Language and Cognition **6** (2014), 408–426. doi:10.1017/langcog.2014.12

'Hollering from across the yard': fictive path in manner of speaking events*

CARLA VERGARO

JODI L. SANDFORD

ROBERTA MASTROFINI

AND

YHARA M. FORMISANO

University of Perugia, Italy

(*Received* 31 *May* 2013 – *Revised* 18 *December* 2013 – *Accepted* 18 *December* 2013 – *First published online 23 April 2014*)

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to see how and to what extent the Talmyan notion of fictive motion is realized in the conceptual frame of speaking. Drawing from a previous in-depth analysis of the speaking event Manner component in English (cf. Vergaro, Sandford, Mastrofini, and Formisano, unpublished observations),[1] we investigate the realization of fictive path in 186 English manner of speaking (henceforth MoS) verb entries accessed through the *Corpus of Contemporary American English* (henceforth COCA). Fictive path is always involved in the conceptualization of the speaking event. Communication is elaborated through the CONDUIT METAPHOR, which is, in turn, motivated by the embodied act of speaking. Fictive path is further considered in relation to image schemas and windowing. Different degrees of path windowing emerge from this study, illustrating how the speaker focuses attention on a specific portion of the speaking event. Image schema distribution and an implicational hierarchy of the various types of path elaboration also become evident in this study.

KEYWORDS: CONDUIT METAPHOR, emanation path, fictive motion, fictive path, image schemas, path windowing, speaking event.

[*] We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments, and careful suggestions. Address for correspondence: Jodi L. Sandford, Dipartimento di Lettere - Lingue, letterature e civiltà antiche e moderne, Università degli Studi di Perugia, Palazzo San Bernardo, Via degli Offici 14, 06123, Perugia, Italia. tel: (+39) 075.585.4823; e-mail: jodi.sandford@unipg.it.

[1] 'Trill, purr and wail': manner of speaking verbs in English. Ms under revision.

1. Introduction

This study investigates the conceptual domain of manner of speaking (hereafter MoS) verbs in English. In particular, drawing upon Talmy's notion of 'fictive motion',[2] it investigates the presence of fictive path, types of path elaboration, and path-windowing in speaking event-frames. Unlike that of Manner of Motion (hereafter MoM) verbs, the domain of MoS verbs has received less attention in the literature and, more relevant, the verification of fictive path of MoS verbs has not been researched to date. Despite this, it is a provocative issue that needs to be pursued, especially because interesting similarities do emerge in the way English encodes fictive motion in both MoM and MoS verbs.

As for research on MoS verbs, Zwicky first identified twenty-two morphosyntactic properties with which MoS verbs could be selected and, subsequently, analyzed (see Zwicky, 1971). However interesting and pioneering, his paper lacks some clarity in associating such properties (or, at least, some of them) exclusively to this class of verbs. Since Zwicky's paper, interest in this linguistic domain has emerged in the works of Mufwene (1978), Snell-Hornby (1983), Levin (1993), Urban and Ruppenhofer (2001), and Rojo and Valenzuela (2001). Among these, the most exhaustive study is Snell-Hornby's who, focusing on both English and German, combines verb descriptivity through extensive and contrastive analysis with a dynamic semantic approach to the category of MoS verbs. As for the others mentioned, Mufwene (1978) criticizes Zwicky's approach and proposes a "semantic class version approach" (p. 278) in which the concept of typicality – and not necessarily exclusivity – is seen as being fundamental in natural language and not as a lack of explanatory properties. Zwicky's list is expanded by Levin (1993, p. 204), who includes seventy-seven verbs classified into nine subclasses. However, her proposal overlooks that some verbs are a combination of two or more subclasses and that manner is not just a matter of sound expression. From the perspective of frame semantics, Urban and Ruppenhofer (2001) offer a corpus-based account of MoS verbs. They argue that the syntactic and semantic behavior of these verbs changes according to their communicative or non-communicative uses, thus drawing a distinction between core and noise verbs. Finally, from a contrastive perspective, Rojo and Valenzuela (2001) analyze the possible gain or loss of information when translating MoS verbs from English to Spanish. They show how relevant the semantic information conveyed by MoS verbs is, and discuss how, when translating from an S-framed language (English) to a V-framed one (Spanish), it is maintained or added. These results are in contrast with Slobin's (1996, 1997) findings on MoM verbs.

[2] 'Fictive motion' is also known as *abstract* motion (Langacker, 1986), and *subjective* motion (Matsumoto, 1996a, 1996b).

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Partly in keeping with and partly refuting these previous contributions to the topic, the recent study by Vergaro et al. (unpublished observations) proposes an in-depth description of how English MoS verbs are construed. Their collection combines the verbs found in previous research and all the synonyms found in Dictionary.com, Wordreference.com, and Merriam-Webster.com. The corpus thus obtained was then expanded by consulting a number of dictionaries (*Oxford English Dictionary*, *Oxford Dictionary of English*, *Cobuild Dictionary*, *Macmillan English Dictionary*, *Longman Language Activator*, *New Oxford American English Dictionary*), resulting in 186 verb entries. In Vergaro et al. each verb entry is described, going beyond just the physical auditory components considered in previous research, and includes and accounts for semantic–pragmatic components.

The descriptive categories on which Vergaro et al.'s (unpublished observations) analysis of English MoS verbs is based are established according to two superordinate components: physical auditory and semantic–pragmatic. The authors propose, consequently, a fine-grained analysis of these verbs through the use of these descriptive categories, which are motivated by the embodied act of speaking and which can be conceptualized according to the CONDUIT metaphor. Our experiential basis of the speaking event allows us to identify and interpret the parts of the sounds/words, thereby creating a response or a reaction. Sometimes the speaker speaks with a specific intention in mind, and sometimes the act of speaking is a physiological response to another event. The effect on the hearer can be positive or negative. These aspects are then reflected in our embodied experience of speaking.

The physical auditory components of our embodied experience include *pitch*, *volume*, *speed*, and *rhythm;* the semantic–pragmatic components include *directionality*, *persistence*, *formality*, *speaker's attitude*, *speaker's intention*, and *effect on the hearer*. Vergaro et al. (unpublished observations) discusses how MoS verbs include properties and specifications that belong to the context or to the participants in the conversation in order to convey a message in a particular way. Such implications, at a semantic–pragmatic level, play a major role in communication and permit a more precise profiling of the conceptual domain of MoS verbs. Following Slobin's (1997) distinction between first- and second-tier verbs,[3] these initial findings suggest that the combination of physical auditory and semantic–pragmatic components, or lack thereof, accounts for the diverse properties that define these MoS

[3] In Slobin's (1997) terminology, the first tier consists of the more "neutral, everyday verbs" (p. 459) such as *walk*, *jump*, or *run* that express manner in broad categories. In contrast, the second tier consists of "the more expressive and exceptional verbs" (p. 459) such as *scurry*, *trudge*, or *bolt* that express the manner in a more refined way. English is particularly rich in the second tier of manner of motion verbs, as are most other S-framed languages.

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

verbs. This thus enables identification of first-tier (e.g., *call*, *cry*, *yell*, *shout*) and second-tier (e.g., *bicker*, *drone*, *shriek*, *yammer*) verbs within this domain. Moreover, this type of analysis has proved to be useful in distinguishing nuances of meaning in groups of apparently synonymous verbs.

Since Vergaro et al. (unpublished observations) focuses only on the semantic analysis of MoS verbs, the present study concentrates on how and to what extent fictive path is realized in MoS verbs. The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 illustrates the framework used for this analysis. Section 3 provides the methodology used in our corpus analysis of the MoS verb entries and the realization of fictive path. Section 4 discusses the results in relation to the framework of analysis used. Finally, Section 5 concludes with a summary and a proposal for further research.

2. Framework of analysis

The term 'fictive motion' was coined by Talmy in (1996) and extensively discussed in Talmy (2000). It refers to "the cognitive representation of nonveridical phenomena – instances that depict motion with no physical occurrence" (2000, p. 100), as illustrated by the following examples:

(1) a. The fence goes from the plateau to the valley.
b. The cliff wall faces toward / away from the island.
c. I looked out past the steeple.
d. The vacuum cleaner is down around behind the clothes-hamper.
e. The scenery rushed past us as we drove along.

More precisely:

> The fictivity pattern, in language, is extensively exhibited in the case where one of the discrepant representations is the belief held by the speaker or hearer about the real nature of the referent of a sentence, and the other representation is the literal reference of the linguistic form that makes up the sentence. Here, the literal representation is assessed as less veridical than the representation based on belief. Accordingly, the literal representation is fictive, while the representation based on belief is factive. […] Thus, in *The fence goes from the plateau to the valley*, we presume by our general beliefs that the fence is factively stationary, while the literal meaning of the sentence fictively presents the fence as moving (Talmy, 2000, p. 101).

Talmy discusses a number of distinct categories of fictive motion, though he gives broad coverage especially to the Emanation Type, namely "the fictive motion of something intangible emerging from a source. In most subtypes, the intangible entity continues along its emanation path and terminates by impinging on some distal object" (2000, p. 106). The Emanation Path type includes the

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

subtypes of Orientation (2a), Radiation (2b), Shadow (2c), and Sensory Paths (2d). Talmy's (2000) examples are given below for each of these types.

(2) a. The cliff wall faces toward / away from / into / past the valley.
b. The sun is shining into the cave / onto the back wall of the cave.
c. The tree threw its shadow down into/across the valley.
d. I can hear/smell him all the way from where I am standing.

According to Talmy, in (2a), the Figure (*cliff wall*) moves relatively to the Ground (*the valley*) along a path indicated by directional adpositions. In (2b), the radiating event involves three different processes: the emanation of the radiation from the radiator (*the sun*), the motion of the radiation along the path designated by the satellites (*into*, *onto*), and the impingement of the radiation on the irradiated object (*the back wall of the cave*). Moreover, in the Shadow Path example (2c), the shadow of an object (*the tree*) can be perceived as the fictive movement of the shadow from that object to a surface (*the valley*). Finally, in (2d), two entities are conceptualized, the Experiencer (*I*) and the Experienced (*he*), together with the movement of something intangible (*the sound or smell*) in a straight path between the two.

Further categories of fictive motion discussed by Talmy, albeit in a less detailed way, include Pattern Paths (3a), Frame-Relative Motion (3b), Advent Paths (3c), Access Paths (3d), and Coextensive Paths (3e); all the examples are from Talmy (2000).

(3) a. As I painted the ceiling, (a line of) paint spots slowly progressed across the floor.
b. I rode along in the car and looked at the scenery we were passing through.
c. The palm trees clustered together around the oasis.
d. The bakery is across the street from the bank.
e. The fence goes/zigzags/descends from the plateau to the valley.

Furthermore, Talmy (2000) defines the notion of the 'windowing' of an event in saying that "languages can place a portion of a coherent referent situation into the foreground of attention by the explicit mention of that portion, while placing the remainder of the situation into the background of attention by omitting mention of it" (p. 257). It is thus possible to have a window of prominent attention placed over the beginning, middle, or end portion of the fictive path; that is, one may have initial, medial, and/or final windowing (p. 259). In the specific case of path windowing, the path is foregrounded by inclusion in the sentence of explicit linguistic material referring to it. The explicated path may refer to a determined portion known as single windowing, or portions known as combined windowing. Example (4) foregrounds the medial and final portion of the path (the two sides of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

street), whereas its initial portion is gapped (where the path begins, the location of the speaker).

(4) My bike is across the street.

In contrast, example (5) shows medial gapping (where Jane and John are) and foregrounds the initial and final portion of the path (the location of Jane and John).

(5) Jane sat across from John.

Example (6) shows final gapping ('where they ran to') and describes the initial (*from the kitchen*) and medial windowing (*out of the door*).

(6) They ran from the kitchen out of the door.

Fictive motion, in defining a path, is necessarily conceived through a visual representation that enacts the conceptual metaphor on which the construal of an event is processed. Image schemas and metaphoric models are employed in the organization of our knowledge (Lakoff, 1990). The speaker/listener accesses the image schema that serves as a basis for the linguistic conceptualization of space and time. As Langacker explains:

> image schemas are seen as basic, 'preconceptual' structures that give rise to more elaborate and more abstract conceptions (or at least provide their skeletal organization) through combination and metaphorical projection. (Langacker, 2008, p. 32)

Duly, one of the primary types of image schemas is the SCALE schema that includes PATH (cf. Johnson, 1990; Lakoff, 1990; Croft & Cruse, 2004). And, as we illustrate in Section 3.2, the different levels of path elaboration therefore require some variation of the image schema. Lakoff (1990) describes the basic image schemas as those

> simple everyday structures that constantly recur in our everyday bodily experience: CONTAINERS, PATHS, LINKS, FORCES, BALANCE, and in various orientations and relations: UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, WHOLE-PART, CENTER-PERIPHERY, etc. (Lakoff, 1990, p. 267)

The PATH image is schematic, in that it is an abstract representation of factive/fictive motion. The schema, known more specifically as the SOURCE–PATH–GOAL schema, describes a point of departure (the SOURCE), a GOAL or destination (the end point), the PATH (which is made up of the series of connected locations between the source and the destination), and the implicit DIRECTION toward the goal (Lakoff, 1990, p. 275).

Another cognitive mechanism involved in the conceptualization of an event is Conceptual Metaphor, which motivates human comprehension of any experience

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in the projected structure of Figure, Ground, and Path and the elaboration of the source and goal. More precisely, the speaking event is manifested through the 'CONDUIT metaphor', which yields COMMUNICATING IS SENDING MEANING OBJECTS FROM A MIND CONTAINER TO ANOTHER MIND CONTAINER ALONG A CONDUIT (Kövecses, 2010, p. 84). This maps our knowledge of IDEAS (MEANING) ARE OBJECTS, LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS, and COMMUNICATION IS SENDING (Reddy, 1979; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 10). Furthermore, this basic conceptualization has been similarly elaborated as COMMUNICATION IS TRANSFER, and PERCEPTION IS RECEPTION – the perception involved in the case of MoS verbs is hearing. Accordingly, the image schema of a path is a manifest part of our metaphoric structuring of the speaking event. The speaker (Experiencer) marks the source of the sound, the goal (Experienced) is the listener, and the path follows the direction of the sound, from the Figure across the Ground.

3. Methodology

3.1. CORPUS

We used the 186 MoS verb entries identified and analyzed in Vergaro et al. (unpublished observations) to conduct a qualitative corpus-based analysis to verify fictive motion constructions. For this purpose we utilized the COCA corpus,[4] entering the search string for each of the MoS verbs from our list and checking its collocation with all the prepositions the corpus revealed.

The procedure we followed to retrieve the MoS verb constructions was to insert the verb in brackets so as to identify the verb category, and then select the option of six post-verb collocates for all the prepositions. For each verb entry we analyzed the prepositions that emerged and verified the most complex path that was present among those prepositions, taking note of what kind of path elaboration each collocation allowed. Up to the first 100 examples were analyzed per verb satellite construction when available.

3.2. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Data retrieval revealed that 158 out of 186 verb entries have fictive path examples in the COCA corpus. We did not find fictive motion examples for

[4] See <http://corpus.byu.edu/coca>. The COCA is a corpus containing about 465 million words, equally divided among academic texts, fiction, popular magazines, newspapers and spoken language. The size of the COCA subcorpora is as follows: 91 million words in academic journals [ACAD]; 90 million words in fiction [FIC]; 95 million words in popular magazines [MAG]; 92 million words in newspapers [NEWS]; 95 million words in spoken language [SPOK].

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the following twenty-eight verb entries: *carp* (2)[5] *chirrup*, *decry*, *drivel*, *ejaculate*, *objurgate*, *palaver*, *perorate*, *rap* (1), *rouse*, *shrill*, *sibilate*, *singsong*, *snuffle*, *spiel*, *squabble*, *squall*, *susurrate*, *thunder*, *thrum*, *twaddle*, *twang*, *twitter*, *ululate*, *vociferate*, *whoop*, *wrangle*, and *yak*.[6]

The analysis of the examples showed a variety of path elaboration for MoS verbs that, following Talmy (2000), falls within the emanation (sensory) path. This path category proved to be complex, thus we further divided it into four categories according to the degree of path elaboration: location (L), direction (D), minimum path (MP), and elaborated path (EP). The following examples of L in (7), D in (8), and MP in (9) are listed according to the type of image schema specification – we present one example for each type of preposition found for each path category – whereas the examples of EP in (10) are alphabetically ordered according to the MoS verb selected. This is because the kind of image schema that each utterance represents in (10) is a unique series of satellites, which, being Elaborate, did not lend themselves to specific schematic categorization.

Verbs that only had examples with prepositions describing the location were characterized as belonging to the L category. Location designates the scope of attention as being in the final part of the path. We consider Location as 'final' only, because to imagine X as being 'at Y' or 'on Y' means that a path from an implicit point of departure 'Z" has already been followed before reaching location 'Y', which is the sole scope of attention. As Slobin (2008, p. 206) suggests, the 'goal' of the speaking event is designated by prepositions such as *in*, *outside, on*, *under*, *at*. Examples of this category are reported in (7):

(7) a. Then I *sighed in* his ear, "You don't know how much that means to me." [2010 FIC]
b. Florence had grasped, as soon as boys had begun to *bay outside* her windows, that in addition to being a gift, beauty was a tool, like a Swiss army knife. [2004 FIC]
c. This evening, we will look at how three conservatives and three liberals, all of whom *bloviate on* the radio, are handling the presidential race. [2008 SPOK]
d. "Good heavens!" Hannah *exclaimed under* her breath. Since she didn't remember why she'd been smiling, her smile would just have to remain a mystery. [2007 FIC]

[5] The number in brackets following some of the verbs refers to the n-senses attached to the meaning of the MoS verb, as explained in Vergaro et al. (unpublished observations).
[6] Of these twenty-eight verbs, twenty-five (with the exception of *ejaculate*, *rap* (1), and *rouse*) were found with fictive path examples in other corpora, but were not present in COCA. This appears to be due to the lack of contemporary use of these lexemes in American English.

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

e. Followers of the case got a gruesomely intimate portrait of the Simpsons' relationship when police released the transcript of a 911 call Nicole Brown Simpson made as her ex-husband *raged at* the door of her house. [1994 MAG]

(7a) uses *in* and (7b) *outside* to indicate the final location of the speech sound that has traveled from the speaker through the air and is either interior or exterior to the factive/fictive container. (7c) conceptualizes the final location as a surface and the MoS takes place *on* the horizontal plane of the container. (7d) uses *under* to indicate the final location of the speech sound as being in a lower vertical spatial relation to a factive/fictive plane. (7e) is an example of *at* that indicates a location or position in the SPACE schema. This is a case in which *at* may metaphorically signify contact or being 'against' something; *at*, however, can also imply direction in the sense of 'toward' or 'against', as in the FORCE schema (see (8d)).

In the D category we included verbs that have examples with prepositions focusing on the direction of the path in the speaking event, such as: *from*, *to*, *against*, *at*, *out*, *about*, *around*, as exemplified in (8):

(8) a. "You will be warriors!" *yowled* the tabby *from* the high rock. Thunder, River, Wind, and Shadow bowed their heads. [2007 FIC]
b. To the point where I *bemoaned to* my yoga teacher, "I'll never be able to clear it out, and even if I do, it'll just pile up again." [2011 MAG]
c. To demonstrate the depths of Jacobin hatred toward Christianity, Hamilton said that revolutionary leaders congratulated children who appeared in the Convention hall "to *lisp* blasphemy *against* the King of Kings." [1997 ACAD]
d. "Don't listen to him" he *yapped at* a reporter seeking insight from Eddie, 32-year-old evangelist four years older than Ben. [1990 NEWS]
e. "D.J., y'all gonna have to take all that rowdy shit somewhere else" she *hollered out* of the kitchen window. [2008 FIC]
f. I'm tired, I've got to tell you, of reporters *bellyaching about* this stuff. [2010 SPOK]
g. What's more, says Wendy Hilliard, president of the Women's Sports Federation, men have long reaped the 'bonding' benefits of sports, as they've *schmoozed around* the collective water cooler about their golf games. [1997 NEWS]

(8a) uses *from* to describe the direction of the speaking event, focusing attention on the point of departure of a path as described in the SCALE

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

schema. (8b), (8c), (8d) use *to*, *against*, and *at* to indicate the intermediate phase of this path (medial windowing), describing the speech sound traveling towards the receiver. (8e), on the other hand, uses *out* to express the movement of sound from the inside to the outside of the container. (8f) and (8g) use *about* and *around* as an indication of movement that winds in a nondescript fashion through space, focusing on the intermediate phase (medial windowing) of the path.

Verbs included in the MP category are used with prepositions that window a combination of location and direction, and may presuppose the crossing of a boundary, employing the SPACE or CONTAINER schema accordingly. Examples of these prepositions are *into*, *over*, *upon*, *across*, *through*, and *along,* as shown in (9):

(9) a. "You want to skate all that way?" "Now you're talking. I'd love to go all the way with you." She *snorted into* the phone. "I'll be at your place in half an hour." [1995 FIC]

b. "Olivia," the assistant *squawked over* the intercom, "thirty-five dollars for a woman with bracelets who's about to float through." [1995 FIC]

c. The accusation of treason was soon to be *retorted upon* him. Evidently, in Burke's acutest displays of sensibility his opponents thought they could detect an indelicate curiosity about the fall of a king. [1991 ACAD]

d. "Don't, don't, don't, / don't," she *stutters across* the line break, and we begin to see that he does now see what she can't stand to see. [2008 ACAD]

e. Can't you people hold your horses? "I remained silent as my mother *admonished* me *through* the barricade of a door; the only sound I made came from a breath of fresh relief. [2010 FIC]

f. "I wished I could see her face instead of just hearing her – it was impossible to sort out how much truth she was *spouting along* with the rest of it." [1990 FIC]

(9a) uses *into* to describe the medial and final windowing of the speaking event, where the direction is given by 'to' and the location is indicated by 'in', focusing the attention on the interior of the factive container (*the phone*). (9b) and (9c) use *over* and *upon* to describe the fictive path of the speech sound that moves across a surface. (9d) and (9e) use *across* and *through* to focus on a path that passes from one side to another of a boundary. (9f) uses the fictive path of *along* to window the medial part of a path event that runs parallel to the length, or the direction, of a Ground.

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The EP category is the most complex and includes verbs that allow constructions with multiple prepositions that describe initial, medial, and final windowing, as in the examples in (10):

(10) a. Suzanne Pappas, our instructor, sits astride a bike facing the class. She *barks out* orders *from under* her black beret. [1998 MAG]
b. "It's a dog," Chuy says, *panting up to* me *through* the ocean of the air, and sure enough, that's what it is, a dog. [2010 FIC]
c. Molly's voice, speaking to him. It is her real voice, speaking in real time, but it is ghostly, *pealing out* disembodied *from among* the empty rooms or *from* the shadows *under* the live oaks. [1990 FIC]
d. "She was very good in the clip from the movie of the week," the casting guy *piped in from* a chair *in* the corner; none of them acknowledged him or turned around. [2000 FIC]
e. As I was walking in, someone *screamed out from across* the street, "How's Anne?" [2002 NEWS]
f. "What does your father do?" Pinky had *squeaked at* the kid *from across* the reject's table *in* the dining hall during the first week at lunchtime. [2005 FIC]
g. "Wait," he told Brother S as Jerry went into the chapel. "Let him see for himself" Jerry *stormed through* the hermitage *from* cell *to* cell, throwing doors open and rushing into rooms. [2005 FIC]

(10a) describes a path that illustrates the speech sound that travels *out* of the person's mouth (CONTAINER), giving the direction with *from* indicating the starting point, which is further specified by *under*. This type of specification is pertinent in identifying an EP, rather than windowing just a combination of L and D, or an MP. Similarly, (10b) describes the path with *up* indicating the vertical direction, which is further specified by *to* establishing the horizontal direction, and *through* details the medial windowing that crosses a boundary. In the case of (10c), similarly to (10a), the speech sound travels *out*, indicating the direction, and *from among* or *from … under*, which describe a detailed horizontal and vertical axis of the initial windowing in the speaking event. (10d) describes, through the CONTAINER schema, the location of the speech sound with *in*, creating the direction with the starting point of the flow with *from*, and its further specification with *in*. (10e) also describes the direction of the speaking event with *out*, its departure point with *from*, and the specification of the sound traveling perpendicularly to the ground with *across*. In contrast, (10f) gives us a complete EP with the direction indicated with *at*, the point of departure with *from*, the perpendicularity to the ground with *across*, and also the final location with *in*. (10g) windows the medial part of the path with *through*, the crossing of a boundary, the initial windowing with *from*, and medial windowing of the direction of the speaking with *to*, thereby gapping the final windowing of the event.

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In keeping with the cognitive linguistic paradigm and the results that have emerged from our corpus analysis, we argue that the categories we have identified situate themselves on a dynamic continuum of path elaboration, as shown in Figure 1.

The continuum of path elaboration also results in a hierarchical scale. In other words, considering the example of the verb *bark*, verbs that allow constructions of EP (11a) *bark out … from under*, also allow constructions of MP (11b) *bark into*, D (11c) *bark from*, and L (11d) bark … *at*:

(11) a. Suzanne Pappas, our instructor, sits astride a bike facing the class. She *barks out* orders *from under* her black beret. [1998 MAG]
b. The old man had been *barking into* the void. # Let them pin you and you were dead. [2011 FIC]
c. He'd *barked* instructions *from* the backseat, where he and Kelog pored over a soggy map and planned intricate double-backs. [2001 FIC]
d. Then he *barked* something *at* the man to his left, who rose from inspecting mirror fragments in the sand. [2012 FIC]

This relation, though, is not bidirectional. Verbs that we have classified in the L category are not used with D, MP, or EP constructions. Verbs in the D category are not used with MP or EP constructions, but they are used with the L constructions. MP verbs are not used with EP constructions, but they are used with L and D constructions. And finally, the EP verbs are used with all the other constructions, L, D, and MP. Table 1 shows the 186 MoS verb entries grouped according to their maximum degree of path elaboration as they emerged from the randomized corpus analysis.

This means thus that, as in the case of (11) *bark*, verbs which allow for the maximum degree of path elaboration EP, also allow for the other constructions and are at the top of the hierarchical scale. Table 2 clarifies this relation by listing the verbs according to the range of possible use. It shows the results we found for the 158 verb entries; 85% allow L constructions (which is the sum of L, D, MP, and EP), 83% allow D (which is the sum of D, MP, and EP), 72% allow MP (which is the sum of MP and EP), and 51% allow EP.

The EP category is the most complex, in that verbs in this category allow one to follow the mental map of the speaking event path through the satellite clustering. Category L is the lowest on the path elaboration scale. It is the least elaborated category, and it is the one for which we found the highest number of verbs allowing it.

In Section 4 we discuss these results in relation to what previous research on motion events suggests about English. We then describe the conceptual processes lying behind the fictive path of MoS verbs.

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Location <	Direction <	Minimum Path <	Elaborated Path

Fig. 1. Dynamic continuum of path elaboration.

TABLE 1. *186 MoS verb entries grouped according to the maximum degree of path elaboration*

Category	Verb entries	# of verb entries	%
not found	Carp (2), Chirrup, Decry, Drivel, Ejaculate, Objurgate, Palaver, Perorate, Rap (1), Rouse, Shrill, Sibilate, Singsong, Snuffle, Spiel, Squabble, Squall, Susurrate, Thunder, Thrum, Twaddle, Twang, Twitter, Ululate, Vociferate, Whoop, Wrangle, Yak	28	15%
L	Carol, Patter, Rabbit	3	2%
D	Bay, Bemoan, Bloviate, Boast, Brag, Exclaim, Gabble, Gripe, Grouch, Grunt (1), Gush, Hail, Hoot (2), Jaw (1), Jaw (2), Kvetch, Rap (2), Retort (2),Tattle, Yap, Yowl	21	11%
MP	Admonish, Babble, Badger, Bellyache, Berate, Buzz, Chitchat, Confabulate, Declaim, Din, Drawl, Drone, Drool, Groan, Lilt, Lisp, Maunder, Mouth (2), Mouth (3), Mumble, Mutter, Pipe, Prod, Purr, Quack, Shriek, Snap, Snivel, Snort, Sob, Spout, Sputter, Squeal, Stumble, Trill, Trumpet, Wail, Whimper, Yammer, Yodel	40	21%
EP	Bark, Bawl, Bellow, Bicker, Bitch, Blab, Blare, Blather, Bleat, Blubber, Blurt, Boom, Bray, Bumble, Burble, Cackle, Call, Carp (1), Chant, Chat, Chatter, Chide, Chipper, Chirp, Clack, Clamor, Coo, Croak, Croon, Crow, Cry, Discourse, Falter, Gab, Gibber, Growl, Grumble, Grunt (2), Harangue, Hiss, Holler, Hoot (1), Howl, Intone, Jabber, Jeer, Lament, Moan, Mock, Mouth (1), Murmur, Nag, Natter, Orate, Pant, Peal, Plead, Pontificate, Prate, Prattle, Rage, Rail, Ramble, Rant, Rattle, Rave (1), Rave (2), Rave (3), Retort (1), Roar, Rumble, Schmooze, Scold, Scream, Screech, Sermonize, Shout, Sigh, Slur, Snarl, Spit, Splutter, Squawk, Squeak, Stammer, Storm, Stutter, Waffle, Wheedle, Wheeze, Whine, Whisper, Yell, Yelp	94	51%

4. Discussion

4.1. PATH WINDOWING

As far as the partitioning of the speaking event is concerned, MoS verbs allow both single windowing (Table 3) and combined windowing (Table 4) of the path. Table 3 illustrates each type of single windowing (initial, medial, and final).

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 2. *Results for each category*

Category	Total percentage
Location	85%
Direction	83%
Minimum Path	72%
Elaborated Path	51%

TABLE 3. *Single windows*

Initial windowing	"You have got all the luck in the world", Wanda *grumbles from* the next bed. [2004 FIC]
Medial windowing	On my way out I pass an old man scratching his arm as he *raves through* an open compartment, "How can you be out of fish sandwiches?" [2006 FIC]
Final windowing	This evening, we will look at how three conservatives and three liberals, all of whom *bloviate on* the radio, are handling the presidential race. [2008 SPOK]

In Table 3, initial windowing is indicated by *grumbles from*. It windows one's attention to the 'point of departure' of the fictive path in the speaking event. The medial windowing is represented by *raves through,* which focuses on the 'central part' of the fictive path. The final windowing is expressed by *bloviate on,* which focuses on the 'point of arrival' of the fictive path in the speaking event.

Going back to our distinction of degrees of path elaboration, the verbs in our four categories all permit single windowing. On the other hand, combined windowing is allowed in the categories of MP and EP. MP, however, is unique because it includes both verbs that allow only single windowing and verbs that allow combined windowing. Table 4 illustrates the various possible combinations of windowing.

The first example of initial–medial windowing expressed through *blurted … from across* describes the departure point *from* of the utterance pronounced by *someone* (the Figure) and moving towards the central part of the path *across the room* (the Ground), gapping the endpoint of arrival. Initial–final windowing is indicated by *chippered away at*, that focuses the attention on the point of departure *away* [from] 'Myrta' and the point of arrival *at anyone*, without explicitly describing the central portion of the path. The medial–final windowing is articulated by *mouthed … to … across* that gaps the departure point, drawing attention to the point of arrival *to her* and the central portion of the path *across the table*. The last and most complex combined window is initial–medial–final, also called

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

TABLE 4. *Combined windows*

Initial–medial windowing	"Hey you're the guy" *blurted* someone *from across* the room where I was sitting, holding my portfolio. [1993 MAG]
Initial–final windowing	Myrta, the city clerk, had *chippered away at* anyone who would listen about the call she'd gotten from some man wanting to know about farm property for sale. [2008 FIC]
Medial–final windowing	His way of giving approval, like when he *mouthed* the words *to* her *across* the table at a division meeting, cocking his head to the side, as if approving of a well chosen investment. [2000 FIC]
Initial–medial–final	"What does your father do?" Pinky had *squeaked at* the kid *from across* the reject's table *in* the dining hall during the first week at lunchtime. [2005 FIC]

maximal windowing (Talmy, 2000, p. 266), which describes each portion of the path from the beginning *from* 'Pinky', through the middle *across the reject's table*, to the end *at the kid … in the dining hall*. Thus, the maximal window example from Table 4 is exemplified by *squeaked at … from across … in*.

In the following section the link between path elaboration and the conceptualization process is discussed.

4.2. SENSORY PATH AND CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR

Considering the speaking event in terms of a fictive path that is elaborated according to the specific communicative need, it is useful to describe the embodied perspective. All humans perceive the speaking event as a primary experience that is characterized by three entities: the speaker, the speaking event itself, and the speech receiver. The speaking event involves three processes: the generation and emanation from the speaker, the motion of the speech/sound along a fictive path, and the impingement or reception of the speech/sound by the receiver/listener. The speech event path is a subtype of the Emanation Path defined by Talmy (2000, p. 115) as a Sensory Path, as in (2d), see Section 1. An opposite directional example is:

(12) I can hear/smell him all the way from where he is standing.

The sensory path involves the conceptualization of "something intangible moving in a straight path between the two entities in one direction or another" (Talmy, 2000, p. 115). In the case of sound there is nothing to be seen, but the sound is felt or sensed as present and moving in clearly localized space in either direction: (13a) listener perspective and (13b) speaker perspective. The sound of speech travels through materials (13c) and in space (13d).

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(13) a. As I was walking in, someone *screamed out from across* the street, "How's Anne?" [2002 NEWS]
b. "Three guesses who's here," she *trilled into* the telephone. [1996 FIC]
c. I would have to *scold* her *through* the plastic curtain, mop in hand, my view blurred by drops and rivulets on the curtains. [1990 FIC]
d. It seemed that in my obsession, I'd lost all proportion. I was *yodeling* stuff *across* the street. I was not of right mind. [2006 FIC]

Moreover, the conceptualization of fictivity vs. factivity is in keeping with Conceptual Metaphor Theory (cf. Kövecses, 2010; Lakoff, 1990; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, 1999; Lakoff & Turner, 1989), as clarified by Talmy (2000).

> Metaphor theory […] accords readily with general fictivity. The source domain and the target domain of a metaphor supply the two discrepant representations. The representation of an entity within the target domain is understood as factive and more veridical. The representation from the source domain that is mapped onto the entity in the target domain, on the other hand, is understood as fictive and less veridical. (Talmy, 2000, p. 168)

Duly 'A is B' is fictive and 'A is not B' is factive. The metaphorical concept is fictive. It is pervasive in thought and not a mere rhetorical figure (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Today the conceptual metaphor/metonym base of language is seen as having an embodied neural foundation (Feldman, 2008). It is considered a cognitive mechanism that replicates the mechanics of neural connections between domains of our brains.

Hence, we argue that Conceptual Metaphor Theory is fundamental in motivating human understanding of the speaking event in the projected structure of Figure, Ground, and Path (see Section 2). The domain of speaking is conceptualized through the 'CONDUIT metaphor', which is further elaborated with our conceptualization of the speech event as PERCEPTION IS RECEPTION, where the source domain is RECEPTION, GETTING, POSSESSION, and the target domain is PERCEPTION, PERCEIVING, SEEING, SMELLING, *HEARING*. As explained specifically in the Master Metaphor List:

> Note: The perception is understood as traveling from the outside to the experiencer. Notice we do not have separate words for sensory experience as perceived apart from stimulus: 'That is a wonderful view/sight/smell/sound', 'I experienced a wonderful view/sight/smell/sound'. (Lakoff, Espenson, Goldberg, & Schwartz, 1991, p. 127)

The concept of speech/sound moving along a path is intrinsic to the conceptualization of communication: speaking or sending, and hearing or receiving, is established through a primary image schema. Thus the distinction

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the ever-present fictive motion path in MoS utterances as identified in this paper is possible to varying degrees of elaboration and windowing of the event. Image schemas are the simple cognitive structures that organize our bodily interaction with the world, and our non-bodily experience via metaphor (Lakoff, 1990, p. 453). The CONDUIT image schema – both a container and an extended linear path – on which an individual bases communication conceptualization is further designated according to interaction with other image schemas. The CONTAINER schema that is employed in the CONDUIT metaphor, in terms both of our minds and of the linguistic expression itself, gives us a series of schematic mental representations of the 'CONTAINER ' that fit with *in*, *out*, *into*, *out of*, the 'SURFACE' *on*, *off*, the 'SCALE' *path* and the 'SPACE' *up*, *down*, *from*, *to*, *at*, *away*, *front*, *back*, *through*, *over*, and *about*. These are all satellites that make the realization of path explicit.

5. Conclusion

This study presents a descriptive analysis of fictive path as it is realized in the domain of MoS verbs. Although the Talmyan notion of fictive path has been applied to domains different from that of motion (cf. Cifuentes-Férez, 2006; Slobin, 2008), to the best of our knowledge this study is the first that applies this notion to the domain of speaking. This was possible due to a previous in-depth analysis carried out on English MoS verbs (Vergaro et al., unpublished observations). The study is based on authentic data. Through a comprehensive qualitative analysis we have identified the existence and the type of fictive path in contemporary American English for 186 MoS verb entries.

Although the study may be considered preliminary, the results suggest that, from the cognitive point of view, MoS verb fictive paths are motivated by conceptual organization through primary image schemas. The CONDUIT metaphor represents a primary image schema of a linear path that moves between the speaker and the listener, being therefore the conceptual grounding of the presence of fictive path in the speaking event process. The various kinds of SCALE/SPACE/PATH image schemas have been illustrated in relationship to the notion of path windowing of MoS fictive path. When people use satellites combined with prepositional phrases to express fictive path, the choice of windowing one part or the whole path has to be made. Windowing is an aspect of the cognitive process involved in the focusing of attention. The mental elaboration of paths is based on the representation of spatial relations according to abstract image schemas. This highlights the correlation between the use of satellites with the MoS verbs and the cognitive processing of the speaking event. Thus, the conceptual basis of COMMUNICATION IS TRANFER that is manifested via the CONDUIT

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

metaphor constrains the use of these verbs with fictive path constructions which may be implicit, though they are regularly made explicit.

The results of the study show that among the various types of fictive paths envisaged by Talmy (2000), MoS verbs realize paths falling into the category of Emanation (sensory) Path. This category allows both single and combined windowing of the path. A preference for combined windowing may be motivated by the English characteristic of being an S-framed language, which allows the encoding of Path in a very granular way. However, further research is needed to confirm this behavior.

Due to the objective of this study, which was to see how and to what extent fictive motion is realized in the frame of speaking, quantification of the occurrence of *each* type of path for *each* verb goes beyond our present scope. Research to verify the number of the combinations of the various satellites for each verb remains for future investigation.

REFERENCES

Cifuentes-Férez, P. (2006). La expresión de los dominios de movimiento y visión en inglés y en español desde la perspectiva de la Lingüìstica Cognitiva. (Unpublished MA thesis) University of Murcia, Spain.

Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feldman, J. A. (2008 [2006]). *From molecule to metaphor: a neural theory of language*. Cambridge, MA / London: MIT Press.

Johnson, M. (1990 [1987]). *The body in the mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kövecses, Z. (2010 [2002]). *Metaphor: a practical introduction*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, G. (1990 [1987]). *Women, fire and dangerous things: what categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., Espenson, J., Goldberg, A., & Schwartz, A. (1991 [1989]). The Master Metaphor List: University of California Berkeley, online: <http://araw.mede.uic.edu/~alansz/metaphor/METAPHORLIST.pdf>.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh*. New York: Basic Books.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003 [1980]). Afterword. In *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More than cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1986). Abstract motion. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 445–471). Berkeley, CA: University of Berkeley.

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar*. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Levin, B. (1993). *English verb classes and alternations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Matsumoto, Y. (1996a). How abstract is subjective motion? A comparison of access path expressions and coverage path expressions. In A. Goldberg (Ed.), *Conceptual structure, discourse and language* (pp. 359–373). Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Matsumoto, Y. (1996b). Subjective motion and English and Japanese verbs. *Cognitive Linguistics*, **7**(2), 183–226.

Mufwene, S. S. (1978). English manner-of-speaking verbs revisited. In D. Farkas, W. M. Jacobsen, & K. W. Todrys (Eds.), *Parasession on the lexicon* (pp. 278–288). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Reddy, M. J. (1979 [1993]). The conduit metaphor – a case of frame conflict in our language about language. In A. Ortony (Ed.), *Metaphor and thought*, 2nd ed. (pp. 164–201). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rojo, A., & Valenzuela, J. (2001). How to say things with words: ways of saying in English and Spanish. *META*, **46**(3), 467–477.
Slobin, D. (1996). From 'thought and language' to 'thinking for speaking'. In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 70–96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Slobin, D. (1997). Mind, code, and text. In J. Bybee, J. Haiman, & S. A. Thompson (Eds.), *Essays on language function and language type: dedicated to T. Givón* (pp. 437–467). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Slobin, D. (2008). Relations between paths of motion and paths of vision: a crosslinguistic and developmental exploration". In V. M. Gathercole (Ed.), *Routes to language: studies in honor of Melissa Bowerman* (pp. 197–221). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Snell-Hornby, M. (1983). *Verb-descriptivity in German and English: a contrastive study in semantic fields*. Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitatsverlag.
Talmy, L. (1996). Fictive motion in language and 'ception'. In P. Bloom, M. A. Peterson, L. Nadel, & M. F. Garrett (Eds.), *Language and space* (pp. 211–276). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics. Vol. I: concept structuring systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Urban, M., & Ruppenhofer, J. (2001). Shouting and screaming: manner and noise verbs in communication. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, **16**(1), 73–94.
Zwicky, A. M. (1971). In a manner of speaking. *Linguistic Inquiry*, **2**, 223–233.

https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2014.12 Published online by Cambridge University Press