

The encoding of dynamic deixis in motion events: A crosslinguistic exploratory study

Clément Voirin, Jinke Song & Anetta Kopecka

Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage & Université Lumière Lyon 2

Clement.Voirin@univ-lyon2.fr, Jinke.Song@univ-lyon2.fr, Anetta.Kopecka@univ-lyon2.fr

Key words: motion events, dynamic deixis, centripetal motion, centrifugal motion, crosslinguistic study

When encoding *dynamic deixis* in motion events (see Lamarre & al. 2017) speakers of various languages can choose a perspective which entails motion either *toward* (centripetal, hereafter CTP) or *away from* (centrifugal, hereafter CTF) a deictic center (Fillmore 1971, 1975; Gathercole 1977; Wilkins & Hill 1995). By doing so, speakers rely on the linguistic devices available in the language they speak (Slobin 1987, 2004, 2017). However, languages vary not only in the type of devices they have to encode a deictic perspective but also in the availability of such devices for language use (Gathercole 1977; Wilkins & Hill 1995; Nakazawa 2007). While some languages have been shown to be fully (e.g. Spanish, Hungarian) or predominantly (e.g. French, English) deictic, others have been revealed to be non-deictic (e.g. Polish, Russian), as far as motion is concerned (Ricca 1993). These language-specific tendencies observed in previous research have led us to explore the following points with regards to the expression of dynamic deixis in different languages: i) the choice of taking a deictic perspective or not, ii) the preference for the CTP or CTF perspective, iii) the variation of perspective as to the data *genre* such as narrative or dialogue. We investigate these issues through a crosslinguistic study based on different sources of data from English, French, Polish and Chinese.

Firstly, we examine crosslinguistic variation by comparing (1) Chinese and Polish stimuli-based data gathered with native speakers (12 and 14 respectively) using the video-clips called *Trajectoire* (Ishibashi et al. 2004), and (2) English, French, and Polish text-based data extracted from novels. The first analysis reveals that Chinese speakers encode deixis in 31.6% of motion event descriptions, showing a preference for the CTP perspective (23.6% of the data); for Polish speakers, the encoding of dynamic deixis is almost irrelevant as it accounts for 0.3% of the descriptions only. The second analysis based on text data reveals that French encodes dynamic deixis more frequently (53.9%) than English (41.5%) and Polish (32.9%). Interestingly, while French and English tend to take more frequently the CTP perspective (34.2% in French and 27.7% in English), Polish speakers tend to focus more frequently on the CTF motion (24.4%).

Secondly, we examine intra-linguistic variation by comparing (1) stimuli-based and text-based data in Polish, and (2) stimuli-based and TV series-based data in Chinese. In both languages there is a difference between the *genres*, with a tendency to encode dynamic deixis more frequently in discourse than in simple motion descriptions. In particular, in Polish narratives the expression of dynamic deixis represents 32.9% (vs. 0.3% in video descriptions), while in Chinese TV series, it represents 96.6% (vs. 31.5% in video descriptions). We may also note that Polish shows a preference for the CTF perspective (as mentioned previously), while in Chinese there is a difference between the *genres*: both CTP and CTF perspectives are equally used in the TV series, whereas the CTP perspective is predominant in the stimuli-based data.

In this talk, our aim is to further investigate the presence or absence of perspective in deictic expressions across the languages under study and across different *genres*, and try to explore the factors that prompt the deictic perspective taking in our data.

Selected references

- Fillmore C. 1975. *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis*, Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Gathercole V. C. 1977. A Study of the Comings and Goings of the Speakers of Four Languages: Spanish, Japanese, English, and Turkish, *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2, 61–94.
- Lamarre C., Vittrant A., Kopecka A., Voisin S., Bon N, Fagard B., Grinevald C., Moyse-Faurie C., Risler A., Song J-K., Tan A. & Voirin C. 2017. *Deictic directionals revisited in the light of advances in typology*, Paper presented at Neglected Aspects of Motion-Event Description, ENS, Paris. 19-20 May 2017.
- Ricca D. 1993. *I Verbi Deittici di Movimento in Europa: Una Ricerca Interlinguistica*, Firenze, La Nuova Italia Editrice.
- Slobin D. I. 2017. Afterword. Typologies and language use, In Ibarretxe-Antuñano I. (ed.), *Motion and Space across Languages*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 419-446.
- Wilkins D. P., & Hill D. 1995. When “Go” Means “Come”: Questioning the Basicness of Basic Motion Verbs, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 6(2-3), 209–259.