Figuration, constructions and English phrasal verbs: The instances of *come up*

Efthymia Tsaroucha

University of Thessaly, Volos, Greece

Abstract

The paper investigates the evocation of the figurative meanings of English phrasal verbs of the form: component verb *come* + component particle *up* when they are employed in resultative constructions. Four instances of *come up* are discussed. It is suggested that the figurative meanings of *come up* are rooted to conceptual metaphors.

Key words: English phrasal verbs; figuration; construction grammar; cognitive grammar; resultatives; conceptual autonomy-dependence relation; conceptual metaphor.

1. Introduction

This present paper suggests that the special grammatical status of English phrasal verbs derives from the verb plus particle composition. Research has shown that the grammatical category of English phrasal verbs constitutes a challenge not only for foreign learners of English but also for native speakers. Particularly, Sag and his colleagues (2002) observed that English phrasal verbs constitute a complex and difficult area of the English grammar, especially when it comes to their listings in the mental lexicon. According to them, the study of English phrasal verbs could be characterized as 'a pain in the neck.'

Along the same lines, Li and his colleagues (2003: 513) stated that the language speaker faces difficulties in storing English phrasal verbs in his/her mental lexicon because they cannot be that easily recalled. According to them, this recall problem is mainly due to separable English phrasal

verbs such as *turn off*, which allow for syntactic units to be inserted inside the phrasal verb compound (for example, *turn it off* or *turn the radio off*). Moreover, Villavicencio (2003) noted that one of the most challenging aspect of English phrasal verbs is that they carry a strong degree of idiosyncrasy. According to him, the verb-particle combination is subject to a continuum of idiosyncrasy ranging from highly idiosyncratic constructions (for example, *Bill got on well with his new colleagues)* to semi-idiosyncratic ones (for instance, i*n a rage she tore up the letter Jack gave her*) (ibid: 57).

As far as the definitions of English phrasal verbs are concerned, a review of the literature has shown that there is no common ground. English phrasal verbs have been defined as 'preposition verbs,'[1] 'idiomatic and non-idiomatic verbs,'[2] 'compound verbs,'[3] 'multi-word verbs'[4] and as 'single-word verbs.'[5] This paper suggests that the grammatical category of English phrasal verbs constitutes a special kind of composite structure in the sense that the component verb and the component particle are semantically composed in order to form a unified construction (cf. Tsaroucha, 2018). It is also suggested that the composite whole of an English phrasal verb constitutes a relation (which is conceptually dependent); however, each one of the component parts of a phrasal verb also express relations. The paper suggests that the component particle is 'more autonomous' relative to the component verb in the composite whole of a phrasal verb (cf. Tsaroucha, 2018, 2019).

Moreover, the framework of Cognitive Linguistics addressed the challenging nature of English phrasal verbs and argued that English phrasal verbs serve as prompts for meaning construction. It was stated that English phrasal verbs are idiosyncratic and idiomatic in nature. Meaning construction is a conceptual process involving elaboration and integration of both linguistic and non-linguistic information in a highly productive way (cf. Turner, 1991, 1996; Fauconnier, 1994, 1997; Fauconnier & Turner, 1998, 2002).

Summarizing the core tenets of some of the most groundbreaking cognitive linguistics-based approaches to English phrasal verbs, it is worth mentioning that Rudzka-Ostyn's (2003) approach was based on image schemas. This approach highlighted the contribution of the semantics of the particle to the meanings of English phrasal verbs. Moreover, Ruiz de Mendoza and Galera-Masegosa's (2011) approach to English phrasal verbs argued for the combination of two metaphors for the interpretation of the figurative mean-

---

[1] English phrasal verbs as 'preposition verbs' (cf. Curme, 1925; Jowett, 1950; Eckersley & Eckersley, 1960; Live, 1965; McArthur, 1999; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Dixon, 2005).

[2] English phrasal verbs as 'idiomatic and non-idiomatic verbs' (cf. Palmer, 1974; Hampe, 1997).

[3] English phrasal verbs as 'compound verbs' (cf. Kruisinga, 1925; Bolinger, 1971).

[4] English phrasal verbs as 'multi-word verbs' (cf. Crystal, 1995).

[5] English phrasal verbs as 'single-word verbs' (cf. Bolinger, 1971; Fraser, 1976; Pelli, 1976; Shaked, 1994; Li et al., 2003).

ings of this grammatical category. According to them, English phrasal verbs constitute a special category of idiomatic expression due to their formally fixed and (at least partially) non-compositional semantic nature (ibid: 1). They also suggested that English phrasal verbs can be interpreted by means of 'metaphoric complexes' which involve 'metaphoric amalgams' and 'metaphoric chains.' 'Metaphoric amalgams' "require the integration of selected aspects from the metaphors that play a role in the process", whereas in 'metaphoric chains' "there are two subsequent metaphoric mappings such that the target of the first mapping becomes the source of the second" (ibid: 17).

In addition, White's (2012) approach suggested that Cognitive Linguistics and sociocultural theory enrich learners' cognition. White adopted Lindner's (1981) concept of 'zone of activity5' and he suggested that "the particle, in combination with the literal or figurative sense of the verb, locates the phrasal verb's action or activity in a physical or metaphoric space, a place relative to the zone of activity" (ibid: 423). He explained that in a sentence like *throw out the trash* the zone of activity could be interpreted as "immediately surrounding the person holding trash" (ibid: 423). White (ibid: 425) also stated that a conceptual approach to the instruction of English phrasal verbs aims at motivating learners to utilize conceptual tools. According to him, a conceptual approach encourages learners to view English phrasal verbs as "constructions that are conceptually motivated rather than as seemingly arbitrary combinations of verb + particle" (ibid: 430).

Mahpeykar and Tyler's (2015) approach investigated the contribution of the multiple meanings of the verb to the meanings of English phrasal verbs. They examined the interaction of the polysemy networks of both the verb and the particle in *get up, take up, get out* and *take out*. Mahpeykar and Tyler (ibid: 9) identified the central or core meanings of the verbs *get* and *take* and they found 41 uses for *take* and 37 uses for *get*. They suggested that a distinct sense i) "must contain additional meaning not apparent in other proposed senses", ii) "need not be strictly physical/spatial in meaning", iii) the extended sense prompts for a different spatial scene" (ibid: 10). The central idea of their approach is that the meanings of English phrasal verbs are not fully compositional because they are based on embodied experience and background knowledge; meaning extension (from the central sense to distinct senses) explains why English phrasal verbs can have several systematic, motivated meanings.

Kohl-Dietrich, Juchem-Grundmann and Schnotz's (2016) approach investigated if raising awareness for the underlying conceptual motivation of the verbs and the particles helps learners study phrasal verbs more efficiently. The scholars followed Tyler's (2012) ideas stating that the Cognitive Linguistics view of language entails pedagogical implications for the English as a foreign language classroom. They hypothesized that these ideas could facili-

tate learning, retention and transfer of learners' knowledge to novel lexical items. The findings of their study showed that "explicit CL-based teaching does not enhance learning in terms of retention" (ibid: 206). However, as far as transfer is concerned, the results were slightly different. When participants had to tackle novel phrasal verbs, they could profit from a cognitive linguistics-based teaching approach, whereas an implicit knowledge transfer could not be proven (ibid: 206-207).

Finally, the present paper aims to propose that the evocation of the figurative meanings of English phrasal verbs should be studied within constructions. It is suggested that it is the construction as a whole and not the English phrasal verb as an isolated entity that prompts for figurative interpretations. It is argued that constructional patterns have the dynamicity to explain how relations among the participating entities are established. Constructions also explain how the established relations among the focal participants function to evoke figurative meanings. Following Goldberg's (1995) theory, it is suggested that a construction grammar approach to English phrasal verbs explains how verb meaning (that is the meaning of a phrasal verbs) is fused with constructional meaning (that is the meaning of a phrasal verb along with the the other participating entities in a construction).

The following parts of the paper explain why English phrasal verbs should be treated as relational constructions and why a construction grammar approach to English phrasal verbs explains how their non-literal meanings are encouraged. The paper also discusses the evocation of the figurative meanings of four instances of *come up* when they are employed in resultative constructions, namely intransitive resultative constructions and transitive resultative constructions.

2. English phrasal verbs as relational composite structures

Radden and Dirven (2007) stated that "at the level of thought, we need no more than two basic types of conceptual units: things and relations." 'Things' are autonomous conceptual entities that are typically expressed as nouns; on the contrary, 'relations' are dependent conceptual entities that are typically expressed as verbs and adjectives (ibid: 41). 'Things' are autonomous conceptual entities in the sense that they are independent conceptual units, which have certain stability in space and time (ibid: 42). For example, the most prototypical things in our experiential world are represented by physical objects, such as 'computers'; on the contrary, less prototypical relations constitute abstract concepts, such as 'illnesses' and 'joy.' 'Relations,' however, in contrast to 'things', are dependent conceptual units that link two or more things and they have a lower degree of time stability than things. 'Relations' are expressed as verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions

and conjunctions (ibid: 42). Applying the afore-mentioned ideas to English phrasal verbs, it is suggested that English phrasal verbs constitute relations which serve as conceptually dependent entities.

As far as the conceptual autonomy-dependence relation is concerned, Langacker (1988: 103) stated that a verb serves as a conceptually dependent entity t because "[...] it presupposes, as an inherent part of its own internal structure, the two things participating in the correspondences." According to him, the most important factor in order to distinguish between the autonomous and the dependent structure is that the dependent structure is equated with the predicate and the autonomous structure is equated with the arguments of the predicate (ibid: 103).

According to Sullivan (2013: 8-9), "the dependent element needs to be filled in by another structure of a particular type," namely the autonomous element. According to her, in *obese cat* the noun *cat* is conceptually autonomous because we can conceptualize a cat without being aware of its weight. She also explained that the adjective *obese* is conceptually dependent because its conceptualization depends on the conceptualization of an animal or human that demonstrates the quality of obesity (ibid: 9). As as far as metaphoric grammatical constructions are concerned, Sullivan claimed that "in grammatical constructions that evoke a metaphor in the absence of any other contextual clues, a conceptually dependent element in the construction communicates the metaphoric source domain and a conceptually autonomous element indicates the target domain" (ibid: 9).

Applying Langacker's (1988) and Sullivan's (2013) theories to English phrasal verbs, it is suggested that English phrasal verbs serve as conceptually dependent relational expressions that need to be filled and elaborated by autonomous entities, namely nouns (which need to serve as profile determinants). As Langacker (ibid: 106, 108) explained, the profile determinant is conceptually autonomous because its profile prevails in determining the character of the composite structure in canonical valence relations. According to him, "the dependent structure is relational and includes within its profile an entity, specifically a thing, which corresponds to the profile of the autonomous structure."

The present paper also suggests that English phrasal verbs as conceptually dependent entities communicate the source domain of the evoked conceptual metaphor. The paper adopts Sullivan's (ibid: 135) AUTONOMY-DEPENDENCE CONSTRAINT stating that "in a metaphoric phrase or clause that can be understood out of context, every source-domain item must be conceptually dependent relative to at least one autonomous target-domain item."

3. Construction Grammar and Cognitive Grammar: the intransitive and the transitive resultative construction

This part discusses the typology of the resultative argument structure construction and explains how conceptually autonomous and conceptually dependent entities function when they are employed in metaphoric resultative constructions. It is suggested that a construction grammar approach to metaphoric argument structure constructions explains how conceptual metaphors are licensed. In this respect, a construction grammar approach to metaphoric argument structure constructions explains which entities communicate the source domain and which entities communicate the target domain.

3.1. *The intransitive resultative construction*

In intransitive resultatives there are two complements which can be autonomous relative to the verb. These components are the subject and the result phrase (RP). The RP can be of the form prepositional phrase (PP) or adjectival phrase (AP) and designates either a path or a property. A property is the endpoint of the process denoted by the verb (Goldberg 1995, Ettlinger 2005).

According to Sullivan (2013: 95), the RP of the form AP-RP can be conceptually autonomous relative to the verb despite the fact that APs are (normally) conceptually dependent relative to the noun phrases they modify. She claimed that it is more likely to expect RPs of the form PP-RP to be conceptually autonomous relative to their head XP. This is due to the fact that when "when the XP head represents an event, as verbs do, then the PP elaborates that head much as in a resultative" (ibid: 95).

Sullivan (2013) stated that in intransitive resultatives the target domain can be evoked by a) the subject (in this case the RP may serve as a domain-item, b) the RP (in this case the subject may be a domain-neutral item (i.e., when it is a pronoun or a proper name) and c) both the subject and the RP (ibid: 96). The verb is always a source-domain item. As far as English phrasal verbs are concerned, the present paper suggests that the English phrasal verb *come up* means 'something is about to happen' in the intransitive construction *a busy period is coming up in a couple of weeks*. *Come up s*erves as a conceptually dependent entity. The subject *a busy period* serves as target-domain item and functions as a conceptually autonomous entity. The RP *in a couple of weeks* is conceptually autonomous relative to the phrasal verb *come up*. In this context, *come up* evokes the MOTION domain and the subject along with the RP evoke the TIME domain. This intransitive resultative construction encourages the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MOTION.

In addition, Sullivan (2013) stated that in intransitive resultatives the RP can serve as a source-domain item (this means that the RP serves as a conceptually dependent entity) when several conditions are fulfilled. According to her, the target domain must be evoked elsewhere. This condition holds for context-free intransitive resultatives as the target can be evoked only via the subject (ibid: 96). According to this condition, if the result phrase is either a source-domain item or a domain-neutral item then, the target domain must be indicated by the subject (ibid: 96). Sullivan's (ibid) second condition states that the source-domain verb and source-domain result phrase can evoke the same frame. In Sullivan's (ibid: 97) theory, the source-domain RPs are limited to property resultatives "when the RP involves the same frame as the verb, it is helping to evoke a frame that then is elaborated by the subject [and] this makes the RP dependent, at least to some degree, relative to the target-domain subject."

As far as metaphoric intransitive resultative constructions are concerned, Sullivan (2013) stated that they are highly variable in terms of conceptual autonomy and conceptual dependence. However, the verb is always a conceptually dependent entity and serves as source-domain item. The subject and the RP exhibit a great variability because the subject can be either a target-domain item (conceptually autonomous) or a domain-neutral item. The RP can be i) a target-domain item (conceptually autonomous), ii) a domain-neutral item and iii) a source-domain item (conceptually dependent).

3.2. *The transitive resultative construction*

Transitive resultative constructions are different from intransitive resultative constructions in the sense that the former type selects a direct object, whereas the latter does not. According to Gold-berg and Jackendoff (2004: 537), the direct object undergoes the change designated by the RP in transitive resultative constructions. Langacker (1991: 410) stated that in literal transitive resultative constructions such as *Sally pushed the ball down the hill* the direct object is conceptually dependent relative to the verb. As far as metaphoric transitive resultative constructions are concerned, Sullivan (2013: 99) stated that the object is either conceptually autonomous (target domain item) relative to the verb or domain-neutral.

Sullivan (2013) observed that there are three conceptually autonomous entities (subject, direct object, RP) in metaphoric transitive resultative constructions. She stated that the presence of multiple conceptually autonomous entities explains the greater variability concerning domain evocation. According to her, the RP in transitive resultative constructions (as in intransitive resultative constructions) is either a target-domain item (conceptually

autonomous) or a domain-neutral item or a source-domain item (conceptually dependent) (ibid: 99).

Applying these ideas to English phrasal verbs, the present paper suggests that the English phrasal verb *come up* means 'to rise in hierarchy' in the transitive resultative construction *he came up through the ranks to become CEO of the company*. *Come up* serves as a conceptually dependent entity. The object *he* is a domain-neutral item. The RP *through the ranks* serves as a conceptually dependent entity. *To become CEO of the company* serves as a conceptually autonomous entity. *Come up* and *through the ranks* serve as source-domain items and evoke the MOTION domain. *To become CEO of the company* serves as a target-domain item and evokes the ACTIVITY domain. This transitive resultative construction prompts for the conceptual metaphor MOUNTING THE CORPORATE LADDER IS UPWARD MOTION.

Finally, Sullivan (2013: 99-100) observed that in transitive resultative constructions (as in intransitive resultative constructions) the rarest case of domain evocation (by means of the RP) is when the RP serves as a source-domain item (and is a conceptually dependent entity). The RP is conceptually dependent relative to the subject and the direct object when at least one of these two elements evokes the target domain. She stated that a transitive resultative construction with a conceptually dependent RP cannot simultaneously have a domain-neutral subject and an object.

3.3. Conclusion on resultative constructions (transitives and intransitives)

A review of the literature of resultative constructions has shown that both in transitive resultative constructions and in intransitive resultative constructions the verb serves always as a conceptually dependent entity. The result phrase (RP) (in most cases) serves as conceptually autonomous entity. In metaphoric resultative constructions, the conceptually dependent entity communicates the source domain, whereas the conceptually autonomous entity communicates the target domain of the licensed conceptual metaphor. The following part explains how the figurative meanings of *come up* are triggered when this English phrasal verb is employed in metaphoric resultative constructions.

4. *Come up* instances: the evocation of their figurative meanings

The present section discusses how the figurative meanings of *come up* are evoked in transitive and intransitive resultative constructions. The section explains the evocation of the figurative meanings of English phrasal verbs

on the grounds of the autonomy-dependence relation by adopting a Construction Grammar approach. The section also presents some central ideas of the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT).

4.1. *Metaphor and figuration*

For most people, metaphor constitutes a device of poetic imagination; metaphor is a matter of extraordinary rather than ordinary language and is typically viewed as a characteristic of language alone (a matter of words) (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980b: 453). The framework of Cognitive Linguistics views metaphor as being pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action as well (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980b: 454). Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature in the sense that "[t]he concepts that govern our thought are not just matters of the intellect. They also govern our everyday functioning to the most mundane details. Our concepts structure what we perceive, how we get around in the world, and how we relate to other people. Our conceptual system thus plays a central role in defining our everyday realities" (ibid: 454).

Additionally, the framework of Cognitive Linguistics states that conceptual metaphors are different from linguistic metaphors. Conceptual metaphors are overarching cross-domain mappings. Conceptual metaphors influence our thinking and reasoning. Linguistic metaphors are the linguistic realizations of conceptual metaphors. For example, linguistic realizations of the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR are metaphoric expressions such as *he attacked every weak point in my argument*, *I demolished his argument*, *I've never won an argument with him* etc. (Lakoff & Johnson 1980a: 5). As Lakoff and Johnson (1980a: 5) highlighted, the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR "structures the actions we perform in arguing' in spite of the fact that there is no physical battle. According to them, verbal battle is reflected in linguistic metaphors (such as the afore-mentioned) which are linguistic realizations of the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR(ibid: 5).

As far as metaphorical concepts are concerned, Lakoff and Johnson (1980b: 456) stated that they are systematic. For example, in the conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR, expressions like a*ttack a position, indefensible* and *strategy* constitute a systematic way according to which we talk about the war-like aspect of arguing (ibid: 456). Lakoff and Johnson (ibid: 458) argued that metaphorical systematicity "[...] will necessarily hide other aspects of the concept." This means that a metaphorical concept "can keep us from focusing on other aspects of the concept which are not coherent with that metaphor" (ibid: 458).

Croft and Cruse (2004: 55) stated that metaphor involves a relationship between a source domain (namely "the source of the literal meaning of the metaphorical expression") and a target domain (namely "the domain of the experience actually being described by the metaphor"). For example, the conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY generates the metaphorical expression *waste time* (Lakoff & Johnson 1980a). In this example, TIME (the target domain) is compared to MONEY (the source domain). As Croft and Cruse (ibid: 55) observed, in *waste time* "time is construed as a valuable asset that is possessed by human beings and can be 'used' in the same way that money is". This example suggests that metaphor involves a certain kind of inter- action between two domains; as Croft and Cruse (ibid: 193) pointed out, such inter- action "[is] construed from two regions of purport, and the content of the vehicle domain is an ingredient of the construed target through processes of correspondence and blending."

4.2. Come up *instances*

The English phrasal verb *come up* is one of the most frequently used English phrasal verbs. This might have to do with the fact that its two component parts, namely the verb *come* the particle *up* also exhibit a high degree of frequency of use in everyday communication. *Come* prototypically designates actions like 'moving' and means 'to move towards somebody or something' and 'to arrive.' In its more figurative senses *come* means 'to come as emotion or reaction' and 'to have an orgasm.' The particle *up* means 'to cover an area completely' 'to reach the highest limit,' 'to reach a goal,' 'to move to a higher degree or value' (Rudzka-Ostyn, 2003: 77, 80, 86).

The English phrasal verb *come up* has the following figurative meanings[6] 1) 'to come close to someone in order to speak to them' (+to) (e.g., *A young girl came up to me and asked for money.*), 2) 'If someone comes up to a place, they travel north to the place where you are (+to)' (e.g., *Why don't you come up to New York for the weekend?*), 3) 'to mention, discuss a subject' (e.g., *What points came up at the meeting?*), 4) 'to appear for a problem or a difficulty' (e.g., *The same problems come up every time.*), 5) 'to become available (i.e., for a job or an opportunity)' (e.g., *A position has come up in the accounts department.*), 6) 'to be dealt with in a law court' (e.g., *Your case comes up next week.*), 7) 'to happen unexpectedly' (*e.g., I've got to go - something has just come up at home and I'm needed there.*), 8) 'to move up into the sky'(e.g., *It will be so great watching the sun come up.*), 9) 'to begin to grow (e.g., for a plant)' (e.g., *The*

---

[6] The interpretations of the figurative meanings of the English phrasal verb *come up* along with the examples come from the following sources, namely Oxford English Dictionary, Macmillan Dictionary, Collins English Dictionary, Merriam-Webster Dictionary, Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, BNC.

first spring bulbs are just coming up.), 10) 'to have to deal with problems or difficulties (+against)' (e.g., *In every direction he came up against his own incompleteness*.), 11) 'to be discussed or examined (+for)' (e.g., *He wanted more time to study the bill before it came up for discussion on the Senate floor*.), 12) 'to reach a particular standard (+to)' (e.g., H*e didn't come up to his father's expectations*.), 13) 'to think of an idea, answer etc., (+with)' (e.g., *He's come up with a new way to use up cold chicken*.), 14) 'to deliver/produce (+with)' (e.g., *Will you be able to come up with the cash by the end of the month?*).

The following table illustrates the instances of *come up* that are going to be discussed in the present paper.

Table 1: Instances of come up and their figurative meanings.

INSTANCES OF *COME UP*		
Examples	**Identification of the type of the argument structure construction**	**Figurative meanings of *come up***
(1) *A busy period **is coming up** in a couple of weeks.*	Intransitive resultative construction	'something is about to happen'
(2) *A number of interesting points **came up** at today's meeting.*	Intransitive resultative construction	'to appear', 'to refer', 'to mention' etc.
(3) *He **came up** through the ranks to become CEO of the company.*	Transitive resultative construction	'to rise in hierarchy'
(4) *He didn't **come up** to his father's expectations.*	Intransitive resultative construction	'to meet standards'

To begin with, it is suggested that in example (1) *A busy period is coming up in a couple of weeks* the English phrasal verb *come up* is employed in an intransitive resultative construction. Following Goldberg's (1995), Goldberg and Jackendoff's (2004) and Sullivan's (2013) theories on resultative constructions, it is suggested that *come up* serves as a conceptually dependent entity that needs to be filled by an autonomous entity. In example (1), the subject *a busy period* and the RP-PP *in a couple of weeks* serve as conceptually autonomous entities. The subject and the RP-PP fill and elaborate the conceptually dependent phrasal verb.

Moreover, *come up* serves as a source-domain item and evokes the MO-TION domain. The conceptually autonomous entities, namely *a busy period* and *in a couple of weeks* serve as target-domain items and they communicate the TIME domain. The distribution of source- and target-domain items in the intransitive resultative construction (example 1) encourages the evocation of the conceptual metaphor[7] TIME IS MOTION. This conceptual metaphor triggers the figurative interpretation of *come up* as 'something is about to happen.'

In example (2) *A number of interesting points came up at today's meeting*, the English phrasal verb *come up* is employed in an intransitive resultative construction. In (2), the subject *a number of interesting points* and the RP-PP *at today's meeting* serve as conceptually autonomous entities. The subject and the RP-PP fill and elaborate the conceptually dependent phrasal verb.

It is suggested that *come up* serves as a source-domain item and evokes the MOTION domain. The conceptually autonomous entities, namely *a number of interesting points* and *at today's meeting* serve as target-domain items and they communicate the COMMUNICATION domain. The distribution of source- and target-domain items in the intransitive resultative construction (example 2) encourages the evocation of the conceptual metaphor COMMUNICATION IS SENDING. This conceptual metaphor triggers the figurative interpretation of *come up* as 'appear, mention, refer,' etc.

In example (3) *He came up through the ranks to become CEO of the company*, the English phrasal verb *come up* is employed in a transitive resultative construction. *Come up* serves as a conceptually dependent entity that needs to be filled at elaborated by at least one conceptually autonomous entity.

It is interesting to consider that in (3) the autonomous entity that elaborates the phrasal verb is not the RP *through the ranks* because in this example the RP constitutes a conceptually dependent entity. As it was mentioned in the previous part of the paper, in some rare cases the RP can serve as a conceptually dependent entity in transitive resultative constructions. According to the afore-mentioned theories on metaphoric transitive resultative constructions, when the RP is conceptually dependent either the subject or the object must be conceptually autonomous. In (3) the subject *he* serves as domain-neutral item because it communicates neither the source nor the target domain. The object *to become CEO of the company* serves as conceptually autonomous entity that fills the dependent entities (namely, phrasal verb and RP).

---

[7] The labels of the conceptual metaphors (which are evoked when investigating English phrasal verbs within resultative constructions) are taken from Kövecses' (2010) Metaphor and Metonymy Index (online source) and from The Master Metaphor List (online source by Lakoff et al.,). The labels of the source domain and the target domain are taken from The Master Metaphor List (online source by Lakoff et al.).

In (3) the phrasal verb *come up* and the RP-PP *through the ranks* as conceptually dependent entities serve as source domain items. They communicate the MOTION domain. The conceptually autonomous object *to become CEO of the company* serves as a target domain item. The object indicates the BUSINESS domain. It is also suggested that in (3) the distribution of source- and target-domain items prompts for the conceptual metaphor MOUNTING THE CORPORATE LADDER IS UPWARD MOTION. The evoked conceptual metaphor encourages the figurative interpretation of *come up* as 'to rise in hierarchy.'

Moreover, in example (4) *He didn't come up to his father's expectations*, the English phrasal verb *come up* is employed in an intransitive resultative construction. *Come up* is conceptually dependent and needs to be filled by an autonomous entity. The subject *he* serves as a domain-neutral item. The autonomous entity that elaborates the phrasal verb is the RP-PP *to his father's expectations.*

As far as the distribution of source- and target-domain items is concerned, it is suggested that in (4) the conceptually dependent *come up* serves as a source-domain item. *Come up* evokes the MOTION domain. The conceptually autonomous RP-PP *to his father's expectations* serves as a target-domain item. The RP-PP evokes the EMOTION domain. The evoked conceptual metaphor is EMOTION IS MOTION. It is also suggested that the evocation of this conceptual metaphor licenses the figurative interpretation of the English phrasal verb *come up* as 'to meet standards.'

The evocation of the figurative meanings of the English phrasal verb *come up* as investigated in examples (1), (2), (3) and (4) has shown that *come up* is always a conceptually dependent relative to the other elements of the construction. It was also shown that the English phrasal verb needs to be filled and elaborated by at least one conceptually autonomous entity. In all the afore-mentioned examples the English phrasal verb *come up* serves as a source-domain item and communicates the MOTION domain. It was also suggested that the target domain is always indicated by the conceptually autonomous entities. In these metaphoric resultative constructions, the target domain is TIME (example 1), COMMUNICATION (example 2), BUSINESS (example 3) and EMOTION (example 4). The following tables illustrate the evoked conceptual metaphors which license the figurative meanings of *come up*, as well as the distribution of source- and target-domain items in resultative constructions (as discussed in examples 1, 2, 3 and 4).

Table 2: List of conceptual metaphors evoked in resultative constructions (examples 1–4).

LIST OF CONCEPTUAL METAPHORS THAT TRIGGER THE FIGURATIVE MEANINGS OF *COME UP*	
Examples	**Conceptual metaphor**
(1) *A busy period **is coming up** in a couple of weeks.*	TIME IS MOTION
(2) *A number of interesting points **came up** at today's meeting.*	COMMUNICATION IS SENDING
(3) *He **came up** through the ranks to become CEO of the company.*	MOUNTING THE CORPORATE LADDER IS UPWARD MOTION
(4) *He didn't **come up** to his father's expectations.*	EMOTION IS MOTION

Table 3: The distribution of source- and target-domain items in resultative constructions (examples 1–4).

THE DISTRIBUTION OF SOURCE- AND TARGET-DOMAIN ITEMS IN RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS			
Resultative construction	**Type of resultative construction**	**Source-domain items**	**Target-domain items**
(1) *A busy period **is coming up** in a couple of weeks.*	Intransitive resultative	English phrasal verb	subject, RP-PP
(2) *A number of interesting points **came up** at today's meeting.*	Intransitive resultative	English phrasal verb	subject, RP-PP
(3) *He **came up** through the ranks to become CEO of the company.*	Transitive resultative	English phrasal verb, RP-PP	object
(4) *He didn't **come up** to his father's expectations.*	Intransitive resultative	English phrasal verb	RP

5. Conclusion

This paper attempted to suggest that a cognitive Construction Grammar approach to English phrasal verbs can explain how their figurative meanings are licensed. It was suggested that the constructional conventions of figurative language —within the boundaries they set— shape the ways in which figurative meanings are communicated. The paper investigated the evocation of the figurative meanings of *come up* when it is employed in metaphoric resultative argument structure constructions. It was shown that the conceptual autonomy-dependence relation — as a fundamental cognitive tool— explains which entity evokes the source domain and which entity evokes the target domain. The conceptual autonomy-dependence relation prompts for the evocation of conceptual metaphors which further trigger the figurative interpretations of English phrasal verbs. Finally, the paper attempted to demonstrate that English phrasal verbs as relational expressions always serve as conceptually dependent entities and as source-domain items of the evoked conceptual metaphor. English phrasal verbs as conceptually dependent entities need to be filled and elaborated by autonomous entities of the construction in which they are employed.

References

Bolinger, Dwight (1971). *The Phrasal Verb in English.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Croft, William, David A. Cruse (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David (1995). *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Curme, George O. (1925). The development of verbal compounds in Germanic. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 39: 320–361.

Dixon, Robert M. W (1982). *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar,* 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ettlinger, Marc (2005). Constructional compositionality and the English resultative. *Proceedings of 41st Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society* 41.2: 145–160.

Eckersley, Charles Ewart, John Macaulay, Eckersley (1960). *A Comprehensive English Grammar.* London: Longman.

Fauconnier, Gilles (1994). *Mental Spaces: Aspects of Meaning Construction in Natural Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, Gilles (1997). *Mappings in Thought and Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fauconnier, Gilles, Mark Turner (1998). Conceptual integration networks. *Cognitive Science* 22: 133–87.

Fauconnier, Gilles, Mark Turner (2002). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities.* New York: Basic Books.

Fraser, Bruce (1976). *The Verb-Particle Combination in English.* London/New York: Academic Press.

Goldberg, Adele E. (1995). *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Goldberg, Adele E., Ray Jackendoff. (2004). The English resultative as a family of constructions. *Language* 80: 532–568. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2004.0129

Hampe, Beate (1997). Facing up the meaning of "face up to": A cognitive semantico-pragmatic analysis of an English verb-particle construction. Foolen, Ad, Frederike C. van der Leek, eds. *Constructions in Cognitive Linguistics*: *Selected Papers from the Fifth International Cognitive Linguistics Conference, Amsterdam 1997.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.178.07ham

Huddleston, Rodney, Geoffrey Pullum (2002). *Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jowett, W.P. (1950). On phrasal verbs. *English Language Teaching* 5: 152-157.

Kohl-Dietrich, Dorothee, Constanze Juchem-Grundmann, Wolfgang Schnotz (2016). Conceptual motivation as a tool for raising awareness in the English as a foreign language classroom - does it enhance learning outcomes? Insights from an empirical study. *Yearbook of the German Cognitive Linguistics Association* 4: 193-209.

Kruisinga, Etsko (1925). *A Handbook of Present-Day English. Part II: English Accidence and Syntax*, 4th edition. Utrecht: Kemink en Zoon.

Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson (1980a). *Metaphors We Live By.* Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Lakoff, George, Mark Johnson (1980b). Conceptual metaphor in everyday language. *The Journal of Philosophy* 77(8): 453-486.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1988). A view of linguistic semantics. Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida, ed. *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 49–90. https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.50.04lan

Langacker, Ronald W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Volume II. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Li, Wei, Xiuhong Zhang, Cheng Niu, Yuankai Jiang, Rohini Srihari (2003). An expert lexicon approach to identifying English phrasal verbs. *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 513–520.

Lindner, S.J. 1981. A Lexico-Semantic Analysis of English Verb Particle Constructions with OUT and UP. PhD dissertation. San Diego: University of California.

Live, Anna H. (1965). The discontinuous verb in English. *Word* 21: 428–451.

McArthur, Tom (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Mahpeykar, Narges, Andrea Tyler (2015). A principled cognitive linguistics account of English phrasal verbs with up and *out. *Language and Cognition* 7: 1-35.

McArthur, Tom (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, Frank Robert (1974). *The English Verb.* London: Longman.

Pelli, Mario G. (1976). *Verb-Particle Constructions in English: A Study Based on American Plays from the End of the 18th Century to the Present.* Bern: Francke Verlag.

Radden, Günter, René Driven (2007). *Cognitive English Grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rudzka-Ostyn, Brygida (2003). *Word Power: Phrasal Verbs and Compounds: A Cognitive Approach*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, F.J. & Galera-Masegosa, A. (2011). Going beyond metaphtonymy: Metaphoric and metonymic complexes in phrasal verb interpretation. *Language Value* 3(1): 1-29.

Sag, Ivan, Timothy Baldwin, Francis Bond, Ann Copestake, Dan Flickinger (2002). Multiword expressions: A pain in the neck for NLP. *Proceedings of CICLING*: 1-16.

Shaked, Nava Ayala (1994). *The Treatment of Phrasal Verbs in a Natural Language Processing System.* PhD Dissertation, CUNY.

Sullivan, Karen (2013.) *Frames and Constructions in Metaphoric Language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tsaroucha, Efthymia (2018). *A Cognitive Linguistics Approach to English Phrasal Verbs*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece. Available online: http://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/299055/?ln=en.

Tsaroucha, Efthymia (2019). The Conceptualization of English Phrasal Verbs by Greek Primary School Learners: An Empirical Cognitive Approach. *Languages*, 4(3): 51):1-13.

Turner, Mark (1991). *Reading Minds. The Study of English in the Age of Cognitive Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Turner, M. 1996. *The Literary Mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tyler, Andrea (2012). *Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Learning: Theoretical Basics and Experimental Evidence*. New York/London: Routledge.

Villavicencio, Aline (2003). Verb-particle constructions and lexical resources. *Proceedings of the ACL 2003 Workshop on Multiword Expressions: Analysis, Acquisition and Treatment* 18: 57-64.

White, Benjamins J. (2012). A conceptual approach to the instruction of phrasal verbs. *The Modern Language Journal* 96: 419-438.

Dictionaries & Corpus:

Collins English Dictionary. https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english (last accessed 15 June 2018)

British National Corpus. http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk (last accessed 15 June 2018)

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. http://www.ldoceonline.com (last accessed 15 June 2018)

Macmillan Dictionary. http://www.macmillandictionary.com (last accessed 15 June 2018)

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. https://www.merriam-webster.com (last accessed 15 June 2018) Oxford English Dictionary. http://www.oed.com (last accessed 15 June 2018)

The Oxford Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs. Retrieved from: http://english4success.ru/Upload/books/358.pdf (last accessed 15 June 2018)

Online sources:

Index of Kövesces Metaphors.

http://www.bowlib.bowenuniversity-edu.org/joomla/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=1926&Itemid=37 (last accessed 15 June 2018).

Index of Lakoff Metaphors and Metonymies.

http://www.lang.osaka-u.ac.jp/~sugimoto/Master- MetaphorList/metaphors/ (p. 369-375 [last accessed 15 June 2018]).

Index of Lakoff Source Domains.
    http://www.lang.osaka-u.ac.jp/~sugimoto/MasterMetaphor-List/sources/index.html (last accessed 15 June 2018).

Index of Lakoff Target Domains.
    http://www.lang.osakau.ac.jp/~sugimoto/MasterMetaphorList/targets/index.html (last accessed 15 June 2018).

Master Metaphor List.
    http://araw.mede.uic.edu/~alansz/metaphor/METAPHORLIST.pdf (last accessed 15 June 2018).

Author's address:

University of Thessaly
Centre of Foreign Languages
Argonafton & Filellinon
38221 Volos, Greece
E-mail: etsaroucha@uth.gr