

## ON THE FICTIVE INTERACTION QUALITY OF WRITTEN ROUTE DIRECTIONS

José Vicente Santos MENDES<sup>138</sup>

**Abstract:** The paper elaborates on the dialog facet of the model Mendes (2008 [2005]) proposes for the conceptualization of written Route Directions (RD) in German, by showing the same findings as preliminary results of the investigation of this text genre in our mother tongue. It advocates that the concepts ‘motivation’, ‘dialogism’, and ‘co-ontogeny’ can further explain how our object of inquiry fits a ubiquitous Conversation Frame by involving, at least potentially, Fictive Interaction as a communicative strategy. The analysis of an instance out of an ever growing database of written RD in Brazilian Portuguese illustrates the argument.

**Keywords:** Communicative Strategy. Fictivity. Internal Dialog. Other-orientedness. Sociocognitive Interactionism. Wayfinding Instructions.

**Resumo:** *O artigo elabora a faceta ‘diálogo’ do modelo que Mendes (2008 [2005]) propõe para a conceptualização de Diretivas de Rota (DR) escritas em alemão, ao apresentar as mesmas descobertas como resultados preliminares da investigação desse gênero textual em nossa língua materna. Ele advoga que os conceitos ‘motivação’, ‘dialogismo’ e ‘co-ontogenia’ podem explicar melhor como nosso objeto de perquirição evoca uma ubíqua Moldura de Conversação por envolver, pelo menos potencialmente, Interação Fictiva como uma estratégia comunicativa. A análise de uma instância de uma base de dados sempre crescente de DR escritas em Português do Brasil ilustra o argumento.*

**Palavras-chave:** *Estratégia Comunicativa. Fictividade. Diálogo Interno. Orientação-para-o-Outro. Interacionismo Sociocognitivo. Instruções de Percorso.*

---

<sup>138</sup> Professor no Instituto de Humanidades, Artes e Ciências da UFSB, Universidade Federal do Sul da Bahia, Campus Paulo Freire, em Teixeira de Freitas. Doutor em linguística cognitiva por Hamburg Universität, Alemanha. Mestre em linguística teórica por Sophia University, Japão. Licenciado em Português, Inglês e suas Literaturas pela Universidade Federal de Juiz de Fora. Contato: [vicentemendes@hotmail.com](mailto:vicentemendes@hotmail.com)

## **Introduction**

As Mendes (2008 [2005]) demonstrates, the spatial cognition reasoning that human beings are capable of unite two amazing abilities which exemplify how uniquely potent our mind as a species is, namely, mental mapping and sense-making by means of language use in dialogical cooperation. Very briefly, the PhD dissertation proposes a three-faceted model to account for the backstage conceptualization of Route Directions (RD) in written German: A knowledge model, a discourse model, and a dialog model. Here our attention will focus only on the dialog model facet of the proposal.

The paper is designed as follows: First, I sum up the essentials of the Dialog Model Sketch, henceforth DMS, Mendes (2008 [2005]) advances. Then, I extend those findings by showing the preliminary results of an ongoing research project, Mendes (in progress), which amounts to checking if what holds for RD in German also applies to this discourse genre in Brazilian Portuguese. Afterwards, three notions are maintained to explain why a paramount Conversation Frame underlies the verbal semiosis pertaining to my object of inquiry: ‘motivation’, ‘dialogism’, and ‘co-ontogeny’. The concluding discussion looks back at shortcomings and gain of the enterprise so far, after illustrating the argument by analyzing an instance of path descriptions in written Brazilian Portuguese from a database we are in the process of constantly enlarging.

The thrust of the argument can be summed up this way: Human beings make sense of the world around them by cooperatively using language. Part of this cooperation has to do with our navigational capacity, our being able to move around efficiently, and to instruct peers about how to get to places they have never been to. RD can transpire as oral or written verbal behavior. Although the latter may seem at first sight strictly monological, it turns out they are also dialogical, since they comply with an overarching Conversational Frame that calls for fictive interaction between RD’ instructor and RD’ instructee. Let us see how this is the case in theory and practice.

### **The essentials of DMS**

The main claim of DMS is that, although written RD do not belong to the oral language modality, they also show dialogical features. Taking various insights Herbert Clark (and coworkers) contributed to research in psycholinguistics a step further, it maintains that

RD' informant and RD' addressee coordinate at a distance to collude at a meaning construction process. The interactants engage in a joint pretense to conceptualize the RD in question as a storytelling. The instructor tells the instructee a kind of a tale as mimetic/imaginal props to engross the RD' user as a virtual partner in a story world based on imagination. In this fable-like narrative, the addressee finds his/her way around in an unfamiliar environment and successfully – most of the times – reaches the intended target place. What DMS stresses is that the virtual partner plays an active role in the incorporeal joint venture with the narrator. The RD' user's disembodied presence urges that a constant double-sided monitoring run online in the head of the narrator. Such a phenomenon shows in the editing tactics that the narrator/instructor is pressured to adopt by the virtual partner/instructee's immaterial existence. And this configuration may encompass fictive interaction, as it will be detailed shortly.

As a result, the meaning negotiation dynamics RD encompass yields a generalization: RD' informant's self-focused monitoring aims at precision, has to do with local scope repair, and is signaled by discourse markers, and/or, sometimes, by certain punctuation resources. In contrast, RD' informant's user-targeted monitoring aims at the addressee's personal preferences, having to do with global scope repair, and is canonically signaled by means of one or two sentences propounding an alternative version of the whole (or a substantial part of the) path description at hand that has been previously provided. Moreover, it is the virtual partner's existence that causes the double-sided monitoring that RD' informant undergoes, and the editing procedures this narrator hence carries out. Now, pushing this bilateral perspective to any language communication event a step further, DMS expands on the notion of 'imaginary dialogues' Esther Pascual defends. It hence sees RD' informant and RD' user as parties that imaginarily talk to each other in order to agree on the semantic-pragmatic load a given wayfinding instructions token subsumes. The paper will elaborate on this shortly, when it deals with the Conversation Frame paradigm.

### **On fictive motion and fictive interaction**

Several scholars have delved into the phenomenon of fictive motion. To mention just three prominent figures in this query, we could list Talmy, Langacker and Matsumoto. Langacker (1999) opposes actual - including mythical - entities to generic/fictive/virtual/metaphorical/metonymic/blended/hybrid entities as counterparts in our conceptualization of

states, processes and events. Both types of entities are available to us in our everlasting endeavor to make sense of the environment. If we choose a direct, real take of the surroundings, we conceptualize a scene using the former kind of entities. On the other hand, as long as our take on a scene has to do with a departure from actuality, virtual entities are resorted to. Now when it comes to construal of motion events, Matsumoto (1996) talks about ‘subjective motion’, Talmy (1999) speaks of ‘fictive motion’, and Langacker (2008) refers to ‘abstract motion’. These terminological nuances aside, we can follow Evans (2007, p. 78) and adhere to a bottom line: “fictive motion is the ascription of motion to an entity that cannot undergo veridical motion.” Besides, we take up Langacker (1999) and buttress that virtual reality is part of our semiotic life not only with respect to both the situations so being described and the implicit non-actual way of viewing it, but rather insofar as fictivity also exists at speech act, illocutionary force level.

Fictive interaction is a phenomenon in human mental and experiential everyday operations that can be seen as a hub where language, interaction and cognition conflate. It “constitutes a self-sufficient discourse unit conceptualized within a non-factive communicative occurrence, which functions syntactically and semantically as a grammatical constituent” Pascual (2006, p. 245). Pascual acknowledges that fictive interaction is an elaboration on Langacker’s (1999, p. 90) insight of a ‘schematized interactive frame’, which abstracts from tokens of speech acts in language use of particular grammars of the world at the performance level and provides speakers-hearers or writers-readers with a conceptual tier of an interactional scenario whose elements are not totally identified for this or that specific actual speech event. Moreover, Pascual (2006, p. 248) deals with “a conceptual channel of communication between at least two fictive interactants who do not always correspond to the addresser and addressee in the actual communicative situation or even to referents in the current discourse space.”

Pascual’s analysis of ‘fictive interaction’ mentioned above yields her advocating in her 2014 book that speech, meaning and language in general are fundamentally interactional in nature, and there is thus an overarching Conversation Frame as one of the basic underlying structures of cognition and discourse as a whole.

The current paper is in harmony with Pascual’s (2006, 2014) stance on fictive interaction and Conversation Frame. It defends that the self-displacement events written RD subsume involve change of location, Source-Path-Goal image schema, and directionality from a Conversation Frame perspective that allows fictive interaction between RD’s informant and

RD's addressee as a virtual partner. As we will see in the next section, written RD in Brazilian Portuguese consist in a text genre that corroborates this nowadays widely sustained premise: grammar, discourse and cognition in general are at least partially structured by the conversational quality inherent to natural language. Thus, concepts of 'intersubjectivity', 'addressivity' and 'theory of mind' (i.e. attributing intention to other people's mental, linguistic and behavioral moves) will crop up in the dynamics of how a fictive interaction layer of construal renders a paramount Conversation Frame present in the corpus of written RD we here scrutinize.

### **Fictive interaction in written RD in Brazilian Portuguese**

Although the RD tokens under scrutiny do not transpire orally, this paper maintains that they still possess an interactive dimension. This is because RD' instructor and RD' user cooperate at a distance and both give their share to negotiate and agree on the verbal semiosis of this discourse type. Moreover, such dynamics involves Fictive Interaction, henceforth FI, because there is an imaginary talk between instructor and instructee for them both to be able to forge the verbal wording that materializes the RD at hand.

RD' instructor talks fictively to oneself by anticipating route segments that may cause confusion to RD' user and this process of self-monitoring – ultimately other-oriented – urges her to reformulate certain passages of the RD at stake in order to make sure the addressee will have no problems in finding his/her way around even at those most confusing stretches of the way being told. Another manner according to which RD' instructor complies with the virtual presence of RD' user is by adjusting the whole text genre, or a significantly long part of it, to the addressee's individual preferences or likes and dislikes. For instance, by teaching the interlocutor an alternative route (segment) that is more pleasing to the eye, if it belongs to their Common Ground / Mutual Knowledge the fact that the interactant is a person who enjoys contact with nature, and admires environmental beauty more than man-made beauty. RD' user, by her turn, demands from RD' informant that she be as clear and as adherent to a sequentiality in the verbalization of the telling the way in question as possible, adopting the egocentric reference frame prevalent in RD in Indo-European languages most of the time, in Levinson's terms. After all, when following the instructions, the chances to take a wrong turn at a decision point should be minimized as much as possible. This yields a verbalization that most likely will be efficient in leading RD' user from Source to Goal going fictively through

linearly ordered Paths proper and prototypical Landmarks in a mental map or factually out there in the world around an unfamiliar environment.

In a word, the FI quality of the RD instances Mendes (in progress) investigates involves a two-layered outline as a communicative strategy: a virtual talk RD' informant engages into with oneself, and an imaginary talk between RD' informant and RD' user, to assure their congruence in sense making.

The next step consists in the analysis of one instance of written RD in Brazilian Portuguese from our database. Afterwards, the notions of 'dialogicality', 'motivation', and 'co-ontogeny' account for the FI quality of our object of inquiry. Then, a discussion of our enterprise rounds off the text. The data token below is the first one we gathered that was hand-written instead of sent us *per* e-mail. We choose it to illustrate the contentions of our proposal due to its richness in partnership with the reader, which is blatant.

Viçosa, 04 de outubro de 2013

Bom dia Vicente.

Como você sabe, sou uma SãoPaulina fanática e por isso não perco um só jogo do São Paulo.

Bem, no próximo domingo, às 16 horas, haverá um jogo do São Paulo contra o arquirival Corinthians. Esse jogo será transmitido pela rede Bandeirantes ao vivo, como eu já disse às 16 horas. Como sei que você gosta de um bom futebol, gostaria de convidá-lo para assistir esse jogo comigo lá em minha casa. Para chegar lá, saindo do Departamento de Letras, você segue pela Avenida principal da UFV até chegar às 4 pilastras. Chegando lá, você sobe pela rua do cabo (paralela à PH Rolfs). Ao término da rua do Cabo tem um sinal. Você deverá atravessá-lo, seguir reto para frente e chegar na rua Gomes Barbosa. Segue então pela Gomes Barbosa até chegar ao colégio Edmundo Lins. Assim que passar por esse colégio, você entra numa rua que fica à esquerda desse colégio (1a à esquerda)! É a rua Alameda Albano Braga. Siga até o bloco 2 e aperte o interfone 401. Ao subir até o quarto andar, terá uma porta com uma placa lindíssima com os dizeres: Aqui mora uma SãoPaulina feliz. Aperte a campainha e soará o hino do São Paulo. Quando a porta se abrir, uma linda mulher com a camisa do São Paulo te atenderá e lhe servirá uma xícara de chá ou café sem açúcar (sic) no jogo de xícaras do São Paulo. Essa mulher serei eu.

A. – DLA (underlining in original)

I render the idiomatic translation of the token as follows straight, without going over glosses of word by word or proposition by proposition before doing that. This is because the emphasis of the approach I put forth is on the macrolinguistic (text / discourse) level of language use.

Viçosa, October 04 2013.

Good morning Vicente.

As you know, I'm a São Paulo soccer team fanatic rooter and that's why I do not miss one single match São Paulo play.

Well, next Sunday, at 4:00 PM, there'll be a match São Paulo playing their archenemy Corinthians. This match will be broadcast by Bandeirantes channel live, as I already told you, at 4:00 PM. Since I know you like good soccer, I'd like to invite you to see the match with me, at my place. For you to get there, leaving the Languages Department, you walk along the main Avenue of the University Campus until you get to the 4 pilasters [main "gate-like entrance"]. Once you get there, you go up along the Cape Street (parallel to PH Rolfs [Avenue]). At the end of Cape Street there are traffic lights. You should go over them, and straight ahead forward and get to Gomes Barbosa Street. You then follow along Gomes Barbosa until you reach the Edmundo Lins School. As soon as you go past this school, you enter a street that is to the left of this school (First to the left)! It is the Street [called] Albano Braga Grove. Go over to apartment block 2 and ring the interphone 401. Once you get up to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor, there'll be a door with a gorgeous sign on it that reads: Here lives a happy São Paulo soccer team rooter. Ring the doorbell and the anthem of São Paulo soccer team will chime. When the door opens, a very beautiful woman dressed in a São Paulo soccer team T-shirt will usher you in and serve you a cup of tea or coffee no sugar at the São Paulo soccer team cups set. This woman will be me.

A. – Languages and Arts Department

Let us now proceed with the analysis. A double monitoring as a corollary of FI is observable, which suggests that the results Mendes (2008 [2005]) found for German also hold for RD written in Brazilian Portuguese. First of all, albeit here we do not see the use of discourse markers to introduce local repair as a manifestation of the first tier of a two-layered FI (namely RD' instructor imaginarily talks to herself and makes sure that RD' user will be able to take the right route segment at a decision point along the way where potentially the wrong Path proper could be taken), we DO notice a punctuation mark instead to signal such process of near-self-repair. When A. introduces the prototypical Landmark Edmundo Lins School, she goes out of her way to call my attention to where I must turn after I go past this school. And this becomes patent by the use of an exclamation mark, after the reminder in between brackets: "As soon as you go past this school, you enter a street that is to the left of this school (First to the left)! It is the Street [called] Albano Braga Grove."

Now the second tier of the two-layered self-monitoring RD' informant abides by, which is typically introduced by one sentence or proposition, depending on the perspective the analyst takes, either linguistic (semantic-pragmatic) or logical (first-order predicate calculus), in this example is introduced without any overt marker. The preamble is covert. It is as if RD' instructor had started the telling me the way by saying something like "Dear Vicente, I could give you easier to follow or less strenuous RD to my place, but as I know you

love to be in contact with greenery, that you are a great admirer of natural beauty and a regular sports practitioner, I will teach you the way to my place that is somewhat pleasant to the eyes, since you will go past pretty landscape stretches with plenty of foliage and trees from Source to Goal and a steep stretch uphill: some outdoor working out, as you like it too, I'm positive ;-)." And then the RD proper followed. But instead of doing that, this preface to the narrative, so to say, is left implied due to the vast Common Ground or Mutual Knowledge A. and I share, and she goes straight to the RD of a trajectory that for a long while goes past a lake (the segment I should walk along the main Avenue on Campus), then connects after the traffic lights where the steep hill ends to a reasonably nice street which is also quite agreeable to walk along, with plants, a modest canopy... This process manifests the global-repair FI dimension of our illustration token. Factually RD' informant does not utter the introductory statement before teaching me the way per se with the explanatory remarks along the lines of what comes between double quotes above. This takes place only fictively, imaginarily, virtually, or subjectively.

I leave some further comments regarding the analysis of this illustration token for the discussion that consists of the last section of the paper. And I move on to the three notions that together, I contend, may explain why Fictive Interaction is indeed a conceptual and verbal operation that shows in the corpus instances under perscrutation.

### **On dialogicality or dialogism**

Although 'dialogicality'/'dialogism' is a notion coined by Bakthin, Vygotsky, and Voloshinov, all from the Russian school of theorizing about language and thought, here I rely on Per Linell's (2009, elsewhere) updating of its importance. To make a long story short, Linell teaches us that as far as the way human beings happen to cope with the world is concerned, 'perspectivizing', or, more technically, 'construing' reality is intimately associated with an 'other-orientedness' in perceiving, reasoning and languaging.<sup>139</sup> Linell (2009) links this other-orientedness to a network of related terms – internal dialogue, external dialogue, solo thinking and virtual others – that are seminal to the contention this paper advances, since they clearly manifest the ubiquity of a Conversation Frame and how ordinarily FI takes place

---

<sup>139</sup> Definitely, his stance places him in the socio-cognitive interactional front where Salomão, Marcuschi, Fauconnier, Sweetser, Fillmore, Turner, Lakoff, Langacker, Talmy, Sinha, Taylor, Ikegami, Yamanashi, Bergen, Albertazzi, Zlatev, Johanssen, Kertész, Soares da Silva, Geeraerts, and Jackendoff, to mention just a few, present a united legion.



therein. In particular, Linell (2009, p. 166-170) emphasizes that although “some texts are simply more monologizing, (...) all cognition and/or communication are dialogical, [...] [so] we can talk about a scale of several dimensions ranging from ‘monologue’ to ‘dialogue’.” He then lists three fundamental criteria as universally dialogical:

=> Responsivity: the interactants selectively attend to a given set of contextual conditions when they engage in verbal semiosis.

=> Addressivity: there is necessarily one specific (non-canonically generic) interlocutor in the speaker/writer’s mind.

=> Genre and sociocultural belongness: the doing things with words that people who are part of a certain speech community enact day in day out yields cumulatively a history of interactional practices that are easily identifiable to this or that Script, Frame, Scenario, or Discourse Type in general, initial capitals here signaling technical terms.

The corpus here under the microscope meets these three requirements. After all, “[e]ven some parts of discourse that emerge as monologically organized utterances – in which only one participant is overtly activated, constitute dialogical communicative projects” Linell (2009, p. 194). So, dialogicality helps to explain the FI nature of our object of inquiry, as although the tokens in our corpus seem to be nothing but monological language use stretches, they end up revealing solo-thinking, internal dialogue complementing external dialogue, telling stories to others and to oneself, auto-conversing, and other mechanisms that fit a paramount Conversation Frame.

### **On how ‘motivation’ helps to account for Fictive Interaction**

According to Panther e Radden (2011), among all the peripheral information processing systems that collude to beget the human condition, a set that has language as its center – bodily experience, emotion, perception, action, social and communicative interaction, culture, etc. – motivation can be regarded as a special case of influence that one of these systems exerts upon another/others. Panther e Radden (2011) go on to demonstrate that the interrelation between language and cognition is thought. Cognition, in its narrow sense, is understood as specifically human higher-level mental processes: particular reasoning, inference computation, categorization, ecology, Framing, modeling, associative thinking, analogizing, blending and construal, as they move in a two-way traffic along one or several roads that surround this CPU, so to say. The scholars also buttress human interaction as a

subtype of human action that is mandatorily intersubjective, social and communicative, since it is compulsorily guided by intentionality, goal-directedness, and effectiveness. The effect, they remind us, may not be on the physical world by itself but rather on the mental world, [our interpretation/construal of actuality]. Yet it may have, all the same, material consequences. The researchers add that signs, in particular speech acts, but also physical ones, convey human communicative intentions, whose reading is at once culturally, individually and circumstantially anchored. Being able to decipher (or have an educated guess of) other people's mind and what they are hitting at by saying, implying or doing something is the basis of cultural cognition, following Tomasello's findings. From this synthesis, it is possible to see 'motivation' as the stimulus for both factual and fictive interaction in human ordinary mental and bodily behavioral practices in general.

Therefore, this tenet goes along with our defense that a Conversation Frame underlies the semiosis of RD, even when they transpire in the written language modality, by enabling fictivity to unveil how this text genre can also be analyzed from an interactional-turn perspective in cognitive linguistics.<sup>140</sup>

### **The notion of co-ontogeny**

In this section I attempt to adduce, as briefly as possible, evolutionary-based primatology studies from a neo-Darwinian viewpoint that could back up the case for FI as a constituent cognitive mechanism in the semiosis of RD this paper scrutinizes. Considering a continuum from those experts who see verbal communication as exclusively human, almost as a dogma at the very left end of the scale, and those who, more and more flexibly, see it most cogently as a gradual capacity between animal communication systems and human languaging the more you reach the right end of the continuum, we could perhaps propose the following gradient: at the far left pole we would have Noam Chomsky, for obvious reasons, whereas at the far right pole we could have Beto Vianna. In between them, moving from left to right, we might mention, say, Anderson > Dunbar > Suddendorf > Bickerton > Cohen > Hook > Grundmann > Raffaele > Greenspan e Schanker > Matsuzawa and co-workers, for instance.

---

<sup>140</sup> Other names that come to mind when we think about this interactional turn in the language sciences are Levinson, Jaisson, Enfield, Günther, Imo, Doppermann, Pederson, Palmer, Croft, Nuyts, Mello, Martínez, Harris, Kövecses, Tyler, Gibbs, and Demeurt.

Our focus here will be on Vianna's (2011, p. 136)<sup>141</sup> import, whose definition of the term co-ontogeny reads:

[T]here are aspects of living and knowing that refer to living beings in general and are not restricted to humans, which are crucial to address processes that generate language, that is, the recurrent and recursive relationships between two or more organisms (co-ontogeny) which established shared experiences among themselves. [...] Using the explanatory path of specific systems theories and reports of my contact with nonhuman organisms [namely, great apes] and our living and knowing as observers of these organisms are equally instrumental in explaining the recurring co-ontogenic relations and the phenomenon we call language.

Vianna (2011, p. 144) goes on by advancing that living and knowing, biology and cognition, are operational synonyms for orangutans, humans, or any other living system, albeit we may describe in quite different ways what happens in each class of organisms within the coherence of their specific *conversational community norms*. (Emphasis in italics mine). Doing fieldwork with gorillas, Vianna (2011, p. 145-146) comes up with a genealogical tree of the great apes that forks into the African branch and into the Asian branch. The former branches down into humans, chimpanzees, bonobos, and gorillas, whereas the latter only branches further into orangutans. Moreover, Vianna (2011, p. 151-152) remarks that maternal care, social interaction, and using the hands under various circumstances are traits that passed generation after generation among gorillas and humans, in order for us to be able to identify the cousin species he labels under the cover term African great apes, which defines thus a common organization between these two primate kinds (gorillas and humans).

Vianna (2011, p. 153) concludes his argument in this fashion: Two or more organisms in structural connection will correspondingly change their structures in interaction. If these relationships last long enough, recurrently and recursively, *a linguistic domain* (my italics) will be established, which is the basis for a sociocultural system to be born (a network of live systems in consensual coordination of actions). Hence, 'co-ontogeny' might well be described as the biological foundation of the relational space that amounts to what we understand as 'linguistic phenomenon'. As a corollary, if we pay attention to how non-human great apes amorously parent their offspring [feeding, grooming, protecting...], build a complex social

---

<sup>141</sup> In the original: “[H]ay aspectos relacionados con el vivir y el conocer que remiten a los seres vivos en general y no sólo a los humanos, y que son cruciales para hablar de los procesos generativos del lenguaje, es decir, de las relaciones recurrentes entre dos o más organismos (co-ontogenia) que establecen vivencias compartidas entre si. [...] Utilizando la vía explicativa de determinadas teorías sistémicas, así como el relato de mis contatos con organismos no humanos, y nuestro vivir y el conocer de esos organismos son igualmente valiosos en la explicación de las relaciones co-ontogénicas recurrentes y del fenómeno al que llamamos lenguaje.”

network, handle food and several utensils, manually forge instruments, and evolutionarily share(d) with us many other cognizing modi in operating with the elements of their surroundings, we must admit there is a mere tenuous line separating humans from non-human primates. After all, evolution provided us with a natural co-ontogenetic drift of distinct consensual linguistic domains.

The genetic and sociocultural leap that separated us from our great primate cousins was the symbolization of language and thought our species came to, as a hatchet effect, in Tomasello's terms, that with a stroke of good fortune, mingled nature and nurture in a quite peculiar manner. The result is that our human conspecifics became able to interact semiotically, linguistically, and therefore, conversationally, and, at least in potentiality, fictively.

### **Discussion as concluding remarks**

If I had to pinpoint one drawback of the current enterprise<sup>142</sup>, I would say it is the scope of its corpus: the database of RD tokens it analyzes, still being amassed, for now consists in no more than 30 instances of this text genre / discourse type. Yet they are all genuine language-based instances of RD. In other words: They are authentic representatives of sense making interactively arrived at for RD' instructor and RD's immaterial user to agree on the semiosis of this particular subtype of spatial cognition event.

Therefore, we believe the paper was able to cogently make the case for the way Fictive Interaction – under the umbrella of an all-abiding Conversation Frame – pertains to the intersubjective construal of the Route Directions it attends to. Even though they may seem strictly monological at first glance.

Now, coming to the further comments I announced at the end of the section that analyzes one instance of our database above, it should be pinpointed:

=> The analysis could also have taken the perspective of RD' user, who, fictively, would ask RD' instructor to clarify if this virtual partner – the addressee – should go left or right after going past the prototypical Landmark Edmundo Lins School, and/or if this move at

---

<sup>142</sup> The data collection started at my former workplace, Viçosa Federal University, where the investigation for Mendes (in progress) began, and continues at my current workplace, UFSB, as an ongoing research project.

the decision point ought to take place onto the first or the second Path proper along the way at that confusing stretch of the route in vogue.

=> Now for the global scope repair RD' user's immaterial presence obliges RD's informant to comply with, there is a virtual compromise both parties make: on one hand, A. knows that her addressee is someone who loves nature and physical activity, but on the other hand, A. also knows that the addressee's personality traits include a hectic, always-in-a-hurry quality. Thus, although A. could have given me RD that go always along beautiful scenery, (e.g., if, when coming to the 4 pilasters, she guided me round the other side of the lake, and out of Campus through the Acamari side gate, then through the woods, and via Santa Rita Boulevard before turning to the Grove she lives on, this would for sure have been much more picturesque. But it would have avoided the "outdoor gym" part of the route (the steep hill up). Moreover, it would make me take three or four times as long to reach the destination than the RD she opted for did. This delay could have upset me as the RD's user at hand. As a result, the RD she provided me preempted this a 100% bucolic, lighter version/alternative, in a Fictive Interaction negotiation, and the way taught was a balance between attractive urban landscape and medium temporal lapse for displacement from Source to Goal plus provision of some beloved physical effort to her interactant.

## **Acknowledgments**

I thank Aparecida Oliveira for data collection help. I also thank John Taylor, Klaus-Uwe Panther, Len Talmy, Per Linell, Ray Jackendoff, Ron Langacker, and Yo Matsumoto, for providing me with invaluable comments on a draft version of this paper. Needless to say, all the flaws in the final rendition remain entirely mine. I am indebted to Mark Anthony Burdon for proofreading my English. I am also grateful to Esther Pascual and Sergei Sandler, whose invitation for me to contribute a chapter to the volume they were editing *The Conversation Frame: Forms and Functions of Fictive Interaction*, which was later aborted, is ultimately the initial kick that spawned the research this paper presents preliminary results of.

## **References**

- EVANS, V. **A glossary of cognitive linguistics**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- LANGACKER, R. Virtual reality. **Studies in the Linguistic Sciences** 29(2), p. 77-103, 1999.

- \_\_\_\_\_. **Cognitive grammar: a basic introduction.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- LINELL, P. **Rethinking language, mind and world dialogically:** interactional and contextual theories of human sense-making. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009.
- MATSUMOTO, Y. Subjective motion and the English and Japanese verbs. **Cognitive Linguistics** 7, p. 183-226, 1996.
- MENDES, J. V. S. **The semantics-pragmatics of route directions:** unveiling the complexity inherent to a subfield of German language-and-thought backstage spatial cognition. Saarbrücken: Verlag Doktor Müller, 2008. First published from Hamburg University Central Library as a PhD Dissertation in 2005. Available online at <http://www.sub.uni-hamburg.de/opus/volltexte/2005/2410/>
- \_\_\_\_\_. **Please, write me down how to get there:** contrasting route directions in German and in Brazilian Portuguese. Unpublished manuscript. Work in progress.
- PANTHER, K.-U.; RADDEN, G. Reflections on motivation revisited. In: PANTHER, K.-U.; RADDEN, G. (Eds.) **Motivation in grammar and the lexicon.** Human Cognitive Processing 27. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 1-26, 2011.
- PASCUAL, E. Fictive interaction within the sentence: a communicative type of fictivity in grammar. **Cognitive Linguistics** 17-2, p. 245-267, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. **Fictive interaction:** the conversation frame in thought, language, and discourse. Human Cognitive Processing 47. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2014.
- TALMY, L. Fictive motion in language and “ception” In: BLOOM, P. et al. (Eds.) **Language and space:** language, speech and communication. Cambridge, MA: MIT, p. 211-276, 1999.
- VIANNA, B. Co-ontogenia: una aproximación sistémica al lenguaje. **Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana** 6 (2), p. 135-158, 2011.