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Langacross: The Project

The overarching aim of LANGACROSS2 is to study cognitive and linguistic determinants of language acquisition in a cross-linguistic perspective that takes into account discourse factors in language use. The project is framed within a large comparative approach that combines many languages (and language families) and different types of speakers (children and adults) focusing on effects of diversity. LANGACROSS2 extends the preceding LANGACROSS1 project in two ways: it pursues some of the research already begun since 2007, as well as investigate new questions that have emerged from it particularly around the question of the relation between language and cognition. The project investigates two research domains: I- Space/Time, II- Contrastive and additive relations in discourse. It considers two main research themes: 1) typological constraints across languages and uncovering their cognitive implications for native speakers; 2) processes of conceptualization and reconceptualization during L1/L2 acquisition and in bilingualism. In addition, it simultaneously addresses two specific research questions in each domain: 1) the study of cross-linguistic differences in speakers’ output, as measured in production tasks aiming at studying the impact of language-specific properties on how speakers organize information in discourse; 2) the study of the cognitive underpinnings underlying these different outputs, as measured by a variety of psycholinguistic tools aiming at providing access to speakers’ internal representations (e.g. eye movements, categorization, memory), mainly in relation to productions elicited in controlled situations. Finally, it examines these questions in two types of databases for which some corpora are already available or in progress and others will be collected in new experimental situations and in new languages: 1) native speakers of different languages and 2) different types of learners, including children acquiring their first language, bilingual children acquiring two languages simultaneously, adults acquiring a second language, and balanced bilingual adults (see Appendix).
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The conference
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LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND COGNITION:
IMPLICATIONS FOR FIRST AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION
LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND COGNITION:
IMPLICATIONS FOR FIRST AND SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

Lille, 20-21 June 2014
Maison de la Recherche
Conference organized by LANGACROSS2

This conference is organized by the French-German project entitled “Utterance structure in context: Language and cognition during acquisition in a cross-linguistic perspective” (LANGACROSS2, financially supported by the ANR and DFG). The project aims to provide theoretical and empirical advances in the field of language acquisition, with particular attention to the relationship between language and cognition in two major domains of investigation:
I- Contrastive and additive relations; II- Space and Time.
In both domains research is carried out around the following two main research questions: 1) the role of typological constraints across languages and their cognitive implications for native speakers; 2) the nature of conceptualization and reconceptualization processes during L1/L2 acquisition and in bilingualism. Furthermore, two specific research themes are simultaneously addressed: a) cross-linguistic differences in speakers’ output, as measured in controlled production tasks aiming at studying the impact of language-specific properties on how speakers organize information in discourse; and b) the cognitive underpinnings underlying these different outputs, as measured by a variety of psycholinguistic tools aiming at providing access to speakers’ internal representations in relation to their production in controlled situations.
In line with these general aims, the conference brings together advances related to typological accounts of event representation and construal across languages and learners. Additional emphasis is placed on:
1) language use in context,
2) conceptualization processes in relation to language-specific structures,
3) relating the specific course of L1 and L2 acquisition and their outcomes or end-states,
4) in a wide range of languages and language combinations, particularly Germanic and Romance, but also from other groups (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Greek, Russian, Georgian, Arabic),
5) and a wide range of populations: adult native speakers, children acquiring their first language, bilingual children acquiring two languages simultaneously, adults acquiring a second language at different levels of proficiency, balanced bilingual adults,
6) using a variety of methodologies, such as comprehension and production, on-line measures of cognitive processes (eye-movements, reaction times), in verbal and non-verbal tasks (e.g. categorization, memory, picture-matching).
### Program

#### FRIDAY 20 JUNE: DISCOURSE RELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13h30-14h15</td>
<td>Invited speaker: Robert Van Valin (University of Düsseldorf &amp; University at Buffalo), Dejan Matić &amp; Saskia van Putten (Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen) &lt;br&gt; <strong>Variability of contrastive markers: Contrast in Avatime, Even and Lakhota</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h15-14h45</td>
<td>Dominique Bassano, Ewa Lenart, Pascale Trévisiol &amp; Isabelle Maillochon: The emergence of nominal determiners in French: what is the impact of information structure? &lt;br&gt; Sarah Schimke, Maya Hickmann &amp; Saveria Colonna: Learning to maintain and to shift topics in French &amp; German: general and language-specific determinants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h15-15h40</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h40-17h</td>
<td>Cecilia Andorno, Sandra Benazzo, Christine Dimroth, Giusy Turco &amp; Cédric Patin: Additive &amp; Contrastive relations in Germanic vs. Romance languages, as L1 &amp; L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17h-17h20</td>
<td>Short Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17h20-18h</td>
<td>Katia Paykin &amp; Tatiana Aleksandrova: Additive &amp; Contrastive relations in native speakers of Russian &lt;br&gt; Patrizia Giuliano: How to contrast and maintain information in English and Italian, as L1 &amp; L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18h-18h30</td>
<td>Discussion: Discourse relations - with the participation of all speakers &amp; invited discussants &lt;br&gt; Giuliano Bernini (Università di Bergamo), Martin Howard (University College Cork), Jeanine Treffers-Daller (University of Reading)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SATURDAY 21 JUNE: SPACE & TIME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9h-9h45</td>
<td>Invited speaker: Yo Matsumoto (Kobe University) &lt;br&gt; Common tendencies in the descriptions of manner, path and cause across languages: closer look at their subcategories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9h45h-10h30</td>
<td>Invited speaker: Teresa Cadierno (University of Southern Denmark) &lt;br&gt; Cross-linguistic variation in the expression of placement events: Research on L1 and L2 speakers of Danish and Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h30-11h</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h-11h45</td>
<td>Maya Hickmann, Henriëtte Hendriks, Helen Engemann, Efstathia Soroli &amp; Coralie Vincent: Verbal and non-verbal cognition in English and French: adults and L1 acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11h45-12h30</td>
<td>Abassia Bouhous &amp; Christiane von Stutterheim: Implications of aspectual distinctions (+/-) on motion event construal in L1 Tunisian Arabic, French, German and L2 Tunisian -&gt; MSA, L2 Tunisian-French, L2 French-German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h30-13h30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13h30-14h15</td>
<td>Monique Lambert, Christiane von Stutterheim &amp; Mary Carroll: Global principles of information organization in advanced L2 acquisition: Studies based on L1 (source and target) and L2 narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14h15-15h</td>
<td>Invited speakers: Eliana Mastrantuono (University of Seville), Jacqueline Laws &amp; Jeanine Treffers-Daller (University of Reading) &lt;br&gt; Aspectual markers in motion event construals among English and Italian monolinguals and Italian-English bilinguals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h-15h30</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15h30-16h</td>
<td>Discussion: Space/Time - with the participation of all speakers &amp; invited discussants - Giuliano Bernini (Università di Bergamo), Martin Howard (University College Cork), Jeanine Treffers-Daller (University of Reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksandrova, Tatiana</td>
<td>SFL 7023 (CNRS &amp; University of Paris 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andorno, Cecilia</td>
<td>Università degli Studi di Torino</td>
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Variability of contrastive markers: Contrast in Avatime, Even and Lakhota  
Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. (Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf & University at Buffalo, The State University of New York), Dejan Matić (Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen) & Saskia van Putten (Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen)

This presentation looks at the marking of contrast in three unrelated non-Indo-European languages: Avatime, a Kwa language spoken in Ghana; Even, a Tungusic language spoken in Siberia, and Lakhota, a Siouan language spoken in the northern Great Plains region of North America. Each presents a different strategy for coding contrastive focus and contrastive topic. Avatime employs syntactic, morphological and tonal means to signal the two kinds of contrast, whereas Even uses the same marker for both. Lakhota has no dedicated topic or focus markers but nevertheless signals the two kinds of contrast by means of pronouns and a typologically unusual type of cleft construction. A comparison among the three language shows that they differ not only in the morphosyntactic means by which they signal contrast but also in what exactly is signaled.

***

The emergence of determiners in French: What is the impact of information structure?  
Dominique Bassano (CNRS-SFL & University Paris 8), Ewa Lenart (University Paris 8 & CNRS-SFL), Pascale Trévisiol (University of Poitiers, Forell A) & Isabelle Maillochon (SFL 7023 & Université du Havre)

In languages with articles, the acquisition of determiner use is a central aspect of the emergence of grammar in child speech. After a variable period in which children generally ‘omit’ determiners from their productions, they become able to use these morphemes in the contexts required in the target language, although determiners may not be produced as correct forms or with appropriate discourse functions. This acquisition process has inspired many works. Crosslinguistic studies show that determiners emerge earlier in Romance than in Germanic languages and that variation depends on a range of interacting factors; particular attention is given in the literature to prosodic and lexical-semantic influences (for review Bassano, to appear). In contrast, the impact of discourse factors on determiner emergence has been under-investigated. This talk examines the influence of information structure on determiner emergence in French children’s early speech. Based on longitudinal spontaneous production data of six children at 20, 30 and 39 months, we analyse the respective impact of three informational dimensions: topic/comment structure (cf. the Quaestio model, Klein & von Stutterheim, 1991), the information status of
referents in discourse and their status in regard to the nonlinguistic context. Nouns were much more frequently used in children’s comments than in topics, for discourse-given rather than for new referents and for contextually-given referents rather than for non-given. At 20 months, determiner/filler use was significantly favoured for nouns in comments over nouns in topics. It was also favoured for new over given referents in discourse and for non-given over given referents in nonlinguistic contexts. These results, discussed in terms of young children’s sensitivity to informativity and accessibility features, support the early influence of discourse factors on the emergence of grammar.


***

**Learning to maintain and to shift topics in French and German: General and language-specific determinants**

**Sarah Schimke (University of Münster), Maya Hickmann & Saveria Colonna (CNRS & University Paris 8)**

In order to introduce, switch and maintain reference in narrative discourse, speakers have to use linguistic means including word order, specialized syntactic constructions and referring expressions that can vary in explicitness. The use of these means is complex in particular because there is no one-to-one mapping of forms and functions. Moreover, they are exploited differently in different languages and interact with language-specific grammatical constraints. As a consequence, when studying the acquisition of referential means, it is desirable to compare data that have been obtained with the same elicitation stimuli in different languages, so that processes that are specific for a given language can be separated from language-independent developmental changes.

The current study compared retellings of 5, 7 and 10-year old children as well as adults in German and French, obtained with a new set of carefully controlled elicitation stimuli. All participants narrated 16 short video clips, each showing two animals interacting with each other. We coded how participants expressed reference to one of these animals (“target”) throughout the narratives. In the first scene of each video, both animals appeared one after the other. In the second scene, a transitive action happened between the two animals. In the third scene, the target animal disappeared and then re-appeared with an object. We varied whether the target animal appeared first or second in the first scene, and whether it was the agent or patient in the second scene, thereby creating contexts for maintained or switched reference that were highly comparable to each other.

Our results reveal effects of age, language, and discourse context on referential cohesion. French and German adults exploit the means available in their language in
quite different ways. German adults maintain reference by zero anaphora and express switched reference either by full noun phrases or by the demonstrative pronoun *der*. French adults frequently use clitic pronouns and zero anaphora for maintained reference, particularly in chains of increasingly reduced forms (e.g., full NP – relative pronoun – clitic or zero pronoun). 5-year-olds tend to be under-explicit in both languages, resulting in ambiguous references. In contrast, 7-year-olds are highly over-explicit, producing few discourse contexts that favor the use of lean forms, a pattern which is more striking in German than in French. Similarly, German 10-year-olds are highly over-explicit, while French 10-year olds use lean forms as frequently as adults. The late development of an adult-like use of lean forms in German children is probably related to their frequent use of sentence-initial adverbials that lead to obligatory subject-verb inversions (V2-constraint, e.g. *da-V-S*). The resulting postverbal forms are normally associated with new information. As a result, children may have difficulties reconciling grammatical vs. pragmatic constraints on form-position associations.

***

**Additive and contrastive relations in Romance and Germanic languages, as L1 & L2**

Cecilia Andorno (Università di Torino) Sandra Benazzo (Université Lille 3 & UMR 8361 STL), Christine Dimroth (Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster) Giusy Turco (Universität Konstanz) & Cédric Patin (Université Lille 3 & UMR 8361 STL)

At every point in an unfolding discourse speakers have to bring together information that is maintained from prior utterances with information that is changing or new. Different discourse types come with different default regularities for the domains in which maintenance or change is expected (referential movement; Klein & von Stutterheim 2002). In a narration, for instance, at least local maintenance in the domain of a topical referent (‘protagonist’ or ‘agent’) goes hand in hand with temporal shifts and with changing predicates that are claimed to hold for the topical referent(s) at different points in time. Structural differences between languages have been shown to influence the way in which properties of referential movement are mapped onto surface form (e.g. which entity is typically selected as subject; cf. Carroll, Lambert, Stutterheim 2005).

By contrast, less is known about cross-linguistic variation for information contexts which deviate from such a prototypical discourse scheme, i.e. when change and maintenance do no longer conform to default expectations on referential movement. In order to investigate this question, we used an experimental task (the video Finite Story) eliciting narrative discourse stretches where the type of action is given information, whereas the changing information is in the domain of entities or of the assertive polarity. The comparison of native productions in four languages has shown a clear cross-linguistic difference between Romance (French, Italian) and Germanic languages (German, Dutch) in the linguistic structures speakers used to signal such contexts (Dimroth, Andorno, Benazzo & Verhagen 2010). As a follow up to Dimroth et al., this paper presents the findings from empirical studies which further investigate the typological contrast identified between Germanic and
Romance languages in L1 production and discuss its implications for L2 acquisition. The presentation is subdivided in the following 4 parts:

1) Introduction (Dimroth). Part I provides some background information on the theoretical and methodological approach of the sub-project.
2) Polarity Contrasts (Turco). Part 2 reports on data from a controlled dialogue production experiment (Polarity Switch task) in which L1 and L2 speakers of Romance or Germanic languages were encouraged to express switches from negative to assertive polarity.
3) Contrastive relations (Benazzo). Part 3 compares how L2 learners of Romance languages (French, Italian), having either a Romance or a Germanic language as L1, organize the information structures of narrative utterances relating contrasting events.
4) Additive relations (Andorno). Part 4 compares, on the basis of Finite Story data, the sentence information structure (word order, intonation) of additive sentences in German and Italian native speakers and L2 learners (German learners of Italian, Italian learners of German).

The study of native productions highlights the presence of a Germanic vs. Romance preferred discourse perspective to express additive and contrastive relations. Whereas speakers of Italian and French chose marked expressions of topical referents, time spans and predicates (e.g. contrastive pronouns, stressed temporal adverbials etc.), speakers of Germanic languages prefer to manipulate the expression of the hold-for-relation that links the predicate to the topic(s). With the help of intonation (Verum Focus; Höhle 1992) and contrastive particles they can directly access this relation and thus use a different piece of information in order to establish discourse coherence. In addition, the Polarity switch data reveals a different use of contrastive intonation: German native speakers mark assertion by producing a nuclear pitch accent on the finite verb, whereas Romance speakers (Italian and French) prefer other encoding strategies (e.g., accenting the non-finite verb). The analysis of L2 narrative data shows that learners can adopt (to a different extent) the target language discourse perspective, but also that they are particularly reluctant to produce the typical L2 constructions, preferred by native speakers, which diverge from the default topic / comment structure.

***

Additive and Contrastive Relations in native speakers of Russian
Katia Paykin (Université Lille 3 & UMR 8163 STL) & Tatiana Aleksandrova (Université Paris 8 & UMR 7023 SFL)

In line with what has been presented by Andorno et al. (“Additive and contrastive relations in Romance and Germanic languages”), we examine various strategies used by native speakers of Russian in coding additive and contrastive relations in narrative discourse prompted by the Finite Story video. In particular, we try to determine to what extent the typological contrast identified between Germanic and Romance languages can also apply for Russian. To some degree Russian data provides similar
and comparable results to those obtained for Romance languages, in particular in the use of additive particles or contrastive adverbials, which put the emphasis on the entity or the predicate. However, it does seem that speakers of Russian make full use of particularities of Slavic linguistic system to attain maximal coherence, i.e. variable word order accompanied by contrastive intonation, lexical variation in order to avoid repetition and especially the aspectual shift. Moreover, we can trace the same tendencies in Russian speaking learners of French L2 on the intermediate level. These typically Russian means tend to progressively give way to more canonical ways of expression, proper to French, in advanced learners.

***

How to contrast and maintain information in English, as L1 and L2

Patrizia Giuliano (Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II)

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the way informants change or contrast information in the Topic Entity and Topic Time domains (Klein 2008) in Italian and English, as L1s and L2s. In the narrative task proposed, informants also have to maintain predicative information, since a process claimed to hold for some Topic Entities and Topic Time is actually maintained from previous discourse. The data have been elicited using the video clip The Finite Story (Dimroth 2006) and are divided in three groups: English L1, English L2 of Italian advanced learners, Italian L2 of English advanced learners. Dimroth et al. (2010) have analysed Finite Story narrations of German, Dutch, French and Italian adult native speakers, identifying the type of items signalling which parts of the information are maintained and which parts have been changed or contrasted. The anaphoric linking devices range from additive particles to polarity or temporal contrasting markings and to prosodic devices. The same authors suggest that: (a) when a polarity contrast is present, Dutch and German mark this polarity contrast much more frequently than Romance languages, which prefer to mark the contrast on the topic component (entity or time); (b) where no polarity contrast is involved, Germanic languages show a clear preference for the marking of contrast on the Topic Entity with the help of additive particles, while Romance languages can also signal the maintenance of information on the predicate level.

My purpose is to test Dimroth et al.’s hypothesis on English, both as L1 and L2, in order to enlarge the debate about the possible ways of building textual cohesion in Romance and Germanic languages, extending it to the L2 perspective as well.
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Common tendencies in the descriptions of manner, path and cause across languages: closer look at their subcategories

Yo Matsumoto (Kobe University)

In this talk I will discuss some of the findings of NINjAL-Kobe Project on Motion Event Descriptions, in which production experiments were conducted in 16 different languages to elicit descriptions of motion events differing in manner, path, deixis, and cause of motion. The findings show clear typological differences among languages in terms of the coding positions of path (cf. Talmy 1991): some languages tend to code path in the head (i.e. main verb) of the clause while others tend to code it “head-external” positions (e.g., satellites). At the same time, our findings suggest that languages claimed to belong to different typological types exhibit similar tendencies in describing particular subcategories of manner, path, and cause. For example, UP path is described in a position closer to the main verb or the main verb itself, while TO path tends to be expressed closer to nominal argument of the verb. Physical manipulation induces a simplex clause descriptions while verbal commands tend to induce less integrated, often biclausal event descriptions. These suggest that linguistic descriptions of motion events are in fact more similar across languages than might have been believed.

Cross-linguistic variation in the expression of placement events: Research on L1 and L2 speakers of Danish and Spanish

Teresa Cadierno (University of Southern Denmark)

Cross-linguistic research conducted in the last two decades has evidenced widespread variation in how languages cut up the world. While earlier research tended to focus on domains such as color (e.g., Robertson et al., 2000; Regier and Kay, 2009), artifacts (e.g., Ameel et al., 2005; Malt et al., 1999, 2003), topological relations (e.g., Bowerman, 1996; Levinson et al., 2006) and frames of reference (e.g., Levinson & Wilkins, 2006), among others, recent studies have started to investigate the linguistic encoding of every day events (e.g., ‘carrying events’, Bowerman, 2005; and ‘cutting and breaking events’, Majid et al., 2007, 2008). One type of event that has attracted a great deal of attention lately is that of placement events.Placement events are examples of caused-motion (Talmy, 1985, 2000) as they involve an Agent causing an object (the figure object) to move to another location (a goal ground) in space.

The investigation of placement events is an interesting area for SLA as recent research (e.g., Kopecka & Narasimhan, 2012) has revealed considerable variation in
the linguistic conceptualization of this domain by native speakers (NSs) of different languages. For example, NSs of Germanic languages such as Dutch use posture verbs (e.g., *zetten* vs. *leggen*) that express properties of the figure object and its orientation with respect to the ground, while NSs of Romance languages tend to use general-purpose verbs that can apply to a wide range of scenes (e.g., Spanish *poner* ‘put’ or *dejar* ‘leave’).

Following research on the linguistic encoding of placement events in L1 acquisition (e.g., Hickman, 2007; Hickman & Hendriks, 2006; Slobin et al., 2011; Gullberg and Narasimhan, 2010; Narasimhan & Gullberg, 2011), a few studies have started to examine the expression of placement events in functional bilinguals (Berthele, 2012; Alferink & Gullberg, 2014) and adult L2 learners. This latter type of studies have focused on examining the relative degree of difficulty in placement verbs meaning reconstruction when moving from a more general system to a more specific system (Viberg, 1998; Gullberg, 2009) or when moving in the opposite direction, i.e., from a more specific system to a more general one (Gullberg, 2011). Crucially, the direction of the movement has been examined so far in separate studies involving different combinations of L1 and L2 language pairs (e.g., English learners of L2 Dutch and Dutch learners of L2 French). To our knowledge, no research has yet examined in one single study the relative difficulty of moving in one or the other direction. The study that will be reported in the workshop is designed to examine this. By means of a bi-directional design, the investigation examines the semantic categorization of placement verbs in four groups of informants: two groups of native speakers (NSs), i.e., NSs of Danish and NSs of Spanish, and two groups of adult L2 learners with the same level of L2 proficiency, i.e., Danish learners of L2 Spanish and Spanish learners of L2 Danish. Semantic categorization was investigated by means of cluster analysis, a statistical technique previously used in the semantic categorization of other types of events in L1 (Majid et al., 2007a, 2008; Vulchanova et al., 2013; Jessen, 2013) and L2 speakers (Jessen & Cadierno, 2013). The results of the study show difficulties for both learner groups in the semantic reorganization of placement verbs.

***

**Verbal and non-verbal cognition in English and French**

Maya Hickmann (UMR SFL, CNRS & University Paris 8), Henriëtte Hendriks (University of Cambridge), Helen Engemann (University of Cambridge) Efstathia Soroli (Université Lille 3 & UMR STL, CNRS) & Coralie Vincent (UMR SFL, CNRS & University Paris 8)

Spatial systems show considerable variation across languages (Slobin 2004; Talmy 2000). When describing motion events, native speakers differ with respect to the degree to which they pay attention to the Manner in which motion is carried out in addition to the Path followed and this difference follows lexicalization patterns in their language: *satellite-framed languages* (e.g. Germanic, such as English) lexicalize Manner in the verb root and express Path in adjuncts, while *verb-framed languages* (e.g. Romance, such as French) lexicalize Path in the verb root expressing Manner by peripheral means, if at all. Such crosslinguistic differences have been shown to
influence how speakers and learners represent spatial information (e.g. Bowerman & Choi 2003; Caderno 2008; Choi & Hattrup 2012; Engemann 2012; Hendriks & Hickmann 2011; Hickmann et al. 2009; Hickmann 2010; von Stutterheim & Nüse 2003). The present paper addresses the question of whether such language-specific factors have a deeper cognitive impact on speakers’ representations (e.g. Filipović 2011; Gennari et al., 2002; Papafragou & Selimis 2010; Soroli 2012) in adult speakers and on language development by comparing verbal and non-verbal responses across different languages and age groups.

This paper presents preliminary findings from experimental studies investigating the representation of motion in English and French speakers (adults, children of 7 and 10 years) who performed tasks based on animated cartoons showing different types of voluntary motion events. The tasks tested (a) verbal production as well as (b) non-verbal vs. verbal categorization (forced choice paradigm) and (c) memory. The present contribution is subdivided into three parts, each focusing on different aspects of our research, with particular attention to categorization and production:

1. **Issues and implications for language acquisition** (Hickmann & Hendriks): Part 1 provides a general introduction to the framework, aims, and experimental design of our study, highlighting the theoretical and methodological challenges faced by research on linguistic relativity.

2. **Adult native speakers’ event construal** (Soroli): Part 2 examines universal vs. language-specific factors affecting spatial cognitive processing in adult native speakers, extending the study with data from a parallel system of conflation (Greek) and additional non-verbal measures (reaction times, eye-movements).

3. **Children’s event construal** (Engemann): Part 3 discusses the relative role of age-related cognitive determinants vs. typological constraints on first language acquisition and conceptualization across languages, also discussing implications for bilingual language acquisition.

Findings show that at all ages English and French speakers’ productions are language-specific, showing more frequent Manner expressions in English than in French. In categorization, adults focus more on Path than on Manner. Manner focus also varies with condition (non-verbal > verbal), Manner salience (JUMP > WALK), and type of Path (IN/OUT > UP/DOWN). Children are significantly more attentive to Manner than adults in French, whereas no age differences occur in English. These results indicate that language properties influence verbal cognition more than non-verbal cognition, resulting in differential focus on semantic components depending on language, event types, and age. Our ongoing research addresses further issues that arise from these results by comparing complementary methodologies (video stimuli, memory tasks, eye-tracking).

***
Implications of aspectual distinctions (+/-) on motion event construal in L1 Tunisian Arabic, French, German and L2 Tunisian->MSA, L2 Tunisian-French, L2 French-German.

Abassia Bouhaous, Mary Carroll & Christiane v. Stutterheim (University of Heidelberg)


The present study contrasts speakers of typologically distant languages, German (satellite-framed, no verbal aspect), French (verb-framed, no verbal aspect), Tunisian-Arabic (verb-framed, 4 partite aspectual system) and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), (verb-framed, 2-partite aspectual system) and investigates conceptual transfer effects in the description of motion events: L1 speakers of Tunisian Arabic with Modern Standard Arabic as L2 (early acquisition onset), Arabic-German L2 (late acquisition onset) and French-German L2 (late acquisition onset). The experiment involves the description of motion events in which selected components of were varied systematically (short versus long trajectories, boundary crossings (video clips N=70). Speakers elicited online (N=20 in each case) include monolingual speakers of German, Tunisian-Arabic, and MSA as well as advanced Arabic-German L2 speakers and French-German L2 speakers, both describing the events in German. Eye movement was registered during verbalization for all groups. The analyses focus on the following aspects: a) the types of aspectual forms used by the speakers of the Arabic varieties and their distribution across the different types of motion events; b) the types of spatial concepts selected and the formal constituents in which the are encoded (verbs, particles, prepositional phrases); c) the process of acquisition in this domain, comparing in particular L2 speakers of MSA and L2 speakers of German.

Preliminary findings with respect to temporal concepts show convergence for all types of events in that speakers of Tunisian select a subphase of the event, conceptualizing components which are relevant for this phase, whereas speakers of German take a holistic view, integrating given or even only inferred endpoints or resultant states of events. The selection of spatial concepts differs across these two groups when structuring the path of motion in that Tunisian speakers locate the moving figure whereas German speakers relate explicitly to contours of the path. The results for the bilingual speakers differ markedly: MSA L2 speakers do not show traces of conceptual transfer whereas German L2 speakers (Arabic/French L1) do so with regard to specific spatial components of the motion events.

We interpret the contrasts observed across languages in terms of what we call the cognitive diversity hypothesis given the role of grammaticalised concepts in structuring processes of conceptualization in the context of language production. The learner data show that the question of conceptual transfer is not a simple case of ‘either – or’. Concepts are tied to form and associated typologies, with this the hierarchies they entail within the language. We have to assume a complex network in which some components and relations are less readily restructured than others.
Our aim is to gain insight into the cognitively complex underpinnings of these principles.

***

Global principles of information organization in advanced L2 acquisition.
Studies based on L1 (source and target) and L2 narratives
Monique Lambert (Université Paris 8 & UMR SFL), Christiane von Stutterheim & Mary Carroll (University of Heidelberg)

The study presented in this talk is part of a long term research project on L2 acquisition of target language specific preferences in the overall structure of narrative texts. As point of reference to the analyses of L2s, crosslinguistic studies of how L1 speakers proceed in organizing information for expression have shown coherent and distinctive patterns which correlate with typologically differently coalesced grammatical concepts (+/- ongoing aspect, role of the subject, word order).

The focus of the present study lies on the concept of ongoingness in three film retelling tasks which vary in cognitive load (online vs. offline short vs. offline long fragment). The question is whether the selective activation of the knowledge base in the course of the retelling process by L2s follows L1 oriented principles, L2 oriented principles or a mix. Under investigation are principles underlying the selection of events, the temporal perspective coded as ongoing, mapping options (main clause vs. subordinate) and the integration of the individual events in the story line, i.e. the principles of information structure. L1 and L2 participants in each group (n=15 to 20) are all university student assumed to be competent storytellers. L2 speakers’ competence range from advanced to near native.

Numbers of occurrences show that events presented as ongoing vary in both L1 and L2 according to task demands reflecting learners' sensitivity to the contextual factors underlying the choice of this temporal perspective. Distribution, however, manifests remarkable differences: in L1English the selection of coding options follows patterns which can be described as resulting from the following introductory questions and now what can you see? (online condition), and then what can you see? (offline short fragment) and then what happens in this episode? (offline long fragment). In contrast, L2 narrators follow mixed patterns. They adhere to the target system in the uses of ongoingness as applying to the time of speaking and as marker of backgrounded information in subordinate clauses. They diverge from L1s options in their unfrequent use of the be+-Ing form coded as part of the story line, in not providing adequate anchor points for their integration, in not using contextually based gerund constructions.

Regarding patterns of information organization, divergences show up globally at the level of topic management and at the level of sequencing principles based on predominant causal relations by mention of the protagonist’s perceptions and attitudes and by mention of the narrator as witness and source of implicit interpretation, as in source language.

Findings will be discussed in the light of L1 and L2 convergences vs. divergences at the level of conceptual restructuring implied in the 'deactivation' of components of
production routines acquired and automatized in L1. They will be discussed also in relation to the types of input with their different degrees of cognitive load in their implications for patterns of information organization.

***

Aspectual markers in motion event construals among English and Italian monolinguals and Italian-English bilinguals

Eliana Mastrantuono (University of Seville), Jacqueline Laws (University of Reading) & Jeanine Treffers-Daller (University of Reading)

In this paper we focus on the relationship between the presence of aspectual markers and the frequency with which endpoints are mentioned in motion events related by English and Italian monolinguals as well as two groups of Italian-English bilinguals with different levels of proficiency in English. As Von Stutterheim (2003), Von Stutterheim and Carroll (2006), Flecken (2011) and (Von Stutterheim, Andermann, Carroll, Flecken and Schmiedtová, 2012) have pointed out, speakers of languages which obligatorily mark progressive aspect tend to focus on the ongoing prominent phase of the event, whilst speakers of non-aspect languages are more likely to focus on the endpoint of the events. Italian forms a particularly interesting test case for this hypothesis, not only because it shares properties with Verb-framed as well as Satellite-framed languages (Bernini, 2010; Bernini et al., 2006), but also because progressive aspect is not obligatorily marked in Italian (Bertinetto, 2000).

Participants in the study were 30 Italian speakers of L2 English (15 intermediate and 15 advanced level L2-users), 15 monolingual Italians and 15 monolingual English speakers. The bilinguals’ level of English was tested with the Oxford Quick Placement test. The intermediate level participants were at B2 level in their proficiency in English and the advanced level were at C2 level. The video clips of motion events used in the study were developed by the research team of M. Carroll and C. Von Stutterheim and permission for their use was kindly provided by M. Flecken.

Our results demonstrated that Italian monolinguals mark progressive aspect less often than English monolinguals. This finding is in accordance with the earlier studies mentioned above; however, contrary to expectations, Italian monolinguals in our study did not focus more on endpoints of the events than English monolinguals and Italian L2-users of English, despite the lack of aspectual markers in their Italian. There were no differences either between groups in the frequency with which they mentioned different segments of the events: all groups mentioned intermediate segments of the event in about 50% of the cases in which they mentioned endpoints. We therefore conclude that for Italian there is no direct relationship between the presence of aspectual markers and the mention of endpoints or intermediate stages of motion.

Italian monolinguals did focus more generally on path than on manner, as was found by Cardini (2010), but they also expressed manner in more than one fifth of the sentences in adjuncts, which provides some counter evidence to Cardini’s (2012) speech economy principle, according to which the frequent use of path verbs by speakers of V-languages would inhibit speakers from expressing manner information.
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Title: *Time and space in second language acquisition: typological constraints in the acquisition of the French by English adults.*
Name: Demagny, Annie-Claude
Discipline: Linguistics
Supervisor: Maya Hickmann
Institute: University Paris 8.
Date of defense: 12 March 2013
Thesis committee: Sandra Benazzo, Henriëtte Hendriks, Maya Hickmann, Daniel Véronique, Marzena Watorek
Distinction: Highly Honorable with Praise (Summa Cum Laude).

Abstract: A growing number of studies have examined the expression of motion events in the spatial domain. However, few have focused on how this domain interacts with the domain of temporality, including during second language acquisition (SLA). The thesis aims to address two main questions: how space and time are interrelated; whether language-specific properties have an impact on the SLA. Particular attention is placed on the implications of typological factors in English and French (as *satellite-* vs. *verb-framed* languages) in the spatial domain. In addition, the thesis tests several hypotheses concerning the emergence of verbal morphology in SLA. The analyses examine the acquisition of French by English adult learners by means of two tasks that served to elicit verbalizations about motion events. English natives speakers show the lexicalization pattern of S-framed languages: they encode manner and cause in the verb, and path in the network of the verb, where utterances are often bounded. French native speakers show variations in the distribution of these three main components of motion events as a result of the boundary constraint that is typical of verbs in V-framed languages. The learners express cause and manner in the verb and express at first localisations. At the first level of proficiency, they bound their utterances by means of verbal morphology. With the development of their L2, they gradually integrate the lexicalization pattern of the target language. Finally, discourse context plays an important role in how all speakers use verbal morphology. It shows how learners partially integrate the spatial and verbal markings of the L2 to express motion in discourse.

Keywords: Linguistics typology, lexicalization patterns, L2 acquisition, psycholinguistics, space, time, inter-linkages between space and time.

***

Title: *Motion Event Expression in Bilingual First Language Acquisition*
Name: Helen Engemann
Discipline: Bilingual Language Acquisition
Supervisor: Henriëtte Hendriks
Institute: University of Cambridge
Date of defense: 21 November 2012
Thesis committee: Henriëtte Hendriks, Maya Hickmann, Teresa Parodi
Distinction: (not applicable)

Abstract: The thesis explores the implications of Talmy’s typology of motion expression for bilingual first language acquisition of English (satellite-framing) and French (verb-framing), addressing the following question: How does the expression of motion develop in
simultaneous bilingual children in comparison to monolinguals? The particular focus is on the role of crosslinguistic interactions and the extent to which their occurrence and directionality are affected by language-specific properties, children’s age and task complexity.

Oral event descriptions elicited by means of short video clips from bilingual and monolingual children aged 4 to 10 years are analysed and compared across two production tasks of varying semantic complexity. The results indicate both parallels and differences to monolingual performance patterns. Although bilinguals’ event descriptions generally follow the typological tendencies characterising monolinguals’ English and French verbalisation tendencies, they also exhibit significant departures from the monolingual range in both languages, at all tested ages and in both tasks. However, these differences are most prominent in French caused motion expressions. In this task, bilinguals display a striking preference for satellite-framing encoding, resulting both in the overuse of crosslinguistically overlapping packaging strategies and in qualitatively deviant extensions of French locative satellites.

The findings are discussed in the context of recent proposals regarding crosslinguistic interactions in simultaneous bilingualism. The persistence of bilingual-specific effects even at age 10 suggests that crosslinguistic interactions characterise bilinguals’ verbal behaviour throughout development. This supports the notion that the bilingual is a unique speaker-hearer in his own right. With regard to the impact of typological and general determinants, the findings indicate that bilinguals’ verbalisation choices are guided by a complex interplay of event-specific factors and the perceived overlap of language-specific properties of both languages.

**Keywords:** Bilingualism, Language Acquisition (2L1 and L1), Typology, Space and Language, Conceptualisation
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**Title:** Influences translinguistiques dans les productions de quasi-bilingues russes/français

**Name:** Tatiana Aleksandrova

**Discipline:** Linguistics

**Supervisor:** Marzena Watorek

**Institute:** University of Paris 8

**Date of defense:** 11 December 2012

**Thesis committee:** Marzena Watorek, Maya Hickmann, Harriet Jisa, Monique Lambert, Serge Sakhno, Daniel Véronique

**Distinction:** Highly Honorably with Praise (Summa Cum Laude).

**Abstract:** This study focuses on the reciprocal influences of the First language on the Second language in the productions of very advanced Russian learners of French. Learners at this level are defined as quasi-bilinguals. Our analyses show the differences in their productions compared with the productions of monolingual speakers of these two languages, representing the control groups. The differences attested are the result of the crosslinguistic influences in different informational domains: the domain of entities, the domain of time and events. We show that grammatical means of one language tend to be transferred to production in the other language. For instance, grammatical determiners, obligatory in French and optional in Russian, incite quasi-bilinguals to use optional determiners in Russian in contexts where such determiners are absent in the productions of Russian monolinguals. At the same time, the specificity of the categories of time and aspect in Russian influences the choice of narrative strategy adopted by quasi-bilinguals in French. Some other
phenomena linked to the grammatical patterns in the two languages were observed in the discourse of our quasi-bilinguals in both Russian and French. This study contributes to the development of the domain of language contact and brings new elements of analysis regarding language pairs such as Russian and French, which have not been studied together to determine crosslinguistic influences.

**Keywords:** bilingualism, second language acquisition, linguistic transfer, informational structure, narrative, entities, aspect, movement

***

**Title:** Language and Spatial Cognition in French and in English: crosslinguistic perspectives on aphasia
**Name:** Efstathia Soroli
**Discipline:** Psycholinguistics
**Supervisor:** Maya Hickmann
**Institute:** University of Paris 8
**Date of defense:** 12 December 2011
**Thesis committee:** Maya Hickmann, Michel Aurnague, Michèle Kail, Jean-Luc Nespoulous, Loraine Obler, Dan Slobin
**Distinction:** Highly Honorable with Praise (Summa Cum Laude).

**Abstract:** Languages differ strikingly in how they lexicalize and grammaticalize information about motion events. Thus, **Satellite-framed** languages (e.g., English) express manner in the verb root and path in satellites, while **Verb-framed** languages (e.g., French) lexicalize Path in the verb, leaving Manner implicit or expressing it in the periphery of the sentence. Such properties constrain how speakers organize spatial information to encode motion in discourse thereby reviving questions concerning the relation between language and thought. They are also of great relevance for the study of language pathology and more specifically for the study of aphasic speakers who typically present dissociations between lexical and grammatical knowledge. Despite a few crosslinguistic studies of aphasia, little is still known about universal vs. language-specific aspects of aphasics’ deficits. The present comparative study investigates the relative impact of language-independent and language-specific factors on how speakers represent motion events in control groups and in speakers with agrammatism in two languages, English and French, and in monolingual and bilingual contexts. The methodology combines a variety of complementary tasks (production, comprehension, non-verbal and verbal categorization), coupled with an eye-tracking paradigm measuring attention allocation. The findings show that typological properties of languages can have an impact on both linguistic organization and non-linguistic measures (i.e., categorical choices, attention allocation patterns). This research opens new crosslinguistic/typological perspectives on aphasia and contributes more generally to the debates concerning universal and language-specific dimensions of spatial cognition.

**Keywords:** Language and space, typology, spatial cognition, agrammatism, production, categorization, eye-movements

***

**Title:** L’utilisation et l’acquisition des verbes de position en suédois L1 et L2
**Name:** Hellerstedt, Maria
**Discipline:** Linguistics
Abstract: The Swedish posture verbs encode static (stå « stand », ligga « lie », sitta « sit ») and dynamic (ställa « stand », lägga « lay », sätta « set ») location of a person or a concrete object. The elaborated stimuli elicited data from 98 participants. Our data shows that the usage frequency of these verbs guarantees an early acquisition by children learning Swedish as their first language and by adult French-speaking learners of Swedish as a second language. However, their semantic complexity constitutes an obstacle for arriving at idiomatic language use with regard to choosing the correct verb. These difficulties exist even at high levels of competence (children of 10 years and advanced L2 learners respectively). An acquisition order can be distinguished regarding the verb type (static verbs are acquired before the dynamic ones), the semantic parameters (horizontality and verticality are acquired before base and contact/containment) and the prototypical meaning (acquired before the extended meanings). Several strategies are used by the learners to solve these problems: the use of a static verb to encode a dynamic situation; the generalized use of one of the verbs (generally the one encoding horizontality); a collocational use of a verb and a Figure; the use of a verbal ellipsis or a positionally neutral verb, like the copula. The Swedish discourse organization seems to be acquired late by the L2 learners, due to the typological differences between the two languages.

Keywords: posture verbs, language acquisition, L1, L2, semantics, typology

Title: Der Wortartwechsel.Eine linguistisch-kontrastive Untersuchung zur Transposition im Deutschen und Arabischen.

Abstract: The aim of the present work is to contrastively highlight the transposition of parts-of-speech in New High German and Modern Standard Arabic. This will be done by firstly identifying the similarities and differences resulting from the different morphological structures the two languages have and secondly, by comparing these similarities and differences by means of using one single theoretical framework. Establishing such a framework is a basic prerequisite to conduct a contrastive and typological linguistic study. It avoids analysing the same linguistic phenomena from different perspectives and offers a good tool to inquire linguistic features in different language systems whilst using the same analysing criteria. As affixation and conversion are the only word-formation processes inducing the transposition in German, the affixation in Arabic is the sole productive word-formation process. However, this does not work in the same way as in German. Analysing the structure of both languages in terms of concatenative and nonconcatenative morphology shows that German and Arabic have incompatible structures. Affixation in
German implies using concatenative morphology which is usually reflected by adding affixes to a stem belonging syntactically to a specific word-class. This results in a word with different syntactic features (e.g., schön → Schönheit). In other cases the affixation does not transfer the new word into another word-class (e.g., Grammatik → Grammatiker; laden → beladen). Conversion in German is always closely connected with transposition of word-classes. The word-formation process in Arabic is characterised by the extensive use of nonconcatenative mor-phology. Except two nominals, i.e. the nomina qualitatis and the nisba adjective, all the words in Ara-bic are formed by means of morphologically modifying the roots. Conversion in Arabic is a blocked word-formation process due to the word-patterns which are always connected with a specific syntactic and semantic word category. As the stems in German are always connected with a specific word-class but the roots in Arabic are not, I assume that there are two different kinds of transposition in both languages: the first one is a real transposition implying a difference in the syntactic function between a stem and a derivative (schön vs. Schönheit; laufen vs. Lauf). This kind of transposition is typical for the Indo-European languages. The second one is the root modification which characterises the phenomenon found in the Semitic languages, i.e., derivation of words from abstract roots (e.g., √KTB → kitāb; √DRS → madrasa). The following work also shows that the parts-of-speech in German and Arabic are grammatically different. While the parts-of-speech in German are in an ongoing process of degrammaticalization, lan-guages with nonconcatenative morphology like Arabic seem to always have a high degree of gram-maticalization. In order to be able to use the term “transposition” to describe the phenomena found in Arabic, the ref-erence of the term should be extended to include any syntactic or semantic change that can be a result of affixation, conversion of a base or modification of a root.

**Keywords:** Morphologie nominale, grammaticalisation (Wortbildung, Wortarten, Grammatikalisierung)
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**Title:** Contrasting opposite polarity in Germanic and Romance languages: Verum focus and affirmative particles in native speakers and advanced L2 learners.

**Name:** Turco Giuseppina

**Supervisor:** Bettina Braun and Christine Dimroth

**Institute:** Radboud University Nijmegen

**Defense date:** 20 January 2014

**Thesis Committee:** Giuliano Bernini, Aafke Hulk, Carlos Gussenhoven, Steve Levinson

**Abstract:** This dissertation investigated the expression of affirmative polarity contrast (e.g., speaker B: In my picture the child is eating the candies following after In my picture the child is not eating the candies uttered by speaker A) from a typological and an acquisitional perspective, framed in the finiteness-assertion hypothesis proposed by Klein (1998). As recently suggested, polarity contrast plays a crucial role for common ground management in German and Dutch but not in the Romance languages Italian and French (Dimroth, Andorno, Benazzo, & Verhagen, 2010). It is not by accident that the grammar of Germanic languages is equipped with a rich set of linguistic means, namely Verum focus - an accent on the finite verb (e.g., Höhle, 1992) - and affirmative particles (e.g., the Dutch particle wel) for the expression of polarity contrast. A further research question links such typological differences to learnability problems in second language acquisition (L2). As shown in previous studies, even at higher levels of proficiency, learners are not able to encode information structure in a target-like way (von Stutterheim, 2003).
In this dissertation we provided experimental evidence of polarity contrast, by adopting the same task procedure in German, Dutch, French and Italian and in L2 learners. Results showed that for German and Dutch speakers marking polarity contrast is crucial for common ground management. By contrast, even though French and Italian are equipped with assertion/polarity markings (e.g. Verum focus is produced occasionally), speakers do not choose these options in the contexts tested here; conceivably, Romance speakers feel that highlighting the contrast on the relevant operators might result in a “too assertive” pragmatic effect. The analysis on the L2 acquisition data supports these cross-linguistic differences. Results showed that learners tend to look for means in their L2 that allow them to build up L1-like discourse information organization.

***

Title: The expression of motion in L2 Danish by Turkish and German learners – the role of inter- and intratypological differences.
Name: Jessen, Moiken
Institute: Submitted at the University of Southern Denmark.
C.v.Stutterheim, external evaluator on the committee

***

Title: Spatial Language in Tungag.
Name: Fast, Karin
Supervisor: Gunter Senft
Institute: Universität Heidelberg.
Date of defense: 18 October 2013
Distinction: Magna cum laude.
Partners

• Laboratoire « Structures Formelles du Langage » (UMR 7023 CNRS & Paris 8), 2, rue de la Liberté, St Denis, France
• Laboratoire « Savoirs, textes, langage » (UMR 8163, CNRS & Lille 3), BP 60149, F-59653 Villeneuve d’Ascq, France.
• Germanistisches Institut, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster (Schlossplatz 34, D - 48143 Münster, Germany)
• Seminar für Deutsch als Fremdsprachenphilologie, Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg (Plöck 55, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany)

Contacts

Laboratoire Structures Formelles du Langage (UMR 7023)
CNRS & Université Paris 8
59/61 rue Pouchet
75017, Paris, FRANCE
Secretary: Georgie MORAND; Email: georgie.morand@sfl.cnrs.fr
Tel: +33(0)1.40.25.10.40 / Fax: +33(0)1.40.25.10.41

Germanistisches Institut
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster
Schlossplatz 34
D - 48143 Münster, GERMANY
Secretary: Birgit Bohnenkamp, Email: bbohn_01@exchange.wwu.de
Tel. +49 (0)541 8324142

Agence Nationale de la Recherche
212, rue de Bercy
75012 PARIS

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
German Research Foundation
53170 Bonn, Germany