

Linguistic Variation and Lexical Parameters: The Case of Directed Motion

Minjeong Son, CASTL/University of Tromsø

1. **GOAL:** Linguistic variation across languages is often taken to arise due to a particular choice of parameter settings that determine language specific structural properties, i.e., ‘macro’-parametric approaches. The syntactic variation in the expression of directed motion has also been handled by the same application; it is often argued that cross-linguistic variation in expressing *run to the store* is driven by a macro-parametric setting that allows manner verbs to combine with goal PPs (e.g., Beck and Snyder 2001). This paper, however, shows that it is not a macro-parameter *per se* that derives the variation in directed motion by demonstrating counter-examples to such approaches. I further show that the variation is better explained by careful examination of individual adpositions that differ from one language to another, i.e. lexical parameters.

2. **BACKGROUND:** As is well known from Talmy’s (1985, 2000) typology on directed motion, satellite-framed languages (such as English) allow manner verbs to license directed motion interpretations with goal PPs, while verb-framed languages (such as Spanish) do not allow manner verbs to express directed motion (e.g., 1 & 2). Most of the previous works on directed motion argue that the syntactic variation shown in (1) and (2) is driven by syntactic (e.g., Mateu and Rigau 2001) or semantic (e.g., Beck and Snyder 2001) parameters that allow manner verbs to combine with goal (or telic path) PPs. Beck and Snyder (2001), in particular, claim that directed motion constructions such as (1a), goal PP constructions in their terminology, are best analyzed as resultatives, and that goal PP constructions are allowed only in languages that have “Principle R,” a rule of semantic composition that allows complex predicates to be interpretable as resultative. Accordingly, their approach predicts a strong correlation between resultative and goal PP constructions (as do several other parameter approaches); they claim that if a language allows adjectival resultatives, then the language should also allow goal PP constructions, given that both constructions are allowed by Principle R. For example, English/German are marked for Principle R and thus allow both resultatives, as in (3) and (4), and goal PPs, as in (1). Spanish doesn’t have Principle R and thus disallows both resultative, as in (5) and goal PPs, as in (2a).

3. **THE CROSS-LINGUISTIC CORRELATION REVISITED:** I demonstrate in this paper that the parametric approach defended in the works cited above cannot account for a broader range of cross-linguistic data. As more languages are investigated in greater detail, counterexamples emerge in each direction (e.g. Hebrew and Indonesian have manner verbs with goal PPs, but no resultatives (e.g., 6 & 7), while Korean has resultatives (e.g., 8), but no manner verbs with goal PPs. Czech is another language that challenges the putative correlation between directed motion and resultatives; it is similar to German in encoding directionality with manner verbs (i.e., case alternation), but it does not have adjectival resultative phrases, unlike German (examples omitted).

4. **THE SOURCE OF THE VARIATION:** By demonstrating additional problems that arise from the ‘macro’-parametric approaches, I argue that the cross-linguistic variation in directed motion is better explained by considering lexical featural properties of the adpositions in question. I show that the adpositions in verb-framed languages (e.g., Romance *a*, Korean *-ey*) that have often been considered to be equivalent to English *to*, a telic PathP, are not path-denoting adpositions, but place-denoting adpositions, i.e., PlaceP. (Here I adopt the decompositional theory of P that decomposes spatial P into Path and Place, where Place is embedded under Path, e.g., Svenonius 2006). The different lexical properties of the Place adpositions in verb-framed languages and the telic path *to* are confirmed by their ability to occur as complements of stative predicates, as in (9) and (10). I further show that the ungrammaticality of (2) in Spanish and Korean is explained by an event compositional rule under the decompositional theory of the verb phrase proposed by Ramchand (in press). In this framework, a verb phrase is decomposed into three different sub-eventual components as *init*(iation)P, *proc*(ess)P, and *res*(ult)P, as in (11). Each component is syntactically projected and forms a core predication structure with the specifier being filled by its subject. *Init*P introduces the causation/initiation of event and licenses different types of external argument. *Proc*P specifies the nature of the change or process and licenses the object of change or process. *Res*P gives the ‘telos’ of the event and licenses the object of result. The projection of each subeventual component is determined by verbal meaning. In this decompositional model of VP, verbs of the *proc*-type (e.g., manner verbs) cannot combine directly with PlaceP but select PathP as their complements due to event-argument homomorphism (e.g., Krifta 1998). Thus, the combination of manner verbs with path-denoting PPs (e.g., *to*-phrases) is possible (e.g., 1). However, the combination of manner verbs with place-denoting adpositions is not allowed in the system, hence the ungrammaticality of (2). I further

show that the current analysis also captures the possible combination of manner verbs and atelic path PPs (e.g., *toward*-phrase) in verb-framed languages, which the previous parameter approaches fail to account for.

(1) Satellite-framed languages (e.g., Indo-European except Romance, Chinese)

- a. Mary ran/walked/crawled to the store. (English)
- b. Hans lief/kroch zum Laden.
John ran/crawled to.the.DAT store
'John ran/crawled to the store.' (German)

(2) Verb-framed languages (e.g., Romance, Korean/Japanese, Semitic)

- a. *Juan anduvo/gateo a la tienda.
John walked/crawled to the store
'John ran/walked/crawled to the store.' (Spanish)
- b. *Mary-ka kakey-ey ttwi/kel/ki-ess-ta.
Mary-NOM store-LOC run/walk/crawl-PST-DC
'Mary ran/walked/crawled to the store.' (Korean)

(3) a. John pounded the meat flat. b. John broke the vase open. (English)

- (4) a. Sie haben den Tisch sauber gewischt.
they have the table clean wiped
'They wiped the table clean.'
- b. Die teekanne leer trinken.
the teapot empty drink
'Drink the teapot empty.' (German)

- (5) a. *John golpeó la carne plana.
John pounded the meat flat
'John pounded the meat flat.'
- b. *John frotó la mesa limpia.
John wiped the table clean
'John wiped the table clean.'

- (6) a. *Hu cava et ha-kir adom.
He painted ACC the-wall red
'He painted the wall red.'
- b. David rac/zaxal el ha-xeder.
David run/crawl to the-room
'David ran/crawled to the room.' (Hebrew)

- (7) a. *Tika menumbuk daging itu pennet.
Tika pound meat the flat
'Tika pounded the meat flat.'
- b. Tika berlari/berjalan/merangkak ke (dalam) ruangan.
Tika run/walk/crawl to (in) room
'Tika ran/walked/crawled (in)to the room.' (Indonesian)

- (8) Yenghi-ka thakca-lul kkaykkusha-key takk-ass-ta.
Yenghi-NOM table-ACC clean-PRED wipe-PAST-DC
'Yenghi wiped the table clean.'

- (9) a. Gianni é a casa di Maria.
John is LOC house of Maria
'John is at Maria's house.' (Italian)
- b. John-i hakkyo-ey iss-ta.
John-NOM school-LOC be-DC
'John is at school.' (Korean)

- (10) a. *John is to Mary's house. b. *John is to the back of the house.'

- (11) [iniP [DP *init* [procP [DP *proc* [resP [DP *res* [XP (e.g., Place/AdjP)]]]]]]]]

Selected References:

- Beck, Sigrid and William Snyder. 2001. Complex predicates and goal PPs: Evidence for a semantic parameter. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, edited by Anna H.-J. Do, Laura Dominguez, and Aimee Johansen, vol. 1, pp. 114–122. Cascadia Press, Somerville, MA.
- Ramchand, Gillian. in press. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax*. Cambridge University Press, available at <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000307>.