

Fictive Motion: Construction or Construal?

JOSEF RUPPENHOFER
Universität Hildesheim

1. Introduction

This paper seeks to develop an understanding of why a certain class of motion sentence, exemplified by (1), is unattested both in large corpora such as the British National Corpus (BNC)¹ and on the Internet.

(1) ?#The road **arrives** ∅.

Sentence (1) is special in that, on the intended reading, it represents a peculiar constellation of semantic and pragmatic features that together result in low acceptability (or at least low frequency of use) even though individually the features seem unproblematic. First, sentence (1) is an instance of fictive construal of motion. While the core use of motion verbs, exemplified in (2) and (3) below, is to present the motion of an entity which actually moves, possibly portrayed relative to one or more stationary locations, the fictive use consists of applying a motion verb to a stationary entity, usually a potentially traversable path, to indicate its location or topology, without any assumption of actually ongoing travel along the path (Matlock 2004a, 2004b, Matsumoto 1996, Talmy 2000, *inter alia*).^{2, 3} In addition to actual and fictive motion uses, motion verbs have at least two other types of uses, shown in (4) to (7). In sentences (4) and (5), an instance of what I call *relative motion*, there is a reversal in the presentation of the actually moving Theme and the stationary Location such that the Location is construed as moving and the Theme as stationary. Sentences (6) and (7) are instances of what Talmy calls the pattern-path type of fictive motion, in which the resulting path entity comes into being as a result of some ongoing process (2000:128-130).

¹ The British National Corpus is a 100-million word, genre-balanced corpus of spoken and written British English (<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk>).

² I thank Michael Ellsworth, Charles Fillmore, Shweta Narayan, and Laura Michaelis for their comments on this work. All remaining errors are, of course, my own.

³ Other terms used for this phenomenon are abstract, virtual, and subjective motion.

Actual motion

- (2) The dog **ran** into the kitchen.
- (3) Then about 15 minutes later another man **arrived** at Saint Mary's hospital.

Relative motion

- (4) I was fascinated at the speed with which the telegraph poles **raced** by.
- (5) After passing through two ... tunnels the road finally **arrives** Ø.

Pattern-path

- (6) A thin line of yellow highlighter ink **inched** down my colleague's chin as he pointed to question 9.
- (7) The farmers will sell their land once the road **arrives** Ø.

Note that although they are sometimes easily confused with fictive motion uses, the relative-motion and pattern-path uses are to be distinguished from the fictive uses and will be of secondary interest here.

The second important semantic feature of sentence (1) is that like *come*, *leave*, *depart*, *pass*, and *cross*, the verb *arrive* is a location-oriented motion (LOM) verb. It inherently profiles a location, specifically a Goal, with respect to which the motion is described. Motion verbs like *go*, *hop*, or *zigzag* and many others do not profile a location in the same way. The third respect in which sentence (1) is special is that it exhibits the phenomenon of definite null instantiation (DNI). That is, in (1) the conceptually obligatory Goal location is omitted because it is assumed to be retrievable from the physical context or prior discourse (Fillmore 1986). A fourth noteworthy attribute of sentence (1) is that it has a discourse-given subject referent coded by a definite NP.

That none of the above features is by itself a cause of ungrammaticality or unacceptability is shown by examples (8)-(11), all featuring LOM-verbs.

- (8) After some steep turns the road **arrives** in the valley itself. (+definite subject (def.), +fictive (fict.), -DNI)
- (9) The solution occurred to me right before the examiner **arrived** Ø. (+def., -fict., +DNI)
- (10) A path **arrives** Ø from the south and is joined by a smaller one that heads down an embankment to the river east and below. (-def. +fict., +DNI)
- (11) The slip road **leaves** Ø at an almost 90 degree angle with no deceleration lane. (+def., +fict., +DNI)

The acceptability of sentence (11), headed by the verb *leave*, which profiles a particular Source location, shows that the constellation of features found in (1) is acceptable with at least some location-oriented motion verbs (see section 2.7.).

What then are we to make of the fact that sentences like (1) are not attested? I will argue that, appearances notwithstanding, the lack of attestation of sentences like (1) is owed neither to an unmotivated lexical idiosyncrasy of *arrive* nor to a

constraint imposed by the fictive construal or by any of the other features mentioned above, but rather to the interaction of various factors with the establishment of a point-of-view.

2. Potential explanations

What motivation is there to be found for the overall distribution of null instantiation with fictive uses of location-oriented motion verbs? Here I will discuss possible explanations in terms of (1) the frequency of fictive construal, (2) polysemy, (3) aspect, (4) the pragmatic role of the referents, (5) the discourse status of the referents and the discourse function of fictive motion sentences, (6) the discourse status of the referents and the point-of-view of the utterances, and (7) the semantics of the lexical items. I will argue for the importance of the last two factors: the POV of the utterances and the lexical semantics of the predicates.

2.1. Frequency of fictive construal

In studying fictive uses of LOM-verbs like *arrive*, two frequency facts are noticeable. First, even including uses with overt location referents, the fictive motion construal itself is relatively rare for verbs such as *arrive*, *leave*, and *cross*, especially in comparison to motion verbs like *zigzag* or *meander*, which inherently specify a particular path-shape. This is illustrated by the counts in (12)

(12) Frequency of fictive construal (random samples from BNC)

Verb type	Verb lemma	# of fictive (% of fictive)	Sample size
Self-motion	skip	0 (0.0)	89
	hop	1 (1.2)	82
LOM	arrive	0 (0.0)	100
	enter	3 (3.2)	94
	exit	3 (3.3)	91
	pass	15 (10.9)	137
	cross	12 (12.0)	100
Path-shape	zigzag	10 (26.3)	38
	meander	49 (42.2)	116
	snake	48 (48.0)	100

That fictive uses of LOM-verbs are rare is also suggested by an examination of sentences randomly sampled from the BNC in which the NP *the road* occurs as the subject of a motion verb. The majority of tokens in the sample (n=115) are contributed by the verbs *lead*, *run*, and *climb* and the frames Cotheme, Self-motion, Motion, and Motion-directional. Only 16 instances belong to the LOM-subtypes Arriving, Departing, and Traversing. Similar results were found for other subject NP candidates such as *the path*, *the highway*, etc.

The second relevant frequency fact is that for location-oriented motion verbs, DNI is in fact much rarer in fictive contexts than in actual-motion contexts. For instance, of 200 uses of the sequence *the highway passes* that were randomly sampled from the Google search engine, none exhibited null instantiation of the Landmark location, whereas in a random sample of actual-motion uses (n=100) of *pass* from the British National Corpus (BNC), 25% of the Landmarks are omitted. Similarly, in a random sample (n=125) of the sequence *the road arrives* taken from the Google search engine, only 7 (5.6%) Goals were omitted, whereas the Goal omission rate among all actual-motion uses of *arrive* is 62.2% in the BNC. And in fact, all 7 uses of *the road arrives* lacking a Goal are instances of the pattern-path use seen in (6) and (7) rather than of the fictive motion use.

Despite these frequency facts, it seems that the oddness of such sentences is not simply due to the rareness with which they are encountered, given that similar sentences such as (10) and (11), which are also rare, seem perfectly acceptable.

2.2. Polysemy

One way of accounting for the absence of sentences like (1) is to treat fictive uses, at least of LOM verbs, as cases of polysemy. The fictive-motion use of *arrive* would thus be a different sense from the actual-motion use. As a separate sense, the lexical entry for the fictive sense of *arrive* could require overt instantiation of the Goal location. The analysis of *arrive* would thus be similar to that of *complain*: while the medical sense of *complain* ‘state that one is suffering from a symptom of illness’, disallows DNI, the general sense of *complain* ‘express dissatisfaction or annoyance’, does allow DNI. Example (13) is interpreted rather differently depending on whether the *of*-PP is included or not. Similarly, *win* in (14) can have the sense ‘achieve’ only when occurring with an overt object NP.

- (13) Has a patient ever **complained** (*of “feeling hotter” with sunscreens)?
 (14) Our negotiators **won** (*language that calls for ... a toll-free line).

A polysemy analysis of fictive motion sentences is, however, unsatisfying. First, since fictive motion sentences like (10) are acceptable, it would not be descriptively adequate for a fictive motion sense of *arrive* to require overt instantiation of the Goal location. But, while workable, positing two fictive entries with Goal omissibility conditioned on the discourse status of the Theme seems arbitrary. Second, fictive uses of motion verbs are far too regular and productive to be either polysemous senses or to arise just as patterns of analogical coinage.⁴

2.3. Aspect

Unlike actual-motion uses, fictive uses are stative. Maybe stativity makes DNI less acceptable? This is false because there are acceptable fictive uses of LOM-

⁴ It should be noted, however, that there are specifically fictive verbs such as *taper* and *jut*. Thus, not all fictive motion uses are productively formed from verbs of (actual) motion.

verbs with DNI that differ only in POV, e.g. *A path arrives \emptyset from the south*. Also, stativity actually goes rather well with DNI omissions (Ruppenhofer 2004).

2.4. Retrievability

Another attempt at explanation targets the discourse status of the Location rather than its pragmatic role. More specifically, fictive-motion uses of LOM verbs may be constrained to occur only when speakers newly introduce the locations into the discourse, as in (15). Since DNI requires prior mention or contextual accessibility, there are few fictive uses of location-oriented motion verbs with zero locations.

- (15) The Long Range Mountains come into view around Deer Lake. In the island's interior, you pass many small lakes (called "ponds"), rocky outcroppings, and unique ecosystems. The highway **passes** Springdale, Grand Falls, and Bishop's Falls before heading in an easterly direction.

However, given that examples such as *A path arrives \emptyset from the south* (cf. 10) are attested, this explanation falls short: in these sentences it is the road that is newly introduced while the Goal location is given and highly discourse-active.

2.5. Narrow focus

Another hypothesis is that most location referents in fictive uses of location-oriented motion verbs are in narrow focus and therefore cannot be omitted due to a general principle barring omission of focal material. However, most of the fictive uses of location-oriented motion verbs are topic-comment rather than narrow-focus predications. Example (15) above, for instance, does not presuppose a propositional function of the form 'The highway passes x' (Lambrecht 1994). An account in terms of narrow focus is therefore not feasible.

2.6. Point-of-view

As we have seen, general information-structural properties do not explain the absence of fictive uses of LOM-verbs with the Theme's point-of-view (POV). We may now ask whether the problem has to do with the POV that the non-occurring kinds of sentences would have. By POV, I mean the viewing arrangement of the reported fictive motion scene: roughly speaking, whether, in a filmic portrayal, the camera is at the location, attached to the Theme, or external to both.⁵

2.6.1. Actual motion

In particular, we may hypothesize (1) that only one POV is allowed at any given time and (2) that null complementation with the POV on the Theme is unacceptable because the intended POV on the Theme clashes with the point-of-view on the

⁵ If one assumes a theory of language that grounds language understanding in mental simulation, as does Embodied Construction Grammar (Bergen & Chang 2005), the choice of camera angle as a translation of linguistic POV seems an apt one.

Goal that is strongly cued by the null instantiation.⁶ To evaluate this proposal let us begin by considering the factors that influence POV in actual-motion sentences. The POV assigned to an actual-motion sentence built around *arrive* is influenced by several different factors. One is the presence of cognitive or perceptual predicates in the context that strongly suggest continuity of a particular POV. In (16), an act of perception/cognition by the Theme is reported as coinciding with (and being caused by) the Theme's arrival, suggesting that the arrival is also to be envisioned from the Theme's point-of-view.

- (16) When he **arrived** Ø, he found other boys were in the forest, boys like him, forced from their villages while they were in fields tending cattle.

There need not be any explicit evocation of perception or cognition by a particular participant or external viewer. Certain facts are inherently, or most plausibly within the context, accessible only to particular participants. For instance, in (17), the knowledge that she is at home alone is accessible only to Pethammal at the time of the police's arrival. The viewpoint thus cannot be with the police but has to be that of Pethammal or of an external viewer.

- (17) At least six policemen and a villager forced their way into Pethammal's house. Pethammal was alone sleeping when the policemen **arrived** Ø ...

In addition to the cues above, the choice of NP form type for both the Theme and the Location also contributes to the selection of a POV. Consider the following set of sentences, in which the form-type of the Theme NP is varied.

- (18) A man **arrived** at the house.
(19) The police **arrived** at the house.
(20) We **arrived** at the house.

With its indefinite subject, sentence (18) has to be interpreted such that the house is the point-of-view and the man is portrayed as arriving at it. In the consciousness of the viewer at the house, the arriving man is a new entity and has to be encoded accordingly as an indefinite NP. This interpretation follows from Lambrecht's (1994) Principle of the Separation of Reference and Role which says that introducing a referent and simultaneously predicating of it anything other than its existence of presence in a scene, is strongly dispreferred. Using the first person plural *we* as subject, (20), normally has to describe a situation in which the referents of *we* are the point-of-view, since the group includes the speaker. A reading with the POV on the location is possible, for instance, when the sentence is uttered while watching a surveillance video of the house: the speaker may then

⁶ More strictly speaking, within a mental spaces framework (Sweetser & Fauconnier 1996) we might say that only one POV per mental space is allowed.

notice him- or herself among the group of arriving persons. With the NP *the police* as subject, sentence (19) can describe a situation in which the POV is with the police and one in the POV is at the Goal location.

Consider now a set of examples varying the form type of the Goal.

- (21) Five minutes later, John **arrived** at a house.
- (22) Five minutes later, John **arrived** at the house.
- (23) Five minutes later, John **arrived** there.
- (24) Five minutes later, John **arrived** \emptyset .

With the indefinite NP *a house* as Goal, example (21) requires that the point-of-view follow John and that we discover the house with him. With the NP *the house* as Goal, (22) allows three different readings: John, somebody at the destination, or an external viewer. The last version, (24), with a zero Goal, has the same readings as the version with the Goal NP *the house*. With the adverb *there* as Goal, sentence (23) is most easily interpreted with the POV away from the Goal location and on John or an external viewer. Given the right narrative set-up, a reading with the point-of-view on the Goal location is, however, possible, too.

The sets of examples considered just now suggest that the POV cannot be put on inaccessible referents. Inaccessible referents are frequently encoded by indefinite NPs but note that not all indefinite NPs have inaccessible referents. In particular, generically interpreted indefinite NPs, as in (25), can be interpreted as accessible, given that they refer only to the type rather than a particular instance.

- (25) In this neighborhood, when a policeman **arrives** at a house,
 - a. he'll usually be very worried. (policeman's POV)
 - b. the occupants run as soon as they see him approach. (occupants' POV)

2.6.2. Fictive motion

Against the background of actual-motion sentences, the missing cases of DNI with fictive motion might now be explained as follows. The road/path or highway itself is not a viable point-of-view since it does not denote a conscious participant or the static location of one. Fictive motion uses often imply a sentient Theme, favorable for point-of-view status, but that Theme is not represented by an overt NP, let alone an argument of the predicate. The implicit Theme thus has very low discourse prominence. By contrast, the location, as a definite zero, has a highly discourse active referent and readily serves as the POV. Under this account, the non-occurring sentences—fictive uses with location DNI and POV on the Theme—are avoided because they would involve a POV clash between the Location and the Theme.

Note that the account given for the unattested sentences is also compatible with cases such as (26) where we have the POV on the implicit Theme at the same time as having a definite Goal location.

- (26) Winding its way around bay after magical bay, the highway **arrives** in Gisborne, where Captain James Cook made ... landfall in 1769.

What is relevant to the POV selection is activation status rather than mere identifiability. In (26), the Goal location is a uniquely identifiable referent but not a discourse-active one. It is thus not a viable POV and the POV of the sentence can be assigned to the implicit Theme. In fact, it seems that the Theme's point-of-view is too weak only when the Goal is a zero-coded referent. When the location is a definitely-coded referent with a prior mention, as in (27), the point-of-view of the implicit Theme can still prevail.

- (27) The trail steeply descends for about 0.8 mile to the road, **crosses** it, evens up and in 0.2 mile reaches Cold Creek Trail.

The activation-status analysis of POV is of course also consistent with pattern-path uses like (28), where the POV is on the Goal location and there is movement of the road surface during construction.

- (28) The farmers will sell their land once the road **arrives** \emptyset . (=7)

Let us return now to the problem of the missing fictive sentences where location DNI combines with POV on the implicit Theme. Consider examples (29)-(32), which are constructed to suggest a reading with the POV on the Theme.

- (29) The road goes over a dozen bridges before it **arrives** in Oakley.
(30) The road from here to Oakley crosses a dozen bridges before it **arrives** \emptyset .
(31) How do I get to Oakley?
a. Well, there's a road you could take. It goes over a dozen bridges before it **arrives** \emptyset .
b. Well, there's a road you could take. It goes over a dozen bridges before it **arrives** \emptyset , so you have to pay a lot of toll.
(32) Where does this road lead to?
a. It goes to Oakley. You should take a drive there. The road is a lot of fun. It winds through the mountains for miles before it **arrives** \emptyset .

These sentences are interpretable and, though unfamiliar, they probably are acceptable to most speakers. What is it that makes these sentences acceptable, especially compared to simpler ones like (33)? And why aren't they as readily interpreted as very simple actual-motion sentences such as (34)? (We will ignore here the reading of (33) as a relative-motion sentence where the actual Theme is treated as stationary and the highway intersection as approaching.)

- (33) ?? Get on I80 and stay on it. {The highway/it} **arrives** \emptyset after two hours.

(34) I **arrived** Ø.

There seem to be two considerations that contribute to the greater acceptability of (30)-(32). First, they seem to be aided by the strong contextual support for a sustained point-of-view of a Theme, who may be generic or an actual person that considers traveling along the path. For instance, evoking the paying of toll or mentioning that the addressee could take the trip help promote the implicit Theme to greater prominence.

Second, note that LOM-verbs are achievements and entail a change of state of the Theme. When such a change is highlighted, the Theme is a likelier point-of-view. The examples above were constructed purely to improve acceptability but unwittingly emphasized the run-up to the Goal through the use of a fictive, durative main verb, with *arrive* in a dependent *before*-clause. Simple assertions like *The road {arrives/arrived} Ø* are difficult to process because they lack any evocation of a Theme. Also, unlike a sentence like *This road goes to San Jose*, such sentences are not plausibly understood as asserting that a road goes by a certain place because such a reading ignores the Theme's transition upon arrival.

2.7. Lexical differences

As we have seen, not all LOM verbs act like *arrive*. With *exit* and *leave*, there are attested examples such as (35) and (36) that have a null instantiated Source and that involve fictive motion. These uses seem to be possible because, in the departure case, the Theme's point-of-view overlaps with that of a perceiver at the Source location. With verbs like *arrive* and *come*, this is not possible.

(35) U.S. 23 southbound enters Interstate 75 northbound and continues to the next interchange (Exit 193), where the highway **leaves** [the interstate, JR] in tandem with U.S. 20 to Stony Ridge and Lemoyne.

(36) The road **exits** [the Rouge Valley, JR] into the Pickering side of the Rouge Valley area.

Note incidentally that the difference between *arrive* and *depart* also plays a role with pattern-path uses. While *arrive* and *come* have such uses, *leave* and *depart* seem to lack them. Compare (7) to (37). A parallel asymmetry exists between the verbs *enter* and *exit*.

(7) The farmers will sell their land once the road **arrives** Ø.

(37) ?#The construction workers' camp will be moved south once the road **leaves** Ø.

The explanation for the difference seems to lie in the fact that the events of arrival allow for a higher-level construal of the scene as coming into existence of a road-connection, whereas the beginning of construction or the idea of boundary crossing do not entail a road connection for the relevant locations. Note that the same

difference in interpretational affordances is also observed when verbs of motion are used with actually moving entities.

- (38) The door opened and into the room **walked** a small man.
(39) ... as I was getting low to get more good air, all of the sudden, out of the room **walked** a big, hairy, smelly, rodent-looking ...

Both (38) and (39) have presentational readings—enforced in fact by the inversion construction. However, the presentational reading requires that the new referent is newly apprehended and therefore the POV must be inside the room in (38) and outside in (39). Sentence (39) thus differs from (37) in that the crossing of the portal by the creature entails its appearance as a new arrival on the outside whereas in the case of the road neither the road as a whole nor the most recently constructed part has left one place to appear at another. Finally, if we present events of a person entering or exiting a room with the point-of-view inside the room, then only the former case has a presentational reading. Disappearances and departures cannot be ‘presented’ in the same way as appearances and arrivals.⁷

- (39) All of a sudden a man **entered** Ø.
(40) #All of a sudden a man **left** Ø.

When used fictively, LOM verbs differ not only from each other but also from other motion verbs. Fictive motion simulates generic travel and generally no specific purposes and significant state changes of the implicit Theme are simulated, which conflicts with the normal use of LOM-verbs like *arrive* and *leave*. These verbs inherently imply a change of state and when it can be evoked in context, the fictive motion reading is improved (see section 2.6.2). Also, to the extent that fictive motion uses ascribe properties to paths, it seems that while path shape is readily ascribed to a fixed path, particular way points along the path are not readily seen as starting and end points for segments of potential travel.

Finally, I want to consider the question of whether the missing fictive sentences with LOM-verbs are tied specifically to these verbs’ lexical class membership or if we find similar gaps in available interpretations when we combine path-shape or manner verbs with PPs denoting Goal, Source, or intermediate Landmark locations. Sentences (41) and (42) represent clear cases of referent accessibility and POV interacting. Example (43) is the crucial test case for whether the incompatibility between fictive construal and mention of a bounding location such as Goal, Source, or intermediate Landmark exists at the compositional clausal level or at the level of the lexical predicate. In other words, the question is whether (43) can be used with the point-of-view of an implicit Theme.

⁷ Sentence (40) may have a presentational reading when imagined against the background of seeing the person leave but not in the context of noticing a previously filled seat.

- (41) A road **meanders** through the forest.
- (42) The road **meanders** through a forest.
- (43) The road **meanders** through \emptyset .

A web-search for *[tT]he road meanders through* yielded 1 instance among 200 matches in which the Landmark of the preposition was missing.

- (44) ... journey up into the High Atlas Mountains, traveling through very dramatic and rocky mountain scenery. The road **meanders** through \emptyset to the spectacular Tizi n' Tichka pass before dropping into Marrakesh.

Note, however, that in (44) there is an overtly specified Goal present in the form of a *to*-PP, reinforcing the POV of the implicit Theme. Inspection of 200 cases of *the road crosses \emptyset* and did not yield any cases where the POV was on the road with the Landmark location null-instantiated. Likewise, among 115 instances of *the road meanders past*, there were none that had a POV on the road and a null-instantiated Landmark. Given the available corpus evidence, there is thus some reason to believe that fictive uses in which path-shape verbs combine with a Goal, Source, or intermediate Landmark behave just like sentences with LOM-verbs when it comes to the need for a single consistent POV.

3. Conclusion

Location null-instantiation is possible when location-oriented motion verbs are used in actual-motion contexts. There, null-instantiated locations do not have to serve as the point-of view, leading one to expect that in fictive motion contexts the POV of the implicit Theme should be available when the location is null instantiated. However, in fact, location-oriented motion verbs readily only have fictive motion uses with zero locations when the point-of-view is at the location.

Made-up sentences such as (30)-(32) which contain fictive uses of verbs like *arrive* that have the implicit Theme as the POV do not seem incomprehensible or ungrammatical. However, such sentences do not seem to occur in the wild. The absence of such sentences cannot be derived in terms of the pragmatic properties of the road and location referents. Rather, a central part of the explanation seems to lie in the low activation status of the implicit Theme and the idea that the Theme and the location are competing for the status as sole point-of-view. The paucity of fictive motion uses of location-oriented motion verbs is then explained as a consequence of the low discourse accessibility of the implicit Themes. In fictive motion sentences, Themes make poor points-of-view and become acceptable only (1) in contexts where the point-of-view of the Theme and the Location accidentally overlap, as with verbs of departure, (2) contexts in which the Location is not highly discourse-active, in particular, when it is discourse-new, or (3) contexts in which the idea of a generic or potential Theme is particularly strongly evoked, also emphasizing their transition from moving to arriving.

On this account, positing polysemous verb senses or stipulating a construction requiring overt instantiation of the location in order to block DNI with POV on the Theme is not necessary. That sentences such as *The road arrived Ø* are rare or unattested thus has a similar explanation to the fact that sentences such as *A man arrived Ø* are hard to contextualize when the POV is assumed to be on the Theme.

The difference between location-oriented motion verbs and path-shape incorporating ones then consists in the former having an obligatory location argument that is competing with the implicit Theme for point-of-view status. When verbs like *zigzag* or *snake* are used without any overt location element, be it a Goal, Source, or Landmark, the Theme is the only available point-of-view; but with *arrive* and *leave*, the Goal and Source are always available as points of view.

Finally, with respect to methodology, this paper illustrates that very low corpus frequency of a phenomenon may be due to the rarity of occasions for using it rather than specific principles or constructions blocking them. The data considered here also show that we need refined theories of activation, and especially of POV to recognize the limits of their applicability.

References

- Bergen, Benjamin K., and Nancy C. Chang. 2005. Embodied Construction Grammar in Simulation-based Language Understanding. In Jan-Ola Östman and Mirjam Fried, eds., *Construction Grammar(s)*, 147-190. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1986. Pragmatically Controlled Zero Anaphora. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 12:95–107.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press.
- Matlock, Teenie. 2004a. The Conceptual Motivation of Fictive Motion. In Günther Radden and Klaus Uwe Panther, eds., *Studies in linguistic motivation*, 221–248. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matlock, Teenie. 2004b. Fictive Motion as Cognitive Simulation. *Memory & Cognition* 32:1389–1400.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1996. Subjective Motion and English and Japanese vVrbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 7:183-226.
- Ruppenhofer, Josef, 2004. The Interaction of Valence and Information Structure. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley.
- Sweetser, Eve, and Gilles Fauconnier, eds. 1996. *Spaces, Worlds, and Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, volume I: Concept Structuring Systems. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Josef Ruppenhofer
Institut für Informationswissenschaft und Sprachtechnologie
Universität Hildesheim
Marienburger Platz 22
D-31141 Hildesheim

josef.ruppenhofer@uni-hildesheim.de