Deictic Motion verbs in Greek as a Foreign Language by Spanish and Catalan L1 learners: a preliminary approach

Maria Andria
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Alberto Hijazo-Gascón
University of East Anglia

Abstract

Η παρούσα μελέτη εξετάζει την έκφραση της Δείξης στα ισπανικά, καταλανικά και ελληνικά. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, στόχοι της είναι: πρώτον, να περιγράψει και να παρουσιάσει συγκριτικά τις διαφορές ανάμεσα στη χρήση των δεικτικών ρημάτων κίνησης «πάω» και «έρχομαι» στις τρεις αυτές γλώσσες (ισπανικά (*ir, venir*), καταλανικά (*anar, venir*)). Δεύτερον, να μελετήσει τη χρήση/κατάκτηση αυτών των ρημάτων στην ελληνική ως ξένη γλώσσα (Γ2) από μαθητές με πρώτη γλώσσα (Γ1) τα ισπανικά ή/και τα καταλανικά. Ειδικότερα, επιθυμεί να εξετάσει κατά πόσον οι συγκεκριμένες διαφορές στη χρήση των δεικτικών ρημάτων θα οδηγήσουν σε περιπτώσεις διαγλωσσικής επίδρασης *(crosslinguistic influence)*. Τα ελληνικά και τα καταλανικά επιτρέπουν τη χρήση και των δύο συνομιλητών ως δεικτικών κέντρων, ενώ τα ισπανικά επιτρέπουν μόνο τη χρήση του ομιλητή ως δεικτικού κέντρου. Τα αποτελέσματα τόσο της ποιοτικής, όσο και της ποσοτικής ανάλυσης, έδειξαν ότι οι συγκεκριμένες διαφορές ανάμεσα στη Γ1 και στη γλώσσα-στόχο, μπορούν όντως να αποτελέσουν πηγή διαγλωσσικής επίδρασης, καθώς παρατηρήθηκε ότι οι μαθητές ελληνικών συνήθιζαν να μεταφέρουν τη δομή της Γ1 τους στη Γ2. Το ίδιο αποτέλεσμα αφορούσε και τους διγλώσσους μαθητές καταλανικών-ισπανικών, παρά το γεγονός ότι τα καταλανικά εκφράζουν τη δείξη με τον ίδιο τρόπο όπως τα ελληνικά. Τα ευρήματα της έρευνας ερμηνεύονται υπό το πρίσμα της θεωρίας «Σκέπτεσθαι με σκοπό το ομιλείν» (*Thinking-for-Speaking Hypothesis)*.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: Deixis, crosslinguistic influence, motion verbs, second/foreign language acquisition, Greek as a foreign language

1. Introduction

Several studies, taking as a point of departure Cognitive Linguistics, have explored the way motion events are expressed in typologically different languages (Talmy 1991, 2000). Talmy (1991, 2000) argues that languages present different lexicalization patterns in the way they encode MOTION. He also suggests two typological groups into which languages can be classified depending on how the encode the semantic component of Path. As an area of research, the analysis of motion events within Talmy's approach has attracted significant attention from scholars. A subcomponent of MOTION whose encoding patterns have been found to present differences is Deixis, i.e. motion toward the speaker or away from the speaker (Choi and Bowerman 1992, Matsumoto 1996). These differences appear even among typologically close languages (Filipović 2007, Hijazo-Gascón & Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2013, Hijazo-Gascón 2017). Albeit its relevance, the exploration of Deixis has received less attention than the other semantic components of the cognitive domain of MOTION.

Stemming from Talmy's typological classification of languages, Slobin (1991, 1996a, 1996b, 1997, 2004, 2006) proposes the Thinking for Speaking Hypothesis. According to this theory, the systematic differences that speakers of different languages present in the expression of MOTION reflect different thinking for speaking patterns. Slobin states that each language "trains" its speakers to pay attention to specific details of an event when they talk. The speakers make choices on-line according to specific lexicalization patterns that they have acquired as speakers of a particular language. These patterns which has been acquired in childhood are "exceptionally resistant in restructuring in ALA [adult language acquisition]" (Slobin 1993: 245). Recently, several scholars have discussed the relevance of this hypothesis for Second Language Acquisition (SLA) suggesting that learning a new language implies learning a new way of thinking for speaking (Cadierno 2004) or a "re-thinking for speaking" (Robinson & Ellis 2008). Given Slobin's claims about the resistant nature of first language (L1) thinking for speaking patterns, the interest for SLA research is centered on whether a second/foreign language (L2) learner can reconstruct them when acquiring the new target language.

The purpose of the present study is, firstly, to explore the use of the deictic motion verbs "go" and "come" in an under-researched combination of languages: Spanish (*ir/venir*), Catalan (*anar/venir*) and Greek (*πάω* /pao/, /*έρχομαι* /erxome/).

Secondly, it aims at offering a first empirical exploration on the use/acquisition of the Greek deictic motion verbs *πάω* /pao/ "go" and *έρχομαι* /erxome/ "come" by Spanish and Catalan L1 learners. Greek and Catalan allow both interlocutors as a deictic center whereas Spanish allows only the speaker to play this role (Gathercole 1977, Hijazo-Gascón 2017). It is our aim, therefore, to explore whether the present L1 deictic pattern will be a potential source of crosslinguistic influence (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008) for L2 learners of Greek: The main hypothesis is that negative transfer will occur for learners whose L1 has a different deictic pattern (L1 Spanish monolinguals) and positive transfer will occur for bilingual learners whose dominant L1 shares the same pattern (L1 Catalan). Section 2 offers a theoretical overview on the concept of Deixis, while Section 3 discusses the acquisition of deictic motion verbs in an L2.

2. Deixis

The concept of Deixis in linguistics refers to the relation between language and its context. There are certain linguistic elements whose full meaning is context-dependent. For example, if someone finds a post-it next to her office door with the text *Meet you there later* a full decoding of the message can only be achieved when we know about the complete context of the communicative situation (see for example Fillmore 1971[1977] for a detailed definition of Deixis). For instance, let's think that it is 12.30 when the addressee read this note and that she normally goes for lunch at 13.00 with one of her colleagues. The most probable inference is that *later* refers to 13.00 and that *there* refers to the cafeteria at university, assuming that the author of the note is your colleague. The linguistic expressions, like *there* or *later*, that vary their interpretation depending on the context are called *deictic expressions* (Huang 2006), and belong to different linguistic categories, such as adverbs of time and space (*there*/*here*), first and second personal pronouns (*we*/*you*), demonstratives (*this*/*that*) and motion verbs (*come*/*go*).

The way in which deictic motion is expressed across languages varies. Huang (2006) considers that the main directional deictic linguistic elements are either deictic affixes or deictic verbs. In the first group we can find deictic prefixes such as German particles *hin*- 'hither' and *her*- 'thither' (Goschler & Stefanowitsch 2010, Liste-Lamas 2015), or prefixes, such as in Serbian *od*- 'from the speaker' and *do*- 'to the speaker'

(Filipović 2007). In the case of deictic verbs, some languages present a distinction between verbs encoding motion toward the deictic centre, such as English *come*, Spanish *venir,* and Greek *erxome*. The deictic centre is the person who is at the goal of motion at the time of the utterance. This concept is in relation with the traditional notion of *origo* (Bühler 1934, see also Levinson 1996). Fillmore (1971[1977]), in a classical study on English *come* and *go*, claims that these verbs are defined by the fact that its interpretation depends on the spatial and temporal location of the speech act participants. He also notes some specifications, for example the home-based situations, in which motion is not towards the deictic centre, but towards a place that is deeply identified with her, mainly her house or work placement. This allows us to say *I will come to the shop next week* to our addressee, if the shop is run by her or is her current workplace.

Although some authors have considered "come" and "go" as semantic universals (Miller and Johnson Laird 1976), other scholars have claimed for a language-specific analysis of deictic verbs before generalising (Fillmore 1983, Goddard 1997). Indeed, several studies have pointed out the differences between languages in their use of deictic verbs. Gathercole (1977, 1978) shows how the deictic centre vary across languages, which impacts on the use of *come* and *go* equivalents. According to this author, there are two types of Deixis, immediate Deixis and extended Deixis. In the case of immediate Deixis the focus is on cases in which the deictic centre is at the goal of motion at the time of the utterance. The different options are: (i) that the language can use come for motion towards both the addressee and the speaker (e.g. English, Catalan, Greek); (ii) that the language can use come only for motion towards the speaker (e.g. Spanish, Japanese, Chinese); and (iii) that the language does not have presuppositional content (e.g. Indonesian).

For the second case of Deixis, Gathercole defines extended Deixis as the situations in which the deictic centre is not at the goal of motion at the time of the utterance. This would the above-mentioned cases of home-based situations, even in languages that only allow the speaker as the deictic centre. An example in Spanish would be *¿Viene María a la fiesta esta noche?* "Does María come to the party tonight?". In this case, even if the speaker is not at the goal of motion (the party), the use of *venir* "come (only towards the speaker)" implies his or her presence at the party, due to an identification with the place. Gathercole also mentions the possibility of using *venir* in Spanish in cases of accompaniment. In those cases, both *venir* and *ir* are

acceptable but *venir* would imply a greater degree of intimacy with the speaker. For example, in *¿Quieres ir/venir a una fiesta conmigo?* "Do you want to go/come to a party with me" the use of *venir* "come" would imply closeness to the speaker.

Greek presents some differences in this regard, Antonopoulou and Nikiforidou (2002) and Bella (2001) claim that in Greek *erxome* "come" necessarily implies the presence of one of them: *Θα παςστο πάρτυ*; /tha pas sto parti/ "Are you going to the party?" the implication is that the speaker will not be there, whereas in *Θα έρθεις στο πάρτυ;* /tha erthis sto parti/ "Are you coming to the party?" it is implied that the speaker will be there for sure. In addition to this, in concomitative utterances, i.e. utterances where the speaker is accompanied by the addressee, *erxome* is the only possibility in Greek. Therefore it is not possible to make implicit the physical presence of the speaker and the addresse, it needs to be explicit.

Catalan, in spite of being a typologically very close language to Spanish, it does not share the same deictic pattern in relation to the use of the deictic motion verbs under analysis. On the contrary, it is closer to the Greek deictic pattern. For instance, in the sentence *Vens a la festa?* "Are you coming to the party"? or *Vinc amb tu* "I am coming with you", similar to Greek *'Ερχομαι μαζί σου* /erxome mezi su/ "I am coming with you".

The debates on the notion of Deixis also involve the semantic typology of motion events by Talmy (1991, 2000). Talmy classifies languages according to the encoding of the component of Path, i.e. the trajectory of the movement. If Path tends to be encoded in the main verb of the event, as in Spanish, the language would be a verb-framed language. For example, *salir* "go out, exit" in *María sale de casa* "María exits from the house". If Path tends to be encoded outside the main verb of the event, then it is a satellite-framed language, as out in English "María went out of the house". Talmy establishes that Deixis is one of the subcomponents of Path, along with Vector and Conformation. However, other authors working in this framework have claimed for the special status of Deixis, as a separate semantic component, at the same level of Path, Manner or Cause. Choi and Bowerman (1992: 86) place Deixis at the same level as other semantic components as Manner and Cause. They consider that Deixis often patterns differently from other kinds of Paths in the way it is lexicalized. In Korean the main verb is usually *kata* 'go' or *ota* 'come', conflating motion with Deixis, and deictic verbs can be preceded by a Manner and a Path verb.

Matsumoto (1996, 2013) has also studied Deixis in some languages, particularly in Japanese. As in Korean, German or Jacaltek, Japanese has a specific 'slot' for Deixis independent of Path. Matsumoto, Akita and Takahashi (2017) disagree with Talmy's (2000) consideration of Deixis as a subcomponent of Path and claim for the establishment of Deixis as an independent semantic component. Their reasons are that Deixis has its own morpho-syntactic slots in a number of languages, which is different from non-deictic Path information, and that deictic verbs exist independently of the richness of path verbs in a given language (e.g. English and German). This is an on going debate in the literature on motion events. The aim of this paper is to contribute to our knowledge of how deictic motion verbs work. Even though neither Greek nor Spanish and Catalan have a specific morpho-syntactic slot, they present interesting crosslinguistic differences in these areas that are of interest from the perspective of SLA.

3. Deictic motion verbs in SLA

As previously mentioned, Talmy's (1991) typology has been used as a framework to test Slobin's (1991, 1996, 2000) Thinking for Speaking hypothesis. According to Slobin, this is the thinking that is produced at the time of speaking, which differs according to the linguistic resources available in each language. For example, English speakers have more resources available to express Manner of motion than Spanish speakers (Slobin 1996, 2004, 2006). This is due to a higher lexicon of Manner of motion verbs (e.g. *trudge*, *dash*, *prance*, *stagger*, etc.) and to the possibility of encoding Manner in the main slot of the motion event, whereas this is less frequent in Spanish where the verb tends to encode Path. According to the Thinking for Speaking hypothesis, English speakers will tend to give more Manner information, and therefore to pay more attention to Manner information, because Manner is more readily encodable in this language. Spanish speakers will tend to express Manner only when it is cognitively salient. They also tend to give less finer-grained distinctions of Manner, using general verbs such as *jump*, *run*, *fly*, etc. There is a vast literature on this area, giving evidence on how speakers of different languages differ in the encoding of motion events depending on these typological differences (see the classical papers in the edited volumes by Berman & Slobin 1994 and by Strömqvist & Verhoeven 2004; and Filipović & Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2015 for an overview). These differences in the

rhetorical style of how the events are narrated are not only linked to cognitive abilities such as categorisation and attention, but also to memory. For example, and following the same domain, Filipović (2010, 2011) shows how speakers of Spanish were worse at remembering Manner of motion information than English speakers.

But what happens when we learn another language? Can we shift our thinking for speaking patterns? According to Slobin (1996), our Thinking for Speaking is very resistant to change when learning an L2. Some authors have considered this possibility as a different thinking for speaking in the L2 (Cadierno 2004) or a *re-thinking for speaking* (Robinson and Ellis 2008). Different studies have tried to unravel whether this re-thinking for speaking is possible or not (see for example the studies gathered in Han & Cadierno 2010). Although there are some mixed results in the literature, it seems that thinking for speaking is not easy to restructure and that the influence of the first language is pervasive. In fact, MOTION has been identified as one of the prone domains for crosslinguistic influence at a conceptual level (Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008). Crosslinguistic influence, also known as transfer, as the influence from one language into another in the acquisition process is indeed one of the main areas of study in SLA (Odlin 1989, Kellerman 1995, Yu & Odlin 2015, Alonso-Alonso 2016). The influence of the first language onto the second has been widely studied on the acquisition of motion events in general (see Cadierno 2017 for an overview). However, these studies have focused on other semantic components of MOTION such as Manner, Path and Cause.

The attention to how deictic motion verbs are acquired in an L2 has received less attention, although there are some previous studies in this field, looking at different language combinations. For example, Lewandowski (2014) focuses on the acquisition of Spanish deictic motion verbs by L1 Polish speakers and identifies inaccuracies in the interpretation of the meaning of these verbs. His study shows that learners are not aware of the restrictive meaning of *venir* "come" in Spanish that only allows the interpretation towards the speaker. His participants accepted non-idiomatic uses of *venir* that are possible in their first language Polish.

Liste-Lamas (2015) focuses on the acquisition of German deictic particles *hin-* and *her-* by Spanish learners. In this case the challenge for the learners also involve the use of a different construction, encoding the deictic information in a particle instead of doing it in the main verb. Yoshinari (2015) also identifies difficulties in the learning of deictic motion verbs in Japanese as an L2 by speakers whose first languages were

English and Chinese. Hijazo-Gascón (2017) also focuses on the acquisition of Spanish deictic verbs, but in this case by German, French and Italian learners. In this case, he finds difficulties not only for the German speakers but also for French and Italian speakers whose languages belong to the same typological group and genetic family as Spanish. These difficulties involved the avoidance of using deictic motion verbs or their use making reference to motion towards the addressee, which is acceptable in all these three L1s but not in Spanish.

In the current study, we present an original research in that it involves Greek, Spanish and Catalan, a language combination that to our knowledge has not received the attention of researchers and that can contribute to our better understanding of Deixis and how it can be a source of crosslinguistic influence in the process of acquisition of an L2. Concretely, the aim of the present study is to shed some light on the acquisition of the deictic motion verbs *πάω /pao/* "go" and *έρχομαι /erxome/* "come" by Spanish and Catalan and L1 learners. More specifically, the research questions that guide our study are the following:

(1) Are L1 Spanish speakers able to adapt the deictic lexicalization patterns to L2 Greek?
(2) Are early Catalan/Spanish bilinguals able to adapt the deictic lexicalization patterns to L2 Greek?

We could hypothesize that that negative transfer will occur for the Spanish L1 learners, since their L1 has a different deictic pattern (L1 Spanish), and positive transfer will occur for the Catalan/Spanish bilinguals, given that Catalan shares the same deictic pattern (L1 Catalan) with the target language. The influence of Spanish cannot be ruled out among Spanish-Catalan bilingual learners of Greek. However, we hypothesize that speaking a language that shares the deictic lexicalization pattern of the L2 will give them an advantage over the learners who only speak Spanish.

4. Methodology

4.1 Participants

The participants of the present study belonged to two categories: a) learners of Greek as an L2, and 2) native speakers (see Table 1). More specifically, the first one consisted of L2 learners of Greek whose L1 whose either Spanish (N=6) or they were Catalan/Spanish bilinguals (N=6). Bilingual participants are dominant in Catalan, according to their biodata. They were studying Modern Greek as an L2 in a formal language context, at a language school in Barcelona, Spain. Their level of L2 proficiency was B2 according to the *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages* (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001). A control group of native speakers of the three languages analyzed in the study (i.e., Spanish, Catalan and Greek) was also included, in order to have a native baseline with which to compare L2 learners' production. The number of native speakers per group was 6 (total number N=18). In this paper, we will mainly focus on the data provided by L2 learners of Greek, whose answers were compared with those provided by the Greek native speakers.

Table 1:

Number of participants per group

Participants			
Greek L2 learners		**Native Speakers**	
Spanish L1	6	Spanish	6
Catalan/Spanish bilinguals	6	Catalan	6
		Greek	6

4.2. Instruments

The instruments were, firstly, four videos, originally designed by Hijazo-Gascón (2017). Each of the videos shows two people in different scenarios with one of them moving towards the other. Participants were presented individually with these four short videos (each one had a duration of approximately one minute) and were asked to describe them taking each time the position of one of the protagonists of the video. There were two different versions of the instructions (the participant had to take the perspective of different characters and in different situations). The videos had been designed in order to encourage the use of motion verbs. This type of description task was used in order to examine whether the same motion event appearing in the videos

would be described in a different way by Greek native speakers and by native and non-native speakers (von Stutterheim 2003), in this case by Greek native speakers and by Spanish and Catalan L1 learners of Greek. The use of picture description tasks has been considered to be a valuable tool for the investigation of crosslinguistic and cross-cultural influences on L2 acquisition and use (Sánchez & Jarvis 2008). This is because the same visual stimuli can be described in different ways by speakers of different L1 backgrounds, enabling thus the exploration of crosslinguistic influence effects (Berman & Slobin 1994). Here, only results of the versions in which the speaker moves towards the addressee are presented.

In order to complement the experiment, a cloze test activity was also included (see Appendix). The test contained gaps that had to be filled with motion verbs. The Greek version of this test was adapted from Hijazo-Gascón (2017). Again, only the results concerning the gaps in situations where the speaker moves towards the addressee had been considered considered here. The test compensates the free task of video description and minimizes cases of participants avoiding the use of deictic verbs.

Apart from the above-mentioned instruments, a questionnaire has also been administered to the participant in order to elicit biodata and the linguistic background of the participants.

4.3 Procedure

Data collection was carried out individually with each participant. First, participants had to watch each video and, immediately after that, to describe it in their L2 (Greek) and in their L1 (Spanish or Catalan). In order to counterbalance the task, the order of the oral descriptions changed (i.e., some participants described the videos first in their L2 and then in their L1, whereas some others did it in the opposite way). The reason to include L1 data was twofold: Firstly, in order to be sure that the participants had understood the task and produced the target structure (they noticed the target action). Thus, in cases where the participants had written the target form in their L1, but they had omitted it or used something different in the L2, it could be deduced that it was a clear case of avoidance (Selinker 1972, 1992). Secondly, in order to compare the participants' answers in their L1 and in their L2, and explore the difference in the expression of Deixis. This paper focuses on the L2 Greek data. After completing the video description

task, participants had to complete the cloze test. At the end, they completed the questionnaire.

4.4 Analysis

After the data collection, the video description tasks were transcribed and analyzed qualitatively. Regarding the cloze test, the participants were given a global score up to 8 which corresponds to the items including the target deictic motion verbs. The data of this test were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. For the statistical analyses, the Statistical Package of Social Sciences was used (SPSS 15). In order to explore the differences in the linguistic patterns between the native speakers of Greek and the learners of Greek as an L2 a Mann-Whitney *U* test were performed. The dependent variable was the score in the cloze test and the independent variable was the L1 (Greek vs. Spanish/Catalan). Furthermore, another Mann-Whitney *U* test was run in order to explore the differences between Spanish L1 learners and Spanish/Catalan bilinguals. Again, the dependent variable was the score in the cloze test and the independent variable was the L1 (Spanish vs. Catalan). Non-parametric tests were considered more appropriate due to the small number of the sample.

5. Results

The results presented here, albeit being preliminary, allow us to observe some tendencies in the acquisition of Greek as an L2 by Spanish and Catalan L1 learners. Firstly, the findings of the qualitative analyses will be presented, followed by those of the quantitative one. We remind the reader that the focus is on situations in which the speaker moves towards the addressee, given that this is the situation where the Spanish contrasts with Greek and Catalan. In Spanish, andative verbs are used in this context whereas in Catalan and Greek, the tendency is to use venitive verbs instead.

While analyzing the video stimuli, it was observed that there were some cases in which the participants were able to provide the correct deictic verb in Greek, as it is illustrated in the following example (1):

(1) Χθες βράδυ ήμουν σπίτι σε πήρα τηλέφωνο και 7 μαζί στο σπίτι σου, *ήρθα* με ένα μπουκάλι κρασί και περάσαμε ωραία στο στο σπίτι σου.

"Last night I was at home, I called you and we said to have a date at your place. I *came* with a bottle of wine and we had a great time at your home."
(Participant #7 Video 1a, Catalan/Spanish bilingual)

In this example, we can see that the participant made a correct use of the verb *erxome* in Greek, in other words he used venitive instead of the andative, which is what one of his L1 (Spanish) required for this case. At the same time, it could be a case of positive crosslinguistic influence from his other L1, namely Catalan.

Nevertheless, examples like the one that has been just mentioned are very marginal in our data. In most of the cases, both Spanish L1 learners and Catalan/Spanish bilinguals used andative verbs (*pao*) instead of venitives (*erxome*), which is what Greek language requires in this context. Some examples of this tendency are presented below:

(2) Χθες σε πήρα τηλέφωνο και μιλήσαμε λιγάκι και κανονίσαμε να βρεθούμε στο σπίτι σου οπότε *χτενίχτηκα λιγάκι, κοιτάχτηκα στον καθρέφτη και όταν ήμουν έτοιμος έφυγα από το σπίτι μου και *πήγα στο σπίτι σου* και σου έφερα ένα μπουκάλι κρασί.
"Last night I called you and we talked a little bit and then we agreed to meet at your house. So I brushed my hair, I looked myself at the mirror and when I was ready I left my house and *I went to your home* and I also brought you a bottle of wine'
(Participant #1 Video 1a, Spanish L1)

(3) Όλγα μου δεν ξέρω πώς δεν *θυμάσεις αυτό που κάναμε χθες. Εγώ σε τηλεφώνησα στο βράδυ στις 8 και σου είπα, σου είπε συγγνώμη, Όλγα μου *πάω στο σπίτι του*, στο σπίτι σου και κάνουμε φαγητό και εγώ σας φέρω ένα κρασί πάρα πολύ ωραίο από το σουπερμάρκετ κάτω στο σπίτι μου και εσύ μου είπες ναι και *εγώ πήγα στο σπίτι σου* και φάγαμε.

"Olga dear, I don't know how you don't remember what we did yesterday. I called in the evening, around 8 and I told you, he told you sorry, Olga dear I will go to his home, your home and we *do dinner and I bring you a very good wine

from the supermarket under my house and you said to me yes and *I went to your place* and we ate.
(Participant #2 Video 1a, Spanish L1)

(4) Βρε Κριστίνα τι έγινε; Δε θυμάσαι ότι *μου πήρες τηλέφωνο για να πάμε μαζί να αγοράσουμε τα εισιτήρια για τη συναυλία; Εγώ σε…εγώ *πήγα μαζί σου* να τα αγοράσουμε και τώρα δε θυμάσαι;

'But, Cristina, what happened? You don't remember that you called me in order to go together and buy the tickets for the concert? I… *I went with you* to buy them and now you don't remember?
(Participant #4 Video 3a, Spanish L1)

(5) Όλγα χθες στο βράδυ σε πήρα τηλέφωνο για να κάνουμε τραπέζι στο σπίτι του, σου, και εγώ πήρα ένα μπουκάλι κρασί και *πήγα στο σπίτι της*, *στο σπίτι σου* και πίναμε πάρα πολύ.

"Olga, last night I called you in order to make a table (to eat) at her house, at your house, and I took a bottle of wine and I went to her house, to your house and we were drinking a lot."
(Participant #6 Video 1a, Catalan/Spanish bilingual)

What it can be observed from the examples above is that learners of Greek, despite their B2 level, still make an erroneous use of the L2 pattern. Spanish speakers appear to still use their L1 pattern, that is the verb "I go" (/pao/) instead of the expected verb in Greek "I come" (/erxome/). Moreover, it was hypothesized that Catalan/Spanish bilinguals will encounter less difficulties in this aspect, since Catalan follows the same deictic pattern as Greek. This hypothesis was not confirmed in our data, since these learners have also been found to use more andative verbs than venitives. This finding will be further discussed in the Discussion section.

As far as the cloze test is concerned, the results obtained follow the same pattern of the video stimuli results. Both Spanish speakers and Catalan/Spanish bilinguals tended

to use andative verbs, instead of venitives. Some examples of crosslinguistic influence found in the cloze test are presented below:

(6) Ναι, κι εγώ επίσης θέλω πολύ να *πάω* (α) στην Αγγλία να σε δω.
"Yes, I'm really looking forward to *going* to the UK to see you' (cloze test *a*)

(7) Ναι, εννοείται. *Θα πάω* (γ) μόλις σχολάσω από τη δουλειά.
"Yes, of course. I will *go* after work" (cloze test *c*)

(8) Λοιπόν, αν θέλεις βρισκόμαστε εμείς οι δύο πιο πριν και (εγώ) (ζ) *πάω* μαζί σου για να αγοράσουμε τα εισιτήρια.
'Well, if you want, we can meet up before and (g) I *go* with you to buy the tickets' (cloze *g*)

It must be pointed out that all the native speakers of Greek who participated in the study, completed the above-mentioned examples with the verb */erxome/* "come".

Moving to the results of the quantitative analysis of the cloze test, it was observed that they also confirmed the above-described tendencies. Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics for the group of native and non-native speakers of Greek in the cloze test. The descriptive statistics show that the mean of the NS is higher than the mean of the NNS. As for inferential statistics, the results of the Mann-Whitney *U* test indicated that these differences were significant in favor of the NS group (U=.000, *Z*=-.325, *p*=.001).

Table 2:
Descriptive statistics for the NS and NNS groups of Greek in the cloze test

		N	**Mean**	**SD**
Cloze test Score /8	**NS**	6	8	0.00
	NNS	12	2.55	0.84

We were also interested in exploring whether there were any significant differences between the two groups of learners with respect to the use of deictic motion verbs. Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics for each group. As it can be observed, both groups obtained similar scores. The results of the Mann-Whitney *U* test also showed

that there were not any significant differences between the two groups (U=7, Z=-,775, p=.439). This means that both groups performed in the same way regarding the Greek deictic verbs.

Table 2:

Descriptive statistics for two groups of L2 learners of Greek in the cloze test

		N	Mean	SD
Cloze test Score /8	**Spanish L1**	6	2.25	0.50
	Catalan/ Spanish bilinguals	6	2.8	1.3

In the next Section, these results will be discussed in light of previous research in the field.

5. Discussion

The research questions of the current study asked whether Spanish L1 speakers and early Catalan/Spanish bilinguals would be able to adapt the deictic lexicalization patterns to Greek as a Foreign Language. The first group, namely, the Spanish L1 learners were expected to encounter difficulties since their L1 pattern is different from that of the L2. These L1-L2 differences were expected to result in cases of crosslinguistic influence. On the contrary, Catalan/Spanish bilinguals were expected to have an advantage in the acquisition of the L2 deictic pattern, since Catalan, the learners' dominant L1, shares the same pattern with Greek.

Our first hypothesis has been confirmed: Spanish L1 learners of Greek encountered difficulties in the expression of Deixis—a finding which is in line with those of previous studies (Liste-Lamas 2015, Yoshimari 2015, Hijazo-Gascón 2017). Despite their relatively high L2 proficiency, Spanish L1 learners still transfer their L1 lexicalization pattern and tend to use the verb "go" instead of the expected "come"—which is the correct form in Greek—when they express motion towards the addressee. This could be interpreted as evidence for the Thinking for Speaking Hypothesis (Slobin 1991, 1993, 1996a, 1996b): Spanish speakers seem to be still bound to their L1 pattern, which is very resistant to restructuring. Our findings also corroborate the idea expressed

by Hijazo-Gascón (2017: 321) that spatial Deixis could be a potential area of crosslinguistic influence.

As for the second hypothesis, which concerned the group of early Catalan/Spanish bilinguals, it was not confirmed in our study. The results obtained in both the video description tasks and in the cloze test showed that this group performed in the same way as the Spanish L1 group did. In other words, Catalan/Spanish bilinguals also encountered difficulties in the expression of Deixis. There are several explanations that could account for this finding. First of all, the data of the current study were collected in Barcelona, a bilingual community where both languages are present in the everyday life. This means that Catalan and Spanish co-exist on an everyday basis and, therefore, influence from one language to the other can easily occur. This is a usual phenomenon when the bilingual's both languages are active (Grosjean 1989), as it is the case in bilingual communities. The use of the verbs "go" and "come" by Catalan L1 speakers when they speak in Spanish has been found to present differences from that of Spanish monolinguals (García Mouton, 1994: 45), due to crosslinguistic influence from Catalan. More research needs to be carried out in order to shed more light on the use of the deictic motion verbs by Catalan speakers.

Another factor that could explain why these L2 learners still find difficulties in the use of the deictic motion verbs *πάω /pao/* and έρχομαι /*erxome/* could be the nature and morphology of the verbs themselves. The verb *πάω /pao/* "go" is taught at an earlier stage and its morphology and conjugation presents less difficulties than the one of the verb *έρχομαι /erxome/* "come", a medio-passive voice verb (in terms of morphology), a particularly challenging aspect of the Greek grammar for L2 learners. It might be the case that the L2 learners do not feel that confident with the use and complicated conjugation of the medio-passive verb *erxome* and they try to avoid it by using the easier verb *pao.*

6. Conclusions

The current paper aimed at offering a preliminary study on the way the deictic motion verbs "go" and "come" function in Greek, Spanish and Catalan and on how they are acquired and used in Greek as an L2 by native speakers of Spanish and Catalan, an understudied language combination. Our findings demonstrated that Deixis seems to be a problematic area for Spanish and Catalan L1 learners of Greek, as well as an area of

potential crosslinguistic influence. This study contributes to previous research in the area of motion events and highlights the relevance of the semantic component of Deixis in the typology (Choi & Bowerman 1992, Matsumoto et *al*. 2017). This preliminary study is in line with previous research corroborating the Thinking for Speaking hypothesis by Slobin (1991, 1996a). It is also relevant from the point of view of SLA research, particularly in the area of transfer. Our results, though limited in number, point to Deixis an area of difficulty for re-thinking for speaking (Robinson & Ellis 2008) and prone for crosslinguistic influence (as it is motion in general, according to Jarvis & Pavlenko 2008).

More investigation with a larger sample would be necessary, in order to complement the present study. It would be also interesting to carry out longitudinal studies and explore the acquisition and use of the deictic motion verbs at different proficiency levels and over a period of time (Stam 2010, 2015). This would allow us to better examine the reconstructing of L1 patterns throughout the years of L2 acquisition. Another fruitful aspect for future research would be to investigate the other direction, i.e., Greek learners of Spanish (Andria & Hijazo-Gascón 2018) and explore whether these L2 learners of Spanish will also encounter similar problems in adjusting their L1 thinking for speaking patterns to the equivalent L2 ones.

Finally, the present study could certainly have pedagogical implications in the teaching of Greek as an L2. Identifying possible areas of crosslinguistic influence that may cause problems to the L2 learners could help language teachers in the design of pedagogical interventions (Cadierno 2008). Furthermore, the type of instruction could also play a role for a more effective acquisition of the L2 patterns. It may be the case that a more explicit type of instruction would be more effective and would lead to better L2 outcomes (Stam 2010). Teaching crosslinguistic differences explicitly and in a comparative way might potentially help L2 learners become more aware of the non-congruent forms between the L1 and the L2 (Malt & Sloman 2003), facilitating thus the process of L2 acquisition.

References

Alonso-Alonso, R. (ed.) 2016. *Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual matters.

Andria, M. & Hijazo-Gascón, A. 2018, January. Διαγλωσσική επίδραση κατά την εκμάθηση της Ισπανικής ως ξένης γλώσσας από Έλληνες μαθητές: η περίπτωση των δεικτικών ρημάτων κίνησης. Paper presented at the Conferenece *El español como lengua extranjera en el Didaskaleio de Lenguas Extranjeras de la Universidad Nacional y Kapodistríaca de Atenas.* University of Athens, Athens, Greece.

Antonopoulou, E. & Nikiforidou. 2002. Deictic motion and the adoption of perspective in Greek. *Pragmatics*, 12:3, 273-295.

Berman, R. & Slobin, D. I. (eds.) 1994. *Relating events in narrative. A crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bella, S. 2001. *Η Δείξη στη Νέα Ελληνική*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. University of Athens.

Bühler, K. 1934. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprahe.* Jena: Verlag Gustav Fischer.

Cadierno, T. 2004. Expressing motion events in a second language: A cognitive typological approach. In M. Achard & S. Neimeier (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics, second language acquisition and foreign language pedagogy*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 13-49.

Cadierno, T. 2008. Motion events in Danish and Spanish: A focus on form pedagogical approach. In S. De Knopp & T. De Rycker (eds.), *Cognitive approaches to pedagogical grammar*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 239–275.

Cadierno, T. 2017. Thinking for speaking about motion in a second language: Looking back and forward. In I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (ed.), *Motion and Space across languages. Theory and applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 279-300.

Choi, S. & Bowerman, M. 1992. Learning to express motion events in English and Korean: the influence of language specific lexicalization patterns. In B. Levin & S. Pinker (eds.), *Lexical and conceptual semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 83-121.

Council of Europe. 2001. *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, C. J. 1971. *Santa Cruz lectures on deixis*. [Published in 1977 as *Lectures in Deixis*]. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Fillmore, C. J. 1983. How to know whether you are coming or going. In G. Rauh (ed.), *Essays on deixis*. Tübingen: Narr, 219-227.

Filipović, L. 2007. *Talking about motion. A crosslinguistic investigation of lexicalization patterns.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Filipović, L. 2010. Typology meets witness narratives and memory: Theory and practice entwined in cognitive linguistics. In E. Tabakowska, M. Choinski, & L. Wiraszka (eds.), *Cognitive linguistics in action: theory to application and back*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 269-291.

Filipović, L. 2011. Speaking and remembering in one or two languages: Bilingual vs. Monolingual lexicalization in memory for motion events. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 15(4), 466-485.

Filipović, L. & Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. 2015. Motion. In E. Dabrowska & D. Divjak (eds.) *Mouton handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 527-545.

García Mouton, P. 1994. *Lenguas y dialectos de España* [Languages and dialects of Spain]. Madrid: Arco Libros.

Gathercole, V. 1977. 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.

Gathercole, V. 1978. Towards a universal for deictic verbs of motion. *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3, 72-88.

Grosjean, F. 1989. Neurolinguist, Beware! The Bilingual is not two Monolinguals in One Person. *Brain and language*, 36, 3-15.

Goddard, C. 1997. The semantics of coming and going. *Pragmatics*, 7(2): 147-162.

Goschler, J. & Stefanowitsch, A. 2010. Pfad und Bewegung in gesprochenen Deutsch. Ein kollostruktionaler Ansatz. In T. Stoltz, E. Ruigendijk & J. Trabant (eds.) *Linguistik in Norwestern*. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 103-115.

Han, Z.-H. & Cadierno, T. (eds.). 2010. *Linguistic relativity in SLA: Thinking for speaking.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hijazo-Gascón, A. Motion event contrasts in Romance languages: Deixis in Spanish as a second language. In I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (ed.), *Motion and Space across languages. Theory and applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 301-328.

Huang, Y. 2006. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jarvis, S. & Pavlenko, A. 2008. *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. New York: Routledge.

Kellerman, E. 1995. Crosslinguistic influence: Transfer to nowhere? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 21, 47-77.

Lewandowski, W. 2014. Deictic verbs: Typology, thinking for speaking and SLA. *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 27, 43-65.

Levinson, S. C. 1996. Relativity in spatial conception and descrpition. In J. Gumperz and S. C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 177-202.

Liste-Lamas, E. 2015. German directional adverbs with *hin-* and *her-*: A preliminary study on their acquisition by L1 Speakers of Spanish. In I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano & A. Hijazo-Gascón (eds.), *New horizons in the study of motion*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 10-31.

Malt, B. & Sloman, S. 2003. Linguistic diversity and object naming by non-native speakers of English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *6*, 47-67.

Matsumoto, Y. 1996. *Complex predicates in Japanese: A syntactic and semantic study of the notion of 'word'*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications & Tokyo: Kurosio Publishers.

Matsumoto, Y. 2013. Determinants of Manner, Path and Deixis saliency across languages. Paper presented at International Workshop SYLEX III: Space and motion across languages and applications. University of Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain, 21 November 2013.

Matsumoto, Y., Akita, K. & Takahashi, K. 2017. The functional nature of deictic verbs and the coding patterns of Deixis: An experimental study in English, Japanese and Thai. In I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano (ed.), *Motion and Space across languages. Theory and applications*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 95-122.

Miller, G. A. & Johnson-Laird, P. 1976. *Language and perception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Odlin, T. 1989. *Language transfer: Crosslinguistic influence in language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sánchez, L., & Jarvis, S. 2008. The use of picture stories in the investigation of crosslinguistic influence. *TESOL Quarterly*, *42*, 329–333.

Selinker, L. 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching (IRAL)*, *10*(3), 209-231.

Selinker, L. 1992. *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman.

Slobin, D. I. 1991. Learning to think for speaking. Native language, cognition and rhetorical style. *Pragmatics*, 1, 7-29.

Slobin, D. I. 1993. Adult language acquisition: A view from child language study: In Clive Perdue (ed.) *Adult language acquisition: Cross-linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 239-252.

Slobin, D. I. 1996a. From "thought and language" to "thinking for speaking". In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 70-96.

Slobin D. I. 1996b. Two ways to travel: Verbs of motion in English and Spanish. In M. Shibatani & S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 195-220.

Slobin, D. I. 2000. Verbalized events: A dynamic approach to linguistic relativity and determinism. In S. Niemeier & R. Dirven (eds.) *Evidence for linguistic relativity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107-138.

Slobin, D. I. 2004. The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events. In S. Strömqvist & L. Verhoeven (eds.), *Relating events in narrative: Typological and contextual perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 219-357.

Slobin, D. I. 2006. What makes Manner of motion salient? Explorations in linguistic typology, discourse and cognition. In M. Hickmann & S. Robert (eds.), *Space in languages: Linguistic systems and cognitive categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 59-82.

SPSS 15.0 for Windows [Computer software]. 2007. SPSS, Inc.

Stam, G. 2010. Can an L2 speaker's patterns of thinking for speaking change?. In Z.-H. Han & T. Cadierno (eds) *Linguistic Relativity in SLA: Thinking for Speaking.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 59-83.

Stam, G. 2015. Changes in thinking for speaking: A longitudinal case study. T*he Modern Language Journal,* 9: 83-99.

Strömqvist, S. & Verhoeven, L. (eds). 2004. *Relating events in narrative: Typological and contextual perspectives.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stutterheim, C. v. 2003. Linguistic structure and information organization: The case of very advanced learners. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, *3*, 183-206.

Talmy, L. 1991. Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 17, 480-519.

Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Yoshinari, Y. 2015. Describing motion events in Japanese L2 Acquisition: how to express deictic information. In I. Ibarretxe-Antuñano & A. Hijazo-Gascón (eds.), *New horizons in the study of motion*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 32-63.

Yu, L. & Odlin, T. (eds.) 2015. *New perspectives on Transfer in Second Language Learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

APPENDIX : CLOZE TEST (adapted from Hijazo-Gascón 2017)

Συμπλήρωσε την κάθε φράση με το ρήμα που θεωρείς κατάλληλο:

Ο Κώστας ζει στην Αγγλία και η Ελένη θα πάει να τον επισκεφτεί. Μιλάνε στο τηλέφωνο για να κανονίσουν τις τελευταίες λεπτομέρειες.

Κώστας: -Ελένη! Πόσο θέλω να σε δω!

Ελένη: -Ναι, κι εγώ επίσης θέλω πολύ να_____ (α) στην Αγγλία να σε δω.

Κώστας: -Για πες μου, τι ώρα φτάνεις;

Ελένη: -Στις έξι. _____ (β) στο αεροδρόμιο να με πάρεις;

Κώστας: -Ναι, εννοείται. _____ (γ) μόλις σχολάσω από τη δουλειά. Θα δεις τι ωραία που θα περάσουμε! Έχω σκεφτεί ένα σωρό πράγματα να κάνουμε!

Ελένη: Α, δε μου λες… Θέλεις να σου (δ) _____ τίποτα από την Ελλάδα;

Κώστας: Όχι, δεν είναι ανάγκη. Την τελευταία φορά που ήρθες μου (ε) _____ ελληνικό καφέ, που είναι αυτό που μου λείπει περισσότερο εδώ στην Αγγλία… κι ακόμα έχω αρκετό!

Ελένη: Χα χα, εντάξει λοιπόν, οπότε τα λέμε σύντομα! Φιλιά!

Κώστας: Ναι, τα λέμε σύντομα!

Η Σοφία και η Μαργαρίτα πίνουν έναν καφέ στην καφετέρια της σχολής.

Σοφία: - Είδες την ταινία που κέρδισε τόσα Όσκαρ φέτος;

Μαργαρίτα: -Όχι, όχι. Ήθελα να πάω να τη δω αλλά ποτέ δεν έχω χρόνο.

Σοφία: -Λοιπόν, κανονίσαμε να πάμε να τη δούμε το Σάββατο με τα παιδιά. Θέλεις (στ)_____ μαζί μας;

Μαργαρίτα: -Μμμ… Η αλήθεια είναι ότι θα ήθελα να τη δω. Λοιπόν, αν θέλεις βρισκόμαστε εμείς οι δύο πιο πριν και (εγώ) (ζ) _____ μαζί σου για να αγοράσουμε τα εισιτήρια.

Σοφία: -Εντάξει, για μένα τέλεια!

Μαργαρίτα: -Α, να σου πω…. Τώρα θυμήθηκα ότι έχεις τις σημειώσεις μου από το μάθημα Λογοτεχνίας. Θα μπορούσα (η) _____ στο σπίτι σου τώρα και να μου τις δώσεις;

Μαργαρίτα: -Ναι, φυσικά! Είχα ξεχάσει τελείως ότι τις είχα εγώ!

Ο Γιώργος και ο Θανάσης δουλεύουν μαζί στην ίδια εταιρία. Ένα πρωί:

Γιώργος: Θανάση, Δεν καταλαβαίνω τι γράφει αυτή η παραγγελία. Χρειάζομαι τη βοήθειά σου.

Θανάσης: Βέβαια, μισό λεπτό, τώρα ..... (θ).