The second NAMED conference will take place on May 23-24th 2019, at the Ecole Normale Supérieure de Paris. This second conference will specially encourage submission on neglected aspects of fictive motion constructions, although we will also accept papers addressing some neglected aspects of motion description as we did for the first conference.

Fictive motion is defined as the use of dynamic expressions to describe static scenes. For instance, in “The road goes up the mountain”, the road does not move, whereas in “The man goes up the mountain”, the man does move. Fictive motion thus contrasts with actual motion.

The term ‘Fictive motion’ has been coined by Talmy in his reference article *Fictive motion in language and “ception”* (1996; 2000). Other terms have been used: subjective motion (Langacker 1986; Matsumoto 1996), abstract motion (Langacker 1986), virtual motion (Langacker 1999), non-actual motion (Blomberg & Zlatev 2014), which each convey a particular conception of the phenomenon.

The psychological grounds for fictive motion constructions include, in a very general perspective, our “cognitive bias towards dynamism” in both language and cognition (Talmy 2000: 171–172).

Two main motivations for the use of fictive motion have been reported. First, a phenomenon of *enaction*, consisting in the projection of the speaker, or another entity, travelling through the figure entity (i.e. the road in the example above). Second, the visual scanning of the figure entity by the speaker or a character (ex : Matlock, 2001, 2004a, 2004b; Rojo et Valenzuela, 2009 ; Stosic et al., 2015). Fictive motion has been considered as a possible “linguistic universal”; it is generally seen by cognitive linguists as providing evidence of “fundamental properties of the human mind” (Blomberg and Zlatev 2014, alluding to Lakoff 1987; Langacker 1987; Lakoff and Johnson 1999).

We encourage submissions with a contrastive, corpus, diachronic and/or experimental perspective, addressing the following issues:

- Co-extension paths have been broadly described, much more so than other types such as emanation paths (orientation, shadow, radiation, sensory paths), pattern paths, frame-relative motion, advent paths, access paths: is this list complete? Are there important differences across types, e.g. are only some of them universal?
- What are the differences across languages in the use of fictive motion for the description of static scenes? How do linguistic realizations of fictive motion vary across languages?
- Is there a link between the use of fictive motion in a given language and its typological properties (for instance in terms of the satellite-framed/verb-framed distinction)?
- What are the constraints on the nature of figure and ground in fictive motion constructions? Do they vary across languages?
- Are specific types of motion verbs (e.g. deictic, path, manner of motion verbs) more likely to be used in fictive motion constructions? Is it linked to their spatial or to their
aspectual properties? What does it reveal of the structure of the lexicon, or the classification of motion verbs? (cf. Cappelli 2013).
- Is there a continuum of dynamicity of motion verbs, with an impact on their use in fictive motion constructions? What makes a motion verb more or less dynamic?
- What is the actual frequency of Fictive Motion uses with respect to actual motion? How broad is the phenomenon?
- Which constructions (e.g. posture verbs, Stosic et al. 2015) compete with the fictive motion construction?
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