UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI
FILOZOFSKA FAKULTETA
ODDELEK ZA ANGLISTIKO IN AMERIKANISTIKO

ŽAN KOROŠEC

The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator

Vprašanje glagolskega vida v izrazih fiktivnega gibanja, ki vsebujejo glagole premikanja v povedku

Magistrsko delo

Ljubljana, 2019

UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI
FILOZOFSKA FAKULTETA
ODDELEK ZA ANGLISTIKO IN AMERIKANISTIKO

ŽAN KOROŠEC

The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator

Vprašanje glagolskega vida v izrazih fiktivnega gibanja, ki vsebujejo glagole premikanja v povedku

Magistrsko delo

Mentorica: doc. dr. Frančiška Lipovšek

Univerzitetni študijski program druge stopnje: Anglistika – D, P

Ljubljana, 2019

Acknowledgement

ABSTRACT

The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator

The aim of this master's thesis is to present fictive motion, a phenomenon characterised by descriptions of static scenes as though being in some kind of motion. A particular manifestation of fictive motion is known as coextension paths, concurrently a category laboriously scrutinised and the focal point of this thesis, seeing that the pivotal idea is to determine how different types of motion verbs (within FM) are realised in terms of aspect.

With the theoretical segment, we commence by expounding the nature and attributes of construals, which stand as the broader term and integrate fictive motion in their classification. By analysing their properties, we acquire an initial understanding of fictive motion as well, thus a fundamental comprehension that shall serve us across the entire research. The thesis then proceeds to examine motion events and their internal structure, focusing on the distinctions between manner-of-motion and path-conflating motion verbs, before tackling fictive motion categories and lastly aspect – more precisely – the differences between the indefinite and the progressive form.

The subsequent empirical part consists of a corpus-based study (*enTenTen15* via *Sketch Engine*), where selected verbs from both verb groups are inspected in order to ascertain the frequency of both mentioned aspectual forms in sentences featuring coextension paths (the table with examples containing the progressive form is attached in the *Appendix*). The provided data and interpretations offer an insight into the actual usage and appearance of fictive motion present in the English language.

Keywords: construal, fictive motion, coextension paths, manner-of-motion verbs, path-conflating verbs, aspect, indefinite form, progressive form

IZVLEČEK

Vprašanje glagolskega vida v izrazih fiktivnega gibanja, ki vsebujejo glagole premikanja v povedku

Cilj te magistrske naloge je predstaviti fiktivno gibanje – pojav, za katerega je značilen opis statičnega prizora na način, kot bi opisovali dinamični prizor. Posebna oblika fiktivnega so »sorazsežnostne poti« (angl. *coextension paths*), kar hkrati predstavlja podrobno pregledano kategorijo ter osrednjo točko tega zaključnega dela, upoštevajoč dejstvo, da je ključna ideja določiti, kako so z vidika glagolskega vida zastopani različni tipi glagolov premikanja.

Pri teoretičnem delu začnemo z razlago narave ter lastnosti »interpretacij« (angl. *construals*), ki stojijo kot nadredni pojem ter vključujejo fiktivno gibanje v svojo klasifikacijo. Z analizo njihovih značilnosti pridobimo tudi začetni občutek o fiktivnem gibanju, torej temeljno razumevanje, ki nam bo služilo počez celotne raziskave. Delo se nadaljuje s preučevanjem dogodkov gibanja in njihovo notranjo zgradbo, pri čemer se osredotoči na razlike med glagoli premikanja z inkorporiranim načinom premikanja (angl. *manner-of-motion verbs*) in glagoli premikanja z inkorporirano potjo (angl. *path-conflating verbs*), preden poseže po obravnavi fiktivnega gibanja ter nazadnje glagolskega vida – natančneje – razlik med nedoločno ter progresivno obliko.

Sledeča poglavja namenjana empiričnim vsebinam sestojijo iz korpusne študije (*enTenTen15* preko *Sketch Engine*), kjer so glagoli iz obeh skupin pregledani zastran tega, da se odmeri pogostost obeh oblik vida v povedih, kjer nastopajo sorazsežnostne poti (tabela s primeri, ki vsebujejo progresivno obliko, je dodana v prilogi). Navedeni podatki ter interpretacije ponujajo vpogled v dejansko uporabo in pojavnost fiktivnega gibanja, ki ga je moč zaslediti v angleškem jeziku.

Ključne besede: interpretacije, fiktivno gibanje, sorazsežnostne poti, glagoli načina premikanja, glagoli poti premikanja, glagolski vid, nedoločna oblika, progresivna oblika

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Fictive motion (also studied under the expressions *abstract* and *subjective motion*) is a phenomenon ascribed to the branch of cognitive linguistics, incorporated under the broader term of construals. The latter, according to Radden and Dirven (2007: 21–22), are mental operations that aid the speaker to select the suitable structural option between several alternatives, often resembling the principles of visual perception (*ibid.*). *Scilicet*, construals are specific ways how a person defines and describes their thoughts, thus even adopts a precise perspective. Langacker (2008: 43) argues that with these we grammatically encode otherwise fairly neutral content and impose our own perception, because of which the manner how accurately we examine a certain scene, which aspects we concentrate on and where we are positioned plays a monumental role (Langacker, 2008: 55). Apropos, Fauconnier (1997: 8) eloquently expresses that even when we try to verbally depict an objective event or situation, we do not reflect it directly, but via personal cognitive constructions (*ibid.*). And that is the fundamental logic that governs construals, and by extension, fictive motion structures (hereinafter FM). In order to make matters more palpable, let's present a prototypical pair of construals:

> *The postal worker delivered nearly every letter today.*
> *The postal worker failed to deliver all the letters today.* [1]

The base state of affairs is equal in both cases, ergo, the postal worker was left with some undelivered mail; however, the instances differ in the prominent message, whether we accentuated the almost complete success or professional ineptitude of comprehensively concluding the workday. Admittedly, we could speculate about the psychological factors that influence the formation of either option, yet that is not the focus of this master's thesis. What is discussed in detail is how our view determines the formation of FM, a rather distinct dimension of construals. Croft and Cruse (2004: 53) label it as a description of a static scene in dynamic terms (*ibid*.), which may serve as an introductory definition that I have expounded and illustrated further on. Whilst there are several nuances and subcategories of

---

[1] If not stated or cited otherwise, examples and illustrations are of my own design, often even taken from my own everyday life or ideas that abruptly emerged in my mind.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

1

FM – all of which are mentioned in forthcoming chapters with the corresponding nomenclature –, the intent was to delineate those cases in which movement verbs occupy the predicator position. Since these are usually classified into two types, path-conflating and manner-of-motion verbs (Takemoto, 2010: 16), I tried to discern if there were any limitations or peculiarities regarding the application of verbs from each group. However, the main emphasis is not placed on this particular verb taxonomy and its traits, but on the aspect in which these verbs emerge within FM constructions. Additionally, the analysis entirely avoids the perfect variant and thus concentrates on the predominance of either indefinite or progressive form. Albeit some authors tend to discriminate between the perfective and imperfective aspectuality (Langacker, 2005: 175; Waliński 2015: 89) with regard to FM, and therefore employ an alternative terminology and tactic, the principle notion remains similar – do we observe the otherwise stationary scene as ongoing, as though currently scanning the path, or experience it as stable and temporarily unbounded (Langacker, 2005: 176). In the case of the former, the progressive is used, whilst the latter would feature the indefinite. The examples below clarify this difference.

> *The river meanders gently in this region.*
> *The river is meandering gently as we paddle.*

The mechanisms behind such contrasts demonstrate one of the fundamental functions of the progressive aspect, that is to demarcate the situation as being in progress or having (limited) duration (Huddleston and Pullum, 2016: 117). Quirk et al. (1985: 189) state that because there is an overlap of meaning between tense and aspect in English, even interpreting something with the marker "complete/incomplete" is potentially a tremendous oversimplification that may bring forth the mistake of equating the two grammatical categories (*ibid.*). In pursuance of obviating this confusion, I refrained from appropriating the theory pertaining to perfectivity and imperfectivity, rather opted for using the indefinite-progressive model, whilst disregarding the discrepancies between various past, present and future tenses.

Although the progressive aspect is infrequent in comparison to the indefinite one, recurrent mostly in spoken and colloquial English (Quirk et al., 1985: 198), the empirical segment of this master's thesis attempts to exhibit that speakers do decide for the progressive if they wish to accentuate the temporariness. Admittedly, this is conditioned by the context;

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

2

nevertheless, as I have pointed out, the speaker's stance and immediate circumstances are of cardinal importance when the discussion revolves around FM and construals in general. By resorting to a corpus research (via *Sketch Engine*), I have investigated 11 movement verbs, ranging from low- to high-frequency ones, isolated the instances where there is indeed a FM construction in effect, then calculated the percentage of each aspect by means of clarifying the concordance lists. If a particular search yielded an abundant amount of results, surpassing thousands of cases, the random sample option of 250 values was utilised.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructs Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

3

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Radden (2008: 22–23) explicates that the notion of construals is in essence a speaker's choice with regard to how to articulate and which segments of the message shall receive the critical gravity when one conceptualises and depicts a certain scene through language (*ibid.*). These procedures tend to rely on the systems of viewing operations and prominence, where fictive motion is taxonomically included in the first mentioned group (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 22). Yet, before I tackle FM, general properties and classification of construals will be presented, followed by an overall explanation of *Motion Events*, with which concepts such as *Figure, Ground*, *Path, Trajector* and *Trajectory* (Talmy, 2000b: 25; Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 163) shall be rendered transparent. These are not superfluous digressions, but inevitable elements that aid elucidate the structure of FM constructions. Since I focus on movement verbs in the predicator, one category of FM shall serve as the focal point – *coextension paths*. Talmy (2000a: 138) defines this as a representation of an object [inanimate noun occupying the subject position in a clause] as stationary, fictively traversing the depicted path, be that linear or over a multi-dimensional plane (*ibid.*). Later on, examples will make matters clearer.

After I conclude these chapters, aspect shall be discussed. Specifically, the meanings we attribute to the indefinite and progressive respectively. Palmer (1988: 54) argues that while the progressive denotes an action in progress, the indefinite merely reports it. One other contrast being that of habituality, although this depends on the attendant adverbials and repetition as well (*ibid.*: 58, 62). And since I focus on movement verbs, there should not be any dilemmas regarding *non-progressive verbs*, as these – be that *verbs of state* or *private verbs* (*ibid.*: 71–72) – cannot be applied in coextension paths. Therefore, I shall present mainly how progressive can be distinguished from the indefinite in terms of duration, completeness and dynamicity (Downing and Locke, 2006: 373).

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

4

2.1 General Properties and Dimensions of Construals

Even though I have so far declared twice that message-formation is affected by spatial or optical perception, this must in no way be accepted as a staple in cognitive linguistics, seeing that the visual metaphor is predominantly a sheer tool exploited to classify several facets of construals (Langacker, 2008: 55). Another preliminary concept is that of a context; for cognitive linguists, context is a mental phenomenon where the speaker processes the actual, real-world situation and consequently constructs a representation of its integral constituents, then utters it (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 49). It is of integral significance that we acknowledge that most semantic units comprising the context cannot be sufficiently demarcated without implicit or explicit reference to some background concept (Langacker, 1987: 147); for example, *meander (countable noun)* presupposes the comprehension of a river, without which the expression is somewhat inoperable.

In other words, this representation does not exist in isolation, since in order to prevail, it needs to incorporate the knowledge stored in long-term memory, from where context-specific information can be retrieved. This can even evoke a recall of related data (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 49); in our case with *meander*, the categories of *water, current, rapid*, etc., between which associations form, again manipulating the choice of verbalisation. In keeping with Fauconnier's (1997: 38) reasoning, this is how we generate meaning, ergo, construe our thoughts – by applying schemata to physical world situations, we render an interpretation that may link various domains (*ibid.*). As we draw from various sources, the possibilities of how to think of a certain scene become available, and with it, the applicable perspectives. This stands as the fundamental principle behind construal operations (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 22). The accompanying indispensable factors are the speaker's proximal approach towards the setting, focus of attention, protruding elements and position of observation, otherwise known under the labels *specificity, focusing, prominence, perspective* (Langacker, 2008: 55).

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

5

2.1.1 Specificity

The dimension of specificity (vs. generality) refers to how precise we are in conceiving a certain scene, at what level of detail will we characterize a situation (Langacker, 2008: 55). Here we come close to the notion of taxonomies, to conceptual hierarchies. Radden and Dirven (2007: 9) claim that in daily interactions, we are prone to using basic-level terms instead of opting for highly exact designations, because the former are more salient, typically of a superordinate category, plain in form and acquired quite early in the language acquisition process (*ibid.*). Compare the sentences:

(1a) *Can I borrow your phone to call Peter?*
(1b) *Can I borrow your Samsung Galaxy S10e to call Peter?*

Phone is a basic expression, pertaining to the category of 'mobile devices', and a hypernym in relation to *Samsung Galaxy S10e*. If, indeed, we prefer example (1b) the situation is described in fine-grained detail, high resolution, instead of transmitting mere gross features and global, overall traits that (1a) offers (Langacker, 2008: 55). Each way of expressing has its own contextual meaning, as I have said earlier. A speaker might opt for (1b), if they wanted to try their colleague's new phone model, test it, perhaps if they are technologically savvy or enthusiastic. Such conjectures would not be possible if the object [the phone] was not elaborated with this distinct appellation. And, if, circumstances permitting, we add more distinguishing qualities, prolong the expression, the specificity is reinforced.

(1c) *Can I borrow your Samsung Galaxy S10e with the cracked display to call Peter?*

Specificity might now be even more unmistakable; however, the inferences alter as well. One could presume that the speaker is ridiculing their colleague for breaking something only recently bought or purely deriding their carelessness. Each addition can elicit a new interpretation. Langacker (2008: 56) warns that there are practical limits as to how long and defined a situation can be, before it starts sounding rather unnatural and so loses its function of successful categorisation. This limit cannot be absolutely established, because it is contingent upon a peculiar instance and a genuinely required degree of specificity (*ibid.*). Consider:

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

6

(1d) *Can I borrow your Samsung Galaxy S10e with the cracked display which you have bought on August 10 from your local retailer to call Peter?*

We have produced something that does not just seem artificial and inauthentic, but redundant and exaggerated, because the degree of specificity exceeded the permissible discourse grade. Once again, there is no uniform and unanimous rule that could be employed as a dependable framework for ensuring the correct measure of specificity, as this is under the speaker's inherent control.

What I have accomplished from (1a) to (1d) is an amplification in specifications, which confined the initial lexical item *phone* to an increasingly narrower range of potential nuances (Langacker, 2006: 35). On the other hand, basic-level terms provide the largest amount of instantly relevant and digestible information about the object, hence, convey the most substantial bundles of correlated attributes. Because of which, the construal dimension of specificity/generality may remind us of prototypes – *phone* in the category of *mobile devices* (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 75). However, whilst prototypes are the most pertinent members of a category, stretching from central to peripheral (Radden, 2008: 7), specificity does not rely on the number of joint qualities or the lack of thereof between members, but on the granularity and supplementary distinctions for one and the same representative or scene (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 23).

2.1.2 Focusing

This next dimension of construals deals with the focal adjustment of selection, with our ability to incorporate what we deem germane to our current apprehension and disregard what is immaterial (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 47). Langacker (2008: 57) says that via linguistic expressions we access particular portions of our conceptual universe, meaning that we choose which content shall be a part of the imminent linguistic presentation, even arranged into <u>foreground</u> and <u>background</u> (*ibid.*). These two have a manifestation in perception known as the distinction between **figure** and **ground**. As we ascribe prominence to some elements and minimise the relevance others, we automatically position the constituents of a given scene into the salient figure and its opposite, non-salient (back)ground. The figure

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

7

tends to be more conspicuous, scrupulously outlined, often smaller in size than the ground, because of which it succeeds in captivating our attention (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 28). And although authors are inclined towards deliberating about figure and ground, foreground and background denote much more than just visual arrangement, since we can speak of the pair whenever one conception precedes and, in some way, facilitates the emergence of another. In a broader sense, we may claim that expressions invoke background knowledge as a foundation for comprehension, not exclusively an alignment as is the case with figure and ground (Langacker, 2008: 58). Nevertheless, I shall concentrate on the latter version of focusing, since it is more applicable and less abstract.

What might be particularly fascinating about the construal of focusing, and indubitably about its chief culmination, the figure/ground segregation, is that the roles can be in most cases reversed, depending on what we wish to accentuate (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 163). This division of incoming images has its equivalent in linguistic structure, whereas in purely grammatical terms, inverse appropriation of positions is indeed possible (Radden, 2008: 23). Observe:

> (2a) *A swallow's nest is adjacent to the barn.*
> (2b) *A barn is adjacent to the swallow's nest.*

In (2a) *swallow's nest* is the figure and *barn* the ground, which coincides nicely with what I previously stated, that figure is typically smaller and more exposed. And whilst there is nothing wrong with (2b) *per se*, many speakers would consider such a structure odd. That is because figure and ground are asymmetrical, the figure needing some anchoring, reference, which the ground provides (Talmy, 2000a: 311–312), resulting in a reasonable interpretation. In the opposite case, where something larger is affixed by something smaller, the message strikes us as unusual. Yet, what is figure and what is ground may be shifted quite easily, especially if both components are of comparable size or if motion is involved.

> (3a) *The highway runs along the train tracks.*
> (3b) *Train tracks run along the highway.*

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

8

Neither of the two examples strikes us as bizarre, even though I manipulated the figure/ground alignment and altered the anchoring. The only distinction was my decision what to highlight and put into focus.

Another essential facet of focusing is the **scope** (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 50; Langacker, 2008: 62) or **viewing frame** (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 22). Since I adhere here to Langacker's classification, the scope is viewed as a subcategory of focusing, not as its own dimension of construals, which is the other legitimate option. Scope refers to the coverage of a certain domain; do we either recognise the whole entirety of the scene or just one enlarged segment, ergo, what can we mentally encompass at a given moment when looking out at the world (Langacker, 2008: 62). Hence, we are left with but two options: <u>maximal scope</u> (or maximal viewing frame) and <u>limited immediate scope</u> (or restricted viewing frame), depending on whether we aim for the full extent or only for the portion directly relevant (*ibid.*). Radden and Dirven (2007: 22) offer the next pair of examples:

(4a) *This train goes from Norwich to Peterborough.*
(4b) *This train is going from Norwich to Peterborough.*

Sentence (4a) with its indefinite signals the inclusion of the entire route, from the station of departure, across all interim stops, together with the final destination. This would be the maximal scope, in contrast to (4b) where the progressive aspect lets us observe only a section, taken from anywhere on the said course (*ibid.*). In such cases, the aspect provides the opposition between a total event (*goes*) and the antipodal partition (*is going*), where we "zoom in" and therefore exclude the endpoints (Langacker, 2008: 65). Still, the division between both scopes is not limited to aspectuality, since the narrowing of the scope can be established through consecutive combinations of locatives (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 50).

(5) *The keys are in my bedroom, in the cabinet left of the computer, in the second drawer from top till bottom, just next to my wallet.*

With each new locative, the main entity currently in the scope acquires an additional level of definition, thus the view gets progressively more reduced (*ibid.*). In this manner, we arrive at the notion of <u>search domains</u>, where the region of each locative is further constricted by its successor, where every following spatial specification retains the relationship introduced by the opening one, constructing a composite, fastidious setting (Langacker, 1987: 286). Hence, the locative *in my bedroom* limits *the keys* to a designated room in an apartment or house, where only that one chamber should be searched. The second locative, *in the cabinet left of the computer*, imposes another restriction where precisely should one inspect in order to find *the keys*. This concatenation results in the transition from the potential maximal scope to the limited immediate scope.

2.1.3 Prominence

The dimensions of focusing and prominence are reciprocally connected, considering that what we concentrate on is determined substantially by the factors that manage to protrude from the proverbial surface. As stated by Langacker (2008: 66), prominence sorts involve or require the focusing of attention, a strong kind of foregrounding, which is why it becomes problematic if we desire to separate different construals with clear-cut lines (*ibid.*).

One such sort is **profiling**, a phenomenon where different words within one semantic frame [domain] steer our attention to various diverse elements within that same field (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 47). By means of profiling, we designate a conceptualisation through a linguistic expression, acknowledging the grander base that serves as content for characterising (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 30). This suggests that a particular lexeme selects a body of conceptual content [base], either as its maximal scope (across the entire range of applications) or as its immediate scope (what is put forward and foregrounded as instantly relevant). If it is associated with the pertinent locus, the attention is directed to a particular substructure, called the <u>profile</u>, which stands out as the most prominent (Langacker, 2008: 66). I shall try to illustrate this with the expression *iris*. *Iris* profiles the diaphragm of overlapping plates, used to monitor how much light shall reach the lenses. That would be the profile, evoking the conception *camera lens* as its base (and immediate scope), whilst *camera lens* would profile one of the various components of a *camera*, inducing the

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

10

apperception of *photographic equipment* as its base (and maximal scope). Profiling is a rather peculiar instance of construals, since any alteration in the profile impacts the word's meaning and so has its functional consequences (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 47). Even though polysemous items allow several profiles, once a certain meaning is selected, the latter cannot be modified without affecting the message. The only exception here might be metonymies; however, with them the speaker opts for an altogether different contextuality (*ibid.*: 48), where one profile stands instead of another, prompting an extension of the literal meaning, reflecting different associations established via a recognisable, representative segment (Langacker, 2008: 69). Yet, I shall refrain from examining metonymies in detail, as they are of little eminence in relation to construals.

In connection to prominence, we can talk about the participants: the most protuberant one being the **trajector (TR)** in a relational structure with the **landmark (LM)**, which usually has a secondary focus (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 168). These two remind us of figure/ground alignment, considering that the trajector is a spatial figure and landmark a spatial ground. However, trajector/landmark classification eases the perception of a dynamic relation, where we have a moving trajector advancing with regard to the landmark, based on the image schema source-path-goal. The direction is most frequently stated referring to a goal, rarely to a source, and hardly ever to the path (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 307). And that is the reason why I use both classifications, concurrently aware that one is positioned under *Focusing* and the other under *Prominence* (remember that the issue of overlapping has been addressed and explained). Landmark provides the reference point against which the trajector can be assessed and evaluated in order to disclose their relational structure. Since TR/LM are perhaps most evident in cases of physical motion, Langacker (1987: 234) presupposes that an object (TR) proceeding towards a fixed setting (LM) is often regarded as the figure, which is linguistically reflected in the tendency to apply motion verbs that correspondingly institute the "mover" as the subject of the clause – verbs of physical motion are in that regard generally seen as prototypical (*ibid.*).

(6) *Patches ran away from the kennel*.

(7) *The drone is buzzingly gliding over the meadow.*

(8) *The crow is nose-diving towards its target, an oblivious tourist.*

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

11

In (6), the landmark (*the kennel*) is the source, away from which the trajector (*Patches*) is scurrying. In (7), the path equals the landmark (*meadow*), the perception elicited by the preposition *over*. Example (8) features the landmark (*target*) as a goal, where the trajector (*the crow*) is traversing to it. As we can detect, directional prepositions have an essential role in determining the kind of relation. Moreover, TR and LM may – but need not – vary in size and shape, possibly even be in direct contact with each other, whereas the fundamental notion for understanding this alignment is grasping the content behind the accompanying prepositions, as these are what manages the relation (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 168).

However, once movement is gone, TR/LM and figure/ground are indistinguishable, or at least broadly interchangeable. The difference in such cases marks mainly our preference, whether we wish to pursue Langacker's theoretical mainframe with TR/LM (1987: 231) or adhere to Talmy's perceptual grouping that advocates the use of figure/ground (1975: 419). In both cases, the true origin resides in *Gestalt psychology*, from where it was introduced into cognitive linguistics by Talmy in the 1970s (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 56). In my personal view, I acknowledge TR/LM as more salient expressions where the scene features some kind of movement, even if the latter is abstract (or fictive). This might derive from a personal association connected to the dictionary meaning of the word *trajectory*, which in itself entails motion.

2.1.4 Perspective

Several variations of conception, especially those rooted in visual experience and spatial descriptions, depend on the relative position and **viewpoint** of the speaker (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 58). This is rather plain, since we are able to observe an object from numerous sides (e.g. above/under, front/back, etc.) and what we actually see varies accordingly. Thus, if a speaker moves to another position, the viewpoint naturally changes, because of which the same objective situation can via copious vantage points result in a plethora of construals, each with overt consequences (Langacker, 2008: 75). To exemplify, *The Slovenian National Theatre Drama* appears different if viewed from *Slovenska Street* than from *Erjavčeva Street*, and utterly disparate if we spot it from on top of *The Skyscraper* (*Nebotičnik*). Furthermore, the situation, experienced from a singular standpoint, might be processed contrarily when

there is more than one person involved, who provide a multifaceted rendering. Radden and Dirven (2007: 24) illustrate this with quarrels, where one side adopts a diametrically opposite version of an event than the other (*ibid.*). An example from the antiquity is in order:

> (9a) *Menelaus: "Agamemnon, Paris has seduced my wife amidst the festivities conducted in Trojan honour, for reconciliation and diplomacy."*
>
> (9b) *Paris: "That's a lie! Helen came to me willingly, due to your negligence and adultery."*

(9a) and (9b) portray how points of view can differ from person to person. Yet, viewpoints do not have to pertain to the speaker, as we have the capacity to fictively affirm the validity or legitimacy of someone else's vantage, be that the hearer's or any other (3rd party) individual's (Langacker, 2008: 76).

> (10a) *General Anderson: "I will be forced to discharge colonel Lewis if he doesn't meet physical fitness standards examination next week."*
>
> (10b) *Brigadier Wright: "General said that he would have to dismiss Lewis if he fails the fitness test tomorrow."*

Examples (10a) and (10b) reveal that even though viewpoint suggests space and vision, we can employ the same term [construct] in other areas as well, particularly when time is involved (Langacker, 2008: 76). Here we touch upon the notion of deixis, where deictic elements bestow upon us two layers of conceptualisation – one that pertains to the embeddedness of speech act participants, and a second stratum which disturbs this genuine arrangement of interlocutors and propels them to another setting, one with disparate time and/or location (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 60). In (10a) and (10b), *next week* and *tomorrow* are interpreted in relation to the time of the utterance and to the forthcoming event, constituting a matter of temporal deixis, whilst *I* and *General* in direct speech indicate personal deixis (Huddleston and Pullum, 2016: 1451). Were it not for specific vantage points and separate speakers, we would not be able to notice the change in lexis, references, etc. Langacker (1987: 127) exhibits that the speaker's role in construals is intrinsically some kind of an allusion, with which we can determine definiteness and proximity to either something palpable or temporal (*ibid.*).

Aside from the viewpoint, perspective encompasses the subtle contrarieties between **subjectivity** and **objectivity**. In spite of our constitutional tenet that we capture the world in neutral terms, we perceive and ineluctably implant our ponderings into that very same realm of being. With regard to construals, that manifests as a cline, ergo, does the speaker utilizes more unbiased or more partial scene constructions – is the exposition more detached from the elocutionist or does it involve the person performing it (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 25). As we may observe:

> (11a) *Don't you dare disrespect and talk back to me!*
>
> (11b) *Don't dare disrespect and talk back to superiors!*

These two alternative construals highlight how the speaker chooses the suitable focal settings, structures a scene in a certain fashion and forms a construal relationship. The latter comprises both the conceptualiser and the object of conceptualisation, which are ubiquitous and in a perennial interplay (Langacker, 1987: 128). In (11a) the speaker inserts themself in the locus of experience with explicit deictic reference, which is characteristic of a subjective construal. Conversely, objective construal, as is (11b), typifies the actual focus of attention, where the speech act executioner is not directly implicated. As a result of eradicating the speaker, an objective construal achieves a greater effect (Langacker, 2008: 77), since there the speaker (or viewer) surrenders every iota of self-awareness and focuses solely on the object – otherwise phrased, what the conceptualiser observes is exclusively the object of conceptualisation, refraining from explicit reference (Langacker, 1987: 129). In (11b) the speaker described themself – if, per chance, we presuppose involvement – in terms independent of the speech act situation, which gives grounds to objectification as well (Croft and Cruse, 2004: 62).

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

14

2.2 Motion Events

Albeit FM could be discussed in previous chapters along other construal dimensions and realisations, my reason for postponing its analysis is that although FM typically falls under viewing operations, such as viewpoint and viewing frame (Radden and Dirven, 2007: 22), I maintain a conviction that if we were to undertake it prior to an assiduous expounding of related constructs, comprehension would be impaired. To support my statement, I submit the following arguments: in order to deconstruct FM structures properly, one must be familiar with the notions figure/ground and TR/LM (to determine prominence and direction), scope (since aspect is in question), vantage point (so that the position is suitable), even specificity and profiling (which manage the degree of detail and meaning). I offer the same justification for *Motion Events (ME)* – ME's award us with an insight into FM, seeing that the latter is dependent on the perception of movement.

A situation is referred to as a ME if it contains motion or the continuation of a stationary location. One basic ME would be comprised of one object [figure/trajector] traversing with respect to another object [ground/landmark], thus progressing or occupying a certain <u>path</u> due to the component of <u>motion</u> (Talmy, 2000b: 25). A ME can have a *manner* or *cause*, which Talmy examines as constituting a distinct external event (Talmy, 1985: 61). Manner denotes something else than just pure movement; it designates the way an object travels, which is derived from the lexical meaning of the verb (e.g. *to walk* vs. *to run*). And even if we fail to linguistically express why something is moving, we suppose that something must have induced it – that is the cause. Manner and cause together may be in that view regarded as the fifth component of a ME (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 220).

> (12a) *The leaf fluttered down onto the tiled pathway.*
> (12b) *The flat stone skimmed across the surface 8 times.*

In (12a) the leaf did not fall, drop down or slide, but fluttered, so it reached the tiled pathway in delicately quick movements from one side to another. This illustrates manner. In (12b) manner is also present, but let's focus on the cause. Since we can rightfully surmise that pebbles cannot skip the water's surface out of their own volition, we adduce that some animate entity must have thrown it, which institutes the external event and the cause.

2.2.1 Verbs in Motion Events

I must stress that what is studied here are verb roots alone and their lexicalisation types, which circumscribe the patterns: *motion + manner/cause*, *motion + path* or *motion + figure* (Talmy, 1985: 62, 68, 72). These patterns conflate motion and another facet (listed above) into one whole, one verb. The first group, – often remarked as only <u>manner-of-motion</u>, since what is encoded lexically is the way, the cause being mainly inferred, – uses either obligatory or optional prepositions or particles to indicate anything other than the manner (Gennari et al., 2002: 53).

(13a) *Betty sprinted across three lanes to catch her bus.*

(13b) *Seabiscuit galloped ferociously at Santa Anita Handicap.*

(13c) *The guest thrusted their confetti at the newlyweds.*

(13d) *A bullet ricocheted off the soldier's helmet.*

Cases (13a–d) do not impart a general, vague descriptions of movement, but concrete depictions conveyed trough the inherent lexical meanings of the verbs. Talmy (2000b: 29) proves this conflation pattern by dividing an original expression into separate semantic components, therefore "unpacks" the sentence with a phrase standing for the manner (or cause), a form like *"with-the-manner-of"* (*ibid.*). If I now apply this to example (13a):

(13a) *Betty sprinted across three lanes to catch her bus.*

(13b) *Betty moved across three lanes to catch the bus by sprinting.*

Although this sounds rather awkward, since the prepositional *by-phrase* is noticeably superfluous, such structures neatly suggest their intended semantic content which is otherwise fused within the verb (Talmy, 1985: 65–66). Gennari et al. (2002: 54) summarise that because English encodes combinations between motion and manner so frequently and saliently, these in turn become more cognitively available and a habitual target of attention, concerning there is not much need for additional syntactic constituents (as in (13b)) if one expression suffices (*ibid.*). Although a sole motion verb is indeed enough, it is often accompanied by a *satellite*. Talmy defines this as "any grammatical category of any constituent other than noun-phrase or prepositional-phrase complement that are in sister relation to the verb root" (2000b: 102) – with regard to the verb, these are mostly either

adverbial or prepositional particles that encode an additional event component, namely path (e.g. come *in*, drop *by*, move *up*). However, the path needs not be indicated with an extra phrase, as some verbs at once express both the fact of motion and the path – <u>path-conflating motion verbs</u>. If the manner/cause is denoted in the same sentence, it is an independent, usually an adverbial or non-finite construction (Talmy, 1985: 69). Talmy (2000b: 52) assesses that Romance languages are one of the most representative groups that employ such verbs on a massive scale, yet English does have a number of verbs that genuinely incorporate path, such as: *enter, exit, ascend, descend, cross, pass, circle, advance, proceed, approach, arrive, depart, return, join, separate, part, rise, leave, near, follow* (*ibid.*). However, even with these, we can detect quite effortlessly they are not etymologically English words, but borrowings from Romance (e.g. FR *avancer* → ENG *advance*; FR *séparer* → ENG *separate*).

> (14a) *In 2000, Davo Karničar descended Everest on skis.*
> (14b) *The police officer approached the bullet-pierced car with a gun in his hand.*
> (14c) *Astronaut Wolowitz returned to his wife tearing and sobbing.*

Verbs featured in (14a–c) describe not only motion, but information about the path as well, the direction of its traversing, be that as *"moving downwards"* (14a), *"coming nearer"* (14b) or *"coming back"* (14c). Note that any supplementary data about manner is not merged with the verb anymore, but restricted to an accompanying element, to an adjunct of manner (*on skis; with a gun in his hand; tearing and sobbing*). Now, the path itself consists of three subcomponents: *vector, conformation, deictic*. The vector discloses the types of arrival, traversal or departure, which the trajector accomplishes in respect to the landmark. Confirmation is the adjoining geometric complex, which in simpler terms means that it provides a volume, location, enclosure, length, etc. to the path. Lastly, the deictic component either includes or excludes a direction towards the speaker (Talmy, 2000b: 53, 55–56). One last approach that appertains to the path is the division into *open*, *closed* and *fictive*. Open paths are those whose beginnings and ends are at different locations, as opposed to closed paths which follow a circular trail. Fictive paths remind us of static uses of dynamic locative schemas that through figurative extensions provide us with an imaginary trajectory (Ungerer and Schmid, 2006: 223–224).

Unlike manner-of-motion or path-conflating motion verbs are those verbs whose lexical meaning is unified with the figure. In English such instances are few in number, yet still not without a presence in the language. Essentially, the verb must express various kinds of objects or materials as moving or being located (Talmy, 2000b: 57). Talmy (1985: 72) states that, for example, *to rain* refers to the precipitation as falling, and *to spit* implies the saliva exiting the oral cavity (*ibid.*), whilst I would offer the verb *to bleed*, since the substance [figure] *blood* is leaving the body, although the flow of which can be further elaborated (e.g. *profusely, heavily*), yet that is a question of collocations. This category, although interesting, shall be discarded upon commencing with FM, and that for two reasons: the relation between the figure and the verb is too immutable; moreover, English focuses more on the manner/path asymmetry (Waliński, 2018: 49).

2.3 Fictive Motion

This has belatedly brought us to fictive motion. It signifies a construal of an otherwise static scene as motional, which is established through the use of motion verbs. The conceptualiser mentally scans the path associated with the subject noun phrase (which is occupied by an inanimate, inert entity) that results in a recognition of simulated movement (Matlock, 2004a: 5). FM is a nonveridical phenomenon as it does not replicate objective, external environments, but relies on the imaginal capacity of cognition to perceive an actual stationary situation as though dynamic, which mirrors our general mental bias towards locomotion (Talmy, 2000a: 101). This is achieved by having an "imaginary trajector" travelling along the relevant dimension of an object, or along some "imaginary path" as said above, where it is imperative that we do not mistake such fictivity patterns with figurative language (Fauconnier, 1997: 177). Because even though illusory, "the motion has an experiential basis, reflecting what a person encounters while [visually] moving along the expanse of the path" (Langacker, 2005: 175), seizing different positions through time that collectively constitute it. In spite the fact that FM communicates no actual change of state, the conceptualiser imposes such a transformation on what would otherwise be apprehended as a fixed setting (Matlock, 2004b: 1390).

Talmy (2000a: 103) emphasises that FM is not a single formation as it has several relatively distinct categories, namely *emanation, pattern paths, frame-relative motion, advent paths, access paths* and *coextension paths* (*ibid.*). The last manifestation is the one labelled elsewhere as "subjective motion" (Matsumoto, 1996: 184) or "abstract motion" (Langacker, 1986: 463), which is concurrently the focal point of this thesis. For that reason, the first five categories are only briefly presented, mainly for the sake of embracing the width of FM, whilst coextension paths are deliberated in detail.

2.3.1 Non-Coextension Path Categories of FM

Talmy (2000a: 105–106) argues that **emanation** entails an incorporeal entity being emitted from a source, which continues on its preordained path, until it halts on a remote object. This traversing entity is in itself fictive and independent from the observer (*ibid.*).

(15a) *The sun is shining through the window into the room.*

(15b) *The monument threw its shadow onto the park.*

The unifying principle behind is the notion that one of the objects present in the sentence shall acquire a more active role and be conceptualised as the source of efflux. *Sun* in (15a) with the light it generates is the more prominent element than the less illuminated *room*. Similarly, the *shadow* in (15b) is conditioned by *the monument* which produces it, allowing it to follow its path towards *the park*. If it were not for emanation, we could not spatially connect such dislocated units and discuss their interwoven systems of relations, since there is nothing tangible enabling interaction (Talmy, 2000a: 119–121).

The next category are **pattern paths**. The result of some ongoing process is an object arranged in a particular pattern, demarcating a path, which itself underwent a change (Ruppenhofer, 2006: 307). Consider:

(16) *A thin line of yellow highlighter ink inched down my colleague's chin as he pointed to question 9 (ibid.).*

Ruppenhofer provides no concomitant explanation, so I propose the subsequent elucidation. *Highlighter ink* progressed slowly downwards, not necessarily with a uniform speed or in a straight line, perhaps merely leaving both visible and subtle traces on the skin (as it is not the most absorbent material in existence). However, every time the ink *inched down* it left a spot, then these accumulated into a pattern resembling a path of a trajector.

Another variety of FM is **frame-relative motion**. A language can refer to an observer as moving [inside the maximal scope] in relation to immobile surroundings, or alternatively, appropriate a restricted frame around the observer as central [limited scope], where we get the impression that the environs are itinerant (Talmy, 2000a: 130–131). The notion of motion here is indeed present, not abstract as with coextension paths.

> (17a) *Marianne cycled along the avenue, seeing how hedge shapes change from one house to another.*
>
> (17b) *As Joshua was sitting on the dilapidated train seat, looking out the window, the landscape dashed past him.*

In both examples the observer was in fact moving, be that as a result of physical commotion or because utilising a means of transport (in which they were inactive), but they still travelled across a certain [unspecified] distance. However, due to adopting an observer-centred perspective in (17b), disregarding the maximal scope, the sensation that the scene was moving is much more conspicuous, thus instigating fictive motion (Egorova and Purves, 2017: 2).

The fourth category is **advent paths**. These demarcate the location of an anchored object as though it reached a specific site or is leaning in an explicit direction (Waliński, 2018: 73). The entity is tangible and concrete, which is a criterion that cannot be applied to its corresponding motion or materialisation as these are often entirely fictive, if not implausible (Talmy, 2000a: 135).

> (18a) *The round sunflowers veer towards the sun.*
>
> (18b) *Moss patches congregate around the open well shaft.*

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

20

Sunflowers and *moss patches* have always been stationary; nevertheless, since they are in a combination with a motion verb, we perceive their situatedness as a consequence of some migration, rapid emergence, culmination of some erstwhile locomotion (*ibid.*). Pentland (1986: 301) exhibits that people have a tendency to apply solutions that are otherwise intended for animated scenes to structure their fixed environment as well, with which models of perceptual organisation move between boundaries. From this internal assembly derive lawful relations that enable the clustering of objects, their dynamic appearance, etc., where we take a part-model and apply it elsewhere (*ibid.*). For example, we observe a situation where a person throws breadcrumbs on the floor, which attracts pigeons to swoop from nearly every direction. Now these winged creatures are in a semi-circle around the benevolent human, plucking tiny morsels of food from the ground. The pigeons' swooshing in constitutes a part-model of motion, which we "transfer" to examples as (18b) by an analogy.

Before I discuss coextension paths, I need to mention Talmy's understanding of **access paths**. The category of access paths features a stationary object's position as a path that something else may track and finally encounter. Yet, nothing actually traverses this route, the latter might even be implausible to trace, which is precisely what enables fictivity (Talmy, 2000a: 136).

(19) *The shed is on the other side of the riverbank from the farm.*

Example (19) outlines the position of *the shed* as a path that commences at *the farm*, stretches across the river (irrespective of the width) and terminates at *the shed*. This trail could be followed physically by a combination of walking and swimming or solely conceptually by someone consecutively shifting their attention over this mental map (*ibid.*). Matsumoto (1996: 185) claims that such structures rely mostly on prepositional phrases and are based on the conceptualiser's "subjective change", i.e. on the readjustments of focus which seize different segments of that construed mental geographic chart (*ibid.*). Interestingly, what we first identify in (19) is the endpoint, *the shed*, not the beginning of the path represented by *from the farm*. The mental scanning involved here constructs the path inversely, because of which we configure the path only when we reach its incipient point (Langacker, 2005: 168).

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

21

2.3.2 Coextension Path Category of FM

Coextension paths might be the most conspicuous category of FM constructions, considering that the trajector object extends its form, orientation or location across the entire perceptible path, even though it is stationary and inanimate (Talmy, 2000a: 138). This can at first be quite perplexing, in spite of our routine application of such expression in quotidian dialogues, where FM is an imperceptible, though a standard practice in describing spatial layouts (Matlock, 2010: 244). I guarantee that illustrations shall be less convoluted than the definition.

> (20a) *Celovška Cesta goes from the heart of Ljubljana to Šentvid.*
> (20b) *Alpe Adria Trail crosses the Karawanks.*

(20a) and (20b) demonstrate that the meaning of motion verbs (see Chapter 2.2.1) is semantically extended in order to denote spatial relations which enclose no motion *per se*, neither a change of state (Waliński, 2014: 105). With coextension paths we conceptualise a ME by tracking the mover's envisioned progress along the conferred track. The mover is external to the scene, yet through the course of time manages to erect an impression of how they would navigate across this path. In contrast to access paths, what stands as the chief distinction is that we do not have a finely demarcated item in the subject position (such as *a shed* in (19)), expressed similarly to the language function of "giving directions", but an entity that stretches, spreads, continues, etc. (e.g. *a road, river, trail, mountain, slope,* etc.), resulting in a simultaneous coverage of all separate locations of *the path*, thus prompting the notion of dynamism (Langacker, 2008: 529). If there is an infinite number of distinct locations *"from the heart of Ljubljana to Šentvid"*, *Celovška Cesta* grasps them all and that in instantaneous synchrony.

Talmy (2000a: 138) argues that even though it is not specified, the fictively moving entity can be imagined as being the observer (Talmy, 2000a: 138), which corresponds with what I have explained above. Further linguistic evidence that sentences like (20a) and (20b) contain some kind of motion is the transition in positions [directionality] and temporality (Matsumoto, 1996: 185).

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

22

(20a) *Celovška Cesta goes from the heart of Ljubljana to Šentvid.*

(20aa) *Celovška Cesta goes from Šentvid to the heart of Ljubljana.*

These two cases differ in that source and goal are switched, which exhibits directionality along with the prepositions *from* and *to* which indicate movement in opposite directions, yet both describe the same situation (Langacker, 2008: 529). The fictive path is here indeed linear, but might as well radiate outward in several directions (Talmy, 2000a: 138).

(20c) *Trg Republike spreads out towards the Parliament to the North, Valvasorjeva Ulica to the West, Maxi department store to the East, and Central Technological Library to the South.*

Undoubtedly, the example is exceedingly long, yet it marks that FM is not debilitated by a one-way course of advancement. The other facet that plays an important role in mental simulations is temporality.

(20d) *The fence follows the forest's edge for quite some time.*

The temporal phrase *for quite some time* implies the duration of motion transpiring along the *forest's edge*, which is in an unequivocal correlation to the span of the relevant section of *the fence* (Waliński, 2014: 111). This singularity can be clarified only if we assume that some process of an abstract nature is involved, since paths themselves, i.e. without our envisioning of subjective traversing, are atemporal (Jackendoff, 2002: 362). Natural temporality relies predominantly on the employed verbs (*to dash* vs. *to creep*) and on the viewer's processing of the path. If the path is of sufficient length – as is in (20a) – the experiencer requires more time to visualise and to scan the route, to even attempt determining how long they would need to roam across it (Matlock, 2004b: 1392–1393). Contrarywise, if the path is short and promptly passable in a few fast flashes, mental processing is rapid, the sense of temporality hindered.

In spite of that, certain paths cannot be travelled in such a way I have explained above. Granted, if we can imagine ourselves moving, the concept of temporality is more accessible, as it is quite mundanely effortless to picture oneself on *a road, path, plateau, valley,* etc., but we might have an issue pursuing *a cable, wire, pipeline*, since these are not always visible to the beholder (Waliński, 2014: 113). Matsumoto (1996: 187) labels these as <u>non-travelable</u>

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

23

paths which are, simply put, not intended for human travel, because of which they do not promptly instigate the perception of motion (*ibid.*). In addition, non-travelable entities (e.g. *a border*, *a wall*) often utilise a restricted set of motion verbs, not due to grammatical restraints, but out of sheer discourse and pragmatic limitations. These restrictions are not as rigid in English as they are perhaps in other languages considering that we may still form combinations, but still the result of these formations would be highly unnatural-sounding utterances (Waliński, 2015: 89; Rojo and Valenzuela, 2003: 125).

> (21) *The loose thread proceeds all the way from the torn shoulder seam to the end of the sleeve.*

Would someone correct you if you articulated such a sentence? Probably no. However, what are the chances of someone genuinely producing this structure – I wager that million-to-one. That is because the path is too short, especially in comparison to the whole volume of a human being, yet the description is as it would be insurmountably long. For us, these paths are non-travelable, but to, let's say, a louse the distance from a shoulder to the hand is still challenging. That is why I have said that in spite of limitations, most paths are still applicable to FM constructions.

Matsumoto (1996: 194–195) further elaborated the conditions or prerequisites for a prototypical coextension path. He argues that the component of *the path* must always be conveyed, yet the manner only if it denotes some corresponding attribute of the path (*ibid.*). Waliński adds that the path does not need to be encoded within path-conflating motion verbs, rendering some manner-of-motion verbs permittable as long as there is an accompanying adverbial or adpositional phrase that provides the relevant path information (Waliński, 2015: 90). If I recapitulate, the path condition must be fulfilled, otherwise we cannot perceive FM.

> (22a) **The cliffs dive.*
> (22b) *The cliffs dive into the sea.*
> (22c) *The switchback zigzags.*

The verb *to dive* necessitates an adverbial of direction, which provides path-relevant information. On its own, it encrypts solely how one plunges into water, thus manner. *Per*

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

24

contra, *to zigzag* may function without any adposition, as path is already encoded within the inherent lexical meaning of the verb (i.e. *moving in abrupt alternate right and left turns*). Furthermore, it is inadequate to merely add an adverbial expression to a manner-of-motion verb and hope that it meets the criterion of path-relevance. Regardless of how arduously we toil, verbs as *to walk, jog, stride, swim, fly, skate*, etc. cannot represent FM as they do not indicate any property of the path whatsoever (Matsumoto, 1996: 196). In (22b) the information about the manner allows an inference regarding the overall shape and speed of the path, that is in a rather straight line and quite swift. We can even deduce that the slope of the cliffs is steep, whereas similar extrapolations cannot be attained by analysing verbs such as *to slide, to roll*, because they fail to disclose any distinct attribute of the path (Waliński, 2015: 90). The exception to this rule is the verb *to run*, which can represent FM, but only if devoid of its primary quality of rapidity. Upon supressing the meaning of *"never having both feet on the ground simultaneously"*, applying a vaguer understanding, *to run* is restricted to the conceptualisation of a relatively straight line (Matsumoto, 1996: 199–200).

(23) *The Trans-Siberian Railroad runs past taiga, permafrost and swamps.*

Although an originally manner-of-motion verb is used in (23), we perceive linear movement without being impeded by the verb's prime signification of a *"faster than walking animate ambulation"*. With *to run* we can still mentally scan along the path and induce simulated dynamism (Takemoto, 2010: 15).

The majority of given illustrations display the indefinite aspect, though this is in no way a stipulation. The progressive form can be and is applied to coextension paths just as well, whereas the constraints stem only from certain verb classes that are typically incompatible with the progressive, not from the nature of FM. What aspectual variations facilitate are adjustments in focusing, nuances in the scope [viewing frame].

(24a) *The massif ascends steeply towards the peak.*
(24b) *The massif is ascending steeply towards the peak.*

The progressive form in (24b) marks the temporary duration of the process and a gradual change in the path, limited to one specific segment the mover is currently traversing. As I have declared in *Chapter 2.1.2*, we "*zoom in*" and thus interpret only the presently relevant partition. The distinction between (24a) and (24b) is that in (24a) the entire path is *steep*,

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

25

from start to finish, whereas in (24b) what is *steep* is only the section now in focus (Matsumoto, 1996: 207). Whichever the aspectual manifestation might be, both must exclude any reference to the semantics of instrumentality. Objects [figures] exposed in FM are above else stationary, hence ineligible to use any kind of instrument (Waliński, 2015: 90–91).

(25a) *The highway slithers towards the capital by truck.*
(25b) *The highway is slithering towards the capital by truck.*

It is quite onerous to fashion an instrument of motion for FM which would make sense or resemble something logical – (25a) and (25b) are just unpalatable representations of a coerced amalgamation. In connection to instrumentality, some manner-of-motion verbs are entangled with the concept of an instrument, which renders them impermissible for coextension paths. According to Levin (1993: 267–268), these are the verbs that are in explicit relationship to their designated vehicle appellations, which do describe the motion of an entity, but without any particular direction (or path-information). Prototypical members of this category include the verb *to bicycle, canoe, parachute, ski,* etc. (*ibid.*). Waliński reports that our cognitive ability to simulate motion cannot cope with a combination of an instrument and an inert entity, because of which the absence of a sentient agent thwarts any instrument inclusion (2015: 99).

2.4 Aspect

As chapters on construals and FM are concluded, aspect compels a redirection of attention. Lewis (1986: 51) notes that the aspect gives the speaker the opportunity to interpret the temporal nature of the action, ergo, the contrast between completeness and incompleteness, chronological orientation, and whether it consumed a finite period of time or not.

Biber et al. (2007: 460) add that meaning-wise, tense and aspect both communicate nuances which pertain to the concept of time. Still, the elemental disparity between the categories is that tense reveals arrangements linked to mostly past and present spheres, whilst aspect is exploited in order to relays gradations in duration, instantaneity, and temporary eventuality. Hence, both are grammatical categories, "but unlike tense, aspect is not deictic, not relative to the time of utterance" (Quirk et al., 1985: 188). Nevertheless, Quirk et al., similarly to Biber et al., admit that tense and aspect are indeed very much alike from the point of view of semantics, where the distinction was established mostly to conveniently differentiate two categories and extend the terminology (*ibid.*: 189). Here I subdivide the analysis of aspect into meanings and applications associated with either the indefinite or progressive with a concurrent discussion on restrictions.

2.4.1 The Indefinite Form

The indefinite form is mostly found with verbs expressing states, i.e. with undifferentiated and unbounded situation types, which provide no information about the internal structure or segmentation and are in essence without a definable beginning and end (Leech, 1971: 4). The indefinite form merely reports an event (so, a state), which is in terms of duration prolonged, but unspecified, thus lacking clear boundaries (Downing, 2015: 336). The indefinite, or non-progressive form, can be applied whenever the speaker construes an action as a simple totality, as an integrated whole (Lewis, 1986: 94). When used with verbs expressing an occurrence (dynamic situations with internal subparts), the indefinite manages an overall enactment of the event (Quirk et al., 1985: 180–181). However, even though the key initial concept seems to be *(un)boundedness*, situations may be modified by adding an

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

27

adjunct or an adverbial particle, with which we can establish an endpoint (Downing, 2015: 335–336).

(26a) *Andrew painted self-portraits.*

(26b) *Andrew painted self-portraits until he developed a cataract.*

The adjunct of time establishes a definite edge to the verb, which otherwise possesses no additional overtones. We can surmise that the indefinite aspect lacks an explicit reference to the internal temporal constituency of a situation, as these can be both short and long, but still subsumed as a single whole (Comrie, 1976: 21). Another function of the indefinite is to indicate habituality, be that for the past or present. Here as well we do not operate with stative but with dynamic verbs, with which we represent a series of individual situations which as a whole constitute a *state* covering a span of time. The letter is inherently unbound, referring to the total sequence of separate instances (Leech, 1971: 3; Quirk et al., 1985: 179).

(27a) *Roberta used to visit me every day for afternoon tea*.

(27b) *Roberta visits me every day for afternoon tea.*

Example (27a) is prototypical with the application of a *used to* construction, because the phrase accentuates that the habit is no longer valid. Furthermore, although a time expression such as *"but does not anymore"* can be added, the implicit meaning of a discontinued habit is potent enough to make such extensions redundant (Downing, 2015: 341). An indicator of habituality is the ease with which we can include an adjunct of frequency (*every day* in examples above). These are sometimes obligatory if we wish to insinuate repetition (Quirk et al., 1985: 179).

Biber et al.'s (2007: 461) corpus linguistics study demonstrated that the unmarked, indefinite aspect is by far the most frequent, regardless of which register we examine, representing about 90 % of all inspected cases (*ibid.*). In terms of FM and coextensions paths, that would connote that speakers prefer to interpret the scene by means of comprehensive coverage (i.e. maximal scope) whilst appropriating a sufficiently distanced viewpoint – actual or abstract – in order to be able to scan the entire path.

2.4.2 The Progressive Form

I have already expounded that the progressive signifies an action in progress, i.e. an event that continues through a period of time, which in turn establishes duration (Palmer, 1988: 54). In continuance, the meaning of the progressive may be compartmentalised into three components; however, these are not mutually inclusive: the happening has duration, limited duration, is not necessarily complete (Quirk et al., 1985: 198; Leech, 1971: 15). With the progressive, attention is focused on some internal stage [middle phase] of the process which is cognitively observed without intermediaries, as though unfolding before our eyes (Downing, 2015: 337). What we can surmise from the three characteristics is that at the moment of speaking occurrences lack completeness, yet the speaker can apprehend the period denoted by this aspectual form as completable, in the process of being finally terminated (Lewis, 1986: 87). Because of this, the scene can no longer be viewed as instantaneous.

> (28a) *Madam, I bow my head down before you.*
> (28b) *Madam, I am bowing my head down before you.*

(28b) implies a gradual transition in movement, which emphasises the durative element, occurring as a mid-interval within the time of situation. Yet, we can go further and unravel the divergence between unlimited and limited duration.

> (29a) *I have a good time reading Postmodern American literature.*
> (29b) *I am having a good time reading Postmodern American literature.*

(29a) would be a statement uttered to imply that reading Postmodern American literature pleasures me in general terms (as a kind of permanent state), whilst (29b) would indicate that I enjoy this one particular work pertaining to that era, otherwise have no particular positive affiliation to that epoch. If we hypothesise that one is unlikely to read any Postmodern American fiction representative in one single setting, there will be reading interspersed with periods of alternative activities. Nevertheless, these intermissions are still part of the whole situation, which is presented as ongoing, but expected to conclude at some unspecified time (Huddleston and Pullum, 2016: 163).

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

29

The progressive aspect has the effect of surrounding a moment by a *temporal frame*, meaning that there is a point of reference from which the temporary eventuality can be seen as stretching into the future and onto the past. In cases when this temporal frame encloses around a non-progressive, the relationship between them is that of *time-inclusion* (Leech, 1971: 17).

(30) *My ex-girlfriend contacted me when we were celebrating my mother's birthday.*

Example (30) reveals that "the contact" occurred during the festivities, which induces the impression of simultaneity. The adjunct assigns an accurate time at which the conversation ensued, contemporaneously implying that the revelries had started before her interaction and continued after it (Huddleston and Pullum, 2016: 163). In that way, *contacted* is encapsulated in both linear temporal directions by *were celebrating*. However, if there is no non-progressive, the frame is non-existent, thus only simultaneity remains.

(31) *As I was writing my master's thesis, the cat was feasting on some left-overs.*

In (31) we cannot determine the starting- or endpoints of each action, neither their durations, yet we might perceive that at some moment, activities coexisted. The progressive permits this overlap, enabling the speaker to interpret these events as coincident, disregarding incipience, but accentuating the durative nature of ongoing processes (Lewis, 1986: 91–92).

Although I have mentioned habituality with the indefinite, the progressive is capable to express it as well; nevertheless, with the difference that the repetition of a deed is applicable for a limited period, not timeless (Quirk et al., 1985: 199). Again, the prominent characteristic is restricted duration, so when combined with the habituality, the progressive implies a temporary situation, whereas the indefinite suggests greater permanence (Downing, 2015: 339).

(32) *She is conducting a self-help seminar this autumn.*

The agent in (32) does or will perform group sessions across a 3-month period, which does constitute a routine, yet one that is preliminarily restricted in terms of the extent. In a similar fashion, the progressive is employed to signal a recurrent sporadic activity, thus something that is prone to befall again, but undetermined as to the exact time (Palmer, 1988: 64–65).

(33) *Eileen is always picking fights with strangers when she's inebriated.*

Now let's assume *Eileen* is not drunk every Friday, but once every now and then. But when she is in a semi-unconscious state of intoxication, albeit we cannot accurately foretell when such a dipsomania will occur next, she has an altercation with an outsider. This is not her habit *per se*, just something she is known to – under specific circumstances – do.

Whilst we can apply to progressive form to most cases (with the accepted change in meaning), there are several restrictions we must take into consideration when selecting the suitable aspectuality. As verb classes are concerned, the progressive is in general not possible with verbs of inert perception (e.g. *see, hear*) if they signify involuntary physiological conduct (Comrie, 1976: 35). Another group incompatible with the progressive are verbs of inert cognition (e.g. *believe, understand*), unless we use them to stress an intended mental exertion (Leech, 1971: 20, 24). Verbs of bodily sensations (e.g. *ache, hurt*) and emotions (e.g. *hate, love*) as well are not a utilisable class (Quirk et al., 1985: 202–203). These four classes constitute the so-called *private verbs* (*ibid.*), which are not only impractical to combine with the progressive, but unusable with coextension paths, considering we require motion verbs. The last category of verbs unsuited for the progressive are state verbs of having and being (e.g. *be, have, cost, belong*), permissible only where an "activity" meaning may be supplied (Leech, 1971: 25).

(34a) **Constance is being gorgeous. [That is her outward appearance]*
(34b*) Constance is being ungainly. [She is intentionally awkward in demeanour]*

(34b) illustrates that the progressive extends the meaning of stativity induced by the copular verb *to be*, in order to institute its subsidiary notion of purposeful dynamism (Comrie, 1976: 36). Moreover, in cognitive grammar, the progressive construction is often interpreted through its function of imperfectivisation, where the affix *-ing* alters the scope [viewing frame] by removing the endpoints and achieves the effect of "zooming in" (Langacker, 1999: 227). In a manner of speaking, we commence with a total event, after which *-ing* confines our attention to an arbitrarily chosen segment by means of enacting a restricted scope, which thwarts the distinguishable profiling of a possible resultant state, providing only a partial projection (*ibid.*: 228).

3. EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

3.1 Methodology

In order to grasp the frequency of either the indefinite or progressive form in FM constructions incorporating movement verbs in the predicator (i.e. coextension paths), I have employed *Sketch Engine* algorithmic analyses which help identify what is typical in a language and what is just coincidental. I have opted for the *English Web 2015 (enTenTen15)* corpus which has a current base of over 15 billion words, drawing them from the internet, where texts of different types and contents are given equal importance. 11 motion verbs were selected: 5 manner-of-motion (**climb, creep, ramble, traverse, wander)** 5 path-conflating (**ascend, cross, descend, enter, rise**) and verb ***to run*** (an exception to the rule discussed in *Chapter 2.3.2*). These were selected at random[2] from the assortment provided by Levin (1993: 263–266), who differentiates between *verbs of inherently directed motion [path-conflating]* and manner-of-motion verbs; however, such differentiation appears with other authors as well (see Waliński, 2014; Matsumoto, 1996; Talmy, 2000b).

The next step was to determine the subjects of these verbs, whereas both travelable and non-travelable paths were included, yet only the top 5 most frequent combinations between a given motion verb and an inanimate object standing as the trajector (if there were less altogether, then they were all featured). The maximum sample size was 250 values, so high frequency verbs (as *to run*) were analysed in accordance with the *random sample* approach. *Sketch Engine* assures that whoever limits the sample by a specific number (in my case 250) will arrive at exactly the same concordance lines as someone else who delimitated its sample with the same amount. Such behaviour is intentional so that different users can follow the same steps and arrive at the same result (*Sketch Engine*).

Results of each combination are presented in spreadsheets with regard to aspectual form, which are marked by a percentage sign as well. The entire list of examples with the progressive form can be found in the *Appendix* section, individual cases are presented after each verb in order to illustrate the phenomenon.

---

[2] At random, but by considering the limitations related to manner-of-motion verbs which were discussed in chapters 2.2.1 and 2.3.2.

3.2 Research Questions

Acknowledging what I have already discussed, the subsequent indentations constitute the main enquiries of my master's thesis.

RQ_1: Do fictive motion constructions rely mostly on one aspectual form, that being on the indefinite?

RQ_2: Are there significant differences between manner-of-motion and path-conflating verbs when it comes to aspect?

RQ_3: Do path-conflating verbs have more transparent (non)travelable paths?

RQ_4: Is the progressive aspect (in FM expressions) more frequent in some specific contexts?

RQ_5: Is there a recurrent alternative to expressing FM without employing a motion verb in the predicator of a finite clause?

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

33

3.3 Data: Manner-of-motion Verbs

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
trail + climb	241 (96.4%)	0 (0.0%)	9 (3.6%)	Random sample: 250 values
route + climb	204 (81.6%)	0 (0.0%)	46 (18.4%)	Random sample: 250 values
road + climb	222 (88.8%)	1 (0.4%)	27 (10.8%)	Random sample: 250 values
track + climb	213 (85.2%)	1 (0.4%)	36 (14.4%)	Random sample: 250 values
path + climb	179 (84.1%)	2 (0.9%)	32 (15.0%)	213

Selected example: *The road **was climbing** fast and we soon got to its highest altitude – 2145m.*

*The verb is employed in its participial form within a reduced relative clause (but still signalling FM); the verb is in the perfect form with the auxiliary *have* or *have + be*; passive construction with an animate agent; the message does not simulate FM.

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
vine + creep	25 (40.3%)	2 (3.2%)	35 (56.5%)	62
ivy + creep	8 (24.2%)	0 (0.0%)	25 (75.8%)	33

Selected example: *Tubers and stolons can also form at each node if the vine **is creeping** along the soil surface.*

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
trail + ramble	13 (92.9%)	1 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)	14

Selected example: *The trails **are** typically **rambling** alongside creeks and streams, with an occasional pond or field popping up.*

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

34

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
trail + traverse	223 (89.2%)	0 (0.0%)	27 (10.8%)	Random sample: 250 values
highway + traverse	69 (61.0%)	1 (0.9%)	43 (38.1%)	113
byway + traverse	26 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	26
route + traverse	186 (74.4%)	0 (0.0%)	64 (25.6%)	Random sample: 250 values
pipeline + traverse	59 (62.8%)	1 (1.1%)	34 (36.1%)	94
corridor + traverse	27 (48.2%)	1 (1.8%)	28 (50.0%)	56

Selected example: /.../ it was stalled due to several people protesting that the planned elephant corridor **was traversing** their traditional agricultural lands.

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
trail + wander	97 (90.7%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (9.3%)	107

3.4 Data: Path-conflating Verbs

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
staircase + ascend	47 (64.4%)	0 (0.0%)	26 (35.6%)	73
stairs + ascend	34 (42.5%)	0 (0.0%)	46 (57.5%)	80
stairway + ascend	9 (52.9%)	1 (5.9%)	7 (41.2%)	17
trail + ascend	191 (86.4%)	1 (0.5%)	29 (13.1%)	221
ladder + ascend	9 (27.3%)	0 (0.0%)	24 (72.7%)	33
route + ascend	64 (80.0%)	2 (2.5%)	14 (17.5%)	80
hike + ascend	7 (46.7%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (53.3%)	15

Selected example: *The space around him was nearly limitless, as Eileen walked him into a massive hall where two huge stairways* **were ascending** *on each side, to join above, like an old movie set of the 50's.*

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
bridge + cross	82 (32.8%)	0 (0.0%)	168 (67.2%)[3]	Random sample: 250 values
trail + cross	212 (84.8%)	0 (0.0%)	38 (15.2%)	Random sample: 250 values
route + cross	193 (77.2%)	3 (1.2%)	54 (21.6%)	Random sample: 250 values
line + cross	173 (69.2%)	1 (0.4%)	76 (30.4%)	Random sample: 250 values
pipeline + cross	140 (56.0%)	2 (0.8%)	108 (43.2%)[4]	Random sample: 250 values
highway + cross	120 (48.0%)	2 (0.8%)	128 (51.2%)[5]	Random sample: 250 values

The combination *path + cross* was excluded due to the high frequency of idiomatic expressions resembling or signalling the idiom *to cross one's path*.

Selected example: *Two oil pipelines and one gas pipeline* **are** *already* **crossing** *Georgia on their way to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.*

---

[3] The number is so high mostly because of the multitude of reduced relative clauses, whilst the nominal phrase *bridge crossing* influenced the result as well.

[4] The number is so high mostly because of the multitude of reduced relative clauses and passive constructions, which thwart FM interpretation.

[5] The number is so high due to a substantial presence of reduced relative clauses.

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
trail + descend	235 (94.0%)	1 (0.4%)	14 (5.6%)	Random sample: 250 values
stair + descend	37 (33.6%)	0 (0.0%)	73 (66.4%)	110
staircase + descend	52 (57.8%)	0 (0.0%)	38 (42.2%)	90
slope + descend	43 (60.6%)	0 (0.0%)	28 (39.4%)	71
glacier + descend	52 (67.5%)	1 (1.3%)	24 (31.2%)	77
path + descend	141 (74.2%)	3 (1.6%)	46 (24.2%)	190

The combination *plane + descend* was excluded since it mainly correlated in meaning with an aircraft, not with a flat and level surface.

Selected example: *The glacier **is descending** rapidly into Pine Island Bay and the Amundsen Sea.*

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
river + enter	199 (79.6%)	0 (0.0%)	51 (20.4%)	Random sample: 250 values

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
wall + rise	171 (68.4%)	10 (4.0%)	69 (27.6%)	Random sample: 250 values
hill + rise	121 (48.4%)	3 (1.2%)	126 (50.4%)	Random sample: 250 values
peak + rise	110 (44.0%)	0 (0.0%)	140 (56.0%)	Random sample: 250 values

The combination *river + water* was excluded due to the overwhelming context that the water level rose as a result of heavy precipitation or tidal activity, where the notion of fictive motion no longer applies.

Selected example: *A low hill **is rising** also on the right, and flat ground to the left.*

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

37

3.5 Data: The Verb *to Run*

Combination	Indefinite Form	Progressive Form	Other*	Sample Size
line + run	100 (40.0%)	1 (0.4%)	149 (59.6%)[6]	Random sample: 250 values
river + run	111 (44.4%)	1 (0.4%)	138 (55.2%)[7]	Random sample: 250 values
trail + run	88 (35.2%)	1 (0.4%)	160 (64.4%)[8]	Random sample: 250 values
road + run	101 (40.4%)	1 (0.4%)	148 (59.2%)	Random sample: 250 values
route + run	165 (66.0%)	2 (0.8%)	83 (33.2%)	Random sample: 250 values

Selected example: *By the way, at present 77 thousand kilometers of international air routes* ***are running*** *through Kazakhstan airspace.*

---

[6] Besides the linguistic phenomena under *, the number is so high because of the plethora of phrasal verbs that can be fashioned with *to run* (e.g. *to run out of something, to run at*).

[7] Besides the linguistic phenomena under *, the number is so high because of the idiomatic phrases *to run dry, to run red (with blood)*, were merely describing the speed and velocity of the current (e.g. *run fast*), or the water level (e.g. *rivers were running low*).

[8] Besides the linguistic phenomena under *, the number is so high because of the idiomatic expression *(of a trail) to run/go cold* and nominal phrase *trail running*.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

38

3.6 Results and Interpretation

RQ₁: Do fictive motion constructions rely mostly on one aspectual form, that being on the indefinite?

Across all groupings listed above, the pattern or predominant usage of one aspectual form speaks in favour of the indefinite. Nowhere have I encountered a combination where the progressive would surpass the arbitrarily demarcated 10 % of all combined examples (as exhibited as a staple occurrence in Biber et al., 2007; Quirk et al., 1985), therefore instituting the indefinite form as the prevalent option. This is in a way quite logical; not only from the point of general language tendencies and conventions, but from the acknowledgement that even though speakers perceive simulated motion with regard to FM, they are *de facto* describing motionless scenes, where no bona fide or distinguishable change of state betides. Admittedly, by altering the scope we may exclude the entirety of the path, fixate on just a segment and eliminate the endpoints; however, being unable to observe the total event can hinder the perception of fictive motion, since we might not fully comprehend the scenic arrangement which otherwise induces this nonveridical locomotion. This is, of course, merely a speculation, yet if I were to provide support, I would estimate that it is, for example, appreciably less burdensome to detect the rising movement [elevation] of a mountain ridge if the latter is broadly visible to the hiker than if the person interprets only the next few paces in front of them.

RQ₂: Are there significant differences between manner-of-motion and path-conflating verbs when it comes to aspect?

Even though I have not employed inferential statistics procedures, only descriptive ones (structural percentages) that merely provide simplified quantitative conclusions, I have discovered no considerable discrepancies between the two aspectual forms in terms of their manifestations with each verbal group. In order to substantiate my claim, I offer the weighted averages.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

39

$$p_W = \frac{p_1 n_1 + p_2 n_2 + \cdots + p_k n_k}{n_1 + n_2 + \cdots n_k}$$

Progressive form with manner-of-motion verbs:

$$p_W = \frac{\begin{array}{c}(0.0*250)+(0.0*250)+(0.4*250)+(0.4*250)+(0.9*213)+(3.2*62)+(0.0*33)+(7.1*14)\\+(0.0*250)+(0.9*113)+(0.0*26)+(0.0*250)+(1.1*94)+(1.8*56)+(0.0*107)\end{array}}{250+250+250+250+213+62+33+14+250+113+26+250+94+56+107}$$

$$p_W = \frac{995.4}{2218} = 0.45\%$$

Progressive form with path-conflating verbs:

$$p_W = \frac{\begin{array}{c}(0.0*73)+(0.0*80)+(5.9*17)+(0.5*221)+(0.0*33)+(2.5*80)+(0.0*15)+(0.0*250)+(0.0*250)+(1.2*250)+(0.4*250)+\\+(0.8*250)+(0.8*250)+(0.4*250)+(0.0*110)+(0.0*90)+(0.0*71)+(1.3*77)+(1.6*190)+(0.0*250)+(4.0*250)+\\+(1.2*250)+(0.0*250)\end{array}}{73+80+17+221+33+80+15+250+250+250+250+250+250+250+110+90+71+77+190+250+250+250+250}$$

$$p_W = \frac{3014.9}{3807} = 0.79\%$$

Progressive form with the verb *to run*:

$$p_W = \frac{(0.4*250)+(0.*250)+(0.4*250)+(0.4*250)+(0.8*250)}{250+250+250+250+250}$$

$$p_W = \frac{600}{1250} = 0.48\%$$

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

40

If we disregard the percentage of progressive form with the verb *to run*, which is for all intents and purposes an exception, we can assuredly assert that progressive is not dependent on the verb type, be that manner-of-motion or path-conflating, as there is 3.4 ‰ difference in average percentage between the groups (acknowledging that their combined total is 6,025 samples, the difference is not high enough to even make us speculate whether or not the verb-type influences the choice of aspect). However, the mean alone cannot provide anything more than the rudimentary insight, since conclusions extending beyond the immediate data require the introduction of causal analytical methods. Most of what I have displayed remains on the descriptive level, yet what I can additionally offer is the confidence interval (with 5 % risk) delimiting where the percentage of progressive form would be were someone to inspect the whole corpus for these combinations.

Manner-of-motion verbs:

$$standard\ error \rightarrow se_P = \sqrt{\frac{(100\% - p\%) * p\%}{n - 1}} \qquad se_p = \sqrt{\frac{(100 - 0.45) * 0.45}{2218 - 1}} = 0.14$$

$$p - (z * se_{p)} \leq P \leq p + (z * se_P)$$

z-score for 5 % risk = 1.96

$$0.45 - (1.96 * 0.14) \leq P \leq 0.45 + (1.96 * 0.14)$$

$$0.18 \leq P \leq 0.72$$

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

Path-conflating verbs:

$$standard\ error \rightarrow se_P = \sqrt{\frac{(100\% - p\%) * p\%}{n - 1}} \qquad se_p = \sqrt{\frac{(100 - 0.79) * 0.79}{3807 - 1}} = 0.14$$

$$p - (z * se_{p)} \leq P \leq p + (z * se_P)$$

z-score for 5 % risk = 1.96

$$0.79 - (1.96 * 0.14) \leq P \leq 0.79 + (1.96 * 0.14)$$

$$0.52 \leq P \leq 1.06$$

Judging from these equations, path-conflating motion verbs do indeed have a higher percentage of progressive form; nevertheless, and as said before, this difference is so minuscule on both sides of these intervals, it may as well be rendered negligible, especially in comparison to the indefinite form.

RQ₃: Do path-conflating verbs have more transparent (non)travelable paths?

The criterion of transparency or obliqueness is determined by one's own mental faculties and cognitive malleability of discerning motion in otherwise inert environments. Perhaps, it is less arduous to recognize FM if you are the directly involved observer, not experience it through the prism of a medium as is the written language. Anyhow, path-conflating motion verbs do overlap with manner-of-motion in terms of (non)travelable paths, seeing that quite a few occur in both groups (*trail, route, road, path*). The choice of the inanimate subject is restricted even with the inherent lexical meaning of the verb, considering that breaches or extensions in meaning instigate a phraseological, idiomatic interpretation where FM is no longer possible.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

42

RQ₄: Is the progressive aspect (in FM expressions) more frequent in some specific contexts?

Considering that the progressive form was almost absolutely absent across all cited combinations, contextual factors were of no conspicuous relevance. Aspect-wise, indefinite dwarfs the progressive regardless of the surrounding text, be that mountaineering, civil engineering, interior decorating, landscape charting, industrial construction, etc. *Suma summarum*, I have found 46 cases (see *Appendix*) with movement verbs in the progressive, which is insufficient for any kind of further division, as outcomes of such techniques would be blatantly unrepresentative due to low numbers.

RQ₅: Is there a recurrent alternative to expressing FM without employing a motion verb in the predicator of a finite clause?

One construction that pervaded the majority of samples were reduced relative clauses with present participles. An example of such sort would be: "*The main highway **crossing** Oslo from east to west, E18, will finally come up to standard when the crossing of the Bjørvika in Oslo harbour is completed.*" Had we two separate sentences, the percentage of progressive might be higher; nevertheless, that would be wholly redundant from the point of view of pragmatics – "*The main highway E18 **is crossing** Oslo from east to west. It will finally come up to standard when the crossing of the Bjørvika in Oslo harbour is completed.*" However, nothing is there to guarantee that the progressive form would be indeed applied, were we to transform the reduced relative clause. An equally plausible variant is also "*The main highway E18 **crosses** Oslo from east to west. It /…/*". Overall, I do not suggest that longer descriptions are defunct, merely somewhat superfluous seeing that we can pack the same amount of information into a shorter expression. Moreover, this kind of reduced relative clauses seems to be the preferred method of signalling FM in comparison to the scarce numerus pertaining to the progressive form. Further research into FM, albeit rather extraneous to aspect, could focus on how is FM primarily realised in a sentence – through a verb in the predicator (subject of my master's thesis), reduced relative clause (example above), non-finite modifier (e.g. *The <u>undulating</u> Posavje countryside has opened before me*), process of nominalisation (e.g. *The <u>rise</u> of the lookout tower on Rogla is spectacular*), statement of frequency (e.g. *Rest stops appear <u>in regular intervals</u> on the motorway*). Although each of these options is possible, we could benefit from a comprehensive corpus analysis that would indicate what speakers favour.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

43

If someone wanted to elaborate the study on FM, they could opt for a contrastive analysis with Slovene, as there is no cornucopia of presently-available explorations. A COBISS search for "*kognitivno jezikoslovje*" (cognitive linguistics) yields scarce results, even fewer for "*fiktivno gibanje*" (fictive motion) – the only palpable study I was able to find was Lipovšek's *The Role of Motion Verbs in Conveying Path-Related Information in English and Slovene Fictive Motion Expressions* (2018). Albeit it is not directly pertinent to my research, considering that my focus of attention is aimed towards aspect in FM, the author clearly notes that "the aspectual variants of the Slovene verbs call for a contrastive study on the role of aspect in fictive motion" (Lipovšek, 2018: 76). And I concur, as this field would benefit substantially upon being expanded and therefore perhaps gradually even institute cognitive linguistics into Slovene as an independent area of interest.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

44

4. CONCLUSION

This master's thesis has provided an exposition of fictive motion, mostly extracting from and amalgamating Langacker's and Talmy's theoretical exploits for the sake of producing a detailed account about this particular type of construals. As announced, I have concentrated on coextension paths, observed how they emerge with respect to two verb groups – either manner-of-motion or path-conflating – then further elaborated the research by analysing the aspectual forms. Path-conflating verbs were not problematic, the choice which ones to include was performed with zero inhibition or doubt, because they effortlessly combine with inanimate subjects and quite compellingly simulate motion. But the situation with manner-of-motion was somewhat challenging as these largely prohibit their application when it comes to fictive motion. Motion verbs incorporating an instrument (e.g. *to parachute, to raft to rocket*) were immediately discarded, as were those verbs that applied to specific human or animal locomotion (e.g. *to gallop, to jog, to tiptoe*) or were relevant only in connection to some specific activity (e.g. *to fly, to sail*). This was addressed in the chapters on methodology, but it goes to explain why I have examined 11 verbs altogether, since I wanted to balance both verb groups, whilst adding manner-of-motion verbs was relatively limited. However, even though I have analysed 11 verbs, their combined total was 7,275 in terms of samples, sentences I studied in order to determine the prevalence of one aspectual form over the other. As expected, the progressive could not match the indefinite, being represented by only 46 examples – 10 (0.45 %) with manner-of-motion, 30 (0.79 %) for path-conflating, and 6 (0.48 %) for the verb *to run*, which cannot be labelled under any of the previous categories, since it is an exception. This difference between verb groups might be caused by the uneven sample sizes – the collective number of sentences for manner-of-motion is 2,218 cases, whilst path-conflating verbs totals 3,807 examples. From that point of view, the two types are not in equilibrium; however, my modus operandi was to inspect the top 5 most frequent combinations between an inanimate noun and a verb of motion, where I proceeded onto the next pair in instances where such combinations proved to be non-existent. Nevertheless, if we consider that the estimated percentage of progressive form should otherwise be ranging from 5 % to 10 %, the 3.4 ‰ difference is not sufficient enough to cause suspicion and might be only a result of coincidental concordance. The only

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

45

potentially permissible way to elevate these proportions might be to disregard every single occasion explained under *other as being invalid. From a methodological standpoint, that would be completely acceptable, yet, I have refrained from doing so out of one reason. What is encompassed under *other are mostly (my educated guess: around 85 %) reduced relative clauses that still signal fictive motion. By leaving them as they are, we can comprehend not only the ratio between the indefinite and the progressive form, but imagine just how pervasive is this another alternative to expressing fictive motion. Experiencing how abundant reduced relative clauses are in this regard stimulated and enthused me for a conceivable sequel to my master's thesis, which would otherwise be somewhat hindered, were I to discard such sentences in the very first phase. That is why I have said it would be potentially permissible to eliminate them without a second thought, but acknowledging that the recognition of coextension paths, fictive motion, and by extension, construals relies significantly on visual perception and mechanisms of mental processing, leaving a third option for future consideration might not be that detrimental at all.

Fictive motion is not that clear-cut as, for example, forming present indefinite tense where we have a series of rules and conventions that steer us towards a relatively discernible and universal patterns of usage. Fictive motion cannot be comprehended literally, it verges on figurative expression where we have to utilise our imagination and accept that a fair share of it is indeed abstract, that we are engrossed in a complex topic which demands more than a mere unilateral discussion. Since we were worthy enough to be endowed and entrusted with the laudable axioms of our professors from year one, let me divulge one which has etched itself on my cerebrum and was repeatedly uttered by those operating with grammar, literature, as well as those functioning in the pedagogical module: *Learning rules and concords is necessary, unavoidable even, but manoeuvring within paradigms and exercising forms of figurative communication, well that is the pinnacle of language proficiency.*

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

5. POVZETEK V SLOVENŠČINI

Magistrsko delo se osredotoča na pojav fiktivnega gibanja, ki ga zaznamuje nepremični, neživi osebek v kombinaciji z glagolom premikanja v povedku, pri čemer skupaj tvorita opis sicer statične situacije, ki pa vseeno simulira nek abstrakten premik v celotni postavitvi. Pri tem je seveda ključno, kakšno pozicijo zavzamemo kot opazovalci, češ ali je naš pogled celosten ali se slučajno koncentriramo na nek določen izsek, kjer zanemarimo totalnost okolice. Osmisliti moramo, kaj v dani konfiguraciji izstopa kot figura ter kaj je tisto, kar nam služi kot ozadje, saj smo si šele preko tega spoznanja oz. zavedanja zmožni začrtati navidezno pot, ki jo sam osebek tudi prepotuje. Da bi razumeli opisani dve kategoriji, sem v uvodnem ter teoretičnem delu predstavil fiktivnemu gibanju nadredni pojav »interpretacij« (*angl. construals*), ki pojmujejo pravzaprav miselne operacije, katerih se govorec posluži, kadar želi znotraj nabora različnih možnosti po svoji presoji izbrati tisto, s katero bo najustrezneje predstavil dane okoliščine. Če strnem, gre predvsem za to, kako človek opredeli svoje misli ter zavzame določen vidik, kako načeloma nevtralno vsebino prilagodi svojemu dojemanju.

Teoretična poglavja se nadaljujejo s predstavitvijo dogodkov premikanja (*Motion Events*), saj preko njih tudi spoznamo dve skupini glagolov, ki jih kasneje vzamem pod drobnogled, in sicer glagole premikanja, ki v svojem leksikalnem pomenu inkorporirajo tudi način (*manner-of-motion verbs*), ter glagole premikanja, ki pomensko nakažejo tudi karakteristike poti (*path-conflating verbs*). Šele ko tipe glagolov absolviram in prikažem posamične omejitve v kontekstu fiktivnega gibanja, se spustim v prikaz fiktivnega gibanja, usmerjen zlasti v sorazsežnostne poti (angl*. coextension paths*), ki veljajo za najbolj reprezentativno ter poznano kategorijo fiktivnega gibanja. Pri tem izhajam predvsem iz del Langackerja ter Talmyja, vzporedno pa se nanašam na dognanja in izsledke Matsumota ter Walińskega, kar skupaj tvori srčiko razprave. Bistvo sorazsežnostnih poti je v tem, da si lahko zamislimo premik vzdolž posredovane poti, kjer kot opazovalci sledimo ter krmarimo po tipografiji, in ker to zahteva nek časovni vložek ter miselno dejavnost, s tem dobimo občutek gibanja, čeravno zares opisuje zgolj stalno stanje. Zadnji razdelek znotraj teorije predstavi glagolski vid, vendar to ne z vidika dovršnosti ter nedovršnosti, saj si pri tem slovenščina ter angleščina nista čisto skladni, temveč razlike med nedoločno (*indefinite*) ter progresivno obliko (*progressive form*). To me v resnici tudi zanima, torej kako se znotraj fiktivnega gibanja, znotraj obeh omenjenih glagolskih skupin realizirata dani obliki glagolskega vida.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

Empirični del kot tak obsega 11 glagolov (5 iz vsake skupine in glagol *teči* kot izjemo), pri čemer skušam odgovoriti na vprašanja, ki zadevajo pojavnost progresivne oblike, navzočnost izrazov, ki služijo kot pot, obenem pa zabeležim tudi alternative izražanja fiktivnega gibanja, kjer nimamo glagola premikanja v povedku. Primere rabe sem črpal iz angleškega korpusa *enTenTen15*, do katerega sem dostopal preko *Sketch Engine*. Rezultati kažejo, da se pri obeh skupinah glagolov progresivna oblika pojavi v manj kot 1 % vseh primerov, razlika med njima pa se meri v promilih. Samo po sebi to ni alarmantno, kajti pričakovati je bilo, da bo nedoločna oblika prevladala, a vseeno sem sprva domneval, da bo teh primerov nekje med 5 in 10 % (kot kažejo druge korpusne analize), tudi si obetal večje razlike med obema skupinama glagolov. Resda pa sem za potrebe svoje raziskave uporabil večinoma zgolj postopke deskriptivne statistike, kar bi bilo smotrno v sledečih podvigih oplemenititi z inferenčno statistiko ter večjim vzorcem (četudi je že moj obsegal 7.275 enot), kar bi šele dopuščalo posploševanje na celoto primerov. V sklopu preučevanja angleškega jezika bi bilo smiselno pogledati še ostale načine izražanja sorazsežnostnih poti, saj sem denimo zaznal izrazito prisotnost prilastkovih odvisnikov, v katerih je prav tako moč formulirati fiktivno gibanje.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

48

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. (2007). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Comrie, Bernard. (1976). *Aspect.* Cambridge: CUP.

Croft, William and Cruse, Alan D. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: CUP.

Downing, Angela and Philip Locke. (1992). *A University Course in English Grammar*. Wiltshire: Prentice Hall.

Downing, Angela. (2015). *English Grammar: A University Course*. New York: Routledge.

Egorova, Ekaterina and Ross S. Purves. (2017). "Frame-Relative Constructions in the Description of Motion." In *Proceedings of Workshops and Posters at the 13th International Conference on Spatial Information Theory*, edited by Paolo Fogliaroni, Andrea Ballatore, and Eliseo Clementini. COSIT 2017. Lecture Notes in Geoinformation and Cartography. Springer, Cham.

Fauconnier, Gilles. (1997). *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Gennari, Silvia P., Steven A. Sloman, Barbara C. Malt, and W. Tecumseh Fitch. (2002). "Motion events in language and cognition." *Cognition* 83: 49–79.

Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. (2016). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: CUP.

Jackendoff, R. (2002). *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution.* Oxford: OUP.

Langacker, Ronald Wayne. (1986). "Abstract Motion." *Proceedings of the 12th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*: 455–471.

Langacker, Ronald Wayne. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar – Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites.* California: Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald Wayne. (1999). *Grammar and Conceptualisation.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

49

Langacker, Ronald Wayne. (2005). "Dynamicity, fictivity, and scanning: The imaginative basis of logic and linguistic meaning." In *Grounding Cognition: The Role of Perception and Action in Memory, Language, and Thinking*, edited by Diane Pecher and Rolf A. Zwaan, 164–197. Cambridge: CUP

Langacker, Ronald Wayne. (2006). "Cognitive Grammar: Introduction to Concept, Image, and Symbol." In *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, edited by Dirk Geeraerts, 29–68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Langacker, Ronald Wayne. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: OUP.

Leech, Geoffrey. (1971). *Meaning and the English Verb*. Harlow: Longman.

Levin, Beth. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lewis, Michael. (1986). *The English Verb: An Exploration of Structure and Meaning.* UK: Cengage Learning EMEA.

Lipovšek, Frančiška. (2018). "The Role of Motion Verbs in Conveying Path-Related Information in English and Slovene Fictive Motion Expressions." *ELOPE* 15 (2): 63–78.

Matlock, Teenie. (2004a). "The Conceptual Motivation of Fictive Motion." In *Studies in Linguistic Motivation*, edited by Günter Radden and Klaus-Uwe Panther, 221–48. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matlock, Teenie. (2004b). "Fictive Motion as Cognitive Simulation." *Memory & Cognition* 32 (8): 1389–1400.

Matlock, Teenie. (2010). "Abstract motion is no longer abstract." *Language and Cognition* 2 (2): 243–260.

Matsumoto, Yo. (1996). "Subjective Motion in English and Japanese Verbs." *Cognitive Linguistics* 7 (2): 183–226.

Palmer, Robert. (1988). *The English Verb.* London: Longman.

Pentland, Alex P. (1986). "Perceptual Organisation and the Presentation of Natural Form." *Artificial Intelligence* 28: 293–331.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Radden, Günter. (2008). "The Cognitive Approach to Language." In *When Grammar Minds Language and Literature: Festschrift for Prof. Béla Korponay on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday*, edited by Jozsef Andor, Béla Hollósy, Tibor Laczkó, and Péter Pelyvás, 387–412. Debrecen: Institute of English and American Studies.

Radden, Günter and Réne Dirven. (2007). *Cognitive English Grammar.* Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rojo, Ana and Javier Valenzuela. (2003). "Fictive Motion in English and Spanish". *International Journal of English Studies* 3 (2): 123–149.

Ruppenhofer, Josef. (2006). "Fictive Motion: Construction or Construal?" *Berkley Linguistic Society BLS* 32 (1): 307–319.

Takemoto, Masashi. (2010). "Manner-of-Motion Verbs and Subjectification." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Studies* 4: 15–26.

Talmy, Leonard. (1985). "Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, edited by Timothy Shopen, 57–149. Cambridge: CUP.

Talmy, Leonard. (2000a). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics – Vol. 1: Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Talmy, Leonard. (2000b). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics – Vol. 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Ungerer, Friedrich and Hans-Jörg Schmid. (2006). *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Waliński, Jacek Tadeusz. (2014). "Atemporality of Coextension Paths." In *Time and Temporality in Language and Human Experience*, edited by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Krzysztof Kosecki, 105–121. Bern: Peter Lang AG, 105–121.

Waliński, Jacek Tadeusz. (2015). "Instrumentality of Fictive Motion in Coextension Paths." *Kwartalnik Neofilologiczny* 62 (1): 87–101.

Waliński, Jacek Tadeusz. (2018). *Verbs in Fictive Motion*. Łódz: Łódz University Press.

Corpora (Electronic Sources)

Sketch Engine: Language Corpus Management and Query System. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.sketchengine.eu/

7. APPENDIX: Table of Examples Featuring the Progressive Aspect

Combination	Example Number	Example
road + climb	1	The road **was climbing** fast and we soon got to its highest altitude – 2145m.
track + climb	2	Amazing: 20km, asphalt + sand, more than 150 turns and the track **is climbing** over 1500m.
path + climb	3	The path **was climbing** up and, perhaps because of that angle, he tipped away from me, showing me his full yellow back sandwiched between coal black wings.
	4	I am of the conviction that all spiritual paths **are** indeed **climbing** the same sacred mountain, albeit by different routes.
vine + creep	5	Clear leaps in shock as she realizes the vines **are creeping** over her boots and crawling up her leg.
	6	Tubers and stolons can also form at each node if the vine **is creeping** along the soil surface.
trail + ramble	7	The trails **are** typically **rambling** alongside creeks and streams, with an occasional pond or field popping up
highway + traverse	8	For example, if the highway **were traversing** on the bearing of N 45° 00' E and is at right angle to the centerline the westernmost limits of the property being acquired at Station 10+00, it would be erroneous to commence the description at this station.
pipeline + traverse	9	The SDCEA and groundWork, based on the various recorded leaks and spills, are maintaining their call for a complete replacement of all the refinery pipelines in the south Durban area, and for these pipelines to be clearly marked in order that the public are aware of the fact that fuel pipelines **are traversing** their community.
corridor + traverse	10	When the DWLC decided to build an elephant corridor to provide a safe passage for the regular elephant migration from the Uda Walawa NP to the pristine Bogahapattiya protected forest that contained much needed salt-licks for elephants; it was stalled due to several people protesting that the planned elephant corridor **was traversing** their traditional agricultural lands.
stairway + ascend	11	The space around him was nearly limitless, as Eileen walked him into a massive hall where two huge stairways **were ascending** on each side, to join above,

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

		like an old movie set of the 50's.
trail + ascend	12	The result of this equation can be either positive or negative depending on whether the trail **is ascending** or descending for that stretch.
route + ascend	13	The route **is ascending** right up to the cave.
	14	The first part of the route **is** slightly **ascending** but the climbing gets serious after 63,4km of racing when the peloton hits the bottom of the category 3 Col de Bellagranjo (6,6km, 4,6%).
route + cross	15	But surprise, surprise: The solved route **is crossing** the closed bridges!
	16	Many of the main city transport routes **are crossing** near the hotel, that gives the availability to get to the Riga airport, Marine passenger terminal, Daugava river boat terminal, new residential districts.
	17	Many of the main city transport routes **are crossing** near the hotel, that gives the availability to get to the Riga airport, Marine passenger terminal, Daugava river boat terminal, new residential districts.
line + cross	18	The lines **are** already **crossing**.
pipeline + cross	19	The area has been studied and it is not located in the landslide zone, only a section of the pipelines **is crossing** the landslide zone, for which will be drawn up new designs, and it will be conducted by the most secure way.
	20	Two oil pipelines and one gas pipeline **are** already **crossing** Georgia on their way to the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.
highway + cross	21	STC is directly connected to one of "Denmark's biggest intersection", where three highways **are crossing** each other; E20, E47 and E55.
	22	Both highways **are crossing** the Sava river at the same "Gasela" bridge, followed by "Mostar" junction which would be recommended point to leave the highway.
trail + descend	23	The trail **is** mostly **descending**, with a few steep ascends, bringing you down from 12,000 feet to 11,500 feet.
glacier + descend	24	The glacier **is descending** rapidly into Pine Island Bay and the Amundsen Sea.
path + descend	25	The winding path **is** now **descending** on the left side of a trough.
	26	Running ceaselessly across the vineyards, panting between steep ditches till the limit of the wood, where a quick path **was** rapidly **descending** into the dense bushes.
	27	About fifteen minutes outside the village we noticed that the path **was descending** and we realized that we

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

		were going down into an enormous hole in the ground.
wall + rise	28	A massive earth-colored, terraced wall **is rising** along the edge of Monterey Peninsula Airport.
	29	Collège Mixte Le Bon Berger, Montrouis – Slab is poured and walls **are rising**.
	30	The building is now in progress; foundations at each end are new and the walls **are rising**.
	31	Rock Walls Landscaping Canberra Stone walls **are rising** throughout a city of fenceless front yards, giving suburban Canberra depth and character.
	32	After years of planning, the walls **are rising** and the surrounding community is taking notice.
	33	Thus the cornerstone of the principal pillar of the new Turnhalle has been laid, and the outer walls **are rising** at a rapid pace.
	34	Foundation excavation and brick making, all by hand, progressed rapidly, and foundations were done and the walls **were rising** by Jan. 17th, 2011
	35	6th February 2010 The weather is being kinder in the balmy south east and the walls **are rising**.
	36	Instead, all of them remain possible interpretations, as they will throughout his time in Carthage, in the one line Virgil lets him speak for himself: "How fortunate these are/Whose city walls **are rising** here and now!
	37	The stone walls **are rising** with a steady rhythm of mallets and chisels.
hill + rise	38	A low hill **is rising** also on the right, and flat ground to the left.
	39	Just north of the plain Terai, majestic hills **are rising**.
	40	The temperature, along with the hills **were rising** rapidly.
line + run	41	In 1827 eighteen different stage lines **were running** out of Worcester
river + run	42	River Seine- the river **is running** through the heart of the city.
trail + run	43	The trails **were running** through neighborhoods at first and the locals had come out to cheer us on.
road + run	44	The road **is running** along the Yamuna river and industries
route + run	45	At this stage, Ilmari's route **was running** very close to his autumn 2012 route.
	46	By the way, at present 77 thousand kilometers of international air routes **are running** through Kazakhstan airspace.

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

54

8. STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP / IZJAVA O AVTORSTVU

I declare that this master's thesis is my own authorial endeavour and that the employed references and bibliography are cited in accordance with professional standards and current legislation.

Ljubljana, December 2019   Žan Korošec

Izjavljam, da je magistrsko delo v celoti moje avtorsko delo ter da so uporabljeni viri in literatura navedeni v skladu s strokovnimi standardi in veljavno zakonodajo.

Ljubljana, december 2019   Žan Korošec

KOROŠEC, Žan. (2019). *The Question of Aspect in Fictive Motion Constructions Incorporating Movement Verbs in the Predicator*. Master's Thesis. Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.

55

9. CANDIDATE'S STATEMENT / IZJAVA KANDIDATA

The undersigned, _____, declare that the content

of this master's thesis is identical in printed and electronic form, and

allow / do not allow

the publication of my master's thesis on the faculty's website.

Date:

Candidate's signature:

_____

Spodaj podpisani _____ izjavljam, da je besedilo

magistrskega dela v tiskani in elektronski obliki istovetno, in

dovoljujem / ne dovoljujem

objavo magistrskega dela na fakultetnih spletnih straneh.

Datum:

Podpis kandidata / kandidatke: