as to the definition of “satellite-framed” languages given above, because it includes Path encoding in adpositions – while Talmy (1985:102, 1991:486, 2000-II:102) notoriously antagonizes adpositions to satellites. Or does he? Talmy actually used the term “satellite” in two different senses, which led to confusion and arguments over the clarity or even the “usefulness” of the notion. He used the term “satellite” to designate a type of construction (S-framed construction), and also to designate a type of surface element (such as preverbs or particles).

The first use (“S-framing”) covers any construction where Path is not encoded in the verb (thus including constructions where it is encoded in an adposition, e.g. ‘I ran to the school’ in Talmy 2000-II:65).

The second use (“satellite”) covers a category, surface elements such as preverbs and verb particles, and this time explicitly excludes adpositions. This inadequacy led to questions and controversies: are satellites really different from adpositions (as suggested by Cappelle 2005), or are they just intransitive adpositions, namely adpositions that do not introduce a syntactic argument (as suggested by Beavers, Levin, and Wei Tham 2010 and Filipović 2007)?

Talmy (2009:389–90) actually changed his definition while answering one of the controversies over his typology (the “Equipollent-framing” controversy, as developed in Section 3.2). This new version contradicts his own initial statement about opposing satellites and adpositions, both in the (a) constructional and (b) categorial definition of “satellites”:

(a) “If the Path is characteristically represented in the main verb or verb root of a sentence, the language is ‘verb-framed’, but if it is characteristically represented in the satellite and/or preposition, the language is satellite-framed.” [emphasis mine]
(b) “A satellite is a constituent in construction with the main verb (root) and syntactically subordinate to it as a dependent to a head.” [no more mention of an opposition to adpositions]
The “Satellite” controversy has been one of the centers of attention of the CNRS/TUL “Trajectory” Project. The clarification above has been inspired by this project and is further discussed in Imbert, Grinevald, and Söres (forthcoming). For the sake of relevance and brevity, the topic is not treated in the present article; the latter thus relies on Talmy’s original definition and only refers to satellites through constructional considerations, namely through the notion of “framing types”.

Talmy’s typology of V-framing vs. S-framing has been so far widely used by linguists in the description of Motion events language-internally and crosslinguistically. However, as Talmy’s typology was progressively extended to a larger sample of languages and more thoroughly studied by specialists of each language, new problems were raised, making his typological claims more controversial.

2. Making Path Stand Out: The Manner Element Lurking Below

The first line of controversy addresses Talmy’s typology “from the inside” and seeks to refine it. When it comes to Talmy’s dichotomy of framing types, it was pointed out that, in some languages, blurry situations make them difficult to classify in one framing type or the other. For instance, some languages exhibit V-framing or S-framing depending on the type of Path expressed: this may be called split-framing after Talmy’s term “split system of conflation” (Talmy 2000-II:64). To address such situations, Aske (1989), followed by Slobin and Hoiting (1994) and Slobin (1996a), proposed to refine the notion of Path into atelic vs. telic Path (Section 2.1) While trying to make Path distinctions stand out as typologically relevant, Aske’s conclusions somehow backfired against Talmy’s typology as a Path-centered typology: they indirectly emphasized the importance of the Manner element and somehow paved the way for new “Path vs. Manner” typological proposals (Sections 2.2).

2.1. SPLITTING THE ELEMENT OF PATH: THE TELICITY DISTINCTION

Aske (1989) reacted to Talmy’s (1985) first major work on lexicalization patterns by addressing the problem of a split system of Path encoding in Spanish. In Spanish, the predominant pattern belongs to a [motion + Path] conflation type, i.e. it makes this language stand out as V-framed. However, Spanish also exhibits a [motion + Co-event] conflation type in certain situations. According to Aske, this happens frequently and significantly enough to be considered. He thus tried to find out in what conditions a V-framed language like Spanish accepts constructions belonging to another (S-framed) framing type, and why this is possible in some languages while other languages are more consistent in their predominant type and fail to qualify as split systems.

Aske adopted a syntactic view and examined [Verb + Adverbal] and [Verb + Prepositional Phrase] constructions expressing Motion events. He argued that, in Spanish, such constructions may sometimes qualify as V-framed (7a,b) and some other times as S-framed (8a,b). In (7a,b), Path is encoded in the main verb, while the Co-event (here Manner) is somehow subordinated to Path as it is expressed in an optional gerund form: this corresponds to prototypical V-framing. Conversely in (8a,b), the Co-event [Manner] is encoded in the main verb and Path is encoded in the preposition, which corresponds to S-framing:
V-framing in Spanish (after Talmy 2000-II:49)

a. La botella entró a la cueva (flotando)
Figure motion + Path Path Ground (Manner)
“The bottle floated into the cave”

b. La botella salió de la cueva (flotando)
Figure motion + Path Path Ground (Manner)
“The bottle floated out of the cave”

S-framing in Spanish (after Aske 1989:3)

a. La botella flotó hacia/hasta la cueva
Figure motion + Manner Path Ground
“The bottle floated toward/to the cave”

b. La pelota rodó desde el tercer piso
Figure motion + Manner Path Ground
“The ball rolled from the third floor”

Aske argued that this split-framing situation is triggered by a conceptual distinction between two kinds of Path, which he labeled “telicity” (after Vendler 1967). In (7a,b), the Path followed by the Figure is telic: the Figure passes the boundary of the Ground the cave (from “the outside of the cave” to “the inside of the cave”, and vice versa). In (8a,b) however, the Path followed by the Figure is atelic: the Figure is not passing the boundary of the Ground the cave / the third floor: it reaches the boundary or detaches itself from the boundary, but it does not cross that boundary. Therefore, Aske argued that in Spanish the use of S-framing such as in (8a,b) is possible only if the Path expressed is atelic. In terms of conflation types, this means that Spanish speakers may use a [motion + Manner] conflating verb only if the Figure does not cross a Ground boundary. Conversely, they cannot use a [motion + Manner] conflating verb if the Figure does cross a Ground boundary; instead, they strongly tend to use a [motion + Path] conflating verb. Table 3 summarizes these conclusions.

Note that using a non-conflating motion verb (such as go, move...) constitutes a different issue. In such cases, the verb just encodes [motion] and the specification of Path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path type</th>
<th>Conflation type</th>
<th>Type of strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atelic</td>
<td>[motion + Manner] verb</td>
<td>S-framed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telic</td>
<td>[motion + Path] verb</td>
<td>V-framed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Split system of path encoding in Spanish.
(whether telic or atelic) is encoded in non-verbal elements such as prepositions or adverbs. Technically, such constructions qualify as S-framed. However, the possibility to use a non-conflating [motion] verb with a [Path] adverb or preposition seems to be a common feature of both V-framed and S-framed languages; it is therefore not a criteria for the attribution of framing types. Yet, the notion of split-framing may still be recycled in such occurrences in Spanish (9a,b). As opposed to atelic Path (9a), telic Path tends to require a more marked construction, with a locative adverb (9b); this is also more marked than the [motion + Path] verb construction for telic Path shown in (7).

(9) Non-conflating [motion] verb + [Path] adverb/preposition construction in Spanish

a. [motion] verb + atelic Path (unmarked)
   fueron a la casa (corriendo)
   [motion] Path Ground (Manner)
   "They went (ran) to the house"

b. [motion] verb + telic Path (marked)
   fueron adentro de la casa (corriendo)
   [motion] Path Ground (Manner)
   "They went (ran) into the house"

Therefore, split-framing could be addressed in terms of a telic vs. atelic Path constraint on V-framed languages. It does not contradict Talmy’s typology itself but points to the necessity to refine the semantic element of Path and to attend to leaks in the V-framed vs. S-framed dichotomy.

After Aske, Slobin and Hoiting (1994) and Slobin (1996a) relabeled the telicity effect in V-framed languages the “boundary-crossing constraint”, while extending Aske’s investigation from syntax to discourse pragmatics. Talmy (2000-II:64–7), he later recognized Aske’s distinction and incorporated the related data in his typology. He even added examples of other kinds of “split-framing”, different from what happens in Spanish: one is about Emai (after Schaefer 1988), where V-framing is apparently used only for self-agentive Motion events (reflexive caused motion), while S-framing is apparently used for agentive (caused motion) and non-agentive Motion events (spontaneous motion). Some specialists (such as Folli 2008 on Italian) proposed that split-framing could be lexically-triggered, in the sense that S-framing constructions would be allowed with a specific set of [motion + Manner] verbs. Yet other specialists have explored more complex situations; for instance, Filipovic (2007:38 and 109ff) studied the importance of temporality in Serbo-Croatian Motion event expressions: atelic + no change of location, vs. telic + moment-of-change of location, vs. telic + change of location occurred.5) The question of split-framing is thus still not fully settled.

Talmy (2000) actually added other types of “leaks” affecting his dichotomy, for instance parallel-framing in Greek, illustrated in (10): V-framing and S-framing may be used indifferently for the same types of Motion events and with the same level of colloquiality.6 This situation could be collapsed with that found in Shona (Schaefer and Gaines 1997), illustrated in (11) and which Fortis and Fagard7 (2010-II:24) label “alternate framing”; however, Fortis and Fagard underline that V-framing vs. S-framing uses in Shona might be pragmatically-driven:
(10) Parallel-framing in Greek (after Talmy 2000-II:65)

a. V-framed strategy

\[ \text{bika (trekhondas) s-to spiti} \]
\[ \text{motion + Path (Manner) Path Ground} \]
\[ \text{I. entered (running) in-the house} \]
\[ \text{‘I ran into the house’} \]

b. S-framed strategy

\[ \text{etrekxa mesa s-to spiti} \]
\[ [\text{motion + Manner}] \text{ Path Path Ground} \]
\[ \text{I. ran in to-the house} \]
\[ \text{‘I ran into the house’} \]

(11) Parallel-framing in Shona (simplified; Fortis and Fagard 2010-III:24, after Schaefer and Gaines 1997:213ff)

a. muana uakapinda mumba achimahnya
\[ \text{[Figure] [motion + Path] Ground Manner} \]
\[ \text{child entered room while.he.ran} \]
\[ \text{‘The child ran into the room’} \]

b. muana uakamhanya achipinda mumba
\[ \text{[Figure] [motion + Manner] Path Ground} \]
\[ \text{child ran while.he.entered room} \]
\[ \text{‘The child ran into the room’} \]

Table 4 summarizes the notion of framing types in Talmy (2000), after the different proposals and additions made to Talmy’s (1985) original proposal; the column “Constrained” indicates whether the framing type depends on the type of motion or Path expressed.

Still, beyond split-framing and parallel-framing, languages sometimes exhibit both V-framing and S-framing in a more unclear fashion. Recent studies have explored the potential influence of diachronic processes (such as grammaticalization) leading to typological shifts from S-framed to V-framed and resulting in states of “hybrid” framing. Such studies somehow carry the debate about typological “leaks” into diachronic typology. The scope of this paper does not allow an excursion into this vast topic. For S-framed to V-framed typological shifts, the reader is redirected to Kopecka (2004; 2006; forthcoming) on French and to Méndez Dosuna (1997), Skopeteas (2008) and Imbert (2008) on Greek. See also Iacobini (2009) and Iacobini and Masini (2006) for a “live” observation of the current emergence of S-framing in V-framed Italian, by way of verb-particle constructions.

Overall, the split-framing controversy had an interesting double effect. On the one hand, it participated in refining the concept of Path. It also produced tools to attend to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of framing</th>
<th>Path in V</th>
<th>Path not in V</th>
<th>Constrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-framing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-framing</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split-framing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parallel-framing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
typological leaks in Talmy’s framework. Overall, Aske’s paper emphasized the necessity to use framing types to classify Path-encoding constructions – rather than “languages” – as belonging to one type or the other. On the other hand, it indirectly underlined the importance of considering Manner: split-framing issues involve looking at Path-encoding with respect to Manner-encoding. While V-framing usually stands out as “the type that encodes Path in the verb”, languages such as Spanish tell us the story of how Manner is treated in some instances of so-called “V-framing”: for instance, depending on whether Path is atelic or telic, Manner will or will not lurk into the main verb. The attention of some specialists somehow unfocused from the concept of Path by and for itself; further studies rather went for a more pronounced “Path and Manner” conception of Talmy’s typological framework. Moreover, the description of “leaky situations” such as split-framing or hydrid systems encouraged proposals for a more gradient typology of Motion event, as more and more languages were incorporated.

2.2. UNFOCUSING FROM THE PATH ELEMENT: THE “PATH AND MANNER” PERSPECTIVE

To clearly understand how Manner has been foregrounded in discussions and controversies on Talmy’s typology, it is necessary to take into account the role of framing types in the encoding of Manner and, crucially, vice versa. For instance, speakers of V-framed languages are constrained to stick to a [motion + Path] conflation type when expressing Path, thus encoding Manner into an optional, subordinated surface element (or not so clearly in split systems). Another way to put it is to say that speakers of V-framed languages tend to pass on attending to Manner when expressing Path. Conversely, speakers of S-framed languages may use a [motion + Co-event] conflation type, whichever kind of Path they express in the Motion event; another way to put it is to say that speakers of S-framed languages tend to attend to Manner anyway. Such an angle of observation was adopted by Slobin (2004:250), who actually proposed to reconsider Talmy’s dichotomy of S-framed and V-framed as a continuum, a cline of “Manner salience”, from high Manner salient languages to low Manner salient languages. According to Slobin’s proposal, high Manner salient languages provide a ready slot for Manner encoding and a large lexicon of Manner verbs; low Manner salient languages subordinate Manner to Path, exhibit a telicity constraint that enhances subordination of Manner and provide a smaller lexicon of Manner verbs. More crucially, Slobin proposes a Manner-centered gradient typology instead of Talmy’s Path-centered dichotomic typology. Interestingly, a similar and yet reverse angle of observation was proposed by Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2009), with a cline of “Path salience”, from high Path salient languages to low Path salient languages. Although this draws the attention back on Path, it actually completes Slobin’s proposal in an interesting way: languages with accessible, easy to process and frequent Path-encoding devices tend to exhibit more elaborate expressions of Path. Ibarretxe-Antuñano thus focuses on elaborately complex Paths and goes beyond Talmy’s initial proposal: it is not about whether Path is in the verb or a satellite; it is about how elaborate Path-encoding may get in a language, whether V-framed or S-framed. This stresses the importance of considering for each language the specificities of its morphosyntactic toolbox and cultural grounding, all independently of its “typogenetic” classification.

These refinements and reformulations of Talmy’s framework actually worked their way into the domains of psycholinguists, more particularly so through Slobin’s (1996b) work, which has dealt with language acquisition and linguistic relativism. His conclusions on Path and Manner expression led him to the “thinking for speaking” hypothesis: speaking is not a direct encoding of percepts; there is a specific thinking process that acts as a filter...
between perception and expression, and that filter is conditioned by the grammar of our native language. Stemming from Slobin’s work, recent studies confronted speakers with non-linguistic tasks and tested Talmy’s typology through the lens of a “Path and Manner” perspective. If the way Path and Manner are treated grammatically in our language affects the way we express our reasoning about Motion events, does it also affect the way we reason about Motion events?

Table 5 compares some experimental aspects of five studies: Gennari et al. (2002), Papafragou et al. (2002, 2008), Finkbeiner, Nicol, Greth, and Nakamura 2002 and Soroli and Hickmann (2010).

These five studies do not focus on Path itself nor propose a different treatment for different subtypes of Path, such as Aske’s atelic vs. telic Path. Path expression is studied through Manner expression, and vice versa. Two groups of speakers, each time from a “Path language” (V-framed) or from a “Manner language” (S-framed) were confronted with a Motion event scene and then to non-linguistic tasks such as recognition of the scene (memory), categorization (similarity judgement) of two other scenes with respect to the first; some studies also conducted eye-tracking experiments. All of these studies concluded that linguistic patterns of Motion event encoding do not influence the speaker’s reasoning about Motion events, except when the speaker relies on linguistic reasoning. For instance, in a categorization task, the speakers’ answers reflected the framing type of their language if and only if they had to verbally describe the scene before the task or were instructed in advance to do so after the task. In short and as stated by Gennari et al. (2002), “linguistic and non-linguistic performance are dissociable, but language-specific regularities made available in the experimental context may mediate the speaker’s performance in specific tasks”. However, Soroli and Hickmann’s (2010) paper led to a different result: it showed an influence of framing types on a categorization task even where no verbalization was required, before or after the task. Speakers of English and French were shown either a target video or a target sentence. For instance in Figure 1, both visual and verbal stimuli describe a woman on a bike going into a building through an open door.

“There is someone cycling in” / “On voit quelqu’un qui entre à vélo” Then the speakers were shown two other videos. Schematized in Figure 2 and in Figure 3 are two variants of Figure 1: in Figure 2, the Path followed by the Figure is the same (entering), but the Manner differs (walking); in Figure 3, the Path followed by the Figure differs (exiting), but the Manner is the same (biking).

Table 5. Five studies on the effects of “path and manner” linguistic treatment on motion event conceptualization.
For each set of videos, the speakers were asked to choose, as fast as they could and by pressing a key on a keyboard, which one of the two videos seemed the most similar to the target stimulus they had been shown. When the target stimulus (Figure 1) was visual and therefore non-verbal, French speakers mostly chose the same-Path video (Figure 2), while English speakers equally chose between the same-Path video (Figure 2) and the same-Manner video (Figure 3). French speakers therefore put less attention on Manner than English speakers; French speakers subordinated Manner to Path. Now when the target stimulus was verbal, the results showed the same tendency – although this time there was an increase in the choice of the same-Manner video, substantially for French speakers and more significantly for English speakers.

Therefore, this section has shown which kind of proposals were made to build on Talmy’s original proposal: some sought to refine its conceptual framework by addressing Path itself, some aimed at reformulating it to extend typological generalizations and improve language descriptions, and some other led test studies beyond a purely linguistic
scope of analysis. Aske’s paper definitely pointed to the necessity of defining the concept of Path further and include subtypes of it into theoretical and typological considerations. Slobin’s (2004) and Ibarretxe-Antuñano (2009) proposals should be seen as complementing Talmy’s typology, rather than as contradicting it. In a way, they are as binary as Talmy’s original proposal: they still end up classifying languages between two extremes of a continuum (by contrast, other studies such as Croft et al. 2010 have expanded Talmy’s binary schema by adding new types of framing, going rather for triangular schemas (cf. Section 3). Moreover, Talmy’s original typology may also be conceived as a continuum: notions such as split-framing and “hybrid” framing proved it gradient and evolutive. Finally, psycholinguistics has been one extension domain for Talmy’s linguistic typology, especially through the frame of linguistic relativism and language acquisition; it did not aim to provide further tools for description or generate more conceptual distinctions, but nonetheless provided a fascinating testing ground for Motion event typologies within the cognitively central domain of Space.

The third and last section of this article shows how Talmy’s typology has also been the target of tougher criticism and more “alternative” typological proposals. New “types” of framing and more significant reorganizations of the V-framed vs. S-framed dichotomy arose, sometimes leading to downright cacophony, when proposals and counter-proposals did not always “echo” each other.

3. From Dichotomy to Cacophony: Frame These Paths!

In Talmy’s framework (1972, 1985, 2000), the opposition “V-framing vs. S-framing” was proposed in the light of a limited number of language families. The prototype for V-framing was essentially built on Romance languages and Hebrew, while the prototype for S-framing was essentially built on Germanic and Slavic languages. Then, in Talmy’s own work and very early after, the scope of the available literature on Path-encoding broadened; however, the narrow scope of the initial prototypes tended to act as a sort of “template” in which languages had to be put: is Language X “V-framed” like Romance languages or “S-framed” like Germanic and Slavic languages? Finally, when such a template proved insufficient, issues were raised and new proposals were made. Section 2 showed how further refinements dealt with “leaky” framing types (Aske 1989, Slobin and Hoiting 1994, Slobin 1996a, diachronic studies such as Kopecka forthcoming, Iacobini 2009, among others). However, when it came to families such as Sino-Tibetan, Niger-Congo or Austronesian, or tricky constructions such as “complex predicates”, even more difficulties arose and, finally, more drastic modifications of Talmy’s framework were suggested. Some specialists pointed out the exclusion from Talmy’s typology of less common framing strategies, such as those relying on voice markers (3.1) – which in truth are not usually thought of as prototypical members of a language’s Path-encoding toolbox. Some others proposed extensions or reorganizations of Talmy’s typology, such as equipollent-framing and symmetric-framing (3.2).

3.1. PATH WHERE YOU DID NOT EXPECT IT: “VOICE-FRAMING”

Verbs, preverbs, verb particles, prepositions, locative adverbs: these are surface elements where one would expect the semantic element of Path to be encoded. V-framing vs. S-framing determination mostly involved these “grammatical categories”. However, so far and as pointed out by Fortis and Fagard (2010-III), the literature failed to consistently
address other types of grammatical elements, within the frame of Motion event typology: voice markers are such elements.

Voice markers are usually not dedicated to Path encoding. Active voice, passive voice, reflexive voice and the like are concepts usually encoded in inflectional or derivational verbal markers, and which modify the “valency” of the verb: they add or remove arguments from the scope of the verb, and reorganize semantic roles such as Agent and Patient. But voices may also be used to encode or participate in the encoding of Path. For instance in Tagalog and in other Austronesian languages of the Philippines, the precise determination of Path is a task often left to Voice, as illustrated in (17a–c) and (18). In (17a–c), the verb stem lakad ‘walk’ conflates [motion + Manner]. The preposition sa encodes a totally undefined Path and is glossed “LOC”: it just conveys an idea of “location”. The determination of Path relies on the use of Voice, with a simple active voice marker (SAV) or a complex active voice marker (CAV): in (17a), the SAV allows to interpret the Path followed by the Figure as ‘on the bridge’ or ‘up to the bridge’; in (17b), the CAV favors the ‘on the bridge’ interpretation. In (17c), another voice marker (directional-locative; DLV) dismisses the ‘up to the bridge’ interpretation altogether; note in that case the absence of the preposition sa:

(17) Voice marking for Path-encoding in Tagalog (simplified; after Fortis 2006ms)

a. Simple active voice

Lumakad

[[motion+Manner]+Path] [Figure] [Path] [Ground]

SAV.walked I.NOMINATIVE LOC bridge

‘I walked on / up to the bridge’

b. Complex active voice

Naglakad

[[motion+Manner]+Path] [Figure] [Path] [Ground]

CAV.walked I.NOMINATIVE LOC bridge

‘I walked on (up to) the bridge’

c. Directional-Locative voice

Nilakaran

[[motion+Manner]+Path] [Figure] [Ground]

DLV.walked I NOMINATIVE bridge

‘I walked on the bridge’

Tagalog and some related languages such as Ilokano and Cebuano also exhibit a “conveyance voice” (Fortis and Fagard 2010–III:29 after Himmelmann 2004a, 2004b). In Motion events, the conveyance voice marker (CV) i- encodes the idea of a “transfer of the Figure to the Ground”, such as shown in (18a,b). Note how in (18b) it may be attached to non-verbal stems to create a verb that incorporates the semantic element of Ground:
Now what do we do with these examples, when it comes to assign a framing type to them? For the examples in (17a–c), the encoding of the semantic element of Path is distributed in the voice markers and in the undefined preposition *sa*. Should we consider that type of Path-encoding strategy as S-framing because Path is not encoded in the verb stem? However, if Voice is a “verbal” concept, if these Tagalog markers are Voice markers and if Voice markers are verbal inflections not unlike Tense or Mood, then they should be considered as part of the verb and Voice-framing should be considered as a subtype of V-framing: Path is encoded in the verb – by way of inflection. Now how can we maintain this analysis in example (18b), where there is no verb stem at all? According to Fortis and Fagard (2010–III:29), “the base is not a verb before it is prefixed with the conveyance voice affix and functions like a verb in a clause; it is therefore the voice inflection and the base that form a verb”. For that reason, Fortis and Fagard propose to classify the Tagalog strategy of Voice-framing as a sub-type of V-framing that they label “V-framed inflectional”.

The problem of Voice-framing is not a superfluous one as it includes applicative markers, which are much more widespread than the Tagalog type of voice markers and which also exhibit Path-encoding uses. The analysis of their spatial uses is not clear-cut either across studies, let alone their classification into framing types (for instance, Fortis and Fagard tentatively proposed to classify them as a sub-type of S-framing). For applicative constructions, the reader is referred to Creissels (2006–II:73ff) and Payne (1997:186–91) for a general discussion; for spatial uses, see for instance Creissels (2004) for Tswana, Grégoire (1998) for Haya, Michaelis and Ruppenhofer (2001) for German.

This sub-section on the specific issue of Voice-framing had a broader scope: it aimed to show how problems arise when the nature of the surface element that encodes Path cannot easily be determined: Talmy’s dichotomy V-framing vs. S-framing requires a clear identification of what element is the verb element and what element is not the verb element. This question is at the core of another hot debate on framing type: the equipollent-framing and symmetric-framing proposals.

### 3.2. EQUIPOLLENT-FRAMING AND SYMMETRIC-FRAMING

Controversies arose from the analysis of languages exhibiting “atypical V-framing”, very different from V-framing in Romance languages. One of the most discussed types of such constructions is complex predication, namely constructions where *two or more verbs syntactically act together as one predicate*. Much in line with perspectives foregrounding the importance of Manner to address Path, specialists showed how in such constructions, *both*
**Manner and Path are encoded in verbs.** Complex predicates include different sub-types of constructions such as serial verbs (see for an introduction Aikhenvald 2006) or “coverbs” (see Schultze-Berndt 2000, 2006 for coverbs in Jaminjungan languages).

For complex predicates in Path-encoding, the reader is referred for instance by Zlatev and Yangklang (2004) on Thai (Tai-Kadai family), Ameka and Essegbey (2006) on Ewe (Niger-Congo), or Lambert-Bretière (2009) in Fon (Niger-Congo). Example (22) illustrates Thai; the complex predicate appears in bold:

(22) Serial verb construction in Thai (after Zlatev and Yangklang 2004:165)

\[
\text{chán} \quad \text{doén} \quad \text{khāam} \quad \text{thanôn} \\
[\text{Figure}] \quad [\text{motion + Manner}] \quad [\text{motion + Path}] \quad [\text{Ground}] \\
\text{I} \quad \text{walk} \quad \text{cross} \quad \text{road} \\
\]

I walked across the road’

In (22), a [motion + Manner] conflating verb is associated to a [motion + Path] conflating verb to form a complex predicate. In this Thai example as well as in the Spanish examples in (7), Path is encoded in a verb; this should qualify both constructions as V-framed. However, there has been disagreement on the matter. In Thai, both verbs appear to be two equal parts of a construction; this is different from Path-encoding verbs in Spanish that are associated with subordinate Manner-encoding gerund forms. Slobin (2004) and Croft et al. (2010) thus proposed a third type of framing to address such complex predicates, based on the grammatical (a)symmetry of the encoding of Path and Manner. Slobin labeled his type *Equipollent-framing*, while Croft et al. labeled theirs *Symmetrical-framing*. This made Talmy’s dichotomy a trichotomy; it is presented as defined by Slobin in Table 6. Note that Croft et al. adopted a more constructional approach and included Path-encoding constructions as well as resultative constructions – this follows from Talmy (1991), as mentioned in Section 1.2.

While Slobin’s proposal clearly stressed the role of the Manner element, Croft et al. (2010:206–7) put a more general stress on the *asymmetricality* of Talmy’s typology: in both V-framing and S-framing, Path or Manner is encoded in one verb acting as the main predicate; the “remaining” element of the two is encoded in a surface element that cannot act as an independent main predicate. Hence the need for a third, *symmetrical* framing type, for complex verb constructions where Path and Manner are encoded in two parts of the main predicate. Slobin’s and Croft et al.’s proposals were received as a useful tool in the literature on complex predicates and Motion-event encoding. One may see two reasons why a third type of framing helped discuss the matter:

### Table 6. From dichotomy to trichotomy: the intermediary E-framing type (after Slobin 2004:248–9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framing type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V-framing</td>
<td>Path preferentially expressed in a verb; Manner subordinated to path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-framing</td>
<td>Path and manner expressed by equivalent grammatical forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-framing</td>
<td>Path preferentially expressed in a non-verbal element; Manner not subordinated to path</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• First, as developed above, V-framing has been initially studied in greater proportions through Romance languages. These languages acted as a template for V-framing, a reference point from which exceptions were analyzed, such as split-framing phenomena within Romance languages. However, the more typology came to incorporate a growing diversity of languages, the more this template faced situations where even fundamental features of V-framing were not present (Slobin 2004:250): small Manner verb inventories as compared to S-framed languages; telicity constraint favoring Path verbs as main verbs; and most prominently subordination of Manner to Path.

• Second, as developed in Section 2.2, Manner has been given more importance than Talmy originally intended, for instance through the notions of telicity, split-framing, Manner salience. Slobin’s and Croft et al.’s proposals for a ‘more symmetrical’ framing type may thus be seen as building on these tendencies.

They had the interesting effect of focusing the attention on languages that exhibit complex predicates and motivated the elaboration of new methodological tools to incorporate such languages in a typology of Motion event. Unfortunately, the matter is still not settled. Some constructions that could be analyzed as equipollent/symmetrical-framed may actually fit Talmy’s original typology depending on one’s conception of verbhood and on one’s analysis of the language system as a whole. Examples (23a–c) compare complex predicates in Fon, Japanese and Ewe:

(23) Complex predicates
   a. Fon (simplified, after Lambert-Bretière 2009:14)
      cukú clon tón sin kó c me
dog def jump exit from room def in
   ‘The dog jumped out from the room’
   b. Ewe (Ameka and Essegbey 2006:394)
      é-tá  do le xà-a me
5SG-crawl exit LOC building containing.region
   ‘S/he crawled out of the room’
   c. Japanese
      hukuroo-ga tobi- dasi- ta
owl-SUBj fly- exit- PAST
   ‘An owl flew out’

Let us take Fon and Ewe, two related Gbe languages from the Kwa branch of the Niger-Congo family. The Fon construction in (23a) was analyzed as S-framed by Lambert-Bretière. Although it does occur independently as a main predicate, *tn ‘exit’ is not a full lexical verb anymore in (23a): it grammaticalized to the state of ‘satellite verb’, namely it lost some degrees of verbhood and got ‘satellized’.12 Here, it simply encodes the Path of the [motion + Manner] verb *ln ‘jump’, not unlike the verb particle *out in English.

Now in Ewe, the construction in (23b) was analyzed as E-framed by Ameka and Essegbey (2006:394) because both *tá ‘crawl’ and *do ‘exit’ can be analyzed as lexical verbs. However, as remarked by the authors (Ameka and Essegbey (2006:367)), the expression of a transl(oc)ational motion in Ewe actually necessitates Path to be encoded in an extra verb. According to Fortis and Fagard (2010), as Talmy’s typology is about where Path is encoded, this qualifies transl(oc)ational Ewe constructions as V-framed. However, is the [motion + Manner] verb subordinated to the [Path] verb here? Note that this also
suggests a distinction within the system of the language based on the type of motion and/or Path involved, not unlike what is found in split framing.

Finally in (23c), the Japanese construction is usually analyzed as V-framed, for instance by Matsumoto (2003). The latter actually proposed to circumvent the problem. He supported Talmy’s Path-centered typology in the sense that he argued in favor of a focus on where Path is encoded. But he also relabeled Talmy’s framing types into Head framing vs. Non-head framing, the term ‘head’ referring to the syntactic head of the sentence that encodes a Motion event.13 This clearly delimitates syntactic and lexical matters: on the matter of verbs, they may be head or non-head. But in the case of complex predicates, how do one determine which verb is the actual syntactic head of the sentence? May both verbs constitute a syntactic head?

Talmy (2009) made a proposal that argues against the overuse of the notion of “equipollent-framing”, by clarifying some aspects of his typology and proposing descriptive tools as to the verbhood of verbs and the determination of the main verb. First, he clarified his typology. On the semantic layer, he insisted that in his original typology Path was supposed to be the only element in focus; it is not about the Co-event (Talmy 2009:389–90):

“This concept of framing type makes no appeal to the presence versus absence of a co-event or its characteristic location, but only to the characteristic location of the Path, which unlike the co-event is seen as criterial to a Motion event […]” (emphasis mine)

On the surface layer, Talmy analyzed the equipollent-framing proposal as a controversy about languages where it is not clear whether the Path-encoding constituent is the main verb of the sentence or a “satellite verb”, i.e. an element syntactically dependent to the main verb, but which may also be verbal in nature. He therefore elaborated a descriptive tool, a set of several factors to “measure” the degree of verbhood of surface elements and determine which verb is the main verb in a series of different types of complex predicates (serial verbs, coverbs and certain kinds of polysynthetic constructions).

To conclude, equipollent or symmetrical framing types have emerged as theoretical tools for fitting some problematic types of constructions into an expanded Motion event typology. In their paper, Croft et al. (2010:201–2) first statement was that “Talmy’s typological classification of complex events must be elaborated to include additional types”. Although additional types do “frame” real issues, they did not settle the debate on these problematic constructions. However, they definitely come in support of a constructional conception of Motion event typologies. As Croft et al. put it, “Talmy’s typological classification applies to individual complex event types within a language, not to languages as a whole”. This confirms what was anticipated by earlier works on split-framing and typological shifts in Path encoding, when similar issues were met in more familiar types of constructions and languages.

4. Conclusion

This article aimed to get an overview of some recent typological generalizations on Path based on Talmy’s framework and how they interact together in the elaboration of a theoretical framework for Path expression in human languages. Studies of crosslinguistic variation revealed patterns of similarity in Motion event encoding systems but also intratypological and intra-language leaks in such systems. In the end, studies brought up interesting questions as to how typology should be envisaged. One may suggest that a typology of Path expression should not aim to classify languages into discrete framing
types, but to classify strategies adopted in languages for the expression of Path; such strategies rely on a morphosyntactic toolbox, a set of constructions, which allows variety of expression and also constrains such variety. Typologies leak, and languages relate to each other through a continuum of constructions which speakers may or may not use according to different subtypes of spatial situations. Still, the notion of framing types may act not so much as a template but rather as a compass, a descriptive tool for typological classification and generalization.

However, Talmy’s proposal also raised a firework of discussions and issues that do not always echo each other so well. Some points of disagreement appear to need urgent attention, if one aims to elaborate a coherent typology. First, the notion of Path itself is not concensual; it has received different analyses and does not always cover the same scope: should it refer both to translocation and location, or just translocation? Should it incorporate other conceptual elements such as Deixis? Should a proper typology of Path also include fictive Path (e.g. ‘he looked up toward the ceiling’)? What about “conceptual extensions” of Path-encoding expressions, such as Time? Second, other recent proposals argued for alternative Motion event typological frameworks and are playing along different lines. This is the case for instance of Bohnemeyer et al. (2007), who proposed a typology based on the linguistic segmentation of Motion event in languages. They draw a different landscape for Path encoding. Some languages (Type 1) may express several subevents, several portions of Path (initial, final, median) in one single clause (“macro-event”; cf. Talmy 1991, [2000]); such languages cover (a) S-framing, where a single verb phrase may support multiple translative Path-encoding phrases, or (b) Serialization, where a serial verb may encode several portions of translative Path. Some other languages (Type 2) may express the initial and the final portion of Path in one single verb phrase, but will generally need a second verb phrase to express the median portion; such languages correspond to a subtype of V-framing, namely “double marking V-framing”, which admits simultaneous encoding of Path portions in the verb phrase and in additional Ground phrases (such as adpositional phrases). Finally, other languages (Type 3), require a different verb phrase for each portion of Path expressed; such languages cover another subtype of V-framing, namely “radical V-framing”, where Path may be encoded only in the verb root.

Although Bohnemeyer et al.’s syntactic paper implies more notions and a more complex analysis than exposed in these concluding remarks, it is worth mentioning as a good example of how additional frameworks have been sprouting from earlier Talmian proposals, how they tend to refocus on the encoding of Path itself, and how such frameworks are heading further into the definition of Path as a complex and multidimensional concept.
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### Notes

* Correspondence address: Caroline Imbert, LIDILEM, Université Stendhal - Grenoble 3, UFR LLASIC, BP 25, 38040 Grenoble Cedex 9. Email: imbert.caroline@gmail.com

1 If the term “locatedness” refers to static localization, the term “motion” involves subtypes (Talmy 2000:II-25-26 but also Borillo 1998:38–9). A self-contained motion involves a movement of the Figure without change of location (locational) in the time period of its movement (e.g. rotation, oscillation, change of posture such as kneeling down, sitting down, standing up etc.); a transl(oc)ational motion involves a movement with a change of location of the Figure in the time period of its movement (e.g. go, come, exit, etc.).

2 The use of the term “Path” in both locational and translational Motion events is not the only use attested in the literature. For instance, Jackendoff (1983:162–3) makes a clear distinction between what should be linked to a “Path-function” (e.g. to, from, via...) or to a “Place-function” (e.g. on, at, under...). Zlatev (2007) has pointed to the ambiguity of the concept of “Path” and have proposed alternative terminological treatments. The reader should thus be aware that Path is used in this paper as defined by Talmy in his cognitive semantics framework.

3 Overall, similar frameworks have been proposed by other linguists, notably by Langacker (1987), Vandeloise (1986) and Jackendoff (1983), although they adopt a slightly different terminology. For instance, concerning Figure and Ground, one finds the French terms cible and site in Vandeloise (1986); theme and reference in Jackendoff (1983); trajector and landmark in Langacker (1979, 1981, 1987), after Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976) – Langacker also uses the term trajectory instead of Path. Talmy’s terminology is partly adapted from the Gestalt theory in psychology, which focuses on the visual perception of figures and forms.

4 “Distribution” includes what Croft et al. (2010:2/08) labeled “double-framing constructions”; their work will be addressed in Section 3 for their “syntactical-framing” proposal.

5 It ought to be noted that Filipović (2007) does not isolate “Path verbs” in her terminology but refers instead to “directional verbs”, which include both Path verbs and “Deixis” verbs; Deixis situates a Motion event with respect to the speaker or the hearer (e.g. away from the speaker, toward the speaker, etc). It is not clear in the literature whether Deixis should be considered as a “sub-type” of Path or as a different conceptual element altogether (cf. for a general reading Anderson and Keenan 1985, Fillmore 1997). Moreover, even those among these directional verbs that do correspond to Path verbs (Filipović 2007:132) are based on the stem  ili ‘go’ and may also be analysed as Motion verbs with a Path-encoding prefix. One verb however sticks to the “Path verb” definition adopted in this article, ulaziti ‘enter’ which encodes Path in its stem (as shown by Filipović 2007:77). This shows how terminology may differ from one specialist to another and asks the question of whether all controversies can be equally confronted to each other. For instance, if “directional verbs” here are not strictly Path verbs for other specialists, how does one include Filipović’s analysis into the issue of split-framing?

6 As opposed for instance to the verbs enter and exit in English, borrowed from Romance and which are not characteristically nor colloquially used in English.

7 Fortis and Fagard (2010) consists of a critical review of the literature and partly relies on the Trajectory Project’s work and comments from its members. It has been proposed as a course material at Leipzig's Summer School on Linguistic Typology in 2010 and is available online for the interested reader.

8 Other domains of paper have been a source of discussion as to the not-so-uncommon observation of both V-framing and S-framing in one language and the influence of additional parameters such as literacy or...
multilingualism; such as been the case of dialectology (for instance Berthele 2004 for varieties of German and French), intratypological studies and language acquisition (see for instance the edited volume by Strömqvist and Verhoeven 2004).

9 Diachronic studies may be seen as refining typologies, as they may address typological leaks such as ‘split-framing’ in a way synchronic approaches cannot; ultimately, they generally constitute one more argument in favor of conceiving typologies as continua rather than discrete juxtapositions of types.

10 Cebuano (cf. for instance Tanangkingsing 2004) offers a particularly tricky Ground for Talmy’s typology, as it also exhibit complex predicates – cf. Section 3.2 for that notion.

11 Fortis slightly revises his analysis in Fortis and Vittrant (forthcoming:81).

12 For the notion of “satellization” in complex predicates, cf. Imbert, Grinevald, and Söres (forthcoming) and Fortis and Vittrant (forthcoming), both in the same volume.

13 Thus when Path is encoded in prepositions, which are the local head of a prepositional phrase but not the head of the sentence, the construction is classified as Non-head framed.
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