Motion verbs: revisiting the manner/result complementarity in light of French data
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The typology of motion events established by Talmy (1985, 2000) contrasts verb framed languages with satellite framed languages, depending on whether the Path semantic component is expressed in the main verb or in a satellite. This typological division has led to the distinction between two classes of verbs: directed motion verbs (or path verbs) and manner of motion verbs (cf. Levin 1993). At the risk of a certain circularity, the telic/atelic aspectual criterion has supplanted the more complex criterion of change of place or of boundary crossing. Thus, in this perspective, the atelicity became a defining property of manner of motion verbs (walk) and telicity, a defining property of directed motion verbs (come).

Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2010, 2013) defended a general hypothesis according to which a verb lexicalizes either Manner or Path, but not both simultaneously in the same lexeme. Directed motion verbs are considered to describe a particular type of change of place assimilated to a resulting state. Thus their principle generally stipulates a complementarity between the expression of the manner and the result, generalized beyond the domain of motion. I will discuss the limits of this hypothesis by providing counter-examples drawn from the lexicon of French. I will rely on the classification of motion verbs from Aurnague 2011, and defend a conception of manner as independent features (Stosic 2009), potentially associated with any verbal lexeme. This analysis leads to rethinking Talmy’s typology of motion event and more fundamentally, the Manner / Path opposition. I will defend another perspective in which the manner and the Path may both be expressed as semantic features which can be co-lexicalized.
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