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Round-trip properties of deictic motion verbs

Kuiper & Merrifield (1975): Diuxi Mixtec
Speck & Pickett (1976): Texmelucan Zapotec

**Claim:** deictic motion verbs (`come’ and `go’) express round-trip paths.

**Evidence:** progressive-marked `come’ and `go’ can be used even once the destination has been reached, as long as the subject has not returned to the origin.
Round-trip properties of deictic motion verbs

Evidence: progressive-marked `come’ and `go’ can be used even once the destination has been reached, as long as the subject has not returned to the origin.

This is true in San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec (SLQZ):

Ndua z-e Brook.
Oaxaca ZPROG-go Brook
`Brook went to Oaxaca.’

Comment: She may be on her way, in Oaxaca, or on her way back, but she hasn’t returned to San Lucas.
Round-trip behavior of motion verbs

Oaxaca City

San Lucas
Round-trip properties of deictic motion verbs

Round-trip Claim:
deictic motion verbs have round-trip interpretations because the lexical semantics of the verbs express round-trip paths.

My Claim:
round-trip interpretations of deictic motion verbs arise through an interaction with the special z-progressive aspect marker.
San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec

- Western Tlacolula Valley Zapotec language (Otomanguean)
- Spoken in the village of San Lucas Quiaviní in Oaxaca, Mexico
- Endangered and underdocumented (Pérez Báez 2016)
- Data presented comes from fieldwork with eight speakers in the village of San Lucas in 2016 and 2017, as well as textual sources such as Munro et al. (2006), Munro & Lopez (1999), and online writings of SLQZ speakers (Lillehaugen 2016) where cited.
SLQZ Syntax

aspect (morph) root subj. clitic
r- ied -tau =a
HAB VEN eat =1s

`I habitually come and eat’
## SLQZ Aspect Inventory (Munro et. al 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b- / m- / w-</td>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca- / cal- / can-</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g- / ny- / y-</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>neutral/stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r-</td>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s- / z-</td>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-</td>
<td>ZPROG</td>
<td>progressive for motion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The z-progressive aspect

SLQZ deictic motion verbs can’t take the normal ca- progressive aspect; instead they use z-.

Lee (2006) calls it non-future definite and analyzes it as a positive polarity item.

Munro (2007) calls it incompletive and presents evidence that it is not the same as the definite future z- aspect.
SLQZ motion verbs

3 deictic motion verbs in SLQZ:

- *ried `come'*
- *ria `go'*
- *ria `go home'*
Perspectival anchors

Deictic motion verbs describe motion relative to the location of a perspective-holder or anchor.

**Speaker-anchored:** Sarah is coming to see me.

** Listener-anchored:** I will come over around noon.

**Attitude-holder-anchored:** John thought that Sarah was coming to see him last week.

*Context: John is in NY, the speaker and addressee are in LA.*
Perspectival anchors

Perspectives are also time-indexed:

**Utterance-time-anchored:** Come here, please!

**Event-time-anchored:** When I got to the cafe last night, it was packed, but by the time Wilma came, it was nearly empty.

*Context: the speaker is in her office talking to her officemate.*
Perspectival anchors

Not all of these attested perspectival anchors license ried ‘come’ in SLQZ:

R-rilo          Jwany a            bets=ēng a
HAB-think Juan    already brother=3s   already
z-e/*ied-gan                      laēng
ZPROG-go/*come-visit  3s

John thinks that his brother is on the way to visit him.
Context: speaker and listener are not in the same place as John.
The destination of motion does not need to be the location of the perspective-holder, so long as the motion is towards the perspective-holder.

R-inydyag=a ai nih r-to ze z-ied
HAB-hear=1s 3s.dist REL HAB-sell corn ZPROG-come
lo=ën
to=1p

`I hear the man who sells corn coming towards us.'

Context: the man is coming towards us, but not to us—he’ll continue on his route after passing us.
Semantics of deictic motion verbs

Semantics for *ria* `go’:

\[ [[ia \text{ Jwany}]]^{w,c} = \lambda e. \exists p,z,y . \text{Motion}(e) \& \text{Path}(p,e) \& \text{Origin}(p,y) \& \text{Dest}(p,z) \& \text{Patient}(J,e) \]

Semantics for *ried* `come’:

\[ [[ied \text{ Jwany}]]^{w,c} = \]

(a) \( \lambda e. \exists p,z,y . \text{Motion}(e) \& \text{Path}(p,e) \& \text{Origin}(p,y) \& \text{Dest}(p,z) \& \text{Patient}(J,e) \)

(b) J is moving towards the perspective-holder
Round-trip behavior of SLQZ motion verbs

Aëng  z-e        ladi  per  daru
3s    ZPROG-go   side  but  then

gy-i=ëng
FUT-come=3s

`He went to the US but he’s coming back.’

Judgment: felicitous if the subject is on the way to the US, already arrived, or on his way back.
Round-trip behavior of *zia*

Start in New York, then go to San Lucas, and then back to New York.
Round-trip behavior of SLQZ motion verbs

`Brook went to Tlacolula and is returning tonight.'

Context: Brook left in the morning for Tlacolula and is returning that same day.
Round-trip behavior of SLQZ motion verbs

Speaker judgments about *ried ‘come’* are less clear:

# A Bed n-u re’ z-ied-gan
already Pedro ST-be here ZPROG-VEN-visit
danoën
1p

Intended: `Pedro is already here and he is coming to visit us.’

Context: *Pedro has traveled from Oaxaca City to San Lucas.*
Round-trip behavior of SLQZ motion verbs

Speaker judgments about *ried* ‘come’ are less clear:

Z-ied                     Gye’eihlly   laanih
ZPROG-come       Mike             party
`Mike came/is coming to the party.’

Reported judgment (Lee 2006): He’s either on his way, or has just arrived but not yet started participating in the party.
Round-trip behavior of zied
Round-trip properties of deictic motion verbs

Round-trip Claim: deictic motion verbs have round-trip interpretations because the lexical semantics of the verbs express round-trip paths.

My Claim: round-trip interpretations of deictic motion verbs arise through an interaction with the special z-progressive aspect marker.
SLQZ motion verbs are not round-trip

There is no round-trip implication in other aspects:

gw-e xtadmam=a ladi lo 1983.
PERF-go grandfather=1s side in 1983
`My grandfather went to the US in 1983.'

Context: he died there without ever returning.
SLQZ motion verbs are not round-trip

There is no round-trip implication in other aspects:

gw-a=a Bac a’s chiru gwa=a
PERF-go=1s Tlacolula then and PERF-go=1s
Ndua
Oaxaca.City

`I went to Tlacolula, then I went to Oaxaca City.’

Context: Speaker traveled from San Lucas to Tlacolula and then directly to Oaxaca.
SLQZ motion verbs are not round-trip

There is no round-trip implication in other aspects:

b-yal=a de US a nai
PERF-come=1s from US already yesterday
`I came from the US yesterday.'

Context: the speaker arrived in Oaxaca for the first time the day before.
SLQZ motion verbs are not round-trip

There is no round-trip implication in other aspects:

Ladi   ch-a=a       zhi.
side   IRR-go=1s   day
`I’m going to the US tomorrow.’

A gual   gy-i=u.
MOD    IRR-go=2s
`It’s time for you to go.’
SLQZ motion verbs are not round-trip
The semantics of the z-progressive

The z-progressive isn’t an ordinary progressive marker: it requires that a result state of the predicate holds at Topic Time.

\[ [[ZPROG]]^{w,c} = \]
\[ \lambda P_{<e,t>} : [ \lambda t' : \exists e, s. \text{Cause}(e, s) \& t' \subseteq T(s) \& P(e)] \]

A function from predicates of type \( <e, t> \) to predicates of type \( <i, t> \) for which there is an event \( e \) of which the predicate holds and a state \( s \) holding at Topic Time that is caused by \( e \)
The semantics of the z-progressive

The z-progressive requires that a result state of the predicate holds at Topic Time.

$$[[\text{ZPROG}]]^{w,c} = \lambda P_{<\epsilon,t>}: \lambda t': \exists e,s. \text{Cause}(e,s) \& t' \subseteq T(s) \& P(e)]$$

Captures the fact that the z-progressive can be used even when the event it modifies is no longer under way.
The semantics of zia

\[ [[ia \text{ Jwany}]]^{w,c} = \lambda e : \exists p, z, y . \text{Motion}(e) \& \text{Path}(p,e) \& \text{Origin}(p,y) \& \text{Dest}(p,z) \& \text{Patient}(J,e) \]

\[ [[[ZPROG]]]^{w,c} = \lambda P_{<\varepsilon,\tau> : [\lambda t'_i : \exists e,s. \text{Cause}(e,s) \& t' \subseteq T(s) \& P(e)]} \]

\[ [[[zia \text{ Jwany}]]]^{w,c} = \lambda t'_i : \exists e,s,p,z,y. \text{Cause}(e,s) \& t' \subseteq T(s) \& \text{Motion}(e) \& \text{Path}(p,e) \& \text{Origin}(p,y) \& \text{Dest}(p,z) \& \text{Patient}(J,e) \]
Round-trip behavior explained

Tlacolula

✔ zia

San Lucas

✘ zia

✔ zia

✔ zia
Round-trip behavior explained

Aëng z-e ladi per daru gy-i=ëng
3s ZPROG-go side but then FUT-come=3s

`He went to the US but he’s coming back.’

Judgment: felicitous if the subject is on the way to the US, already arrived, or on his way back.

Predicted to be felicitous so long as the result-state of having left holds.
Round-trip behavior explained

De’ihzy   z-a=a
just.now ZPROG-go=1s
`I just left [the party].’

De’ihzy zaa
The semantics of zied

[[ied Jwany]]^{w,c} = (a) \lambda e. \exists p, z, y . \text{Motion}(e) \& \text{Path}(p, e) \& \text{Origin}(p, y) \& \text{Dest}(p, z) \& \text{Patient}(J, e)

(b) J is moving towards the perspective-holder

[[[ZPROG]]^{w,c} = \lambda P_{<\varepsilon, t>} : [\lambda t' : \exists e, s. \text{Cause}(e, s) \& t' \subseteq T(s) \& P(e)]]

[[[zied Jwany]]^{w,c} = (a) \lambda t' : \exists e, s, p, z, y. \text{Cause}(e, s) \& t' \subseteq T(s) \& \text{Motion}(e) \& \text{Path}(p, e) \& \text{Origin}(p, y) \& \text{Dest}(p, z) \& \text{Patient}(J, e)]

(b) J is moving towards the perspective-holder
Round-trip behavior explained
Round-trip behavior of SLQZ motion verbs

Z-ied    Gye’eihlly    laanih
ZPROG-come  Mike    party
`Mike came/is coming to the party.’

Reported judgment (Lee 2006): He’s either on his way, or has just arrived but not yet started participating in the party

Predicted to be felicitous until the subject has reached the perspective-holder’s destination.
Round-trip behavior explained

Intended: `Pedro is already here and he is coming to visit us.'

Context: Pedro has traveled from Oaxaca City to San Lucas. Predicted to be felicitous until the subject has reached the perspective-holder’s destination.
Change-of-state venitive constructions

The result-state semantics of the z-progressive aspect suggests an explanation for a special reading that arises with z-progressive-marked venitive constructions.

**Venitive construction:**

Rata rsily r-ied-tyug Lia Petr gyia.
Every morning HAB-VEN-cut Miss Petra flowers
`Every morning Petra comes and cuts flowers.`
Change-of-state venitive constructions

Andative and venitive constructions usually entail actual motion, but z-progressive venitive constructions give rise to change-of-state readings.

# Gu-ro=ëng.
  PERF.AND-grow=3s
Intended: `He went and grew up.'

Infelicitous because there is no motion

Ladi  gu-ro=ëng.
  side   PERF.AND-grow=3s
`He went and grew up in the States.'

Felicitous because there is motion
Change-of-state andative constructions

Andative and venitive constructions usually entail actual motion, but z-progressive venitive constructions give rise to change-of-state readings.

# Gu-ro=ëng.
   PERF.AND-grow=3s
Intended: `He went and grew up.'

Infelicitous because there is no motion

Uas nguel z-ied-ro=ëng.
very fast ZPROG-VEN-grow=3s
`He’s growing up very fast!'

Felicitous despite lack of motion
Conclusion

❖ The SLQZ z-progressive aspect has a result-state semantics
❖ SLQZ deictic motion verbs do not denote round-trip paths
❖ Perhaps deictic motion verbs in other Otomanguean languages don’t either!
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Xtyozën yuad!
Contexts of no return

I saw my money go. I saw my watch go’

Context: the speaker is talking about being robbed during a border crossing several years ago. (Munro et. al 2006)