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In his article, Matsumoto first presents Talmy’s crosslinguistic typology of lexicalization patterns and of event integration related to motion event, along with the diverse interpretations of it that were born in recent years. He clarifies the nature of and differences between these interpretations.

Then, Matsumoto proposes a modification of Talmy’s typology. Matsumoto thinks that Talmy’s typology of verb- vs. satellite-framed languages suffers from the misleading use of the term “verb” : indeed, as he notices, in some languages verbs can be satellites, and satellites can also be verbs! He thus proposes an alternative to this problematic terminology, basing it on the syntactic function of what is meant by “verb” and “satellite”, rather than on their syntactic category.

Part 1 of the article

The first section presents Talmy’s typology of lexicalization patterns in the expression of motion event. Matsumoto distinguishes 3 types of them:

1. Manner or Cause conflated with Motion in the meaning of the verb (Manner/Cause+Motion),
2. or Path+Motion,
3. or Figure+Motion.

He insists that the subsequent literature mainly focused on the two first types, and mainly on Manner+Motion within the first type. Wienold (1995) and others have opposed “manner languages” vs. “path languages”.
Then, Matsumoto presents the 3 main interpretations found in the literature.

1. **The verb repertoire view**: Talmy’s typology as pointing to the difference in the richness of different types of motion verbs (+ manner of motion verbs vs. + path verbs). The verb is viewed as a lexical category.

2. **The sentence structure view**: Talmy’s typology as referring to what is encoded in the verb as the head of a sentence. The verb is viewed as referring to a syntactic position (the head of a sentence); similarly, the satellite is viewed in terms of its syntactic position or function in a clause (nonhead position), rather than in terms of its syntactic category. Thus, in this view, the focus is laid on how a sentence is semantically organized, whatever the lexical items.

3. **The manner verb difference view**: This view focuses on Talmy’s observation of the difference in nature of manner-of-motion verbs. This view highlights the fact that manner-of-motion verbs in Romance languages are not compatible with a (certain) goal phrase (e.g. “Paul walked to the station”), and seem to generalize this fact (these languages are not able to lexicalize Motion with Manner) and interpret this difference as the most crucial aspect of lexicalization typology. It is the interpretation of Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) and Kageyama & Yumoto (1997).

In the third section, Matsumoto gives Talmy’s position about all this (Talmy, p.c.). **Talmy’s own position is what Matsumoto has called the sentence structure view**, and according to Matsumoto it is clear in Talmy’s formulation of the typology of event integration, which is different from Talmy’s typology in a few respects.

This typology does not focus on the question “which semantic notions in which particular constituent”, but “which constituent for which particular semantic notion”. In the description of motion event, the semantic notion considered is Path: this leads to the distinction between two types of languages: verb-framed languages and satellite-framed languages:

“The verb-framed languages are those languages in which the core schema of Path is encoded by the verb as the head of a clause (cf. path language). The satellite-framed languages are those in which Path is encoded by a satellite. Note that in this typology, how manner and figure are
lexicalized does not matter. What is important in satellite-framed languages like English is that Path is encoded in satellites, not that Manner is conflated with Motion. Figure-conflating languages like Atsugewi are regarded as satellite-framed since Path is encoded by suffixes."
(Matsumoto 2003:63)

Part 2 of the article

Here Matsumoto proposes a revision of Talmy’s typology.

In a first section, on the basis of the sentence structure view’s assumptions, Matsumoto proposes the reformulation of the opposition “verb-framed / satellite-framed” into “head-framed” (path in the head element) / “nonhead-framed” (path in the nonhead element) languages, labelling this typology “Typology of Clause structuring”. Matsumoto argues that what is in fact meant by “verb” in Talmy’s typology is “head of a clause”. Satellites are what is “non-head”. He warns that satellites and nonheads are slightly different notions: all satellites are nonheads by definition, but not all nonheads are satellites. This typology allows to treat occurrences such as English “he walked through the building”, which is not a satellite-framed construction but actually is a nonhead-framed construction. Similarly, Finnish encodes the goal of a motion verb in an illative case; since case markers on nominals are not sisters of the verb (and thus not “satellite”), they are not satellite-framed but they are actually nonhead-framed.

Matsumoto suggests that his proposal captures what Talmy has intended to capture in a more accurate way:

“It avoids the misleading use of the term verb and the relatively unfamiliar notion satellite, in favour of the notions of head and nonhead”.
(Matsumoto 2003:64)

In the second and third section, Matsumoto, having based his typology on the sentence-structure view (cf. above), asks how the two other interpretations of Talmy’s typology (the verb repertoire view and the manner verb difference view) should be understood in connection to his reformulation of Talmy’s framing typology.
The second section deals with the question of the verb repertoire view, which focuses on the fact that languages differ in the richness of manner-of-motion verbs and path verbs. Matsumoto concludes that the typology of languages by verb repertoire difference is independent of the framing typology: some verb-framed (head-framed) languages, such as French, do have a relatively rich manner-of-motion verb system, and some satellite-framed (nonhead-framed) languages, such as Chinese and Thai, have a relatively rich path verb lexicon.

Matsumoto adds other facts showing that the issue of the verb repertoire is at least partially independent of the head vs. nonhead framing typology:

If head-framed languages naturally have a rich set of path verbs (in order to make path distinctions!), nonhead-framed languages may or may not have a rich set of path verbs. Similarly, head-framed languages can use manner verbs as their nonhead element (and such manner-of-motion verb repertoires can be relatively large), and nonhead-framed languages do not necessarily have a rich set of manner-of-motion verbs.

Another reason is that the abundance of manner-of-motion verbs in English and other Germanic languages is a part of their abundance of manner verbs in general. Matsumoto shows that in fact languages attest differences in the syntactic categorization of manner, with a comparison of English and Japanese: some languages such as English are manner-in-verb languages, while languages like Japanese are manner-in-adverb languages. Matsumoto labels this parameter “the manner categorization parameter”; he presents it as a reformulated equivalent of the verb repertoire parameter, saying:

“What is important, it appears to me, is that those languages which categorize manner primarily in adverbs tend not to have a rich set of manner verbs, whether or not (semi-)onomatopoeic [(note: referring to Japanese)] manner adverbs form an independent word class or not.”

Matsumoto 2003:69

He thus affirms that the verb repertoire distinction as a parameter in human language is meaningful, but as parameter distinct from the head- / nonhead-framed parameter. Matsumoto furthermore notes that this parameterization concerns the lexical categories in which manner is coded, and does not specify where in a sentence they
are used. Plus, this parameter may well be a matter of degree, without a clear-cut line between the two types (in verb / in adverb).

Finally, the third section deals with the manner verb difference view. According to Matsumoto, this view considers only a part of lexicalization or framing typology. He insists on the fact that the definitive feature of head-framed languages is the conflation of Path+Motion in the head verb as their dominant pattern, rather than the lack of the expressions typical of nonhead-framed languages. He justifies:

“Examination of whether or not the nonhead-framed pattern is possible without considering how dominant the head-framed pattern is does not do full justice to lexicalization or framing typology. This is especially true when only the expression of a goal is considered for compatibility with a manner-of-motion verb, rather than a full range of path relations.”

Matsumoto 2003:69

Matsumoto refers here to the conclusions presented by Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) from an observation of Tswana.

However, Matsumoto recognizes that a language sometimes allows alternating framing possibilities: head-framed languages often allow nonhead-framed pattern under certain circumstances. He quotes Spanish, in “La botella flotó hacia la cueva” (The bottle floats toward the cave); in general indeed, a direction phrase (e.g. toward) is compatible with manner-of-motion verbs in any language, which raises the question of under what circumstances different patterns are used. Matsumoto quotes Slobin (1996, 1997, 2000) for one hypothesis involving the notion of “boundary crossing”).

Conscious that such a question would need a full treatment in a new paper, Matsumoto proposes a hypothesis: that in fact goal markers that are not compatible with manner-of-motion verbs in Romance languages (French “Il a marché à la gare”) have an alternative use as a locative marker. A goal phrase with such a marker is then more like a locative phrase, “and cannot be interpreted as a goal unless the verb entails translational motion, which many manner-of-motion verbs do not”.

And Matsumoto concludes:
“In this view the difference between the Spanish, French and English sentences [...] and their English counterpart comes from the different nature of the particular prepositions involved rather than the different nature of manner-of-motion verbs. If this is indeed the case, then, this particular difference is not directly related to the issue of framing typology. In fact, Romance-like phenomenon is found in some nonhead-framed languages, [...] and it is not a surprise that some head-framed languages allow manner-of-motion verbs to be compatible with a (non-locative-like) goal phrase.”
(Matsumoto 2003:70-71)

**Au final, un article extrêmement intéressant. Toute personne travaillant dans le cadre et à la suite de la typologie proposée par Talmy devrait être au fait des propositions et analyses que Matsumoto présente dans cet article.**