Revising Talmy's Typology of Motion Events in the Light of Chinese

Jie Yang

J.Yang-13@sms.ed.ac.uk

SSRG, University of Edinburgh

Talmy (1975, 1985, 1991 and 2000) studies Motion event from the perspective of lexicalization. Talmy (2000) proposes six basic semantic elements to describe Motion event; they are Figure, Motion, Path, Ground, Manner, and Cause. The surface elements which conflate the Path information decide the language typology. For example, English is identified as the representation of satellite-framed language and Spanish verb-framed language. Chinese is included in the first group.

However, Slobin (1996, 1997, 2002, 2003 and 2006) argues that Chinese must be an equipollent-framed language, a third language type. The evidence is the serial verb constructions (SVC) in Chinese. In Slobin's analysis, *feī chū* 'fly exit' is a serial verb construction and he insists that *feī* 'fly' and *chū* 'exit' share the same grammatical status in that neither can be omitted for a complete expression of the action of flying out. The first verb encodes the manner information and the latter one expresses the path information. Omitting either part, the expression becomes unacceptable and cannot exactly describe the action. Therefore, Slobin adds the E-framed language to Talmy's dichotomy model.

Is it necessary to employ a third type of lexicalization pattern to account for Chinese? What is SVC?

References

Slobin, D. I. (1996). Two ways to travel: Verbs of motion in English and Spanish. In M. Shibatani & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning* (pp. 195-220). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Slobin, D. I. (1997). Mind, code, and text. In J. Bybee, J. Haiman, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Essays on language function and language type: Dedicated to T. Givón* (pp. 437-467). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Slobin, D. I. (2002). Language and thought online: Cognitive consequences of linguistic relativity. In D. Gentner & S. Goldin-Meadow (Eds.), *Advances in the investigation of language and thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Slobin, D. I. (2003). The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In S. S. L. Verhoeven (Ed.), *Relating Events in Narrative: Typological and Contextual Perspectives in Translation* (pp. 219-257). Mahwah: NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Slobin, D. I. (2006). What makes manner of motion salient? Explorations in linguistic typology, discourse, and cognition. In M. H. S. Robert (Ed.), *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories* (pp. 59-81). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Talmy, L. (1975). Semantics and syntax of motion. In J. Kimball (Ed.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 4* (pp. 181-238). New York: Academic Press.

Talmy, L. (1985). Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and lexical description: Vol. 3. Grammatical categories and the lexicon* (pp. 36-149). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, L. (1991). Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 17*, 480-519.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics: Vol. II: Typology and process in concept structuring*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.