



### *In Memoriam*

*The journal editors and the Department of English Studies at the Universitat Jaume I wish to pay tribute to our colleague, friend and teacher, Dr. Xavier Campos Vilanova who passed away earlier this year. Xavier showed a passionate enthusiasm for the study of the history of the English language and literature, but also for everything he did. From taking photographs, researching on the meaning of the number seven, to studying the history of Castelló – his home town –, he went deep into everything that touched his heart.*

*Xavier kindly accepted to supervise my doctoral thesis (Campoy) on phrasal verbs many years ago even though it did not fit his plans at the moment, since he was then deeply engaged in the study of Old English. I felt this issue on phrasal verbs would be a great opportunity to thank him for his generosity and open mindfulness. It is his wide smile and his distinctive laugh that could fill the room that we will always remember.*



M<sup>a</sup> Carmen Campoy and the editorial team

Castelló, 22 Dec. 2011

## From the Editors

### **MULTIWORD PATTERNS: CONSIDERING PHRASAL VERBS AND THEIR UNDERLYING SEMANTIC SYSTEMS (I)**

This is the first of two issues dealing with multiword patterns. The main focus of these issues is that of phrasal verbs with a special emphasis on the semantic patterns from which they arise. This first issue on this topic includes five articles related to the study of English particles as part of phrasal verbs and in lexical bundles. The issue tackles different perspectives in the analysis and use of phrasal verbs. Most articles adopt a cognitive approach in their investigation of the use and analysis of these units. Two of them, Navarro and Chung et al. also follow a corpus-based approach in their analysis.

Ruiz de Mendoza and Galera-Masegosa's article (*Going beyond metaphonymy: Metaphoric and metonymic complexes in phrasal verb interpretation*) analyses how systematic combinations of metaphor and metonymy can play a crucial role in the interpretation of complex and opaque phrasal verbs. These scholars draw on previous insights on metaphor-metonymy interaction patterns, ranging from metaphonymy (Goossens 1990) to metonymic and metaphoric "complexes" (Ruiz de Mendoza and Mairal 2007, 2011, Ruiz de Mendoza and Pérez 2001). In this paper they focus particularly on two kinds of metaphoric complex: amalgams (metaphors that are integrated into the source-target structure of other metaphors, or double-source metaphoric mappings) and chains (complexes that make use of a single conceptual domain as both target and source to other domains). After the illustration of their postulates along a series of complex examples, Ruiz de Mendoza and Galera-Masegosa conclude that the conceptual makeup of phrasal verbs goes beyond compositionality in terms of meaning and interpretation. It is, nevertheless, largely "predictable and calculable", when the interaction of metaphor and metonymy, for example, in terms of complexes, is taken into account.

In the second article, *Towards an integrated model of metaphorical linguistic expressions in English*, Strugielska puts forth an alternative to Conceptual Metaphor Theory in the form of an *integrated* – as opposed to an *isolated* – model for metaphorical expression. Thus, her proposal presupposes that some expressions

generally classified as metaphors can be seen as largely affected in relation to their figurativeness. Her most important contention is that in the approach to metaphor proposed here conceptual primitives are seen as dialogical elements of semantic profiles, with their prominence relying mostly on the contrast between simple verbs and VPCs.

Both the analysis of particle verbs with *in* and *out* and the notion of strategic construal compose the common ground shared by the contributions of Geld and Geld and Maldonado. By way of this notion, the authors relate Langacker's (1987) "construal" to the process of strategic thinking about the meaning of Particle Verbs (PVs) by two different groups of users of English as a L2 (L1 Spanish vs. L1 Croatian), and analyse the contribution of their elements to different degrees. The reader is advised to read these two articles in our "whole version" format, where it is possible to use links that relate one article to the other.

Geld adopts a general perspective in the analysis of a series of parameters involved in the process of making sense of a series of (relatively opaque) PVs with *in* and *out* by the aforementioned groups. Her analysis derives from a language proficiency test and the reflections of the informants about 20 PVs portrayed in a research questionnaire. It shows how these parameters interact and affect meaning construal in L2, and leads her to conclude that the strategic construal of PVs varies mainly in terms of *language-internal* factors like topological vs. lexical determination (the meaning of the particle overrides the meaning of the verbal element and vice versa) and compositionality (meaning derived from a balanced interaction of both elements), the degree of informativeness of the particle, the nature of the verbal element (light vs. heavy), in combination with *typological* factors such as L1-L2 interface (verb-framed vs. satellite-framed languages) and *language-external* factors like L2 proficiency, years of learning and even the learning environment.

Although the research conducted by Maldonado and Geld departs from the data obtained in the questionnaire employed in Geld (see above), their focus of attention falls mainly onto the contribution of the particle in PV constructions (particularly *how* it is interpreted by learners of English as L2). In terms of specifics, their concern is to describe strategic construal of *in* and *out* in PVs by focussing on a particular set of the

aspects of meaning construal in L2 suggested by Geld (see above), among which topological determination and compositional meaning become central.

In their analysis, they describe the construals of both particles – including nine categories for *in* and ten for *out* – as derived from the data obtained in the questionnaire employed in Geld –, which are schematic representations of the informants' construals. The strategic construal of particles is analysed in relation to the meaning of the whole VPs. The results of their study confirm their three initial hypotheses, namely:

- L2 users are well aware of the symbolic nature of language even while dealing with highly schematic linguistic categories
- The strategic construal of both particles is comparable to their cognitive linguistic description in English as L1
- The strategic construal of both particles shows a cognitively motivated path from the topological to the aspectual.

Navarro's article, *Lexical decomposition of English spatial particles and their subsumption in motion constructions*, is an innovative attempt to account for several aspects of spatial particle semantics within the framework of the Lexical Constructional Model (LCM), a – relatively new, but well-grounded and increasingly expanding – semantic-syntactic system of representation of lexical units and constructions, that takes on both cognitive and functional tenets.

The author first develops the logics for spatial particle semantics within the LCM in terms of the formalism of a Lexical Template (LT). Then, with the help of the COCA as a source of data, Navarro exemplifies his claims by way of the semantic decomposition of seven prepositions. This allows him to take his last step and illustrate how these LTs are subsumed (roughly, how they “fit” into particular constructions by way of a series of cognitive operations that assume semantic-syntactic and pragmatic/discursive constraints on each of the construction elements) into two kinds of motion constructions: caused motion and intransitive motion. The author concludes with a series of remarks concerning the contribution of particles to constructional meaning, and their possible interaction with different verbal Aktionsart types.

Chung, Chao, Lan and Lin analyse the semantic features of the lexical bundle [(VERB) PREPOSITION the NOUN of] including bundles where the verb plus particle is not a prepositional or adverbial verb and some bundles where a phrasal or prepositional verb appear. This five word bundle is contrasted with the four word bundle [PREPOSITION the NOUN of]. By contrasting these two lexical bundles they also investigate on the semantic features the intersection bundle shares. Data for their analysis was obtained from the British National Corpus.

The Book and Multimedia Review section of this volume ends with two reviews, the first one by Pedro Fuertes-Olivera who goes over the main features of the *Macmillan Collocations Dictionary for Learners of English*. Fuertes-Olivera examines among other things the information the dictionary contains as regards typographical representation, collocational information and the dictionary guide. He pays close attention to the collocational patterns and further inspects the case of business collocational patterns.

The second review analyses both *TermStar XV* and *WordSmith Tools* as Terminology Management Systems. These are compared to similar software systems. A table comparing the main features of various TMSs under analysis in the review is also provided. Nuria Edo's review has the added value of considering these programmes for a very specific purpose: that of developing specialised dictionaries. She considers the potential of these systems in term extraction and term in-corpus analysis as well as regarding data processing, management and storage. Their potential for the creation of terminological cards and for the retrieval of specific information as well as the user-friendliness of both export and import task management and environment design are considered.

*Antonio José Silvestre López*  
Guest Editor  
*M<sup>a</sup> Carmen Campoy Cubillo*  
*Miguel F. Ruiz Garrido*  
Editors  
Universitat Jaume I, Spain

## REFERENCES

- Goossens, L.** 1990. "Metaphtonymy: the interaction of metaphor and metonymy in expressions for linguistic action". *Cognitive Linguistics*, 1 (3), 323-340.
- Langacker, R.W.** 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F.J. and Pérez, L.** 2001. "Metonymy and the grammar: motivation, constraints and interaction". *Language and Communication*, 21 (4), 321-357.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F.J. and Mairal, R.** 2007. "High-level metaphor and metonymy in meaning construction". In Radden, G., K-M. Köpcke, T. Berg and P. Siemund (Eds.) *Aspects of Meaning Construction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 33-51.
- Ruiz de Mendoza, F.J. and Mairal, R.** 2011. "Constraints on syntactic alternation: lexical-constructional subsumption in the Lexical-Constructional Model". In Guerrero, P. (Ed.) *Morphosyntactic Alternations in English. Functional and Cognitive Perspectives*. London, UK/Oakville, CT: Equinox, 62-82.