

# **Tumbling buildings, wine aromas and tennis players: Fictive and metaphorical motion across genres.**

**Rosario Caballero (Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Spain)**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The use of motion verbs to convey a dynamic view of intrinsically static scenes and/or entities (e.g. *climbing* roads) has been well documented within cognitive linguistics. However, most research has focused on general and, often, de-contextualised language and has not gone beyond what is referred to as *fictive* or *abstract motion* (Talmy 1996, 2000; Matlock 2004; Langacker 1986, 1987; Matsumoto 1996), explaining the phenomenon as the result of cognitive operations which have nothing to do with metaphor as this is understood within the cognitive paradigm.

The present work explores motion verbs in tennis match reports, architectural reviews and tasting notes, and discusses their metaphorical quality since the target domains are not related to motion, but use elements from that domain to comment upon such abstract concepts as victory and defeat in tennis, as well as more concrete entities like wines and buildings. I am particularly concerned with how those topics are metaphorically rendered in texts. Thus, versus the mainstream view of the source domain as bearing the brunt in a metaphorical mapping, I will attempt to show that in order to analyse, interpret and understand metaphor the topic at issue –i.e. the target in the mapping– should not be neglected. However, this claim can only be sustained if metaphor is explored from a situated perspective, that is, one that narrows the study to a manageable and concrete discourse instance –e.g. one or several genres– and uses both real and abundant data –an endeavour that benefits greatly from the use of corpora.

## **2. THE RESEARCH**

The starting assumption in the research here summarized is that metaphor is sensitive to all the contextual factors determining its use. Thus, in order to understand its mechanics we need to take into account the topic(s) it helps articulate, the people using it, and the goals fulfilled by the interaction where it plays a role. Since all three –topic, participants and goal– are defining traits of genre, a concomitant approach is seen as worth trying in order to research metaphor. Accordingly, I chose three genres where metaphorical motion plays a role, namely, match reports (tennis), building reviews, and wine tasting notes. Despite their differences, these genres illustrate *reviewing* practices: their main goal is to describe and evaluate an event (a tennis match) or an entity (wine and buildings) for an audience that may or may not have any previous knowledge about them, yet is interested in having an assessment written by a knowledgeable source. This is particularly conspicuous in tennis match reports, which tell readers about an event they have –usually– already watched yet recreate it again in written form and make the audience relive all the action. In contrast, building reviews and tasting notes usually describe and evaluate new things for an audience so that they can appreciate them and, in the case of wines, buy them. Together with taking into account the goals shared by these genres, my choice was heavily influenced by the fact that motion verbs are abundantly used in all three. Moreover, with the exception of tennis where motion verbs are also used to refer to actual motion, those found in architectural reviews and tasting notes predicate such intrinsically static entities as buildings and wines.

The questions guiding the research were the following: (a) which metaphors are suggested by motion verbs? (b) what is the role played by such metaphors? and (c) do the verbs instantiate the same metaphors or are these affected by the genre where the verbs are used? In order to answer them I used three corpora representative of the genres under focus:

- 171 match reports covering the Australian Open 2009 (64,417 words) and retrieved from online sources –both the official site of the tournament and several sports sites)
- 95 architectural reviews (77,135 words) from six architecture magazines (*Architectural Record*, *Architectural Review*, *Architectural Design*, *Architecture*, *Architecture Australia*, and *Architecture SOUTH*)
- 12,000 tasting notes (491,822 words) from seven wine magazines, both written and online (*Decanter*, *Wine Enthusiast*, *Wine Spectator*, *The Wine Advocate*, *Wine News*, *The Wine Pages*, and *The Wine Anorak*)

The use of corpora is important since it ensures that (a) the research deals with real language use, (b) enough data can be scrutinized and, most importantly, (c) the phenomenon under analysis is not a mere accident in the texts but is recurrently used by certain communities. As to the verbs regarded as interesting research-wise, these included verbs denoting ‘change of location’ (e.g. *come*, *go*, *move*, *ride*, *swim*, *run*, *jump*, or *creep*) as well as less prototypical verbs which either occurred with particles which turned them into motion verbs (e.g. *scissor down*, *corbel out* from architectural texts) or where ‘motion’ was part and parcel of their semantics –irrespective of whether this was the core meaning of the verbs or conflated with other notions. The latter is the case with verbs concerned with ‘change of state’ such as *unfold*, *stretch* or *unfurl*, and verbs of ‘contact by impact’ like *kick* or *punch* –these usually followed by *in*, *off*, *up* and *through* in the texts under analysis. I also considered those verbs which implied that some sort of motion was being effected before or after the activity referred to by the verb (e.g. *halt*, *rest* or *stay*).

Finally, the verbs were grouped according to the meaning conveyed through them. This was a difficult task since motion verbs encode rich information on the particulars of the activity they refer to (e.g. direction or path, manner, ground or reference frame of the motion event etc.). To simplify things, I classified the verbs into four groups, namely path verbs, manner verbs, path + manner verbs, and other (the latter including verbs encoding motion explicit/implicit, ground, entity moving, cause, use of body part, etc.). In order to refine this first –broad– classification in agreement with the verbs’ semantic profile I drew upon work done on the topic within Cognitive Linguistics (Slobin 2006; Talmy 1996, 2000; Özcaliskan 2004; Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2006; Cifuentes 2009 inter alia).<sup>1</sup> The results from each corpus are shown below.

### 1.1. Motion in tennis match reports

The tennis corpus yielded 1387 instances of motion verbs, which were grouped as follows:

Motion information	Verbs <sup>2</sup>	Hits	%
PATH (some V+ particle)	emerge, rise, advance, enter, ascend, reach, fall, go out/down/up, move up/down	611	44%
PATH + MANNER (manner V + particle)	creep, march, stroll, blast, storm, power, roll, run, ease, bounce, motor, race, cruise, coast, edge, whistle, step, roar	399	28.8%
MANNER	pounce, dart, gallop, fly, rush, scramble, leap, sneak, stumble, slide, ride, scamper	69	5%
OTHER	move, remove, stay, stop, unseat, loom, hover, lead, crumble, crush, propel, hug, extend, cling, unleash	308	22.2%

Of course, since playing tennis involves movement the use of motion verbs in tennis commentary is far from surprising. However, the journalists’ choice of verb to express certain notions is worthy of consideration, as shown below:

<sup>1</sup> Both path and manner verbs have been subjected to much discussion, but this falls out of the scope of this paper. For a detailed overview of the topic see Cifuentes (2009).

<sup>2</sup> Due to space constraints, only some verbs are listed here

- (1) Safina reaches career-best in Australia  
Dinara Safina has advanced to the fourth round of the Australian Open for the first time, thrashing Estonian Kaia Kanepi in an easy 6-2 6-2 win on Friday.  
[...] Safina was all class from the beginning, sprinting to a 4-0 lead before Kanepi could settle into the match. [...] Safina continued to cruise in the second set, breaking the 23-year-old Estonian again and dashing to a 4-1 lead.
- (2) Roddick gallops past Robredo  
Andy Roddick has blitzed his way past Tommy Robredo 7-5 6-3 6-3 to comfortably reach the quarterfinals of Australian Open 2009.  
Roddick's victory would be a bitter pill to swallow for the Spaniard. Not only had he cruised to this stage of the draw by dropping only 18 games, but he has now lost to Roddick a staggering 10 consecutive times.

Motion verbs may be used to refer to the victories of the players involved (*gallop, blitz one's way, cruise*) as well as to their performance in the matches (*thrash, sprint, settle, cruise, dash, drop*) or in the tournament (*reach, advance, reach*). Understanding the event thus reported is important in order to discuss the role played by verbs encoding path, manner or both in tennis texts. Thus, a tennis tournament may consist of five or seven rounds (depending on its category); hence, the abundant use of path (or orientational) verbs to express the progression of players in the event is congruent with its staged and purposeful quality.

The path verbs found in the corpus are mainly concerned with three axes of motion. Verbs such as *advance, arrive, reach, pass, or progress* rely on a front-back –horizontal– axis, foregrounding the notions of advancement and goal implicit in tennis competition (both also expressed via particles such as *to, towards, through, along*). Other verbs express an inside-outside axis, departing from the aforementioned linear view of tournaments to portray these and their different stages (rounds) as containers or enclosed spaces which players *enter, come into/out of, head into, or go out of*. A third set of verbs articulates an up-down axis where 'up' verbs (*emerge, go up*) express victory and 'down' verbs (*go down, fall*) express defeat –following such classical metaphors in the cognitive literature as GOOD IS UP and BAD IS DOWN. Path verbs expressing victory/defeat yielded 204 instances in the corpus. Nevertheless, the verbs discussed so far can also be used to describe the players' performance during matches. Thus, players are reported as *moving to a 2-0 lead, coming from behind* to win a game or set, *falling behind 4-0*, or *getting themselves back into* the match.

However, the most interesting verbs in the corpus are manner verbs or verbs that combine path with manner and are used to express victory and defeat instead of the more conventional *win* or *lose* (181 instances in the corpus). They usually occur in the Headlines and Leads of the reports, where they convey 'what' happened (i.e. the match result) and, most importantly, 'how' it happened. In other words, the verbs fulfil both a summarizing role (who lost/won) and an evaluative role, as shown in the following headlines: "Hewitt ousted by gritty Gonzalez", "Mirza cruises through first round match-up", "Groth bows out at hands of firing Fish", "Verdasco blasts past Tsonga", "Dementieva rolls on", "Djokovic drops Baghdatis", "Bartoli bounces Jankovic out of Open", "Pennetta pushed out by red-hot Spaniard", or "Suarez Navarro marches on".

The two recurrent manner categories or parameters present in the verbs used to express victory are (a) +/- speed as in *breeze, dash, motor, race, sail, rush, gallop, or sprint* (32 instances in corpus) and (b) a combination of +/- effort, +/- force and even violence as in *blast, blitz, break, burst, charge, ease, power, force, knock, romp, steamroll, work, battle* or *struggle* (59 instances in corpus). The use of such verbs is far from random: due to the gruelling quality of tennis, the faster and easier a match is won, the better –although sometimes it is the effort/fight aspect of a victory which makes it the more memorable or epic. In contrast, verbs expressing defeat do not convey speed but, rather, rely upon +/- force or violence as in *blow, bounce, brush, bundle, crash, dump, oust* or *topple* (41 instances in corpus) or what might be called as a 'submission' or 'yielding' component as in *bow out*. It is

interesting to note that in many cases the verbs are used transitively or appear in the passive voice which means that they somehow express both victory and defeat in a very economical fashion, as in the following:

- (3) Verdasco knocked out Andy Murray
- (4) Radwanska has been dumped from Australian Open 2009

Both cases report the forceful and convincing defeat and victory of the players involved (even if the winner in 4 is not mentioned in the Headline).

## 1.2. Motion in wine tasting notes

The wine corpus yielded 1879 instances of motion verbs, which were grouped as follows:

Motion information	Verbs	Hits	%
PATH (some V + particle)	emerge, rise, surge, enter, ascend, exit, fall, penetrate, move up/down, head, recede	586	31.2%
PATH + MANNER (manner V + particle)	soar, ease, pop, claw one's way, fan out	75	4%
MANNER	course, edge, race, zip, rush, jump, leap, sneak, creep, march, roll, run, cruise, toe	575	30.6%
OTHER	appear, detonate, show up/through, blast, hit, punch, poke, slap, strike, move, guide, join, lead, swamp, hang	643	34.2%

Motion verbs describe the way wines are perceived in the nose and mouth (i.e. involves the senses of smell, taste, and touch). This is a complex process that relies upon two dimensions, namely, 'intensity' and 'persistence'; accordingly, the verbs are used to express the higher/lower intensity of perception, and the longer/shorter durability or persistence of wine's aromas and flavors. Moreover, since neither 'intensity' nor 'persistence' are categorical concepts, motion verbs –particularly, manner verbs– help express the nuances of wine's bouquet, flavour and mouthfeel.

Indeed, 'presence' (i.e. the fact that something is actually discernible or perceived) is crucial in wine tasting; hence, the abundant use of path verbs such as *emerge*, *rise*, *surge*, *come/go up/forwards/through/in*, 'appear' verbs such as *burst*, *show up/through* or *explode* (most of which incorporate the notions of '+ violence' or '+ force') and 'hit' or 'contact by impact' verbs such as *hit* or *kick*. Likewise, some elements in wine's composition are crucial in helping other elements to be perceived and, therefore, verbs like *drive*, *lead*, *guide* are also frequently used together with verbs such as *unfold* or *unwind*, which help describe how those very elements show up in the tasting process –i.e. the development of wines throughout the event. The following examples illustrate some of these verbs:

- (5) This wine bursts from the glass with violets, lilies [...]
- (6) Raspberry and smoke emerge in the finish.
- (7) [This wine] kicks off with the purest scent of smashed berries, and then [...]
- (8) [Wine has] plenty of acidity driving the flavors [...]
- (9) The wine unfolds and expands in the glass [...]

All in all, however, it is manner verbs that help articulate the subtleties of the sensory profile of wines and, above all, the aforementioned parameters of 'intensity' and 'persistence'. The key manner parameters in this regard are +/- force and +/- speed (in many cases conflating in the verbs) as well as verbs of 'posture' or 'change of state such as *broaden*, *expand*, *extend* and the like. Concerning 'intensity', verbs such as *power one's way*, *blast* or *march* describe the wine's properties (aromas, flavours or mouthfeel) as intense and unmistakable whereas verbs such as *creep*, *sneak*, *glide* or *float* suggest that aromas and flavors are perceived effortlessly or are less forceful or distinct than expected:

- (10) So elegant and refined, powering its way across the palate with a fireball of intensely concentrated lime, kiwi, pineapple, dried herbs [...]

- (11) Here's a wine that doesn't slap you silly, but creeps up sideways with seductively soft tannins that carry subtle flavors of [...]
- (12) Exotic, exuding red berry aromas and flavors of tropical fruit, spice and flint that sneak up on you rather than hit you over the head.

In turn, the key motion parameter to express 'persistence' is +/- speed as articulated by verbs such as *edge*, *linger*, *sail* as well as the aforementioned 'posture' or 'change of state' verbs (all expressing + persistence). Interestingly, in many cases the greater the 'force' or 'intensity' of wines' aroma(s) and flavor(s), the lesser their 'durability' in the mouth and nose and viceversa. Compare, for instance the two examples below:

- (13) [The wine] manages to feel elegant and restrained as the flavors sail on and on.
- (14) Some firm oak pops up late in the game, but if given a few years, that should be integrated.

Finally, some of the verbs in the wine corpus may also evoke metaphors related to the entities whose prototypical movement is encoded by the verbs. Thus, the metaphor WINES/WINE ELEMENTS ARE ANIMATE BEINGS is suggested by verbs such as *jump*, *kick*, *run*, *dance*, *sneak*, *leap*, *swim*, *creep*, or *punch* –a metaphor that is often reinforced by the verbs' co-text:

- (15) The splash of acid [in this wine] keeps the flavors on their toes (and dancing on your tongue) through a smooth, lingering finish.
- (16) Like a gymnast, this lithe white glides across the palate [...].
- (17) It strikes the right balance of weight and tang. It's a refreshing wine with the legs to run the race.

Another metaphor may be formulated as WINE/WINE ELEMENTS ARE MALLEABLE ENTITIES, and is implicit in verbs such as *unfold*, *fold*, *extend*, *stretch*, and *expand*. Some of these may, in turn, also suggest a 'textile' view of wine, which is congruent with critics' recurrent qualification of wines as being *velvety*, *silky*, *loosely knit*, *supple*, or as offering *a tapestry of flavors*. This can be seen in the following example:

- (18) This is a richly textured red wine that unfolds its ripe black cherry, blackberry and anise flavors like a thick quilt.

### 1.3. Motion in architectural reviews

The architecture corpus yielded 300 instances of motion verbs, which were grouped as follows:

Motion information	Verbs	Hits	%
PATH (some V + particle)	emerge, go up, heave, rise, surge, reach, descend, tilt	51	17%
PATH + MANNER (manner V + particle)	soar, tumble, climb, step, run, ease, flow, edge, bunch up, fan out, corbel out, scissor down, ring	96	32%
MANNER	glide, float, slide, stretch, fold, unfold, meander, sweep, weave	77	25.7%
OTHER	fly, cling, embrace, hug, nose, nuzzle, cascade	76	25.3%

In order to understand the use of motion verbs in architectural discourse, we need to pay attention to the buildings being thus predicated. In this regard, many of the path verbs above as well as those conflating path and manner foreground the verticality of buildings, i.e. encode an up-down spatial axis, which is congruent with building practice in general. Some of them not only foreground their height, but also the 'forceful' quality of the building at issue as in:

- (19) [...] a spindly steel framed cylinder hung with bells (an abstraction of a traditional campanile), soars above the surrounding jumble of roofs.
- (20) [A] fantastic canopy [...] that blasts out from the corner of the building [...].
- (21) It grows with complexity and energy as it surges from the protective brick base into a sort of splintering canopy.

In turn, built arrangements characterized by ‘projected motion on a horizontal plane’ are predicated by *project*, *cantilever*, or *reach*:

(22) [Building’s] roof cantilevers towards the street through two traffic lights

Verbs such as *melt*, *splay*, *spill*, *sprawl*, *expand*, *sweep*, or *spread* are often used to describe short, wide structures, foregrounding the notions of ‘width’ and ‘continuity, extension’, whereas *trail*, *run* or *travel* foreground ‘length’ rather than ‘width’:

(23) Just behind the screen—a shading device that splays away from the building toward the river—are interstitial spaces [...].

(24) [A] fountain of water sandwiched between leaning planes of glass trails in the structure’s wake.

In short, all these verbs try to capture what the artefact at issue looks like, i.e. its external appearance, and can be seen as examples of what is referred to as *image metaphors*, that is, metaphors that project visual information across domains (see Caballero 2006, forthcoming in this respect) and could be formulated as FORM IS MOTION. The graphic motivation of motion patterns in architectural discourse is best illustrated by those that involve denominal verbs like *rake*, *bunch*, *ramp*, *cascade*, *scissor*, *funnel*, *line*, *fan*, or *corbel*.

(25) Customers descend to the store from the parking levels by elevators or by stairs that scissor down through the three-story space

(26) The floor gently rakes up to the second level of the old building.

Thus, while in expressions with *climb*, *meander* or *run* motion is explicitly conveyed through the verbs, in the cases above the verb is mainly concerned with profiling or highlighting the shape of the spatial arrangements at issue and the motion sense is articulated via the particles and/or prepositional phrases occurring with them.

As happens in wine discourse, some of these verbs may also evoke the very entities whose movement is portrayed by the expressions and, therefore, can be interpreted as instantiating metaphors other than FORM IS MOTION. This is the case of verbs such as *nuzzle*, *butt*, *step*, *clamber*, *reach*, *hug*, *embrace*, or *punch* which may equally well point to the metaphor BUILDINGS ARE ANIMATE BEINGS, since they require agents whose bodies can move—some verbs further specifying the limbs involved in the expressions. Other verbs like *hover*, *oversail*, *flow*, or *float* bring to mind water or fluid scenarios and the artefacts belonging to them, suggesting metaphors such as BUILDINGS/BUILDING ELEMENTS ARE MOBILE ARTIFACTS and BUILT SPACE IS A FLUID. Finally, verbs characterizing buildings and parts of them as pliable (*fold*, *unfold*), soluble (*melt*) or flexible (*stretch*, *splay*, *spread*, *flex*, *extend*, *expand*) bring to mind a view of space malleable, tangible matter that architects may shape or mould as if it were clay, stone, or wood. Some of these verbs are shown below:

(27) Nuzzling one end of the huge [building] is a 350-seat IMAX theatre [...].

(28) A cluster of arched tensile canopies reaches out to embrace visitors [...].

(29) A couple of squashed zeppelins [i.e. building’s roofs] hover over the solid structures

In any case, all the motion expressions in architectural discourse appear to be motivated by visually informed metaphors subsumed under the general metaphor FORM IS MOTION in which particular layouts or appearances (i.e. the targets in the mapping) are seen as reminiscent of the kind of movement encapsulated in motion predicates (i.e., the metaphorical source).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

A key tenet in Lakoffian approaches to metaphor is that a metaphorical projection is a unidirectional process in which the *source* plays a crucial role in construing the topic (*target*) at issue. While not wishing to contradict this view,<sup>3</sup> in this paper I attempt to show that knowledge of the target is also crucial to understand many metaphors. Indeed, the

---

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion on the weight of the target in metaphorical mappings see Barnden et al (2004).

metaphorical motion cases found in the tennis, wine and architecture corpora may be used for this purpose. Although the idiosyncrasy of those three topics and the notions metaphorically rendered by motion verbs determines the type of verb found in them (quantity- and quality-wise), some verbs were found in the three corpora, namely: (a) the path verbs *emerge*, *rise*, *surge*, and combinations of *go* and *move* plus particle, (b) the manner verbs *float*, *flow*, *slide*, *sweep*, *fold*, *unfold* and *stretch*, (c) the path + manner verbs *blast*, *break*, *edge*, *soar*, *climb*, *run*, *ease*, and *trail*, and (d) other motion verbs such as *hover* and *cling*. The main dimensions they help articulate are upward motion (*emerge*), +/- effortless motion (*flow* vs *break*), and +/- speed (*edge* vs *sweep*). This co-occurrence might suggest that the same metaphors were used to describe and/or assess tennis matches, wines and buildings. However, knowledge of the topics under focus not only revealed that this was not the case, but also foregrounded some of the problems researchers face when trying to classify –and formalize– the metaphors found in real discourse contexts. Before taking this point further, consider the following three extracts:

(30) Tsonga was in scintillating form as he swept past Juan Monaco 6-4 6-4 6-0.

(31) Zapata's supermarket is a beautiful object – it hums with kinetic energy, sweeping along and up the street like an elegant, silvery comet.

(32) [Wine has] a decisive core of citrus acidity that sweeps through to the finish.

*Sweep* encodes several semantic –manner– notions. Thus, a look at its numerous entries in the OED and WordNet 2.0. reveals that the salient properties in the semantic profile of the verb in its intransitive form are +/- force, + speed, even or continuous motion, motion in contact with a surface, and stately or majestic motion among others. It must be noted here that part of the complexity of the verb itself lies in the fact that the force component must be inferred from the context where it is used: while in some contexts *sweep* may mean effortless motion, in others it foregrounds the force required in a given motion event. The verb may also be seen as polysemous in the sense that the property of continuity and contact may have given rise to the majestic motion of someone wearing a long and trailing garment, and also to the locative meaning 'extend through a long stretch'. The question here is which motion property is selected in the examples found in the corpora analysed and which aspect of the topic(s) thus predicated is foregrounded by the verb (see Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2008).

In (30) *sweep* is used to refer to Tsonga's win against Monaco, describing and evaluating it as a fast and effortless affair if we pay attention to the scores of the match. In (31) we find three notions at play: the verb retains the property of speed but there's a hint at the + force (*kinetic energy*) of a building which is later compared to a comet and effortlessness (helped by the co-text); the notion of 'continuity' is also present here since the verb is basically used to describe –as graphically as possible– the fact that the building at issue met no obstacles on its way. Finally, in (32) we find a component of a wine described as 'sweeping through' the palate; that is, the verb is used to describe the distinct and forceful feel of such an important component as acidity in the wine's mouthfeel –the expression being more concerned with the presence and intensity of an element of wine –as perceived by the sense of touch inside the mouth– than with speed.

However, although the notions of force, speed and contact are present in the three examples, in order to determine which metaphors underlie the expressions we need to take into account the topic thus predicated. Thus, while we could argue that *sweep* in (30) suggests a metaphor that might be formulated as WINNING EASILY IS MOVING FAST AND EFFORTLESSLY, in (31) it would instantiate the metaphor FORM IS MOTION, and the metaphor in (32) might broadly exemplify the comprehensive metaphor PRESENCE/PERCEPTIBILITY IS MOTION and be further specified as INTENSE PRESENCE IS FORCEFUL, CONTINUOUS MOTION. Moreover, the examples may be seen as illustrating three different types of metaphor. Thus, in (30) a concrete way of moving is used to articulate the abstract notions of victory/defeat and to evaluate the way in which these took place, and, accordingly, instantiates a conceptual metaphor. In (31) we have an example of image metaphor since the verb is basically concerned with the graphic (topological) properties of a building (i.e., what it looks like).

Finally, (32) illustrates a synaesthetic metaphor since the topic assessed is the wine's mouthfeel (i.e. the target domain is the sense of touch).

All the other motion instances in the corpora analysed work along these lines: the key issue in tennis matches is the time and effort required to win or to lose, and these are the notions highlighted by motion verbs used to refer to and assess victory and defeat. In contrast, motion is the domain helping architecture and wine critics discuss properties that are accessed via the senses –in the case of buildings, what they look like, and in the case of wines what they smell, taste and feel like– hence, the metaphors here appear to be more physically grounded than those found in the tennis domain. The way all the verbs here discussed are used, however, suggest that target knowledge (encompassing both the topics rendered figuratively and the broad domains where metaphor is used) is crucial in (a) identifying the figurative phenomena underlying/motivating the expressions, and (b) understanding the mechanics of the constructions. In other words, against conceptual metaphor theory where the metaphorical source is seen as the origin of the mappings, a study of metaphorical motion cases in concrete genres reveals that the target also constraints heavily the interpretation of the metaphor.

## REFERENCES

- Barnden, J.A., Glasbey, S.R., Lee, M.G. and Wallington, A.M. 2004. Varieties and directions of inter-domain influence in metaphor. *Metaphor and Symbol* 19 (1): 1-30.
- Caballero, R. 2006. Re-Viewing Space. *Figurative Language in Architects' Assessment of Built Space*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Caballero, R. Forthcoming. FORM IS MOTION. Dynamic predicates in English architectural discourse. In K-U. Panther, L. Thornburg & A., Barcelona, eds., *Metonymy and Metaphor in Grammar*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cifuentes, P. 2009. *A Crosslinguistic Study on the Semantics of Motion Verbs in English and Spanish*. Munich: Lincom.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. 2006. *Sound Symbolism and Motion in Basque*. Munich: Lincom.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I. 2008. Vision metaphors for the intellect: Are they really cross-linguistic? *Atlantis* 30 (1): 15-33.
- Langacker, R. 1986. Abstract motion. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 455–471. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Langacker, R. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. I: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Matlock, T. 2004. The conceptual motivation of fictive motion. In G. Radden & K.-U. Panther, eds., *Studies in Linguistic Motivation* [Cognitive Linguistics Research 28], 221–248. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matsumoto, Y. 1996. Subjective motion in English and Japanese verbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 7: 183–226.
- Özçaliskan, S. 2004. Typological variation in encoding the manner, path, and ground components of a metaphorical motion event. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* (2): 73-102.
- Slobin, D. 2006. What makes manner of motion salient? In M. Hickmann & S. Robert (Eds.), *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*, 59-82. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1996. Fictive motion in language and “ception”. In P. Bloom, M. A. Peterson, L. Nadel & M. F. Garrett, eds., *Language and Space*, 211–276. Cambridge, MA & London: MIT Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol I: Conceptual Structuring Systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.