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Welcome to the Fifth International Conference on Construction Grammar (ICCG-5) at the University of Texas at Austin. This booklet contains the abstracts of all the presentations as well as other useful information. I hope that the conference in Austin will provide the ground for stimulating discussions, just like the previous conferences on Construction Grammar held in Berkeley (2001), Helsinki (2002), Marseille (2004), and Tokyo (2006).

I would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues at UT who served as members of the local organizing committee: John Beavers (Linguistics), Lars Hinrichs (English), Knud Lambrecht (French & Italian), and Marc Pierce (Germanic Studies). Special thanks to Johanna Barðdal as the chair of the program committee, which included the members of the international advisory committee (see previous page). Many thanks go to the office staff of Germanic Studies, particularly Jamie Bowman and Maria Pineda, who have supported the conference organization in so many ways. Without the wonderful student volunteers, it would not have been possible to put on this conference: Many thanks to Nick Gaylord, Daniel Friedman, Kate Shaw, Jale Tumay, Guido Halder, Louise Swanepoel, Erin Covert, Emilie Destruel, Nick Bowden, Inge De Bleecker, Anja Moehring, Elias Ponvert, Elena Liskova, Maggie Gemmell, Ashley Ritter, Raphael Feider, and Andre Souza.

This conference would not have been possible without the financial support of the College of Liberal Arts (Randy Diehl, Dean) and a number of departments: Germanic Studies (John Hoberman, chair), Linguistics (Richard Meyer, chair), French and Italian (Daniela Bini, chair), and English (Elizabeth Cullingford, chair). Finally, John Benjamins Publishing Company is well-known in the Construction Grammar community for publishing the book series “Constructional Approaches to Language” and the peer-reviewed journal “Constructions and Frames” (starting in 2009). We are very grateful for Benjamin’s support of ICCG-5 by providing us with conference bags, pens, and name tags.

Best wishes for an enjoyable conference at the University of Texas at Austin!

Hans C. Boas (Chair of the Organizing Committee)
### GENERAL PROGRAM

**Thursday, September 25<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Welcome reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Lobby of the Applied Computational Engineering and Sciences building, ACES)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday, September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:45</td>
<td>Coffee/Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Santa Rita Room, Texas Union Building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 – 9:00</td>
<td>Welcome: Randy Diehl, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Union Theater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 10:00</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay: Not as hard a problem to solve as you might have thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Union Theater)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 – 10:30</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Santa Rita Room)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 – 11:00</td>
<td>Session 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hsiao: Path types: Directional verb complexes in Mandarin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Union Theater; Chair: J. Beavers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eisenbeiss: Constructing morphological representations: The acquisition of German possessive markers, determiners and quantifiers. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: S. Iwata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lashevskaja/Rakhilina: What construction grammar can tell us about categorical structure? A case study of containers in Russian. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: M. Pierce)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 – 11:30</td>
<td>Session 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuzar: Prototype-based conceptual categorization of evaluative meaning. (Union Theater; Chair: J. Beavers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mischler: A construction grammar approach to pedagogy: Bridging the theory/practice gap. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: S. Iwata)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moder: Noun modification as grammatical construction. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: M. Pierce)

11:30 – 12:00 Session 1.3

Israel: Polarity sensitive catenative verb constructions in English. (Union Theater; Chair: J. Beavers)

Dugruoz/Backus: Dutch influence on Turkish constructions in Turkish–Dutch contact. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: S. Iwata)

Pompei/Grandi: Complex -éō verbs in Ancient Greek: A case study on the interface between derivation, compounding and inflection. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: M. Pierce)

12:00 – 13:30 Lunch

13:30 – 14:00 Session 2.1

Noël/Colleman: The constructional status of "nominative with infinitives" in Dutch. (Union Theater; Chair: L Michaelis)

Lauwers: From lexicalization to constructional generalizations: On complex prepositions in French. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: J. Barðdal)

Asao: Productivity of compounds: An application of constructional morphology. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: K. Lambrecht)

14:00 – 14:30 Session 2.2

Nikolaeva: Root infinitive constructions. (Union Theater; Chair: L Michaelis)

Kim/Sells: A constructional approach to multiple nominative constructions. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: J. Barðdal)

Fradin: Constructions as morphological bases. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: K. Lambrecht)

14:30 – 15:00 Session 2.3

Bergen/Han: Constructional meaning and mental simulation. (Union Theater; Chair: L Michaelis) Cancelled.

Brekke: Are Tibetan monks really revolting? A constructional look at experiencer verbs. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: J. Barðdal)
Yoon: Comprehending and creating novel verb-noun compounds in Spanish: The role of constructional meaning. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: K. Lambrecht)

15:00 – 15:30 Coffee (Santa Rita Room)

15:30 – 16:00 Session 3.1
Salmon: Constructions and the new conventional Implicature. (Union Theater; Chair: M. Pierce)
Chang: A special type of Chinese concessive constructions: A constructional approach. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: A. Moehring)
Family: Light verb constructions in Persian. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: G. Halder)

16:00 – 16:30 Session 3.2
Demeter: The construal of "sorry" in Apologies: A construction grammar perspective. (Union Theater; Chair: M. Pierce)
Gonzálvez Garcia: The 'grammar as fragment' review revisited from a contrastive perspective: Beyond finite complement clauses in English and Spanish. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: A. Moehring)
Tsujimura/Davis: A construction approach to innovative verbs in Japanese. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: G. Halder)

16:30 – 17:00 Session 3.3
Fujii: The antecedent-only conditional constructions. (Union Theater; Chair: M. Pierce)
Deulofeu: «Fragments» and discourse patterns: Backward discourse licensed PPs in spoken French. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: A. Moehring)
Attardo: The full reduplication construction in Sicilian. (Texas Governor’s Room; Chair: G. Halder)

17:00 – 17:45 Break

17:45 – 18:45 Plenary
Barðdal: Reconstructing syntax: Construction grammar and the comparative method. (Union Theater)
Saturday, September 27th, 2008

8:30 – 9:00  Coffee
             (Santa Rita Room)

9:00 – 10:00 Plenary
             Michaelis: Myths about construction grammar. (Union Theater)

10:00 – 10:30 Coffee
              (Santa Rita Room)

10:30 – 11:00 Session 4.1
              Moehring: Over and over vs. again and again: Similarities and
differences of two instances of the x-and-x construction in English.
              (Union Theater; Chair: F. González García)

              Steels/van Trijp: Argument realization in fluid construction
              grammar. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: L. Hinrichs)

              Acuña-Fariña: The close apposition map. (Eastwoods Room;
              Chair: G. Halder)

11:00 – 11:30 Session 4.2
              Huang: 1,000 ways to die: Resultative V-si in Mandarin Chinese.
              (Union Theater; Chair: F. González García)

              Hasebe: An object-oriented computational model for processing
              linguistic constructions. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: L. Hinrichs)

              Kim: Conative and its related constructions: An extended semantic
              map approach. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: G. Halder)

11:30 – 12:00 Session 4.3
              Lien: Interface of lexical properties and constructions: A case
              study of soah4 in TSM. (Union Theater; Chair: F. González
              García)

              Bryant: Exploiting statistical information in constructional
              analysis. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: L. Hinrichs)

              Lu: The semantics of the English caused-motion construction.
              (Eastwoods Room; Chair: G. Halder)
12:00 – 13:30 Lunch

13:30 – 15:30 Posters
(Santa Rita Room)

Gaytán: Constructions and the Spanish subjunctive

Chishman/Bertoldi/Kohlrausch: The FrameCorp project: A preliminary report

González: Transitivity and impersonality: The demise and return of the Spanish impersonal construction

Guénot: Parsing paratactic relations with a multi-dimensional construction grammar: The case of antithetic constructions

Hsiao: The Degree of constructional meaning abstractness of chi(EAT)+XP in Chinese

Li: Variation of X det4 constructions in Hakka

Reed: Incremental fluid Construction Grammar

Sams: A construction grammar analysis of written English quotatives

Tsuchiya: A corpus-based approach to Japanese adjectives in adnominal and conjunctive form

Weber: The possessive suffixes of Huallaga Quechua: A reconsideration in light of Construction Grammar

Wen: Tautological constructions in Mandarin Chinese

15:45 – 16:15 Coffee
(Santa Rita Room)

16:15 – 16:45 Session 5.1

Ross: Where better to talk about this than here. (Union Theater; Chair: K. Lambrecht)

Hudson/Wiktorsson: Constructions around the relaters about and between. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: S. Wechsler)

Lai/Yeh: Causative constructions without causative markers: Cases from Hakka. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: H. Boas)
16:45 – 17:15  Session 5.2

Kanetani: *Just because of* a causal PP doesn't mean that it cannot be a subject: An analogical construction. (Union Theater; Chair: K. Lambrecht)

Willems: A constructional corpus-based approach of 'weak' verbs in French. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: S. Wechsler)

Hu: Constructions out of constructions: A case study of *choe3-chit8-e7* and *e7-ku2* constructions in Taiwanese Southern Min. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: H. Boas)

17:15 – 17:45  Session 5.3

Hoffmann: Preposition pied piping and stranding in British English: An experimental- and corpus-based construction grammar analysis. (Union Theater; Chair: K. Lambrecht)

Lancioni: From formulas to constructions: the case of Arabic. Quadrangle Room; Chair: S. Wechsler)

Iwata: Another look at the maximal end-point constraint on resultatives. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: H. Boas)

17:45 – 18:30  Break

18:30 – 19:30  Plenary

Sag: English Filler-Gap Constructions. (Union Theater)

20:00 – 23:00  Banquet
(AT&T Executive Education and Conference Center, 1600 University Avenue, Room 301)

______________________________
Sunday September 28th, 2008
______________________________

8:30 – 9:00  Coffee
(Santa Rita Room)

9:00 – 9:30  Session 6.1

Prado-Alonso: A constructional analysis of full-verb inversion. (Union Theater; Chair: J. Barðdal)
Hollmann: Constructions in the mind and in society: the grammaticalization of 'lie' into a progressive aspect marker. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: S. Iwata)

9:30 – 10:00  
Session 6.2

Ellsworth/Lee-Goldman: A constructional extension to syntactic control: Enter semantics and metaphor. (Union Theater; Chair: J. Barðdal)

Chiang: The reification of situational dynamic modality without modals: Hakka idiomatic "yu1/mo5 N ho2 V" construction. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: S. Iwata)

10:00 – 10:30  
Session 6.3

Lai/Luo: The implicit theme construction in Hakka: Interaction of structure, meaning and discourse. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: S. Iwata)

10:30 – 11:00  
Coffee  
(Santa Rita Room)

11:00 – 12:00  
Plenary

Webelhuth: A Lexical-Constructional Approach to "Movement Mismatches". (Union Theater)

12:00 – 13:30  
Lunch

13:30 – 14:00  
Session 7.1

Pedersen: Levels of constructional organization: Typological differences. (Union Theater; Chair: L. Hinrichs)

Zhu: Ergative constructions in Mandarin. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: L. Michaelis)

Sawada: Intermediate transitive constructions in Japanese: A construction grammar approach. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: J. Beavers)

14:00 – 14:30  
Session 7.2

Petrucc: Empowering constructions. (Union Theater; Chair: L. Hinrichs)

Lyngfelt: Relativizing transitivity and voice: Reflexive and deponent constructions in Swedish. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: L. Michaelis)
Ueda: The Japanese -te yaru benefactive construction revisited. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: J. Beavers)

14:30 – 15:00
Session 7.3

Simó: The frame elements of NOVELTY in chess: A cross-linguistic exploration. (Union Theater; Chair: L. Hinrichs)

Collemann: Variation and change in constructional semantics: The Dutch ditransitive. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: J. Beavers)

15:00 – 15:30
Coffee
(Santa Rita Room)

15:30 – 16:00
Session 8.1

Ohara: Representing lexicon and grammar in Japanese FrameNet. (Union Theater; Chair: H. Boas)

Nir-Sagiv: Resonating constructions in narrative discourse. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: A. Moehring)

Bilbiie: Reconstructing ellipsis: The case of gapping in Romanian. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: F. Gonzálvez Garcia)

16:00 – 16:30
Session 8.2

Hasegawa/Ohara/Fujii/Lee-Goldman/Fillmore: Constructions for measurements and comparison in Japanese and English. (Union Theater; Chair: H. Boas)

Terkourafi: Beyond intersubjectivity: Some cross-linguistic evidence for the motivation for constructional structure in language. (Quadrangle Room; Chair: A. Moehring)

Cappelle/Shtyrov/Pulvermüller: MEG evidence for lexeme status of phrasal verbs. (Eastwoods Room; Chair: F. Gonzálvez Garcia)

16:30 – 16:45
Closing Remarks
LECTURE ROOMS AND MAPS OF THE UT CAMPUS

UNB  Union Building: Union Theater, Santa Rita, Governor’s, Eastwoods, and Quadrangle Rooms.
ACE  Applied Computational Engineering and Sciences Building: Reception Sept. 25, 2008, 18:00 – 20:00.

ATT  AT&T Executive Education and Conference Center, Corner of University Avenue and MLK Boulevard: Room 301. Conference Banquet, Sept. 27th, 2008, 20:00 – 23:00.
Union Building Detail
PLENARY LECTURES

Reconstructing Syntax: Construction Grammar and the Comparative Method*
Jóhanna Barðdal
University of Bergen
17:45 – 18:45, September 26th, 2008

It has been categorically assumed within both synchronic and diachronic linguistics that oblique or non-nominative subjects are a modern phenomenon in the Indo-European languages where they are attested and that they have developed from objects, although the exact nature of this development remains both unexplored and unaccounted for. A more radical view was recently suggested in Eythórsson & Barðdal (2005) where it is argued that subject-like obliques already behaved syntactically as subjects in Old Germanic. This raises the question whether this syntactic peculiarity of these Germanic languages should be regarded as an archaism inherited from Proto-Indo-European or as an (independent) innovation in the Germanic languages. This in turn begs the question of what the typological status of the case marking and alignment system in Proto-Indo-European was, i.e. nominative–accusative, ergative–absolute or stative–active.

The theory of Construction Grammar, where all linguistic units, including syntactic units, are treated as a pairing of form and function, allows for the reconstruction of the syntax of Proto-Indo-European, which is definitely its least studied subfield. On a constructional account, there is no fundamental difference between sentences and words. This means that if words can be reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European, as form-function correspondences, on the basis of the comparative method, so can structures at the sentence level. Hence, the development of the theoretical framework of Construction Grammar actuates a reconstruction of case and argument structure constructions for the proto-language, as the comparative method within Indo-European studies has only been applied to argument structure constructions to a very limited degree. Specifically the assumption that syntactic structures in themselves carry meaning, with which semantically compatible verbs are mapped, entails that case and argument structure constructions cannot be studied in isolation from the verbs which instantiate them.

Such a syntactic comparison, carried out across the archaic and ancient Indo-European languages, must thus involve both the relevant case and argument structure constructions, as well as the predicates instantiating these constructions. The etymological development of the relevant lexemes must also be investigated in order to throw light on the origin of the case marking patterns. Crucially, however, if the argument structure of oblique-subject predicates can be shown to have existed in several of the earliest Indo-European languages, then the likelihood of this being an inherited feature from Proto-Indo-European increases significantly. Consequently, the case marking of oblique subjects must have its roots in the case marking and alignment patterns of corresponding structures in the proto-language. This is consistent with a stative–active, i.e. Fluid-S, alignment system where case marking is semantically motivated. Hence, any attempt to reconstruct a stage in which the oblique subject was an object may be groundless, as structures containing oblique subjects must perhaps be assumed as far back as Proto-Indo-European.


*Joint work with Thórhallur Eythórsson, University of Iceland
A number of 'wrap-around modifiers', including too, enough, so, more, less, -er, and as have in common the basic distributional property that their complement can (usually must) follow their head, as exemplified in (1).

(1)  
   a. too old an issue to worry about  
   b. more windows than I wanted to wash  
   c. So many more girls than boys that the dance was postponed

Also, as exemplified in (1c), more than one of these items, with its complement, can occur in a phrase.

However, these elements fail to share many distributional properties. For example, the complements of too, so, and enough cannot precede complements of a modified adjective, while comparative complements can. Compare (2) and (3)

(2)  
   a. too afraid of the water to swim  
   b. so afraid of the water I was shivering  
   c. *too afraid to swim of the water  
   d. *so afraid I was shivering of the water

(3)  
   a. more afraid than Kim of the water  
   b. less at home than Kim in the water

Similarly, comparative complements licensed in VP can either precede or follow complements of the modified adjective, but complements of too, enough, and so cannot. Compare (4) and (5).

(4)  
   a. more willing to help than Kim  
   b. more willing than Kim to help

(5)  
   a. so willing to help that everyone was surprised  
   b. *so willing that everyone was surprised to help

An analysis in Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG) attempts to sort out, explain, and model these and other details of differing distributions of different classes of wrap-around modifiers.
Observers of language behavior from varied backgrounds have converged on the insight that knowledge of language includes grammatical generalizations of varied grains. Cognition researchers offer construction-based models of acquisition (Tomasello 2006), aphasia (Gahl et al. 2000), sentence processing (Glenberg & Karschak 2002, Goldberg & Bencini 2005) and concept learning by autonomous agents (Steels & De Beule 2006). Bewilderingly, however, Construction Grammar (CxG) has affected neither the practice nor ideology of mainstream syntax. Persuading our fellow syntacticians to think constructionally will require us to refute some persistent but inaccurate stereotypes about Construction Grammar: (1) it is anti-formal and therefore nonrigorous; (2) it fails to capture generalizations in grammar; (3) its practitioners are obsessed with linguistic marginalia; (4) it is opposed to compositional semantics; (5) it is not constrained (“anything can be a construction”); and (6) it does not provide a universal framework for syntax. For each of these charges, I will offer a response that effectively reframes the problem:

(1) Not all work in CxG is formal, nor should it be: without descriptive work, there would be nothing to formalize. But constructions also provide tools for formalists. In Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG; Sag 2007), the basic units of grammatical description are signs (licensed either by lexical entry or construction). The grammar comprises a set of lexical entries and a set of constructions, structured by a type hierarchy.

(2) Construction-based transformational grammars did miss generalizations that more recent grammatical research addresses. But SBCG abandons the foundations of TG (string-rewriting systems) in favor of model-theoretic, constraint-based foundations.

(3) The constructions proposed in SBCG are intended to capture all combinatoric patterns of a language—from the most idiomatic to the most general. The latter include the specifier-head pattern and the head-complement pattern. We view the core-periphery distinction as a gradient phenomenon, and do not assume a cut-off point within a language at which our descriptive obligations end.

(4) On the strict view, a compositional language does not contain any paired non-synonymous phrases with identical structure and pairwise synonymous constituents (Szabó 2007). But if this is true, either English is noncompositional or any phrase with both idiomatic and composed readings (e.g., spill the beans) has two different syntactic analyses. For constructionists, each meaning is licensed by a distinct construction. Construction-based grammars are therefore intuitively compositional: if you know the meanings of the words and all the rules that combine words and phrases into larger formal units, then you know the meanings of all the larger units.

(5) Type hierarchies allow us to both capture potentially universal generalizations and describe entrenched exemplars of particular constructions.

(6) SBCG makes strong universal claims, captured by the Sign Principle and the Head-Feature Principle. Other putatively universal constraints on grammatical architecture, in particular those advanced by proponents of Principles and Parameters, appear to confuse representational conventions with linguistic facts.
This paper delineates the parameters of variation among English Filler-Gap constructions, arguing that an account of the variation is available within a framework based on the notion of ‘grammatical construction’. This account, which treats similarities and differences among topicalization, interrogatives, relatives, exclamatives, and comparative correlative clauses, is articulated within the framework of Sign-Based Construction Grammar (Sag 2007, available at: http://lingo.stanford.edu/sag/papers/theo-syno.pdf).

The Parameters of Variation in English FG Clauses include the following:

1. Is there a distinguished wh-element in the filler daughter, and if so, what kind (interrogative, relative, exclamative, definite, none)? (*[What a book] do they like?)

2. What are the possible syntactic categories of the filler daughter (among NP, PP, AP, AdvP)? (*[In what a mansion] they were living!)

3. What are the possible syntactic categories of the head daughter (S, CP, VP)? (*Bagels, [that I like])

4. Can the head daughter be inverted? Must it be? (*The more do you see (the more (do) you suspect).)

5. Can the head daughter be infinitival? (*It’s amazing [how many people (for us) to talk to].)

6. What is the semantic and/or syntactic category of the mother (proposition, question, fact,...)?

7. What is the semantic and/or syntactic category of the head daughter (proposition, soa,...)?

8. Is the clause a filler-gap island? (*[How many of the visitors]i did he say that [[bagels]j, he would give j to i ]?)

9. Must the clause be an ‘independent’ (‘main’) clause? (*We wondered about [who did he see].)

By organizing constructs via cross-classifying types, the appropriate generalizations are straightforwardly expressed as type constraints of varying grain. The results presented here stand as a challenge to any transformation-based analysis, including those developed within the ‘Minimalist Program’.
A Lexical-Constructional Approach to "Movement Mismatches"
Gert Webelhuth
Georg-August Universitaet Goettingen
11:00 – 12:00, September 28th, 2008

Usually, when dislocation from a phrase structural position is possible, then this position can also be overtly filled by an expression of the same part of speech as the filler. There exist exceptions to this generalization, however. This talk provides an overview of these exceptions, establishes a typology, and presents mutually compatible analyses of the major exception types in terms of the interaction of lexical and constructional constraints.
The Close Apposition Map
Juan Carlos Acuña-Fariña
University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain
10:30 – 11:00, September 27th, 2008

In Acuña-Fariña (2006) I discuss paradigmatic appositions like Madrid, the capital of Spain, and related loose or non-restrictive structures, under a construction grammar perspective, and argue that the verticality (or asymmetry) of inheritance links may not be the best way to capture the structure of the whole appositive space, the reason being that prototype structure is not the dominating categorisation route for all of the space. Here I would like to suggest that another network may be discerned for the category of so-called close appositions (including constructions like the poet Burns, my friend the poet, the word ‘Burns’, here in Texas, or we the men). The category is made up of similar but subtly different members and it is constrained by a number of parent specifications. More than that, however, what gives it more conceptual, formal, and even ontological reality is the density of the ties, the taxonomic ties, that connect all the constructions together and define a region in space via the sheer density of the ties in question. The region emerges as a result of taxonomic tie density (Langacker 2006), since the same density is not apparent when one compares any of the individual constructions with other constructions outside the category. This talk has two main objectives: the first is to show the lattice of interrelated constructions which creates a monosemous schematic category, that is, one with an overarching schema that captures all the members and where the distance between the schema and the instances leans to the minimal. The second is to argue that the lack of excessive drift, the strong conventionalization of each of the forms, and their relative frequency of occurrence, as well as their long entrenchedness in the language, together with the existence of conflicting and competing sanctioning noun phrase schemas exerting their influence on their constituency and maybe even in their origin, all conspire to create some segments with little internal stability in terms of constituency, segments which are nevertheless externally very stable. Their external stability is granted from the top, by the construction as a whole, which must be listed, and must enjoy a place in the representational organization of the language system as a whole.

References
This paper demonstrates that productivity of compounds can be best captured by using the idea of construction morphology (Booij 2005), based on a simulation study of Japanese verbal compounds.

While productivity of derivational affixes has been extensively studied, productivity of compounds has received less attention. Although quantitative measures for productivity of derivational affixes (Baayen 1992) can be naively applied to compounds, this cannot be a sufficient description because productivity of compounds does not conform with a one-dimensional scale.

The lack of a rigorous method of describing productivity of compounds has caused serious confusion in the classification of Japanese compounds. For example, compound verbs like (1a) have been considered rule-based because their first constituents are open-ended, while deverbal compounds like (1b) have been considered lexical because their second constituents are lexically restricted.

(1) a. tabe-hazimeru (eat-begin, ‘begin eating’) 
b. inaka-zumai (countryside-live, ‘rural life’)

In fact, both classes behave in the same way: their first constituents are open-ended and their second constituents are lexically restricted.

Such confusion, however, is easily resolved if we assume that each compound is an instance of a morphological construction. For example, the fact that -hazimeru ‘begin’ can productively yield compound verbs in Japanese, as in (1a), can be described by positing the construction [[V] -hazimeru]. In this view, the productivity of -hazimeru can be equated with the strength or degree of entrenchment of the corresponding construction. In the same vein, the existence of the construction [[N] - [N]] suggests not just that noun compounds are productive, but also that both first and second constituents are open-ended in noun compounds. In short, construction morphology offers a concise way to describe the set of possible and probable compounds in a given language.

A number of studies suggest that a construction is acquired in a bottom-up way. This paper tests this idea with a simple simulation model using actual frequency data of Japanese verbal compounds. Compounds are exposed to the model one after another, and the model gradually grows constructions based on similarity among them. It will be shown that the results well reflect the intuition of native speakers as to which compounds are likely to be productively created.

Methods shown in this study could be extended to more general computational models of how constructions are acquired and used in language.
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This paper documents an unusual reduplicative construction in Sicilian (a Southern “dialect” of Italian). Full reduplication in Sicilian has the common iconic meaning of intensification (nicu nicu = small small, very small), the relatively common sense of “authentic quality” (café café = coffee coffee, real coffee), and of durative aspect (talia talia, look look, looking on) as well as habitual aspect (zu vasa vasa, uncle kisses kisses, uncle who usually kisses) but also the relatively uncommon meanings of indeterminacy (comu vinni vinni, how it came it came, however it came out) and, to the best of my knowledge, almost unique meaning of indeterminate motion through space (caminari casa casa, to walk house house, to walk through the house).

I will examine critically previous attempts at explaining this construction, and primarily Wierzbicka’s mono-semantic account and then develop a cognitive account of the phenomena, in which I argue that the full reduplication construction in Sicilian has three basic meanings: intensity, iteration, and indeterminacy, from which all the senses described above can be analyzed. I also argue that attempts to reduce the various constructions to semantic or pragmatic derivations from a basic sense are not supported by the data.

Data for this study have been obtained from a variety of sources, but primarily from texts collected by Pitré (1875) and from the novels of Andrea Camilleri (1925-), elicitation, and native intuition.
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Constructional theories of grammar propose that grammatical constructions contribute semantics to a sentence not attributable to individual lexical items. The parade example is the distinction between the ditransitive and dative constructions. Exemplifying the approach adopted throughout Construction Grammar, Goldberg (1995) characterizes the ditransitive as encoding a transfer of possession meaning, while the dative encodes a caused motion meaning. Langacker (1990) goes slightly farther to argue that semantic contrast between the two argument structure constructions lies in the contribution that the word to makes to the assembled meaning of the utterance; in dative sentences, the morpheme to profiles the path travelled by the theme while the ditransitive apposition of two NPs highlights a possession relationship between the agent and the theme.

If grammatical constructions encode meaning in a psychologically real way, then there should be measurable differences in how individual language users interpret dative versus ditransitive sentences online. But exactly what differences should we expect? One version of Construction Grammar, known as Embodied Construction Grammar (Bergen & Chang 2005), makes testable claims about language processing. Embodied Construction Grammar proposes that constructional meanings, in combination with lexical meanings, culminate in the performance of mental simulations in the minds of language understanders. It further claims that language users mentally simulate the scenes described by language they process and that this mental simulation uses perceptual, motor, and other modality-specific brain systems. If the ditransitive and dative constructions have different meanings, then these should surface as differences in the mental simulations that understanders perform when they process sentences containing them. In particular, understanders should more intensely mentally simulate a path when processing a dative sentence than when processing a ditransitive one.

To test this claim, we had participants listen to dative (1a, 1b) and ditransitive sentences (1c, 1d) that described motion either away from (1a, 1c) or towards themselves (1b, 1d). Immediately after each sentence, participants performed a non-linguistic ‘target shooting’ task that required them to move the mouse either away from or towards themselves in order to hit a static target on the screen. We recorded how far they moved the mouse, which told us whether they over- or under-shot the target and by how much. We predicted that if the dative construction really highlights motion path, while the ditransitive does not, then participants who have just processed a dative sentence should perform actions that move along longer paths, even when performing a different action.

1. (a) You are sliding the cafeteria tray to Sally. [dative, away]
(b) Sally is sliding the cafeteria tray to you. [dative, towards]
(c) You are sliding Sally the cafeteria tray. [ditransitive, away]
(d) Sally is sliding you the cafeteria tray. [ditransitive, towards]

The results showed a significant difference in the distance that participants moved the mouse after the two constructions, \(F_1(1,29) = 3.914, p = .057\); \(F_2(1,35) = 4.392, p = .043\). After processing dative sentences, as compared with ditransitive sentences, participants moved the mouse farther. These results provide experimental evidence for the proposed semantic contributions of argument structure constructions; even with the same content words, sentences that use the dative more strongly activate path representations in understanders than do sentences that use the ditransitive. This effect can be measured through differences in the grounded motor routines that are used as language understanders perform mental simulations to interpret language.
Non-constituent Coordination phenomena (e.g. Right Node Raising, Argument Cluster Coordination and Gapping) remain a challenge for both derivational and non derivational framework relying on phrase structure, the most widespread view being that apparent ‘non-constituents’ involve some ‘elliptical’ process (conceived either as a full (syntactic) reconstruction, i.e. coordination taking place between two full sentences – cf. Hartmann 2000, Merchant 2004, Chaves 2005 –, or as a ‘semantic’ reconstruction with syntactic parallelism, i.e. coordination of a full sentence with a fragment – cf. Ginzburg & Sag 2000, Culicover and Jackendoff 2005).

The basic issue raised by gapping constructions such as (1) (where a complete sentence is coordinated with some elliptical one missing its head verb and possibly some other dependents) is the one raised by ellipsis in general, namely to determine at which level the missing material is to be reconstructed.

(1)  
a. [John ate an apple] and [[Mary] [a banana]].
b. [Jim flew to London on Sunday] and [[Mary] [to Paris] [on Thursday]].
c. [John tried to begin to write a poem] and [[Bill] [a song]].
d. [John will bring some flowers to Mary] and [either [[Bill] [some wine]] or [[Jane] [some whiskey]].

Here we provide new data from Romanian against approaches that rely on syntactic reconstruction, with deletion (or some null proform) in the ellipsis site, as schematized in (2a) (arguments: impossibility of verbal reconstruction in all cases; lack of complementizer in some relative or completive fragments, going against a sentential status of the fragment; semantic problems related to adverbial scope or to referential (non)identity of nominals), arguing for an analysis of the gapped conjunct as a verbless fragment, construction available also for short answers (cf. Culicover and Jackendoff 2005).

We then show some problems with accepting parallelism as a strong constraint: the constituents of the fragment may vary from their antecedents, according to grammatical category, case, number of valents or word order, but every constituent of the cluster must obey subcategorization rules imposed by missing predicate. We need a ‘semantic’ parallelism (i.e. Kontrast relation between constituents of the full sentence and elements in the cluster, cf. Hartmann 2000), but not necessarily syntactic symmetry.

Finally we show how a fragment-based analysis such as (2b), with semantic reconstruction can be handled formally within a construction-based HPSG framework. We model syntactic parallelism and semantic reconstruction, building from Ginzburg and Sag 2000 (for syntactic parallelism) and relying on the equational technique of Dalrymple et al. 1991, and Culicover and Jackendoff 2005 (for semantic reconstruction).

(2)  
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Setting the stage for a fresh look at some Experiencer verbs (like amaze, intrigue, or move, revolt etc.) the paper begins with an attempt to characterize the current Construction Grammar (CxG) paradigm against a backdrop of well established historical analyses of specificity levels in terms of ‘collocation vs. colligation’ (Firth) or even ‘etic vs. emic’ (Pike), and to view the familiar opposition between specific/lexical and schematic/formal expressions from a new vantage point as a continuum rather than a dichotomy.

One obvious candidate for a CxG reanalysis is the motley group of verbs loosely referred to as Psychological Predicates, and particularly the fifty or so physical/emotive Experiencer verbs (e.g. revolt) which display a systematic dualism between a literal “physical action” interpretation and a more metaphorical “psychological reaction” interpretation, each participating in their respective (and distinct) grammatical constructions. The crucial point is how to construe their meaning in expressions devoid of contextual clues, such as the question in the title of this paper, which can easily be disambiguated by replacing the adverb by “openly” or “somewhat,” forcing the respective physical/emotive reading. Determining the precise cognitive content of a given surface expression thus hinges crucially on the nature of its conceptual underpinnings as revealed (or concealed) by constructional elements.

A similar case can be made for possibly resolving certain conventional indeterminacies in the realm of terminology, where the often variable behavior of “multi-word terminological units” can be seen as quite similar to that of multi-word idioms containing variables (e.g. “pull [somebody-possessive] leg”). It is not obvious whether such expressions are best handled paradigmatically through listing of every variant in the lexicon, or syntagmatically through a grammatical rule filling in slots which are lexically unfilled, but again the CxG framework offers a fresh perspective for exploring these alternatives on the basis of concrete terminological examples.

The paper will argue that CxG, observed in the long historical perspective, can be viewed as an offshoot of Saussurean “sign” theories. Although a recent school of thought, it turns out to have long roots reaching into the rich soil of the history of linguistic ideas.
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Recent work in linguistics argues that statistical information should be considered a part of grammar [2]. Consistent with this hypothesis, statistical information plays an important role in the process of mapping an utterance onto its meaning using constructions. We call this process Constructional Analysis. The implemented analysis system takes as input an utterance and a grammar specified in the Embodied Construction Grammar formalism [1]. It searches for the most likely analysis of the utterance given the grammar’s syntactic and semantic constraints. The system then outputs both the constructions used to interpret the utterance and the utterance’s semantic representation in terms of frames and image schemas.

The program’s search process can also be used to predict which words in an utterance are associated with increased reading time, but the accuracy of the predictions depends crucially on the inclusion of the following probabilistic parameters:

1. Pr( omitted, local | α, β ): The probability of construction α’s constituent β being expressed locally (as a normal constituent) or omitted altogether. This term represents a construction’s preference for omitting each of its constituents.

2. Pr( filler = θ | α, β, local(β) ): Assuming construction α’s constituent β is expressed locally, this term specifies the likelihood of a particular constructional filler θ. For example, this term encodes the subject-predicate construction’s preferences on the kinds of noun phrases that fill its subject role.

3. Pr( frameRole = ρ | γ, σ ): This parameter encodes the likelihood of a particular semantic filler σ being assigned role ρ in frame γ. e.g. The difference between a criminal being assigned the agent role versus the patient role in the Arrest frame.

Using these parameters, the model generates reading time predictions that follow the trends found by McRae, Spivey and Tannenhaus [3] in their experiments with reduced relative sentences such as The cop arrested by the detective was guilty. The fact that these predictions can only be made if the grammar is augmented with probabilistic parameters provides further evidence that statistical information should be considered a part of grammar.
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There has been a considerable debate in the science of language on whether verb-particle combinations (e.g., turn up, break down) are generated and processed as two separate items connected by phrase-structure rules or whether they correspond to a single lexical representation, in other words, whether they are basically phrases (‘XPs’) or words (‘X0’s’). In constructionist approaches to language, such a debate has become pointless, since the building blocks of language are proposed to be all possible kinds of conventional pairings of form and meaning (broadly taken) and this definition then fits, among other things, multi-word items just as well as simplex words. In such theories, we can straightforwardly consider a combination like look up, even in its discontinuous manifestation (look ... up), as a kind of lexeme (a lexical item) all by itself, rather than as a mere combination of lexemes. So far, however, there are insufficient empirical data, particularly from neurolinguistic studies, to support the putative lexeme status of potentially discontinuous multi-word items. We therefore tested their lexeme status using MEG brain imaging.

We recorded so-called ‘oddball-evoked’ brain responses (mismatch negativity, MMN) to auditorily presented particles as they formed real or non-existing phrasal verbs with a preceding head verb (heat up, cool down, *cool up,*heat down, etc). Responses to the same particles (up, down) presented in conventional and anomalous combinations were computed and compared to each other. Previous work has shown that words stored in the mental lexicon show an enhanced MMN compared to meaningless pseudo-words. In contrast, combinations of words or morphemes elicit a reduced MMN if they are morpho-syntactically well-formed or semantically coherent compared to combinations with a morpho-syntactic or semantic anomaly.

We found that at about 100-200ms, the brain’s response was larger whenever the same acoustic event (i.e. the particle) was part of a real phrasal verb (heat up, cool down) than when it was included in a non-existing phrasal verb (*heat down, *cool up). This is the case even for transparent combinations like rise up and fall down compared to *rise down and *fall up. In conjunction with the earlier findings of the lexical enhancement of the MMN response, the current increased activation for meaningful phrasal verbs strongly suggests that a verb and its particle together correspond to one single lexical representation, i.e. that they form a single lexeme, and that a unified cortical memory circuit exists for it, similar to that encoding a monomorphemic word. In other words, our new finding supports the view, endorsed by constructionists, that the mental lexicon is not just made up of single words but also of items larger than single words.
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Compared with robust studies on Construction Grammar (CG) of Indo-European languages (Boas 2007), little attention has been given to the synchronic aspects of Chinese Grammar in terms of CG (Lien 2006). To bridge the gap, this study offers an in-depth examination of Chinese Concessive Construction “V1+Dou+V2+Le” (henceforth V1DV2L), based on CG. It is proposed that V1DV2L has intrinsic grammatical characteristics, which lead to some crucial constraints (e.g. semantic, syntactic and pragmatic facets), as shown in example (1), culled from corpora (Udndata news database), consisted of news and stories:

(1) Zuotian/ *mingtian chi-dou-chi-le, women ye mei banfa. (UdNews)
yesterday Tomorrow eat all eat Asp we also not methods
Lit. ‘We had already eaten something yesterday. We cannot change the situation.’
‘Something was eaten yesterday. We can do nothing about it. So, let it be!’

We can tease out the characteristics of (1) featuring the construction V1DV2L from semantic, syntactic and pragmatic viewpoints. Semantically, in keeping with semantic agreement, the stage-level predicate, such as activity verb chi ‘eat’ denoting semantic features [+Dynamic, +Telic] (hereafter [+D, +T]), can occur in the V slots of V1DV2L ([+D, +T]) , whereas an individual-level predicate, such as stative verb gao ‘tall’ ([D, -T]), is ruled out. Syntactically, a past time adverbial, zuotian ‘yesterday’ ([past]), instead of mingtian ‘tomorrow’ ([past]), can harmonically collocate with V1DV2L ([past]) in the subordinate clause. Finally, pragmatically, the sui generis construction V1DV2L denoting the relation of protasis and apodosis carries a concessive sense: the protasis (we ate something) and the apodosis (we should accept the result of the eating event). In addition, one cannot deny the eventualities of protasis in the main clause, owing to the implicature effect.

As summarized in (2a-d), the architecture of the construction in question can be captured in terms of a pair of form and meaning as well as three dimensions:

(2a) **Form**: variables (V1 and V2) and constants (Dou and Le) are components of “V1+Dou+V2+Le”, where V1 equals V2

(2b) **Semantic facets**: possible V1/V2 candidates that can occur in V1DV2L are stage-level predicates ([+D, +T]) rather than individual-level predicates ([D, -T]) in line with semantic agreement

(2c) **Syntactic facets**: V1DV2L imposes a realis event ([past]) that pre-empts the occurrence of adverbials denoting future time ([past])

(2d) **Pragmatic facets**: V1DV2L coerces a realis event that cannot be cancelled

In sum, the present study of the construction with V1DV2L yields two substantive results: (i) the construction in question can be given an adequate explanation in terms of CG and (ii) the data lends support to the claim that constructional aspects should be tackled in terms of various grammatical facets, detailed semantic, syntactic and pragmatic restrictions, indicated in literature (Boas 2007; Lien 2006).
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While situational dynamic modality cross-linguistically is usually denoted by modal verbs as English can, Hakka has an idiomatic construction that can covertly express this situational ability meaning: yu1/mo5 N ho2 V (have/not.have N suitably V). In this construction, whereas N and V stand for schematic elements, the other two are fixed: yu1, literally meaning ‘have’, alternates with mo5 (a negative marker) to denote existence or non-existence; ho2, literally meaning ‘good’, is grammaticalized into an adverb denoting ‘suitably’ (e.g. Gi5-deu1 mo5 mi2 ho2 siit8 (they not.have rice suitably eat) ‘There exists no rice suitably for them to eat.’) Adhering to the tenets of Construction Grammar, insisting that both item-specific knowledge and generalizations coexist (cf. Goldberg 1995, 2006; among others), the generalizations and peculiarities displayed will be shown in this study.

Four specific issues will be dealt with. First, this construction displays a substantive-schematic scale (cf. Fillmore et al. 1988: 505). On the schematic end, the manifestations of N and V are flexible and predictable; in the middle of the scale, N is fixed as mak8-ge3 ‘what’, possessing the generalized meaning ‘something’ in this case; on the substantive end, N even disappears and this implicit theme construction “yu1/mo5 ø ho2 V” is not productive and can be used only when N is semantically recoverable (cf. Goldberg 2005). Following this issue, the next topic is the ambiguity of this construction. Take yu1 mak8-ge3 ho2 siit8 (have what suitably eat) as an illustration. In addition to expressing situational ability (Does there exist anything suitably for someone to eat?), this sentence can display another meaning (Is there anything delicious?) derived from the compounding meaning of ho2-siit8 (delicious). This ambiguity occurs only in the cases when V becomes substantive and is further compounded with ho2. Moreover, it is noted that the semantic roles played by N relating to the verbal actions can be Patient (e.g. mo5 mi2 ho2 siit8 ‘have no rice to eat’), Instrument (e.g. mo5 sui2 ho2 cung1 pien3-so2 ‘have no water to flush the toilet’). Place (e.g. mo5 vuk8 ho2 het8 ‘have no house to live’) or Time (e.g. mo5 sii5-gien1 ho2 bot4-mung3 ‘have no time to dream’). Therefore, the third issue to be analyzed is the semantic relationships between N and V from the frame-semantic perspective, the semantic constraints on V, the definiteness condition of N, and the syntactic manifestation resulting from these semantic relationships. Finally, since Construction Grammar is considered a usage-based model, with the help of sufficient contexts, the pragmatic functions such as threatening and advising in the seemingly interrogative form yu1 mak8-ge3 ho2 V (have what suitably V) ‘Does there exist anything suitably for one to...) surfacing from form-function mismatches will be analyzed.

After examining this construction from the formal as well as the functional perspectives, this study will not only provide a complete and full-fledged analysis of this specific construction in Hakka, but also help to understand how situational dynamic modality, a linguistic issue hardly touched upon, is manifested in language.
Variation and change in constructional semantics: The Dutch ditransitive
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One of the basic tenets of construction grammatical approaches to language is that schematic grammatical constructions such as the ditransitive [Sbj [V Obj₁ Obj₂]] argument structure construction are not fundamentally different from lexical items, since both must be considered as stored pairings of a certain form with a certain meaning. Since the semantic properties of lexical items are known to be subject to intralingual variation and change, it follows from the above that the same will apply to the semantic properties of schematic grammatical constructions. However, while a lot of work in Construction Grammar has been concerned with the elucidation of the semantics of grammatical constructions at the level of the synchronic standard language, much less energy has been devoted to the investigation of patterns of language-internal variation and change in constructional semantics.

The present paper addresses this issue through an exploration of the semantic range of the ditransitive construction, illustrated in (1), at several stages in the history of the Dutch language and in several regional varieties of the present-day language. Along the lines of Goldberg’s (1995) analysis of the equivalent English construction, the Dutch ditransitive can be analysed as a polysemous category built around a semantic core ‘Agent successfully causes Recipient to receive Patient’, with the first three verbs in (1) instantiating this core sense and verbs such as aanbieden ‘offer’, beloven ‘promise’ and weigeren ‘refuse’ representing various sense extensions (see Geeraerts 1998 for an overview of the semantic possibilities in present-day standard Dutch).

(1) Jan heeft zijn broer een boek gegeven/overhandigd/aangeboden/beloofd/geweigerd/ ... .
‘John has given/handed/offered/promised/refused... his brother a book.’

On the basis of data from a diachronic corpus of 17th- to early 20th-Century Dutch, we shall illustrate a number of now obsolete subsenses of the Dutch ditransitive and document their demise. Examples of uses which have either completely disappeared from the grammar since the Early Modern Dutch period or which have been marginalized include the use of the ditransitive construction with verbs of dispossession such as roven ‘rob’ and stelen ‘steal’, the use of the ditransitive to encode events of benefaction which do or do not involve a subevent of reception (e.g. iemand een taart bakken ‘to bake s.o. a cake’, iemand de deur openen ‘to open s.o. the door’), and the use of the construction with attitudinal verbs such as benijden ‘envy’, prijzen ‘praise’ and vergeven ‘forgive’. Such shifts suggest that the semantic range of the Dutch ditransitive has decreased considerably over the last three to four centuries (consistent with Barðdal’s 2007 findings for the ditransive in Scandinavian languages). In addition, it will be shown that there is also regional variation. The benefactive ditransitive, for instance, which has all but disappeared from the grammar of standard Netherlandic Dutch, is still fairly productive in Belgian Dutch and in local dialects from the eastern provinces of The Netherlands. Ongoing shifts in constructional semantics can therefore be seen to have progressed further in some (regional) varieties than in others.
Speech act research has been one of the very active areas of pragmatics recently, with different speech acts being analyzed from different perspectives, either in the case of speakers of English as native speakers (Butler, 2001; Deutschmann, 2003; Risen & Gilovich, 2007) as well as non-native speakers (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2006; Cohen, 2005), or in that of speakers of different languages (Cohen & Shively, 2007; Demeter, 2006; Wouk, 2006). Yet other studies were comparative analyses of two or more languages (Jung, 2004; Lubecka, 2000; Márquez-Reiter, 2000; Tamanaha, 2003). Recently, however, speech act studies have brought in a new perspective by advocating a cognitive linguistics approach to speech acts, and to pragmatics in general, in which the analysis should rely both on communicative-functional and cognitive aspects (Moeschler, 2004; Nuyts, 2004; Wolf & Polzenhagen, 2006).

Thus, the present paper attempts to analyze one speech act, the apology, making use of one of the theories put forward by cognitive linguistics, namely construction grammar (Croft & Cruse, 2004; Fillmore, Kay, & O'Connor, 1988; Goldberg, 2006). In the lines of this theory, it is our claim that “sorry” should not be considered a standalone lexical item in an apology, but rather as an integral part of a construction. Moreover, the meaning of the apology would then be given by the entire construction, and not only by the lexical item “sorry.”

The purpose of the present study is to examine the different constructions that “sorry” is used in order to construe apologies, and whether there is a relationship between the type of construction and the meaning that the apology expresses. A corpus analysis methodology was used to examine formal spoken discourse, more specifically a 1,981,165-word corpus comprising transcripts of committee meetings and press briefings, part of the Corpus of Spoken Professional American-English (CSPAE). The different constructions that “sorry” is part of are presented, and several examples are used to demonstrate the fact that the meanings of the apologies in which it is used are given by the entire construction. For example, a pair of constructions that clearly demonstrates this claim is (I’m) + sorry + for + gerund and I’m + sorry + for + passive gerund. In the case of the first construction, such as in “I’m sorry for being late,” the speaker in expresses an apology which also contains an acknowledgment of responsibility for being late to the meeting. On the other hand, in the case of the second construction, such as in “I’m sorry for being delayed,” by using a passive gerundial construction instead of an active one, the speaker shifts the responsibility for the delay. Thus, he does not acknowledge responsibility anymore, and suggests that the delay was out of his control, and blames the bureaucratic problem in the apology.

The conclusion that is drawn at the end of this study is that the meanings of the different apologies that use “sorry” is given by the entire construction in which they are used.
Ford and Thompson (1986) first pointed out cases of adjuncts PPs taking scope on large segments of the following discourse. Examples of this pattern are easy to find in spontaneous varieties of spoken French:

(1) au Bangladesh tu as aucune femme dans la rue - autant en Inde les femmes travaillent dans les champs la femme c’est quelqu’un c’est une personne très importante dans la famille dans la société dans le village - au Bangladesh la femme elle passe toute sa vie enfermée à la maison et parfois elles sortent jamais.(voy, 43, 10)

In Bangladesh there are no women in the streets as much as in India women work in the fields the woman (it) is somebody (it) is a person very important in the family in the society in the village In Bangladesh (on the contrary) the woman she spends all his life home and sometimes they never go out

The locative adjunct en Inde extends its scope on a following discourse unit composed of three independent sentences. This “broad” scope can receive two explanations. The first one involves a mismatch between syntax and semantics: a preposed adjunct with non terminal contour syntactically attached to one sentence can take as semantic argument a conjunction of propositions. Under the second one, involving a syntax-semantics matching, the PP is an independent syntactic unit, an orphan fragment (Culicover Jackendoff 2005), linked to the context by a topic-comment like “discourse pattern” determining the scope of the adjunct. The main goal of this presentation will be to give theoretical and empirical arguments in favour of the “matching” hypothesis. My strongest argument will be based on the description of a less noticed empirical fact, which independently requires a solution based on discourse patterns. Consider the following example of a “backwards oriented” wide scope adjunct (in bold):

(2) Il y en a qui demandent du kirsch d’autres préfèrent la vanille d’autres c’est de la poire enfin au goût de des différentes personnes

some order Kirsh liquor, others prefer vanilla, others, it is pear (spirit), well according to each person’s taste

The detached PP cannot be licensed only by the preceding verb. The reduction would definitely sound very strange:

(2’)?? d’autres c’est de la poire au goût des différentes personnes

In this case, the matching hypothesis is the only available solution. I will show, in a second step, that, although (1) and (2) are examples of discourse licensed PPs, the two licensing discourse patterns are different. For instance, the backwards wide scope pattern can be unambiguously marked by a special morphosyntactic device tout ça (all this) as in:

(5) et dans cette même prison dernièrement il y a eu d’autres cas de ce genre je /ne, O/ sais pas si vous aviez appris le cas + de ce garçon ... qui s’appelait Sandraboze et aussi ce garçon + il s’appelle Seliah heu + ce garçon on l’a laissé mourir aussi+ + + tout ça dans cette même prison +

and in this jail itself lastly there have been other similar cases I don't know if you happen to hear about the case of this guy who was called Sandraboze. And also this guy Selah well this guy they also let him die also – all this (happened) in this very jail

From the content point of view, the “forwards” oriented pattern can be informally defined as a
domain setting one, the “backwards”, as a comment on a recapitulation (tout ça) of the preceding context. I will examine the types and status of the recapitulating device, using the context feature to implement the patterns in the framework of Construction Grammar.
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Languages in contact influence each other in several ways (Thomason 2001). This influence can be in different structural forms varying from individual lexical items (e.g. codeswitching, Backus 1996) to whole syntactic patterns (e.g. word order changes, Thomason 2001, Winford 2003). However, little is known about what happens to multi-word collocations in case of contact. In this presentation, we provide a synchronic overview of multi-word collocations that are copied from Dutch onto Turkish as spoken in Holland (NL-Turkish).

Following traditions in cognitive linguistics (Langacker 1987, Croft 2001), we assume that there are no clear-cut borders between lexicon and syntax. Instead, there is a continuum where the maximally specific side is represented by lexicon and the maximally schematic side by syntax. In between are the partially schematic units.

[Ik weet het niet] (I know that not) “I don’t know” is a frozen expression used as a filler in spoken Dutch. Turkish also has a similar expression: [ne bil-e-yim] (what know-opt-1sg) “I don’t know”. The structural difference between the two is that Turkish does not make use of a subject pronoun. In NL-Turkish, however, a subject pronoun is added to the fixed expression as in [ben ne bil-e-yim] (I what know-opt-1sg). This sounds unconventional to Turkish speakers in Turkey (TR-Turkish) since the additional pronoun is perceived as contrastive, which is not the intention.

The Dutch construction of [school/vak doen] (school/course do) “do a course/go to school” construction has wide-range of uses from completing an educational level (e.g. basisschool doen “primary school do”) to taking a course (e.g. Engels doen “English do”). Instead of this particular construction, different constructions with different verbs (e.g. okul-a git “school-dat go, İngilizce gör “English see”) are used in Turkish. NL-Turkish, on the other hand, copies this construction from Dutch onto Turkish with its wide range of uses (e.g. okul yap “school doen”, İngilizce yap “English do”). These uses are unconventional for TR-Turkish speakers since they invoke different meanings such as “literally building a school” (for [school doen]).

The third form is somewhat more syntactic: a particular form of reported speech construction. In Dutch, the reported speech construction has one frozen form [S ZEGGEN DAT reported clause (with a finite verb)] “S SAY THAT reported clause (with a finite verb)”. Turkish, on the other hand, has different constructions with different reporting verbs (e.g. de-mek “say” söylemek “say-inf.”) in which the reported sentence can be formed with finite and non-finite verbs and with a different order: [S reported clause (with a finite verb) SAY] or [S reported clause (with a non-finite verb) SAY]. In NL-Turkish, a Dutch-like reported speech construction is taking over. This new way of reporting sounds unconventional for TR-Turkish speakers due to the violation of word order and the finiteness of the reported clause.

Although Dutch influence leads to creation of unconventional constructions, not all of them are conventionalized in the NL-Turkish community. We will discuss the social factors that are influential in this conventionalization process. Our data will be drawn from spoken corpora collected from the Turkish community in Holland and in Turkey.
Proponents of construction-grammar/usage-based approaches argue that children’s earliest morpho-syntactic representations may lack some target distinctions, and that children acquire these distinctions incrementally, with initial restrictions of inflections to individual words (Tomasello 2006). Similar predictions can be derived from lexical learning models, which also assume item-based incremental learning (Eisenbeiss 2003). In contrast, proponents of generative full-competence approaches argue that children in the early two-word stage have already acquired the morphological distinctions of their target and generalise inflections rapidly (e.g. Wexler 1998).

This talk provides evidence for incremental, item-based learning. It is based on 48 recordings from 4 monolingual German children (1;11-3;6) and presents an analysis of (i) D-elements: case/gender/number-marked articles, possessive pronouns, demonstratives, quantifiers and (ii) possessive -s on names or kinship terms (Susanne/Mamis Auto ‘Susanne/mommy’s car’):

· The rate of overt D-elements is initially low in stage I, rising to 60-64%. In II, it drops to 4-42%, increasing in III and reaching target-like values in IV. This U-shaped development suggests reanalysis, which is supported by the observation that in I, D-elements occur in formulaic predicate+D-combinations (e.g. das-is-ein-X ‘that-is-a-X’, ≤74% of overt D) or in a few D+noun-combination types (<10 per file).

· In I, children do not exhibit target-like D-element inflection. Anneline, Leonie and Mathias also show U-shaped curves in the rate of target-like inflections (I: 50-66%, II: 25-55%, III: 38-86%, IV: 72-85%), suggesting that early target-like forms are part of unanalysed combinations. Hannah initially uses 68% phonologically reduced forms, then produces a few correct forms (8/10) before she goes through a stage of D-element omission, which suggests reanalysis.

· Children start to mark individual grammatical distinctions at different stages: II: sg-vs.-pl, fem-vs.-masc/neut, III: neut-vs.-masc, nom-vs.-acc/dat, IV: acc-vs.-dat. Before the respective distinction appears, overgeneralizations occur, e.g. overgeneralizations of masculine forms to neuter contexts before the acquisition of the neut-vs.-masc-distinction.

· Developmental dissociations also suggest incremental development: forms with -0-endings (ein a’,...) and the nom.fem and nom.masc endings –e and –r appear early, but are initially often overgeneralised (40-45% in I). Anneline and Mathias use nom/acc.neut.sg.-s in I, but only in 6 potentially formulaic utterances (da-is-au(ch)-eins ‘there-is-another-one’,...). A later drop in -s-correctness rates suggest re-analysis. Acc.masc–n appears early, but in inappropriate contexts. It is not used in II and only 43% target-like in III. Dat.masc/neut–m appears in IV.

· In I, no possessive -s occurs (0/11 contexts), but rates soon increase: II:4/11, III:35/40, IV:24/24. The first markers are restricted to high-frequency nouns (e.g. mamis ‘mommy’s’,...). -s-Overgeneralizations only occur in III/IV (e.g. affes, ‘monkey’s’,...III:1/40, IV:2/24).

Taken together, the observed developmental dissociations, U-shaped curves and initial lexical restrictions of possessive and D-element support construction-grammar/usage-based approaches or lexical learning approaches which assume item-based incremental development.
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Familiar syntactic control involves identification of syntactic roles between governing and subordinate predicates: subject-subject in \textit{I tried to leave}, object-subject in \textit{I want her to stay} and prepositional object-subject in \textit{I said to them to go}—the semantics of each bolded item thus fills roles associated with two different predicates. Raising operates in a similar way, but the NP in the upper predicate (the “controller”) is not assigned a semantic role by the upper predicate (\textit{There seems to be a problem}). From a construction-grammar point of view, however, every role is constructional, and thus characterized semantically as well as syntactically. Under this view, traditional control can be modeled as co-identification of constructional roles mediated by the roles’ syntactic features, an analysis fully in line with Jackendoff & Culicover 2005.

There is, however, no a priori reason why all argument co-identification should be mediated by syntactic features. This paper has two goals: first, it will demonstrate the reality of “semantic control,” a phenomenon in which the meaning of an argument of a higher predicate (the “control predicate”) is identified with an unexpressed \textit{semantically-selected} argument of a lower predicate. Second, it will show that such cross-predicate argument linking may be mediated by conceptual-metaphorical mappings, the details of which may differ on a construction-to-construction basis.

Semantic control is demonstrated by sentences like (1a-c) below. In each sentence, the bold argument fills an Undergoer role of the control predicate \textit{undergo}. This role is then co-identified with a Patient argument of the subordinate Event. In this case, we cannot claim that the identification could equivalently be made on the basis of the syntactic role within the subordinate constituent, both because the subordinates are nominals (which only questionably assign syntactic roles) but also because (1a) and (1b), when compared to the syntax of corresponding verbs \textit{maintain} and \textit{move}, contrast in syntactic assignment: in (1a) \textit{our site} is the object of \textit{maintain}, while in (1b) \textit{each machine component} is the subject of \textit{move}.

An interesting proof that control can be semantically mediated is that, in certain cases, metaphorical mappings serve as the input to the semantic construal process. First, consider \textit{need} as a transitive verb (2a). The literal sense involves a Needer requiring possession of a Sought (entity). Contrast this with state-of-affair-denoting objects. In (2b), \textit{smack} evokes a frame with an Agent and a Patient, and Jan must be identified as the Patient. Since there is no recourse for overt expression of such an argument locally to \textit{smack} (at least in this construction), this is clearly semantic control. In (2c), \textit{look} has a notional Agent and Patient, but in this case Jan must be identified as the Agent. This semantic linking can be related to the literal sense via one of two metaphors: \textsc{undergoing is receiving (UiR)} or \textsc{benefitting is receiving (BiR)}. Literal \textit{needing} evokes a receiving scenario, where the Needer is a Receiver and the Sought is the Theme. In (2b), the concept of \textit{smack} unifies with the UiR metaphor. UiR maps the Patient to the Recipient role, i.e. the subject of the sentence, and so Jan is the Patient (and metaphorical Recipient) of the blow. On the other hand, (2c) requires that Jan benefit, and so BiR is a better fit. This ambiguity of role-assignment is thus attributable to differences in metaphorical mapping and cannot be explained in a purely syntactic theory. A constructional approach is required.

1a. \textbf{Our site} undergoes regular maintenance.  
\textbf{b.} Prior to the actual testing, \textbf{each machine component} must undergo motion  
\textbf{c.} The percentage of abortions undergone by teens in this period decreased.

2a. Jan needs a stopwatch.  
\textbf{b.} \textbf{Jan} really needs a good smack.  
\textbf{c.} \textbf{Jan} needs another look at the problem before we can be sure it's good.
Persian has a deceptively small repertoire of about 160 single word verbs which belies an intricate system of light verb constructions (LVC), similar to the English *take a walk* or *give a speech*. In fact, about 15 light verbs (LV) form the foundation of a vast array of LVCs in Persian. Most verbal notions expressed in other languages by simple verbs are expressed in Persian through these constructions (e.g. *to dream* is ‘see sleep’, etc.). A sophisticated verbal system results from this small set of general-action verbs. The LVs, combine with an open set of preverbal elements (PV) to produce new verbal expressions semantically distant from the LV itself. In other words, the meaning of the whole is more than the sum of the meaning of its parts.

This productive compounding has evolved according to certain principles that help organize semantic space in Persian and is the only manner of verb formation. Unlike English, where nouns morph into verbs, as in ‘I will phone you,’ Persian speakers must always produce verbs by combining words with an appropriate, non-random LV (e.g. *telefon ẓædæn* ‘telephone HIT’ to phone).

The objective of the current study is to investigate the mechanisms that regulate the meaning of LVCs. Although the system is easily acquired by Persian speakers, the rules underlying this compounding process have never been deciphered. The framework needed must account for the key features of this system: compositionality, productivity, and polysemy. The tenets of Construction Grammar inherently provide us with these features.

I introduce the idea of islands, where a cluster of LVCs express similar verbal notions using the same LV and a strict class of PVs. Each island is represented by a construction which includes an LV and attributes of the PVs, resulting in an LVC with a meaning different from the sum of its components and not derivable by strict compositionality. These islands form a generative system in which knowledge is organized in constructions.

Through my study of the Persian verbal system I have found that the productive capacities of Persian speakers actually lie in the knowledge and development of a highly structured semantic space. This space contains many nodes that serve as attractors to certain types of verbal notions. My analysis shows that Persian LVCs contain semantic, lexical, and syntactic information, and that differentiation between the grammar and the lexicon is superfluous. This is the first study to investigate these properties of LVCs in Persian using and extending several cognitive linguistic theories, including Construction Grammar.
1. Lexemic bases Normally, derived agent nominals in -eur (Fr) or -er (E) are formed on a verbal lexeme, the first argument of which has the properties of an Agent e.g. Fr. LAVEUR ‘washer’ < laver ‘wash’, E. DRIVER < drive. Criteria of agentivity have been proposed by (Dowty 1991; Van Valin & Lapolla 1997; Davis & Koenig 2000) among others. When the V does not satisfy the criteria, the derivation is blocked e.g. Fr. *jouxteur < jouter ‘be next to’. The effect of this constraint is illustrated in (1), (2). As is well-known, the threshold of agentivity varies across languages e.g. Fr. *sombreur < sombrer ‘sink’ vs. Dutch zinker < zink ‘sink’ (Booij 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Derived N OK</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Derived N *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHON</td>
<td>(lav)</td>
<td>(laver)</td>
<td>(ʒukst)</td>
<td>(ʒukstær)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>V 0</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td>V 0</td>
<td>N 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARG-STR</td>
<td>&lt;NP0, ...&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;NP0, ...&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-ROLE</td>
<td>NP0 = Agent</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP0 = Figure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Polylexemic bases However, in some cases the derived agent nominal cannot be constructed on the basis of the corresponding lexemic V, because the V in question does not satisfy the agentivity criterion. For instance, in (3): La prime aux naisseurs de chevaux de sport (www.haras-nationaux.fr), NAISSEUR cannot denote the referent corresponding to the NP0 of NAIÎTRE ‘be born’ in (4a), since this V is unaccusative. It corresponds to NP0 in construction (4b), where the causative verb FAIRE ‘make’ clearly makes the referent of NP0 an Agent:  (4) a. NP0 naître ‘NP0 be born’; b. NP0 faire naître NP1 ‘NP0 make NP1 be born’. Hence naisseur de chevaux means ‘the one who makes horses give birth (to foals)’.

There are also cases where no verb provides a formal basis for the derived agent nominal. The base is instead a N denoting a type of activity or an artifact closely linked to an activity, as illustrated in (7). These Ns are suitable bases only as far as they occur as heads of NP1 in constructions (5): NP0 (faire / jouer à) NP1, where NP1 has either a generic or a partitive reading e.g. faire la noce ‘to live it up’, jouer au bridge ‘play bridge’, faire du golf ‘play golf’. Then, although the V bridger does not exist, BRIDGEUR does and means (6): (λx. play’(e,bridge’,x)), where x corresponds to NP0 in (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>Base N denotes</th>
<th>Base N</th>
<th>Derived N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPORTS</td>
<td>escrime ‘fencing’</td>
<td>escrimeur ‘fencer’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAMES</td>
<td>bridge ‘bridge’</td>
<td>bridgeur ‘bridge player’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVERBAL NS</td>
<td>louage ‘renting’</td>
<td>louageur ‘(truck) renter’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td>noce lit. ‘wedding’</td>
<td>noceur ‘reveller’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTIFACTS</td>
<td>médaille ‘medal’</td>
<td>médailleur ‘medal maker’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Account If we believe that derivational rules are schemas that correlate lexemes with (new) lexemes (Riehemann 1998; Koenig 1999), we have to explain why BRIDGEUR, NAISSEUR, etc. have a meaning involving a polylexemic construction, even though they are formally built upon a lexeme. Suppose that the lexicon contains both the lexeme BRIDGE and instantiation (8) of (5): SYN NP0 jouer-à bridge, cat:S, NP0 = AGT, SEM (λx. λe. play’(e,bridge’,x)), x = NP0. Suppose further that the semantics of BRIDGE includes the SEM rubric of (8). The claim is that BRIDGE is a well-suited base for a derived agent nominal because it denotes an agentive scenario. The agentivity constraint is respected and the meaning of the derived N is straightforwardly constructed on the N’s semantics. All we need to assume for these derivations to exist is semantic sharing.
The antecedent-only conditional constructions:
The ‘-tara to omou to’ construction compared with the ‘I can (just) imagine if P’ construction
Seiko Fujii
University of Tokyo
16:30 – 17:00, September 26th, 2008

Predictive conditionals are typically expressed with bi-clausal conditional constructions, such as the if P then Q construction in English and the P -tara/-ebea/ to + Q constructions in Japanese. Both English and Japanese, however, can convey conditional meanings without explicitly stating the consequent clause (Q) (e.g., (1)). This paper explores such ‘antecedent-only conditional constructions’, focusing on the specific construction involved with (1), namely the ‘I can (just) imagine if P’ construction, and particularly its Japanese counterpart construction — the ‘-tara to omou to’ construction.

(1) I can just imagine if it was my daughter. (Dancygier and Sweetser 2005) Vancouver Sun (Oct. 4, 2000)

Bi-clausal predictive conditionals in English normally involve three construction types requiring particular patterns of paired verb forms in P-clauses and Q-clauses: a. If P-present, Q-will-future (neutral stance); b. If P-past, Q-would (distanced negative stance); c. If P-pluperfect, Q-would have (distanced negative stance). The speaker selects one of these constructions according to his or her epistemic stance as well as temporal viewpoint. By virtue of the specific tense/aspect/mood morphology and semantics associated with each construction, the antecedent-only construction (by maintaining the same morphology) can evoke conditional mental spaces in the same manner as the bi-clausal version, by construing the single clause as part of a bi-clausal conditional. (1), for example, presents P alone with distanced stance (i.e., b) and evokes a counterfactual mental space including the corresponding counterfactual consequent as well. Another interesting property of this truncated construction is that the antecedent-only construction is embedded within the complement of the verb ‘imagine’. Furthermore, in (1), the use of “can (just) imagine” is required to accommodate the antecedent-only construction (* I imagine if it was my daughter).

The Japanese equivalent of (1) is shown in (2):

(2) (kore ga) zibun no musume dattara to omou to.
this NOM (my-)self GEN daughter COP-Cond(if) QUOTATIVE think Cond(if/when)
Lit. As/when/if (I) think if (it was) my daughter. (Cf. I can imagine if it was my daughter.)

The Japanese equivalents also use the antecedent-only construction without an ostensive consequent, and are embedded within the complement of a cognitive verb such as omou ‘think’, soozoo suru ‘imagine’ and kangaeru ‘think’. What is very special and unique to the Japanese version is that the whole utterance ends with another conditional clause-linker to, constructing the antecedent of another conditional/temporal construction without its consequent clause. Though its consequent can be either ostensive (e.g., osorosii ‘feel terrified’; zotto suru ‘shudder’) or non-ostensive,
Japanese requires this second layer of antecedent construction.

I will discuss two issues: (i) How is the interpretation of a negative emotive valuation obtained so clearly without the ostensive consequent; (ii) Why is the clause containing the complement of the cognitive verb ‘think’ embedded in yet another space-building antecedent? Why does it come in two layers of conditional antecedents? For (i), this paper presents a corpus analysis, examining 1000 tokens of “-tara ∅ to omou to”, and shows that the -tara ∅ to omou to construction associated with negative valuation has been highly entrenched. To examine (ii), this paper explicates the mental spaces the -tara ∅ to omou to construction evokes, showing that the higher-order antecedent (marked with to ‘as/when’) builds an on-site emotive mental space and triggers how the speaker feels now in the speech site as a result of imagining the counterfactual situation (evoked by the embedded antecedent). The -tara ∅ to omou to construction thus highlights the speaker’s fear in the speech site, whereas the ‘I can (just) imagine if P’ construction highlights the speaker’s imagination of her/his negative emotion in the counterfactual space.

In conclusion, this paper shows both that certain patterns of antecedent-only utterances constitute well-entrenched (yet language-specific) constructions associated with specific functions, and that such truncated constructions inherit important properties of their fuller bi-clausal constructions.
The ‘grammar as fragment’ view revisited from a contrastive perspective: Beyond finite complement clauses in English and Spanish
Francisco Gonzálvez García
University of Almería, Spain
16:00 – 16:30, September 26th, 2008

Drawing on naturally-occurring data extracted from the spoken components of the British National Corpus (BNC henceforth) and the Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual (CREA henceforth), this paper critically revisits the analysis of (object) finite complement complements proposed in Thompson (2002), who contends that the complement-taking predicates together with their subjects are stored as epistemic/evidential/evaluative fragments. This paper critically examines whether this analysis can be argued to hold for other complementation strategies with greater syntactico-semantic compression, such as verbless complement clauses (or, alternatively, “small clauses”) after *verba cogitandi* in English (e.g. “think”, “consider”, “find”, “believe”, etc) and Spanish (“considerar” ‘consider’, “ver” ‘see’, “encontrar” ‘find’, “creer” ‘think’), as in (1)-(2) below:

(1) The Chinese consider the dry testicles of balls a great aphrodisiac (BNC KCU 9875)
(2) Yo es-e tramo lo consider-o fundamental
1SG DIST-M.SG path ACC.3SG consider-PRS.1SG essential

‘I consider that path essential’ (CREA, Oral, GC-14, Mujer de 60 años. Catedrática de instituto)
The verbless clause frame is shown to display a number of intricate constraints on the semantico-pragmatic profile of the entity in the object slot and the obligatory predicative phrase (XPCOMP) which cannot be adequately accommodated within Thompson’s analysis. Drawing on Gonzálvez-García (2003, 2007, 2008), it is argued that the entity in the object slot is usually specific, since it functions semantically as the STIMULUS of perception by the subject/speaker. This explains among other things, why e.g. existential “there” in English – which conveys an abstract setting – is barred in this environment, but is nonetheless acceptable in the finite counterpart. Consider (3) below:

(3) He believed there *(to be) new genera amongst them (BNC ALU 897) :: He believed that there were new genera amongst them

In addition, the XPCOMP should encode an original, direct stance by the subject/speaker implying a high degree of commitment towards the state of affairs envisioned in the complement clause. Crucially, this restriction does not hold for the corresponding finite-clause counterparts, which allow identifying XPCOMPs such as proper nouns.

(4) #I found the winner Mary :: I found that the winner was/had been Mary
(5) (a) * A aquell-a mujer la cre-ia Agustina Izquierdo
OBJ DIST-F.SG woman ACC.3.F.SG think-IMPPRET.1SG Agustina Izquierdo [NAME]
(b) Cre-ia que aquell-a mujer era Agustina Izquierdo
think-IMPPRET.1SG COMP DIST-F.SG woman be.IMPPRE T.1SG Agustina Izquierdo [NAME]

The most significant difference observed in this environment in these two languages concerns information structure (see also Ambridge and Goldberg 2008). The verbless clause configurations frequently occur in spoken Spanish with a preverbal unstressed clitic “lo”, as in (2) above, giving discourse prominence to an explicit or implicit co-referential fronted constituent. The overall conclusion is that while, at a high degree of resolution, there is indeed evidence for the existence of fragments such as “find X difficult” or “lo veo difícil” (‘I see it difficult’) in spoken English and Spanish, broadest generalizations of the type captured in Goldbergian constructions (Goldberg 2006) are nonetheless necessary to account for otherwise puzzling restrictions on the
entity in the object slot and the XPCOMP, at least from the point of view of encoding (see Boas 2008 for the implications for encoding). Finally, this paper shows how the commonalities and idiosyncratic particulars of the configurations in (1)-(2) can be connected with three other sub-constructions after verbs of saying, volition and preference and which, taken together, form the family of object-related depictives (Gonzálvez-García 2008) in English and Spanish.
A computational model for storing and processing corpus data is introduced. It maps fine-grained linguistic data onto data objects and relates every object to other objects in a cognitively realistic fashion. By implementing this model, a computational network representing linguistic constructions can be built in a way that is highly consistent with the theories and principles of cognitive linguistics (Croft 2002; Goldberg 2006; Langacker 2008).

An advanced multi-layered data processing system (AMPS) takes linguistic data that are tagged in a multi-layered format and maps them onto objects of different classes, such as sentences, morphemes, frames, and conceptual primitives. These classes are in a relationship of “composition” in terms of object-oriented program design (Meyer 2000; Hasebe 2005), and provide an outer layer of the network. Each of these classes, in turn, has its internal complexity also; with superclasses in above and subclasses below, realizing a rather inner layer of the network. Placed amongst such an intertwined network structure, linguistic constructions (or any other smaller linguistic units, for that matter) can be defined not as a set of values assigned to a certain number of parameters, but as a profiled region of the (possibly enormous) whole, corresponding to the fundamental idea of cognitive linguistics.

Software/database design has not been accorded the importance it deserves in the fields of linguistics, although there are a few successful attempts to structure linguistic data in a way that is cognitively plausible (e.g. Fillmore et al. 2002; Bergen and Chang 2004). It is important to note, however, that the application of cognitive linguistics also to the way linguistic data are actually stored and processed is desirable for the purpose of both constructing useful corpus systems and providing a demonstrable proof of theory.
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This study attempts to account for measurement and comparison expressions in Japanese and English in terms of the combined constructicon and lexicon developed by FrameNet. In English, measurement is expressed by a measurement expression followed by some (not all) ‘neutral’ scalar adjectives indicating the parameter: 2 inches thick, 5 inches wide, 6 feet tall, 3,000 feet high (but not *3 feet short, *1,000 feet low, or *20 kg heavy, *$9 expensive). The corresponding Japanese expressions use nouns indicating the dimension, followed by the measurement: e.g. nagasa 100 peeji ‘length 100 pages’. The topic-comment construction is used for describing the dimensions of an object.

(1) kono hon wa nagasa hyaku peeji da. ‘This book is 100 pages long.’
this book TOP length 100 page COP-NPST

While scalar adjectives behave similarly in Japanese and English, e.g. (2a), significantly different interpretations result when such adjectives are juxtaposed with a measurement expression, e.g. (3).

(2) a. kono hon wa naga-i. b. kono hon wa hyaku peeji da.
this book TOP long-NPST 100 page COP-NPST
‘This book is long.’
‘This book is (consists of) 100 pages.’
(3) kono hon wa hyaku peeji hyori nagai. ‘This book is 100 pages longer.’
100 page long-NPST
While (2a) translates ‘this book is long’, (3) does not mean ‘this book is 100-page long’. Rather, it renders only ‘this book is 100 pages longer’. The comparison reading is neither a property of the measurement expression itself, cf. (2b), nor of the adjective itself, cf. (2a). Therefore, the comparison reading should be considered a property of the construction, not compositionally derived from the meaning of its component(s). Despite the fact that Japanese comparison constructions have attracted considerable attention in recent years, to our knowledge, this construction has never been discussed in relevant literature.

In FrameNet, the Comparison construction has two types of construction elements (CEs): inner and outer. The inner CEs consist of Marker (e.g. more, -er) and Base_expression (e.g. tall, fond of grapes). The construct composed by the two inner CEs evokes the Comparison frame in FrameNet. It has as its frame elements (FEs) Item, Standard, Scale, and Extent. The formal realization of these elements is determined by the construction, e.g. [She Item] is [three feet Extent] [taller Scale] [than her father Standard]. The Item and Standard are compared with respect to their values on a Scale (e.g. height, intelligence). The lexical identity of the Marker determines the nature of comparison (greater/less than, equal to).

In Japanese, three comparison Markers are identified:

(4) kono hon no hoo ga ano hon yori hyaku peeji motto nagai.
this book GEN side NOM that book than 100 page more long-NPST
‘This book is 100 pages longer than that book.’

Any one of the markers is sufficient to evoke the Comparison frame:

(5) a. kono hon no hoo ga nagai. b. ano hon yori nagai. c. motto nagai.
‘This book is longer.’ ‘It’s longer than that book.’ ‘It’s longer.’

As shown in (3), the mere juxtaposition of a measurement and a scalar expression retaining
only Extent and Base_expression without any comparison marker nonetheless forces a comparison interpretation. This line of analysis allows us to perspicuously describe similarities and differences between Japanese and English measurement and comparison constructions without an ad hoc stipulation.
Preposition Pied Piping and Stranding in British English: An Experimental- and Corpus-based Construction Grammar Analysis
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Preposition placement in English has attracted a great deal of attention in the linguistic literature (cf., e.g., Gries 2002; Hoffmann 2007; Trotta 2000) since many syntactic contexts license two competing structural variants (cf. Pullum and Huddleston 2002: 627): in preposed, interrogative, exclamative and wh-relative clauses the preposition can either be “stranded”, i.e. appear without an adjacent NP complement (3.1), or occur “pied piped”, i.e. in clause-initial position (3.2):

(3.1) a. [Stranding], I’ve heard of.
    [preposing]
b. [What], is he talking about?
    [interrogative]
c. [What a great topic], he talked about!
    [exclamative]
d. the structure [[which], he talked about].
    [wh-relative]

(3.2) a. [Of stranding], I’ve heard.
    [preposing]
b. [About what], is he talking?
    [interrogative]
c. [About what a great topic], he talked!
    [exclamative]
d. the structure [[about which], he talked].
    [wh-relative]

Non-wh-relative clauses (3.3a), comparative (3.3b), hollow (3.3c) and passive clauses (3.3d), however, only permit stranding:

(3.3) a. the structure [(that), he talked about].
    [non-wh-relative]
b. the same stuff, as [I talked about].
    [comparative]
c. His thesis, was easy [to find fault with].
    [hollow]
d. Stranding, has been talked about, enough.
    [passive]

While all earlier accounts of preposition placement only focussed on specific clause types, the present talk investigates the distribution of preposition pied piping and stranding in all of the clause types in (3.1) to (3.3). For this I will draw on empirical corpus data (the British English components of the International Corpus of English ICE project) and experimental data (using the Magnitude Estimation method), which have been subjected to various statistical analyses. (The corpus data were analysed employing the Coll.analysis 3. and HCFA 3.2 scripts for R for Windows [Gries 2004a/b] and Goldvarb; the experimental data were subjected to a repeated measures ANOVA analysis).

As I will argue in my talk, a usage-based construction grammar account (Croft 2001; Goldberg 2006) which incorporates an interaction of processing constraints with type and token frequency effects can best explain the effects uncovered by the statistical analyses (such as, e.g., the categorical stranding effect of the preposition like, the fact that interrogatives strongly favour stranding or that the factor formality only affects relative clauses).
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The grammaticalisation of the posture verbs ‘sit’, ‘stand’ and ‘lie’ into markers of progressive aspect is a crosslinguistically frequently attested phenomenon (see e.g. Bybee et al. 1994, Kuteva 1999, Heine and Kuteva 2002). Dutch is among the languages in question, the verbs *zitten* ‘sit’, *staan* ‘stand’, and *liggen* ‘lie’ with infinitival complements all being subject to this development (see e.g. Haeseryn et al. 1997, Lemmens 2005). However, full acceptability is not (yet?) reached, the original postural meanings often still being relatively dominant — especially for the constructions other than *zitten*. Consider the following example involving *liggen*, from an exchange on an internet forum:

(1) A: *dus wat ligt je te zeuren meisje*  
   ‘So why are you whining, girl?’

B: *ik ben geen MEISJE maar een VROUW. En ik*  
   *LIG niet ik ZIT.*
   ‘I am not a GIRL but a WOMAN. And I’m not LYING, I’m SITTING.’

Whilst the typological literature generally treats the grammaticalisation of *liggen* in the same way as that of the other posture verbs, there is evidence that matters are actually a bit less straightforward. Song (2002), for example, has shown that in Korean the progressive meaning is only available for the vulgar verb *cappaci* - ‘lie’, not for *nwup* - ‘lie (plain)’. In addition, it is said to carry connotations of a negative speaker evaluation of the event described, which is also true for the Tamil *kita* - ‘lie’ construction (Lehman 1989:223) as well as for Dutch *liggen* (Haeseryn et al. 1997:973, Lemmens 2005:209).

With respect to the Dutch data (mostly obtained with the web concordancer KWicFinder) this paper will argue that in addition to progressive aspect (and remnants of the postural semantics) the meaning of *lie* may include a sociolinguistic dimension. Specifically, it appears to be used as a marker of the speaker’s assessment of themselves as ‘cool’ — also *cool* in Dutch. (Following the sociological literature ‘coolness’ is defined as a social construct, see e.g. Adler et al. 1992, Morgan 1998; or, in the Dutch context, Dibbits 2006). As to why Dutch *liggen*, but not *zitten* or *staan*, is associated with ‘coolness’ I will draw on Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980) — and many others’ — suggestions concerning the embodied nature of thought and language, and argue that there is a metaphorical connection between resting in horizontal posture and the idea of being ‘cool’. Consider in this relation also expressions such as being ‘laid back’ or ‘relaxed’, which are both connected to ‘coolness’.

Since the metaphors we live by are often not language-specific one may suspect that the link between the ‘lie’ progressive and ‘coolness’ is not restricted to Dutch. Indeed, I will speculate that this link may also help explain the peculiar status of the Korean *cappaci-* and Tamil *kita-* constructions.

The paper concludes with some remarks concerning the desirability of a social dimension in cognitive linguistics. Croft (to appear) shows how cognitive linguistics may be extended to account for what he calls “first-order variation”, i.e. variation where the variants don’t carry social meaning. I take this a step further, by illustrating how “second-order variation” — where variants *have* been invested with social meaning — may be brought within the scope of a social cognitive linguistics as well.
In this paper, I examine why directional verb compounds (DVC) and serial verb constructions (SVC) denote various meanings in Mandarin and propose a better explanation of a speaker’s interpretation of these constructions based on the interaction between the event templates (hypothetically) associated with the construction and the notions of PATH.

Less attention is paid to the semantic distinction between a DVC and an SVC (Kang 2001; Lu 1977; Newmeyer 2004; Paul 2004; Zhang 1991; Zou 1994). When describing a spatial change-of-location, both DVCs in (1)-(2) and SVCs in (3) are commonly used to encode directed motion events. At first glance, (1a) and (1b) are similar, except for each adjoining with a different V2. *jin* ‘enter’ and *hui* ‘return’. The varied interpretations of (1b) do not surface without provided context. The complicated differences can be seen as soon as we submit them to an adverbial time phrase *qi dian* ‘seven o’clock’ and a temporal scope-sensitive adverb *cai* ‘only’ (Bi 1988; Lai 1999), as shown in (2)-(3). Three major differences are observed. First, the interpretations of the SVC in (3a) and (3b) are distinct. Second, when comparing (2a) and (2b), we notice that the interpretation of (2b) is ambiguous. Third, the meaning of (2bii) somewhat overlaps with (3bii), but the infelicitous interpretation in (iii) of (2b) and (3b) is actually in complementary distribution. The question remains as to what triggers the dual interpretations: a lexical distinction (i.e. PATH V2), the construction (i.e. DVCs vs. SVCs), or both.

First, I show that the semantic event composition of sub-events is asymmetric across DVCs and SVCs. Secondly, I propose that the key to capturing the event composition is the distinction of PATH notions, viz. a minimal vs. an extended PATH (Beavers 2002; Wechsler 2003). Third, I demonstrate that three distinct event representations are associated with an SVC involving an extended PATH, while only one (result-salient) representation tend to be realized when appearing with a minimal PATH. Overall, I conclude that the varied reading exhibited in a DVC/SVC is actually a characteristic of the interaction between the representations (event templates) of DVCs (result-salient)/SVCs (manner/means-salient) and the notions of PATH. In terms of minimal vs. extended PATH s, we are in a better position to explain why inconsistent readings are obtained in other semantic tests (i.e. *kuai* ‘almost’; *kaishi* ‘begin’). Also, we are able to highlight the stage difference denoted by a DVC and an SVC in reference to the event headedness (Pustejovsky 1995) or stage salience (Caudal 2005).

(1a) Ta kai jin xuexiao qu le
3sg drive enter school DEIC LE
‘(lit.) S/He drove into the school (and arrived).’

(1b) Ta kai hui xuexiao qu le
3sg drive return school DEIC LE
(i) ‘S/He is on her/his way to the school (by driving).’
(ii) ‘S/He arrived at the school (by driving).’
(iii) ‘S/He just drove back to the school.’

(2a) Ta qi dian cai kai jin xuexiao qu le
3sg seven o’clock only drive enter school DEIC LE
‘S/He didn’t drive into the school until 7.’

(2b) Ta qi dian cai kai hui xuexiao qu le
3sg seven o’clock only drive return school DEIC LE
(i) ‘S/He didn’t arrive at school until 7.’
(ii) ‘S/He was on her/his way to school by 7 (by driving).’
*(iii)(lit.) S/He didn’t start to drive back to school until 7.*

(3a) Ta qi dian cai kai che jin xuexiao qu le
3sg seven o’clock only drive car enter school DEIC LE
‘S/He didn’t driving into the school until 7.’

(3b) Ta qi dian cai kai che hui xuexiao qu le
3sg seven o’clock only drive car return school DEIC LE
(i) ‘S/He didn’t start driving back to school until 7.’
(ii) ‘S/He was on her/his way to school by 7 (by driving).’
*(iii) ‘S/He arrived at school at 7 (by driving).’*
Constructions out of Constructions: A Case Study of choe3-chit8-e7 and chit8-e7-ku2 Constructions in Taiwanese Southern Min
Chia-yin Hu
National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan
16:45 – 17:15, September 27th, 2008

This paper explores two intriguing types of constructions which ‘grow out of’ existing constructions as realized in choe3-chit8-e7 and chit8-e7-ku2 in Taiwanese Southern Min (TSM). As Lien (2007) and Li and Wang (2003) so insightfully observed, in addition to the typical semantic and grammatical properties of the combination of a numeral plus a verbal classifier, chit8-e7 ‘(lit.) one-time’ has formed a frozen expression with new semantic and pragmatic functions. However, a close survey of chit8-e7 in the database of Modern TSM1 reveals that there are in fact new frozen expressions extended from, or ‘grew out of’ the construction chit8-e7. One of the new expressions is choe3-chit8-e7 ‘(lit.) do-one-time’. Instead of the compositional meaning of ‘do (something) for one time’, choe3-chit8-e7 depicts an event being performed by a group, roughly translated as ‘all together’. Thus the syntactic subject is restricted to plural, which is not a constraint of chit8-e7. Moreover, distinct from chit8-e7 modifying the verb phrase, choe3-chit8-e7 is like a sentential adverb, as (1) illustrates.

(1) chiong3 huat4-kuann1 choe3-chit8-e7 kin2-tiunn7 khi-lai
   all judge all-together nervous up
   ‘The judges got nervous all together.’

Another construction is chit8-e7-ku2 ‘(lit.) one-time-long time’. When chit8-e7 combines with the adjective ku2 ‘a long time’, the extended expression means ‘after a long time.’ In addition to the new semantic property, pragmatically, it functions as a discourse marker, introducing a subsequent event, as illustrated in (2):

(2) a chit4-e5 hoonn2-ki5 e lang5 chit8-chhu3 kue3 chit8-chhu3 a sit4-bong7 ji5 ku1 a chit8-e7-ku2 le tio7 lai5 hong3-khi3 a lai5 pang3-be7-ki7 a
   PART this curious DE person once pass once PART disappoint and return PART for-a-long-time PART and come give-up PART come forget-it PART
   ‘This curious person went by again and again, but returned home, disappointed.

After a long time, (he) forgot all about it.’

To sum up, choe3-chit8-e7 and chit8-e7-ku2 are two instances of form and meaning pairings which are extended from an existing frozen expression. That is, a construction may take in additional elements, and forms a new construction, in which non-compositional semantic content and/or new pragmatic significance further evolve. This paper adopts the view of Construction Grammar and explores the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties and constraints of such constructions by the case study of choe3-chit8-e7 and chit8-e7-ku2 in Taiwanese Southern Min.

References

1 The database is Minnan yu ziliaoku (Taiwan Southern Min Database), built by the Graduate Institute of Linguistics, National Tsing Hua University, Taiwan.
1,000 Ways to Die: Resultative V-si in Mandarin Chinese  
Han-Chun Huang  
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Consistency between verbal and constructional arguments can be found in Mandarin resultatives as in (1), though mismatches between them are not uncommon as in (2)-(4). Despite this difference, (1)-(4) are all object-oriented resultatives and involve causal relation between grammatical subjects and objects (underlined parts): (data from Chinese Gigaword; CL=classifier; ASP=aspect marker)

(1) Zhè qún bàotú céng yì duándāo kān-sí le yì míng jīngchá. the:CL:bandit once with dagger slash-dead ASP one:CL:police  
“The bandits once slashed a police officer to death with daggers.”

(2) Rèlàng zhìshāo rè-sí le sǐshìwàng zhī jī. heat:wave at:least hot-dead ASP 400,000:CL:chicken  
“The heat wave caused at least 400,000 chickens to die.”

(3) Mēiguó zhìkòng shādān hūshēng è-sí rénmín. U.S. accuse Saddam:Hussein hungry-dead people  
“The U.S. accused Saddam Hussein of starving the people to death.”

(4) Wēiērgāng chī-sí le sì ge rén. Viagra eat-dead ASP 4:CL:person  
“Four people died from taking Viagra.”

To account for the licensing of the arguments in (1)-(4), a constructional approach is resorted to: NP1 and NP2 in the construction [NP1 V-si NP2] are Causer and Causee, respectively, which combine with whatever roles V provides. Verbs (or adjectives) allowed in the four sub-constructions above vary. A corpus search of Chinese Gigaword shows the following results (following Levin’s (1993) classification):

Type (1) allows, among others, verbs of contact by impact (e.g. qiāo “to knock”, zhuàng “to hit”, tī “to kick”, cǐ “to stab”, yào “to bite”, shè “to shoot”), verbs of cutting (kān “to slash”), verbs of exerting force (yā “to press”, jǐ “to push; to squeeze”), verbs of killing (shā “to kill”, dú “to poison”, lēi “to strangle”, diào “to hang”, yān “to drown”, mēn “to suffocate”). Type (2) allows adjectives such as lěng “cold”, rè “hot”, là “spicy”, and xián “salty”; Type (3) allows adjectives such as è “hungry”, qì “angry”, lèi “tired”, and fán “annoyed”. Type (4) allows verbs such as chī “to eat” and hē “to drink”.

To summarize, Type (1) allows highly transitive verbs; Type (2) allows adjectives which describe properties that kill; Type (3) allows adjectives which express human physical conditions or psychological emotions. Type (4) allows verbs of ingesting. These constraints are encoded in the four sub-constructions.

One virtue of the constructional approach is that it accommodates verbs as well as adjectives (which usually are stative) in the V slot of [NP1 V-si NP2]. Our analysis not only captures language facts but also explains the diverse verbal and constructional relations in (1)-(4). The unified analysis is preferred on theoretical grounds. The four sub-constructions have peculiarities of their own, while inheriting properties from the general one.
Constructions around the relaters about and between
Jean Hudson¹, Maria Wiktorsson²
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The broader aim of this paper is to contribute to the body of empirical data in support of a construction grammar approach to the description of English. The words *about* and *between* belong to a relatively small set of highly multifunctional items which, in the traditional analysis, are assigned a marginal role as appendages to adjacent entities. Construction grammar opens up for a more sophisticated analysis, taking into consideration all that is happening around the word in focus. This paper presents a construction grammar account of *about* and *between*, as part of a larger project investigating the relaters in general.

All occurrences of *about* and *between* were extracted from the sub-corpus ‘spoken conversation’³ of the BNC (4.2 million words) in order to identify and catalogue the constructions around them in terms of: [X r Y], [X r], and [r Y] where X and Y stand for constituents of different types (r = relater). The results of the analysis show that form-meaning mappings indeed emerge, producing constructions from the most substantive to the highly schematic. We also find that discourse function is frequently involved in these mappings.

In the case of *about*, for example, when the X element is an adjective there is even at the most schematic level [X about] a persistent or unfavourable orientation either in the item preceding r (1), or in its close environment (2). Where negative orientation is apparently absent, closer investigation frequently reveals a background situation that is somehow problematic (sickness, financial problems) and where the *about* construction signals an improvement in the otherwise undesirable situation (3).

(1) And we were concerned about their land rights or in other words, their human rights their natural human rights. NEGATIVE SEMANTICS OF ‘CONCERN’

(2) My girlfriend’s a Villa fan but isn’t always happy about it especially when I suggested painting the bedroom claret and blue. NEGATION IN CLAUSE

(3) (Uttered in the context of a door that is difficult to open): She said she’s looking forward to the day that we get it fixed! Said, oh I'm sorry mum, I'll go and get you some eggs! Cos they are quite tame, I mean that’s one thing about the hens I mean they can’t come out though... POSITIVE ORIENTATION AGAINST NEGATIVE BACKGROUND

With *between*, one interesting pattern is the concurrence of *between* in the ‘connecting’ sense with a following (Y) element that is almost always a plural personal pronoun referring to humans:

(4) and they bought that house between them Romana’s mum and dad

(5) maybe we can sort something out between us

(6) knowing that you wanted to get somewhere between you

Further, in contrast to the case of *about*, it is only in the ‘separating’ sense of *between* that there is a marked semantic affinity with the preceding (X) element – with words denoting difference, division, choice, and separateness.

In the traditional account, the distinction between bound (eg. *about*) and unbound (eg. *between*) prepositions is unclear. A construction grammar analysis captures many of the subtler nuances along this cline and provides a framework for the comprehensive analysis of items in the relater category in their own right.

---

¹ An umbrella term for all words that can be prepositions, many of which can also belong to other word-classes.

³ We assume that informal speech encodes the most salient and core meanings. We therefore use conversational data in order to create a benchmark for the investigation of other discourse types.
While it is well-known that modal verbs are often polarity sensitive (Edmondson 1983; van der Wouden 1996), theoretical and descriptive work on sensitivity has mostly focused on quantificational and adverbial constructions, to the exclusion of verbal polarity items. This paper examines a broad class of polarity sensitive verbs and argues that constraints on their distributions reflect their status as grammaticalized scalar pragmatic operators.

Previous work on English, Dutch and German (Horn 1972; Hoeksema 1994; Falkenberg 2001) has shown that verbal NPIs cluster in a few narrow semantic domains. I show here that each of these domains regularly includes both NPIs and PPIs, and that, as predicted by the Scalar Model of Polarity (Israel 1996, 2001), these items consistently encode either a high or a low scalar semantic value. The basic pattern is illustrated in (1-4).

1) Inclination:  
NPIs: dream of Ving  
PPIs: rather V  
LOW  
HIGH  

2) Aversion:  
NPIs: (can) resist Ving  
PPIs: (can) do without Ving  
LOW  
HIGH  

3) Tolerance:  
NPIs: (can) stand Ving  
PPIs: (can) live with  
LOW  
HIGH  

4) Effort:  
NPIs: bother Ving  
PPIs: take a stab at Ving  
LOW  
HIGH  

While these domains each provide distinct motivations for the grammaticalization of NPIs, they also have much in common. Most importantly, all the verbs in (1-4) denote a scalar relation between an actor/experiencer (denoted by the subject NP) and a possible situation in which that actor is the distinguished participant (denoted by a VP complement), and the sensitivities of these verbs appears to be motivated by the rhetorical functions of emphasis and attenuation which can be conventionally associated with the use of scalar operators.

While the pattern here suggests the existence of an abstract, polarity sensitive catenative verb (PSCV) construction, the individual verbs licensed by this construction exhibit very different patterns of usage. Thus bother Ving occurs primarily with negation and in rhetorical questions, but care to V and mind Ving each have special uses in polar questions with 2nd person subjects where they help indicate illocutionary forces of invitation (would you care to...?) and request (would you mind...?) respectively. Evidence of this sort suggests that speakers must master a number of highly specific PSCV subconstructions, each with distinct syntactic, semantic and pragmatic properties. Further evidence for the item-specific nature of individual PSCV constructions comes from the diversity of patterns observable in the grammaticalization of such forms and in patterns of usage in very young children.

I argue that all these facts are naturally captured by positing a rich hierarchy of constructions related by normal inheritance. I further argue that the different sensitivities of individual PSCV constructions are best understood as reflecting different constraints on the sorts of mental space configurations (Cutrer 1994; Fauconnier 1997) within which these constructions can be felicitously understood.
Another look at the maximal end-point constraint on resultatives:
Seizi Iwata
Osaka City University, Japan
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Since Green’s (1972) observation in (1), it has been well-known that not every adjective can appear as a result phrase.

(1) He wiped it {clean/dry/smooth/*damp/*dirty/*stained/*wet}. (Green 1972)

Wechsler (2005a, 2005b) argues that this restriction can be accounted for in terms of a maximal end-point constraint: clean, dry, and smooth are all maximal end-point closed-scale adjectives, whereas damp, dirty, stained, and wet are minimal end-point adjectives.

There are apparent counter-examples to this constraint as in (2), where minimal end-point adjectives do appear in the result phrase.

(2) a. The shadows stretched long over the road.
   b. & and then the door opened wide. (both from BNC)

But since these resultatives are known to be different from resultatives like hammer the metal flat (Pustejovsky 1991, Rapoport 1999, Horrocks & Stavrou 2003, Iwata 2006, among others), they may not count as true counter-examples. This suggests that the maximal end-point constraint should be better regarded as applicable only to resultatives like hammer the metal flat, whose syntax and semantics are to be attributed to argument structure constructions, rather than to verbs (Goldberg 1995).

But even this revised version of maximal end-point thesis suffers from a number of counter-examples. Thus in (3) slightly less damp cannot possibly be taken to indicate a maximal end-point.

(3) Sandra surely must have felt she would be losing face today as she toweled the kids hair only slightly less damp &

Furthermore, the adjective can be modified by almost or somewhat, and be in a comparative form.

(4) a. & then sensor 3 is wiped dry or almost dry &
   b. I used a hacksaw to cut off the head of the bolt, then hammered this end somewhat flat on an anvil, &
   c. & the tables can be wiped much cleaner & (all from web)

Thus even resultatives like hammer the metal flat are not subject to the maximal end-point constraint.

This paper argues that once we realize that change of state is to be regarded as entering into a new state, rather than reaching a goal, it becomes clear why resultatives are not subject to the maximal end-point constraint. Also, this paper considers where the restriction against dirty and wet as observed in (1) ultimately comes from.
This paper deals with what I call the JBo-X DM-Y construction (ex.1: *Just because of one incident doesn't mean he doesn't deserve the award*). While the JB-X DM-Y construction (ex.2: *Just because I'm a linguist doesn't mean that I speak many languages*) has been analyzed in detail, our construction has received little attention, partly because of its substandard nature. Matsuyama (2001), for example, argues that the JBo-X DM-Y construction is not acceptable from a generative point of view. In contrast to his observation, however, a lot of attested examples exist (particularly in informal registers). With a number of actual sentences, I argue for the existence of this construction, pointing out that the construction under discussion requires a constructional, rather than purely morphosyntactic, analysis. First, slightly modifying Hirose’s (1999) inheritance model, I claim that the construction at issue is not a “static” construction but emerges (on-line) from the JB-X DM-Y construction via analogy. This conclusion leads to another argument that while the JB-X DM-Y construction is well entrenched (cf. Hilpert, 2005), the JBo-X DM-Y construction is not. This straightforwardly accounts for the latter’s substandard nature and supports the usage-based model of grammar.

Hirose (1999) analyzes the clausal JB-X DM-Y construction (ex.3: *Just because I’m a linguist, it doesn’t mean that I speak many languages*) as a subpart of the inferential because-clause construction (ex.4: *It must have rained, because the ground is wet*), and the latter as being related to the causal because-clause construction (ex.5: *the ground is wet because it has rained*) by a metaphorical mapping. In this paper, I consider the clausal JB-X DM-Y construction to inherit its information directly from the causal because-clause construction (i.e., the inferential because-clause construction is not relevant), for the following reasons. First, the focusing adverb just may focalize causal because-clauses, but not inferential ones. Second, causal because-clauses may be within the scope of matrix negation, just like the because-clause of the JB-X DM-Y construction, whereas inferential ones may not. Third, unlike causal because-clauses, inferential ones do not appear in sentence-initial position without a lexicalized inference marker in the main clause, such as *I think* (ex. 6: *Because the ground is wet, *(I think) it has rained*). Kanetani (2007) argues that the interpretation of this sentence is coerced into the causal one due to the sentence form; i.e., ex. 6 is an instance of the causal because-clause construction. As with ex. 6, the clausal JB-X DM-Y construction (ex. 3) can be viewed as a kind of causal because-clause construction, given that the because-clause precedes its main clause with the lexicalized counter-inference marker doesn’t mean (cf. Bender & Kathole, to appear). Then, the JBo-X DM-Y construction is created by the analogy that casual because-clauses may be nominalized as because of NP (ex. 7: *The ground is wet because of the rain vs. *It has rained, because of the wet ground). This analogy is motivated not only by functional similarities between the because-clause and the because of phrase used in the constructions at issue but also by their formal similarities; i.e., they share the same lexeme because. This is verified by a crosslinguistic analysis. That is, English allows such a specific construction as (ex. 1) because both formal and functional conditions are met in the language.

Thus, the existence of the JBo-X DM-Y construction can be accounted for by an analogy that is motivated by (i) the entrenchment of the JB-X DM-Y construction and (ii) the functional and formal similarities between the because-clause used in the JB-X DM-Y construction and because of phrases.
A Constructional Approach to Multiple Nominative Constructions
Jong-Bok Kim\(^1\), Peter Sells\(^2\)
\(^1\)Kyung Hee University, \(^2\)SOAS
14:00 – 14:30, September 26\(^{th}\), 2008

The so-called ‘multiple’ nominative constructions (henceforth MNCs) exemplified in (1) are some of the more puzzling phenomena in topic-prominent languages like Korean, Japanese, and Chinese:

(1) a. John-i-uy son-i khu-ta
   b. yelum-i-ey/*-uy maykwu-ka choyko-i-ta
   ‘John’s hand is big.’
   ‘Summer is the best time to have beer.’

In both examples, it is not the first but the second nominative (NOM) phrase that is the argument of the intransitive matrix predicate: it is the hand that is big, and it is the beer that tastes good in summer. John and summer are not direct arguments of the matrix predicate. Considering that a clause usually contains at most one subject, expressed as a NOM phrase, the function of the first NOM is then a puzzle.

In terms of pragmatic conditions, the first NOM phrase in both cases characterizes the remaining part (which is often called ‘sentential predicate’). For example, in (1)a having a big hand is a characterizing property of John whereas in (1)b, tasty beer is a characteristic of summer. If there is no such relation, the first phrase cannot be NOM, though it can be a genitive modifier:

(2) a. John-uy/*-i [swuep-i ttapwunha-ta]
   b. yelum-ey/*-i [John-i congcong mikwuk-ul ka-n-ta]
   ‘John’s class is boring.’
   ‘In summer, John often goes to America.’

However, the first NOM in these examples also behaves differently. In examples like (2)a (which we call the possessive nominative construction (PNC)), the two consecutive NOM phrases are in a possessive relation, as attested by the alternation with the possessive marker on the first NOM. Meanwhile, in examples like (2)b (which we call the adjunct nominative construction (ANC)), there is no such a relation. The first phrase functions more like an adjunct, as indicated by the locative marker.

As a way of capturing generalizations about the shared properties of diverse construction types (including the MNCs here), our grammar adopts the notion of constructions from Ginzberg and Sag (2001) and classifies phrases in terms of HEADEDNESS and CLAUSALITY, as represented in (3):

(3)

As shown in the hierarchy here, each type of phrase is cross-classified, inheriting both from the CLAUSALITY type and from a HEADEDNESS type. The constraints on the subtypes of
HEADEDNESS will license well-formed phrases in the language.

‘Multiple nominative’ constructions present challenges to theoretical as well as computational linguists. In particular, the functions of the first NOM phrase in MNCs are not straightforward. The first NOM can be either a specifier or an adjunct, and it has a specific semantic relation with regard to the remaining sentence – it is ‘characterized’ by the rest of the sentence. This paper shows that a grammar allowing interactions of declarative constraints on types of signs – in particular, constructions (phrases and clauses) – can provide an robust and efficient way of parsing these two different types of MNC.
A large number of theoretical frameworks have been devoted to the problem of the conative construction (hereafter CC, ‘verb-at’, shot at the bear). Pinker (1989), Levin (1993) and Beavers (2006) address the CC in terms of lexical semantics; van der Leek (1996) and Dixon (2005), in terms of a compositional approach; Goldberg (1995), in terms of Construction Grammar; and Broccia (2003), in terms of Cognitive Grammar. However, it would seem that none of them provide a fully consistent explanation for i) why (1a) through (4a) are acceptable whereas (1b) through (4b) are not:

(1a) Terry patted at the cat.  (1b) *Terry touched at the cat.
(2a) Mary hit at the naughty child.  (2b) *Mary spanked at the naughty child.
(3a) He carved away at the roast.  (3b) *He carved at the roast.
(4a) John hit out at the door.  (4b) *John hit out the door.

Furthermore, these approaches lack an explication of the relationships between the CC (underspecifying a patient’s affectedness) and other constructions: away (continuous, chat away), out (uncontrolled, hit out), away at (continuous conative, carve away at) and out at (uncontrolled conative, hit out at) constructions.

This paper presents an extended semantic map model (Kim, Y. 2008) by integrating Talmy’s attentional system into the semantic map model (Croft 2001). The semantic map model shows the relationships between the various semantic functions of a multifunctional construction. However, it has some theoretical limitations. First, it lacks criteria with which to specify the arrangement of the geometry of semantic functions and the distance between them. Second, a conceptual space makes little reference to cognitive operations like construal, indicating that this model leaves out the role of the conceptualizer.

I argue that there is a relation between the windowing of attention on event schemas (the X-axis of the semantic map) and the focus of attention on participants (Y-axis). Participants who control an event are more likely to have the speaker’s focus of attention in Activity-windowing event schemas so that these controllers are prototypically construed as Agents. On the other hand, participants who undergo change are more likely to have the focus of attention in Change or State-windowing event schemas so that these undergoers are prototypically construed as Themes.

The CC is an [Activity- (Cause)]-windowing construction: 1) it implies, but does not entail the Change of a Theme, 2) it is likely to occur with imperfective aspect, non-past tense, or nonspecific Object, 3) it does not have a stative passive, and 4) it is unlikely to occur with the Resultative construction. The away and out constructions, encoding a continuous and uncontrolled event respectively, are more Activity-windowing than the CC because unlike the CC, they can form a construction without a Theme (He chattered away. He hit out wildly.). It can explain why the [Activity-Cause]-windowing hit is less likely to occur with the more [Activity]-windowing out construction as in (4b) whereas it can occur with the CC as in (2a).

The [Activity- (Cause)]-windowing CC can occur also with the more [Activity]-windowing away and out constructions. The away construction shifts the windowing of attention from Change in carve to Activity in carve away, and the out construction shifts the windowing of attention from [Active-Cause] in hit to Activity in hit out so that they can easily occur with the [Activity- (Cause)]-windowing CC as in (3a) and (4a) respectively.

The CC is less likely to occur with touch and spank verb types because touch verb types lack intention to affect a Theme, and spank verb types are less [Activity]-windowing since they prototypically entail affectedness of a Theme. On the other hand, the CC is more likely to occur with pat and hit verb types, both of which window Activity rather than Change.
Prototype-based conceptual categorization of evaluative meaning
Ron Kuzar
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This paper addresses the following construction, labeled here Evaluative Sentence (EVS):

1. Example: It is good to see you / that they have a plan.
   Structure: expletive evaluative predicate phrase evaluee (INFP or that-clause)

The function of the construction is to evaluate an event (or state). This is done in a predicate-initial construction with an evaluative predicate phrase and an evaluee (INFP or that-clause) representing the event. Clearly not all predicates are felicitous in this construction:

2. It is yellow/metallic to see you / that they have a plan.

The question is: what are the constraints on predicates in the EVS construction? I suggest that there is a conceptual category (CC) of evaluation, encoded in the EVS construction. It is a prototype-based radial category, consisting of a core and four rings of periphery around it. The structure of the CC of evaluation is summarized and exemplified in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Predicate has modal V/N/A head. Hence VP/NP/AP is modal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It annoys me to see this / It is a lot of fun to visit you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ring</td>
<td>Predicate has non-modal N head. NP is compositionally modal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a bad idea to look for them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ring</td>
<td>Predicate has non-modal P/V head. PP/VP is compositionally modal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is a great thing that you parents work here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd ring</td>
<td>Predicate has time/cost VP. It is non-modal but still evaluative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It takes me an hour to get to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th ring</td>
<td>Predicate has any of the above. Evaluee = NP NP represents an event (see Eng. Trans.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It cost me two dollars to get my watch fixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keday lexa maxšev xadaš [Hebrew] worthwhile for-you computer new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It is worth your while [to get] a new computer’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CC of evaluation, as manifest in the EVS, is common to English and Hebrew with the exception of the 4th ring. Since the function of this construction is to evaluate events, it is in line with prototype behavior that a language would marginally allows an NP to appear in the evaluee slot, provided that it can be metonymically construed as representing an event.

The validity of the CC of evaluation can also be demonstrated in expletive behavior. English canonically requires expletives, while Hebrew does not. Non-canonical behavior in informal English clusters around the core, while in Hebrew it is restricted to the periphery:

3. (a) Eng.: no expletive: Shame/pity/good thing you didn’t show up.
   (b) Heb.: expletive (ze) ze moci oti mida’ati laševet kan kol-kax harbe ša’ot
   IT takes me from-my-mind to sit here so many hours
   ‘It drives me crazy to sit here for so many hours’

English and Hebrew are two poles in a typological group of languages that maintain this CC, and express it in the EVS construction. The CC is predicted to be similar in all languages near the core and to progressively differ at the periphery (as has been the case here with the metonymically construed NP behavior, found only in Hebrew).
As observed in many languages, unexpressed arguments can often be on account of cognitive or pragmatic accessibility (Fellbaum & Kegl 1989; Goldberg, 1995, 2005, 2006). Goldberg (2005), for instance, argues that semantic recoverability and low discourse prominence can allow the theme arguments of verbs of emission/contribution in English to be underspecified. Similarly, argument omission commonly occurs in Spoken Hakka, one of the major Chinese languages. An implicit theme construction is characterized as syntactic configuration, where the obligatory theme argument remains underspecified or appears elsewhere. While the particular construct in Hakka is motivated by similar principles as cases in English in some respects, it nevertheless differs from those in English both structurally and semantically.

First, verbs that allow their themes to be unexpressed can be generalized to a wide array of verbs from verbs of ingesting, verbs of perception/verbs of communication, and verbs of doing, to verbs of sending, verbs of cooking, verbs of commercial transaction, and verbs of manner. Second, the syntactic forms also arrange from schematic to substantive, giving rise to diverse idiomatic meanings. On the one hand, some examples are syntactically rendered as \([\text{ASP} \ V_1 \psi \ \text{ASP} \ V_2 \psi]\) as in \(\text{gin}2 \ \text{lui}5 \ \text{gin}2 \ \text{kiu}\)l ‘to repeatedly pestle (the green tea, sesame, and peanuts) and stir (its powder)’, or represented as \([V_\up V_\down]\) as in \(\text{let}5 \ \text{song}2 \ \text{let}5 \ \text{ha}3\), ‘to walk up and down while holding (something) close with arms’ denoting durative, repetitive or inchoative aspect. On the other hand, some examples are unique frozen expressions, carrying idiomatic meanings. Clearly each of the examples has its theme unexpressed under certain discourse conditions. The parallel juxtaposition of the two contrastive verbs—hearing and talking as in \(\text{siit}\)3 \(\text{tang}1 \ \text{ng}5 \ \text{siit}\)3 \(\text{kong}2\) ‘I have heard (of this) but I have never talked (it) about.’, for example—is a discourse strategy to mark out the prominence of the action while deemphasizing the non-focal object.

Third, moving into larger discourses, we find that the unexpressed theme is displaced rather than omitted. While a theme argument occurs pre-verbally, it can also take a post-verbal position although both portray the same scene. Such syntactic and semantic variations serve as linguistic devices to package the information for communication. The question is what makes the discourse coherent and what guarantees the smoothness of the information flow.

Thus, this study aims to tackle two issues: to scrutinize qualification for components to be in the implicit theme construction, looking into how form and meaning interact with one another to generate a range of meanings from schematic to substantive; and to offer an explanation for the observed preference for the implicit theme construction over its canonical structure in Hakka in terms of information structure. It is hoped to argue that any form-meaning pairings arise from the actual usage in context motivated by the information packaging strategies of language users.
A causative construction, denoting a complex event, is defined as a structure that is derived from a simple active sentence by adding a new argument to indicate the role of CAUSER (Palmer 1994). While some languages employ a special causative affix which derives a transitive verb from an intransitive verb (Dixon 2005), others like English use MAKING verbs such as have, make, let, and get to play the role of causative markers in English causative constructions. Similar causative markers like rang4 (讓) ‘let’ or ling4 (令) ‘let’ observed in Mandarin can illustrate causative meanings as well.

In Hakka, the two words lau1 (捲) (verbal meaning: ‘mix’) and bun1 (分) (verbal meaning: ‘give’) play the role of causative markers as in the typical causative structure NP1 + LAU (捲)/ BUN (分) + NP2 + VP. However, it is observed that in LAU (捲) causative constructions, both NP1 and NP2 participate in the activity designated by VP while only NP2 involves in the activity designated by VP in BUN (分) constructions. Though both of them represent causative meanings, the sub-events perform diversely.

On the other hand, some constructions without overt causative markers in Hakka can still be detected carrying causative meanings. For example, in the sentence shui2 zai1 da2 zeu2 liong1 sa5 ngin5 (水災打走兩億人) ‘The flood flushed away two people’, the prototypical causative marker lau1 (捲) or bun1 (分) does not emerge. However, the causal representation is observed explicitly since the flood which plays the role of effector causes the patient to be flushed away. Another example is gai1 zii2 da2 zoi3 lon2 hok4 (雞子打嘴卵殼) ‘The chicken breaks the eggshell by its beak’ in which the chicken causes the eggshell to be broken. Intriguingly, the post-predicate element in the former sentence is an intransitive verb zeu2 (走) ‘to go, to run’ while in the latter, a noun zoi3 (嘴) ‘the mouth’. In addition, the transfer of energy in the first example is transparent and the causation from NP1 to NP2 is overt. However, the transfer of energy in the second example is opaque. Furthermore, the result of the causation is implicit. There is no clue to denote the broken status of the patient lon2 hok4 (卵殼) ‘eggshell’. Therefore, the causation from NP1 to NP2 is covert. In any event, the grammatical device to express the meaning of causing someone to perform the relevant action is absent in these cases. Without causative markers, the responsibility of offering the causative representation will be ascribed to the construction itself consequently.

This paper hence attempts to provide an analysis of the syntactic variations and semantic features of causative constructions in Hakka encompassing specific issues such as the integration of the constituent elements of the structures. Emphasizing on the relationship between forms and semantic or discourse functions, constructionist approaches, in the stream of thought of Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004), Goldberg (2006), among others, propose the constructional view in an overall vision of grammar. Following this line of argument, this study will provide a framework to account for both the generalizations and the particularities of Hakka causative constructions syntactically and semantically.
From formulas to constructions: the case of Arabic
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Formulas and constructions within Construction Grammar have often been described as distinct kinds of structures, with clearly different defining features: constructions are regarded as open and related by a thick network of motivated relations (Goldberg 1995), while formulas are a stock of ready-made forms, directly retrieved in the speaker’s working memory (Wray 2002). On the other hand, oral traditional studies, since Milman Parry’s seminal work on the Homeric Poems (papers from the ’20s and early ’30s posthumously gathered in Parry 1971), have shown that formulaic language is a constituent element of the poetic fabric in most oral poetic productions.

Work by Monroe 1972 and Zwettler 1978 has convincingly shown that the pre-Islamic corpus of Arabic poetry is formulaic to a relevant degree, and that the text of the Koran is significantly close, from a linguistic point of view, to that corpus. Since Classical Arabic [ClA], he historical antecedent of Modern Standard Arabic [MSA], is exactly a language reconstructed from this selected, close textual corpus, centred along the Koran and pre-Islamic poetry, it can be assumed that ClA inherited important formulaic features from its models, which are consistently missing from spoken Arabic variants; these features range from text chunks to morphological and syntactic patterns (including redundant case affixes, and syntactically determined partial agreement: see Lancioni forthc. for a discussion).

The general consequence of the hypothesis presented is that formulaicity in written languages can be strongly reinforced by the model of literary varieties, even long after the original textual constraints disappeared. Possible extension of the model to other linguistic domain include, among others, Classical Greek (where a prototypical formulaic model can be found in Homeric poems), Biblical Hebrew and Sanskrit.

A second important consequence is that Construction Grammar may be able to explain diachronic change in a more plausible way than other formal models are able to do: in the case of Arabic, a gradual process coinage → formula → construction → expansion can be reconstructed, which is able to explain how some significant features of the language evolved across time through grammaticalization of originally formulaic features. As a by-result, a continuum from coinages through formulas to constructions is proposed, against some widespread assumptions within Construction Grammar (e.g. Kay 2002).
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Container is one of the basic topological categories (L. Talmy) which is relevant for different languages and is one of the earliest in language acquisition. The concept of ‘container’ is commonly represented as having a radial structure, which presupposes, on the one hand, a clearly defined categorical center (as boxes or bowls), and, on the other hand, a periphery, assembling various names of objects (like hats or spoons) which do not readily fit into what a prototypical container is supposed to be. Still, it is not a priori clear, whether containers can be represented as an integral notional category with a common structure – so that it would display the same type of behaviour in different linguistic conditions.

From the point of view of Construction Grammar the structure of this category can be seen in a new perspective. As CG suggests, it is not a notional category which determines the meaning of a given construction, but, on the contrary, each construction sets its own way of how the world’s properties are to be interpreted and, so to say, builds its own categorization.

We examine four Russian constructions which have a slot that can be filled by the names of containers: locative construction ‘Y in X’ (cf. kasha v tarelke ‘porridge in the bowl’), attributive construction with an adjective like glubokij ‘deep’ (deep X, cf. glubokaja tarelka ‘deep bowl’), comitative construction ‘X with Y’ (cf. tarelka s kashej ‘bowl with porridge’), and genitive construction of measure ‘X of Y’ (cf. tarelka kashi ‘a bowl of porridge’). Although all these constructions involve nouns with a container-like topology, each construction prefers its own classes of containers, and this choice is motivated by the semantics of the construction.

The locative construction combines with all sorts of containers, among other things, those without bottom (in a crack), without entrance (in a belly / shoulder), and oriented horizontally or upside-down (in a niche / cupola). In this construction the concept of a 3D-space is opposed to a 2D-surface (another categorial center), so the notion of “container” can be extended here to layers and substances (in sand / dust) and some spaces (in the taiga / tundra).

The adjective construction (deep X) is found only with those containers which are “measured inside” (cf. *a deep glass, deep shoes) and most likely “rigid” (*deep sack). We can also measure the depth of layers (deep snow, sand, water), but not substances per se (*deep pebble, dust).

The comitative construction ‘X with Y’ usually refers to two objects unequal in natural conditions which occur to be in one and the same space (cf. passengers with children; meat with vegetables; tea with sweets; a man with his paper). The first slot of the construction can be filled by the name of a container only if “container” and “contained” are conceptualized as different objects (cf. vase with flowers, but *river with water).

In genitive construction ‘X of Y’ container is considered a measure (a glass of water). Containers are possible here only if they refer to a special place for keeping something (cf. *river of water, *crack of sand), have a standard capacity (cf. *aquarium of fish, *pocket of keys), and contain obviously more than one object (cf. *case of spectacle).

The paper demonstrates that each construction sets its own center and periphery for containers. This idea is entirely in keeping with the theory of Construction Grammar, but at the same time it implies that we can’t propose once-and-for-all fixed center and periphery for the concept. Does this mean that there is no unified radial conceptual structure of a container?
Much has been published on the problem of complex prepositions (= CPs) called *locutions prépositives/prépositionnelles* in the French linguistic tradition, i.e. phrases that behave externally like prepositions:

\{sous l’emprise (manifeste) de / à cause de / par\} l’alcool

‘under the (clear) influence of / because of / by alcohol’

Most of the discussion has focused on the question of lexicalization and the criteria for establishing lexicalization. As a consequence, the question what those CPs might have in common and which patterns may be identified in a family of formally related CPs has been somewhat neglected in the literature, except in the work of Gross (1986) and Dubois & Dubois-Charlier (2004), who have tried to establish a taxonomy of CPs, though from a purely syntagmatic point of view.

In this study we put the lexicalization issue aside and we will try to establish regular complex form-meaning patterns (= constructions) within a family of formally related CPs. In doing this, we will benefit from concepts like construction, inheritance and schematicity. To tackle this issue in more detail, we will examine (semi-fixed and fixed) CPs introduced by the preposition *sous* ‘under’ (e.g. *sous le contrôle de, sous la bienveillance de*, etc.). Starting from the most schematic constructions of the preposition *sous* (*sous un arbre ‘under a tree’*), we will focus on the construction *sous* + definite article + N + (adj.) + *de* + NP expressing ‘mediate dependency’ : e.g. X (V) *sous le contrôle de la police* ‘X is dependent on Y, more specifically X is subject to the control exerted by Y’. Although the traditional approach inspired by the issue of lexicalization may have some doubts about the (semi-)fixed character of most of these *locutions prépositives*, they clearly display stable semantic and syntactic properties that relate to the construction as a whole, which make them instantiations of a more abstract construction (type): the obligatory presence of the definite article, invariably singular ; an obligatory prepositional phrase introduced by *de* (*sous la botte --> sous la botte de quelqu’un ‘under the thumb [lit. boot] of’) that completes the central nominal element by which it is subcategorized. In most cases, the construction contains a slot for free adjectival modification, but in less schematic (or more idiomatic) constructions modification is blocked (e.g. *sous la coupe de*).

The construction as a whole has its own meaning and in some cases, coerces the semantics of the central noun, for instance in the case of nouns designating instruments (*botte ‘boot’) and property nouns (*‘willingness’). Admittedly, most of the coerced nouns that can be used in this construction are rather conventionalized, but the construction itself can be considered productive, since creative examples can be found with *baguette* (*baton* [of the conductor]) and *sifflet* (*whistle*), for instance. Finally, we will adduce some (clusters of) structures that do not fit in our hierarchy of constructions, but that are not entirely unrelated to it, for instance *sous l’angle de* (*‘from the viewpoint of’*) and *sous (la) condition de/que* (*‘on condition that’*).
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This paper explores the multiple functions of *soah* in Taiwanese Southern Min (TSM) based on the framework of Construction Grammar (Fillmore et al. 1988, Goldberg 1995, Jackendoff 2002, Boas 2003, and Borer 2004). *Soah* in its original sense denotes ‘kill’, a sense attested in old texts, but not in TSM (Wu 2001: 668), and later such a verbal function takes on the sense of ‘put an end to, come to an end’, as in (1abcd). It also develops other grammatical functions such as secondary predicate or complement, as in (2ab), SFP, as in (3 and 5), adverb, as in (4), and SMF, as in (6).

1 Verb
   (1a) *soah* chium\(^7\) stop-itch ‘stop itching’
   (1b) *soah* hi\(^3\) end(VI)-play(N) ‘the movie is over’
   (1c) *soah* chiu\(^3\) tal stop-mouth-dry ‘quench the thirst’
   (1d) goa\(^2\) kah\(^4\) i1 soah\(^4\) okhi\(^3\) I-with-he/she-end-PFM ‘I am done with her’

2 Secondary predicate or complement
   (2a) m\(^7\) pang\(^3\) i1 soah\(^4\) not-release-he/she-end ‘won’t let him off’
   (2b) png\(^7\) chiah\(^4\) soah\(^4\) meal-eat-finish ‘finished (eating) the meal’

3 Sentence-final particle (SFP) expressing subjective estimation
   (3) Siong\(^7\) oann\(^8\) si\(^7\) chap\(^8\) it\(^1\) tiam\(^2\) soah\(^4\)
       most-late-also-is-eleven-o’clock-SFP
       ‘It is no more than eleven p.m. at the latest’

4 Adverb expressing unexpectedness
   (4) phoa\(^3\) pinn\(^7\) soah\(^4\) khit\(^4\)-hoo\(^7\) si\(^2\) okhi\(^3\)
       Become-ill-ADV-ADVERSATIVE MARKER-die-PFM
       ‘died from illness unexpectedly’

5 SFP in conditional complex sentence
   (5) Na\(^7\) boe\(^7\) eng\(^7\) tit\(^4\) chiah\(^4\) mai\(^1\) choe\(^3\) soah\(^4\)
       If not use can then don’t do PRT
       ‘If it is not feasible, then we can just not do it’

6 Sentence-medial particle (SMF) as a marker of rhetorical question
   (6) I1 soah\(^4\) u\(^7\) kong\(^2\) beh\(^4\) lai\(^5\)
       he-RQM-have-say-want-come
       ‘Did he say that he would come at all?’

The syntax of *soah* including its grammatical categories and structural properties is underspecified and the pinning down of these characteristics crucially hinge on the constructional types it enter, not the word alone. Each constructional type featuring *soah* will take on a gestalt effect not wholly calculable from the sum total of its building blocks. Albeit its inflexionless nature, Modern Chinese, TSM included, shows a wide range of words with multiple functions which involve a fairly subtle and no less amazing complexity of structural properties parallel to their counterparts in richly inflectional languages like German and Russian in magnitude. The present paper is an attempt to capture the changes of lexical properties of the word in question triggered or coerced by a range of constructions in which it occurs as well as a set of constructional types showing various functional categories in higher hierarchical positions.
The Semantics of the English Caused-motion Construction: A Dynamic Cognitive Perspective
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Opinions differ on the question of polesemy regarding constructional senses. Langacker (1987), who proposed ‘verbal polysemy’ argues that verbs are usually polysemous and the different uses of a verb each have its own semantic structure. He also very much emphasizes that conventional polysemous verb senses have become entrenched in the language user’s knowledge of his language. This view, however, does not give due recognition to the role of cognition, or rather ‘backstage cognition’ and has failed to unveil the cognitive regularities involved in the generation of language structures.

Based on verbal polysemy, it can be said that the verb swim in these examples has, in itself, three distinct linguistic senses. However, this view is inconsistent with one of the main tenets of Cognitive Linguistics that ‘language underdetermines meaning’, and thus, imposes more senses on the same verb.

Goldberg (1995), on the other hand, defies verbal polysemy and argues that verbs have one basic sense, while the complement constructions where verbs can occur, are themselves polysemous, having a central sense as well as extended senses, independently of lexical content. Constructional polysemy, as Goldberg favors, in effect, shifts polysemy from verbal to constructional senses and blatantly draws a distinction between a central sense and extended senses, one example being her caused-motion construction.

This paper, therefore, takes a dynamic cognitive position and makes an analysis on the senses of the English caused-motion construction. It holds that there is only one base concept for any lexical entity (verbs, etc.), out of which cognition constructs the appropriate and reflected senses in context. The semantics of the English caused-motion construction accordingly, can be approached and deciphered as follows:

1) Identification of the relation between a base concept and its reflected senses. A base concept is the truly abstract but unified basic concept underlying a lexical item like a verb that characterizes what is truly unpredictable about its meaning; the reflected senses refer to any actualizations of the base concept in the varying contexts. The ‘swim’ example above in (1) again serves to demonstrate that cognition pulls out of memory the frame or ICM it has formed of ‘SWIM’ and constructs different reflected senses in relation to the given contexts for the word.

2) Assignment of the oblique complement of a verb in the caused-motion construction as a subpredicate of the verb. Here, the verb and the oblique complement form a complex predicate, with the verb itself head. In other words, the verbal predicate is the ‘profile determinant’ of the complex predicate.

(2) Sam sneezed the napkin off the table.

In line with the above claim, the agent argument role (Sam) is explicitly linked to not only the concept underlying the lexical verb (sneeze), but also to that underlying the oblique complement (the goal: ‘off the table’), and that its relation with the theme argument (the napkin) consists in this complex predicate (sneeze...off the table). It is cognition that builds a sense in context for the complex predicate which can come to symbolize a transitive situation when appropriate.

A dynamic cognitive view, which involves the grammatical construction, the base concept underlying the lexical item and the relevant frame-semantic information brought in by the lexical items that ‘fill’ the construction, is undoubtedly, a feasible approach to the semantics of the English caused-motion construction and will provide insights for the deciphering of other English argument structure constructions.
Structures that are neither quite active nor passive, or neither quite transitive nor intransitive, are often marked morphologically. In Swedish, the typical markers are reflexives and so-called deponents. The latter are formed by an s-suffix on the verb, which is also used in passives and derives historically from the reflexive sig. Some examples are given in (1).

(1)  
a. Kan du precisera dig?  
  *Can you make-precise yourself*  
  ‘Can you specify what you mean?’  

  *Kim tease-S*  
  ‘Kim is teasing someone/me’ or ‘Kim is a tease’

c. Projektet utvecklas/utvecklar sig enligt planen.  
  *project-DEF develop-S/develop REFL according-to plan-DEF*  
  ‘The project develops according to plan’

In (1a-b) the reflexive and deponent elements serve a detransitivizing function; in (c) they mark middle voice, i.e. associate a Patient role with the subject. Also in other structures they typically relativize transitivity and/or voice, although in different ways in different constructions. These markers exhibit a partially overlapping distribution; both appear in reciprocals, for instance, but there are also constructions specific to one or the other. Especially the reflexives are quite versatile with respect to their constructional distribution.

In this talk, I will present a Construction Grammar account of reflexive and deponent constructions in Swedish, based on investigation of some 400 reflexive verbs and 200 deponent verbs in a major Swedish dictionary. One might describe the general approach as a cross between Levin (1993) and Goldberg (1995). The lexical starting-point and the ambition to make a comprehensive inventory of structures resemble Levin’s work – but the theoretical and analytical perspective is constructional, not lexical, and the outcome is a set of Goldberg-style argument constructions. The analysis distinguishes around 30 reflexive and deponent constructions. Together, they cover a wide array of more or less transitive and more or less active functions.

It is striking how the analysis for the most part represents an ”intermediate” level of abstraction compared to a lexical or syntactic account. The 30 constructions assumed can be compared with the 600 lexical entries they are based on, on the one hand; and the few (4-7) general categories that are proposed in grammar books, on the other. Note that this intermediate level was not an aim beforehand; on the contrary, the overall approach is essentially multigrain (cf. Sag 2007). These are simply the relevant generalizations suggested by the data. The constructions are typically semiproductive, neither fully general nor restricted to specific verbs, and the distinguishing characteristics cannot be ascribed to a single linguistic level but consist of a combination of phrasal, lexical, and morphological features. Thus, the patterns recognized would be hard to capture from a purely lexicalist or syntactic perspective.

References
<http://lingo.stanford.edu/sag/publications.html>
Second language researchers studying learner attention and noticing have shown that learning a linguistic structure requires attention to the structure; therefore, productive use of a specific linguistic form by a learner first requires parsing the structure into its component parts. Parsing of the structure in its context of authentic use also uncovers the function and meaning of the linguistic unit. As a form/meaning pair is parsed and its functions are understood by the learner, the structure can then be used productively for communication.

Language educators have developed several teaching methodologies to increase learner awareness and parsing of constructions, including Focus on Form (FoF) and language awareness. The main weaknesses of FoF and language awareness are that the methods address how to teach grammar but not what structures to teach. In addition, the methods do not address the processes of the mind, such as noticing and parsing, which affect language learning, comprehension, and use. Overall, FoF and language awareness do not explicitly include a theory of language or a theory of cognition; yet, both types of theory are needed to employ the results of research in attention in language teaching pedagogy.

To overcome these problems, cognitive-linguistic approaches to language teaching have been explored, including Construction Grammar Theory (CGT). Unlike FoF and language awareness, CGT specifically includes the learning of form/meaning constructions in its view of language learning, and addresses the need for a theory of language and a theory of cognition identified by second language researchers. Overall, CGT offers several advantages which address important aspects of language learning discussed by second language researchers, and has the potential to resolve the pedagogical problems.

The study discussed in this presentation employed CGT to design a pedagogical method for teaching grammar to second language learners. A critical analysis of previous work in grammar pedagogy is presented first, including the strengths and weaknesses of several current teaching methods. The potential benefits of CGT are then discussed in detail. Finally, a model for teaching the English ditransitive construction is proposed. The study is an attempt to apply current theory in linguistics to the teaching of grammar, in order to bridge the gap between language theory and teaching practice.
The conceptual processes relevant to the formation and interpretation of phrases involving noun modification, including ADJ-Noun (dirty shoes, healthy budget) or Noun-Noun combinations (dirt road, health care), have been the subject of periodic debate in linguistics. Formalist approaches to language that posit the separation of semantics and pragmatics typically consider the interpretation of such phrases to be fully compositional, assuming that each item has an inherent, context-free meaning, and that the meanings of the two combine in a predictable rule-governed way (Ladusaw 1988, Enç 1988, Lappin 2001). However, empirical investigations of this claim for English noun combinations (Downing 1977, Ryder 1994) have indicated that there is no limited set of predictable rules that adequately describes the relationships speakers use in interpreting these combinations. Cognitive linguistic research (Langacker 1991, Turner & Fauconnier 1995, and Sweetser 1999) analyzes these structures as entailing analogical, categorical, metaphorical or generic blending of the two mental spaces named by the nouns. They also acknowledge a possible role of context in meaning composition, suggesting that either conventional lexical meaning or context may indicate overlap in conceptual structures. Moder (2004), in a study of metaphorical N-N combinations, found that context was an important aspect of the interpretation of such combinations, but that even conventional combinations could take on new mappings within a specific discourse context and seemingly similar structures could result in very dissimilar mappings. These findings suggest that noun modification patterns might productively be analyzed within the framework of grammatical construction theory (Goldberg, 1995, 2006; Tomasello, 2003; Croft 2001) using a usage-based approach. Recent usage-based approaches to construction grammar have suggested that type–token frequency patterns are critical to our understanding of constituent structure (Bybee 2007) and that collostructional analysis provides further detailed insights into the patterning of lexical items in constructions (Gries & Stefanowitsch 2004; Gries, Hampe & Schönewald 2005).

This study examines the effects of frequency, distinctive co-lexeme analysis, and context on the use of N-N versus ADJ-Noun combinations within similar semantic domains (dirt road, dirty work; health care, healthy growth). The corpus for the study was a set of tapes and transcripts of spoken American English taken from National Public Radio news programs (500,000 words) and a related written American English corpus of 2 million words of text from The New York Times. The study examined expressions which took the form of ADJ-N or N-N combinations, focusing on items in which there were related noun and adjective modifiers (health, health; dirt, dirty; noise, noisy; sleep, sleepy). The corpus was examined for instances of these modification constructions and then context, frequency, and collocational analyses were used to consider the extent to which expressions were being lexicalized with a particular meaning or grammaticized in a particular construction.

The results indicated distinctive association patterns for N-N versus ADJ-Noun constructions. Furthermore, noun and adjective modifiers tended to evidence different type and token frequency patterns that contributed to their lexicalizing different meanings. In general, noun forms in the modifier slot had lower token frequency than the corresponding adjective forms and were typically more restricted in the type frequency of the nouns with which they co-occurred. Further evidence of the greater flexibility of the adjective modifiers was that they were generally much more likely to be used in metaphorical combinations than noun modifiers. There is also evidence that very high frequency combinations may be autonomous and evidence different associations from other items in a constructional pattern. The implications of these findings for an integrated construction-based theory of noun modification will be discussed.
In this paper I compare the two instances of the x-and-x construction in English, over and over and again and again, based on data from the BNC. The x-and-x construction consists of two identical constituents which are connected by the coordinating conjunction and (Lindström 2001; Linell 2003). This construction is not unique to English; it exists at least also in Swedish, e.g. modern å modern ‘modern and modern’ (Lindström 2001: 2) and German, e.g. weiter und weiter ‘further and further’ (DWDS corpus).

In English, however, the x-and-x construction has a specific, grammatical meaning: it marks an event as continuous (or durative) by pushing the endpoint of the event out of side, i.e. the construction adds an aspectual value to the denoted situation. Ordinary coordinations with and do not inherently carry this meaning (e.g. compare: They came down to the verge of the lake, and drank and drank (BNC) and He ate and drank with relish... (BNC)).

Conveying a continuous aspectual value, the use of the x-and-x construction should be restricted. A cursory investigation regarding the constituents of the construction reveals that only verbs (e.g. We ran and ran but it chased us. (BNC)), the comparative form of adjectives (e.g. It gets bigger and bigger every year, (BNC)), some temporal adverbs (e.g. ...both told me to [stop], often and often. (BNC)), mostly spatial prepositions (about, across, around, by, down, in, on, out, over, through, up (based on the BNC), and verb particles (e.g. The pop tapes went on and on. (BNC) appear in the x-slots of the x-and-x construction. Nouns, naturally, don’t seem to occur in this construction but a more thorough investigation is needed to verify this claim. Furthermore, the x-and-x construction is only compatible with situations that are bounded by an arbitrary endpoint, i.e. activities in Smith’ (Smith 1997) terminology.

In this paper, I focus on over and over (e.g. ... he smiled broadly, revealing rows of black ... teeth, repeating over and over, ‘Merci, merci’. (BNC)) and again and again (e.g. You must ... take risks again and again. (BNC)) as instances of the x-and-x construction. Both constructions have been characterized as aspectual markers in previous research (Rice and Newman 2004), over and over as being iterative and again and again as ‘a kind of habitual aspect’ but ‘otherwise indistinguishable or virtually interchangeable’ (Rice and Newman 2004: 322).

This study shows how the two constructions differ in denoting slightly different situation types, i.e. over and over refers to a series of repetitions within one situation whereas again and again denotes a (potentially endless) series of identical situations. This difference in meaning is shown to result from the lexical semantics of the constituents, namely the covering sense of the preposition over, and the iterative meaning of the adverb again which are also responsible for the more restrictive usage of over and over. The choices that speakers make in discourse reveal pragmatic information of how they perceive a given situation.
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The paper focuses on German, French, English and Russian root infinitives (RI), i.e. infinitives used in matrix contexts. In the existing literature these constructions are sometimes analyzed as containing covert syntactic elements (either features localized on the clausal head or covert lexical items) which are associated with various non-assertive forces and induce non-finiteness (Kayne 1992; Brandt et al. 1992; Platzack & Rosengren 1998; Grohmann 1999, 2000; Grohmann & Extepare 2000, 2002). An alternative view relies on the idea that all RIs allow an identical structural representation, and that the interpretation has to be inferred on pragmatic grounds Rizzi 1993/1994; Haegeman 1995; Reis 1995; Lasser 1997; Han 2000). However, neither approach seems to be sufficient. The ‘reductionist’ analysis has to posit idiosyncratic syntactic elements, which will not exist in contexts other than those for which they are posited. The ‘identical representation’ analysis fails to address the question of why RIs exhibit different structural properties. In addition, both approaches encounter a number of empirical problems.

I show that in the relevant languages RIs fall into several semantico-pragmatic types: (i) Imperative (German, French, Russian): Einsteigen! (ii) Deliberative (German, French, English): Comment dire non? (iii) Exclamative (German, French, Russian, English): What, me worry?! (iv) Desiderative (German, French, Russian, English): Einmal richtig ausschlafen! (v) Descriptive: Eine ganze Pizza so schnell (zu) verschlingen! (vi) Hortative (German, Russian) Den Pullover umdrehen (vii) Modal (Russian): Mne exat ‘I have to leave’, and (viii) Narrative (French, Russian): Et Maigret de grommeler. Each type exhibits very different grammatical behaviours as far as subject licensing, topicalization, questioning and some other properties are concerned. This implies that RIs form a natural class only inasmuch as they represent independently used non-finite forms. Each type can be analyzed as a construction in its own right.

The paper suggests a Construction Grammar analysis of RIs. I maintain, following existing research, that illocutionary force is directly incorporated into the formal representation of a syntactic pattern. However, it is not determined by the syntactic presence of a clause-typing element. Instead, it follows from the network of inheritance between constructions. Illocutionary forces are not semantic values but higher level constructions that are exclusively defined in pragmatic and semantic terms and lack any morphosyntactic content. However, they may motivate the morphosyntactic properties of their actual realizations. Abstract illocutionary ‘super-constructions’ are further associated with particular linguistic forms and such associations become lower-level constructions. In other words, each illocutionary construction licenses a family of sub-constructions which inherit its semantico-pragmatic properties but are subject to different formal constraints.

RIs, then, share their basic meanings with other syntactic patterns. For example, the abstract Directive Construction is taken to be the grammatical corollary of the directive speech act. It licenses the family of imperative constructions, i.e. syntactic configurations whose structure contributes the semantic content associated with the Directive Construction and is to some extent motivated by it. Both Imperative RIs and regular imperatives are actual instances of the abstract Directive Construction, and some of their basic grammatical and semantic properties follow from this categorization. Narrative RIs inherit certain properties of the Declarative Construction, and so on. On this analysis information provided by the verbal form and information provided by the construction are clearly separated. The illocutionary force is not projected from the specification of the main verb, but is a property incorporated into the description of the constructional pattern, whereas the verbal form (the infinitive) is basically deprived of any illocutionary meaning of its own. This allows the same infinitival form to be used in a variety of independent functions.
Resonating Constructions in Narrative Discourse
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The notion of a construction in the context of extended discourse has been defined in the sense of highly abstract ‘discourse patterns’ (Halmari & Östman, 2001; Östman, 2005). Along these lines, the goal of the present study is to identify constrained and conventionalized patterns of usage (Slobin, 1971; Tomasello, 2003) expressing specific functions in producing narrative texts.

Underlying the study is the assumption that discourse is constructed from inter- and intra-connected segments (see van Dijk, 1982; Grosz & Sidner, 1986; Berman & Slobin, 1994; Matthiessen, 2002). Specifically, the study examines an innovative unit of discourse analysis, “Clause Packages”, as multi-clausal constructions in the context of narrative discourse (Nir-Sagiv, 2006). The notion of Clause Packages [CPs] is based on a typology of clause-combining relations, taking into account semantic and pragmatic criteria such assertion (Cristofaro, 2003), dependency (Lyons, 1968; Halliday, 1994), and integration (Givón, 1980; 1990). These yield a hierarchical taxonomy (Berman & Nir-Sagiv, in press), ranging from (1) Isotaxis – in the form of isolated clauses; via (2) Parataxis – symmetric linking by coordination and asymmetric linking by complementation; to (3) Hypotaxis – by adverbial and non-restrictive relative clause constructions; and to (4) Endotaxis – nesting of one clause inside another. These inter-clausal relations combine to create complex, highly abstract constructions that cannot be specified in terms of their form. Rather, as suggested by Verhagen (2006), the notion of ‘form’ is treated as observable patterns that trigger the inference of something unobservable (i.e., the abstract construction).

The study devolves around a database of 312 authentic texts produced in both speech and writing. All consist of personal-experience narratives (Labov, 1997), produced by native speakers of two languages (Hebrew and English) in different age-groups (schoolchildren, adolescents, and adults) on the shared topic of interpersonal conflict (see Berman & Verhoeven, 2002). And it examines ‘patterns of usage’ in the sense of how deployment of linguistic devices for the purpose of expressing particular discursive functions is constrained by the boundaries imposed by CPs as units of discourse. Specifically, each of twelve architectures of inter-clausal relations identified as the opening sequences of CPs are analysed in terms of whether or not they are resonated (Du Bois, 2007). The notion of resonance relates to the process of activating relationships between comparable linguistic elements through the repeated use of constructions throughout discourse, providing a rhetorical effect of parallelism and thus creating a cohesive texture within the text. As it is used here, resonance means that a particular constellation of clause combining is selected to function as the conventionalized or preferred form in the course of discourse construction, achieving textual coherence by force of ‘cohesive harmony’ (Hasan, 1984) across CPs. Results show that inter-clausal relations are resonated throughout the database, with no effects for modality, language, or age. The bulk of texts show at least one occurrence of constructional resonance, with the proportion of structurally resonating texts rising as a function of age to as high as around 90% in the adult group. Moreover, recurrently resonated patterns constitute more than half of the CPs within any given text on average, with some speaker-writers going so far as to construct an entire text around a single type of repeated internal architecture.

In sum, the study shows that the distribution of form and function inside and across CP boundaries is highly constrained. And it concludes by considering the implications of this finding for the claim that segments of discourse - and possibly, discourse in general - conform to the same organizing principles as more simplex constructions, and should be considered an integral part of the inventory of constructions of any language (Fillmore, 1988; Östman, 2005).
The constructional status of “nominative and infinitives” in Dutch
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This paper deals with the Dutch verb pattern exemplified in (1) to (3), in which a passive matrix verb (in italics) is combined with a subject and an infinitival complement.

(1) Ze werden populair bij atleten en wielrenners omdat meer rode bloedlichaampjes worden geacht een ‘zuurstofvoorsprong’ te geven. (ConDiv NRC_VARIA01)
‘They [EPO hormones] became popular with athletes and cyclists because more red blood cells are thought to give an “oxygen advantage”.’

(2) Een abt wordt verondersteld in zijn abdij te vertoeven. (ConDiv GVA2)
‘An abbot is supposed to reside in his abbey.’

(3) De labresultaten worden verwacht klaar te zijnen eind oktober. (ConDiv LN_ALL)
‘The lab results are expected to be ready by the end of October.’

This so-called “nominative and infinitive” (or NCI) constitutes a small but remarkable ingredient in the grammar of Present-day Dutch, because the corresponding active pattern, the accusative and infinitive (or ACI), exemplified for achten ‘consider, think’ in the 18th-Century example in (4), is long obsolete. In the early stages of Modern Dutch the ACI could be productively combined with all kinds of verbs of perception, cognition and utterance – much like in Present-day English – but this is no longer the case today (cf. Fischer 1994).

(4) Praat me niet van Vriendschap; hoorde ik onlangs iemand zeggen, dien men achten de Waereld wel te kennen. (De Denker, c. 1770)
‘Don’t speak to me of friendship, I recently heard somebody say, whom one considers to be well acquainted with the ways of the world.’

In the grammar of English, the NCI is usually treated as merely the passive variant of the ACI. Noël (2001), however, has argued that the NCI can instantiate several constructions, with specific semantic properties which cannot be reduced to the combined meanings of the ACI and the general passive construction. Patterns like be said to and be believed to, for instance, are frequently used as evidentiality markers and the patterns be expected to and be supposed to have also developed deontic meanings. The facts of the Dutch NCI provide additional support for such an analysis. We shall investigate the lexical scope of the NCI constructions in Present-day Dutch and the immediately preceding periods, provide an analysis of their constructional semantics, and look into their synchronic and diachronic relation with the ACI.
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This study is a preliminary attempt to represent interactions between lexical units and constructions of Japanese sentences within Japanese FrameNet (Saito, Fujii, and Ohara 2008), in terms of the combined lexicon and “constructicon” currently being developed in FrameNet (Fillmore 2006). The data discussed are taken from a parallel corpus of Japanese and English.

Ohara (2007) argued that in order to look into how different languages encode the same scene, it is also necessary to make cross-references between lexical units and grammatical constructions rather than only analyzing the semantics of lexical units. This paper investigates how such cross-references can be represented in Japanese FrameNet.

In (1) below, predicates are shown in bold. In the English sentence (1a) *tied* evokes the *Being_attached* frame (“An ITEM is attached by a HANDLE, via a CONNECTOR, to a GOAL.”), while in the Japanese translation (1b) the verb *sibarituke* ‘bind’ may be construed as evoking the *Attaching* frame (“AGENT causes an ITEM to be physically connected to a GOAL.”). If we compare the semantics of the predicates only, we are forced to say that whereas the English original sentence describes a state, the Japanese translation describes an action, which is not a preferred pattern in corresponding English and Japanese sentences (cf. Ikegami 1991).

(1)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. To this post a figure was tied[Being_attached] ...  
  \item b. kono hasira ni, ... ningen ga sibarituke [Attaching] te a-tta  
  \hspace{1cm} this pillar LOC person NOM bind RESULT-PAST  
  \hspace{1cm} ‘To this pillar ... a person had been bound.’
\end{itemize}

The paper argues that (1b) is an instance of the Resultative construction in Japanese. In the “constructicon” of FrameNet, there are two types of construction elements (CEs): inner and outer. In the Resultative construction, as shown in (2), the inner CEs consist of Action (e.g. *sibarituke*) and Resultative_marker (e.g. *te a-aru*). The two inner CEs combine to form a state expression which has a valence, i.e. an outer CE: Entity. The outer CE is linked to the frame element (FE) ENTITY in the Resultative frame, which describes an ENTITY’S STATE resulting from an ACTION (Hasegawa 2005).

(2) kono hasira ni, .. [ningen ga Entity] [ [sibarituke Action] [te a-tta Resultative_marker] ]  
ENTITY
The paper argues that, in (2), the Resultative construction evokes the Resultative frame, which is compatible with the Attaching frame evoked by the predicate *sibarituke*. In other words, the Japanese translation (1b) describes a state, just like the English original (1a).

It is hoped that the study will give support to working out the details of the new FrameNet directions of combining lexicon and “constructicon.”
Levels of constructional organization: Typological differences.
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Construction grammar frameworks (e.g. Fillmore 1988, Goldberg 1995) suggest that clausal information is organized in constructions at different levels of specificity. There are, from this point of view, at least two ways in which information is organized in basic clause structure: A) In lexical constructions, and B) In schematic constructions. In addition, clausal expressions are, according to some CXG-frameworks (e.g. Croft 2001), supposed to be built on language specific construction types. One important insight is that English tends to organize the basic clausal information in schematic argument structure constructions, and that this information is specified in lexical constructions, particularly by the verb:

(1) [Peter [fought] his way out of the restaurant] **way-construction**: [SUBJ, V POSS, way OBL]

I will argue, on the basis of contrastive data, that Spanish seems to differ systematically from English in this respect:

(2) Pedro se [abrió] camino ([a codazos]) para salir del restaurante

Pedro for himself opened way (by using elbows) to get out of the restaurant

Examples like (2) suggest that Spanish, as opposed to English, tends to organize the basic clausal information (in (2) the basic meaning of the way-construction) lexically by the verb, while supplementary information may be provided by means of schematic (adverbial) constructions (*a codazos*).

This contrastive analysis has interesting implications for Talmy’s descriptive typology of macro-events (patterns of satellite- versus verb-framing of the main event and the co-event, Talmy 1991, 2000), and for its theoretical status. The present construction-based typology provides a solution to a serious flaw in Talmy’s typology: In (3) it is counterintuitive that the satellite lexeme (*out*) should determine the main event (‘X caused Y to move Z’):

(3) [Peter [pushed] him out of the restaurant] **caused motion construction**: [SUBJ V OBJ OBL]

(4) Pedro lo [echo] del restaurante [a empujones]

Pedro him threw out from the restaurant by pushing

The parallelism between (3)-(4) and (1)-(2) indicates that the typological patterns observed by Talmy should not be interpreted as differing lexical mappings of directed motion, as hitherto claimed, but rather as specific manifestations of differing constructional organization of clausal information in English and Spanish as suggested in this paper.

The primary data used in this study stems from a contrastive analysis of short stories by H. C. Andersen. The corpus material has been available in six parallel versions: The original Danish version, and an English, German, Spanish, Italian and French version (The Mulinco project, University of Copenhagen). This material has been supplemented with systematic searches in the Spanish corpus CREA (200 million words).
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Analyzing data culled from the British National Corpus, this paper provides a Frame Semantics description of EMPOWERMENT which assigns semantic roles to what can be called “empowering constructions”. After defining the frame and illustrating the most typical linguistic realizations of the semantic roles, we describe some of the unpredictable characteristics of the constructions, thus contributing to the growing body of research that supports the constructional approach to grammatical description (e.g. Fillmore 1988, Kay and Fillmore 1999, Fried and Östman 2004).

The semantic roles, or frame elements (FEs), that uniquely define EMPOWERMENT are (A) an empowering entity; (B) an entity that gets empowered; and (C) what the empowered entity gets, with typical examples given below (1), where each syntactic constituent in a sentence (or clause) is marked with the FE that it instantiates.

(1)  
   a. [The Act (A)] also empowers [the police (B)] [to set up roadblocks (C)]....
   b. [The Indians (B)] are empowered [to set up their own system of forest guards (C)]....

The corpus data suggest that empowering entities (A) tend to be (legal) institutions (act, statute, legislation, parliament, bill) or individuals/organizations in positions of authority or power (political party). It is necessary to construe the entity that gets empowered (B) as subordinate to the empowering entity (A) for examples like those in (1a) to be understood as EMPOWERMENT events; we do not usually consider the police as less than powerful (1a). And, the (newly) empowered entity gets the right or capacity to do something that it didn’t have previously (C).

Exemplified by (1b), a notable 41% of the sentences in the corpus occur in the passive voice, with the subject of the verb instantiating the entity that gets empowered (B). Additionally, in NPs where the head noun is modified by the adjective empowering, that noun is always the empowering entity (A): empowering provisions, empowering statute. Furthermore, the entity that gets empowered (B) is realized as the modifying noun of NN-compounds whose head is the event noun empowerment (2), and as the object of the preposition in constructs whose form is empowerment of N, as in empowerment of youth, empowerment of women.

There is nothing in the grammar of English that would predict the behavior of the EMPOWERMENT words as described in reference to these “empowering constructions”. Consider, for example, the semantically related authorize, and notice the difference in the semantics of NN-compounds with empowerment and authorization (2). While the modifying noun of empowerment-compounds identifies the patient/recipient of the empowerment, the modifying noun of authorization-compounds identifies the agent of the authorization.

(2)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Authorization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>community empowerment</td>
<td>Cabinet authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group empowerment</td>
<td>Supreme court authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority empowerment</td>
<td>State Department authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people empowerment</td>
<td>Secretary of State authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth empowerment</td>
<td>cash-facility authorization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present paper demonstrates how Frame Semantics is both useful and usable for constructional analysis.
Complex -éō verbs in Ancient Greek: A case study on the interface between derivation, compounding, and inflection
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Ancient Greek complex verbs ending in –éō with a nominal item as first constituent (e.g. karpo-logéō ‘to gather fruit’, hulo-makhéō ‘to fight in the woods’, paido-poiéō ‘to beget children’, oiko-doméō ‘to build (a house)’) are usually described as the result of a derivation process from nominal or adjectival compounds (oikodómos ‘architect’; karpológos –ón ‘gathering fruit’, paidopoiós –ón ‘begetting children’; cf. Schwyzer 1939; Chantraine 1968-1980). This analysis is primarily based on two facts: (1) as a rule, compounds in –os are more ancient than corresponding –éō forms (cf. Mycenaean ipoqowo = hippoforbós ‘horse-keeper’); (2) –éō endings typically occur in verbs of secondary formation, i.e. in deverbal (potéōmai ‘to fly hither and thither’ < pétomai ‘to fly’) or denominal forms (oikéō ‘to live’ < oîkos ‘house’). The fact that the second constituent of many of these verbs is different from the corresponding free form (*logéō vs légō ‘to gather’) seems to support this interpretation.

However, a deeper investigation of data reveals that the situation is far more complicated and some other phenomena back up an analysis of these verbs as compounds.

First of all, in some cases the nominal / adjectival base of these verbs either is not attested at all (*hulomákhos) or is more recent (cf. phônaskestos ‘who train(s) the voice’ ~ phônaskeō ‘I train the voice’). Secondly, and more importantly, the second constituent of some complex -éō verbs may also occur as a free form (cf. poiéō ‘fare’, askéō ‘esercitare’). Furthermore, corresponding nominal / adjectival –os compounds may as well have a second constituent which either never occurs as a free form (*poiós) or has only homophones (*lógos ‘gathering’ vs lógos ‘verbal utterance’).

What is really intriguing is that there seem to be two parallel morphological processes that ‘feed’ each other (that is, nominal /adjectival compounds in –os can generate complex verbs in –éō, and, vice versa, verbal compounds in –éō can generate complex nouns / adjectives in -os). Moreover, both of them can give rise to new free simple words by means of reanalysis processes (doméō ‘to build’ < oiko-doméō; pompós ‘guide’ < psuchompóps ‘guide of souls’). In all these processes, analogy plays a crucial role.

This paper aims to demonstrate that such word formation processes are not to be accounted for separately, but rather that it is necessary to draw a single picture describing all of them, by exploring and sketching all possible interrelations. In particular, we propose that analogical relations between different formations can be accounted for by the abstract model of Construction Morphology. In the case at hand, we posit a structure [[X]N [ROOT –os, -on]] A/N and [[X]N [ROOT –éō]] v respectively, where inflection might be considered as external to the whole [[X]N [ROOT]] formation or internal to the second constituent.
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Over the past few years, full-verb inversion — constructions in which the subject follows the entire verb phrase in a declarative clause, as in “On the near corner was Herb’s Gas Station” or “Upstairs was a bedroom and a bathroom” — has received a considerable amount of attention from a functional perspective (Birner 1996; Dorgeloh 1997; Chen 2003, Kreyer 2006; Prado-Alonso 2008). This paper is a further contribution to this line of research and offers a constructional analysis of full inversion in Present-day written English.

A central thesis of Construction Grammar is that information is not only conveyed through individual lexical items but also through constructions, namely form-meaning correspondences or symbolic units in cognitive terms (cf. Langacker 1987: Ch. 2), which in themselves carry meaning, independently of the words in the sentence. According to Goldberg (1995), a distinct construction is said to exist if one or more of its properties are not strictly predictable from knowledge of other constructions existing in the language. In my presentation, I will argue that the different full inversion types distinguished in the literature are clear instances of constructions in Goldberg’s sense. I will further argue that, despite their formal and functional dissimilarities, these inversions still relate to one another in systematic and predictable ways. It will be shown that in fact the inversions are grouped in relation to a unit in the schematic network which is naturally most salient – the prototype – and form with it a family of nodes – extensions from the prototype – in the system. In sum, the analysis will show that the inversions are constructions which form an interconnected, structured system or network and inhabit a conceptual space that is best understood in reference to different forms of inheritance (cf. Goldberg 1995: 72 ff).
This paper aims at opening one of Pandora’s more capacious boxes: the pragmantax of such rhetorical questions as the above title and similar sentences such as those in (1).

(1)  
a. Where better to play chess than on I35?  
b. When better (for us) to finish off the Rocky Road than right now?

The general structure of these clauses is schematized in (2):

(2)  
[WH-phrase of syntactic type i] [“compared” (sentential) adjective of type j]  
[for NP to V + X] S than [definite syntactic phrase of type i]

Definite syntactic phrase of type i: this condition is necessary to get grammatical sentence like (1a,b), rather than ones whose than clauses exhibit a mismatch in syntactic type, as in (1’a,b):

(1’)  
a. *Where better to play chess than right now?  
b. * When better (for us) to finish off the Rocky Road than on I35?  
   [starred on the relevant reading]

Sentential adjectives of type j: for me these are (a subset of) the class of adjectives which have complement subject clauses, such as those in (3a); some examples involving them appear in (3b).

(3)  
a. good, advantageous, useful, easy, profitable, obvious, surprising (interesting, fascinating, etc. – the whole class of V+ing adjectives), weird, strange, sick, etc.  
b. i. Where so advantageous to build a church that even pagans will come?  
ii. When as useful to buy a flashlight as just before getting a flat tire?  
iii. How as easy to dispose of a burglar as to plug him right between the eyes?

As we see, the adjective of type j can not only be compared, as in the title of this paper, but also modified by the other five sentential ways of expressing adverbs of degree:

(4)  
a. Where better to cut the pizza (than on the table)?  
b. Where as good to cut the pizza (as in Mark’s pad)?  
c. Where so good to cut the pizza that we won’t even be audited *(if not right here)?  
d. Where best (of all the places in this room) to cut the pizza *(if not right here)?  
e. Where good enough to cut the pizza to fool the GAO *(if not right here)?  
f. ?? Where too appropriate to cut the pizza for those fools in accounting to find some reason to complain about *(if not right here)?

At present, it seems beyond the power of a transformational rule to state the conditions involving the matching of adverb types. Whether construction grammar is up to the task remains to be seen. My best will be tried at the conference.
This paper investigates a sentence type that has been referred to as a double-subject construction\(^4\) and an unlinked topic construction\(^5\). The constructions of interest in this essay are observed primarily in Brazilian Portuguese vernacular (BPV), as in (1), which has been argued to be a topic-prominent language\(^5\).

(1) O apartamento, as garrafas de cerveja estavam por toda a parte.  
‘The apartment, beer bottles were everywhere’.

The primary components of these double-subject constructions (DSC) include a left-dislocated NP and a following root utterance. In BPV, there is an obligatory intonational break between the dislocated NP and the following sentence. The DSC can be distinguished structurally from left dislocations because there is no anaphoric link to the root sentence. Similarly, the DSC is distinguished from topicalization because there is no syntactic gap in the root sentence which might be co-indexed with the dislocated element.

This essay does two things. First, it shows how the DSC can be given a seemingly satisfying account in the multidimensional semantic framework developed in Potts\(^6\). Potts provides a multidimensional logic for data he considers to be conventional implicature (CI). Importantly, his data, which are primarily parentheticals and expressive language, are quite different from Grice\’s\(^2\) original conception of CI, which was based on conjunctions like therefore and but. Further, Potts suggests that the latter Gricean data do not contribute CIs at all but can in fact be explained as instances of something else: hence, my use of “the new CI” to refer to Potts’s data. While Potts’s program is elegant and far-reaching, upon close investigation inconsistencies emerge in key parts of the framework, rendering its explanatory powers somewhat less convincing. In part, this is due to the diverse range of data which Potts must bring under one account. His parentheticals and expressives clearly share certain properties, but they diverge enough that it is problematic to hold them together as a unified phenomenon.

On the other hand, a constructional account\(^1\) of this kind of data both provides for shared properties, via inheritance networks, and expects constructional diversity as part of the basic identity of the individual constructions: that is, it captures the systematic and allows for the idiosyncratic aspects of CIs. A constructional account of the DSC is straightforward, and we can point to similarities in other data such as sentence adverbs and vocatives (which are also CIs for Potts) that can be similarly described via inheritance relations. This leads to the broader implication that perhaps other kinds of CI data—both Gricean and Pottsian—can be more profitably considered as constructions. One downside of this is sentimental: i.e. we would no longer need the long-discussed category of conventional implicature. On the happy side, however, Grice’s purely pragmatic conversational implicature, which was always his first priority anyway, could be freed from the taxonomic puzzles created by its more conventional cousin.
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This paper deals with a Japanese transitive construction, as in (1):

(1) John-wa ie-o tate-ta.
    John-TOP house-ACC build-PAST
    ‘John built his house.’

(1) is ambiguous, with two possible readings. The first interpretation is that the subject referent “John” is the agent who built his house by himself. The second interpretation is that the subject referent “John” is the causer (e.g. client) who had his house built by someone else (e.g. carpenter). In the latter interpretation, the causative action is encoded as a single event in spite of the understood existence of an intermediary agent. I use the term Intermediary Transitive Construction (ITC) to refer to the latter type of the transitive construction.

The purpose of this paper is to clarify the constructional properties of the ITC in Japanese from the viewpoint of Construction Grammar and to propose the following hypothesis concerning the ITC:

(2) In ITC, the intermediary agent and his or her action must be cognitively backgrounded.

This hypothesis shows that the event of the ITC consists of the result state of the object referent brought about by cognitively “backgrounding” (or conceptually neglecting) the intermediary agent and his or her action. The hypothesis is supported by the following pieces of evidence.

First, accomplishment verbs, but not activity verbs, can occur in an ITC:

(3) Watashi-wa kuruma-o {syuurishi/*untenshi}-ta. (ITC)
    I-TOP car-ACC {repair/drive}-PAST
    ‘I {repaired/drove} my car.’

Second, “resultative adverbs”, but not “manner adverbs”, can occur in an ITC:

(4) *Watashi-wa kami-o {mijikaku*/teineini} ki-tta. (ITC)
    I-TOP hair-ACC {short/carefully} cut-PAST
    ‘I cut my hair {short/carefully}.

Last, let us compare ITCs in Japanese and English. Goldberg (1995) points out that the following sentences are well-formed as ITCs:

(5) a. Chris cut her hair at the salon on University Avenue.
    b. She painted her house. (When in fact the painters did the painting) (Goldberg 1995: 169)

However, the judgment on (5) varies among English native speakers, and Have/Get constructions (cf. Chris had/got her hair cut.) are preferred in these situations (see also, Ziegler and Lee (2006)). Moreover, the following sentences in Japanese can be naturally interpreted as ITCs, whereas the corresponding sentences in English cannot:

(6) a. Watashi-wa shikaiin-de ha-o nui-ta. (ITC)
    I-TOP dental office-at tooth-ACC extract-PAST
    ‘I extracted my tooth at the dental office. (ITC)

The examples in (6) suggest that the ITC in English is not a productive as that in Japanese and constructional schema of the ITC in English has not been established yet.

The semantic and syntactic properties associated with ITC are not predictable from an entirely lexically-based approach and they give strong support for a Construction Grammar approach.
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The advances in cognitive linguistics, among them frame semantics (Fillmore, 1982) and construction grammar (Goldberg, 1995, 2006) provide an excitingly new way to better understand language. Studies that apply a frame semantic analysis to language phenomena have been motivated by several factors, such as ethnobiological classification (Martsa, 2000); shift in word meaning (Payne, Ole-Kotikash & Ole-Lekutit, 2001); metaphorical and metonymical uses of body part words (Petrucc, 1995), or the causative construction (Gilquin, 2003). Few of these studies investigate frames cross-linguistically (Marsta, 2000). Moreover, cross-linguistic frame analysts have rarely investigated naturally occurring data.

The present study has been called into being by the quest to find out about the 'new move' frame in relation to chess in two languages. As part of a bigger research, it was found that American and Hungarian college students view the possibility of novelty as an important element of games. Moreover, the two populations’ conception of chess seems to be different, even though it is a game of medium typicality for both populations. As chess is a game in which new moves and new ideas are of utmost importance, chess articles from several sources of naturally occurring data (daily papers, chess magazines, sport and chess websites) in both languages have been searched for expressions that comment on new moves. It was found that beyond reporting the fact, the most important frame elements are actor, source of information, evaluation, effect, and preconditions. Based on the data, both the importance of and the specific ways in which these elements are expressed appear to be different for the two populations. Standard forms to express the fact include new move (új lépés) and novelty (újitás) in both languages. At the same time, Hungarian tends to express that it is the new idea (Kramnik új terve- Kramnik’s new plan) that counts more than just the move to a bigger extent. In the American data, the actor, that is, the person who made the move, is stated in only about 40% of the expressions, and is invariably the player’s name (Anand used a novelty). In Hungarian, on the other hand, actor is stated about 70% of the time, and sometimes it is only the player’s title that is given (A bulgár exvilágbajnok-the Bulgarian ex-world-champion). Moreover, evaluation, which can be split into unequivocally positive expressions (a brilliant novelty) and those that convey doubt of different degrees (It looks a little bit strange; A novelty of dubious worth) seems to be a more foregrounded frame element for Americans than for Hungarians. Conversely, the effect of the novelty, most often that of surprise, is expressed more often by the Hungarian writers (Anand újabb meglepetése újitás- Anand’s another surprise is a novelty).

To conclude, this cross-linguistic investigation of naturally occurring language use has revealed that the same discourse context, namely, the reporting of new moves in chess articles, motivated the usage of overlapping frame elements in American English and Hungarian. At the same time, the weighing of those elements as expressed in linguistic constructions shows remarkable differences. In an attempt to explain these findings, the presenter will speculate about their possible connections to her findings on the psychological prototype concept of chess as a game in the two cultures, as well as to those of her other linguistic explorations of chess articles.
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Fluid Construction Grammar is a computational framework for exploring issues in construction grammar. Here we focus on how argument realization is approached in this framework. Although every linguist agrees that there is a strong connection between the semantic representation of a verb and its morphosyntactic behavior, the exact nature of this connection is largely unresolved. In constructional approaches, the argument structure of verbs is not pushed entirely into the lexicon, as in lexicalist approaches, but is partly governed by argument constructions, such as the ditransitive construction, which conventionalise a bi-directional mapping from semantic frames (which combine a set of semantic roles for a particular class of events) to syntactic frames (which combine a set of syntactic roles and a particular class of verbs). Instead of the linking rules found in lexicalist approaches we therefore get a 'fusion' process as suggested by Goldberg. The question addressed here is how this fusion process works.

We present an operational system for the fusion process. The lexical entry of each verb contains a meaning-form mapping. The meaning contains information on the event class and potential semantic roles and the form contains information on the verb class and potential syntactic roles. Constructions select out of this potential valence the roles that they require and they may expand or modulate the meaning and form supplied by the verb. The implementation of all this is complicated but has been achieved within a unification-based feature structure oriented formalism.
Beyond intersubjectivity: some cross-linguistic evidence for the motivation for constructional structure in language
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In a recent monograph, Verhagen (2005) makes a compelling case for analyzing several phenomena that have been central to linguistic theorizing over the past few decades, such as negation, clausal complementation and discourse connectives, as involving an intersubjective dimension—that is, a dimension at which the speaker/writer invites the addressee to coordinate cognitively with her by construing the situation in a certain way. Verhagen associates this dimension with a basic human ability for conceiving of others—and hence of oneself—as intentional agents (Tomasello 1999): once the human infant—around the age of nine months—is able to represent others as separate agents with their own intentional states, it can attempt to manipulate those states in various ways. While meticulously put together based on detailed analyses of empirical data, what this picture lacks is a motivation why humans should have an interest in coordinating cognitively along these lines. This paper takes up this question through an analysis of two constructions, one from English and one from Greek, that leads to the conclusion that in both cases, what interlocutors are managing, more than simply their construal of the situation, is their interactional positioning with respect to each other—or, what has been called in the anthropological literature, their ‘face’.

The English construction discussed is the familiar ‘let alone’ construction. According to standard analyses, including Verhagen’s own (2005: 35-41, 60-69), the function of this construction is to reconcile conflicting Gricean demands for informativeness and relevance, by enabling the speaker to address a proposition that is ‘on the table’ given prior discourse (satisfying Relation) while simultaneously indicating her awareness of the greater informativeness of another proposition (satisfying Quantity). These analyses ignore the second sub-maxim of Quantity (Grice 1989: 26), which places an upper bound on informativeness. In contrast to these standard analyses, it is proposed that the speaker’s reasons for providing the additional information lie with considerations of face: the additional information may function as a ritual gift to the addressee, intended to achieve approaching; or it may signal the speaker’s privileged state of knowledge with respect to the addressee, intended to achieve disassociation and withdrawal. In either case, the motivation is to be found at the level, not of maxim-like injunctions, but of the management of interpersonal relations.

The second construction discussed is the Greek oi na+V (NEG SUBJ V) construction which functions to express ‘requests not to X’ in conversational data. When oi na+V carries this force, certain further conditions—a particular intonational pattern, informality of the setting, and familiarity between participants—tend to hold. Pragmatically, the import of the construction oi na+V may be modeled as a conventional implicature: it introduces into the discourse context the affirmative of the proposition expressed in the negated clause as something the addressee may be tempted or likely to do, and proceeds to warn the addressee against V-ing. By taking the hearer’s perspective on things and proceeding to advise him/her accordingly, oi na+V emerges as an interpersonal management device intended to achieve approaching, which also accounts for its situational distribution. In sum, the cross-linguistic evidence discussed in this paper suggests that considerations of face, defined as a basic dimension of approach/withdrawal directed at an Other as distinct from Self (Terkourafi 2007), play a pivotal part in motivating constructions of intersubjectivity in language.
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There are a number of innovative verbs in Japanese that are formed based on nouns of various sources including loan words, mimetic words, and proper names. Examples of denominal innovative verbs in the present tense form are shown in (1).

(1)  
a.  (non-Chinese) loanword based: kopiru (<copy), kaferu (<café), teroru (<terrorism)  
b.  Sino-Japanese-based: kokuru (<kokuhaku “confession”), jikoru (<jiko “accident”)  
c.  mimetic-based: nikoru (<nikoniko: for smiling), chibiru (<chibichibi: for little by little)  
d.  proper name-based: makuru (<McDonald’s), sutabaru (<Starbucks)  

There is a cluster of properties shared by these denominal innovative verbs, and each of these properties is not predictable from component parts, which meets the definition of a construction (Goldberg 1995).

First, a noun undergoes clipping to form a verbal root, but the clipping must result in a root that ends with a vowel, excluding moraic nasal. For instance, in attempting to derive a verbal root based on pingpong, pinpo-ru would be natural but *pin-ru or *pinpon-ru would not: the latter two roots, which are ill-formed, end with moraic nasal. Such segmental restriction is not predictable from the Japanese verbal morphology since there are native Japanese verbal roots that end with moraic nasal (e.g., sin- “die”, yom- “read”). Second, a clipped root must be at least 2-mora long. This length requirement, however, is not a common pattern of Japanese verbal system, and there are verbal roots that are 1-mora long (e.g., ni- “boil”, mi- “see”, ne- “sleep”).

Third, while the verbs in (1) appear to be vowel-ending, leading to the morphological analysis of kopi-ru, niko-ru, and sutaba-ru, their past tense forms actually force their roots to include /r/ so that they follow the conjugation pattern of consonant-ending roots: kopitta, nikotta and sutabatta. That is, /r/ is always epenthesized to a root, leading to the consonant-ending inflection. This obligatory epenthesis is not expected of a native verbal root. Furthermore, the vowel-ending inflection, which is available to native verbs, is not an option for denominal innovative verbs.

Fourth, regardless of the location of the accent in an original noun, the accent of the verbal root invariably falls on the root-final mora. This is shown in the gerund forms of denominal verbs since the gerundive suffix –te does not influence the location of the accent in verbal roots: kopitte, nikotte and sutabatte, all of which have the accent on the vowel before the final geminate, i.e., the root-final position. Again, the unique accentuation pattern is not expected based on the location of the accent in base nouns, which demonstrate a wide variety of accentuation possibilities. Finally, the use of these denominal innovative verbs is restricted in that they are casual in style, bear a broad sense of “playfulness”, or are sometimes slang-like, none of which is a general property of base nouns or the category of native verbs.

These properties are, thus, better captured as a collective set of properties by recognizing innovative verbs as constituting a full-fledged construction that takes the templatic form of (2).

(2)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...(C)V(C)V-C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/r/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The presence of /r/ in (2) gives rise to the conjugation pattern of the consonant-ending roots, which is discussed as the second property.)

*
Shibatani brings examples like those in (1) within the scope of his papers (1994, 1996), and attempts a unified analysis of the Japanese benefactive auxiliary verb ‘te yaru ‘give’.

(1) a. Taroo-ga Hanako-ni hon-o katte yatta. ‘Taroo bought a book for Hanako’
    b. Taroo-ga (*Hanako-ni) sinde yatta. ‘Taroo died (for Hanako)’

He assumes that the auxiliary verb inherits the thematic structure from the base verb. He schematically represents the auxiliary verb’s thematic structure as follows:

(2) auxiliary verb -te yaru: <Agent, Goal, Theme \ EVENT>

To account for the data concerned, he makes three further assumptions, as listed below:

i. The Goal role of the auxiliary verb can be instantiated by either the recipient of a transferred object or the person who enjoys the benefit of the event described by the main verb.

ii. The Goal role, if syntactically realized, is marked with the dative marker ni.

iii. A Theme role cannot be associated with more than a Goal role.

These three assumptions make it possible to identify a covertly expressed beneficiary, allow the auxiliary verb to provide a transitive verb with a Goal NP, and prevent a Goal NP from overtly occurring with an intransitive verb in the benefactive construction, as in (1b).

Shibatani has a keen insight into some linguistic facts about the Japanese benefactive construction, to be sure, but there is room for improvement. This paper aims to show that the Japanese benefactive construction can be adequately explained by fewer assumptions.

My central claim is that the auxiliary verb –te yaru contributes a Beneficiary role rather than a Goal role, and has no power to contribute a Goal NP. A piece of supporting evidence is that some verbs (such as kau ‘buy’, which Shibatani (1994: 48) says “does not license the goal nominal”) can take a Goal NP without the help of the auxiliary verb. This means that the auxiliary verb does not have to augment the valence of a verb. A second piece of evidence is given in (3):

(3) a. sono ko-ni booru-o nageta ‘(I) threw a ball to the boy’
    b. sono ko-ni booru-o nagete yatta ‘(I) threw a ball to the boy’

Although both sentences can refer to the event of playing catch, sentence (3b) strongly implies that the speaker threw the ball in such a way that the boy could catch it easily. Besides, only (3b) can be uttered felicitously in a context like this: the speaker accidentally found a ball rolling toward himself, picked it up and threw it to the boy. This suggests that the ni-marked NP is not just the Goal reached by the ball. I propose that the Beneficiary role serves as if it were a higher-order role. In this case the boy plays a dual role, that is, the Goal and the Beneficiary. On the other hand, the boy in (3a) plays a single role of the Goal. This approach can eliminate the unnecessary assumptions listed above, and explain a wider range of data (such as the case of a ‘comitative’ NP understood as a beneficiary).
A constructional corpus-based approach of ‘weak’ verbs in French
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‘Weak’ verbs are often treated in linguistic literature from a merely pragmatic point of view: they are characterized as « parenthetical », « evidential » or « epistemic » verbs, and, through a process of advanced grammaticalization or pragmatization, are often assimilated with adverbs. In this paper we will argue that those verbs do not undergo a change of category but simply remain verbs and that they can be fruitfully described in a constructional framework: they enter a specific construction, an original pairing of syntactic properties with a specific meaning. In French, ‘weak’ verbs, particularly frequent in spoken discourse, occur in a cluster of three related structures, revealing the same semantic meaning of “mitigation”.

(1)  je trouve que c’est dommage
[I think that this is a pity]
(2)  c’est dommage je trouve
[this is a pity, I think]
(3)  - c’est dommage
[it’s a pity]
- oui je trouve
[yes I think]

Other verbs can enter one of those syntactic patterns, but only with the “weak” verbs do all three possibilities occur. The three related structures present interesting differences in word order and scope. They are often used by speakers of French in an alternative way.

The inventory of verbs entering the construction is not an easy one to draw and it presents interesting cross-linguistic differences. In this paper, we will limit ourselves to the three most frequent verbs in modern French: je crois, je pense, je trouve. We will describe the syntactic properties of each realisation and the specific selectional properties of each verb. Our study is based on some 2000 examples taken from a corpus of spoken French.

Each of those three verbs can enter other constructions, with different meanings. The link between the “strong” and the “weak” meanings of those verbs has been described as semantic bleaching, as part of the “grammaticalisation” process. For us, however, this is merely a case of verbal polysemy and the coexistence of different meanings linked to different constructional properties.
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Comprehending and creating novel verb-noun compounds in Spanish: The role of constructional meanings
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This study examines native speakers’ comprehension and production of novel [Verb + Noun (V + N)] compounds in Spanish (e.g., sacacorchos ‘pulls-out corks [corkscrew]’) based on insights drawn from constructional approaches (Boas 2003, 2005; Lakoff, 1986, 1987; Goldberg, 1995, 2006, among others). Most previous studies, which mainly concerned the endocentric or exocentric nature of the Spanish [V + N] compounds, have treated them as having one common structural and semantic property (Contreras 1985; Clements 1992; Varela 1990; Wong-opasi 1994, among others). More recently, however, a more semantically oriented analysis in Yoon (in press) within the framework of Construction Grammar (Lakoff, 1986, 1987; Goldberg, 1995, 2006), has claimed that there are two types of [V + N] compound constructions in Spanish, each with its own respective constructional meaning: Type 1 with higher transitivity in its associated predicate that normally involves a true patient (e.g., limpiabotas ‘cleans-boots [shoeshine boy]’) in which there is a potential beneficiary of the action; and Type 2 with a lower degree of transitivity that does not involve a true patient in its associated predicate (e.g., tientaparedes ‘feels-walls [one who gropes his/her way]’) and where the existence of a potential beneficiary of an action is not suggested. Yoon (in press) further suggests that the productivity of both patterns is related to the existence of a different construction for each compound type. In other words, newly formed expressions are acceptable to the extent that they can be associated with both the form and meaning of the two types of [V + N] compound constructions that already have unit status, and that individual occurrences of Spanish [V + N] compounds are sanctioned by either of the two constructions.

In order to address the issue of productivity of Spanish [V + N] compounds outlined above, I have conducted a study that consists of comprehension and production tasks. A total of ten native speakers of Spanish participated in both tasks. In the comprehension task, which was based on a multiple-choice format, the participants were asked to identify the best description for each of a total of eleven compounds. If they did not find any possible definition of the given compound in the given descriptions, they were asked to write their own definition that would work for that compound. In the production task, on the other hand, the participants were asked to create novel compounds consisting of a verb and a noun for each of a total of twelve descriptions of an object or a person. The results of the comprehension task revealed that the participants tended to interpret some novel compounds only as a Type 1 compound in which a potential beneficiary of the actions is evoked in an action scenario and the object involved in the action is more likely to be affected; they associated other novel compounds only with the Type 2 meaning if such an interpretation was not available. The majority of the novel compounds, however, were interpreted either as Type 1 or Type 2, depending on whether the participants highlighted the resultant state of the action in which the presence of the potential beneficiary of such actions is suggested. The results of the production task revealed that the participants created numerous examples of creative novel compounds with a wide range of lexical items, but the method of creation was not a random process, but regulated by the core constructional meanings of either the Type 1 or Type 2 compound construction. This study proposes that the two types of constructional meanings play a crucial role in the comprehension and creation of novel compounds (cf: constructional coercion in Michaelis 2003, 2004), but external constraints such as world knowledge (Boas 2005) is also deemed important in order to fully understand the cognitive mechanism that regulates the productivity of the Spanish [V + N] compound.
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This research investigates the syntax and semantics of ergative verbs and ergative alternation patterns in Mandarin Chinese. Specifically, the major questions it aims to answer include: How ergative verbs and ergative constructions in Chinese are defined, characterized and classified? What factors are involved in determining the likelihood of a verb’s participation in the ergative alternation? What generalizations can be made about the status of ergative syntax in Chinese against a broader cross-linguistic background?

It is argued that a unified constructionist approach with inputs from typology, lexical semantics and formal syntax may provide a more desirable solution to the aforementioned questions than previous studies. Drawing insights from recent typological research on inchoative/causative alternation pairs, this study first examines the semantics of ergative alternation with a set of Mandarin verbs. It is shown that the level of agentivity the agent has in the event, transferability of the agentivity, and the likelihood of spontaneous occurrence of the event are among the most important semantic factors conditioning the ergative alternation. The syntactic behaviors of the verbs are examined with three test frames, and explicit representations of their semantics are offered, employing a form of Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS). Based on a fine-grained classification of the verbs and the constructions they can appear in, it demonstrates that different types of ergative verbs and ergative constructions in Chinese exhibit different markedness patterns, thus forming a continuum along both formal and semantic dimensions. Adapting the framework of Unification Construction Grammar (UCxG), the present work further investigates the conditions on ergative formation, arguing that the alternation is possible only when the semantic frame of a verb can unify with that of a relevant construction.

The research is further extended to cover the resultative compounds that may participate in ergative alternation, and two other related constructions. It concludes that all relevant constructions are linked to one other, forming a family of related types along an inheritance hierarchy.
The FrameCorp Project can be described as an initiative to construct a semantically annotated corpus of Brazilian Portuguese with frame information. This work is a first experiment to discover some problems that FrameCorp Project will face. The corpus of our research, named SUMM IT, is composed by 50 texts, totaling 17,123 tokens. Other associated researchers have still added anaphoric and rhetorical relations. Our task is to add a layer of frame information. As a characteristic of these texts, they are composed by many sentences in reported speech. Then, we decided to start annotation by Statement frame. The Statement frame describes a situation in which a Speaker talks about a Topic or sends a Message through a Medium. The verbs of Statement have been studied in other approaches. Levin (1984) treats these verbs as Communication Verbs, creating some classification for then, like Verbs of Transfer of a Message, Verbs of Manner of Speaking, and Verbs of Instrument of Communication. Neves (2000) classifies the verbs of Statement as Verbs of Elocution. One of the objectives of this study is to verify whether the FrameNet approach captures the semantic richness of these verbs. After have chosen the frame “Statement” to annotate, the next step was finding Portuguese translation equivalents for the entries listed in the FrameNet database. All the lexical units evoking Statement frame were manually identified.

After reaching the final list of the lexical units evoking Statement frame, we started to compare the syntactic and semantic combinatorial possibilities between English and Portuguese. The study of the lexical unit dizer, say in English, has showed that the lexical units of Statement have in Portuguese a similar behavior to those in English. Through the use of SALTO annotation tool, we could certify that the FrameNet database fruitfully be used to annotate Portuguese sentences. We found in our corpus 7 different lexical units evoking the Statement frame, all of them having an English translation equivalent in FrameNet. Statement verbs seem to be a critical class. While there are verbs semantically more neutral, like “say”, others are less neutral. There are verbs that lexicalize the mean by which the statement was made, like “write”. Others express a positive evaluation, like “affirm”, or a negative, like “deny”. We have seen in the corpus analyses that these verbs can be exchanged for enunciative reasons. Even though, this is not the objective of FrameNet, one of the solutions for this enunciative phenomenon could be the creation of semantic relations to represent elocution verbs.
The Spanish subjunctive (subjv) is largely understood as being selected by verbs, nouns, adjectives, and prepositions that take sentential complements. In some cases, however, the Spanish subjunctive is selected by a construction, rather than by a lexical item. In this paper, I will discuss one of these constructions in its different versions. I will call it the sentential subject construction (SSC):

(1) a. \[s[NP[det[el [s que [S [NP ...] [VP[ V_{subj} ...]]]]]] [VP [V ...]]]\\

b. El que la policía los haya interrogado tiene lógica.

The fact that the police interrogated them has indicative logic

In (1a) the subjunctive sentential subject is introduced by the determiner (det) el ‘the’ followed by the complementizer que ‘that’, plus a sentence obligatorily conjugated in the subjunctive. The main verb of (1a) can be any verb. A different version of the SSC is the one in which the sentential subject appears without the determiner, and optionally to the right of the construction, as shown by (2a):

(2) a. \[s[NP[VP[V es [NP{pred}]] [NP[ det ∅] [[s que[s [NP [VP[V_{subj}...]]]]]]]]\]

a. es acoso que llames a Maria todas las noches.

It is harassment that (you) call to Maria all the nights

The main verb of (2a) is always ser ‘to be’, followed by a predicative NP. The predicative slot can have as its head any noun that refers to an event or state (Jackendoff, 1990). Another version of the SSC is the one which has a infinitival sentential subject. The main verb of this version is also ser ‘to be’, and the predicative is a sentence introduced by que ‘that’, and conjugated in the subjunctive:

(3) a. \[s [NP[Sinfinite]] [VP[V[ser [S{pred} que[s [NP [VP[V_{subj}]]]]]]]]\]

a. Ser buen estudiante es que saques buenas notas en todas las clases.

To be good students is that (you) get good grades in all the classes

Both (2a) and (3a) are used to express the conceptualization by the speaker of the situation expressed by the predicative noun (2a), or by the infinitival sentential subject (3a). For example, (3a) could be used in a context in which the speaker is contrasting his conceptualization of the state ser buen estudiante ‘to be a good student’ with that of the hearer, for whom the situation only involves getting good grades in one class. Interestingly, construction (1a) is not used to express a conceptualization of a situation by the speaker, and its meaning may be related to presupposition.
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The notion of transitivity plays a major role in the grammar of the indoeuropean languages. Its influence can be exerted beyond the verbal syntax and affect also the grammar of sentence. In the history of Spanish and other Romance languages, the transitive sentence, as a complex unit, was grammaticalized. As a result, it became a construction, in the sense that this term has in the work of Croft (2001) and Goldberg (2006). The main effect of this process is that the transitive construction was linked with a specific semantic prototype. On the other hand, the consolidation of the transitive construction was the cause that other sentence frames with opposite meaning ended up grammaticalized and gave rise to the birth of new constructions. This was just the case of the impersonal construction, which was integrated into a semantic associative network of constructions in the Romance languages.

The purpose of this research is to address the history of these impersonal constructions that were possible in Old Spanish (and also in the early stages of some Indo-European languages) but tended to be replaced by new constructions with subject, that emerged under the growing influence of the grammaticalized transitive construction.

These impersonal constructions, that were possible within a specific group of stative verbs, were semantically linked with the conceptual field of emotions, feelings, pains, and modality. The syntax of these constructions shows a consistent evolutive pattern, similar to the one which can be observed among the Germanic languages. Their use was much more frequent then than it is nowadays, and therefore it is reasonable to claim that they are moving back in all these languages partially or even totally. In recent linguistic research, specially in the Germanic area, there has been an intense debate on the syntactic status of some of these constructions wherein no NP bears the expression of a canonical subject (nominative case, concordance with verb, etc). These impersonal constructions (of the type of me-thinks) normally have a subject-like NP which bears a dative or accusative case marking. Most of these “quirky subjects” (as they are usually called) have tended to be replaced by similar constructions with standard subjects.

In Latin they were even more frequent and varied than they are in modern Indo-European languages. They were also not scarce in the Romance family. In Old Spanish they can be easily found in texts from the Middle Ages or even later. Some residues of these structures still remain in nowadays Spanish (e. g. me da vergüenza de ti).

The central thesis of this research is that the loss of the impersonal constructions is tied in with the increased productivity and schematicity of the transitive construction
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In my precedent work I introduced a **Multi-Dimensional Construction Grammar** (MDCxG) framework. The model is illustrated by a set of descriptions of French spontaneous speech constructions, based on corpus studies of written and spoken productions, and represented into the *Property Grammars* formalism (see for example BLANCHE’s paper in CSLP-05 procs). Its main particularity among other CxG models (as well as among other grammar models in general) is that it contains both syntagmatic and paradigmatic constructions. Syntagmatic constructions are characterized by **hypotactic** (i.e. head-dependent) relations between their constituents, whereas paradigmatic ones make it possible to introduce constructs in which constituents are connected by **paratactic** relations, i.e. of equivalence or reciprocal dependency (as defined in the *Pronominal Approach* by BLACHE-BENEVISTE et al.). This elementary distinction led to original formalizations of diverse phenomena, such as **disfluencies** (see GUÉNOT in TALN-05 procs) and **coordination** (see GUÉNOT in TALN-06 procs).

Coordination phenomena gathers many different kinds of constructions that can be more or less constrained and present specific lexical, syntactic, semantic, prosodic and/or pragmatic properties. What I propose here is the description of **Antithetic constructions** (1).

(1)  
\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a. une recette appréciée par petits et grands pour 6 pers. 500 g de rhubarbe (...) } \\
&\text{b. Cette notion concerne aussi bien la source d’un comportement (son origine), que les moyens qui sont employés, et le ou les buts qui sont visés (les intentions).}
\end{align*}
\]

For the description of the phenomenon, I primarily based my work on MURPHY’s one about **Antonym construction** (in ICCG3 procs and *Constructions* SV1-8/2006), which I adapted to French language and I extended to enumerations (1b), and to the coordination of clauses and of different categories’ constituents. Then I formalized this description into MDCxG, and I finally integrated the construction into my grammar for French (verifying this does not require any ad hoc representation, and does not cause any incoherence in the resource considered as a whole).

The construction inherits Coordination’s constraints: (i) a common syntactic function co-assumed by its different constituents, (ii) the possibility of being syndetic or asyndetic, (iii) of relating elements from different categories, and (iv) of being partly elliptic. Among coordinations, they can be identified by a set of constraints coming from different domains: (i) **lexical** properties that constrain the lexemes’ choice, (ii) **syntactic** ones that applies on the order of constituents (and can be more or less fixed), and (iii) **semantic** ones that requires semantic incompatibility between constituents and their sharing of a same semantic field. The conjunction of these different constraints leads to a **pragmatic** effect of constrast between the constituents, even if their own semantic properties do not oppose them *a priori*.

I will finally show how the extension of the grammar with the description of such a precise phenomenon can have consequences beyond the single considered description, up to more general constructions (here, coordinations and paradigmatic constructions in general); in other terms, how the enhancement of a very local part of a grammar can bear consequences up to the *global* coherence of the grammar itself, as a set of interactions between descriptions.
This study addresses the constructional template of a family of 'chi+XP' in Chinese and explores the cognitive status and structural constraints of XPs that play a crucial role in lexical processing. Chinese verb chi often has other idiomatic meaning than its literal sense of 'eat', particularly when it co-occurs with indefinite NPs and QPs. For example, chi you 'eat oil' means not merely '(the car) runs by oil' but 'the car is heavy on oil'. Other examples are like: chi ren 'eat people' means 'rip off'; chi shui liang xun 'eat water mark twain' means '(the ship) has a draught of 2 fathoms'. The recent study will give an analysis that treats the consuming construct 'chi+XP' as an argument structure of EAT [Edible+, Agent affected+, Theme consumed+]. Firstly, we begin with posting definiteness of core arguments on layered tiers and recognizing their versatilities of roles and constructural design of linking algorithm. Such a multi-layer architecture involves a specific set of semantic entities that can be shared between different conceptual domains. Secondly, we put forward the lexical semantic property of chi under cognitive domain model and attempt an explanation of the distinction between multiple senses of chi, such as be, consume, diet and etc. The result of semantic decomposition suggests that idiosyncratic constraints of chi+XP need not be encoded in lexical entries as syntactic configuration but must be encoded in information template as pairing presetting. Thus, it is argued that, when the process of applying lexical principle, there must be an all-around process of mapping thematic roles into different layers of argument structure of the construct, since the internal relations between semantic arguments leads to the idea that there is a strong influence: the degree of abstractness of thematic representations. One point is that although the quantities of physical entities in chi+QP are used to convey different amounts of accumulative theme, they might be regarded as abstract representations, while the more abstract the thematic representations, the higher the fixedness of the constructional property. Therefore, to investigate these discrepancies, we performed an implementation of the constructional framework that draws a parallel resolution of the interface between linguistic features.
Taiwan Hakka has three variations of $X\ det_4$ construction, i.e. $V\ det_4$ construction, $zo_3\ det_4\ VP$ construction and $S/VP/V\ m_5\ det_4$ construction. According to our analysis on semantic reconstruction, $det_4$ is originally a verb denoting get or obtain and diachronically grammaticalizes into a modal. Synchronically, $det_4$ is usually used as $X\ det_4$ construction in which its meaning is partially composed of $X$ and something else rather than from the composition of $X$ and $det_4$ ‘obtain’. $X\ det_4$ construction can be used to simultaneously mark situational dynamic modality. For example, both $gi_5\ hi_3\ det_4$ and $gi_5\ zo_3\ det_4\ hi_3$ simultaneously mean ‘he can go’ and ‘he is permitted to go’. In other words, $X\ det_4$ construction specifies ability and permission, and its meanings partially come from the composition of its components as well as the constructions, which is like what Goldberg (1995, 2006) mentions that the form-meaning correspondences exist independently of particular verbs.

From the examples above, it seems that $V\ tet_4$ construction is the alternative of $zo_3\ det_4\ VP$ construction and that $S/VP/V\ m_5\ det_4$ construction is the negation of the former two constructions. However, after our analysis, it is found that the alternatives are neither arbitrary nor unlimited. For instance, although $siit_8\ det_4$ and $zo_3\ det_4\ siit_8$ can specify situational dynamic modality ‘is eatable’ and deontic dynamic modality ‘is permitted to eat’, the usage of $gam_1\ za_3\ ge_3\ muk_4\ oi_3\ ka_3\ fat_4\ zang_3\ siit_8\ det_4$ ‘the longer the knot is, the more eatable the sugarcane is’ sounds more natural than other variants. Moreover, $ngi_5\ oi_3\ siit_8\ fan_3\ zang_3\ zo_3\ det_4\ siit_8$ $diam_2\ sim_1$ signifies deontic modality rather than situational dynamic modality.

In this research, we testify that the ambiguity of $V\ det_4$ and $zo_3\ det_4\ VP$ is a result of layering of historical changes caused by the competition between dynamic and deontic modality. It is necessary that the events in these two constructions are specific enough; otherwise, the constructions will become ungrammatical. In addition, animacy of subjects and verb types such as accusative and unaccusative verbs will not only influence meanings of constructions but also affect the choices of constructions. Roughly speaking, $V\ det_4$ construction favors unaccusative verbs and inanimate subjects when expressing ability/root possibility while $zuo_3\ det_4\ VP$ construction favors accusative verbs and animate subject when expressing permission. Asymmetry exists in $X\ det_4$ construction. We have $S/VP/V\ m_5\ det_4$ construction but never have $S/VP\ det_4$ construction, which is prevalent in Mandarin Chinese and Taiwanese Southern Min (Lien 1997; Wei 2004). It is apparent that more than one property of $X\ det_4$ construction is not strictly predictable from knowledge of other constructions existing in the Hakka grammar.

1 The component $zo_3$ means ‘do’. Here in the variants, $X$ includes $S/VP/V$. The symbol $S$ represents a sentence, $VP$ a phrasal unit, and $V$ a lexical item or a compound.

2 Situational dynamic modality refers to inherent potential or inherent necessity/inevitability, no matter the potential or necessity ascribed in the entity is an individual, a situation, or a mixture of both (Nuyts 2006: 4).
A cognitively-plausible implementation of Fluid Construction Grammar (FCG) is described in which the grammar rules are adopted from Double R Grammar (DRG). FCG provides a bi-directional rule application engine in which the working memory is a coupled semantic and syntactic feature structure. FCG itself does not commit to any particular lexical categories, nor does it commit to any particular organization of construction rules. DRG, previously implemented in the ACT-R cognitive architecture, is a linguistic theory of the grammatical encoding and integration of referential and relational meaning in English. Its referential and relational constructions facilitate the composition of logical forms. In this work, a set of bi-directional FCG rules are developed that comply with DRG. Results demonstrate both the lexically incremental parse of an utterance to precise, discourse-referential, logical form, and the semantically incremental production of the original utterance, given as input the discourse-grounded logical form.
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While syntactic theories have focused on the descriptions of clausal and phrasal relationships such as subordination and coordination, these syntactic theories have limitations when addressing the more complex relationships between quotatives and direct quotations. In (1), the quotative is bolded:

(1) “You should have seen him, Dad,” I plead. (Korman 2002: 109)

In previous studies, quotatives have been labeled ‘main clauses’ and quotations ‘subordinate clauses’ (e.g., Suñer 2000). Other studies base the syntactic relationship between quotatives and direct quotations on specific quotative features, such as quotative position (Ruppenhofer 2001, Vries 2006) and quotative inversion (Collins and Branigan 1997). Ruppenhofer (2001) and Vries (2006) analyze quotatives in the initial position—like the example in (2)—as main clauses and quotatives in medial or final positions—like the examples in (3) and (4)—as parenthetical clauses.

(2) Initial: As I took it out of my wallet, he continued, “To say you were over the speed limit is putting it mildly.” (Duncan 1989: 148)
(3) Medial: “I know you’re new here, Lola,” purred Carla Santini, “and you don’t understand how things work yet.” (Sheldon 1999: 47-48)

Collins and Branigan (1997) state that non-inverted quotatives—those quotatives in which the Speaker precedes the quoting verb, as in (5)—are main clauses while inverted quotatives—those in which the quoting verb precedes the Speaker, as in (6)—are parenthetical clauses.

(5) “Blair doesn’t know, does she?” Serena asked Nate quietly. (von Ziegesar 2002: 35)
(6) “Have you listened to one word I’ve said?” asked Ella. (Sheldon 1999: 96)

However, these analyses do not account for many quotative features, such as quoting verb variety.

Based on data I collected of written English quotatives, I analyzed features of the quotatives, including position, inversion, and the vast variety of quoting verbs authors creatively use in quotatives, many of which do not intrinsically denote speech acts (e.g., explode, snap, sigh). I argue that the varying relationships between quotatives and quotations are the products of constructions, some of which determine the order of the quotative relative to the quoted speech and some of which create the possibility of using creative quoting verbs. By using constructions and not confining the analysis to terms such as ‘coordination,’ and ‘subordination,’ even marginal examples of quotatives (such as those interpreted as being co-temporal to the quotation, like the example in (7)) can be included in the analysis and not listed as exceptions.

(7) “Come on!” the guy pounded the door with his fist. (Caletti 2002: 264)

Thus, a construction grammar approach to analyzing the relationship between quotatives and quotations allows a discussion inclusive of more variable quotative features.
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The main issue of this research is the semantic deviation between adnominal and conjunctive forms of Japanese adjectives. The result of this research strongly suggests that these two forms are, with high probability, forming different constructional schemata, and each constructional schema requests different adjectives. Semantic differences between these two forms do not stem from the derivational meaning of adjectives, but from the constructional meaning, which is constituted independently.

Mikami (1955, *Gendai Goho Shinsetsu* [The New Theory on Modern Japanese]) has pointed out the crucial semantic and usage difference between adnominal and conjunctive forms of adjectives. For example, adnominal form *osoroshi-i* and *ita-i* in (1a) and (2a) still retain its literal meaning of ‘fearfulness’ and ‘painfulness’, while conjunctive form *osoroshi-ku* and *ita-ku* in (1b) and (2b) do not.

(1) a. *osoroshi-i* taiken (2) a. *ita-i* chusha
fearful-ADN experience painful-ADN injection
fearful experience painful injection
b. *osoroshi-ku* mazui b. *ita-ku* kando-suru
fearful-CON distasteful painful-CON be impressed
very distasteful very impressed

Though this semantic variation indicates that adnominal and conjunctive forms of adjectives are different at the morphosyntactic level, it has been excluded from investigation.

In order to show the difference of each adjective’s requisition of word, we first checked the frequencies and distribution of adnominal and conjunctive forms of Japanese adjectives in three different Japanese corpora (*Shincho-bunko 100*, *Shincho-shinsho 100*, *Yomiuri News* (11years)). Accordingly, 11,566 phrases of adnominal form, and 17,134 of conjunctive form were found, and then we coded morphological information. Pearson’s correlation coefficient has shown more than 0.80 of high relation among the corpora, and illustrated the distributional regularity of adnominal and conjunctive forms, regardless of the difference between the corpora. Second, we examined the coefficient of variance (CV) of inflected forms from the basic form with chi-square test with 0.7 point of CV and more than 1 percent of significance. From this result, we then found high resemblance of adjective inflection and usage pattern among the corpora.

This research indicated the presence of numerous adjectives which are used only as either adnominal or conjunctive form. Each adjectival expression specifies a set of slots, and forms item-based construction (Tomasello, 2000, *The Item-based Nature of Children’s Early Syntactic Development*), without mutual influence. Adnominal form and conjunctive form shape different constructional schemata as to lexical level distribution.
In Huallaga Quechua the most frequent class of suffixes is the “possessives”. These are used in many ways (Weber 1976). The “possessive construction” (Juan-pa maki-n / wa:ka-n / mama-n /... ’John's hand / cow / mother /...’) is ubiquitous. There are less frequent, specialized sub-constructions, for example, spatial uses (wasi hana-n ’on top the house’, wasi han’qa-n ’up the hill from the house’), temporal uses (lunis-pa wara-n-ni-n ’the day after Monday’), and with quantifiers and numerals (llapa-nchi ’all of us’, ishka-nchi ’the two of us’). There are very specific constructions, some of which admit only -n ’third person’ and some for which it is not clear that -n is a possessive suffix, for example, X-n X-n (wara-n wara-n ’day after day’, yora-n yora-n ’from tree to tree’). And then there are some that seem related but which Weber (1976:48) does not consider to be possessive suffixes, for example, the -n in numeral phrases (pachak chunka-n ’110’) and in superlatives (hatun-ni-lla-n ’just the biggest’).

This paper reconsiders these data in the light of construction grammar. The various uses of possessive suffixes (liberally understood) are defined as constructions, achieving greater precision. These constructions are linked in an inheritance hierarchy, economically capturing how they are related.
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Tautological constructions are a type of interesting constructions which has particular syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic characteristics. They are like gestures or interjections: they appear ‘natural’, universal, and self-explanatory; but they are also conventional, language- and culture specific. They show both ‘natural logic’ and ‘cultural logic’; and the more ‘natural’ they seem, the more culturally revealing they are.

Tautological constructions have been studied from the perspectives of semantics (e.g. G. Leech 1983) and pragmatics (e.g. Brown & Levinson 1978, A. Wierzbicka 1991), but seldom done in the framework of cognitive linguistics, construction grammar in particular. There are still some holes or problems in the previous studies. For example, why have English tautological constructions been so widely mistaken for universal devices fully interpretable on the basis of Grice’s maxim of quantity? Why does Levinson (1983) regard “a dismissive and topic closing quality” as a shared property of tautological constructions of different kinds? One obvious reason is that the form of tautological constructions is so deceptively simple, and so deceptively similar to logical tautologies that it is easy to jump at a conclusion. Therefore, it is necessary for us to reconsider tautological constructions here.

The aim of this purpose is to investigate the syntactic and semantic properties of the Chinese nominal tautological construction “NP1 shi NP1” (NP1 is NP1) in the framework of construction grammar. Sometimes, contrastive studies will be made between English and Chinese. And the methodology used here is contrastive analysis and linguistic typology.

Tautological constructions are ubiquitous, which occur in both English and Chinese. For example, in English, we have the following constructions:

(1) Boys are boys. War is war. Friend is friend. Home is home, be it never so homely. A wolf, after all, is a wolf in spite of its artful disguises.

In Mandarin Chinese, the similar counterparts can be found:

(2) Nanhai jiu shi nanhai (Boys are boys). Zhanzheng jiu shi zhanzheng (War is war). Pengyou jiu shi pengyou (Friend is friend).

This demonstrates that tautological constructions can be universal and their constructional meaning can be similar or identical.

In addition, in Mandarin Chinese, there are some tautological constructions which have no counterparts in English. For example:

(3) Tou shi tou, jiao shi jiao. (Head is head, foot is foot)

This sentence is used to describe the beauty of girls or women, because in China women’s hairstyle and feet are considered very important. Most Chinese girls or women like to decorate their hair and feet. This example indicates that tautological constructions can be language- and culture-specific.

Through the study of this paper, we can draw some important conclusions: the meaning of Chinese nominal constructions is conventional; it seems that the meaning may vary according to context, but there is an underlying abstract conceptual content realized by various types of Chinese tautological constructions.

In sum, it is a matter of fundamental significance to study tautological constructions.
Apparently, this significance doesn’t come from the frequency of use, or the necessity of tautological constructions. It derives from the fact that one’s decision on a ‘small’ point like this has far-reaching importance in respect of one’s whole idea of what linguistics is all about, what it is supposed to do, and what it can do. The basic question is this: should grammar (syntax) be autonomous of semantics and pragmatics, or should constructional meaning be spelt out within a holistic framework of cognitive linguistics? The answer is very clear, I think!