

## International Workshop / Journée d'Etudes

### *Of Time and Space: cognitive, typological and multimodal perspectives*

7 September 2022

Venue: Univ. Lille, Campus Pont de Bois, Villeneuve d'Ascq (amphi B7)

Parallel zoom session :

<https://univ-lille-fr.zoom.us/j/92403866014?pwd=QU5Td0lhS1k3VmxySUJIK3NpOTBNdz09>

Org.: Maarten Lemmens (Univ. Lille, UMR 8163 STL, France)

## ABSTRACTS

MEGANE LESUISSE (Univ. Lille, UMR 8163 STL, France)

### *Seeing and Speaking: the modulation of attention on locative events.*

Locative events, e.g., the glass on the table, have been shown to be encoded differently across languages. Lemmens & Slobin (2008) notably draw the distinction between **disposition**-framed languages, such as Dutch, which encode the disposition (or orientation) of the Figure (the glass) with regards to the Ground (the table) via the use of a Cardinal Posture Verb (CPV; *staan* 'stand', *liggen* 'lie', *zitten* 'sit', e.g., *het glas staat op tafel* 'the glass stands on the table'), and **location**-framed languages, such as French, which do not habitually express the orientation of Figure and rely on existential *be* copula (e.g., *le verre est sur la table* 'the glass is on the table'). Other languages mostly behave as location-framed languages but occasionally use CPVs (Newman, 2002; Lemmens & Perrez, 2012; Bosse & Papafragou, 2010, 2018). This is the case of the English language which has been shown to display some 'dormant predisposition' to the use of the CPVs as locative markers (Lemmens, 2014; Lesuisse & Lemmens, 2018). This suggests a linguistic continuum with Dutch, a posture-rich language on the one end, French, a posture-poor language on the other end, and English straddling the middle. Such linguistic differences raise several questions regarding their potential cognitive impact on verbal and non-verbal thinking: does our language influence the way we perceive locative events?

This talk investigates the impact of these linguistic differences on the (very) perception of locative events in two different verbal contexts (with and without interaction) via the analysis of the eye-movements of L1 speakers of French, English, and Dutch (N=187). Beyond the confirmation of the expected linguistic differences, this presentation demonstrates how the experimental setting and, more specifically, the conversational need for the expression of orientation influence the visual exploration of locative events within and across languages. First, we show how cross-linguistic differences in gazing get blurred as the conversational need for the expression of orientation increases: the French and the English participants, who do not systematically encode orientation, do pay attention to the orientational features of the Figure, foregrounding a clear contextual modulation of attention across verbal conditions. This finding also reveals that even if linguistic preferences do not guide the speaker to pay attention to specific aspects of the event, the speakers may look beyond what they encode. Second, we address the case of English and of its in-

between status (see above). Depending on the verbal task, English speakers present either more French-like or more Dutch-like gaze explorations (in the interactive and in the non-interactive context respectively). We attribute this shift of gazing strategies to some orientational colour left in the English system because of some Germanic legacy. This nicely confirms the 'dormant predisposition' first formulated on diachronic grounds (Lesuisse & Lemmens, 2018) on synchronic co-verbal eye-gazing.

## References

- Bosse, S. and A. Papafragou. (2010). Spatial position in language and visual memory: A cross-linguistic comparison. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* 32: 1052-1057.
- Bosse, S. and A. Papafragou (2018). Does language affect memory for object position? A cross-linguistic comparison. *Spatial Cognition and Computation* 18: 285-314.
- Lemmens, M. (2014). Une grammaticalisation ratée? Une étude diachronique de stand en anglais. *Anglophonia* 18. (Last accessed online on 18 April 2022).
- Lemmens, M. and J. Perrez (2012). A quantitative analysis of the use of posture verbs by French-speaking learners of Dutch. *CogniTextes* 533. Available at: <https://journals.openedition.org/cognitextes/609> (Last accessed 1 June 2022).
- Lemmens, M. and D. Slobin (2008). Positie- en bewegingswerkwoorden in het Nederlands, het Engels en het Frans. *Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 118: 17-32.
- Lesuisse, M., and M. Lemmens. (2018). Constructions and halfly-missed grammaticalization: A diachronic study of English posture verbs In E. Coussé, P. Andersson and J. Olofsson (eds.) *Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*. John Benjamins. 43-74.
- Newman J. (2002). A cross linguistic overview of Posture verbs 'sit', 'stand' and 'lie' In J. Newman (ed.). *The linguistics of sitting, standing and lying*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. 1-24.

**CHRISTINA PIOT** (Univ. Lille, UMR 8163 STL, France & U. Liège, Belgium)

## *Talking and gesturing about motion in L1 and L2*

The typological differences between verb-framed and satellite-framed languages observed by Talmy (2000) have been shown to be reflected in co-speech gestures as well (Brown & Chen, 2013; Kita & Özyürek, 2003; McNeill, 2005; McNeill & Duncan, 2000). Such gestures should therefore be taken into account when studying L2 learners' thinking for speaking patterns (Stam, 2018). More specifically, studies show different correlations between the types of language and (i) the realization of *manner fog* gestures and (ii) the synchronization between gestures and speech (Kita & Özyürek, 2003; McNeill & Duncan, 2000). Against this background, our study aims at determining how motion events are expressed in speech and co-speech gestures by French speakers, Dutch speakers, and CLIL French-speaking learners of Dutch.

We conducted an elicitation experiment in which participants recounted scenes from a *Tweety and Sylvester* cartoon. Fifteen French speakers, fifteen Dutch speakers, and fifteen CLIL French-speaking learners of Dutch with a pre-intermediate level completed the task. Using Kopecka's (2006) taxonomy, we identified the semantic components (*manner* and *path*) encoded in the verbs and satellites. Gestures were classified as *iconic*, *beat*, *metaphoric*, *deictic*, or *pragmatic* (McNeill, 1992; Kendon, 2004). Iconic and deictic gestures were further analyzed regarding the aspects of motion they convey (e.g. *manner*, *path*, *ground*, *manner & path*) and their type (only for iconic gestures: *enacting*, *representing*, *drawing*, or *molding* (Müller, 2014)). Finally, we looked at the synchronization between speech and gestures following Stam (2006).

So far, 592 utterances and 741 gestures have been analyzed and our results show that French speakers tend to use  $\text{PATH}_{\text{VERBS}} + \text{PATH}_{\text{SATELLITES}} + \text{PATH}_{\text{GESTURES}}$  in both their L1 and L2 descriptions, whereas Dutch speakers prefer using  $\text{MANNER}_{\text{VERBS}} + \text{PATH}_{\text{SATELLITES}} + \text{PATH}_{\text{GESTURES}}$ . Second, CLIL-French-speaking learners of Dutch align path gestures with verbs less often and more often with linguistic units that are not core elements of motion events than French speakers and Dutch speakers than in the case of French speakers and Dutch speakers. Finally, CLIL French-speaking learners of Dutch produce more manner fog and non-substantive gestures. These tendencies suggest that CLIL French-speaking learners of Dutch rely more on gesture than L1 speakers and that they tend to replicate the thinking for speaking pattern of French speakers and that they show specificities of their own.

## References

- Brown, A., & Chen, J. (2013). Construal of Manner in speech and gesture in Mandarin, English, and Japanese. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 24(4), 605–631. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2013-0021>
- Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible action as utterance*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kita, S., & Özyürek, A. (2003). What does cross-linguistic variation in semantic coordination of speech and gesture reveal?: Evidence for an interface representation of spatial thinking and speaking. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 48(1), 16–32. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X\(02\)00505-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X(02)00505-3)
- Kopecka, A. (2006). The semantic structure of motion verbs in French: Typological perspectives. In M. Hickmann & S. Robert (Eds.), *Typological Studies in Language* (Vol. 66, pp. 83–101). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.66.06kop>
- McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and Mind: What Gestures Reveal about Thought*. University of Chicago Press.
- McNeill, D. (2005). *Gesture and thought*. University of Chicago Press.
- McNeill, D., & Duncan, S. D. (2000). Growth points in thinking-for-speaking. In D. McNeill (Ed.), *Language and Gesture* (1st ed., pp. 141–161). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620850.010>
- Müller, C. (2014). Gestural modes of representation as techniques of depiction. In C. Müller, A. J. Cienki, E. Fricke, S. H. Ladewig, D. McNeill, & S. Tessendorf (Eds.), *Body—Language—Communication: An international handbook on multimodality in human interaction*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Stam, G. (2006). Thinking for speaking about motion: L1 and L2 speech and gesture. *IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 44(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/IRAL.2006.006>
- Stam, G. (2018). Gesture as a window onto conceptualization in second language acquisition: A Vygotskian perspective. In J. P. Lantolf, M. E. Poehner, & M. Swain (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Development* (Routledge, pp. 165–177).
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics* (Vol. 2). MIT Press.

**EVA SOROLI & ALINA TSIKULINA (Univ. Lille & UMR 8163 STL, France)**

### *Language and cognitive processing of events: Theoretical and experimental perspectives*

Does the language we speak, or a language we learn, influence the way we think about the world and the events that occur around us? In the last decades, this long-standing question has revived and there have been several attempts to connect language use

with cognitive mechanisms in order to understand the role typological (language-related) vs. language-independent factors play in event processing. With respect to language use, in the domain of motion event encoding, the languages of the world offer very different strategies for the mapping of spatial semantic components: *Verb-framed languages* (e.g., French) invite speakers to lexicalize in the main verb Path information leaving Manner of motion omitted, expressed in the periphery of the sentence or periphrastically; *Satellite-framed languages* (e.g., English, Russian) invite them to lexicalize Manner in verbs and express Path with particles, prepositional phrases or other adjuncts; and *Parallel systems of conflation* (e.g., Greek) allow for mixed *Verb-* and *Satellite-framed* strategies in equal frequency. The question we address here is whether such typological differences can guide speakers from different linguistic backgrounds – monolinguals and second language learners - not only to speak differently, but also to process non-verbally events based on language-specific constraints. In this talk, we share some examples from experimental studies - involving verbal production, non-verbal decision making and eyetracking - suggesting that the answer is (at least partially) yes.

**HENRIËTTE HENDRIKS** (Univ. Cambridge, UK) & **ANNIE-CLAUDE DEMAGNY** (CNRS, SFL)

### *The impact of elicitation method on the expression of motion in adult native speakers and L2 learners*

Many studies have examined Talmy's hypotheses on satellite- and verb-framed languages (Path location; frequency of Manner and Path). Many current studies test these hypotheses in experimental designs specifically eliciting motion only, but initial interest in the expression of motion comes from findings on motion expression in a narrative context. In this study we reflect on the impact context has on findings. We will study native speakers of typologically different languages and adult L2 learners.

Specifically, we ask if the choice of linguistic means in narrative contexts is different from choices in more experimental contexts where often single utterances are a sufficient response. A second question asks if adult L2 learners can adapt to the expression of space in a new and potentially considerably different way in their L2.

To answer these questions, we elicited narratives from native speakers of English and Chinese (satellite-framed) and French (verb-framed) and from Chinese L2 learners of English or French and English L2 learners of French. A picture sequence showing a short story (Hickmann 2003) was used to elicit the narrative. The narratives were analysed in terms of lexicalization patterns and density of information, to verify if native speakers showed expected typological differences, and if findings corresponded to those reported previously in more experimental set-ups. L2 learner groups were acquiring either an L2 in the same or in a different typological group.

Results show that although expected typological tendencies are visible across all native speaker data, they are less pronounced in a narrative context compared to other experimental contexts indicating that a full understanding of the expression of motion events can only be achieved when we study the phenomenon across many different contexts. L2 learners are shown to successfully adapt to L2 lexicalization patterns indicating that they may have shifted their thinking for speaking.

**Keywords:** Motion; Narratives; Cross-linguistic differences; Thinking-for-Speaking

**ALIYAH MORGENSTERN (Univ. Sorbonne Nouvelle, France)**

*A cross linguistic analysis of grammatical aspect, tense, verb semantics, and gestures (French, German and Russian)*

<abstract>

**BENJAMIN FAGARD (ENS | PSL & Univ. Sorbonne Nouvelle, France)**

*(Still) thinking about goals: Evidence from typology and language use*

Source/goal asymmetries in linguistic descriptions of space were first suggested to be a language universal (Ikegami 1987). Further research has confirmed the existence of a bias across speakers and languages to express goals rather than sources (Bourdin 1997: 190). It has been observed, for instance, that goals tend to be expressed more frequently (Kopecka & Narasimhan 2012; Lakusta & Landau 2005), more precisely (Fillmore 1992) and/or more simply (Stolz et al. 2014).

The literature on space in language, and more specifically on goal bias, has contributed data from various languages which generally confirms this trend, and it seems that the question now is not so much whether it exists as what forms it may take in language systems and language use. This is precisely the question I will address, by comparing the expression of source and goal, mostly in languages of Europe (e.g. Romanian, Breton, German, Polish, Hungarian), i.e. in what I call a microtypological perspective. This method limits typological generalizations, but makes it possible to look beyond language structure and include a closer look at language use.

### **References**

- Bourdin P. 1997. On goal-bias across Languages, *Proceedings of LP'96*, 185-216.  
Fillmore C. 1997. *Lectures on deixis*. Stanford: CSLI.  
Ikegami Y. 1987. Source vs. Goal: a Case of linguistic dissymmetry. In Dirven & Radden (eds), *Concept of case*. Tübingen: Narr, 122-146.  
Kopecka A. & Narasimhan B. (eds). 2012. *Events of 'putting' and 'taking': A crosslinguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.  
Lakusta & B. Landau. 2005. Starting at the end: The importance of goals in spatial language. *Cognition* 96, 1-33.  
Stolz T., N. Levkovych, A. Urdze, J. Nintemann & M. Robbers. 2017. *Spatial Interrogatives in Europe and Beyond*. Berlin: Mouton.