

## Conditions on the Passivization of Cognate Object Constructions\*

Tetsuya Kogusuri

### 1. Introduction

In this article, I will investigate Cognate Object Constructions (henceforth, COCs) such as those exemplified in (1).<sup>1</sup> While researchers vary in regard to how they actually treat Cognate Objects (COs) syntactically, at least two types of CO have been identified: the passivizable CO and the unpassivizable one. Consider the contrast in grammaticality shown in (2):

- (1) a. Bill sighed a weary sigh. (Jones (1988:89))
- b. Bernadette danced the Irish jig. (Massam (1990:163))
- (2) a. \* A weary sigh was sighed by Bill. (Jones (1988:91))
- b. The Irish jig was danced by Bernadette Dooley. (Massam (1990:163))

If there are two distinct types of CO, a question that naturally follows is how to identify what kind of CO can be passivized.

The purpose of this article is to establish conditions under which COs can be passivized. This requires a close scrutiny of syntactic and semantic properties of COs, particularly in terms of the argumenthood. In what follows, I will make the following claims, one of which is adopted from Kitahara (2006, 2007, 2010):

- (3) a. COs are syntactic arguments which divide into two types: constructional arguments and verbal arguments.
- b. Passivization of a CO is possible if either of the following conditions is satisfied:
  - (i) the CO receives a type reading (if necessary, from context).  
(Kitahara (2006, 2007, 2010))
  - (ii) the COC functions as a presentational sentence in discourse, which focuses on the occurrence of an entity.

---

\* This article is indebted to many discussions with Ken-ichi Kitahara (Reitaku University). Without these discussions, this article could not have been written. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to him. Thanks are also due to Michael Wonch, Jannet Depiazzi, and Kyle Bergman for kindly acting as informants. I'm also grateful to anonymous TES reviewers for their helpful comments. Needless to say, any remaining errors are on my own. This work was supported by JSPS Research Fellowship for Young Scientists (JSPS Research Fellow DC2) and by Grand-in Aid for JSPS Fellows.

<sup>1</sup> Some researchers exclude “non-cognate” objects like *the Irish jig* in (1b), a subtype of CO; however, I will define the category of COs more broadly to include such a subtype.

The organization of this article is as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews a previous approach to COCs and points out its problem. Section 3 lays out an overarching analysis by Kitahara (2006, 2007, 2010). His analysis not only resolves the problem of the previous approach but presents a comprehensive account of the behavior of COCs including passivization. However, it still leaves some problems unsolved. In section 4, I propose an alternative analysis that explains broader data of COCs. Based on this analysis, section 5 provides another licensing condition of passivized COCs stated in (3bii). Section 6 presents the conclusion.

## 2. Two Types of CO: Adjunct and Argument

To account for the two contrastive patterns illustrated in (2), a possible approach is to treat the two COs as syntactically distinct elements, i.e. adjunct and argument COs: *a weary sigh* is an adverbial modifier of the verb, while *the Irish jig* is the direct object of the verb *sigh*. In fact, the CO in (1a) is said to be semantically equivalent to the corresponding manner adverbial adjunct, as in (4a). On the other hand, *the Irish jig* in (1b) cannot receive such a manner reading. The paraphrase with the manner adverbial in (4b) alters the original meaning:

- (4) a. Bill sighed a weary sigh. (= (1a))  
       = Bill sighed wearily. (Jones (1988:93))  
       b. Bernadette danced the Irish jig. (= (1b))  
       ≠ Bernadette danced in the Irish-jig-like manner.

In general, adjuncts cannot undergo passivization but arguments can. The syntactic distinction of adjunct and argument COs will thus explain the difference between the two COs in (2) straightforwardly.

In addition to passivizability, there are two more diagnostic phenomena taken up in the literature which validate the argument-adjunct distinction of COs. First, some COs cannot occur with strong determiners such as *this* and *every*, but others can do:

- (5) a.\* John screamed *{this scream / every scream}* we heard today.  
(Moltmann (1989:301))  
b. Tom sneezed *every* sneeze that we heard that day. (Massam (1990:169))

Second, the difference in *it*-pronominalization also confirms the two-way distinction of COs. Consider the following examples cited in Kuno and Takami (2004:132):

- (6) a. He was horrified, but he smiled a happy smile. \*He *smiled it* (= the happy smile) in order to disarm the intruder.  
 b. John sang a beautiful song. He *sang it* (= the beautiful song) to cheer her up.

The contrastive syntactic patterns as in (5) and (6) again support the view that COs divide into two syntactically distinct categories.

Bearing in mind the dichotomy of adjunct and argument COs, one might think that the syntactic status of COs is correlated to the transitivity of the verbs: the adjunct type of CO serves as a modifier of an intransitive verb, while the argument type is taken by a transitive verb. In this view, whether COs can be passivized is attributed to the difference in transitivity of the verbs. Representative researchers taking such an approach are Jones (1988), Kuno and Takami (2004), among others (cf. Yasui (1983)). They argue that the genuine COC is a combination of an intransitive verb and its CO, whereas the apparent COC is a transitive sentence, i.e. a transitive verb with its direct object. Thus, *sigh*, *scream*, and *smile* are intransitive verbs and their COs are adjuncts, while *dance*, *sneeze*, and *sing* are transitive verbs that take COs as their direct objects. In short, according to these researchers, the syntactic behavior of COs is determined by the transitivity of the verbs. Let us refer to this approach as the verb-specific approach.

As Kitahara (2007, 2010) explicitly points out, however, such a verb-specific approach confronts an unavoidable empirical problem: the syntactic status of a CO cannot be identified by the verb alone. In fact, even a single verb may exhibit two conflicting patterns in terms of three grammatical phenomena. Compare the following pairs, each of which has a common verb (*italics* are mine):

- (7) *Passivization*  
 a. \* A weary sigh was sighed by Bill. (Jones (1988:91))  
 b. A weary sigh was sighed by the overworked field worker at the end of a long day. (Macfarland (1994), cited in Felser and Wanner (2001:108))
- (8) *Co-occurrence with a Strong Determiner*  
 a. \* A death occurred today in this clinic. It was John who died *that* death. (Moltmann (1989:301))  
 b. "...He died *that* death which is the death of all."  
 (Robert P. Lightner, *The Death Christ Died*)
- (9) *Pronominalization*  
 a. He was horrified, but he smiled a happy smile. \*He *smiled it* (= the happy smile) in order to disarm the intruder. (= (6a))

- b. Mary smiled Marilyn Monroe's smile. Nancy *smiled it*, too.  
(Kitahara (2006:54))

As these examples demonstrate, COs of the same verb may allow for two contrastive syntactic patterns. In this respect, the verb-specific approach cannot explain the contradictory behavior of COs, let alone the condition for their passivizability.

### 3. Form-Meaning Correspondences of COCs

Given the problem with the verb-specific approach, Kitahara (2006, 2007, 2010) claims that the syntactic status of COs is dependent on their semantic interpretations; that is, how they can be construed is crucial for their syntactic behavior. This section lays out his analysis based on form-meaning correspondences in COCs.

#### 3.1. Two Types of Form-Meaning Correspondence of COCs

Under a lexical-constructional approach (Iwata (2008)), Kitahara (2006, 2007, 2010) proposes that COCs have two distinct syntactic structures corresponding to different sentential meanings. In conformity with the basic tenet of Construction Grammar (e.g. Goldberg (1995)), he assumes that all linguistic expressions constitute form-meaning pairings, so-called “constructions.” From this perspective, COCs are assumed to form a complex category which consists of syntactically and semantically distinct constructions. On the syntactic side, COCs have two clausal structures: (i) the intransitive construction with the adjunct CO and (ii) the transitive construction with the argument CO, as represented below (Kitahara (2010:118)) (the subscript *c* indicates the cognateness between the verb and its object; the *M* is an abbreviation for the modifier):

- (10) a. [SBJ INTRVERB<sub>c</sub> (M) OBJ<sub>c</sub><sup>ADJUNCT</sup>]  
b. [SBJ TRVERB<sub>c</sub> (M) OBJ<sub>c</sub><sup>ARGUMENT</sup>]

On the semantic side, these distinct syntactic structures are associated with three possible readings of COs, as is observed by Matsumoto (1996). According to Matsumoto's observation, COCs can potentially be interpreted in the following ways (a similar observation is also made in Höche (2009)):

- (11) *Mary danced a beautiful dance.*  
Reading A: the activity of dancing is beautiful.  
Reading B: the result of activity of dancing is beautiful.

Reading C: a certain type of dance, e.g. a tango, is famous for its beauty.

(Matsumoto (1996:214))

The sentence *Mary danced a beautiful dance* in (11) receives one of the three readings from A to C: (i) the activity reading (e.g. Mary danced in a beautiful manner), (ii) the result reading (e.g. even though she stepped wrongly and fell to the floor, Mary's dancing was beautiful on the whole), or (iii) the type reading (e.g. Mary performed an existing beautiful type of dance).

On the basis of Matsumoto's observation, Kitahara (2007, 2010) suggests that the activity and result readings are linked with the intransitive structure with the adjunct CO in (10a), while the type reading is unique to the transitive structure including the argument CO in (10b). In the activity/result reading, the CO describes how an event denoted by the verb proceeds. For example, *a beautiful dance* in (11) denotes how Mary danced or how her dance was eventually done. In this case, the CO can be conceived of as modifying the event of the verb. In Kitahara's analysis, the activity/result reading of a CO, which describes a manner of an activity, is associated with its adjunct status.

By contrast, the CO with a type reading denotes an entity which instantiates a particular existing type. The existence of the denoted entity is independent of the event denoted by the verb (cf. Langacker (1991:363)). For example, the type reading of *a beautiful dance* in (11) refers to an instance of a type of dance that can be replicated by the agent, like *waltz*, *tango*, and *polka*. Thus, in this reading, Mary "recreated" or performed a dance that was already established prior to her activity (Kitahara (2007:76, 2010:141-142); cf. Rice (1987) and Langacker (1991)). The independent existence is a prototypical semantic feature of direct object (Hopper and Thompson (1980)); for example, in *John ate an apple*, the eaten apple must be existent before John's eating, whether he actually ate it or not. Since the CO with a type reading denotes an independently existent entity, it takes on the syntactic status of the direct object appearing in a transitive sentence.

The different semantic functions of COs are evidenced by what type of question they can be answers to (Horita (1996:238-239)):

- (12) How did Catherine smile?
  - a. She smiled a sudden smile.
  - b. \* She smiled a thin-lipped smile.
- (13) What sort of smile did Catherine smile?
  - a. \* She smiled a sudden smile.
  - b. She smiled a thin-lipped smile.

The CO *a sudden smile* obtains an activity reading, i.e. her smiling happened suddenly. *A thin-lipped smile*, on the other hand, describes a particular type of smile; hence this CO receiving a type reading.<sup>2</sup> As in (12), only the former can be a reply to the question using *how*. By contrast, as in (13), only the latter is felicitous as an answer to the question with *what sort of* (Horita (1996)). Thus, the two COs are different in type of *wh*-question to which they can be adequate answers. This fact verifies distinct semantic functions of the COs.

According to Kitahara (2010:120), these different semantic functions of COs reflect their different relationships in meaning with the verbs. The CO with the activity/result reading denotes an abstract event the existence of which is dependent upon the event of the verb: for instance, the sudden smile is identifiable as the event of the verb *smile* in (12a). The CO with the type reading *a thin-lipped smile* in (13b), on the other hand, encodes an entity which exists independently of the verbal event. With the verb-CO relationships in mind, Kitahara (2010) term the former type of CO the *event-dependent CO*, and the latter type the *event-independent CO*. Hereafter, I will follow his terminology for the two-way classification, i.e. the event-dependent/event-independent COs or COCs.

To sum up, in Kitahara's analysis, the event-dependent CO is an adverbial adjunct associated with the activity/result reading, while the event-independent CO is the direct object of a transitive verb and receives a type reading. These form-meaning correspondences are assumed to constitute distinct constructions as summarized below:<sup>3</sup>

(14) a. *Event-dependent COC*

Syn: [SBJ INTRVERB<sub>c</sub> (M) OBJ<sub>c</sub><sup>ADJUNCT</sup>]

Sem: ['X Vs, (as a direct result of and concurrently with which the state of being M obtained)']

b. *Event-independent COC*

Syn: [SBJ TRVERB<sub>c</sub> (M) OBJ<sub>c</sub><sup>ARGUMENT</sup>]

<sup>2</sup> There are many cases where I find difficulty to identify the CO as denoting a single entity (i.e. a token) or an instance of a type. Given the fact shown in (12-13), hereafter, I will use two types of adjectival modifier as a basic diagnostic for identifying the event-dependent CO, which is the main focus in the later discussion: temporal adjectives (e.g. *sudden, slow, quick*) and property adjectives (e.g. *happy, beautiful, small, merry*). According to Iwasaki (2007:10, fn. 16, 20) and Höche (2009:83), the former adjectives trigger an activity reading, while the latter facilitate a result reading.

<sup>3</sup> Following the observation by Höche (2009), Kitahara (2010) identifies a further subtype of event-independent COC in which the CO is an NP denoting a created product as the result of the event denoted by the verb (e.g. *Real plants should be planted with warmed water in the tank* (BNC; cited in Höche (2009:84)). For the purpose of the discussion, I will set aside this type of COCs, but see for detail Höche (2009:84-86) and Kitahara (2010:139-140).

Sem: ['X acts on a thing or type (evoked by the verb) whose existence is independent of any single instantiation of the action']  
(Kitahara (2010:137, 147))

Under this analysis, if a verb occurs in the event-dependent COC, the construction determines the category of the verb as intransitive and its CO as an adverbial adjunct. Conversely, if occurring in the event-independent COC, the verb assumes a status of a transitive verb and its CO is the direct object.

The form-meaning correspondences for COCs in (14) can account for the contradictory patterns in terms of diagnostics for transitivity. Since the event-dependent CO serves as an adverbial adjunct, the event-dependent COC blocks passivization, modification by a strong determiner, and *it*-pronominalization. By contrast, the event-independent COC is compatible with these phenomena, for the CO is a true argument of the verb. The relevant examples are reproduced here:

- (15) a. \* A weary sigh was sighed by Bill.  
       b. \* John screamed {this scream / every scream} we heard today.  
       c. He laughed a hearty laugh. \*He laughed it (= the laugh) because he was truly amused by her joke.
- (16) a. The Irish jig was danced by Bernadette Dooley.  
       b. Tom sneezed every sneeze that we heard that day.  
       c. John sang a beautiful song. He sang it (= the beautiful song) to cheer her up.

For example, a weary sigh is understood as a single entity that is made by an agent. Generally speaking, the existence of a sigh is not presupposed. The CO in (15a) is thus event-dependent and the passivization cannot apply. The Irish jig, on the other hand, is a lively dance originating in Ireland. It is an entity that has already existed prior to the agent's dancing, i.e. event-independent, hence the acceptability in (16a).

The form-meaning correspondences in (14) also account for the following interesting fact: if a given CO is susceptible to passivization and modification by a strong determiner, the manner adverbial interpretation of the CO is unavailable:

- (17) A merry dance was danced by Sam.  
       ≠ Sam danced merrily. (Jones (1988:91))
- (18) Sam danced {the beautiful dance / every beautiful dance}.  
       ≠ Sam danced beautifully (Kitahara (2010:193))

As illustrated above, neither the CO in the passive subject position nor the CO modified by the strong determiner receives a manner adverbial interpretation, i.e. an activity or result reading. This is in sharp contrast to the case of *Mary danced a beautiful dance* in (11), which receives all three possible readings. As in (17) and (18), the CO displaying the behavior as a direct object may never obtain an adverbial interpretation. This observation is naturally accounted for by Kitahara's analysis: since transitive patterns of COCs are closely associated with the type interpretations of COs, no adverbial interpretation is available in (17) and (18).

Thus far, we have overviewed Kitahara's (2006, 2007, 2010) analysis based on the two types of form-meaning correspondence. The most important point is that the syntactic status of a CO is not defined by the verb alone, but by the whole sentence; in particular, the interpretation of the CO in the sentence is crucial: a COC is an intransitive sentence with an adverbial adjunct if the CO is interpretable as an event or a result of an event describing how the verbal event unfolds; on the other hand, a COC is a transitive sentence if the CO evokes a recognizable type which is independent of the event denoted by the verb. In this analysis, then, COs are passivizable if they are construed as event-independent COs.

Kitahara's analysis yields an interesting implication: contextual factors which are relevant to the interpretation of a CO may improve the acceptability of passivization. For example, *a smile* normally obtains an activity/result reading and is not readily passivized. However, in an appropriate context, the CO obtains a type reading, and as a result it becomes passivizable:

- (19) a. \* A silly smile was smiled by Sam. (Jones (1988:91))  
 b. Marilyn Monroe's smile was smiled by Mary. (Kitahara (2007:70))

In (19b), as Kitahara (2007) sharply points out, the proper noun *Marilyn Monroe* helps the CO evoke a type of smile which the famous actress showed repeatedly. The type of smile was recreated by the individual other than Marilyn Monroe, i.e. Mary. Hence, the CO in (19b) is construable as an event-independent CO. In this case, in contrast to (19a), the passivization of *a smile* is felicitous.

In short, under Kitahara's analysis, what is of crucial importance for passivizing COs is whether they denote particular, recognizable types which exist independently of the verbal events. After his observation, I will term this type of passivization the *type-establishing passivization*. Now, Kitahara's analysis (2006, 2007, 2010) is summarized as follows:

- (20) a. COCs divide into two distinct form-meaning pairs, i.e. constructions:



event-dependent COCs and event-independent COCs.

- b. In the event-dependent COC, the verb is intransitive and the CO is an adverbial adjunct.
- c. In the event-independent COC, the verb is transitive and the CO is its direct object.
- d. COs are passivizable if they denote particular, recognizable types of entity the existence of which is independent of the verbal events.

Kitahara's (2006, 2007, 2010) approach successfully explains the fact that a particular CO may change the syntactic behavior depending on its possible interpretation, which is problematic for the verb-specific approach.

### 3.2. *Argumenthood and Passivizability of Event-Dependent COs*

As far as the data that we have seen so far are concerned, Kitahara's (2006, 2007, 2010) analysis provides a comprehensive account of the variable syntactic behavior of COCs, which cannot be dealt with by the verb-specific approach. Especially, his innovative concept of event-dependency is capable of capturing the slight but non-trivial difference in meaning between the two types of CO and is potentially extendable to other linguistic phenomena (Kitahara (2007)). Yet, there are two kinds of data that run counter to his analysis, particularly, to the claims summarized in (20b) and (20d).

With respect to (20b), two observations presented in the literature challenge the adverbial analysis of event-dependent COs. Macfarland (1995) and Mittwoch (1998) point out that, in contrast to manner adverbs, event-dependent COs cannot be isolated in *do so* substitution:

- (21) a. Sue smiled sweetly and Ben did so enigmatically.
  - b.\* Sue smiled a sweet smile and Ben did so an enigmatic one.
- (Mittwoch (1998:329), with slight modifications)

As is well-known, if a phrase may be isolated for the substitution, it is proven to be an adjunct which adjoins to the outer layer of the (lowest) V-bar level structure. Therefore, the ungrammaticality in (21b) tells us that the event-dependent CO is situated inside the VP, not outside the VP as in the case of the corresponding manner adverb in (21a) (see Macfarland (1995) for further pieces of evidence for the VP-internal status of COs).

In addition to *do so* substitution, there is another type of data against the adverbial analysis: adjacency between the verb and its CO. As a generally



obvious that the passivized COs in (24) have adverbial function, hence being event-dependent COs. This fact is worthy of attention given that event-dependent COs have been alleged as unpassivizable. Then the passivization in (24) is another type of passivization distinct from the type-establishing type and must be explained independently. As will be elucidated later, the passivization of event-dependent COs is indeed possible under certain circumstances.

In sum, Kitahara's analysis needs to be modified in two respects: (i) event-dependent COs are not adverbial adjuncts and (ii) there are attested examples of passivized event-dependent COs. The questions to be asked, then, are:

- (26) a If event-dependent COs are not adverbial adjuncts, what is the exact syntactic status of them?
- b. What licenses the passivization of event-dependent COs?

In what follows, I will address these questions in turn. Section 4 is devoted to exploring the exact syntactic and semantic nature of event-dependent COs and to proposing an alternative analysis under the framework of Conceptual Semantics. Section 5 in turn reveals the licensing condition of the passivized COs in (24) from a discourse-pragmatic perspective.

A note is in order here. I totally agree with Kitahara's analysis of event-independent COs as passivizable. The major concern of the discussion below lies rather in presenting a modified analysis of event-dependent COs. To this end, I would like to restrict the following discussion to event-dependent COs, leaving aside event-independent COs.

#### **4. An Alternative: Event-Dependent COs as Constructional Arguments**

In this section I reconsider the complex syntactic and semantic nature of event-dependent COs and propose a constructional argument analysis.

##### *4.1. Further Evidence for the Argumenthood of Event-Dependent COs*

As observed in section 3.2, the syntactic diagnostics of the *do so* substitution and the adjacency condition bear out the argument status of event-dependent COs. In addition to these diagnostics, three pieces of syntactic and semantic evidence support the argumenthood of the COs. The first evidence comes from their restricted distribution. Event-dependent COs cannot be ordered as freely as adjuncts. In (27), the adjuncts *carefully* and *yesterday* occupy the preverbal position and the sentence-initial position respectively. Event-dependent COs, however, must be in the postverbal position, as illustrated in (28):

- (27) a. She *carefully* straightened out the spikes. (BNC FNW)  
 b. *Yesterday* he was favorite again at 2-1 and won impressively. (BNC A33)
- (28) a. \* Mary *a beautiful smile* smiled yesterday.  
 b. \* *A crazy laugh* John laughed at night.

The restricted distribution of event-dependent COs contrasts with the free ordering of adjuncts, and therefore confirms their argumenthood.

The second evidence is concerned with *one*-pronominalization. There is a general fact that *one* as well as *it* cannot pronominalize any adjuncts, as shown in (29). However, compared to *it*-pronominalization, *one*-pronominalization is much more easily applicable to event-dependent COs (Horita (1996:238), Höche (2009:27); (30a) is from Horita (1996:238); (30b) is my own):

- (29) John walked slowly, and Mary walked {\*it / \*one}, too.
- (30) a. Mary smiled a sudden smile. Rose smiled {\*it / ?one}, too.  
 b. John sneezed a hearty sneeze. Bill sneezed {\*it / one}, too.

Since only nouns are replaceable by *one*, the examples in (30) reveal that event-dependent COs are NPs qualified as arguments rather than adverbial adjuncts.

The last evidence is that event-dependent COs can be in fact pronominalized with *it* in appropriate contexts. In each of (31), *it* refers back to the preceding CO in brackets:

- (31) a. At a high class party, John laughed [a sudden laugh]<sub>i</sub> during the passionate speech by the host. When *it*<sub>i</sub> happened, everyone was very surprised.  
 b. The princess smiled [a sudden smile]<sub>i</sub>. When *it*<sub>i</sub> appeared on her face, everyone was so surprised, because she'd never smiled all her life.

Note that these COs are the event-dependent type, as can be seen from the occurrence of *sudden*, an adjective denoting a temporal property of an event. The question then arises: what blocks the *it*-pronominalization in (30)?

The answer to this question concerns the type of context in (30): the entities denoted by the COs are construed as being recreated by different individuals (Massam (1990:181)). For example, the pronoun *it* in (30a) refers to the very smile that Mary did suddenly; therefore, the second clause means that Rose recreated the Mary's sudden smile. As a result, the sentence is understood as anomalous. The same is true of (30b). Then, the unacceptability of (30) is not because of the adjunct status of the COs but because of the type of context where the entity denoted

by a CO is recreated by another agent. (Note that this kind of context is compatible with event-independent COCs. (e.g. *I sang the aria then Tosca sang it.* (Massam (1990:164))) If the context does not establish such a situation, the *it*-pronominalization of event-dependent COs is possible as in (31).

It has now been further proven by the additional three pieces of empirical evidence that event-dependent COs are not so much adverbial adjuncts as syntactic arguments. The argument analysis of the COs, however, raises issues of whether or not they are arguments of the verbs and how their adjunct-like behavior can be accounted for. These are the topic of the next subsection.

#### 4.2. *A Conceptual Semantic Approach to Event-Dependent COs: Constructional Argument Analysis*

Given that, as discussed above, event-dependent COs are true syntactic arguments, it might be predicted that they would be semantically selected by verbs. However, this is not the case because the verbs preceding them are intransitives. I propose instead that event-dependent COs are syntactic arguments that fill in the direct object position of a constructional idiom in the sense of Jackendoff (1990, 1997); that is, they are licensed constructionally.<sup>6</sup>

A constructional idiom is generally defined as a sentence pattern not strictly predictable from properties of the head, which is uniquely associated with a particular non-compositional meaning (Jackendoff (1990, 1997); cf. Goldberg (1995)). For example, the *way*-construction, exemplified in (32), has a fixed syntactic pattern such as [V *pro*'s *way* PP] along with the specified meaning “traverse the path PP while/by doing V” (Goldberg (1995)):

- (32) a. Bill belched his way out of the restaurant.
- b. Harry moaned his way down the road.

(Jackendoff (1990:211))

As the main verbs are normally regarded as intransitive verbs, the complement structure of this construction is unusual. Therefore, the *one's way* is not a syntactic argument of the verbs but an argument licensed by the constructional idiom. Likewise, in the case of event-dependent COCs, the V-NP pattern is unpredictable from the subcategorization feature of the verb *per se*, because most of the verbs

---

<sup>6</sup> I will use the term “constructional idiom” in accord with Jackendoff (1990, 1997) rather than the “construction” to emphasize the idiomaticity of the construction under discussion and its similarity with VP idioms like *kick the bucket*. In this respect, the term “constructional idiom” is used here in a narrower sense than the “construction” in Construction Grammar (cf. Kitahara (2010:214-216)).

preceding event-dependent COs are intransitives.

In addition to the syntactic property of the verbs, there is another evidence for the constructional argument status of event dependent COs. The event-dependent COC is associated with a conventionalized meaning which does not dissolve into the meanings of constituent lexical items: a creation event in which an entity is effected through the event named by the verb. In section 3.1, we considered Matsumoto's (1996) observation that event-dependent COCs allow for either an activity or a result of activity reading. According to Höche (2009:104), the activity or the result of activity can be conceived of as a created event or a created object that comes into existence through the event named by the verb (see also Massam (1990:172-173)). For instance, *a sudden smile* in (33a) refers to the event of her smiling which comes into existence by the agent's smiling; in (33b) *his missing-toothed smile* describes an outcome of the activity, i.e. a facial expression which comes into existence on his face through the event of the agent's smiling.

- (33) a. She smiled a sudden smile. (Horita (1996:238))  
 b. Fly smiled his missing-toothed smile. (BNC CRE)

Even if verbs such as *smile* in themselves do not express creation, whole event-dependent COCs describe events of creation, and event-dependent COs denote created events or objects. The non-compositional meaning of creation can be viewed as a conventionalized, idiomatic meaning which is tied with the event-dependent type of COC.

If event-dependent COs are indeed constructionally licensed arguments, they should be differentiated from arguments selected by verbs. This prediction is empirically justified by two kinds of data. First, event-dependent COs cannot be coordinated with the direct object selected by a verb:

- (34) a. \* John nodded his head and a sudden nod.  
 b. ... they had more money and built *a gallery and a huge house* in front of it.  
 (BNC ED9, my italics)

As in (34a), coordinating the verbal argument *his head* with the event-dependent CO *a sudden nod* is ruled out. This is highly contrastive with the case of coordinated subcategorized objects in (34b). Since NPs of the same role in the sentence are conjoinable, the consequence in (34a) tells us that event-dependent COs are qualitatively distinct from verbal arguments.

Second, another piece of evidence that event-dependent COs are not verbal

arguments but constructional arguments stems from nominalization. According to Carrier and Randall (1992), process *-ing* nominalization can be used as a diagnostic to attest whether or not a given postverbal NP is the direct object selected by the verb. The NP introduced by *of* (i.e. the *of*-NP) is restricted to either (i) the underlying direct object of the base verb, or (ii) an adjunct such as a time adverbial *the 1990s* (italics theirs):

- (35) a. For New Year's Eve parties, the slicing *of the cheese* alone often takes two hours.  
 b. The quick cooking *of the 1990s* requires a microwave.  
 (Carrier and Randall (1992:199))

Applying this diagnostic to event-dependent COs, it turns out that they cannot occupy the *of*-NP position, as shown in (36):

- (36) a. \* Mary's smiling of a beautiful smile  
 b. \* Obama's laughing of a hearty laugh

This demonstrates that event-dependent COs are neither direct objects selected by verbs nor adverbial adjuncts. Intriguingly enough, in terms of *-ing* nominalization they correspond to the fixed arguments of constructional idioms like *blow off some steam* and *drink oneself sick*:

- (37) a. \* Your blowing off of some steam surprised us. (Fraser (1970:23))  
 b. \* The drinking of oneself sick is commonplace in one's freshman year.  
 (Carrier and Randall (1992:201))

Thus, event-dependent COs are constructional arguments, not verbal arguments. Event-dependent COCs as constructional idioms have in common the form of [<sub>VP</sub> V NP] and denote creation events.

Given the above analysis, I would like to formulate the correspondence between the syntactic and semantic structures of event-dependent COCs in the framework of Conceptual Semantics (Jackendoff (1990), among others). Conceptual Semantics is a semantic theory which encodes linguistic meanings in terms of the structured semantic representation called *conceptual structure*. Using function-argument pairs, conceptual structure can represent semantic structures in a compositional way and well capture a variety of form-meaning correspondences.

Recall now that event-dependent COs denote created events or objects, as

considered in (33). Let us first consider the case in which the event-dependent CO receives a created-event reading. In this case, the form-meaning pairing of the event-dependent COC can be represented using the syntactic structure (SS) and conceptual structure (CS) as follows:<sup>7, 8</sup>

(38) *Mary smiled a sudden smile.*

SS: [<sub>S</sub> Mary<sub>1</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> smiled [<sub>NP</sub> a sudden smile]<sub>2</sub>]]

CS: CAUSE ([<sub>Event</sub> SMILE (MARY<sub>1</sub>)], BECOME (BE ([<sub>Event</sub> SMILE;  
SUDDEN]<sub>2</sub>, [<sub>Property</sub> IN-EXISTENCE])))

The CS representation in (38) consists of two subevents: (i) Mary's smiling and (ii) her sudden smile coming into existence. Creation events in general are taken to have complex event structures which consist of two subevents: the agent's activity and the concurrent appearance of an entity (cf. Dowty (1979)). For example, the event of *John built a house* divides into the activity of John's building and the appearance of a house. The former subevent causes the latter subevent. The CS in (38) is based on this generally assumed template for creation events. All in all, ignoring the tense, the CS indicates that Mary's smiling causes the event of her smiling suddenly to come into existence.

Next, let us turn to the case of the CO as a created object. The syntactic and conceptual structures can be represented as follows:

(39) *Fly smiled his missing-toothed smile.*

SS: [<sub>S</sub> Fly<sub>1</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> smiled [<sub>NP</sub> his missing-toothed smile]<sub>2</sub>]]

CS: CAUSE ([<sub>Event</sub> SMILE (FLY<sup>α</sup><sub>1</sub>)], BECOME (BE ([<sub>Thing</sub> SMILE;  
MISSING-TOOTHED; α]<sub>2</sub>, [<sub>Property</sub> IN-EXISTENCE])))

The Greek letter α in the CS is used to mark the conceptual binding relation, which indicates an identification between one conceptual constituent and another: here the causer FLY, the binder, is identified as the possessor of the created smile (i.e. the referent of *his*), the bindee. Note here that, in contrast to (38), what is created in the lower subevent is a physical object of a smile, which is marked by the ontological category of Thing. This representation describes the meaning of the

<sup>7</sup> The notation which I use here for the CS is a simplified version of the notation developed by Jackendoff (1990) (see also Levin and Rappaport (1995)).

<sup>8</sup> In (38), *Event* and *Property* in the brackets are ontological categories of concepts. The subscripts 1 and 2 are used to express the correspondence relations between the syntactic and conceptual constituents. The semicolon in [<sub>Event</sub> SMILE; SUDDEN] indicates a modification relation: [A; B] means that B is a modifier of A.



COC as “Fly’s smiling causes his missing-toothed smile to come into existence.”

The representations in (38) and (39) capture the constructional semantics of event-dependent COCs but still remain unclear about the semantic relationship between the verb and its CO. According to Kitahara (2007, 2010), an event-dependent CO further specifies the notion that is implied by the meaning of the verb. This means that the denotation of a CO is (partly) identical to the verbal event. In other words, the event-dependent CO denotes a created event or object which is identifiable as the verbal event. The relationship between the verb and the CO is presumably essential for the concept of event-dependency. This relationship can be incorporated into the CS representations in (38) and (39) as in:

- (40) a. CAUSE ([SMILE (MARY)]<sup>α</sup>, BECOME (BE ([<sub>Event</sub> α; SUDDEN],  
[IN-EXISTENCE])))  
b. CAUSE ([SMILE (FLY<sup>β</sup>)]<sup>α</sup>, BECOME (BE ([<sub>Thing</sub> OUTCOME-OF α;  
MISSING-TOOTHED; β], [IN-EXISTENCE])))

For illustration purpose, the semantics of the verbs (and their agent arguments) is underlined, while the meanings of the COs are marked by dotted lines. Using the notation of conceptual binding, these representations capture the relations between the verbal meanings and the referents of the event-dependent COs.

Based on (40), the SS/CS representation of event-dependent COCs is now generalized as follows:<sup>9</sup>

- (41) *Event-Dependent COC* (the first approximation)  
SS: [<sub>VP</sub> V<sub>C</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> Det Adj N<sub>C</sub>]<sub>2</sub>]  
CS: i. CAUSE ([MOVE (X<sub>1</sub>)]<sup>α</sup>, BECOME (BE ([<sub>Event</sub> α]<sub>2</sub>,  
[IN-EXISTENCE])))  
ii. CAUSE ([MOVE (X<sub>1</sub>)]<sup>α</sup>, BECOME (BE ([<sub>Thing</sub> OUTCOME-OF α]<sub>2</sub>,  
[IN-EXISTENCE])))

(41) says that the event-dependent CO has the structure of an NP in the SS and its paired CS, [<sub>Event</sub> α] or [<sub>Thing</sub> OUTCOME-OF α]. In the created-event reading, the CS of the CO is identical to that of the verb. In the created-object reading, the CS corresponds to one which embeds the verbal meaning in the argument position of

<sup>9</sup> In the SS representation, adopting the notation used in Kitahara (2010), I use the index *c* to express the cognateness between the verb and the noun. In the CS, the MOVE-function is a representation for verbs denoting activities or processes (Jackendoff (1990:89)) and takes the agent as a single argument X, which is linked to the underspecified subject NP in the SS.

OUTCOME-OF.<sup>10</sup> The identification between the semantic structures of the verb and of its CO is a reflection of the event-dependency couched by Kitahara (2010). In sum, the representation in (41) for the event-dependent type of COC captures two crucial features of the constructional semantics: (i) the COC denotes a creation event and (ii) the semantics of the CO is (partly) identical to the verbal semantics.

The constructional argument analysis developed here can give a natural explanation for the apparent adjuncthood of event-dependent COs, especially for the incompatibility with strong determiners and the adverbial interpretation of the adjectival modifier. First of all, the incompatibility with strong determiners can be accounted for by the constructional meaning of creation. In general, strong determiners presuppose that the referent of the quantified NP must already exist or is supposed to exist contextually (Moltmann (2006), among others). For example, *John might publish every book* presupposes a set of books in the preceding context (Moltmann (2006:180)). However, event-dependent COs denote entities that are newly created, so they inherently contradict with such presuppositions triggered by strong determiners.

(42) \* John screamed {this scream / every scream} we heard today. (= (15b))

Screams are unlikely to be recognized as presupposed types, therefore being incompatible with strong determiners.

Next, the adverbial function of event-dependent COs can be drawn from their status as constructional arguments: the adjective modifying a fixed argument of an idiom can potentially be interpreted as an adverbial. According to Jackendoff (1990), adjectives in the idiom *take advantage of* and the *way*-construction, which modify the fixed arguments, can be interpreted adverbially. Consider (43), which can be paraphrased as (44) (my italics):

(43) a. Officials doubt that many customers took *unfair* advantage of the situation... (New York Times, March 20, 1993)

b. Bill belched his *miserable* way out of the restaurant. (Jackendoff (1990:217))

(44) a. Officials doubt that many customers *unfairly* took advantage of the situation...

b. Bill went *miserably* out of the restaurant, belching. (Jackendoff (1990:217))

---

<sup>10</sup> The two CS representations for event-dependent COs are related to each other in a metonymic relationship (cf. Höche (2009)). See Höche (2009) and Kitahara (2010) for the relation between the different types of CO.

Since event-dependent COs are also constructional arguments, it follows from the present analysis that the adjectival modifier in (4a), reproduced as (45), can be interpreted as an adverbial modifying the whole event.

- (45) Bill sighed a weary sigh.  
= Bill sighed wearily.

Thus, the constructional argument analysis of event-dependent COs explains the apparently adverbial-like behavior, the incompatibility with strong determiners, on the one hand, and the adverbial interpretation of the adjectival modifier, on the other. What remains unsolved is the problem of unpassivizability of event-dependent COs. As has often been observed, passivized event-dependent COs are in most cases unacceptable as in (46). However, my analysis cannot yet account for the unacceptability; in fact, it is possible to passivize the constructional argument in the resultative construction and the object NP denoting a created entity, as in (47):

- (46) a. \* A silly smile was smiled by Sam. (= (19a))  
b. \* A gruesome death was died by John. (Jones (1988:91))  
(47) a. We were talked into a stupor by Tara. (Jackendoff (1997:544))  
b. The house was built by Thomas Underwood of Dunsfold... (BNC AB4)

If, as proposed above, event-dependent COs are true syntactic arguments and licensed constructionally, they should be subject to passivization as with (47). Hence, the ungrammaticality in (46) must be explained by another property of event-dependent COs that we have not observed yet.

#### 4.3. *Unpassivizability of Event-Dependent COs*

To explain the unpassivizability of event-dependent COs, an observation by Massam (1990) is worth considering. She points out that the possessor pronoun modifying an event-dependent CO must be coreferential with the agent NP:

- (48) a. Gabriel sneezed {a / his / \*her} hefty sneeze. (Massam (1990:173))  
b. She slept {her / \*his} sound sleep. (Horita (1996:234))

Massam accounts for this obligatory coreference by assuming that the CO is a “copy” of the verbal event derived by a lexical rule. By virtue of the copy operation, the variable within the copied event, i.e. the possessor, must be coreferential with the agent of the entire event (Massam (1990:174)).

On the basis of this observation, Massam (1990) posits in the syntactic structure an (implicit) bound pronoun which must refer back to the antecedent NP in the same clause. Under Massam's analysis, the unpassivizability of event-dependent COs is due to this (implicit) bound pronoun. In general, no possessive NP in the passive subject position is allowed to establish coreference with the antecedent NP in the *by*-phrase, as in (49).

- (49) a. \* His<sub>i</sub> mother is loved by John<sub>i</sub>. (cf. John<sub>i</sub> loves his<sub>i</sub> mother.)  
 b. \* His<sub>i</sub> role was played by John<sub>i</sub>. (cf. John<sub>i</sub> played his<sub>i</sub> role.)  
 (Zubizarreta (1985:255-256), with slight modifications)

In other words, the bound pronoun fails to be coreferential with the antecedent if it appears in the passive subject position. This results in the violation of the obligatory coreference shown in (48). Following this analysis, the syntactic structure of example (46a) will be analyzed as follows:

- (50) \* A silly smile was smiled by Sam.  
 [<sub>S</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> (pro<sub>i</sub>) A silly smile] [<sub>VP</sub> was smiled by Sam<sub>i</sub>]]

Massam's (1990) idea of positing a bound pronoun is worth pursuing and can be incorporated into the present analysis. Following her idea, I will modify the representation in (41) to include a bound pronoun, which blocks passivization like:

- (51) *Event-Dependent COC* (the final version)  
 SS: [<sub>VP</sub> V [<sub>NP</sub> (pro<sub>3</sub>) Det Adj N]<sub>2</sub>]  
 CS:i. CAUSE ([MOVE (X <sup>$\beta$</sup> <sub>1</sub>)] <sup>$\alpha$</sup> , BECOME (BE ([<sub>Event</sub> [ $\alpha$ : MOVE ( $\beta$ <sub>3</sub>)]<sub>2</sub>,  
 [IN-EXISTENCE]])))  
 ii. CAUSE ([MOVE (X <sup>$\beta$</sup> <sub>1</sub>)] <sup>$\alpha$</sup> , BECOME (BE ([<sub>Thing</sub> OUTCOME-OF  
 [ $\alpha$ : MOVE ( $\beta$ <sub>3</sub>)]<sub>2</sub>, [IN-EXISTENCE]])))

Even though Massam assumes the bound pronoun as the product of a lexical rule being applied to the COC, I assume here that it is derived from the constructionally specified meaning, i.e. the event-dependency between the verbal event and the referent of the CO. The important point captured by the representation in (51) is that the possessor  $\beta_3$  in the CS corresponds to the bound pronoun *pro*<sub>3</sub> in the SS. This correspondence relation reflects the idea that the occurrence of the bound pronoun is deeply associated with the constructional meaning of the event-dependent COC.

To summarize, the passivization of event-dependent COs is ruled out due to the occurrence of a bound pronoun, which is associated with the constructional meaning of the event-dependent COC. Now, the answer to the question raised in (26a) can be given as follows:

- (52) *If event-dependent COs are not adverbial adjuncts, what is the exact syntactic status of them?*

The event-dependent CO is a syntactic argument licensed as a part of a constructional idiom; it contains a bound pronoun which blocks its passivization.

It will be shown in the next section that the analysis presented here will play a significant role in explaining the passivization of event-dependent COs.

## 5. Passivized Event-Dependent COCs and the Discourse Function

In this section, I will turn to the question in (26b): what licenses the passivization of event-dependent COs? First of all, reconsider the relevant examples of passivized event-dependent COCs:

- (53) a. Pictures were taken, *laughs were laughed*, food was eaten.  
 b. And the crowd responded with such outpourings of enthusiasm as I have never before witnessed. *Screams were screamed, cheers cheered, sighs sighed*, underwear thrown.  
 c. I started running towards the hospital. Once I was in front of Isabella's room I knocked softly. *A soft cough was coughed*. "Come in." Isabella said softly.  
 d. Crew is recruited, sails are set and sounds are crossed. Harbors are entered and pools are swum. Many meals are eaten and *long sleeps are slept*.

As a matter of fact, these examples are rare in number on the corpora (cf. Höche (2009:178)). In addition, the relevant passive sentences are less acceptable if they are out of the contexts, according to my informants. In these respects, it may safely be said that these passives of event-dependent COCs are exceptionally licensed cases.

What deserves particular notice in (53) is that the examples lack the agentive *by*-phrase. Interestingly, if it is overtly realized on the surface, the acceptability of the sentences is quite degraded (Kuno and Takami (2004:128), italics mine):



(53), the passage as a whole describes a series of events that happened or happens in the described situation. The passivized COC conveys one of the events. In addition, in (53a), (53b), and (53d), the neighboring sentences are also passivized with the agentive *by*-phrase unexpressed and stand in contrast with each other. In a word, this passage reports the occurrence of a sequence of events in the scene; the relevant COC describes one of the events, which constitutes a part of the scene description.

This kind of discourse function, the function of reporting an event that newly happens, is the very characteristic of so-called presentational sentences (Bolinger (1977), among others). Presentational sentences can be defined as follows (cf. Lambrecht (1994:144)):

(57) The Presentational Sentence:

The sentence which introduces an event or an entity into the discourse without linking it either to an already established topic or to some presupposed proposition

Whether a given sentence is presentational or not is diagnosed by the following question-answer test adapted from Lambrecht (1994:223):

(58) A: What happened?

B: My CAR broke down.

The question *what happened?* does not presuppose anything in the preceding context, except the information that something happened. The answer in (58) presents the breakdown of the speaker's car as a striking event enough to report. In this case, the answer functions as a presentational sentence, and its overall meaning is in focus in the discourse (e.g. Lambrecht (1994)). Applying this to the COCs in (53), the results confirming their presentational status are available as follows:

(59) a. A: What happened?

B: Laughs were laughed.

b. A: What happened?

B: Screams were screamed, cheers cheered, sighs sighed.

Thus, the passivized event-dependent COCs function as presentational sentences.

In light of this observation, the non-agentivity of passivized event-dependent COCs can be drawn from the interaction between the presentational function and the

constructional semantics of event-dependent COCs. First, as noted above, presentational sentences introduce a new referent into discourse context. In conformity with this function, presentational sentences are cross-linguistically compatible with verbs of appearance or existence, such as *be*, *live*, *arrive*, and *have* (e.g. Lambrecht (1994:180), Bresnan (1994:83), Levin and Rappaport (1995)). In other words, the core meaning of presentational sentences is appearance or existence of a newly introduced referent, and the very meaning is discourse-functionally focused on.

Next, as in (51), I have analyzed event-dependent COs as denoting created events or objects and event-dependent COCs as inherently conveying events of creation. The events of creation, as mentioned above, can be viewed as complex events consisting of two subevents: the agent's activity and the appearance of an entity. The second subevent is related to the referents of event-dependent COs.

Then, if the presentational function focuses on the appearance (or existence) of an event or entity, the second subevent, the referent of the CO's coming into existence, will be the most prominent, focused part in the sentential meaning. For instance, in the case of *laughs were laughed* in (53a), what is focused on is that the event of laughing or the sounds of laughter come into existence. Based on the CS in (51), the interaction between the semantic structure of event-dependent COCs and the discourse function of presentational sentences can be informally stated as below:

- (60) *Laughs were laughed.*  
 CAUSE ([LAUGH ( $\phi^\beta$ )] BECOME (BE [LAUGH ( $\beta$ )], IN-EXISTENCE))  
 <Focus by the Presentational Function>

In (60), the BECOME-function and its argument, denoting the appearance of laughs, are focused on by the presentational function. Concomitantly, the agent of the event is out of the focused domain, as indicated here by the shaded part. Hence it is discourse-functionally backgrounded in the relevant event, whereby it is suppressed from the representation at the discourse level. The passivization of the event-dependent COCs in (53) is thus licensed by the interaction between the constructional semantics and the presentational function.

This interaction between semantics and discourse function is independently evidenced by the Locative Inversion Construction (i.e. LIC) with a passive verb:

- (61) a. Among the guests of honor was seated my mother.  
 b. In this rainforest can be found the reclusive lyrebird.

(Bresnan (1994:78))



LICs also have a presentational function: they introduce or reintroduce the logical subject in the sentence-final position as a new entity into the discourse (see Bresnan (1994) and the references cited therein). For example, LICs are inconsistent with sentence negation by nature, as in (62). This is because the appearance or existence of an entity is negated and thereby the negation comes into conflict with the presentational function. The same holds for event-dependent COCs, as in (63):

- (62) a.?\*Among the guests of honor was {not / never} seated my mother.  
 b.?\*Into the room {did not run / never ran} a mouse.
- (63) ??Strangely, the crowd sat in silence today. *Screams were never screamed, cheers never cheered, sighs never sighed, underwear never thrown.*

From these examples, it is clear that LICs have a presentational function as with passivized event-dependent COCs.

Interestingly enough, the agent suppression also holds true with passive LICs: neither the agentive *by*-phrase nor agentive adverbs can co-occur with them:

- (64) a.??Among the guests of honor was seated my mother by my friend Rose.  
 b.??In this rainforest can be found the reclusive lyrebird by a lucky hiker.  
 (Bresnan (1994:78-79))
- (65) a.\* Out of the room walked a man with long hair *deliberately*.  
 b.\* Into the room walked a man *slowly*.  
 (Nishihara (1999:395))

The ungrammaticality shown in (64, 65) is quite parallel to the case of the COCs:

- (66) a.??Laughs were laughed *by (the) people*. (= (54a))  
 b.\* Screams were screamed, cheers cheered, sighs sighed *deliberately*. (= (55))

The fact that the agent suppression holds for LICs indicates the close association between the presentational function and the non-agentivity, which independently bears out my analysis of event-dependent COCs.

It is by now clear how the passivized event-dependent COs are licensed: the presentational function focuses on the appearance of a created event/object in the CS, while the agent, which is out of focus, is suppressed at the discourse-functional level. Then, here is my answer to the question in (26b):

- (67) *What licenses the passivization of event-dependent COs?*



focuses on the occurrence of an entity.

## REFERENCES

- Bolinger, Dwight (1977) *Meaning and Form*, Longman, London, New York.
- Bresnan, Joan (1994) "Locative Inversion and the Architecture of Universal Grammar," *Language* 70-1, 72-131.
- British National Corpus* [BNC].
- Carrier, Jill and Janet H. Randall (1992) "The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 23-2, 173-234.
- Dowty, David (1979) *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*, D. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Felser, Claudia and Anja Wanner (2001) "The Syntax of Cognate and Other Unselected Objects," *Structural Aspects of Semantically Complex Verbs*, eds. by Nicole Dehé and Anja Wanner, 105-130, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Fraser, Bruce (1970) "Idioms within a Transformational Grammar," *Foundations of Language* 6-1, 22-42.
- Goldberg, Adele (1995) *Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Höche, Silke (2009) *Cognate Object Constructions in English: A Cognitive-Linguistic Account*, Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen, Tübingen.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson (1980) "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse," *Language* 56-2, 251-299.
- Horita, Yuko (1996) "English Cognate Object Constructions and Their Transitivity," *English Linguistics* 13, 221-247.
- Iwasaki, Shin-ya (2007) "A Cognitive Analysis of English Cognate Objects," *Constructions* 1, 1-40, [<http://www.constructions online.de>].
- Iwata, Seizi (2008) *Locative Alternation: A Lexical-Constructional Approach*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam; Philadelphia.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1990) *Semantic Structures*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1997) "Twistin' the Night Away," *Language* 73, 534-559.
- Jones, Michael A. (1988) "Cognate Objects and the Case-Filter," *Journal of Linguistics* 24, 89-110.
- Kitahara, Ken-ichi (2006) "Gendai Eigo ni okeru Douzoku Mokutekigo Koubun no Jittai – Koubun-Bunpouteki Kanten kara (The Nature of Cognate Object Constructions in Present-day English: From the Perspective of Construction Grammar)," *Eigo Gohou Bunpou Kenkyu (English Grammar and Usage)* 13, 51-65, Kaitakusha, Tokyo.
- Kitahara, Ken-ichi (2007) "On the Predicative Cognate Object Construction and the Adjunct Resultative Construction: A Construction Grammar Approach to Language Universals," *Tsukuba English Studies* 26, 67-90.
- Kitahara, Ken-ichi (2010) *English Cognate Object Constructions and Related Phenomena: A*

- Lexical-Constructional Approach*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Tsukuba.
- Kuno, Susumu and Ken-ichi Takami (2004) *Functional Constraints in Grammar: On the Unergative-Unaccusative Distinction*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam; Philadelphia.
- Lambrecht, Knut (1994) *Information Structure and Sentence Form: A Theory of Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Langacker, Ronald W. (1991) *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. II, Descriptive Application*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav (1995) *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Macfarland, Talke (1994) "Event Structure and Argument Structure in Cognate Objects," *ConSole I Proceedings*, eds. by Peter Ackema and Maaïke Schoorlemmer, 165-182, Academic Graphics, The Hague, Holland.
- Macfarland, Talke (1995) *Cognate Objects and the Argument/Adjunct Distinction in English*, Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University.
- Massam, Dianna (1990) "Cognate Objects as Thematic Objects," *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 35-2, 161-190.
- Matsumoto, Masumi (1996) "The Syntax and Semantics of the Cognate Object Construction," *English Linguistics* 13, 199-220.
- Mittwoch, Anita (1998) "Cognate Objects as Reflections of Davidsonian Event Arguments," *Events and Grammar*, ed. by Susan Rothstein, 309-332, Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Moltmann, Friederike (1989) "Nominal and Clausal Event Predicates," *CLS* 25, 300-314.
- Moltmann, Friederike (2006) "Presuppositions and Quantifier Domains," *Synthese* 149-1, 179-224.
- Nishihara, Toshiaki (1999) "On Locative Inversion and *There*-Construction," *English Linguistics* 16, 381-404.
- Rice, Sally (1987) *Towards a Cognitive Model of Transitivity*, Doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- Stowell, Timothy (1981) *Origins of Phrase Structure*, Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Yasui, Izumi (1983) "Douzoku Mokutekigo ni tsuite (On Cognate Objects)," *Gengo Jyohou* 58-3, 79-92, University of Tsukuba.
- Zubizarreta, Maria Louisa (1985) "The Relation between Morphophonology and Morphosyntax: The Case of Romance Causatives," *Linguistic Inquiry* 16-2, 247-289.

Doctoral Program in Literature and Linguistics  
 University of Tsukuba  
 ay\_ust\_et\_gok@hotmail.com