EXPLORATION THROUGH TEACHING REALITY: ENCOUNTERS WITH THE TARGET MOTION EVENTS

Xu Zhaorong, Roslina Mamat & Zaid Mohd Zin

INTRODUCTION

All human beings experience motion events (ME) in their daily lives. While understanding and describing ME are universal aspects of human cognition, individuals differ in their capacity to observe, interpret, and convey events (Park, 2022), especially in the foreign language classroom. Since languages have different encoding rules for describing events, teachers need to specify which elements of event representation differ and which are common between typologically different languages such as Japanese and Chinese. There is a body of research that focuses on cross-linguistic differences in the acquisition of ME (Allen et al., 2007; Cadierno, 2008; Laws et al., 2021). However, to facilitate the learning task, it is crucial that learners perceive and utilise cross-linguistic similarities to existing knowledge (Ringbom, 2016).

Jarvis and Pavlenko (2007) pointed out that cross-linguistic similarity, as a linguistic factor, was one of the earliest and most widely recognised factors limiting the occurrence of language transfer. Many studies have shown that cross-linguistic similarity can have positive and negative effects on second language acquisition. If the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) have similar features in their linguistic resources, such as lexical choices or grammatical structures, this can facilitate the acquisition process, otherwise it can lead to major difficulties for learners. This discussion targets the area of [Motion] to emphasise the

need for comparative studies between Japanese and Chinese ME constructions in the classroom based on Leonard Talmy's (2000) Linguistic Typology Framework so that L2 learners can receive explicit instruction about the acceptability of different patterns.

This study is of great importance, as there are numerous studies on Indo-European languages that focus on the factor of cross-linguistic similarity, including the study by the authoritative researcher Ringbom (2006 & 2016). He studied Finnish, Swedish, and English which belong to the Indo-European language family, and these languages have a close relationship. However, as for Chinese and Japanese, one of which belongs to the Sino-Tibetan language family, and the other to the agglutinative language family, we can conclude that they belong to different language families, even though there are many borrowed Chinese characters in the Japanese writing system. In addition, despite its teachability, motion is a neglected area in language learning and teaching (Cadierno, 2008). Laws et al. (2021) suggested that second language (L2) teachers are often unaware of the complexity of dynamic space and pay little attention to this issue. Therefore, this study has implications for in-depth research on cross-linguistic similarities and linguistic typology and will enrich research on ME expressions to some extent.

DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

According to Talmy's definition (1985, p. 60), a motion event is "... a situation containing movement or the maintenance of a stationary location alike ...". He claims that there are four basic components of a ‘motion event’: Figure, Motion, Ground and Path, as well as a number of co-events such as Manner and Cause.

(1) The bottle - floated out of -the cave.
Figure - Motion Path - Ground
Manner/Cause

Examples can be found in sentence (1). According to Talmy (1985), the moving entity 'bottle' is called a Figure that changes its location with respect to the 'cave' called Ground. The term Motion describes the fact that an entity changes its location, and the changing course is represented by Path. Manner and Cause are events related to Motion, describing the ways in which Figure moves and the Cause due to which the Figure moves.

Next, another term, Cross-linguistic similarity, is discussed. According to Jarvis and Pavlenko (2007), Cross-linguistic Similarity, considered as a linguistic factor, is one of the earliest and most widely recognised factors limiting the occurrence of language transfer. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2007, p. 192) further state that it refers to "the relationship or degree of congruence between the source and the recipient language", and it implies the existence of similarities as well as differences between languages.

Based on the relationship or degree of congruence perceived by learners, Ringbom (2006) has classified three cross-linguistic similarity relations: the similarity relation, the contrast relation and the zero relation, which are considered as a continuum in different positions. The similarity relation states that the TL items or pattern is perceived "as formally and/or functionally similar to a form or pattern in the first language (L1) or some other language known to the learner" (p. 5). Contrast relations refer to the fact that "an item or pattern is perceived in important ways differing from the L1 form or pattern" (p. 6). In the case of zero relations, it means that "an item or pattern appears to have little or no perceptible relation to the L1 or any other

language the learner knows" (p. 7). The zero or near-zero relation between L1 and TL poses great difficulties for learners in their early stages of learning. Based on Ringbom's (2006) classification, this study broadly categorises motion event constructions into two types: Congruent constructions and incongruent constructions. The incongruent constructions are further subdivided based on semantic or syntactic differences.

LINGUISTIC TYPOLOGICAL THEORY

According to Talmy (1985), two main typological patterns of lexicalisation can be identified from the syntactic packaging of these components: (a) verb-framed languages (V-languages) such as Spanish and Japanese typically encode Path in the verb root, and (b) satellite-framed languages (S-languages) such as English and Chinese usually encode Path in the "satellites".

The following English and Japanese examples show the differences between an S-language and a V-language.

(1) a. He swam across the pool.
b.彼はプールを泳いで渡った。
Kare-wa pūru-o oyoi-de watat-ta.

As we can see in the English sentence (2), the Manner of the moving entity is described by the main verb 'swim', the Path is typically encoded by a satellite 'across'. In Japanese, however, Motion and Path are characteristically described in the verb root '*wataru*', and the Manner of swimming is expressed by a verb infection '*oyoide*' before the main verb, which is not a necessary component in the sentence.

The typological theory of Talmy (1985, 2000) has stimulated research to investigate the characteristic

lexicalisation patterns of different languages of the world that involve the expression of motion events (Allen et al., 2007; Asaye, 2021). However, Slobin (2004) proposed an equipollent-framed (E-framed) type that goes beyond the above two language patterns, such as Chinese and Thai, which consist of serial verb patterns in which both deictic verbs and manner verbs are considered as main verbs, e.g. zǒu lái 'walk come' (Chen Liang & Guo Jian Sheng, 2009; Wen & Shan, 2021). Based on the typological theory of Talmy (2000) and Slobin (2004), this study selects examples from the written corpus of JFL students learning Japanese as a foreign language, focusing on the motion verbs in the constructions. On this basis, the motion constructions are categorised into the following three types: pathME constructions, mannerME constructions and cause ME constructions.

PATH ME CONSTRUCTIONS

As mentioned above, Japanese is classified as a V-language, in which the verb root indicates both the fact of Motion and Path, and the information about manner the way or the cause must be present as an independent constituent. There are extensive Path a variety of Path verbs in Japanese, such as, "上がる (*agaru*)", "降りる (*oriru*)", "入る(*hairu*)", "出る(*deru*)", "回る(*mawaru*)", etc. In addition to these core verbs that express the Path, the Japanese often use compound verbs to express motion events. Tanaka and Matsumoto (1997) have shown that the characteristics of compound verbs are that Path elements serve as the latter but as the core of the whole verb.

(2) 彼は階段を駆け上がった
(He ran upstairs)。
(*kare-wa kaidan-o kakeagat-ta*)

For example in sentence (3), 上がった (*kakeagat-ta*), which is part of the compound verb in the sentence (3), takes up the core role expressing path concepts, 駆け(*kake*), as a co-event of manner expressed in this sentence, can be established in the surrounding discourse or even omitted.

According to Talmy (2000), there are three different types of arrival (To), traversal (Via) and departure (From) in a Path phase. Kageyama (1997) pointed out that Japanese motion verbs, unlike English, mostly focus on just one type, such as, "出る(*deru*)", "離れる(*hanareru*)", "去る(*saru*)", "立つ(*tatsu*)" refer to the type of departure (From), whereas "入る(*hairu*)", "着く(*tsuku*)", "至る(*itaru*)", "乗る(*noru*)"are used in sentences leading from a source (From). However, Mandarin Chinese is considered as S-language in which Path is characteristically expressed in satellite called serial verb constructions, including "进（*jin*）", "出 (*chu*)", "上(*shang*)", "下(*xia*)", "过(*guo*)", "回(*hui*)", etc. (Yan, 1998).

For example,

(3) 瓶子漂出岩洞
(The bottle floated out of the cave)。
píng zǐ piào chū yán dòng.

In sentence (4), "出 (*chu*)", which is the second element of a verb compound "漂出 (*piào chū*)", trace the movement of the bottle. It should be noted that although the path element in this sentence is expressed by satellite, "出 (*chu*)" is originally a path verb itself and it can be used alone, e.g. "瓶子出了岩洞 (*píng zǐ chū le yán dòng*)".

Based on these differences, Table 1 presents a revised version of Zhang's (2020) comparison of the main Japanese and Chinese pathME constructions, which can be categorised

into five types. We can see that the first type is the Japanese-Chinese incongruent ME construction in word order, since the Japanese and Chinese equivalents have exactly the same components but with different word order, one is SOV and the other is SVO. For instance, in the sentence (5) '*kare*' corresponds to '*ta*'; '*hait-ta*' equals '*jin*' and the perfective aspect marker '*le*'; '*heya*' matches '*fangjian*'. But in (5)a the object '*heya*' is placed before the verb, whereas in (5)b the corresponding '*fangjian*' is positioned after the verb.

(4) a. 彼は部屋に入った
(He entered the room)。
Kare-wa heya-ni hait-ta

b. 他进了房间
(He entered the room)。
ta jin le fangjian.

Table 1: Comparison of constructions for Path motion events between Japanese and Chinese

	Japanese Constructions	Chinese Constructions	Degree of Japanese-Chinese Congruence
1	Figure+Ground+Verb (彼は部屋に入った。 He entered the room.)	Figure+Verb+Ground (他进了房间。 *tā jìn le fáng jiān*）	Incongruence in word oder
2	Figure+Verb+くる （彼は戻って来	Figure+Verb+来 （他回来了。 *tā huí lái le*）	Congruence

	た。 He came back.）		
3	Figure+Verb （リンゴは落ちた。 The apple fell off.）	Figure+Verb+Satellite+来 (苹果落了下来。 *píng guǒ luò le xià lái*)	Incongruence in lexical
4	Figure+Verb+くる (リンゴは落ちてきた。 The apple fell off.)		
5	Figure+Ground+Verb (二人はその場を去る。 They left there.)	Figure+Verb (两人离开（那个场所）了。 *liǎng rén lí kāi（nà ge chǎng suǒ ）le* or 两人从那个场所离开了。 *liǎng rén cóng nà ge chǎng suǒ lí kāi le*)	Incongruence in structure

Construction 2 exhibits a high degree of correspondence between Japanese and Chinese in terms of constituents and word order. Example (6) is an illustration of this type. Specifically, '*Kare*' matches with '*ta*', a compound verb '*modot-te ki-ta*' equals the Chinese serial verb '*huí lá*', the perfective aspect marker '*le*' acts as the equivalent of '*ki-ta*'.

(5) a. 彼は戻って来た
(He came back)。
Kare-wa modot-te ki-ta.

b. 他回来了。
tā huí lái le

Construction 3 and construction 4 have lexical differences. In example (7)a, a simple path verb '*ochi-ta*' is used whereas in (8) '*ochi-te k-ita*', a compound verb, is employed in the sentence. And both (7)a and (8)a are correspond to the same Chinese construction '*luò le xià lái*', in which a satellite '*lai*' is added to the serial verb '*luo xia*'. Thus, when we compare the expression of '*ochi-te ki-ta*' and '*luò xià lái*', lexical incongruence could be detected.

(6) a. リンゴは落ちた
(The apple fell off)。
Ringo-wa ochi-ta.

b. 苹果落了下来。
píng guǒ luò le xià lái

(7) a. リンゴは落ちてきた
(The apple fell off)。
Ringo-wa ochi-te ki-ta.

b. 苹果落了下来。
píng guǒ luò le xià lái

Construction 5 shows structural incongruence between Japanese and its Chinese equivalent. In example (9)a, the ground element 'sonoba' is essential in the Chinese but not in the Japanese version.

(8) a. 二人はその場を去る
(They left there)。
Futari-wa sonoba-wo saru.
b. 两人离开了。

liǎng rén lí kāi le

What's more, the verb ' *lí*' in the Chinese sentence is followed by the satellite '*kai*', and this satellite can participate in path expressions of either the coalesced or the uncoalesced type: While in the coalesced form the object comes after the verb complex, in the uncoalesced form the prepositional phrase comes first (Talmy, 2000, p. 109). In this example, it can occur in both constructions. They are therefore structurally incongruent.

MANNER ME CONSTRUCTIONS

According to Talmy (2000), manner refers to the action or state that accompanies the movement. Slobin (2004) considers that the term manner encompasses concepts from several dimensions, including the type of motion (jumping or hopping), and is often associated with factors such as speed (walking, running, or dashing), intensity (stepping, stomping, or treading) and attitude (strolling, wandering, or sauntering) and so on.

In Japanese, there are only a few verbs of motion, and the particular Manner is carried out by means of satellites next to the verb root. Perhaps the richness of mimetic manner adverbs makes up for the paucity of manner verbs in Japanese (Matsumoto, 2018).

(9) 彼は{意気揚々と/車で/歩いて}山の頂上まで登った
(He｛proudly climbed/ drove/ walked｝to the top of the mountain)。
Kare-wa ikiyooyoo-to/kuruma-de/arui-te yama-no tyoojyoo-made nobot-ta

For example, in the sentence (10), the adverbial

component '*ikiyooyoo-to/ kuruma-de/ arui-te*' indicates the way of moving, which comes to stand next to the verb. Despite that, Matsumoto (2018) indicated several verbs, which are relatively few and are quite general in meaning, conflating the fact of motion with manner, e.g. *aruku* 'walk', *hashiru* 'run', *hawu* 'crawl', *oyogu* 'swim', *tobu* 'fly' etc. It should be notable that these manner verbs can only be used in sentences involving departure (VIA) expressions. If it occurs together with the expression of the endpoint, it must be combined with a subsequent verb that can express the path element to form a compound verb so that it has a directional meaning.

According to Yan (1998), there are expressions in Chinese that connect motion with manner, and he has listed some verbs of manner in Chinese, such as:

Nonagentive: *hua*(slide), *gun*(roll), *liu*(slip), *tiao*(jump), *tan*(bounce), *piao*(float)
Agentive: *gun*(roll), *pai*(bounce), *ji*(squeeze), *ning*(twist)
Voluntary: *pao*(run), *tiao*(jump), *chong*(rush), *ben*(hurry)

However, many studies (Chen & Ai, 2009; Zhao & Hu, 2018; Wang et al., 2021) have concluded that Chinese also has a comparatively smaller amount of specific manner lexicon, which is expressed in adverbs rather than verbs. For example, the Chinese word for "slink" is "*tou-tou-mo-mo de zou",* where the adverb "*tou-tou-mo-mo de*" comes before the action of walking. Table 2 describes the commonly used manner motion event constructions.

Table 2: Comparison of constructions for Manner motion events between Japanese and Chinese

	Japanese constructions	Chinese constructions	Degree of Japanese-Chinese congruence
1	Figure+Verb （坊ちゃんはお父さんと一緒に散歩をしている。 The son is walking with his father.）	Figure+Verb （有一对父子俩在散步。 *Yǒu yì duì fù zǐ liǎ zài sàn bù*）	Incongruence in word order
2	Figure+Ground+Verb (父は木に登る。 The father is climbing the tree.)	Figure+Verb+Satellite+Ground （父亲爬上树。 *Fù qīn pá shàng shù*）	Incongruence In lexicon
3	Figure+Ground+Verb (お父さんは実に飛びかかる。 The father jumped up to hit the apple.)	Figure+Verb+Satellite+来 （父亲跳起来去打苹果。 *Fù qīn tiào qǐ lái qù dǎ píng guǒ*）	Incongruence In structure

A comparison of these constructions also reveals that they can be divided into three types. The first type shows an incongruence between Japanese and Chinese in the word order. Example (11) is an illustration of this type. In (11)a,

'*sanpoo-wo site-iru*' is a verb phrase, in which the noun '*sanpoo*' precedes the imperfective verb '*site-iru*', whereas in (11)b the imperfective aspect mark '*zai*' is located in the front.

(10) a. 坊ちゃんはお父さんと一緒に散歩をしている
(The son is walking with his father)。
Bootyan-wa otoosan-to issyoni sanpoo-wo site-iru

b. 有一对父子俩在散步。
yǒu yì duì fù zǐ liǎ zài sàn bù

Construction 2 refers to the second type, which illustrates the lexical difference between Japanese and Chinese. Sentence (12) shows the difference, as the Chinese expression adds a satellite (*shang*) to introduce the Ground (*shu*) while only an adposition (*ni*) is used in the corresponding Japanese version.

(11) a. 父は木に登る
(The father is climbing the tree)。
Chichi-wa ki-ni oboru.

b. 父亲爬上树。
fù qīn pá shàng shù

The third type is the structural incongruent construction. An example of this type can be found in example (13). Example (13)b implies that in the utterance of a manner ME, a deictic verb '*lai*' is added to the Chinese construction, hence, suggesting structural incongruence with its Japanese equivalent.

(12) a. お父さんは実に飛びかかる
(The father jumped up to hit the apple)。
Otoosan-wa jitsu-ni tobi-kakaru.

b. 父亲跳起来去打苹果。
fù qīn tiào qǐ lái qù dǎ píng guǒ

CAUSE ME CONSTRUCTIONS

The cause is the action or behaviour that triggers a movement. Talmy (2000) examines the elements of causality in the Atsugewi language, a nearly extinct language spoken by people in northeastern California in the United States. It encompasses a wide range of types and provides examples of different dimensions of causal factors, including natural forces (such as wind blowing, rain beating, gravity), the action of objects (such as piercing, stomping, digging, stirring), the action of body parts (such as stuffing, pinching, blowing), and perceived action (such as seeing, hearing, smelling), etc.

Talmy (2000) also distinguishes between two types of causal factors: causal and non-causal. In English, causative verbs can be used for both causative and non-causative motion events. In Chinese, causative verbs are mainly used for causative movements. In Japanese, however, according to Tanaka and Matsumoto (1997), "cause" refers to non-causative events and it is commonly conflated in the motion to form a lexicalization pattern of <cause+path>, such as the preceding verbs in "崩れ落ちる (*kuzure-ochiru*)", "焼け付く(*yake-tsuku*)" etc. Whereas "means" refers to causative motion, such as the preceding verbs in "投げ上げる(*nage-ageru*)" ,"振り落とす (*furi-otosu*)" etc. The cause factors in this study only involve causative motion events, therefore,

there is no distinction between "cause" and "means", and they are collectively referred to as cause factors.

Since different languages possess different lexicalisation patterns, Talmy (2000) pointed out that verbs referring to states are mainly lexicalised in the autonomous type in Japanese, and an inflexion is added to the verb to represent the corresponding agentive.

For example,

(13) a. ドアが開いた
(The door opened)。
Doa ga aita

b. 彼はドアを開けた
(He opened the door)。
Kare wa doa o aketa

While the above sentences are expressed in Chinese as in example (15), we can notice that unlike Japanese, in Mandarin a "*ba*" structure is added to convey the agentive concept. That is, instead of causation by the result of an event, Chinese prefers to represent causation by an event.

(14) a. 门开了
(The door opened)
mén kāi le

b. 他把门打开了
(He opened the door)。
tā bǎ mén dǎ kāi le

Table 3: Comparison of constructions for Cause motion events between Japanese and Chinese

	Japanese constructions	Chinese constructions	Degree of Japanese - Chinese congruence
1	Figure+Verb （父が木を揺らした。 The father shook the tree.）	Verb+Figure (父亲摇苹果树。 *fù qīn yáo píng guǒ shù*)	Incongruence in word order
2	Figure+Verb （父子はそのリンゴを取ろうとした。 The father and son want to pick up the apple.）	Verb+Satellite+Figure (父子想取下苹果。 *fù zǐ xiǎng qǔ xià píng guǒ*)	Incongruence in lexicon
3	Figure+Verb （靴を取り戻す。 They want to get the shoes back.）	‘把/将’+Figure+Verb + Satellite (父亲将鞋子取回来。 *fù qīn jiāng xié zǐ qǔ huí lái*)	Incongruence In structure
4	Figure1 +Figure2 + Verb (子供はリンゴを落とそうとした。 The father wants to make the apple fall.)	Figure1 +’使/让’ +Figure2 +Verb +Satellite +来 （父亲想使苹果掉下来。 *fù qīn xiǎng shǐ píng guǒ diào xià lái* ）	Incongruence In structure

According to Table 3, these constructions can be categorised into four types. The first type displays an incongruence in the word order of the Japanese and the corresponding Chinese ME constructions, i.e. differences between SOV and SVO constructions, which were explained

in detail in section 3. The second type demonstrates lexical differences between Japanese and Chinese, which are illustrated in sentence (16). When the Chinese version uses a satellite (xia) to introduce the Ground (ping guo), a simple SOV construction is used in the corresponding Japanese expression.

(15) a. 父子はそのリンゴを取ろうとした
(The father and son want to pick up the apple)。
Chichi-to musuko-wa sono-ringo-o toroo-to shi-ta.

b. 父子想取下苹果。
fù zǐ xiǎng qǔ xià píng guǒ

The third type is the structural incongruent construction. Example (17) serves as an example of this type of construction. Sentence (17)a uses a compound verb '*torimodosu*' to express the motion events caused and the subject can be omitted. Sentence (17)b, on the other hand, adds a satellite '*lai*' to the serial verb '*qǔ huí*' and uses a 'ba/jiang' structure to express the corresponding event, which is a structural incongruence with sentence (17) a. Thus, the Japanese expression and its Chinese equivalent are structurally incongruent.

(16) a. 靴を取り戻す
（They want to get the shoes back）。
Kutsu-wo torimodosu

b. 父亲将鞋子取回来。
fù qīn jiāng xié zǐ qǔ huí lái

The last type is also the structurally incongruent construction. Example (18) illustrates that in Japanese a transitive verb ‘otosu’ is used to express a caused ME, while in Chinese a singular ‘shi/rang’ structure must be assumed, indicating structural incongruence with its Japanese equivalent.

(17) a. 子供はリンゴを落とそうとした
(The father want to make the apple fall)。
Kodomo-wa ringo-wo otosou-to shi-ta.

b. 父亲想使苹果掉下来。
fù qīn xiǎng shǐ píng guǒ diào xià lái

To sum up, the above three sections investigate the types of similarity relationships between the Japanese ME construction and its Chinese equivalent. In terms of an ME construction, there are two main types of similarity relations between Japanese and Chinese: congruence and incongruence. And the incongruity relation involves several subtypes: Word order incongruence, lexical incongruence, and structural incongruence. It makes sense that learners facilitate their language learning when they better understand the similarity relationships (Ringbom, 2016).

CONCLUSION

Based on the typological theory, this chapter analysed the similarities and differences between Japanese and Chinese ME constructions. We can find that the similarity relations between Japanese and its Chinese equivalent vary not only between the three types of ME (path, manner and cause), but also within the same type. If the SL and the TL have similar grammatical structures and lexical choices, this may facilitate the learning process; conversely, if the SL and the

TL have very different linguistic resources, difficulties may arise as the learner applies his/her L1 patterns to the L2. If we compare the features of three types of ME constructions in the two languages, we can get a more complete picture of the acquisition of motion events for JFL learners.

This writing has important implications for the classroom, allowing teachers to better understand the acquisition of JFL learners and develop more effective strategies for teaching this language structure. The study of cross-linguistic similarity can help teachers and learners predict potential transfer effects and develop appropriate approach to combat them. For example, they can provide more explicit instructions and exercises on motion events in class and design tasks for better understanding and production of motion events for foreign language learners. Further studies could investigate how teaching factors, i.e. the type of input or the teaching method, influence the acquisition of motion events in the learning process.

In addition, we should also consider the cultural differences in the way motion events are conceptualised and expressed, as they may influence the way JFL learners perceive and produce motion events in the L2. Further discussion is needed to provide more neuroscientific evidence demonstrating the complex relationship between language and cognitive processing in the human brain (Athanasopoulos & Casaponsa, 2020).

REFERENCES

Allen, S., Özyürek, A., Kita, S., Brown, A., Furman, R., Ishizuka, T., & Fujii, M. (2007). Language-specific and

universal influences in children's syntactic packaging of manner and path: a comparison of English, Japanese, and Turkish. *Cognition*, *102*(1), 16-48.

Asaye, G. A. (2021). Static locative expressions in Amharic. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics*, *42*(1), 1-26.

Athanasopoulos, P., & Casaponsa, A. (2020). The whorfian brain: Neuroscientific approaches to linguistic relativity. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, *37*(5-6), 393-412.

Cadierno, T. (2008). Learning to talk about motion in a foreign language. In P. Robinson & N. C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition* (pp. 249-285). Routledge.

Chen, J., & Ai, R. (2009). Encoding motion and state change in L2 Mandarin. In Y. Xiao (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 21st North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics (NACCL-21)* (pp. 149-164). Smithfield.

Chen, L., & Guo, J. (2009). Motion events in Chinese novels: Evidence for an equipollently- framed language. *Journal of pragmatics*, *41*(9), 1749-1766.

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2007). *Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition*. Routledge.

Kageyama, T. 1997. Ch. 3: Tango o koeta gokeisei [Ch. 3: Word formation beyond words]. In T. Kageyama & Y. Yumoto, *Gokeisei to gainenkōzō [Word formation and conceptual structure]* (pp. 128–197). Kenkyusha.

Laws, J., Attwood, A., & Treffers-Daller, J. (2021). Unlearning the boundary-crossing constraint: Processing instruction and the acquisition of motion event construal. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, *60*(4), 1089-1118.

Matsumoto, Y. (2018). Motion event descriptions in Japanese from typological perspectives. In P. Pardeshi & and K. Taro (Eds.), *Handbook of Japanese contrastive*

linguistics (pp. 273-289). De Gruyter Mouton.

Park, H. I. (2022). The role of language in expressing agentivity in caused motion events: A cross-linguistic investigation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*(June), 1-10.

Ringbom, H. (2006). *Cross-linguistic similarity in foreign language learning*. Multilingual Matters.

Ringbom, H. (2016). Comprehension, learning and production of foreign languages: The role of transfer. In R. A. Alonso (Ed.), *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition* (pp. 38-52). Multilingual Matters.

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 (vol. 2): Typological and contextual perspectives* (pp. 219–257). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Talmy, L. (1985). Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, *3*(99), 36-149.

Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics: Typology and process in concept structuring.* The MIT Press.

Tanaka, S., & Matsumoto, Y. (1997). *Japanese-English comparative selections 6: Expressions of space and movement*. Kenkyusha.

Wang, M., Gan, Q., & Boland, J. (2021). L2 syntactic alignment in the reading-writing integrated continuation task: Evidence from Chinese EFL learners' description of motion events. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *44*(3), 292-313.

Wen, X., & Shan, X. (2021). The adventure of a third way: Motion events in Mandarin. *Language Sciences*, *85*(101362), 1-24.

Yan C. S. (1998). Yiwei: Yundong shijian de cihuihua moshi: Yinghan bijiao yanjiu [Inversion: The lexicalization patterns of motion events: A comparative

study between English and Chinese]. *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages, (6),*8-12.

Zhang, L. H. (2020). Empirical research on the japanese motion expression of Chinese learners from the perspective of conceptual transfer: A case study based on self- motion, caused-motion, and fiction-motion events. *Journal of Japanese Language Study and Research*, *207*(2), 37-47.

Zhao, C., & Hu, B. (2018). The role of event structure in language production: Evidence from structural priming in Chinese motion event descriptions. *Lingua*, *208*, 61-81.