http://dx.doi.org/10.17651/SOCJOLING.35.2
Received: 7.09.2020 / Revised: 18.07.2021
Accepted: 9.08.2021 / Published: 31.12.21

Socjolingwistyka XXXV, 2021
PL ISSN 0208-6808
E-ISSN 2545-0468

ARIADNA STRUGIELSKA
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5137-1923

KATARZYNA PIĄTKOWSKA
Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4924-5557

SATELLITE-FRAMED OR VERB-FRAMED? TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF MOTION EVENTS IN ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA

Keywords: English as a lingua franca, Talmy's typology, motion event, V-languages, S-languages, contact language.

ABSTRACT

The present paper analyzes English as a lingua franca (ELF) from the perspective of Talmy's (2000b) typology, which divides languages into S- and V-types. S-languages express the path of motion in a verb particle and the manner of motion in a verb, while V-languages encode the path in a verb and manner in an adverbial. Talmy's (2000b) typology has been felicitously applied in research on standard languages. However, studies on dialects (Berthele 2004) have shown that a division into S- and V-categories may not be sufficient in the case of contact languages. To test this hypothesis, we apply Talmy's (2000b) typological distinction to English as a lingua franca. Based on the results of a qualitative pilot study among Polish users of English, we demonstrate that although Polish and English are both classified as S-languages according to Talmy's (2000b) typology, ELF – a contact language between them – reveals characteristics not yet classified as belonging to either S- or V-types. We thus conclude that Talmy's (2000b, 2017) dichotomous distinction is in need of further refinements to be applicable in the context of ELF.

1. TALMY'S APPROACH TO A MOTION EVENT

Talmy (2000b, 2017) examines the motion domain by investigating typological patterns by which the conceptual structure of this domain is linguistically encoded across languages. Talmy (2000b, 25) defines a motion event as "[…] a situation containing motion and the continuation of a stationary location alike […]". Thus, a motion event can be divided into two types: static and dynamic. Static motion, or locatedness, is

mnemonically represented as BELOC (being located) whereas dynamic motion is captured by the form MOVE.

Furthermore, Talmy (2000a) distinguishes between factive (physical) and fictive (metaphorical) motion. To illustrate this point, the sentence *He entered the room* encodes a physical occurrence of motion while in sentences *This fence goes from the plateau to the valley* or *The cliff wall faces toward/away from the island* (Talmy 2000a, 99), motion is apparent or perceived rather than physical. Consequently, the first example encodes factive motion, while the second and third encode fictive motion.

According to Talmy (2000b, 2017), the conceptualization of a motion event involves motion event components and co-event elements. The former relates to the motion event proper and encompasses four conceptual categories: Figure, Ground, Motion, and Path. The Figure is an object which moves or is located with reference to another object – the Ground. The Path of motion is the path followed by the Figure from the Source to the Goal or the site occupied by the Figure with respect to the Ground. In other words, the Figure is a moving or stationary entity, the Ground is a spatial reference for motion, while the Path relates to directionality. Motion refers to the presence of motion or locatedness in the event. Co-event components include, among others, Manner, Cause, Enablement or Subsequence[1]. Importantly, both motion event and co-event categories are codable and, thus, linguistic constructions typically contain not only information about Motion itself but also about its nature, usually conveyed via distinct linguistic units, e.g. lexical verbs or prepositional phrases. For example, in the sentence *The cat moved across the room with dignity*, the cat represents the Figure, the verb encodes Motion, *across* conveys the Path, *the room* stands for the Ground, and the final prepositional phrase shows Manner. In other words, the verb *move* is conceptually schematic in that it encodes "pure" motion or, as Talmy (2000b, 62) puts it, "the verb root expresses the Motion component alone, without the conflation of any other component of the Motion event". Typically, though, this, i.e. zero conflation, is not the case, and other meaning components are likely to be coded together with Motion within the verb (phrase). For instance, the verb *roll* in *The pencil rolled off the table* integrates Motion and Manner, while the verb *blow* in *The pencil blew off the table* fuses Motion and Cause (Talmy 2000b, 26). Other possibilities include conflating Motion with Path, Figure or Ground, as well as having multiple fusions, as in *I skidded the shoe over (there)* (Rice 2002, 2), where the verb encodes Motion, Manner and Cause.

Although practically any conceptual category within a motion event can be integrated with Motion, Manner and Path have received special attention since Talmy (2000b) distinguishes two major types of languages depending on whether Motion conflates with Manner or Path. The first pattern of fusion is typical of satellite-framing (S) and the other of verb-framing (V) languages. S-languages are thus defined as conflating Motion and a co-event conceptual component, with Path typically expressed "in a constituent

[1] Talmy (2000b, 47) considers Subsequence a "cover term" for a number of "finer conceptual relations", including Consequence and Purpose.

which stands in a sister position to the verb: either a satellite [i.e. a verb particle] or a prepositional phrase" (Berthele 2004, 95), whereas V-languages fuse Motion with another semantic category of the motion event proper, i.e. Path, leaving conceptual components of co-events to be encoded by less central elements of a clause, e.g. adverbials.

Apart from the above-presented central parameters differentiating between S- and V-languages, a number of other characteristics have been introduced to refine Talmy's (2000b) original classification (see Cadierno 2008; Han and Cadierno 2010; Lewandowski 2014; Lewandowski and Mateu 2016; Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2017; Łozińska and Pietrewicz 2018; Ji 2019). For example, compared to users of V-languages, users of S-languages display higher attention to Manner, which is evidenced in a more frequent use of manner or motion verbs and a higher variety of these types of verbs. Consequently, Manner is not only conflated with Motion but is, generally, more salient in S- than V-languages. Furthermore, users of S-languages exhibit a high degree of attention to the description of Path (i.e. use detailed descriptions of Path trajectories), which entails that various segments of the Path schema (Source, Path, Goal) tend to be coded within a single clause, as in *The deer threw the boy over a cliff into the pond* (Cadierno 2008, 248). Users of V-languages, on the other hand, focus on static aspects of scenes, concentrating on "endstates of motion" (Berman and Slobin 1994, 119), or Goals.

The above refinements imply that Talmy's (2000b) proposal can be approached in two ways. The first one, which we call a coarse-grained approach, concentrates solely on the locus, i.e. either the verb or its sister slot, of the Path and thus imposes rather discrete distinctions between languages: satellite framing is typical of Indo-European (except Romance), Finno-Ugric and Chinese languages, while verb framing is characteristic of Romance and Semitic languages, Japanese, Korean, Turkish, Tamil, and Polynesian (Talmy 2000b). The other option – a fine-grained perspective – is to treat a motion event as a gestalt and look at all its conceptual components, which leaves room for flexibility and gradual distinctions. For instance, while both English and Polish are S-languages with reference to the locus of the Path, they also display other important differences. English, for instance, has far more manner verbs than Polish, but it also has far more verbs conflating Motion and Path, e.g. approach, arrive, come, enter, exit, return or trespass (Fortis 2010). Strictly speaking, then, or if just the locus of the Path is considered, English is less S-framed than Polish. Loosely speaking, however, English is a better example of S-framing due to the variety of manner conceptualizations it sanctions (see Kopecka-Piech 2010 for details).

Adopting a holistic perspective of Talmy's (2000b) typology, although it is undoubtedly revealing, entails its own challenges. Both Berthele (2004) and Slobin (2004), for instance, note that a fine-grained approach to motion events means not only incorporating into the analysis semantic components typical of co-events but also handling the impact of factors outside the event itself. These additional elements might include the linguistic forms available to interlocutors, their levels of fluency and literacy, the speakers' perspective and communicative aims or their cultural and aesthetic values. To put it differently, the more we zoom in on the idealized categories of S- and V-framed languages, the more

likely it is that new patterns and, consequently, new conceptual components, come to the fore. For instance, in his study of Swiss German (Muotathal dialect), Standard German and French, Berthele (2004) reveals that not every S-framed language is a manner-salient language, which goes against the predictions of both coarse- and fine-grained versions of Talmy's (2000b) proposal.

Obviously, Berthele's (2004) findings are most important because they show that Talmy's (2000b) typology continues to provide intriguing avenues of research that can lead to (at least) its further refinements. However, his study also shows that in order for developments to materialize, the neatly delineated realm of standard languages needs to be abandoned, and less clearly demarcated territories, typical of contact languages, should be explored.

Consequently, we extend Talmy's (2000b) typological work with the present study by applying its fine-grained version to English as a lingua franca data, a context not considered by previous research.

2. ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA AS A CONTACT LANGUAGE

Mauranen (2018, 7) defines a lingua franca as "a vehicular language between speakers who do not share a first language". Two types of lingua franca are distinguished: the first one refers to pidgins or jargons which do not have native speakers, resulting from contact situations in the form of a mixture of languages, and are meant for restricted purposes; the second type refers to a natural language used for unrestricted communicative purposes by various groups of people. Spread around the world, used for a variety of functions and purposes and spoken by users for whom it is either a second or simply additional language, English can thus be considered a lingua franca of the second type.

ELF as a contact language is defined in two ways; while the first definition applies only to users for whom English is not a first language, which excludes native speakers of the language, the second understanding expands the circle of ELF users to include native speakers of English. Following the latter approach, Jenkins (2012, 486) and Seidlhofer (2011, 7) define ELF as a means of communication between people who come from different first language backgrounds. Similarly, Jenkins (2006) refers to ELF as a means of communication in English between speakers who have different linguacultures. Consequently, ELF includes second and foreign language users as well as native speakers of English. This view of ELF is adopted for the purpose of this paper.

A contact language, and ELF as a consequence, can be approached from three broad perspectives: sociolinguistic, interactional and cognitive (Mauranen 2018).

Discussing the first approach, Mauranen (2018) establishes an analogy between ELF and a dialect, since both involve contact between speakers of lects. In the case of ELF, the idiolects of speakers who share a first language and learn a particular second language display similarities especially in pronunciation, lexical choices and syntactic features, which prompts the emergence of a similect. In other words, a similect arises from contact between a particular L1 and English. Thus, similects do not develop in any

regional speech community where specific features of a language arise as a result of frequent interactions between speakers. While mirroring learner languages, similects have a clear social dimension as their sociolinguistic context is not restricted to any specific learning environment, such as a classroom. Consequently, the English resulting from language contact between English itself and other languages can be treated as a result of contact between speakers from different similects, with speakers' first languages as sources of affinity. Thus, Mauranen (2018, 10) emphasizes that ELF entails contact between contact-based lects. In other words, as Mauranen (2018, 10) further stresses, ELF emerges from a second-order language contact, and ELF communities, though diffuse, create their own norms of language and accommodate towards them, which leads to the second, interactional perspective on ELF as a contact language.

The interactional perspective on ELF assumes that language emerges largely through the process of accommodation, which accounts for what Mauranen (2018) calls the process of diffusion of features as a result of language contact. In an attempt to compensate for the lack of a common denominator, speakers adjust their speech through elaborating content or simplifying grammatical structures according to communicative needs. Thus, ELF communication is governed by available linguistic structures, which shapes grammar so that either some structures become used more frequently than others or simply some grammatical structures are renewed. Searching for common ground and communicative success, speakers opt for shared features, which gives rise to structural simplification. Consequently, speakers of different similects tend to choose features which are particularly salient, learnable and simple, as these lead to successful communication. However, while some structures are simplified, others, as argued by Mauranen (2018), simultaneously become more complex.

Finally, the basic premise of the cognitive perspective is that the experience accumulated from a language acquired in infancy will be different from the experience accumulated from a language learnt later in life. The most important processes responsible for the individual's cognitive system are entrenchment and abstraction, which both depend on the speaker's linguistic experience. Mauranen (2018, 16) argues that less entrenched items will affect production and reception as they require a greater strain on memory, slow down retrieval and schema accessibility. The process of abstraction, in turn, plays an essential role in shaping the grammar of ELF users. Mauranen (2018, 16) maintains that "as a speaker's aggregate of lifetime experience accumulates it gets categorised, and gradually the abstractness of the categorisation rises", which leads to the fixedness of grammatical items at high levels of abstraction. Therefore, ELF users' language is dynamic, emergent, and undergoes constant changes.

To conclude, what integrates the three perspectives discussed above is the social nature of language and the inclusion of individual cognition. ELF is viewed as a contact language which, from a sociolinguistic perspective, is a second-order contact between various similects. From the interactional perspective, all levels of language undergo constant changes as individual interactions lead to alterations. In addition, ELF lacks regulatory mechanisms typical of standard languages which impose certain norms.

The focus on ELF has mainly fluctuated between the sociolinguistic and the interactional, relegating the cognitive dimension to the narrow confines of the processing, representation and development of English in learners and neglecting the cognitive resources and mechanisms underlying ELF (Hall 2018, 74). Consequently, researchers (Alptekin 2013; Hall 2018) call for a more cognitively oriented approach to ELF. Recent discussion of the phenomenon recognizes usage-based linguistics as a tool appropriate for capturing the cognitive aspects of ELF (Hall 2018). In a usage-based methodology, language is viewed as constructed and developed on the basis of frequency of occurrence and distribution of particular linguistic tokens in the input (i.e. usage events) experienced by users of a given language. Consequently, the framework assumes that linguistic patterns are not created top-down in the process where rules conform to universal principles, but rather emerge bottom-up from social, contextualized and individual experience with a given language. A similar perspective is adopted in a fine-grained approach to Talmy's (2000b) typology, where S- and V-types are not taken for granted but allowed to display new parameters emerging from contextualized data analyses.

The theoretical insights outlined above are useful for demonstrating how we approach ELF based on actual language usage and why this approach should be supplemented with a cognitive perspective. Thus, in the following section we apply the core notions of the theoretical and empirical work by Talmy and his followers, i.e. a fine-grained perspective upon S- and V-languages presented above, and analyse the way(s) ELF users conceptualize and formulate expressions of motion events.

3. THE STUDY

The following study was designed in order to explore a fine-grained perspective on Talmy's (2000b) typology. Specifically, we verified whether a division into S- and V-languages based on existing criteria was sufficient in the case of a contact language such as ELF or whether additional elements, both within and outside the motion event, needed to be introduced.

3.1. Participants

The participants were 17 Polish students (native speakers of Polish – an S-language) of English philology in Nicolaus Copernicus University in Poland. The respondents were 21 years old. The subjects reported that they use English (an S-language) at university during classes where the language is used as the medium of instruction, and socially with other foreign students of their majors, who are non-native users of English. The respondents' level of non-native competence in English was C1 according to the Common European Framework of Reference (Council of Europe 2017).

3.2. Instrument

For the purpose of the study we used an excerpt from a *Tom and Jerry* cartoon, *The Milky Waif* (1946). We chose a wordless cartoon in order to prevent the subjects from being heeded by the potential language used in the cartoon, which could have affected the results of the study. The excerpt lasts 30 seconds and can be divided into nine scenes:

scene 1 – Jerry is sitting and drinking milk from Tom's bowl,
scene 2 – Tom is standing and looking at Jerry drinking his milk,
scene 3 – Tom tries to catch Jerry,
scene 4 – Jerry gets under Tom's skin and moves towards his tail,
scene 5 – Tom shoots his tail,
scene 6 – Jerry runs away,
scene 7 – Tom chases Jerry with a swatter,
scene 8 – Tom corners Jerry,
scene 9 – Jerry is standing, and Tom is hitting him with a swatter.

Arranging nine scenes into a one-minute slot involves quick changes and a lot of internal dynamic. Hence, the story seems particularly suitable for conceptualizing dynamic motion. Still, static elements, e.g. standing or sitting, can also be discerned.

3.3. Data collection

Following other studies on motion events (e.g. Berthele 2004; Fortis 2010), we adopted a narrative approach typical of a fine-grained perspective.

3.4. Procedure

The participants were asked to watch the cartoon and narrate the story in English. The task was assigned as their homework. The narrations we gathered can be exemplified by the following two descriptions:

> The grey mouse in a diaper is drinking milk from a bowl, when it suddenly notices, it is observed by a cat. The cat attempts to catch the mouse, but mouse manages to get under its skin and moves towards his tail. The cat tries to shoot the mouse with a pistol but, once again, it manages to run away. Tom is chasing the mouse all around the house, trying to smack it with a red fly-flap and when it is trapped in a corner, he finally manages to hit it.

> A mouse smaller than Jerry is caught by Tom after drinking his milk. At first, Tom doesn't succeed in catching it but then he corners the mouse and spanks it with a spatula.

The striking quantitative difference in the two responses above, whereby the first student concentrates on virtually every scene while the other ignores most of them,

suggests that the cognitive mechanism of attention windowing might have influenced the respondents' narratives[2].

3.5. Data analysis

Since a fine-grained methodology assumes that factors outside the motion event shape its structure in a non-trivial way, we analysed the data in accordance with the windowing of attention framework, grouping the nine scenes into three windows: initial (1 and 2), medial (3–7) and final (8–9).

Examples within each window were then analysed using the features of S- and V-languages already discovered through the fine-grained approach and presented above. We repeat them here for the sake of convenience:

S-languages:

- express Path in a verb-sister slot,
- conflate Motion with conceptual categories of a co-event, typically Manner,
- pay higher attention to Manner, i.e. display Manner salience, which is evidenced in a frequent use of manner of motion verbs and their higher variety,
- pay higher attention to the description of Path and its segments (source, path, goal).

V-languages:

- express Path in a verb,
- do not typically conflate Motion with conceptual categories of a co-event, e.g. Manner,
- are not Manner-salient,
- concentrate on endstates of Path.

On a more specific note, the following methodological choices were made:

1) we took into consideration only those examples which contain Path (e.g. the clause *The grey mouse in a diaper is drinking milk from the bowl* was analysed since Path is encoded in the verb-sister slot, while the clause *when it suddenly notices* was not since Path cannot be discerned either in or outside the verb slot; consequently, out of the 90 examples gathered, 40 were classified as motion events and analysed,
2) we took into consideration simple and complex verb structures; in the case of the latter, (e.g. manages to escape) we classified the to-infinitive as associated with the Path schema and defined it as the final component state of a complement process

[2] The notion of attention plays a significant role in Talmy's (2000b) typological framework. Talmy (2000b) specifies how individuals distribute their attention over the event, differing the strength of this attention and forming attentional patterns. According to Talmy (2000b, 257), "languages can place a portion of a coherent referent situation into the foreground of attention by the explicit mention of that portion, while placing the remainder of that situation into the background of attention by omitting mention of it". In other words, parts of a scene which are foregrounded by inclusion and thus reflected in an utterance are windowed and parts which are backgrounded by exclusion (and omitted at the linguistic level) are gapped (Talmy 2000b, 257). The cognitive process responsible for this phenomenon is called the windowing of attention by Talmy (2000b).

construed as a path leading to its completion (Langacker 2008, 446); however, to distinguish between a prototypical Goal and the category conveyed via the infinitive marker, we adopted Talmy's (2000b, 47) category of Purpose for the latter,
3) looking for the Path component, we adopted Sachs' (2010) strategy and checked every verb etymologically (using www.etym.online); however, we differentiated between verbs with more and less salient Path; the former, e.g. *observe*, have Path morphologically embedded, while the latter, for instance *hit*, do not,
4) the passive voice was treated as expressing location (Talmy 2000b, 246).

3.5.1. Results

The results of the study are discussed with reference to each window of attention using the features of S- and V-languages. The analysis of each window in this section is arranged according to aspects typical of a fine-grained methodology, i.e. conceptual elements of both the motion event proper and its co-events, conflations in the verb slot and the semantics of the verb-sister slot. A new element is the type of motion event, i.e. fictive or factive, which was included in the analysis due to the high prominence of this distinction in our data.

3.5.1.1. Window 1

What strikes us immediately when looking at table 1 representing the analysis of window 1 is that the window is not salient, as it is represented by only two scenes. Furthermore, the students paid unequal attention to the two scenes, i.e. while the first scene has 13 responses out of 15, the second scene has only 2 such responses.

The subjects' narratives have been analyzed with respect to the way the verb slot of a motion event is expressed. Whenever a Figure changes its location in the narrative, a construction referring to Motion, Path and optionally Ground as well as Manner is used. The third column in table 1 is an account of the motion verb usage in the data. A closer look at the table reveals that there are two co-events in motion verbs frequently used by the subjects, i.e. Manner (13 examples out of 15) and Cause (10 examples). There is also one instance of zero conflation (i.e. a verb does not conflate with any conceptual element or a co-event), and three cases where Path is mapped onto a verb. Interestingly, whereas two instances out of three where Path is conflated with the verb refer to the second scene, only one such example refers to the first scene.

The conceptual elements contain 4 typical elements, i.e. Figure, Ground, Motion, Path. Additionally, Cause is included in 10 clauses. The expressions of Manner are not varied (i.e. they are limited to two verbs, *drink* or *sip*), leading us to the conclusion that Manner is not salient in these examples. The configuration of the conceptual elements in caused motion examples is not various, as in most cases the pattern is the same, i.e. Cause/Motion/Manner/Figure or Cause/Motion/Manner/Figure/Path/Ground. Thus, there is no qualitative difference in the way caused motion in these scenes is expressed. However,

we may notice a difference in the way the conceptual elements in the two scenes are configured. While the patterns in the first scene are more diverse (there are 4 different configurations; this is probably due to a higher number of responses in this scene), the configurations in the second scene assume either a Figure/Motion/Manner/Path/Agent pattern or a Figure/Motion/Manner/Path/Ground pattern.

The verb-sister slots encode Path, which focuses either on a source (6 examples), purpose (2 examples), or a goal (1 example). Thus, the subjects paid attention to the description of Path and its particular segments. Yet, the expressions of the source or purpose are limited to *out of* and *from*. Interestingly, in the example *A baby mouse is sipping on his milk*, the process of redundancy is present as Path is encoded in both the verb slot and the verb-sister slot. There is also a striking difference between the scenes with respect to the way the verb-sister slot is filled. While in the first scene there are 9 examples where Path is expressed in the verb-sister slot, in the second scene Path is encoded in the verb slot in the two responses provided.

In most cases, the two scenes are expressed through a factive type of motion event (11 examples out of 15). However, the informants overwhelmingly used a factive type of motion in the first scene (11 examples), while in the second scene they preferred a fictive type of motion as the two clauses representing this scene are rendered through this type of motion event.

To sum up our analysis of the data in window 1, we can detect the following features typical of S-languages: 1) Manner is a typical co-event conflated in a verb; 2) Path is encoded in a verb-sister slot; 3) the respondents focused on Path and its particular segments. However, the window also includes the following characteristics typical of V-languages: 1) minor cases (only 3) of Path mapped onto a verb; 2) not varied expressions of Manner. Consequently, we may conclude that it is difficult to state definitely if window 1 is expressed through an S- or V-type framing.

Table 1
The analysis of window 1

Example	**Conceptual elements**	**Verb slot**	**Verb-sister slot**	**Type of motion event**
The mouse is drinking his milk. (4)	CAUSE/ MOTION/MANNER/ FIGURE	MOVE + MANNER + CAUSE		FACT
The (grey) mouse (in a diaper) is drinking milk from the bowl. (4)	CAUSE/ MOTION/MANNER/ FIGURE/PATH/GROUND	MOVE + MANNER + CAUSE	SOURCE	FACT
The mouse is drinking the milk out of the cat's bowl.	CAUSE/ MOTION/MANNER /FIGURE/PATH/GROUND	MOVE + MANNER + CAUSE	SOURCE	FACT

A small mouse sips milk from a bowl.	CAUSE/ MOTION/MANNER/ FIGURE/PATH/GROUND	MOVE + MANNER + CAUSE	SOURCE	FACT
A baby mouse is sipping on his milk.*	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/GROUND	MOVE + MANNER	GOAL	FACT
The mouse tries to drink milk.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
The mouse wants[3] to drink milk from the bowl.	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + PATH	PURPOSE	FICT
It is observed[4] by the cat.	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/AGENT	BELOC + PATH + MANNER		FICT
The cat is observing him.	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/GROUND	MOVE + PATH + MANNER		FICT

3.5.1.2. Window 2

Looking at the results for window 2 in table 2 below, we may conclude that compared to windows 1 and 3, window 2 is the most salient as it is represented by 5 scenes. However, when narrating the story, the respondents paid most attention to scenes 3 and 5 and the least attention to scenes 4, 6 and 7, which received 9, 6, 2, 4 and 4 responses respectively.

Looking at the third column of the table, we may notice a striking difference between the way the verb slots were filled in windows 1 and 2. While in window 1 the most common elements conflated in the verb slots were Manner and Cause, in window 2 Manner is not a standard co-event, as it is encoded in the verb slots in only 4 clauses out of 25. There are only 2 instances where Cause is a co-event in a verb slot. Furthermore, 13 clauses encode zero conflation. In 8 clauses, Path is mapped onto a verb. However, the Path encoded in a verb in 3 examples (scene 5) is not salient, as it is not morphologically embedded.

The patterns of the conceptual elements are not diverse as one dominates, i.e. Figure/ Motion/Path/Ground, which contains basic conceptual elements (20 clauses). There are also instances of caused motion (4 clauses), out of which 3 examples contain inconspicuous Path discussed above. These examples are the most varied in this window as the combination of the conceptual elements is different in these 4 instances. Interestingly, in 15 examples including a to- infinitive clause, Ground is untypical as it appears to be yet another type of motion. Similarly to window 1, the verbs of Manner in this window are not diverse (limited to try, attempt, want, shoot, hunt, chase, run).

The verb-sister-slots are filled in 23 clauses and concentrate on endstates of Path, focusing on either a purpose or a goal, which is similar to window 1.

[3] Want: from PIE *weno-, suffixed form of root *eue- "to leave, abandon, give out".

[4] Observe: from ob "in front of, before" (see ob-) + servare "to watch, keep safe".

In most cases, the respondents preferred a fictive type of motion event over a factive one as there are 17 and 8 examples of each type respectively. The former prevails in the Figure/Motion/Path/Ground pattern, while the latter does so in caused motion. A closer look at the data reveals that the factivity – fictivity dichotomy is also linked to the scenes. Scenes 3 and 6 are conceptualized as fictive motion events, whereas scene 7 is a factive motion event. The remaining two scenes, i.e. 4 and 5, are expressed as both fictive and factive motion.

Consequently, the following 4 features: 1) Path mapped onto a verb; 2) zero conflation 3) unvaried expressions of Manner; 4) the focus on endstates of Path; let us conclude that the scenes in this window are expressed through features typical of V-languages. Yet, it has to be mentioned that although focused on endstates of Path, in as many as 23 clauses Path is encoded in a verb-sister slot, which is typical of S-languages.

Table 2
The analysis of window 2

Example	**Conceptual elements**	**Verb slot**	**Verb-sister slot**	**Type of motion event**
The cat tries to catch the baby-mouse. (4)	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
The cat attempts[5] to catch the mouse.	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + PATH	PURPOSE	FICT
He wants to catch it.	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + PATH	PURPOSE	FICT
Tom goes on to catch the baby mouse.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GOAL/GROUND	MOVE	PATH+ PURPOSE	FICT
He doesn't succeed[6] in catching it.	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + PATH	PURPOSE	FICT
He accomplishes[7] it (i.e. catching).	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + PATH		FICT
The mouse manages to get under his skin.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
It moves towards his tail.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	GOAL	FACT
He tries to shoot the mouse with a pistol. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
He attempts to shoot the baby mouse.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + PATH	PURPOSE	FICT

[5] Attempt: from assimilated form of ad "to, toward" + temptare "to try".
[6] Succeed: from sub "next to, after" + cedere "go, move".
[7] Accomplish: from ad "to" + complere "to fill up".

He points[8] the gun at the mouse.	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ FIGURE/GROUND	BELOC + *PATH*	GOAL	FACT
He shoots[9] his tail.	CAUSE/MOTION/ PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + *PATH* + CAUSE		FACT
He shoots himself in the tail.	CAUSE/MOTION/ GROUND/ PATH	MOVE + *PATH* + CAUSE	GOAL	FACT
The mouse manages to escape. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
The mouse manages to run away.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
He manages to slip away.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
The cat hunts for a tiny mouse. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + MAN-NER	GOAL	FACT
Tom is chasing the mouse all around the house.	CAUSE/MOTION/FIGURE/ PATH	MOVE + MAN-NER + CAUSE	PATH	FACT
He runs after Jerry's baby.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + MAN-NER	GOAL	FACT

3.5.1.3. Window 3

Similarly to window 1, window 3 is not salient as it includes only two scenes. Table 3 below renders an account of the motion expression usage in the data. If we compare the verb slots of windows 1 and 3, we discover that as opposed to window 1, in window 3 Manner is not such a frequent co-event since in 6 examples out of 14 it is conflated with a verb. What is striking is a relationship between a type of motion event and a conflation. Namely, in a factive type of motion the verbs conflate with Path (7 clauses), which is not morphologically embedded, i.e. not salient, whereas in a fictive type of event the verbs are rather non-path (zero conflation) (5 clauses). Therefore, this window is similar to window 2 with respect to the presence of both zero conflation and an inconspicuous Path in the verb slot. Furthermore, compared to windows 1 and 2, this window (scene 9) displays a greater variety of verbs of manner (e.g. *hit*, *smack*, *spank*, *bat*, *beat*), but Path remains inconspicuous in the clauses referring to this scene, which may suggest that the subjects avoided multiple conflations.

The verb-sister slots are the least elaborate in this window in comparison to windows 1 and 2, and focus on purpose (likewise window 2) in 5 examples and location in 2 instances. Similarly to window 1, window 3 in one of the clauses (*Tom beats up the mouse*) includes redundancy, as Path is encoded in the verb and the verb-sister slot.

[8] Point: "direct toward an object".

[9] Shoot: from Old English sceotan "to send forth swiftly".

The motion events in this window are expressed through a factive (9 examples) and a fictive type (5 examples) of motion event. In this respect this window is more similar to window 1, where factivity dominates over fictivity, as opposed to window 2, where a fictive type of a motion event is more frequent than a factive one.

Window 3 has been analyzed with respect to the configuration of the conceptual elements. Examination of the data reveals that while the conceptual elements are configured in a fictive motion type of event in almost the same way, i.e. Figure/Motion/Path/Ground, in the case of a factive type of motion the patterns of the conceptual elements are more varied (e.g. Figure/Motion/Manner/Path/Ground or Figure/Motion/Path/Instrument/Ground).

Consequently, the window displays features typical of S- as well as V-languages. Whereas characteristics such as a greater variety of verbs of Manner or Motion conflation in a verb suggest the fact that the scenes are expressed through an S-type framing, features such as zero conflation or Path encoded in a verb suggest a V-type framing.

Table 3
The analysis of window 3

Example	**Conceptual elements**	**Verb slot**	**Verb-sister slot**	**Type of motion event**
Tom corners[10] him.	CAUSE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND/FIGURE	MOVE + CAUSE + *PATH* + GROUND		FACT
The cat manages to drive the mouse into a corner from which it cannot escape.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
It is trapped[11] in a corner.	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER(MEANS)/PATH/ GROUND	BELOC + *PATH* + MANNER (MEANS)	LOCATION	FACT
The mouse is met[12] with the corner.*	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ INSTRUMENT/ GROUND	BELOC + *PATH*		FACT
It gets stuck in the corner of the house.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	BELOC + MANNER	LOCATION	FACT
He finds[13] him.	FIGURE/MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + *PATH*		FACT

[10] Corner: "bring to a point by convergence".
[11] Trap: "encircle".
[12] Meet: from Old English metan "to fall in with, come into the same place with".
[13] Find: from Old English findan "come upon".

He hits[14] the mouse with a flyswatter. (2)	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/ GROUND/INSTRUMENT	MOVE + MANNER + *PATH*		FACT
He hits her bottom with all his strength.	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/ GROUND/INSTRUMENT	MOVE + MANNER + *PATH*		FACT
He is trying to smack it with a red fly-flap.	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
He tries to kill the baby mouse. (2)	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
He tries to hurt him.	FIGURE/ MOTION/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE	PURPOSE	FICT
Tom beats up the mouse.	FIGURE/MOTION/ MANNER/PATH/ GROUND	MOVE + MANNER	PATH	FACT

3.6. Discussion and conclusion

In the preceding three sections, the expressions of a motion event have been analyzed with reference to a division into S- and V-languages, with a view to finding whether the existing criteria are sufficient in the case of a contact language such as ELF or whether new elements have to be introduced. The aspects of a fine-grained methodology were taken into consideration in the analysis. The most essential findings can be summarized with reference to ELF and Talmy's (2000b) typology.

Typically for S-languages, Manner is conflated with Motion in a verb slot (see window 1 and 3) in most expressions of a motion event. However, the expressions of Manner are varied only in window 3. In the remaining examples Manner is not salient. Furthermore, the subjects paid higher attention to various segments of Path (see window 1) or mapped Path onto a verb-sister slot (see window 2), which is characteristic of S-languages, but there are also examples where the endstates of Path are focused on (see window 2), or Path, although not salient, is conflated in a verb slot (see windows 2 and 3), which is typical of V-languages. Therefore, considering the aspects of conflation and Manner saliency, it is difficult to assess which type of framing (S- or V-) dominates in the data. Furthermore, Talmy's (2000b) typology does not seem to provide sufficient tools for the analysis of particular aspects of ELF (e.g. untypical Ground in to-infinitive clauses used by the subjects repeatedly – see window 2). Consequently, we may conclude that the simple dichotomy of Talmy's (2000b) typology is not precise enough to analyze a contact language such as ELF.

Furthermore, the results of the study revealed the relevancy of certain cognitive processes in ELF in the expression of a motion event which require further studies and

[14] Hit: from late Old English hyttan, hittan "come upon, fall in with".

appear to be potential factors to be taken into consideration in typological research in a contact language such as ELF. One such process is the windowing of attention, which as recent literature (Stocker and Laeng 2017) demonstrates, is linked to typology. The factive – fictive typology appears to be another important aspect which is present in all three windows. The analysis of the data also demonstrated high usage of zero conflation, which is typical of V-languages. A tendency towards a fictive type of motion and zero conflation may point to a high degree of abstraction, which is a cognitive process typical of ELF users (see the discussion above). Factivity, on the other hand, may be understood as a tendency toward concretization. Redundancy (see window 1) is yet another cognitive process used by the subjects in the expression of a motion event. Thus, the findings clearly indicate that a fine-grained methodology not only allows for a more precise assessment of ELF users' language, but also provides valuable information about cognitive processes underlying ELF. It remains an empirical question as to whether ELF can be classified as belonging to an S- or V-type, and more research is undoubtedly necessary that would target not only the S- and V-dichotomy, but also the processes affecting typology mentioned above.

REFERENCES

Alptekin, C. 2013. "English as a lingua franca through a usage-based perspective: Merging the social and the cognitive in language use". *Language Culture and Curriculum* 26 (2): 197–207.

Berman, R., and D. Slobin, eds. 1994. *Relating Events in Narrative: A Crosslinguistic Developmental Study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Berthele, R. 2004. "The typology of motion and posture verbs: a variationist account". In *Dialectology Meets Typology. Dialect Grammar from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, ed. B. Kortmann. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 93–126.

Cadierno, T. 2008. "Learning to talk about motion in a foreign language". In *Handbook of Cognitive Linguitcs and Second Language Acquisition*, eds. P. Robinson and N.C. Ellis. New York–London: Routledge, 239–275.

Council of Europe. 2017. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment. Companion Volume with New Descriptors*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Fortis, J.-M. 2010. Space in Language. Leipzig Summer School.

Hall, Ch. 2018. "Cognitive perspectives on English as a lingua franca". In *The Roudledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, eds. J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey. New York: Routledge, 74–84.

Han, Z., and T. Cadierno, eds. 2010. *Linguistic relativity in second language acquisition: Thinking-for-speaking*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. 2017. "Motion and semantic typology: A hot old topic with exciting caveats". In *Motion and Space across Languages: Theory and applications*, ed. I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 13–18.

Jenkins, J. 2006. "Current perspectives on teaching World Englishes and English as a lingua franca". *TESOL Quarterly* 40 (1): 157–181.

Jenkins, J. 2012. "English as a lingua franca from the classroom to the classroom". *ELT Journal* 66 (4): 486–494.

Ji, Y. 2019. "Linguistic and mental representations of caused motion in Chinese and English children". In *Cognitive Linguistics and the Study of Chinese*, eds. D. Shu, H. Zhang and L. Zhang. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 285–308.

Kopecka-Piech, K. 2010. "Convergent Landscape. 39 and Half as a (Multi) Promotional Intertext". *Journal of Education Culture and Society* 2: 139–155.

Langacker, R. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lewandowski, W. 2014. "The locative alternation in verb-framed vs. satellite-framed languages". *Studies in Language* 38 (4): 864–895.

Lewandowski, W., and J. Mateu. 2016. "Thinking for translating and intra-typological variation in satellite-framed languages". *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 14 (1): 185–208.

Łozińska, J., and B. Pietrewicz. "Lexicalisation of Vertical Motion. A Study of three Satellite-Framed Languages". *Cognitive Studies* 18: 1–13.

Mauranen, A. 2018. "Conceptualising ELF". In *The Roudledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*, eds. J. Jenkins, W. Baker and M. Dewey. New York: Routledge, 7–24.

Rice, S. 2002. "Figure/Motion/Manner/Path Conflation Patterns in the Dene Sųłiné Verb". 2002 Athapaskan Languages Conference. Fairbanks, Alaska, 16–18 June 2002.

Sachs, A. 2010. *Motion Events in Seri: Applying Talmy's Typologies*. Unpublished MA thesis.

Seidlhofer, B. 2011. *Understanding English as a lingua franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Slobin, D. 2004. "The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events". In *Relating events in narrative. Typological and contextual perspectives*, eds. S. Strömqvist and L. Verhoeven. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 219–257.

Stocker, K., and B. Laeng. 2017. "Analog and digital windowing of attention in language, visual perception, and the brain". *Cognitive Semantics* 3 (2): 158–181.

Talmy, L. 2000a. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, vol. 1: *Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, L. 2000b. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, vol. 2: *Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, L. 2017. "Past, present and future of motion research". In *Motion and Space across Languages: Theory and applications*, ed. I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 13–38

Tom and Jerry, The Milky Waif, 1946. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sgFK9b_4do8 (July 2, 2020).

Rama satelitarna czy czasownikowa? W kierunku typologii zdarzeń ruchowych w języku angielskim jako *lingua franca*

Słowa kluczowe: język angielski jako lingua franca, typologia Talmiego, zdarzenie ruchu, V-języki, S-języki, język kontaktu.

STRESZCZENIE

Niniejszy artykuł analizuje język angielski jako lingua franca (ang. ELF) z perspektywy typologii Talmiego (2000b), która dzieli języki na typy S i V. Języki S wyrażają ścieżkę ruchu w partykule czasownika a sposób ruchu w samym czasowniku, podczas gdy języki V kodują ścieżkę w czasowniku a sposób ruchu w przysłówku. Typologia Talmiego (2000a) została z powodzeniem zastosowana w badaniach and językami standardowymi. Jednak badania (Berthele 2004) wykazały, że podział na kategorie S i V może nie być wystarczający w przypadku języków kontaktowych. Aby sprawdzić tę hipotezę, stosujemy rozróżnienie typologiczne Talmiego (2000a) na język angielski jako lingua franca. Na podstawie wyników jakościowego badania pilotażowego wśród polskich użytkowników języka angielskiego pokazujemy, że chociaż polski i angielski są klasyfikowane jako języki S zgodnie z typologią Talmiego (2000b), ELF (język kontaktowy) wykazuje cechy jeszcze niesklasyfikowane jako należące do typu S lub V. W związku z tym dochodzimy do wniosku, że dychotomiczne rozróżnienie Talmiego (2000b, 2017) wymaga dalszych udoskonaleń, aby można je było zastosować w kontekście języka angielskiego jako lingua franca.